

**CCWG-Accountability:
Using Stress Tests to evaluate existing and proposed accountability measures**

An essential part of our CCWG Charter calls for stress testing of accountability enhancements in both work stream 1 and 2. Among deliverables listed in the Charter are:

Identification of contingencies to be considered in the stress tests
 Review of possible solutions for each Work Stream including stress tests against identified contingencies. The CCWG-Accountability should consider the following methodology for stress tests

- analysis of potential weaknesses and risks
- analysis existing remedies and their robustness
- definition of additional remedies or modification of existing remedies
- description how the proposed solutions would mitigate the risk of contingencies or protect the organization against such contingencies

CCWG-Accountability must structure its work to ensure that stress tests can be (i) designed (ii) carried out and (iii) its results being analyzed timely before the transition.

In addition, the CCWG chairs has asked our work party to consider this yes/no question:

While this is not a gating factor, is the threat directly related to the transition of the IANA stewardship?

CCWG Work Team 4 gathered an inventory of contingencies identified in prior public comments. That document was posted to the wiki at <https://community.icann.org/display/acctcrosscomm/ST-WP+---+Stress+Test+Work+Party>

In Singapore, the work party drafted several examples of using these stress tests evaluate existing and proposed accountability measures:

Stress test category V. Failure of Accountability to External Stakeholders.

Stress Test	Existing Accountability Remedies	CCWG Proposed Accountability Measures
14. ICANN or NTIA choose to terminate the Affirmation of Commitments. (AoC) Consequence: ICANN would no longer be held to its Affirmation commitments, including the conduct of community reviews and required implementation of review team recommendations.	As long as NTIA controls the IANA contract, ICANN would not unilaterally terminate the AoC. But as a result of IANA stewardship transition, ICANN would no longer need to adhere to AoC in order to retain IANA contract with NTIA.	One proposed mechanism is community challenge to a board decision, referring it to an Independent Review Panel (IRP) with the power to issue a binding decision. If ICANN canceled the AoC, the IRP mechanism could reverse that decision. Note that an IRP could not prevent NTIA from unilaterally canceling the AoC. Another proposed measure is to import AoC provisions into the ICANN bylaws, and dispense with the bilateral AoC with NTIA. Bylaws would be amended to include AoC commitments 3, 4, 7, and 8, plus the 4 periodic reviews required in paragraph 9. If ICANN’s board proposed to amend/remove these bylaws provisions, another proposed measure would empower the community to veto that proposed bylaws change.
Conclusions: This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship	Existing remedies are inadequate.	Proposed remedies are adequate.

Stress test category IV. Failure of Accountability

Stress Test	Existing Accountability Remedies	CCWG Proposed Accountability Measures
<p>16. ICANN engages in programs not necessary to achieve its limited technical mission. For example, uses fee revenue or reserve funds to expand its scope beyond its technical mission, through grants for developing nations or other causes. Consequence: ICANN has the power to determine fees charged to TLD applicants, registries, registrars, and registrants, so it presents a large target for any Internet-related cause seeking funding sources.</p>	<p>As long as NTIA controls the IANA contract, ICANN would risk losing IANA functions if it were to expand scope without community support. But as a result of IANA stewardship transition, ICANN would no longer need to limit its scope order to retain IANA contract with NTIA.</p> <p>Community was not informed or supportive of ICANN Board’s secret resolution to initiate government negotiations to create NetMundial. There was no apparent way for the community to challenge or reverse this decision to expand ICANN scope.</p>	<p>One proposed measure is empowering the community to veto ICANN’s proposed annual budget. This measure could block a proposal by ICANN to increase its expenditure on initiatives the community believed were beyond ICANN’s limited mission.</p> <p>Another proposed mechanism is community challenge to a board decision, referring it to an Independent Review Panel (IRP) with the power to issue a binding decision. If ICANN made a commitment or expenditure outside the annual budget process, the IRP mechanism could reverse that decision.</p> <p>Another proposed measure is to amend ICANN bylaws to prevent the organization from expanding scope beyond what is needed for SSR in DNS operations.</p> <p>If ICANN’s board proposed to amend/remove these bylaws provisions, another proposed measure would empower the community to veto that proposed bylaws change.</p>
<p>Conclusions: This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p>	<p>Existing remedies are inadequate.</p>	<p>Proposed remedies are adequate.</p>

Stress Test	Existing Accountability Remedies	CCWG Proposed Accountability Measures
<p>22. ICANN Board fails to comply with bylaws and/or refuses to accept the decision of a redress mechanism constituted under the bylaws. Consequence: Community loses confidence in multistakeholder structures to govern ICANN.</p>	<p>As long as NTIA controls the IANA contract, ICANN would risk losing IANA functions if it were to ignore bylaws. But as a result of IANA stewardship transition, ICANN would no longer need to follow bylaws in to retain IANA contract with NTIA.</p> <p>Aggrieved parties can ask for Reconsideration of board decisions, but this is currently limited to questions of whether process was followed.</p> <p>Aggrieved parties can file for IRP but decisions of the panel are not binding on ICANN.</p>	<p>One proposed measure is to change the standard for Reconsideration Requests, so that substantive matters may also be challenged.</p> <p>One proposed measure is empowering the community to challenge a board decision, referring it to an Independent Review Panel (IRP) with the power to issue a binding decision. If ICANN failed to comply with its bylaws, the IRP mechanism could reverse that decision.</p> <p>If the ICANN board were to ignore IRP decisions, another proposed measure would empower the community to force resignation of some or all of the ICANN board.</p>
<p>Conclusions: This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p>	<p>Existing remedies are inadequate.</p>	<p>Proposed remedies are adequate.</p>

Stress test category I. Financial Crisis or Insolvency

Stress Test	Existing Accountability Remedies	CCWG Proposed Accountability Measures
<p>5. Domain industry financial crisis. Consequence: significant reduction in domain sales generated revenues and significant increase in registrar and registry continuity costs, threatening ICANN's ability to operate.</p>	<p>ICANN could propose revenue increases or spending cuts, but these decisions are not subject to challenge by the ICANN community.</p>	<p>One proposed measure is empowering the community to veto ICANN's proposed annual budget. This measure could block a proposal by ICANN to increase its revenues by adding fees on registrars, registries, and/or registrants.</p> <p>Another proposed mechanism is community challenge to a board decision, referring it to an Independent Review Panel (IRP) with the power to issue a binding decision. If ICANN made a revenue or expenditure decision outside the annual budget process, the IRP mechanism could reverse that decision.</p>
<p>Conclusions: This threat is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p>	<p>Existing remedies are inadequate.</p>	<p>Proposed remedies are not adequate.</p>

Stress test category III. Legal/Legislative Action

Stress Test	Existing Accountability Remedies	CCWG Proposed Accountability Measures
<p>19. ICANN attempts to re-delegate a gTLD because the registry operator is determined to be in breach of its contract, but the registry operator challenges the action and obtains an injunction from a national court. Consequence: The entity charged with root zone maintenance could face the question of whether to follow ICANN re-delegation request or to follow the court order. (also see Stress Test #21)</p>	<p>Under the present agreement with NTIA, the entity performing root zone maintenance is protected from lawsuits since it is publishing the root per contract with the USG.</p> <p>But as a result of IANA stewardship transition, the root zone maintainer would not likely be operating under USG contract, so would not be protected from lawsuits.</p>	<p>While it would not protect the root zone maintainer from lawsuits, one proposed mechanism is community challenge to a management decision, referring it to an Independent Review Panel (IRP) with the power to issue a binding decision. If ICANN took action to re-delegate a gTLD, the IRP mechanism could reverse that decision.</p> <p>Questions about entity and process for root zone maintenance are being considered by the CWG for IANA stewardship transition. We will evaluate CWG proposed mechanisms in this area when they are published.</p>
<p>Conclusions: This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p>	<p>Existing remedies might not be adequate.</p>	<p>Proposed remedies have not yet been evaluated.</p>