

Annex 12 – Recommendation #12: Committing to Further Accountability Work in Work Stream 2

2nd Reading CONCLUSIONS :

1. Interim Bylaws clarifications confirmed to be addressing most of the Board’s concerns (pending further confirmation by Icann Board), by highlighting that WS2 will be following similar rules as WS1 : consensus recommendations, endorsement by Chartering Orgs. ability for the Board to engage special dialogue, 2/3 threshold for such Board decisions....
2. Edits to the documents will include focus on fact that WS2 deliberations will be open to all (similar to WS1)
3. List of WS2 items is “limited to” instead of “related to”. A note is added that clarifies that further items beyond this list can be accommodated through regular review cycles, or specific CCWG.
4. Timeframe discussion : target dates are needed, but hard deadlines would not be appropriate or helpful. Document will be reviewed in line with that direction.
5. Agreed to incorporate PEG Advisor input to strengthen diversity requirement
6. Enhancing Ombudsman role and function is confirmed as a WS2 item
 1. Summary graphics has been updated (see page 4)
 2. Becky and Avri to provide a paragraph to describe the type of enhancements that will be considered (to be clarified on list)

Board comment received :

First, the Board agrees that a transitional bylaw can be used to define the Board’s commitment on WS2 matters. Second, the effort anticipated in WS2 should be performed through cross community working groups chartered by multiple groups across ICANN, effort and not all work must be done by the existing CCWG-Accountability. Third, the Board agrees that it will treat consensus based-recommendations on the limited list of WS2 topics (set out in the CCWG-Accountability’s redline) just as it will consider the consensus-based WS1 recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability. Fourth, the Board does not support the inclusion of a timeline for the required completion of WS2 efforts in the transitional Bylaw. Finally, the Board supports that the costs of WS2 must be subject to the budgetary process for the year. If the budget is exhausted and additional resources are necessary, the chartering organizations must support a request for Board consideration on additional funding.

- Formatted: Underline
- Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering
- Formatted: Font:Italic

1. Summary

- 1 The CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 is focused on addressing those accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions may extend beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.

- Deleted: <#> -
- Formatted: Font:(Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

- 2 As part of Work Stream 2, the CCWG-Accountability proposes that further enhancements be made to a number of designated mechanisms:
- Improving ICANN's transparency with a focus on:
 - Enhancements to ICANN's existing Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP).
 - Transparency of ICANN's interactions with governments.
 - Improvements to the existing whistleblower policy.
 - Access rights to ICANN documents.
 - Considering improvements to ICANN's standards for diversity at all levels.
 - Addressing jurisdiction-related questions, namely: "Can ICANN's accountability be enhanced depending on the laws applicable to its actions?" The CCWG-Accountability anticipates focusing on the question of applicable law for contracts and dispute settlements.
 - Developing and clarifying a Framework of Interpretation for ICANN's Human Rights commitment and proposed Draft Bylaw.
 - Considering enhancements to the Ombudsman's role and function.
- 3 The CCWG-Accountability expects to begin refining the scope of Work Stream 2 during the upcoming [ICANN55 Meeting](#) in March 2016. It is intended that Work Stream 2 [recommendations](#) will be [published for comments](#) by the end of 2016.
- 4 The community raised concerns that, post-transition, there may be a lack of incentive for ICANN to implement the Proposals arising out of Work Stream 2. To prevent this scenario, the CCWG-Accountability recommends that the ICANN Board adopt an Interim Bylaw that would commit ICANN to implementing the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 recommendations [according to the same process and criteria it has committed to use to consider the Work Stream 1 recommendations](#). In a [letter](#) dated 13 November 2015, the ICANN Board confirmed its intent to work with the ICANN community and to provide [adequate support](#) for work on these issues.

2. CCWG-Accountability Recommendations

- 5 The CCWG-Accountability recommends that the Board adopt an Interim Bylaw that would commit ICANN to [consider the CCWG-Accountability consensus recommendations according to the same process and criteria it has committed to use to consider the Work Stream 1 recommendations](#). [The Bylaw would task the group with creating further enhancements to ICANN's accountability limited to the Work Stream 2 list of issues:](#)
- Improving ICANN's transparency with a focus on:
 - Enhancements to ICANN's existing DIDP.
 - Transparency of ICANN's interactions with governments.
 - Improvements to the existing whistleblower policy.
 - Access rights to ICANN documents.

Comment [w1]: The document is not fully consistent. Some stakeholders require a firm commitment to this deadline

Deleted: completed

Comment [w2]: While the detailed part of the recommendation was clarifying that this was the intent, the Board concern (which specifically mentioned GPI) was that it would have to implement recommendations without the safeguards included in its October 2014 resolution.

Comment [w3]: Several comments stressed the need to secure outside legal support. Should the recommendation be more explicit ?

Deleted: implementing

Comment [w4]: While the detailed part of the recommendation was clarifying that this was the intent, the Board concern (which specifically mentioned GPI) was that it would have to implement recommendations without the safeguards included in its October 2014 resolution.

Deleted: ,

Deleted: and

Comment [w6]: As concluded during 2nd reading

Deleted: including, but not limited to,



- Considering improvements to ICANN's standards for diversity at all levels.
- Addressing jurisdiction-related questions, namely: "Can ICANN's accountability be enhanced depending on the laws applicable to its actions?" The CCWG-Accountability anticipates focusing on the question of applicable law for contracts and dispute settlements.
- Developing and clarifying a Framework of Interpretation for ICANN's Human Rights commitment and proposed Draft Bylaw.
- Considering enhancements to Ombudsman's role and function.

[The CCWG-Accountability notes that further enhancements to Iann Accountability can be accommodated through the accountability review process (see Recommendation #10) or through specific, ad hoc, cross community working group initiatives.]

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Comment [w7]: Clarification discussed during 2nd reading.

3. Detailed Explanation of Recommendations



Deleted:

6 Commenters made the observation that general accountability requirements, such as diversity and Supporting Organization (SO) and Advisory Committee (AC) accountability, were not fully addressed. Specific criteria were developed for these two key parameters:

7 Diversity

8 Comments received on prior drafts asked that concrete steps to ensure the diversity of the views, origins, and interests of the global Internet community be adequately represented through a multidimensional approach, specifically as the community becomes more empowered. While acknowledging the importance of diversity in the accountability mechanisms, commenters have also expressed the view that any diversity requirement should not prevail over skills or experience requirements.

9 The CCWG Accountability acknowledges the specific Advice received from the Public Expert Group Advisors which stresses the importance of such diversity enhancements. Maximally participatory and transparent deliberations by all affected stakeholders are necessary in order to capture diversity of views that constitute the (global) public interest in a given instance.

Comment [w9]: Following specific Advice from PEG Advisors, as discussed in 2nd reading

10 In assessing diversity, the CCWG-Accountability identified that existing mechanisms were in place for entities constituting the ICANN ecosystem. Requirements stemming from the following initiatives and governance documents were evaluated:

- [ICANN Bylaws.](#)
- [The Affirmation of Commitments.](#)
- [ATRT 1 Recommendations.](#)
- [ATRT 2 Recommendations.](#)
- Documents from each of the ICANN SOs and ACs.

11 Analysis of the above documents determined that improvements are needed. During its discussions, the CCWG-Accountability considered a non-exhaustive list of criteria and sought input on the following suggestions:

- Expanding ATRT reviews into Accountability, Transparency, and Diversity reviews.
- Establishing threshold regarding composition of each body.
- Incorporating the Structural Reviews into Structural Accountability, Transparency, and Diversity Reviews of SOs and ACs, under the Board's supervision.

12 Comments received on the Second Draft Proposal revealed that incorporating the diversity component into Accountability and Transparency reviews may overburden Review Teams. Therefore, the CCWG-Accountability recommends the following actions with the view to further enhancing ICANN's effectiveness in promoting diversity:

- Including diversity as an important element for the creation of any new structure, such as the Independent Review Process (IRP) (for diversity requirements for the panel) and the ICANN Community Forum.
- Adding Accountability, Transparency, and Diversity reviews of SOs and ACs to structural reviews as part of Work Stream 2.
- Performing, as part of Work Stream 2, a more detailed review to establish a full inventory of the existing mechanisms related to diversity for each and every ICANN group (including

Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies, Regional At-Large Organizations, the Fellowship program, and other ICANN outreach programs). After an initial review of the current documents, it became clear that they do not address the full concerns raised by the wider community on the issue of diversity.

- Identifying the possible structures that could follow, promote, and support the strengthening of diversity within ICANN.
- Carrying out a detailed working plan on enhancing ICANN diversity as part of Work Stream 2.
- Strengthening commitments to outreach and engagement in order to create a more diverse pool of ICANN participants, so that diversity is better reflected in the overall community and thus more naturally reflected in ICANN structures and leadership positions.

13 **Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee Accountability**

14 As the community's power is enhanced, legitimate concerns have arisen regarding the accountability of the community (organized as SOs and ACs) in using new Community Powers, i.e., "who watches the watchers."

15 The CCWG-Accountability reviewed existing accountability mechanisms for SOs and ACs as well as governance documents (see above). Analysis revealed that mechanisms are limited in quantity and scope. Having reviewed and inventoried the existing mechanisms related to SO and AC accountability, it is clear that current mechanisms need to be enhanced in light of the new responsibilities associated with the Empowered Community.

16 The CCWG-Accountability recommends the following:

As part of Work Stream 1:

- Include the review of SO and AC accountability mechanisms in the independent periodical structural reviews performed on a regular basis. These reviews should include consideration on the mechanisms that each SO and AC has in place to be accountable to their respective Constituencies, Stakeholder Groups, and Regional At-Large Organizations, etc.
- This recommendation can be implemented through an amendment of Section 4 of Article IV of the ICANN Bylaws, which currently states: "The goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness."

As part of the Work Stream 2:

- Include the subject of SO and AC accountability as part of the work on the Accountability and Transparency review process.
- Evaluate the proposed "Mutual Accountability Roundtable" to assess viability.

- Propose a detailed working plan on enhancing SO and AC accountability as part of Work Stream 2.
- Assess whether the IRP would also be applicable to SO and AC activities.

Transparency

17 Transparency is considered quintessential to the viability of community empowerment and its associated legal framework. As such, the CCWG-Accountability recommends reviewing the following to ensure appropriate safeguards are in place:

- Improving ICANN's transparency with a focus on:
 - **Enhancements to ICANN's existing DIDP:** The CCWG-Accountability sets an objective to review and update ICANN's DIDP within two years, with the goal of justifying denials with a specific harm and limiting the scope of non-disclosure.
 - **ICANN's interactions with governments:** The CCWG-Accountability is considering if ICANN should be required to compile and publicly post a quarterly report providing: the names of individuals acting on ICANN's behalf who have been in contact with a government official; the names and titles of such government officials; the date, nature, and purpose of those government contacts. In addition, it considers that a line item accounting of the amount ICANN spent on government engagement activities should be reported.
 - **Improvements to the existing whistleblower policy.**
 - **Transparency of Board deliberations**

Comment [w10]: Suggested addition from NCSG comment

18 Human Rights

19 To ensure that adding a draft Human Rights Bylaw into the ICANN Bylaws does not lead to an expansion of ICANN's Mission or scope, the CCWG-Accountability will develop a designated Framework of Interpretation as part of Work Stream 2 and will consider the following as it elaborates on the language to be used:

- Consider which specific Human Rights conventions or other instruments, if any, should be used by ICANN in interpreting and implementing the Draft Human Rights Bylaw.
- Consider the policies and frameworks, if any, that ICANN needs to develop or enhance in order to fulfill its commitment to Human Rights.
- Consistent with ICANN's existing processes and protocols, consider how these new frameworks should be discussed and drafted to ensure broad multistakeholder involvement in the process.
- Consider what effect, if any, this proposed Bylaw would have on ICANN's consideration of advice given by the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC).
- Consider how, if at all, this Bylaw will affect how ICANN's operations are carried out.

Comment [w11]: For consistency with following bullets which all mention "if any".

- Consider how the interpretation and implementation of this Bylaw will interact with existing and future ICANN policies and procedures.

20 Jurisdiction

- 21 Jurisdiction directly influences the way ICANN's accountability processes are structured and operationalized. The fact that ICANN today operates under the legislation of the U.S. state of California grants the corporation certain rights and implies the existence of certain accountability mechanisms. It also imposes some limits with respect to the accountability mechanisms it can adopt.
- 22 The topic of jurisdiction is, as a consequence, very relevant for the CCWG-Accountability. ICANN is a public benefit corporation incorporated in California and subject to California state laws, applicable U.S. federal laws and both state and federal court jurisdiction. ICANN is subject to a provision in paragraph eight¹ of the Affirmation of Commitments, signed in 2009 between ICANN and the U.S. Government.
- 23 ICANN's Bylaws (Article XVIII) also state that its principal offices shall be in California.
- 24 The CCWG-Accountability has acknowledged that jurisdiction is a multi-layered issue and has identified the following "layers":
- Place and jurisdiction of incorporation and operations, including governance of internal affairs, tax system, human resources, etc.
 - Jurisdiction of places of physical presence.
 - Governing law for contracts with registrars and registries and ability to sue and be sued in a specific jurisdiction about contractual relationships.
 - Ability to sue and be sued in a specific jurisdiction for action and inaction of staff, and for redress and review of Board Decisions, IRP, and other accountability and transparency issues, including the Affirmation of Commitments.
 - Relationships with the national jurisdictions for particular domestic issues (ccTLDs managers, protected names either for international institutions or country and other geographic names, national security, etc.), privacy, freedom of expression.
 - Meeting NTIA requirements.
- 25 At this point in the CCWG-Accountability's work, the main issues that need to be investigated within Work Stream 2 relate to the influence that ICANN's existing jurisdiction may have on the actual operation of policies and accountability mechanisms. This refers primarily to the process for the settlement of disputes within ICANN, involving the choice of jurisdiction and of the applicable laws, but not necessarily the location where ICANN is incorporated:

¹ 8. ICANN affirms its commitments to: (a) maintain the capacity and ability to coordinate the Internet DNS at the overall level and to work for the maintenance of a single, interoperable Internet; (b) **remain a not for profit corporation, headquartered in the United States of America with offices around the world to meet the needs of a global community**; and (c) to operate as a multi-stakeholder, private sector led organization with input from the public, for whose benefit ICANN shall in all events act.

- Consideration of jurisdiction in Work Stream 2 will focus on the settlement of dispute jurisdiction issues and include:
 - Confirming and assessing the gap analysis, clarifying all concerns regarding the multi-layer jurisdiction issue.
 - Identifying potential alternatives and benchmarking their ability to match all CCWG-Accountability requirements using the current framework.
 - Consider potential Work Stream 2 recommendations based on the conclusions of this analysis.

26 A specific Subgroup of the CCWG-Accountability will be formed to undertake this work.

27 **Considering Enhancements to Ombudsman’s Role and Function**

28 Through the enhanced Request for Reconsideration process (see Recommendation #8: Fortifying ICANN’s Request for Reconsideration Process), the CCWG-Accountability has given increased responsibility to the Ombudsman. Perceived as a key component of accountability, the CCWG-Accountability has identified further enhancements to the Ombudsman’s role and function as an area to explore in Work Stream 2.

Comment [w12]: Some commenters called for clarifications of enhancements considered.

29 **Interim Bylaw**

30 The CCWG-Accountability recommends that the Board adopt an Interim Bylaw that would commit ICANN to consider the CCWG-Accountability consensus recommendations according to the same process and criteria it has committed to use to consider the Work Stream 1 recommendations. The Bylaw would task the group with creating further enhancements to ICANN’s accountability related to the Work Stream 2 list of issues, according to process and procedures similar to those of the work stream 1 : openness to all participants, transparency of deliberations, public comment inputs...

Comment [w13]: While the detailed part of the recommendation was clarifying that this was the intent, the Board concern (which specifically mentioned GPI) was that it would have to implement recommendations without the safeguards included in its October 2014 resolution.

31
32 This Interim Bylaw must be incorporated in the ICANN Bylaws as part of Work Stream 1, prior to the IANA Stewardship Transition. This Interim Bylaw has been proposed to address concerns that, post-transition, an absence of incentives may lead to the ICANN Board dismissing the CCWG-Accountability’s proposed Work Stream 2 recommendations. However, in a [letter](#) dated 13 November 2015, the ICANN Board confirmed its intent to work with the ICANN community and to provide adequate support for work on these issues.

Comment [w14]: In Dublin, the group agreed to issue a finite list of items. The “not limited to” should have been removed. This addresses one of the Board’s concerns.

33 Enshrining the commitment to Work Stream 2 as an Interim (Transition) Bylaw provides stronger guarantees compared to an approach that would rely on a Board resolution. A Board resolution could indeed be changed by the Board itself at any time, and the composition of the Board changes over time. Also, enshrining the process and conditions within a Bylaw (even if it’s a transition article) triggers the ability for IRP challenge if the CCWG Accountability or the Board did not comply with the process or conditions described in the Bylaw.

Comment [w15]: Added as a result of 1st reading

Deleted: The CCWG-Accountability recommends that the ICANN Board adopt an Interim Bylaw that would commit ICANN to implementing the CCWG-Accountability recommendations, and task the group with creating further enhancements to ICANN’s accountability, including, but not limited to, the Work Stream 2 list of issues.

34 The language of this Interim Bylaw provision should provide that the CCWG Work Stream 2 recommendations, when supported by full consensus or consensus as described in the CCWG-Accountability Charter, and endorsed by the Chartering Organizations, be considered in a

Comment [w16]: Clarification about the rationale for an Interim Bylaw (this direction was taken during the Istanbul F2F)

Deleted: -Accountability

similar status to the work stream 1 recommendations. The ICANN Board's decision would be subject to challenge through enhanced Request for Reconsideration and Independent Review Processes.

35 The Bylaw would be consistent with the language described in the CCWG-Accountability Charter, and explicitly mention the NTIA criteria as a reference for the recommendations, as well as the requirement that recommendations are based on consensus.

36 The Bylaw would also describe the process outlined in the Icann Board's resolution of 16 October 2014 (see <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en#2.d>), such as :

- The requirement for Work Stream 2 recommendations to be consensus recommendations, endorsed by the Chartering Organizations;
- The requirement to initiate a specific dialogue in case the Board believes it is not in the global public interest to implement a recommendation, as well as the description of the steps of this dialogue
- The requirement of a 2/3 majority of the Board to determine that implementing a recommendation is not in the global public interest.

37 **Timeline**

38 The initial plan includes the following key milestones:

- March 2016 (ICANN55): Definition of scope of work and organization into Subgroups.
- March 2016 to end of June 2016: Drafting of Proposals by Subgroup, under supervision by CCWG-Accountability.
- June 2016 till early October 2016: 40-day Public Comment Period, including discussions during ICANN56 and/or ICANN57.
- October – mid-January 2017: Refinement of Proposals by Subgroups, under supervision of the CCWG-Accountability.
- Mid-January – March 2017: Second 40-day Public Comment Period, including discussions during ICANN58.
- By end of June 2017: Finalize Proposals and deliver to Chartering Organizations.
- Obtain approval and deliver Proposals to ICANN Board at ICANN58.

Comment [w17]: Clarifies that the WS1 "standard" applies to "WS2". This is consistent with the Board comment.

Deleted: recommendations

Deleted: from Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) Review Teams

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 6 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: -0.28" + Indent at: -0.17"

Comment [w18]: This section provides clarification of the intent of the CCWG, which was not clearly perceived by the Icann Board. It addresses the concerns raised in the Board's comment and provides clearer directions for implementation (Bylaw drafting).

Deleted: <#> .

Comment [w19]: The timeframe is inconsistent across the document (June 17 or Dec 16 ?) Requires discussion on :
 - Appropriate timeline
 - Need of a firm deadline ?

4. Changes from the "Second Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations"

39 Public comments revealed that a review of staff accountability should not be pursued. The development of a designated Framework of Interpretation for the proposed Human Rights Bylaw and expansion of the transparency-related issues are also noteworthy changes. The proposed solution of incorporating a review of diversity into Affirmation of Commitment-mandated Accountability and Transparency reviews was removed.

5. Stress Tests Related to this Recommendation

- ST1
- ST2
- ST11

6. How does this meet the CWG-Stewardship Requirements?

- N/A

7. How does this address NTIA Criteria?

40 **Support and enhance the multistakeholder model.**

- In-depth review of diversity and SO and AC accountability is planned for Work Stream 2.
 - Addition of an Interim Bylaw will secure Work Stream 2 towards enhancing the general accountability framework.
-

41 **Maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet DNS.**

- Accountability of SO and AC structures and their components will help ensure one entity cannot singlehandedly change or block a process.
 - Addressing the question of applicable law for contracts and dispute settlements.
-

42 **Meet the needs and expectation of the global customers and partners of the IANA services.**

- Analysis of transparency will help contribute to ensuring visibility is given into operations of ICANN.
 - Development of a Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights Bylaw will help maintain limited scope of ICANN's Mission.
-

43 **Maintain the openness of the Internet.**

- Consolidating, enhancing diversity and SO and AC accountability.
-

44 **NTIA will not accept a proposal that replaces the NTIA role with a government-led or an inter-governmental organization solution**

- Transparency of interactions with governments is flagged as a topic to further explore.
-