

[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 (special) working modalities of each SO/AC (and any subgroups).

[questions]

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.

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.

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

[The timeline for submitting the response]

Commented [1]: particular

Commented [2]: or "specific."

Commented [3]: 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 [4]: This was suggested by Alan Greenberg on the call on 6th October

Commented [5]: 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 [6]: "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 [7]: More fundamentally, it's not clear to me that individual SG/C/RALO etc. accountability falls into the remit of this Subgroup.

Commented [8]: Can we formulate the questions as follows:

- What are the published policies and procedures by which your AC/SO is accountable to the designated community that you serve, including include 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.

- 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.

To the extent that there are multiple stakeholder groups or constituencies in your AC/SO, please forward this request accordingly.

Commented [9]: agree with this framing

Commented [10]: I also agree on Giovanni's suggestions.

Commented [11]: agree

Commented [12]: Agree with Giovanni's suggestions

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.