

Dear Colleagues,

Please consider this response as a contribution from Afnic, definitely not from me as a co chair. The proposals below are "strawman".

Le 08/07/2015 22:45, Jan Aart Scholte a écrit :
Hello All

Excellent, productive calls. Thank you, Leon. In response to Paul's urgings for a practical agenda for action, the main suggestions that I have taken from the first two conversations are:

Workstream 1

*to make explicit commitments regarding diversity (minimally geographical, perhaps also cultural, linguistic, age and gender) in the proposed new accountability bodies (in particular the SO/AC community empowerment mechanism and the IRP)

I agree with Jan and would propose the following :

- to set Icann into a continuous improvement path regarding diversity, ATRT reviews could be expanded into **Accountability, Transparency and Diversity Reviews**. The review team would be tasked to assess and make recommendations regarding diversity across all Icann bodies. This is a simple step, that remains flexible so that diversity remains focused on the goal of making Icann as representative as possible of the wider Internet community.

- to protect against undue influence from 1 Region in the groups, instead of imposing a strict 1 vote, 1 region rule, we could set a limit that each SO or AC could appoint (to the community council or review teams) **no more than 1/3 of its representatives from a single Region**. This ensures in the community council that no Region reaches by itself the 1/3 threshold which is sufficient to block certain votes.

*to indicate how SOs/ACs in holding the board accountable through the new community empowerment mechanism are themselves also sufficiently accountable in the exercise of these powers (partly this might be demonstrated by listing relevant points from existing SO/AC rules and procedures, partly it may be secured with new measures such as the suggested MAR or adherence to the INGO Accountability Charter)

I also agree with Jan and others we should start by listing existing mechanisms. The Mutual Accountability Roundtable is also an idea which I fully support.

I also would suggest that we set the continuous improvement loop in motion in a more formal manner. To that end, we could update the Structural Reviews of SO/ACs (as defined in article IV of the Bylaws) and transform them into **Structural Accountability and Transparency Reviews of SO/ACs**, under the Board's supervision. These reviews would lead to recommendations for improvements that would have a similar status as the AoC review team recommendations has to the Board (SO or AC MUST deliberate whether or not to implement,

and this decision can be challenged in front of the IRP).

I believe this would provide greater strength to the notion of "Mutual Accountability", and remains a simple and flexible recommendation, with very little complexity of implementation or lead time.

Best regards
Mathieu

Workstream 2

*to include in the CCWG report (and carry over into the ICG consolidated proposal) an itemised list of specific issues and objectives regarding diversity, SO/AC accountability, and staff accountability; progress towards these objectives to be evaluated two years down the line as part of the IANA transition review - this undertaking would seem to imply a continuation of the CCWG Accountability or some successor construction

No doubt others can articulate the points more precisely, but it could be helpful to have a concise synthesis to move us forward in the limited time available?

Greetings

Jan
