Subject:	[CCWG-Accountability] WS1 vs WS2 recap and proposals
Date:	Monday, January 5, 2015 9:56:15 AM Central Standard Time
From:	Mathieu Weill (sent by accountability-cross-community-bounces@icann.org <accountability-cross-community-bounces@icann.org>)
To:	accountability-cross-community@icann.org

Category: Accountability

Dear Colleagues,

During our 30th December call, we had extensive discussions regarding what our group would consider work stream 1 or swork stream 2. We concluded with an action item as such :

> **ACTION:** Recap of definitions of WS1/WS2 for mailing list and discussion next week.

As Co-chairs, we have attempted to summarize the various inputs expressed on the list as well as during the calls on the matter. Below is a recap, including a proposal for discussion, inspired by the WA2 proposal, and which, in our opinion, would be a good candidate to move forward.

This is for you review at this stage before we discuss it tomorrow during the weekly call. Comments or alternate will be welcome during the call or later on this thread.

I'd like to once again thank Steve del Bianco and the WA2 team for their essential contribution to this key piece of our work.

Mathieu

Main inputs, comments and positions expressed so far regarding WS1/WS2:

> Problem statement from our Charter :

>> The concerns raised during these discussions around the transition process indicat
>> e that the existing
>> ICANN accountability mechanisms do not yet meet stakeholder expectations. Rece
>> nt statements
>> made by various stakeholders suggest that current accountability mechanisms nee
>> d to be reviewed
>> and, if need be, improved, amended, replaced, or supplemented with new mechan
>> isms (see for
>> instance ATRT recommendations). Considering that the NTIA has stressed that it is
>> expecting
>> community consensus regarding the transition, a failure to meet stakeholder expe
>> ctations with
>> regards to accountability may create a situation where NTIA does not accept the IA
>> NA transition
>> proposal as meeting its conditions. Thus reviewing ICANN's accountability mechani
>> sms was
>> considered to be crucial for the transition process.

> Work stream scopes from our Charter :

>> In the discussions around the accountability process, the CCWG-Accountability will

proceed with two Work Streams:

- **Work Stream 1** : focused on mechanisms enhancing ICANN accountability that must be in place or committed to within the time frame of the IANA Stewardship Transition;
- **Work Stream 2** : focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation may extend beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.

The CCWG-Accountability will allocate issues to Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2. Some issues may span both Work Streams.

Suggested questions to be considered as part of Work Stream 1 include, but are not limited to:

- What would be the impact of NTIA's transition of the IANA Functions Contract in ensuring ICANN's accountability and what potential accountability concerns could this cause?
- What enhancements or reforms are required to be implemented or committed to before the NTIA Stewardship Transition?
    - How will these enhancements or reforms be stress-tested?
- What enhancements or reforms must be committed to before the NTIA Stewardship Transition, but could be implemented after.
    - If the implementation of enhancements or reforms are to be deferred, how can the community be assured they will be implemented?
    - How will these enhancements or reforms be stress-tested?

Work Area 2 proposed definition of WS1/2 :

WS 1 is designated for accountability mechanisms that must be in place of rimly committed to before IANA transition occurs.
All other consensus items could be in WS2, provided **there are mechanisms in WS1 adequate for force implementation of WS2 items despite resistance from Icann management and Board.**

Paul Rosenzweig tentative defintiion of WS0 :

As a result, I think that part of what we should be doing in the long run is focusing on the core/critical 3-5 items that are absolutely essential to ensuring accountability. In short, I think there is actually a sub-category of WS1 (call it **WS0** for want of a better term) that would be fundamental red-lines for the community.

Alan Greenberg's concern :

Needs to demontrate why items in WS1 or WS2 are needed as a consequence of the NTIA transition.

Comment from Becky Burr :
Understands the community to say there were certain basic accountability mechanisms that

would enable them to feel comfortable with the IANA transition, these may not be directly related to the transition itself. What we need from WS1 is the community feels comfortable that tools are in place to continue the work to create real and meaningful accountability.

Proposal submitted for comments (to be presented and initially discussed during tomorrow's call):

WS1 mechanisms are those that, when in place or committed to, would provide the community with confidence that any accountability mechanism that would further enhance Icann's accountability would be implemented if it had consensus support from the community, even if it were to encounter Icann management resistance or if it were against the interest of Icann as a corporate entity.

```
--
***************************
Mathieu WEILL
AFNIC – directeur général
Tél: +33 1 39 30 83 06
mathieu.weill@afnic.fr
Twitter : @mathieuweill
***************************
```