

[preamble]

The newly-adopted ICANN bylaws created several Work Stream 2 accountability subgroups. This subgroup is responsible for reviewing how each SO and AC is accountable to its designated community, and potentially to global Internet stakeholders as well. The background and progress for this group are described [here](#).

The new Bylaws charge our subgroup with reviewing and developing recommendations relating to "Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee accountability, including but not limited to improved processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture". Moreover, the CCWG-Accountability has recommended that the group "Develop a detailed working plan on enhancing SO and AC accountability taking into consideration the comments made during the public comment period on the Third Draft Proposal."

To that end, we are asking each AC and SO chair to point us to resources and documents used to maintain accountability to your respective designated community, taking into account the particular or specific working modalities of each SO/AC (and any subgroups).

[questions - Based on Giovanni's Reformulation]

- What are the published policies and procedures by which your AC/SO is accountable to the designated community that you serve, including procedures to encourage participation by that designated community, and transparency about your AC/SO deliberations, decisions, [eligibility](#), and elections?  
Please include link where they can be consulted.

The designated community of each AC/SO has been defined in ICANN bylaws. Please comment on whether you would validate or expand the bylaws definition.

- Were these policies and procedures updated over the past decade? If so, could you clarify if they were updated to respond to specific community requests/concerns?

- Do your AC/SO have mechanisms by which your members can challenge or appeal decisions and elections? Please include link where they can be consulted.

- Do your AC/SO maintain unwritten policies that are relevant to this exercise? If so, please describe as specifically as you are able.

[questions proposed by Steve DelBianco]

The designated community of each AC/SO is defined in ICANN bylaws:

ALAC is "the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual internet users"

**Commented [1]:** Based on the comments we received during our last call, we need to define eligibility.

ASO is "the entity established by the Memorandum of Understanding [2004] between ICANN and the Number Resource Organization ("NRO"), an organization of the existing RIRs"

ccNSO is "ccTLD managers that have agreed to be members of ccNSO"

GAC is "open to all national governments (and Distinct Economies upon invitation)"

GNSO is "Open to registries, registrars, commercial stakeholders (BC, IPC, ISPCP), and non-commercial stakeholders"

RSSAC "members shall be appointed by the Board" to "advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System"

SSAC members are "appointed by ICANN board" to "advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems."

Please comment and/or provide links to:

Your interpretation of the designated community defined in the Bylaws. For example, do you view your designated community more broadly or narrowly than the Bylaws definition?

Your policies and efforts in outreach to individuals and organizations in your designated community who do not yet participate in your AC/SO.

Your policies and procedures to determine whether individuals or organizations are eligible to participate in your meetings, discussions, working groups, elections, and approval of policies and positions.

[To the extent that there are multiple stakeholder groups or constituencies in your AC/SO, please forward this request (as appropriate.)

Please point us to any published policies and procedures by which your AC/SO is accountable to the designated community that you serve.

The designated community of each AC/SO has been defined in ICANN bylaws. Please comment on whether you would validate or expand the bylaws definition.

**Commented [2]:** Alan Greenberg suggested to replace accordingly with as appropriate. on 6th October meeting.

**Commented [3]:** It's not clear from this question whether the individual stakeholder groups and constituencies are expected to answer this question with regard to (a) the SO or AC as a whole, (b) the particular stakeholder group or constituency, or (c) other stakeholder groups and constituencies within that SO, or more than one of the above. This needs to be clear before this goes out.

**Commented [4]:** "Stakeholder Group" and "Constituency" are terms specific to the GNSO. Other SO/ACs have subparts with different terminology (e.g., RALOs). This should be rephrased to take all of these into account, either by being more general or being more complete.

**Commented [5]:** More fundamentally, it's not clear to me that individual SG/C/RALO etc. accountability falls into the remit of this Subgroup.

**Commented [6]:** Does this refer to the actual members of a given SO/AC/SG/C/RALO or to the global community? Shouldn't this be differentiated? Being accountable to membership is not the same thing as being accountable to, e.g., all Internet end users or all ISPs.

**Commented [7]:** It refers to the community they serve. that community is defined in the bylaws. Designated community includes non members/ stakeholders that do not participate. But I think what should be clear here that accountability of SO/AC to the nonmembers and external stakeholder groups should be limited to: outreach and ease of participation (entry barrier).

This could include procedures to encourage participation by that designated community, and transparency about AC/SO deliberations, decisions, eligibility, and elections.

Please describe any mechanisms by which your members can challenge or appeal decisions and elections, and the criteria used to resolve those challenges.

If you also maintain unwritten policies that are relevant to this exercise, please describe as specifically as you are able.

[The timeline for submitting the response]

We request a response by 1-Nov-2016 or sooner, so that our team can begin its review and assessment tasks. Please be assured that the recommendations that will be submitted to the CCWG-Accountability by the subgroup for enhancing the accountability of SO/ACs will not be finalized without first consulting with the SO and ACs that have chartered the CCWG.