

ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

Work Item: WP1-7A: Existing SO/AC Processes mechanism
Drafter: Jordan Carter (jordan@internetcz.net.nz)
Version: 1.0
Date: Circulated on 18 March 2015 @ 19h00 UTC

| | Name of Mechanism | Existing SO/AC Processes (SOAC) |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Description | Description | Each Power available to the Community as a result of the CCWG’s work would be exercised by each SO or AC allocating its “votes” as set out below. These would be determined by each SO or AC individually. |
| | Category (check & balance, review, redress) | Not Applicable (N/A) The categories apply to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| | Is the mechanism triggered or non triggered ? | N/A This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| | Possible outcomes (approval, re-do, amendment of decision, etc.) | N/A This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| | Conditions of standing (ie « last resort », type of decision being challenged, ...) | N/A This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| Standing | Who has standing (directly or indirectly affected party, thresholds...) | N/A This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| | Which standards is the decision examined against (process, principles, other standards...) | N/A This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| Standard of review | Which purpose(s) of accountability does the mechanism contribute to ? | N/A This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |

ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Composition | Required skillset | Not applicable. |
| | Diversity requirements (geography, stakeholder interests, gender, other...) | Not applicable. |
| | Number of persons (approximate or interval) | SOs and ACs would have notional “votes” available under this mechanism, available as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five votes for each of the following community bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ccNSO ○ GNSO ○ ASO ○ ALAC ○ GAC • Two votes for each of the following bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SSAC ○ RSSAC |
| | Independence requirements | Not applicable. |
| | Election / appointment by whom ? | Not applicable. |
| | Recall or other accountability mechanism | None: this would simply have the same accountability as SOs and ACs generally have. |
| | Decision making | Is the decision mandated or based on personal assessment |
| Decision made by consensus or vote ? | | N/A This would be specified for each of the powers exercised by the community, not as part of this mechanism itself. |
| Majority threshold (if applicable) | | N/A This would be specified for each of the powers exercised by the community, not as part of this mechanism itself. |
| Accessibility | Cost requirements | The cost of whatever secretariat services required to collate votes. |
| | Timeframe requirements | To be implemented before IANA stewardship transition (i.e. WS1). |
| | Language requirements | As general in ICANN – translated into the usual languages. |

ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

CCWG Accountability

Template

| | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Implementation | Potential means to implement | To implement this approach, the relevant powers would need to be set out in the bylaws along with voting thresholds etc. A separate section of the bylaws would need to describe the generic process and assign notional “voting weights” as proposed here or as amended, to each SO/AC. |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|