

Summary Report of Public Comment Proceeding

Recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability			
Publication Date:	2 August 2017		
Prepared By:	Patrick Dodson		
Public Comment Proceeding		Important Information Links	
Open Date:	14 April 2017		
Close Date:	26 May 2017		
Staff Report Due Date:	1 July 2017		
Staff Contact: Patrick Dodson		Email:	patrick.dodson@icann.org
Section I: General Overview and Next Steps			
<p>This WS2 project is described in the CCWG Final Proposal, Recommendation 12 under Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee accountability as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Include the subject of SO and AC accountability as part of the work on the Accountability and Transparency Review process.</i>• <i>Evaluate the proposed “Mutual Accountability Roundtable” to assess viability.</i>• <i>Propose a detailed working plan on enhancing SO and AC accountability as part of WS2.</i>• <i>Assess whether the IRP would also be applicable to SO and AC activities.</i> <p>To address these requirements the sub-group separated its work into 3 tracks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Review and develop recommendations to improve SO/AC processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture.2. Evaluate the proposed “Mutual Accountability Roundtable” to assess its viability and, if viable, undertake the necessary actions to implement it.3. Assess whether the Independent Review Process (IRP) should be applied to SO/AC activities. <p>To support this work the CCWG-Accountability WS2 solicited input and documentation from each SO and AC (and from Group constituencies and stakeholders groups) in order to review and assess existing mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and participation. The draft report reflects several months of research and deliberation, starting with exploration of whom ICANN’s SO/ACs are accountable to.</p> <p>Track 1 recommendations present 25 best practice recommendations for the SO & ACs to consider implementing in the areas of Accountability, Transparency, Participation, Outreach and Updates to Policies and Procedures. Track 2 recommendations include not implementing</p>			

the Mutual Accountability Roundtable (where a minority of CCWG-Accountability WS2 members disagreed with this) while Track 3 concludes that the IRP should not be made applicable to activities of SO & ACs.

These inputs will be analyzed by the CCWG-Accountability WS2 who will consider amending its recommendations in light of the comments received and will publish a report on the results of the public consultation. If significant changes are required as a result of the public consultation the CCWG-Accountability WS2 may opt to have a second public consultation on the amended recommendations.

Section II: Contributors

At the time this report was prepared, a total of ten (10) community submissions had been posted to the forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
ALAC	Alan Greenberg	ALAC
gNSO – Business Constituency	Steve Delbianco	GNSOBC
gNSO – ISPCP	Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen	ISPCP
gNSO – NCSG	Mathew Shears	NCSG
gNSO – RySG	Stéphane Van Gelder	RYSG
Government of India	T.Santhosh	GOVIN
ICANN - Board	N/A	ICANNB
INTA	Lori Schulman	INTA
SSAC	N/A	SSAC

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
John Poole	DomainMondo.com	JP

Section III: Summary of Comments

***General Disclaimer:** This section intends to summarize broadly and comprehensively the comments submitted to this public comment proceeding but does not address every specific position stated by each contributor. The preparer recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).*

The responses to the public consultation noted a number of issues with the recommendations:

- General concern about expanding ATRT's already sizable scope.
- Concern about volunteer bandwidth to address reporting recommendations

- Concerns regarding the transparency steps outlined (public open meetings, recording meetings, publishing minutes, public mailing lists).
- Mixed responses overall, and general lack of support for a mandatory or formal round table
- Clear support for not using the IRP for resolving SOAC issues, however some respondents clearly identified the need to develop a mechanism for dealing with these types of issues.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

These inputs will be analyzed by the CCWG-Accountability WS2 who will consider amending its recommendations in light of the comments received and will publish a report on the results of the public consultation. If significant changes are required as a result of the public consultation the CCWG-Accountability WS2 may opt to have a second public consultation on the amended recommendations.