

CCWG-ACCOUNTABILITY DRAFT

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

PROPOSAL V. 10

1 May 2015

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:42 PM

Deleted: 30 April

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 4 |
| 1) INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND..... | 8 |
| 1.1 INTRODUCTION..... | 8 |
| 1.2 DEFINITIONS & LEGAL SCOPING..... | 9 |
| 1.3 LEGAL ADVICE | 10 |
| 1.4 INPUT GATHERED FROM THE COMMUNITY: REQUIRED COMMUNITY POWERS..... | 11 |
| 2) ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS | 12 |
| 2.1 DESCRIPTION OF OVERALL ACCOUNTABILITY ARCHITECTURE | 12 |
| 2.2 REVISED MISSION, COMMITMENTS & CORE VALUES | 14 |
| 2.3 FUNDAMENTAL BYLAWS | 25 |
| 2.3.1 WHAT IS A "FUNDAMENTAL BYLAW" | 25 |
| 2.3.2 ESTABLISHING FUNDAMENTAL BYLAWS | 25 |
| 2.3.3 ADDING NEW OR CHANGING EXISTING FUNDAMENTAL BYLAWS | 26 |
| 2.3.4 WHICH OF THE CURRENT BYLAWS WOULD BECOME FUNDAMENTAL BYLAWS ? | 26 |
| 2.4 INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL ENHANCEMENT | 27 |
| 2.5 RECONSIDERATION PROCESS ENHANCEMENT | 32 |
| 2.6 COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT..... | 36 |
| 2.6.1 MECHANISM TO EMPOWER THE COMMUNITY | 36 |
| 2.6.1.1 THE COMMUNITY MECHANISM: SO/AC MEMBERSHIP MODEL..... | 37 |
| 2.6.1.2 INFLUENCE IN THE COMMUNITY MECHANISM | 40 |
| 2.6.1.3 GOVERNANCE MODELS AND COMMUNITY POWERS..... | 41 |
| 2.6.2 POWER: RECONSIDER/REJECT BUDGET OR STRATEGY/OPERATING PLANS | 41 |
| 2.6.3 POWER: RECONSIDER/REJECT CHANGES TO ICANN "STANDARD" BYLAWS | 42 |
| 2.6.4 POWER: APPROVE CHANGES TO "FUNDAMENTAL" BYLAWS | 43 |
| 2.6.5 POWER: REMOVING INDIVIDUAL ICANN DIRECTORS..... | 44 |
| 2.6.6 POWER: RECALLING THE ENTIRE ICANN BOARD | 46 |
| 2.7 INCORPORATING AOC INTO THE ICANN BYLAWS | 47 |
| 2.7.1 PRESERVING ICANN COMMITMENTS FROM THE AOC | 48 |
| 2.7.2 AOC REVIEWS | 51 |
| 2.8 BYLAWS CHANGES SUGGESTED BY STRESS TESTS | 57 |
| 2.8.1 FORCING THE BOARD TO RESPOND TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE FORMAL ADVICE | 58 |
| 2.8.2 REQUIRE CONSULTATION AND MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SOLUTION FOR GAC ADVICE THAT IS BACKED BY CONSENSUS | 59 |
| 3) STRESS TESTS..... | 61 |
| INTRODUCTION | 61 |

| |
|----------------------------------|
| Deleted: 7 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 7 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 10 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 13 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 24 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 24 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 24 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 25 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 25 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 26 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 31 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 35 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 35 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 36 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 38 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 40 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 40 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 41 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 42 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 43 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 44 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 45 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 46 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 49 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 55 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 56 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 57 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 59 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM |
| Deleted: 59 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM |

| | | |
|--|-----------|---|
| PURPOSE & METHODOLOGY..... | 61 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 59 |
| I. FINANCIAL CRISIS OR INSOLVENCY (SCENARIOS #5, 6, 7, 8 AND 9)..... | 62 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 60 |
| II. FAILURE TO MEET OPERATIONAL OBLIGATIONS (SCENARIOS #1,2,11, 17, AND 21) | 63 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 60 |
| III. LEGAL/LEGISLATIVE ACTION (SCENARIOS #3, 4, 19, AND 20) | 63 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 60 |
| IV. FAILURE OF ACCOUNTABILITY (SCENARIOS #10, 12, 13, 16, 18, 22, 23, 24 AND 26) | 63 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 60 |
| V. FAILURE OF ACCOUNTABILITY TO EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS (SCENARIOS #14, 15, AND 25)..... | 63 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 60 |
| STRESS TEST CATEGORY I: FINANCIAL CRISIS OR INSOLVENCY | 65 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 60 |
| STRESS TEST CATEGORY II: FAILURE TO MEET OPERATIONAL EXPECTATIONS..... | 67 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 60 |
| STRESS TEST CATEGORY III: LEGAL/LEGISLATIVE ACTION..... | 71 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 60 |
| STRESS TEST CATEGORY IV: FAILURE OF ACCOUNTABILITY | 75 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 60 |
| STRESS TEST CATEGORY V: FAILURE OF ACCOUNTABILITY TO EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS | 81 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 61 |
| 4) ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION IN WORK STREAM 2 | 83 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 63 |
| COMMITMENT TO WORK STREAM 2 PROPOSAL CONSIDERATION..... | 84 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 64 |
| ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION WITHIN WORK STREAM 2..... | 85 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 69 |
| 5) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN INCLUDING TIMING | 85 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 72 |
| 5.1 TIMELINE | 85 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 79 |
| 5.2 NEXT STEPS | 86 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 81 |
| 5.3 IMPLEMENTATION | 87 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 81 |
| 6) PUBLIC COMMENT INPUT | 89 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 82 |
| GLOSSARY | 93 | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 83 |
| | | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 83 |
| | | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 83 |
| | | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 83 |
| | | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 83 |
| | | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 83 |
| | | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 84 |
| | | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 87 |
| | | Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:04 PM Deleted: 90 |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account... [2]

Executive Summary

- 01 On 14 March 2014 the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) announced its intent to transition its stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions and related root zone management to the global multistakeholder community. NTIA asked ICANN to convene a multistakeholder process to develop a proposal for the transition.
- 02 As initial discussions of the IANA Stewardship Transition were taking place, the ICANN community raised the broader topic of the impact of the transition on ICANN's current accountability mechanisms. From this dialogue, the Enhancing ICANN Accountability process was developed to propose reforms that would see ICANN attain a level of accountability to the global multistakeholder community that is satisfactory in the absence of its historical contractual relationship with the U.S. Government. This contractual relationship has been perceived as a backstop with regard to ICANN's organization-wide accountability since 1998.
- 03 This report for public comment represents the current work product of the CCWG-Accountability. It is focused on draft Work Stream 1 recommendations (Work Stream 1 is the CCWG-Accountability's work on changes to ICANN's accountability arrangements which must be in place, or committed to, prior to the IANA Stewardship transition), which were the focus of the first five months of work (from December 2014 until May 2015). These recommendations do not reflect CCWG-Accountability consensus at this point. The CCWG-Accountability is seeking confirmation of its approach, and guidance upon several options, from the community.
- 04 The CCWG-Accountability Charter has been endorsed by the GNSO, ALAC, ccNSO, GAC and ASO. The CCWG-Accountability is composed of 25 members, appointed by each endorsing organization, and 154 participants. Participation in the group is open to any party. The CCWG-Accountability work was conducted through weekly conference calls, attended on average by 44 participants and members, and it held face-to-face meetings in Frankfurt (19-20 January 2015), Singapore (9-12 February 2015) and Istanbul (23-24 March 2015) as well as two intense work days (23-24 April 2015) with each 6 hours of telephone conferences.
- 05 The CCWG-Accountability has designed its work so that it may be coordinated with the timeline of the IANA Stewardship Transition. The work stream 1 proposals, when finalized, will be presented to the ICANN Board of Directors for transmission to NTIA along with the ICG assembled transition proposal.
- 06 The CCWG-Accountability has established a set of requirements that need to be fulfilled in order to enhance ICANN's accountability. In order to do so, the CCWG-Accountability has established
- ❑ An inventory of existing accountability mechanisms;
 - ❑ An inventory of contingencies that ICANN must be safeguarded against; and

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:22 PM
Deleted: 254
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:08 AM
Deleted: on April 23rdth and 24th
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

- ❑ A set of 26 stress tests to establish whether the newly designed accountability architecture efficiently protects ICANN from the contingencies identified.

07 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) has based its deliberations on requests and suggestions that have been provided by the community during a public comment period conducted last year following the NTIA announcement and added its own findings as well as input from independent advisors to establish a list of requirements that need to be met by an improved accountability system in ICANN. With this report, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) is seeking additional input and guidance from the community.

08 To date, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) has defined the following requirements:

09 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) identified four building blocks that need to be in place and that would form the accountability mechanisms required to improve accountability. These building blocks are:

- ❑ Principles that form the Mission and core values of ICANN
- ❑ The [Board](#) of Directors
- ❑ An empowered community
- ❑ Independent appeal mechanisms

10 The recommendations include revising ICANN's [Bylaws](#) to clarify the scope of ICANN's policy authority, reflect key elements of the Affirmation of Commitments, and establish a set of "Fundamental [Bylaws](#)", which enjoy special protection and can only be changed based on prior approval by the Community. The following items shall have the status of Fundamental [Bylaws](#):

- ❑ The [Mission](#);
- ❑ The [Independent Review Process](#);
- ❑ The power to veto [non-fundamental](#) Bylaw changes and to approve changes to Fundamental [Bylaws](#);
- ❑ [Any reviews required by the CWG-Stewardship \(e.g. the IANA Function Review\)](#);
- ❑ New community powers such as recall of the [Board](#).

11 [The group also recommends bringing the regular reviews, which are required by the Affirmation of Commitments \(such as the accountability and transparency reviews\) into ICANN's Bylaws. In response to the recommendation in the CWG-Stewardship proposal, the IANA Function Review would be added in as a Fundamental Bylaw.](#)

12 A key recommendation of the [CCWG-Accountability](#) is to empower the community to have more influence on certain [Board](#) decisions. The group identified powers and associated mechanisms including the ability to:

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:40 PM
Deleted:

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:40 PM
Comment [1]: 01 Edited to reflect Jordan's Carter's comment about the IANA Function Review not being a regular review, but rather one enshrined in the Fundamental Bylaws.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

- ❑ Recall the ICANN [Board](#) of Directors;
- ❑ Remove individual [Board](#) Directors;
- ❑ [Veto or approve](#) changes to the ICANN [Bylaws](#), Mission and Core Values;
- ❑ Reject [Board](#) decisions on Strategic Plan and budget, where the [Board](#) has failed to appropriately reflect community input in these documents.

In addition to the aforementioned powers, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) recommends significantly enhancing ICANN's Independent Review Panel. The Panel should become a standing panel of 7 independent panelists, proposed by the ICANN [Board](#) with a confirmation procedure involving the community. Materially affected parties, including in some cases the community itself, would have standing to initiate a procedure in front of the panel. The decisions of the panel would not only assess compliance with process, but also the merits of the case against the standard of ICANN's Mission, [Commitments](#), and Core values. Additionally, the decisions of the [Panel](#) would be binding for the ICANN [Board](#). The [CCWG-Accountability](#) also recommends improvements in the Panel's accessibility, especially the cost of access.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:59 PM
Deleted: [Guarantees/

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:59 PM
Deleted:]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

13 Finally, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) proposes a number of key reforms to ICANN's Request for Reconsideration process. The key reforms proposed include the expansion of the scope of permissible requests to include [Board](#)/staff actions or inactions that contradict ICANN's [Mission](#) or [Core Values](#), and the extension of the time for filing a Request for Reconsideration from 15 to 30 days.

14 **IMPLEMENTATION:**

15 In its deliberations and in discussion with its independent legal counsel, it has become clear that all requirements established by the [CCWG-Accountability](#) can be implemented within ICANN's current setup as a non-profit corporation based in California. [Specifically, ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws may be amended to empower to the multistakeholder community as proposed by the CCWG-Accountability.](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:43 PM
Deleted: reserve

16 [The CCWG-Accountability proposes the creation of a formal membership body called the "SO/AC Membership" model. This is the approach that - based on analysis so far - fits requirements best. This model, referred to here as the Reference Mechanism would have the following key characteristics:](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

1. [The ICANN Supporting Organizations \(SOs\) and Advisory Committees \(ACs\) would each become a "Member" of ICANN. To provide SOs and ACs the legal status required to be Members, they would be established as unincorporated associations. As unincorporated associations, the SOs and ACs would exercise the community powers set out in this part of this Report. The SOs and ACs would be Members. No third party and no individuals would become Members of ICANN.](#)

2. There would be no need for individuals or organizations to change the ways in which they participate in ICANN nor the SOs or ACs to create the new "Members" or "unincorporated associations."
3. Our legal counsel have advised that through this structure, there would be no material increase in the risks and liabilities individual ICANN participants face today.
4. In the group's reference option, a community group exercising the community powers would have 29 votes in total; 5 for the gNSO, the ccNSO, the ASO, the GAC and ALAC; 2 each for SSAC and RSSAC.

- 17 The group discussed variations of these mechanisms and seeks guidance from the community regarding the proposed options.
- 18 An essential part of the [CCWG-Accountability](#) Charter calls for stress testing of accountability enhancements. 'Stress Testing' is a simulation exercise where a set of plausible, but not necessarily probable, hypothetical scenarios are used to gauge how certain events will affect a system, product, company or industry. The 26 stress tests were grouped into 5 categories: financial crisis or insolvency, failure to meet operational obligations, legal / legislative actions, failure of accountability and failure of accountability to external stakeholders.
- 19 Applied to the recommendations, the stress tests demonstrate that these [Work Stream 1](#) recommendations increase ICANN's accountability significantly, providing adequate mitigation measures in situations where that was not the case without these recommendations. The requirement that ICANN remains compliant with applicable legislations, in jurisdictions where it operates, is also fulfilled.
- 20 The stress test exercise demonstrates that [Work Stream 1](#) recommendations do enhance the community's ability to hold ICANN [Board](#) and management accountable, relative to present accountability measures. It is also clear that the [CWG-Stewardship](#) proposals are complementary to [CCWG-Accountability](#) measures. One stress test regarding appeals of ccTLD revocations and assignments (ST 21) has not been adequately addressed in either the [CWG-Stewardship](#) or [CCWG-Accountability](#) proposals, awaiting policy development from the ccNSO.
- 21 The [CCWG-Accountability's](#) assessment is that its recommendations published for public comment are consistent with the [CWG-Stewardship](#) expectations regarding budget, community empowerment, review and redress mechanisms, as well as appeals mechanisms with regards to ccTLD related issues. The group is grateful to the [CWG-Stewardship](#) for the constructive collaboration that was set up across the groups.
- 22 During the public comment period, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) will pursue its efforts in order to finalize its proposals and facilitate implementation. An indicative, best case implementation plan is provided in this report.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:20 PM
Deleted:
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

1) Introduction & Background

Note: This section is a summary. For more information on background, methodology, definitions and scoping, we invite you to refer to Appendix A of this report. An inventory of existing ICANN Accountability Mechanisms may also be found in Appendix A.

1.1 Introduction

- 23 On 14 March 2014 the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) [announced](#) its intent to transition its stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions and related root zone management to the global multistakeholder community. NTIA asked ICANN to convene a multistakeholder process to develop a proposal for the transition.
- 24 As initial discussions of the IANA Stewardship Transition were taking place, the ICANN community raised the broader topic of the impact of the transition on ICANN's current accountability mechanisms. From this dialogue, the Enhancing ICANN Accountability process was developed to propose reforms that would see ICANN [attain](#) a level of accountability to the global multistakeholder community that is satisfactory in the absence of its historical contractual relationship with the U.S. Government. This contractual relationship has been perceived as a backstop with regard to ICANN's organization-wide accountability since 1998.
- 25 Informed by community discussions and public comment periods, the final [Revised Enhancing ICANN Accountability: Process and Next Steps](#) includes considering how ICANN's broader accountability mechanisms should be strengthened in light of the transition, including a review of existing accountability mechanisms such as those within the [ICANN Bylaws](#) and the [Affirmation of Commitments](#).
- 26 The Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability ([CCWG-Accountability](#)) was convened, designed and approved by a Drafting Team (DT) composed of five ICANN community groups. The [CCWG-Accountability Charter](#) was circulated for adoption on 3 November – see appendix B.
- 27 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) consists of 222 [people](#), organized as 26 [members](#), appointed by and accountable to the [CCWG-Accountability](#) chartering organizations, 154 [participants](#), who participate as individuals, and 48 [mailing list observers](#).
- 28 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) also includes:

| |
|----------------------------------|
| Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:04 AM |
| Deleted: realize |
| Unknown |
| Field Code Changed |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM |
| Deleted: CCWG |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM |
| Deleted: CCWG |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:39 PM |
| Deleted: -Accountability |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM |
| Deleted: CCWG |
| Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:07 AM |
| Deleted: 2 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM |
| Deleted: CCWG |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM |
| Deleted: CCWG |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM |
| Deleted: Thursday |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM |
| Deleted: April 30 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM |
| Deleted: , |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM |
| Deleted: 21 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM |
| Deleted: 2 |
| Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM |
| Deleted: 98 |

- ❑ 1 ICANN [Board](#) liaison who brings the voice of the [Board](#) and [Board](#) experience to activities and deliberations¹;
- ❑ 1 ICANN staff representative who provides input into the deliberations²;
- ❑ 1 former ATRT member who serves as a liaison and brings perspective and ensures that there is no duplication of work³;
- ❑ 4 ICG members who participate in the [CCWG-Accountability](#), including two who serve as liaisons between the two groups.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:50 PM
Deleted: -Accountability
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:50 PM
Deleted: -Accountability

29 Seven [Advisors](#) have also been appointed by a [Public Experts Group \(PEG\)](#) to contribute research and advice, and to bring perspectives on global best practices to enrich the [CCWG-Accountability](#) discussion, all while engaging with a broader network of accountability experts from around the world.

30 More information on the background, please refer to [Appendix A](#)

1.2 Definitions & Legal Scoping

31 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) scoped out and elaborated a problem statement along with definitions to help refine its understanding of the task it was entrusted with. The group endeavored to produce a definition of what accountability is, listed transparency, consultation, review mechanisms and redress mechanisms as criteria of accountability mechanisms.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

32 As a general concept, the group proposed that accountability encompassed processes whereby an actor answers to others for the effects on them of its actions and omissions. For the [CCWG-Accountability](#), then, accountability involves the processes whereby ICANN answers to its stakeholders for the impacts on those stakeholders of ICANN's decisions, policies and programs.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

33 The group proposed that accountability is comprised four dimensions: One, transparency, means that an actor (ICANN) is answerable to its stakeholders by being open and visible to them. A second, consultation, means that the actor (ICANN) continually takes input from and explains its positions to the stakeholders. Third, review means that the actor's actions, policies and programs are subject to outside monitoring and evaluation. The fourth dimension, redress, means that the accountable actor makes compensations for any harms of its actions

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

01 _____
02
03
04

¹ Should there be an issue of a consensus call, the [Board](#) Liaison would not participate in such a consensus call.
² Should there be an issue of a consensus call, the staff representative would not participate in such a consensus call.
³ Should there be an issue of a consensus call, the ATRT Expert would not participate in such a consensus call.

and omissions, for example, by means of policy changes, institutional reforms, resignations, financial reparations, etc.

34 Independence and checks and balances were identified as two key qualities of any accountability mechanism. The group defined "checks and balances mechanisms" as a series of mechanisms put in place to adequately address the concerns from the various interested parties in the discussion and decision process, as well as to ensure that the decision is made in the interest of all stakeholders. The group investigated two different non-exclusive views in order to assess independence: independence of persons participating in the decision process, and independence of a specific accountability mechanism with regards to other mechanisms.

35 The group flagged to whom should ICANN be accountable as an important component, and assembled a list of stakeholders which distinguished between affected parties and parties affecting ICANN. The following principles were agreed to guide [the CCWG-Accountability's](#) activities:

- ❑ ICANN accountability requires that it comply with its own rules and processes (part of "due process", as a quality of fairness and justice);
- ❑ ICANN accountability requires compliance with applicable legislation, in jurisdictions where it operates;
- ❑ ICANN should be accountable to achieving certain levels of performance as well as security;
- ❑ ICANN should be accountable to ensure that its decisions are for the benefit of the public, not just in the interests of a particular set of stakeholders or ICANN the organization.

36 See Appendix C "[CCWG-Accountability](#) Accountability – Problem definition" (current version, 13 March 2015) for more information.

1.3 Legal Advice

37 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) engaged two law firms to [provide advice](#) on [the](#) feasibility of its proposed frameworks and mechanisms, Adler & Colvin and Sidley Austin LLP. The firms' [work was coordinated](#) through the Legal Sub-Team of the [CCWG-Accountability](#). See Appendix B for more information on the legal sub-team methodology. The legal advice was key to the [CCWG-Accountability](#) in formulating its recommendations.

38 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) Legal Sub-Team's rules of engagement and working methodologies are described in Appendix D.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:18 PM
Deleted: receive expertise
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:18 PM
Deleted: coordination of the
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

1.4 Input Gathered from the Community: Required Community Powers

39 As indicated in [the methodology section of Appendix A](#), the group reviewed the collection of public comments received during the development of the Enhancing ICANN Accountability and categorized these as [Work Stream 1](#) and [Work Stream 2](#). [Work Stream 1](#) mechanisms were defined as those that, when in place or committed to, would provide the community with confidence that any accountability mechanism that would further enhance ICANN's accountability would be implemented if it had consensus support from the community, even if it were to encounter ICANN management resistance or if it were against the interest of ICANN as a corporate entity.

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 12:36 PM

Deleted: section 2

40 The mechanisms were divided in three sections:

1. **Mechanisms giving the ICANN community ultimate authority over the ICANN corporation.** Most of these were initially designated as [Work Stream 1](#), since community [members](#) need the leverage of IANA transition to obtain these [Bylaws](#) changes.
2. **Mechanisms to restrict actions of the [Board](#) and management of the ICANN corporation.** Most of these are initially designated as [Work Stream 2](#), since the Members could [veto certain Board](#) decisions if [reserved for Members if](#) Members are empowered in [Work Stream 1](#) (1, above).
3. **Mechanisms to prescribe actions of the ICANN corporation.** Most of these are initially designated as [Work Stream 1](#), since the Members could [veto certain Board](#) decisions if [reserved for Members if](#) Members are empowered in [Work Stream 1](#) (above). For example, a bottom-up consensus process to change ICANN [Bylaws](#) might be rejected by [the ICANN Board](#), but the Members could then [veto](#) that decision.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM

Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM

Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM

Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

41 Work Stream 1 accountability mechanisms are presented in detail in [Section 2](#).

42 In addition, the [CWG-Stewardship](#) co-chairs detailed, in a [correspondence](#) dated 15 April 2015, the expectations from their group with regards to [CCWG-Accountability](#) accountability [Work Stream 1](#) recommendations. These expectations are:

- ❑ **ICANN budget:** The [CWG-Stewardship](#) supports the ability for the community to “veto” a budget, [including on IANA functions’ costs](#). This expectation is dealt with in section 2.6.2.
- ❑ **Community empowerment mechanisms:** The [CWG-Stewardship](#) will be relying on the community empowerment and accountability mechanisms that the [CCWG-Accountability](#) is currently considering and developing being in place at the time of the stewardship transition. In particular, mechanisms such as: the ability to [veto ICANN Board](#) decisions relating to periodic or [special](#) reviews of the IANA functions undertake

through the IANA [Function Review](#) ([exercise IFR](#)); as well as the related creation of a stakeholder community / member group in order ensure the ability to [exercise](#) these kinds of [rights](#). This expectation is dealt with in section 2.6.

- ❑ **Review and redress mechanisms:** The [CWG-Stewardship](#) would like to have the assurance that an IANA [Function Review](#) (or related [special](#) review) could be incorporated as part of the AoC mandated reviews integration into ICANN's [Bylaws](#). This expectation is dealt with in section 2.7.2.
- ❑ **Appeal mechanisms (especially with regard to ccTLD related issues):** The [CWG-Stewardship](#) recommends that the [CCWG-Accountability](#) should be mindful of the recommendations of the [CWG-Stewardship](#) in relation to an appeals mechanism for ccTLDs in delegation and re-delegation. The [CWG-Stewardship](#) has conducted a survey among the ccTLDs as part of the work of our Design Team B, and the results led to a recommendation which notes that ccTLDs may decide to develop their own appeals mechanism regarding re/delegation at a later date (post-transition). As such, any appeal mechanism developed by the [CCWG-Accountability](#) should not cover ccTLD delegation / re-delegation issues as these are expected to be developed by the ccTLD community through the appropriate processes. However, the [CWG-Stewardship](#) does want to emphasize the importance and need for an appeal mechanism to cover any other issues that may involve IANA and notes that this is option is expected to be specifically called out as one of the possible escalation mechanisms[1] in the draft transition proposal. This expectation is dealt with in section 3.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:43 PM
Deleted: review ...unction ... [4]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:22 PM
Deleted: PRF or possibly IRF); the ability to approve or reject board decisions on PRF
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:43 PM
Deleted: F
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG...WG-Steward... [5]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG...WG-Steward... [6]

⁴³ [1] As a note of clarification, the [CWG-Stewardship](#) has been referring previously to this appeals mechanism as IAP (Independent Appeals Panel) but understands that the [CCWG-Accountability](#) is referring to this mechanism as Independent Review Mechanism (IRP) which would also include the option for appeal. As such the [CWG-Stewardship](#) will be updating its references.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG...WG-Stewardship... [7]

2) Accountability Mechanisms

2.1 Description of Overall Accountability Architecture

⁴⁴ The [CCWG-Accountability](#) identifies four building blocks that would form the accountability mechanisms required to improve accountability.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Accounta... [8]

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account... [3]



45

Drawing a state analogy:

- ❑ Empowered community refers to the powers that allow the community i.e. the people to take action should ICANN breach the principles.
 - ❑ The group identified powers and associated mechanisms including the ability to:
 - [Remove individual directors or recall the ICANN Board](#) of Directors;
 - Approve or [veto](#) changes to the ICANN [Bylaws](#), Mission, [Commitments](#) and Core Values
 - Reject [Board](#) decisions on Strategic Plan and budget, where the [Board](#) has failed to appropriately consider community input
 - ❑ Principles form the Mission, [Commitments](#), and Core Values of the organization (i.e the Constitution).
 - ❑ The group proposes changes that should be made to the Mission, [Commitments](#), and Core Values in ICANN's [Bylaws](#). For example, the group discussed how key provisions of the [Affirmation of Commitments](#) (AoC) could be reflected into the [Bylaws](#)
- ❑ ICANN [Board](#) represents the executive entity the community may act against, as appropriate
- ❑ Independent Review Mechanisms, (i.e. the judiciary), confers the power to review and provide redress, as needed

- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:49 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:49 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:50 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

- The group proposes to strengthen the existing independent review process suggesting improvements to its accessibility and affordability, and process design including establishment of a standing panel with binding outcomes. The IRP panel decisions would be guided by ICANN's Mission, [Commitments](#), and Core Values.

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:50 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

46 This section of the public comment report details the key recommendations upon which the [CCWG-Accountability](#) would like to receive input from the community. These recommendations do not reflect [CCWG-Accountability](#) consensus at this point.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:50 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

2.2 Revised Mission, [Commitments](#) & Core Values

47 ICANN's current [Bylaws](#) contain (a) a Mission statement; (b) a statement of Core Values; and (c) a provision prohibiting policies and practices that are inequitable or single out any party for disparate treatment. These three sections are at the heart of ICANN's accountability: they obligate ICANN to act only within the scope of its limited mission, and to conduct its activities in accordance with certain fundamental principles. As such, these three sections also provide a standard against which ICANN's conduct can be measured and held accountable [through existing and enhanced mechanisms such as Reconsideration and Independent Review](#).

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:06 PM
Comment [2]: 02Addition by Becky Burr

48 The relevant language in the current [Bylaws](#) was adopted in 2003. Based on community input and our discussions since January, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) concluded that these provisions should be strengthened and enhanced to provide greater assurances that ICANN [is](#) accountable to its stakeholders and the global Internet community. In particular, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) found that:

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

- ICANN's Mission statement needs clarification with respect to the scope of ICANN's policy authority;
- The language in the [Bylaws](#) describing how ICANN should apply its Core Values is weak and permits ICANN decision makers to exercise excessive discretion;
- The current [Bylaws](#) do not reflect key elements of the Affirmation of Commitments; and
- The [Board](#) should have only a limited ability to change these key accountability provisions of ICANN's [Bylaws](#).

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

49 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED CHANGES

50 [\[Note: Legal counsel have not reviewed the underlying proposed Bylaw revisions at this stage. The proposed language for Bylaw revisions is conceptual in nature at this stage; once there is consensus about direction developed through this comment process, the legal team will need time to draft appropriate language for revisions to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.\]](#)

The [CCWG-Accountability](#) is seeking input on a number of recommended changes to the ICANN [Bylaws](#) to address the deficiencies described above. We have deliberately attempted to minimize language changes, and in the [charts that follow](#), we have (i) included the existing language; (ii) provided a redline showing proposed changes; and (iii) identified the source or justification for the proposed changes. Below we provide a summary of the proposed changes.

1. **ICANN Mission Statement.** The [CCWG-Accountability](#) recommends the following changes to ICANN's "Mission Statement," ([Bylaws](#), Article I, Section 1):

- a. Clarify that ICANN's [Mission](#) is limited to coordinating and implementing policies that are designed to ensure the stable and secure operation of the DNS and are reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, and/or stability of the DNS.
- b. [Clarify that ICANN's Mission does not include the regulation of services that use the DNS or the regulation of the content these services carry or provide. Regulation of content is inconsistent with ICANN's limited technical mission.](#)
- c. Clarify that ICANN's powers are "enumerated" – meaning that anything not articulated in the [Bylaws](#) are outside the scope of ICANN's authority. [This does not mean ICANN's powers can never evolve – but ensures that any changes will be deliberate and supported by the community.](#)
- d. [The group discussed how to balance the needs of limiting ICANN's mission and the necessary ability of the organization to adjust to a changing environment.](#)

2. **Core Values.** The [CCWG-Accountability](#) recommends the following changes to ICANN's "Core Values" ([Bylaws](#), Article I, Section 2 and Article II, Section 3):

- a. Divide the [existing](#) Core Values [provisions](#) into [Commitments](#) and "Core Values."
 - i. Incorporate into the [Bylaws](#) ICANN's obligation to operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carry out its activities in accordance with applicable law and international law and conventions through open and transparent processes that enable competition. These [obligations](#) are now contained in ICANN's Articles of Incorporation.
 - ii. Designate certain [Core Values](#) as "[Commitments](#)". These values are so fundamental to ICANN's operation that they should rarely need to be balanced against each other. Those [Commitments](#) include ICANN's obligations to:
 - 1. Preserve and enhance the stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS and the Internet;

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:10 PM
Deleted: annotated language,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:09 AM
Deleted: m

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:07 PM
Deleted: Regulation of content is the role of a sovereign, and is inconsistent with ICANN's limited technical mission.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:12 PM
Comment [3]: 03Edit by Becky Burr

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:50 PM
Deleted: "Guarantees"

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:11 PM
Deleted: Commitments

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:51 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:51 PM
Deleted: "Guarantees."

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:51 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

2. Limit its activities to those within ICANN's [Mission](#) and require or significantly benefit from global coordination;
 3. Employ open, transparent, bottom-up, multistakeholder processes; and
 4. Apply policies consistently, neutrally, objectively and fairly, without singling any party out for discriminatory treatment.
- iii. Slightly modify the remaining Core Values to:
1. Reflect various provisions in the Affirmation of [Commitments](#), e.g., efficiency, operational excellence, and fiscal responsibility;
 2. Clarify that any decision to defer to input from public authorities must be consistent with ICANN's [Commitments](#) and Core Values. We believe that this is inherent in the current [Bylaws](#), but felt that it was appropriate to call it out clearly for purposes of accountability. This does not interfere with the ability of the GAC to provide input or advice on any topic; rather, it clarifies that ICANN must always act in compliance with its [Bylaws](#) obligations.
 3. Add an obligation to avoid capture.

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:09 AM
Deleted: m

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:22 AM
Deleted: Guarantees

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:51 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

3. Balancing or Reconciliation Test

- a. Modify the "balancing" language in the [Bylaws](#) to clarify the manner in which this balancing or reconciliation takes place. Specifically:
 - i. In any situation in which one Guarantee must be reconciled with another Guarantee or with a Core Value, the proposed language requires ICANN to ensure that its interpretation is (i) justified by an important, specific, and articulated public interest goal within its Mission; (ii) likely to promote that public interest goal; (iii) narrowly tailored to achieve that goal; and (iv) no broader than necessary to do so; and
 - ii. In any situation where one Core Value must be reconciled with another, potentially competing Core Value, the balancing must further an important public interest in a way that is substantially related to that interest.
4. Fundamental (Durable or Enduring) [Bylaws](#) Provisions. The [CCWG-Accountability](#) recommends that the

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:28 PM
Deleted: -ACCT

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

revised Mission Statement, [Commitments](#) and Core Values be adopted as “durable” or “enduring” elements of the ICANN [Bylaws](#). Any modification to these [Bylaws](#) provisions would be subject to heightened standards including, for example, community ratification or subject to community veto.

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:51 PM
Deleted: Guarantees,

DISCUSSION

52 To whom is ICANN accountable? For what is it accountable? Those questions were a necessary starting point for the work of the [CCWG-Accountability](#), and the answers inform all of our recommendations. Our work on Independent Review attempts to answer the first question. The [Bylaws](#) changes recommended here are designed to answer the second. Most important, ICANN has a limited mission, and it must be accountable for actions that exceed the scope of its mission. In undertaking its mission, ICANN is also obligated to adhere to an agreed-upon standard of behavior, articulated through its [Commitments](#) and Core Values. Taken together, the proposed Mission, [Commitments](#), and Core Values statement articulate the standard against which ICANN’s behavior can be measured and to which it can be held accountable. Because these [Bylaws](#) provisions are fundamental to ICANN’s accountability, we propose that they be adopted as Fundamental [Bylaws](#) that can only be changed with the [approval](#) of the community subject to procedural and substantive safeguards.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:52 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:52 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:30 PM
Deleted: demonstrated support

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:52 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:

1. Do you agree that these recommended changes to ICANN’s Mission, [Commitments](#) and Core Values would enhance ICANN’s accountability?
2. Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would amend these requirements.

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:52 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:30 PM
Deleted: the specific language may need to be tweaked to address legal issues. Actual proposed Bylaws text changes

53 The proposed language is intended to convey the substance of the proposed [Bylaws](#) changes related to ICANN’s Mission, [Commitments](#) and Core Values. [Legal counsel have not reviewed the underlying proposed Bylaws revisions. The proposed language for Bylaw revisions is conceptual in nature at this stage; once there is consensus about direction developed through this comment process, the legal team will need time to draft appropriate language for revisions to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. Once further developed, the proposed amendments to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws will be subject to public consultation.](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

54 The table below compares the current draft proposals with the current language and explains the context in the “Notes” column. We are particularly interested in the community’s view as to the broad approach painted: of providing an almost “constitutional core” for ICANN against which the [Board](#) and staff can be held to account – by the community, and by the various review and redress procedures that feature elsewhere in this report.

MISSION

| Current Bylaws Language | Working Draft New/changed text appears in red or strike-out text | Notes, Comments, Questions |
|--|---|---|
| <p>55 The mission of The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems. In particular, ICANN:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinates the allocation and assignment of the three sets of unique identifiers for the Internet, which are Domain names (forming a system referred to as "DNS"); Internet protocol ("IP") addresses and autonomous system ("AS") numbers; and Protocol port and parameter numbers. 2. Coordinates the operation and evolution of the DNS root name server system 3. Coordinates policy development reasonably and appropriately related to these technical functions. | <p>56 The mission of The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems. In particular, ICANN:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinates the allocation and assignment of the three sets of unique identifiers for the Internet, which are Domain names (forming a system referred to as "DNS"); Internet protocol ("IP") addresses and autonomous system ("AS") numbers; and Protocol port and parameter numbers. 2. Coordinates the operation and evolution of the DNS root name server system 3. Coordinates policy development reasonably and appropriately related to these technical functions. <p>57 <i>In this role, with respect to domain names, ICANN's mission is to coordinate the development and implementation of policy developed through a bottom-up, consensus-based multistakeholder process that is designed to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique names</i></p> | <p>62 <i>The additional language is intended clarify, but not to either diminish or expand ICANN's current Mission. The proposed Mission statement also reflects ICANN's obligation under the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC).</i></p> |

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:10 AM
Deleted: m

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:13 PM
Deleted: *Consensus Policies*

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:30 PM
Deleted: *(as defined in Specification 1)*

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:13 PM
Deleted: *that (a) e*

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: **CCWG**

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | <p><i>systems, and for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and/or stability of the DNS.</i></p> | |
| 58 | <p><i>In this role, with respect to IP addresses and AS numbers, ICANN's mission is described in the ASO MoU between ICANN and RIRs</i></p> | |
| 59 | <p><i>In this role, with respect to protocol port and parameter numbers, ICANN's mission is to [to be provided by the IETF]</i></p> | |
| 60 | <p><i>In this role, with respect to the DNS root server system, ICANN's mission is to [to be provided by root server operators]</i></p> | |
| 61 | <p>ICANN shall not undertake any other mission not specifically authorized in these Bylaws. Without in any way limiting the foregoing absolute prohibition it is expressly noted that ICANN shall not engage in or use its powers to attempt the regulation of services that use the Internet's unique identifiers, or the content that they carry or provide.</p> | <p>63 Some members of the CCWG-Accountability have expressed concern that this language may constrain ICANN's ability to evolve to meeting the changes needs of the DNS. Others, however, point out that this does not preclude such evolution; rather, it merely requires such changes to be agreed upon and formally reflected in the Bylaws.</p> |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:13 PM
Deleted: *to as*

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:13 PM
Deleted: **INSERT**

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:13 PM
Deleted: **INSERT**

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:39 PM
Comment [4]: 04Addition by Becky Burr

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:52 PM
Deleted: **GUARANTEES**

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:32 PM
Comment [5]: 05 [Sidley note: AoC and Affirmation of Commitments are used inconsistently throughout. Consider conforming to use only one term](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: **CCWG**

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

COMMITMENTS AND CORE VALUES

64 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) proposes to ensure that all elements of the [Affirmation of Commitments](#) are reflected in ICANN's [Bylaws](#) and Articles of Incorporation. Some AoC provisions are incorporated as Commitments and Core Values, others are included in other sections of the governing documents. For example,

1. In **AoC Section 8(b)**, ICANN commits to 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.
 - a. Article XVIII, Section 1 of the [Bylaws](#) currently provide that *“the principal office for the transaction of the business of ICANN shall be in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, United States of America. ICANN may also have an additional office or offices within or outside the United States of America as it may from time to time establish.”*
 - b. As set forth in the current Articles of Incorporation, ICANN’s is incorporated as a *“nonprofit public benefit corporation under the California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law for charitable and public purposes.”*
2. In **AoC Section 7**, ICANN commits to adhere to transparent and accountable budgeting processes, fact-based policy development, cross community deliberations and responsive consultation procedures, including detailed explanations of the basis for decisions, including how comments have influenced the development of policy consideration, to publish an annual report of its progress, and to provide thorough and reasoned explanations for its decisions, etc. The [CCWG-Accountability](#) proposes to incorporate this commitment into [Bylaws](#) Article III, which governs transparency.
3. In **AoC Section 4**, ICANN commits to perform and publish analysis of the positive and negative effects of its decisions on the public. The [CCWG-Accountability](#) proposes to incorporate this commitment into [Bylaws](#) Article III, which governs transparency.

65 In each case above, any changes to the relevant governing documents would be subject to rejection by the community or a direction that the [Board](#) reconsider the proposed change in accordance with the recommendations set out in Section 2.6.3 of the [CCWG-Accountability](#) Draft Report.

| Current Bylaws Language | Working Draft New/changed text appears in red or strike-out text | Notes, Comments, Questions |
|---|--|---|
| 66 Bylaws re reconciling competing Core Values | 69 Commitments and Core Values | 77 <i>ICANN’s Mission Statement articulates WHAT is in scope and includes examples of what is out of scope for ICANN. ICANN’s “Core Values” articulate HOW ICANN is to carry out its Mission. The CCWG-Accountability acknowledges that in some situations the Core Values may be in tension with one another, requiring a decision maker to reconcile the competing values</i> |
| 67 In performing its Mission, the following core values should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN: [Core Values Listed] | 70 In performing-carrying out its Mission, ICANN will act in a manner that complies with and reflects ICANN’s Commitments and respects ICANN’s Core Values, both described below. | |
| 68 These core values are deliberately expressed in very general terms, so that they may provide useful and | 71 These Commitments and Core Values are deliberately expressed in very general terms, so that they may | |

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:52 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:10 AM
Deleted: m
- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:10 AM
Deleted: m
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:59 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:53 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>relevant guidance in the broadest possible range of circumstances. Because they are not narrowly prescriptive, the specific way in which they apply, individually and collectively, to each new situation will necessarily depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated; and because they are statements of principle rather than practice, situations will inevitably arise in which perfect fidelity to all eleven core values simultaneously is not possible. Any ICANN body making a recommendation or decision shall exercise its judgment to determine which core values are most relevant and how they apply to the specific circumstances of the case at hand, and to determine, if necessary, an appropriate and defensible balance among competing values.</p> | <p>intended to apply provide useful and relevant guidance in the broadest possible range of circumstances. Because they are not narrowly prescriptive, the The specific way in which they apply, individually and collectively, to each new situation will necessarily may depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated. and because they are statements of principle rather than practice, Situations may will inevitably arise in which perfect fidelity to all eleven Fundamental <u>Commitments</u> and Core Values simultaneously is not possible.</p> <p>72 To the extent a Commitment must be reconciled with other <u>Commitments</u> and/or one or more Core Values in any particular situation, such reconciliation must be:</p> <p>73 Justified by an important, specific, and articulated public interest goal that is within ICANN's Mission and consistent with a balanced application of ICANN's other <u>Commitments</u> and Core Values (a "Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest");</p> <p>74 Likely to promote that interest, taking into account competing public and private interests that are likely to be affected by the balancing;</p> <p>75 Narrowly tailored using the least restrictive means reasonably available; and No broader than reasonably necessary to address the</p> | <p>to achieve ICANN's Mission. ICANN's current <u>Bylaws</u> describe this process and permit the decision maker to exercise its judgment in order to achieve "an appropriate and defensible balance among competing values."</p> <p>78 While some degree of flexibility is needed, the language in the current <u>Bylaws</u> provides no principled basis for reconciling the principles in any particular situation. The proposed language articulates the standard to be applied when an ICANN decision maker is required to reconcile competing values. To facilitate this process and to limit opportunities for abuse, the <u>CCWG-Accountability</u> proposes to create a two-tiered values statement consisting of ICANN "<u>Commitments</u>" and "Core Values."</p> <p>79 To the extent that this kind of reconciliation would impinge on one or more of the fundamental <u>Commitments</u>, the proposed language would require the decision maker to meet a high bar, demonstrating that any balancing is necessary and likely to achieve an important public interest goal, and narrowly tailored to achieve that goal. The bar is set to be somewhat more flexible with respect to reconciliation of Core Values.</p> |
|--|--|--|

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:53 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:53 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:59 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:59 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:53 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>specified Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest.</p> <p>76 In any situation where one Core Value must be reconciled with another, potentially competing Core Value, the balancing must further an important public interest in a way that is substantially related to that interest.</p> | |
| <p>Section 2. CORE VALUES.</p> <p>80 In performing its Mission, the following core values should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global Interoperability of the Internet. 2. Respecting the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to those matters within ICANN's mission requiring or significantly benefiting from global coordination. 3. Employing open and transparent policy development mechanisms that (i) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (ii) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process. 4. Making decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity | <p>81 Commitments, In performing its Mission, the following core values should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN: ICANN must operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and applicable law and international conventions and through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets, and that reflect the Commitments and Core Values the Fundamental Rights set forth below. Specifically, ICANN's action must:</p> <p>82 Preserveing and enhanceing the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS and the Internet; 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; Respecting the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by</p> | <p>83 This additional language is derived from ICANN's current Articles of Incorporation. This language also supports Affirmation of Commitments language, including Section 3, in which ICANN "commits to: (a) ensure that decisions made related to the global technical coordination of the DNS are made in the public interest and are accountable and transparent; (b) preserve the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS; (c) promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace; and (d) facilitate international participation in DNS technical coordination."</p> <p>84 In <i>AoC Section 9.2 and AoC Section 3(b)</i> ICANN commits to preserve the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS.</p> <p>85 In AoC Section 8(a), ICANN affirms its commitments to 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.</p> <p>86 In AoC Section 8(c), ICANN</p> |

- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:54 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:10 AM
Deleted: m
- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:10 AM
Deleted: m

- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:54 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>and fairness. ALSO: Bylaws Section 3: ICANN shall not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition.</p> <p>5. Remaining accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN's effectiveness.</p> | <p>the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to matters that are within ICANN's Mission and requireing or significantly benefit from global coordination; Employing open, transparent and bottom-up, private sector led multistakeholder policy development mechanisms processes that (i) seeks input from the public, for whose benefit ICANN shall in all events act, (ii) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (iii) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process; Makeing decisions by applying documented policies consistently, neutrally, objectively, and fairly, with integrity and fairness without singling out any particular party for disparate discriminatory treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition; Remainig accountable to the Internet Community through mechanisms defined in the Bylaws that enhance ICANN's effectiveness.</p> | <p>commits to operate as a multi-stakeholder, private sector led organization with input from the public, for whose benefit ICANN shall in all events act.</p> <p>87 The changes in the current Bylaws for Core Value #8 reflect and incorporate current Bylaws Section 3. On NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT. The OED defines "disparate" as "Essentially different in kind; not able to be compared." "Discriminatory" is defined as "making or showing an unfair or prejudicial distinction between different categories of people or things." This change was suggested by one of the CCWG-Accountability's independent experts.</p> <p>88 In <i>AoC Section 9.1</i>, ICANN commits to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency."</p> |
| <p>89 Core Values: In performing its Mjssion, the following core values should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN:</p> <p>90 4. Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.</p> | <p>96 Core Values: In performing its Mjssion, the following core values should also guide the decisions and actions of ICANN:</p> <p>97 Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making to ensure that</p> | <p>104 In <i>AoC Section 7</i>, ICANN commits to "fact-based policy development, cross-community deliberations, and responsive consultation procedures that provide detailed explanations of the basis for decisions, including how comments have influenced the development of policy consideration."</p> <p>105 AoC 3(a) provides that ICANN will ensure that decisions made</p> |

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:10 AM
Deleted: m

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:11 AM
Deleted: m

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:11 AM
Deleted: m

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| 91 3. To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties. | decisions are made in the global public interest identified through the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process and are accountable, transparent, and respect the bottom-up multistakeholder nature of ICANN process; | related to the global technical coordination of the DNS are made in the public interest and are accountable and transparent. |
| 92 5. Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment. | 98 To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties and the roles of both ICANN's internal bodies and external expert bodies; | 106 Text has been added in an attempt to address the difficulty in defining "public interest" without reference to the substantive issue in question, the context in which the issue arises, and the process through which it is identified. Does this solve the problem? Is the language redundant and unnecessary in light of the Commitment to operate for the benefit of the public? |
| 93 6. Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest. | 99 Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a healthy competitive environment in the DNS market that enhances consumer trust and choice. | 107 In <i>AoC Section 9.3</i> , ICANN commits to promote "competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice." |
| 94 9. Acting with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected. | 100 Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest as identified through the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process. | 108 <i>AoC 3(c)</i> provides that ICANN will "promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace." |
| 95 11. While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account governments' or public authorities' recommendations. | 101 Operate with efficiency and excellence, acting in a fiscally responsible and accountable manner and at a speed that is responsive to the needs of the global Internet community. | 109 In <i>AoC Section 9.3</i> , ICANN commits to promote "competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice." See discussion above re "public interest." |
| | 102 While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for | 110 In <i>AoC Section 7</i> , ICANN "commits to adhere to transparent and accountable budgeting processes." |
| | | 111 In <i>AoC Section 8</i> , ICANN commits to "operate as a multi-stakeholder, private sector led organization." <i>AoC Section 8</i> |

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | public policy and duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities in accordance with the Bylaws and to the extent consistent with these Fundamental Commitments and Core Values. | further provides that ICANN is a private organization and not controlled by any one entity. |
| 103 | [Not advance] [Refrain from advancing] the interests of one or more interest groups at the expense of others | 112 In AoC Section 4, ICANN commits to perform analyses to ensure that its decisions are in the public interest, and not just the interests of a particular set of stakeholders. |

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:54 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:33 PM
Comment [6]: 06 **Adler note: Will both alternatives be left in the report?**

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:11 AM
Deleted: c

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:11 AM
Deleted: m

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:11 AM
Deleted: c

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:11 AM
Deleted: v

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:33 PM
Comment [7]: 07 ← **These cross-references need to be updated. (a) and (b) are no longer used, and this is confusing as written!**

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:44 PM
Deleted: <#>That this defining and establishing clause of the Fundamental Bylaws can only be changed by the process mentioned in b) above (that it, it is listed in the provision in a) above). -

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

2.3 Fundamental Bylaws

2.3.1 What is a “Fundamental Bylaw”

113 ICANN’s Bylaws can generally be changed by resolution of the Board. With a 2/3 majority, the Board can change the rules of the game within ICANN. The CCWG-Accountability believes that some aspects of ICANN’s Bylaws should be **harder to change** than others. These would be deemed Fundamental Bylaws. The Core Mission, Commitments, and Values of ICANN, or core features of the accountability tools set out in this Report, would be examples of things that the Board on its own should not be able to change.

2.3.2 Establishing Fundamental Bylaws

114 The CCWG-Accountability therefore proposes the creation of Fundamental Bylaws. They become fundamental by identifying them as such, and by defining a different (and more difficult) process to change them than the process used for general Bylaws changes.

- 115 **To implement this, a new provision would be added to the Bylaws that sets out:**
1. Which sections of the Bylaws are Fundamental Bylaws (i.e. a list of the articles / sections / subsections that are Fundamental – **which would include this new provision**)
 2. How new Fundamental Bylaws can be defined and how existing Fundamental Bylaws can be changed or removed

116 Legal advice has confirmed this proposition is feasible.

2.3.3 Adding new or changing existing Fundamental [Bylaws](#)

117 It is important to be able to define new Fundamental [Bylaws](#) over time, or to change or remove existing ones, as the purpose of these accountability reforms would not be served if ICANN could not change in response to the changing Internet environment. On the other hand, there appears to be consensus that ICANN should be able to expand its Mission only under very limited circumstances. To establish a new Fundamental Bylaw or to change or remove an existing one, the following steps would be followed where the [Board](#) (or the staff through the [Board](#)) is proposing the addition:

1. The [Board](#) would propose the new Fundamental Bylaw or a change to / removal of an existing one through the usual process, but would need to identify it as a Fundamental Bylaw Proposal throughout the process.
2. The [Board](#) would need to cast 3/4 of votes in favor of the change (higher than the usual threshold of 2/3).
3. The new community power set out in 2.6.4 to approve changes to Fundamental [Bylaws](#) would apply. The threshold to approve the change would be set at a high bar, similar to the level of support needed to recall the entire [Board](#).
4. If the change were agreed, then the new Fundamental Bylaw would appear in the [Bylaws](#) wherever it had to, and reference to the text as a Fundamental Bylaw would be added to the part of the [Bylaws](#) that lists them. In the case of an amendment, the text would be amended. In the case of a removal, the text would be removed and the reference to that part would be removed.

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:35 PM

Deleted: 6

118 [QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:](#)

119 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) welcomes feedback on whether there is a need, as part of Work Stream 1 (pre-Transition), to provide for any other means for other parts of the ICANN system to be able to propose new Fundamental [Bylaws](#) or changes to existing ones. In particular, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) welcomes feedback on whether the Mission Statement should be subject to even higher bars.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 10:11 AM

Deleted: m

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:55 PM

Deleted: Guarantees

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

2.3.4 Which of the current [Bylaws](#) would become Fundamental [Bylaws](#)?

120 The general approach should be to have only critical matters defined in the Fundamental [Bylaws](#) to avoid introducing unnecessary rigidity into ICANN's structures. It would harm, not help, accountability to make changes to [Bylaws](#) in general face the same thresholds as are proposed for Fundamental [Bylaws](#). In the [CCWG-Accountability](#)'s view, "critical matters" are those that define the corporation's scope and [Mission](#), and the core accountability tools the community requires. Accordingly, the following would be Fundamental [Bylaws](#) in the first instance:

1. The Mission / [Commitments](#) / Core Values;
2. The Independent Review process;

3. The manner in which Fundamental [Bylaws](#) can be amended;
4. The powers set out in section 2.6 of this report;
5. [Reviews that are part of the CWG-Stewardship's work – the IANA Function Review and any others they may require;](#)

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:42 PM
Deleted: 6

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:44 PM
Deleted: s

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:36 PM
Deleted: the Separation Review;

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:36 PM
Deleted: <#>The CCWG is interested in views from the community about whether there are other parts of the Bylaws that should be protected by making them Fundamental Bylaws. .

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 8:03 AM
Comment [8]: 08Per Kavouss' comment

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 8:03 AM
Deleted: s

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:55 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:35 PM
Deleted: in all cases

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:55 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:36 PM
Deleted: they are But

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

121
QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:

122 3) Do you agree that the introduction of Fundamental [Bylaws](#) would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation, [including the list of which Bylaws should become Fundamental Bylaws](#)? If not, please detail how you would recommend amending these requirements.

2.4 Independent Review Panel [Enhancement](#)

INTRODUCTION

123 The consultation process undertaken by ICANN produced numerous comments calling for overhaul and reform of ICANN's existing Independent Review Process (IRP). Commenters called for ICANN to be held to a *substantive standard of behavior* rather than just an evaluation of whether or not its action was taken in good faith. Commenters called for a process that was *binding* rather than merely advisory. Commenters also strongly urged that the IRP be *accessible*, both financially and from a standing perspective, [transparent](#), *efficient*, and that it be designed to produce *consistent and coherent results* that will serve as a guide for future actions.

124 The process described below calls for a standing, independent panel of skilled jurists/arbitrators who are retained by ICANN and can be called upon over time and across issues to resolve disputes regarding whether ICANN is staying within its limited technical Mission, whether it is abiding by policies adopted by the multistakeholder community, and whether in carrying out its mission and applying consensus policies it is acting in accordance with the [Commitments](#), to the community and its Core Values, as required by the proposed [Bylaws](#). (See, *Statement of Mission, Commitments, and Core Values*.)

125 The proposal calls for a fully *independent* judicial/arbitral function. The purpose of a standing panel is to ensure that panelists are not beholden to ICANN or any of its constituent bodies – but a core skill of this IRP's panelists is the need to build a thorough and detailed understanding of how ICANN's Mission is implemented, and its commitments and values applied – over time and across a variety of situations.

1. **Purpose of the IRP:** The overall purpose is to ensure that ICANN does not exceed the scope of its limited technical mission and, in carrying out that mission, acts in a manner that respects community-agreed fundamental rights, freedoms, and values.
 - a. Empower the community and affected individuals/entities to prevent "mission creep," enforce compliance with established multistakeholder

5. **Standing:** Any person/group/entity “materially affected” by an ICANN decision maker that (a) exceeds the scope of ICANN’s limited Mission; (b) has been undertaken in a manner that violates ICANN’s [Commitments](#), and/or Core Values; or (c) violates an established ICANN policy.
 - a. Interim (prospective, interlocutory, injunctive, status quo preservation) relief will be available in advance of [Board](#)/management/staff action where a complainant can demonstrate:
 - b. Harm that cannot be cured once a decision has been taken or for which there is no adequate remedy once a decision has been taken;
 - c. Either (a) a likelihood of success on the merits or (b) sufficiently serious questions going to the merits; and
 - d. A balance of hardships tipping decidedly toward the party seeking the relief.

6. The [CCWG-Accountability](#) recommends giving the community, as described in section 2.6.1, the right to have standing before the IRP. In such a case, the burden of the legal fees would be on ICANN. The precise process for such a case is still under development.

7. [In their letter dated 15 April 2015, the CWG-Stewardship-Stewardship indicated “As such any appeal mechanism developed by the CCWG-Accountability should not cover ccTLD delegation/re-delegation issues as these are expected to be developed by the ccTLD community through the appropriate processes”. As requested by the CWG-Stewardship, decisions regarding ccTLD delegations or revocations would be excluded from standing, until relevant appeal mechanisms have been developed by the ccTLD community, in coordination with other parties.](#)

8. **Standard of Review:** A party challenging an action or inaction has the burden to demonstrate that the complained-of action violates either (a) substantive limitations on the permissible scope of ICANN’s actions, or (b) decision-making procedures, in each case as set forth in ICANN’s By-laws, Articles of Incorporation, or *Statement of Mission, [Commitments](#), and Core Values.*

9. **Composition of Panel; Expertise:** Significant legal expertise, particularly international arbitration expertise and expertise, developed over time, about the DNS and ICANN’s policies, practices, and procedures. At a minimum, Panelists should receive training on the workings and management of the domain name system. Panelists must have access to skilled technical experts upon request. In addition to legal expertise and a strong understanding of the DNS, panelists may confront issues where highly technical, civil society, business, diplomatic, and regulatory skills are needed. To the extent that individual panelists have one or more of these areas of expertise, the process must ensure that this expertise is available upon request.
 - a. While most of the working group was comfortable with this formulation, some participants prefer to require that the panelists themselves

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:55 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:54 PM
Deleted: [\[Sidley Note: Standing would also necessarily require an agreement to be bound by the outcome of the IRP process on behalf of the person invoking it\]. \[Sidley Note: Intervention by affected third parties may also be allowed under the IRP rules of procedure\].](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:55 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:56 PM
Deleted: [\[Sidley Note: may wish to add, \(c\) in violation of the California Corporations Code as interpreted by courts of competent jurisdiction\].](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

possess the requisite skill sets – of course, individual panelists need not possess every kind of expertise, rather, they suggest that taken together the panel should possess the requisite skills.

10. **Diversity: Geographic diversity.** English as primary working language with provision of translation services for claimants as needed. The Standing Panel members should have diversity in geographic and cultural representation. Diversity of experience will be considered in completing the composition of the Panel. Reasonable efforts should be undertaken to achieve such diversity.

11. **Size of Panel**

- a. Standing Panel – 7
- b. Decisional Panel – 1 or 3 Panelists

12. **Independence:** Members must be independent of ICANN, including ICANN SOs and ACs. Members should be compensated at a rate that cannot decline during their fixed term; no removal except for specified cause (corruption, misuse of position for personal use, etc.) To ensure independence, term limits should apply, and post-term appointment to [Board](#), NomCom, or other positions within ICANN would be prohibited.

13. **Selection and Appointment:** The selection of panelists would follow a 3-step process:

- a. Third party international arbitral bodies would nominate candidates
- b. The ICANN [Board](#) would select panelists and propose appointees.
- c. The community mechanism (see section 2.6) would be asked to confirm appointments.

14. **Recall or other Accountability:** Appointments made for a fixed term with no removal except for specified cause (corruption, misuse of position for personal use, etc.).

15. **Settlement Efforts:**

- a. Reasonable efforts, as specified in a public policy, must be made to resolve disputes informally prior to/in connection with filing an IRP case.
- b. Parties to cooperatively engage informally, but either party may inject independent dispute resolution facilitator (mediator) after initial CEP meeting. Either party can terminate informal dispute resolution efforts (CEP or mediation) if, after specified period, that party's concludes in good faith that further efforts are unlikely to produce agreement.
- c. The process must be governed by clearly understood and **pre-published rules applicable to both parties** and be subject to strict time limits.

16. **Decision Making:**

- a. In each case, a single or 3 member panel will be drawn from standing panels. In single member panel, ICANN and complaining party agree

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:56 PM

Deleted: [\[The location of the panel would need to be specified and could be limited to Los Angeles or other locations where ICANN has offices.\]](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

on panelist. In 3-member panel cases, each party selects one panelist, and those panelists select a third. We anticipate that the Standing Panel would draft, issue for comment, and revise procedural rules. Focus on streamlined, simplified processes with rules that are easy to understand and follow.

- b. Panel decisions will be based on each IRP panelist's assessment of the merits of the claimant's case. The panel may undertake a de novo review of the case, make findings of fact, and issue decisions based on those facts. All decisions will be documented, and made public, and will reflect a well-reasoned application of the standard to be applied (i.e., the *Statement of Mission*, *Commitments*, and *Core Values*.

17. **Decision:**

- a. Panel decisions (where there is more than one panelist) would be determined by a simple majority. Alternatively, this could be included in the category of procedures that the IRP itself should be empowered to set.
- b. The CCWG-Accountability recommends that IRP decisions be "precedential" – meaning, that deference should a panel give to prior decisions? By conferring precedential weight on panel decisions, the IRP can provide guidance for future actions and inaction by ICANN decision-makers, which is valuable. It also reduces the chances of inconsistent treatment of one claimant or another, based on the specific individuals making up the decisional panel in particular cases. But this makes it more likely that a "bad" decision in one case affects other cases going forward.
- c. It is expected that judgments of the IRP would be enforceable in the court of the US and other countries that accept international arbitration results.

18. **Accessibility and Cost:**

- a. The CCWG-Accountability recommends that ICANN would bear the administrative the costs of maintaining the system (including Panelist salaries). The Panel may provide for loser pays/fee shifting in the event it identifies a challenge or defense as frivolous or abusive. ICANN should seek to establish access to pro bono representation for community, non-profit complainants.
- b. The Panel should complete work expeditiously; issuing a scheduling order early in the process, and in the ordinary course should issue decisions within a standard time frame.

19. **Implementation:** The CCWG-Accountability proposes that the revised IRP provisions be adopted as Fundamental Bylaws.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:56 PM
Deleted: [

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:56 PM
Deleted: ?]

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:56 PM
Deleted: *Guarantees*

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

- 20. **Transparency:** The community has expressed concerns regarding the ICANN document/information access policy and implementation. Free access to relevant information is an essential element of a robust independent review process. We recommend reviewing and enhancing the DIDP as part of the accountability enhancements in Work Stream 2.

126 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES**

127 4) Do you agree that the proposed improvements to the IRP would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

128 A detailed list of questions regarding principles and implementation for the IRP is provided in Appendix I. The [CCWG-Accountability](#) Accountability would appreciate detailed community input to guide its work into providing more detailed requirements for the enhanced IRP. A specific community input form is provided.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

2.5 Reconsideration Process Enhancement

129 **INTRODUCTION**

130 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) proposes a number of key reforms to ICANN's Request for Reconsideration process, whereby the ICANN **Board** of Directors is obliged to reconsider a recent decision or action / inaction by ICANN's **Board** or staff, and which is provided for in Article IV, section 2 of ICANN's **Bylaws**. The key reforms proposed include: the scope of permissible requests has been expanded to include **Board**/staff actions or inactions that contradict ICANN's mission or core values, and the time for filing a Request for Reconsideration has been extended from 15 to 30 days. Additionally, the grounds for summary dismissal have been narrowed and the ICANN **Board** of directors must make determinations on all requests (rather than a committee handling staff issues). Another proposed change is that ICANN's ombudsman should make the initial substantive evaluation of the requests to aid the **Board** Governance Committee in its recommendation, and then requesters are provided an opportunity to rebut the BGC's recommendation before a final decision by the entire **Board**. More transparency requirements and firm deadlines in issuing of determinations are also proposed.

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 8:03 AM
Comment [9]: 09Per Kavouss' comment

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 8:03 AM
Deleted: s

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

131 **STANDING**

132 Amend "who" has proper standing to file a Reconsideration Request to widen its scope by including **Board**/staff actions/inactions that contradict ICANN's *mission or core values* (was only *policies* before). It is noted that under the existing **Bylaws** paragraph 2 significantly reduces the rights purportedly granted in paragraph 1 of the Reconsideration Request process.

133 **ICANN's [Bylaws](#) could be revised (added text in red below):**

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

- a. ICANN shall have in place a process by which any person or entity materially affected by an action of ICANN may request review or reconsideration of that action by the [Board](#).
- b. Any person or entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction ("Reconsideration Request") to the extent that he, she, or it have been adversely affected by:
 - a. One or more [ICANN Board](#) or staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy(ies), **its mission, core values**; or
 - b. One or more actions or inactions of the [ICANN Board](#) that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of ~~material~~ **relevant** information, except where the party submitting the request could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the [Board](#)'s consideration at the time of action or refusal to act; or
 - c. One or more actions or inactions of the [ICANN Board](#) that are taken as a result of the [Board](#)'s reliance on false or inaccurate ~~material~~ **relevant** information.

134 [In their letter dated 15 April 2015, the CWG-Stewardship requested indicated "As such, any appeal mechanism developed by the CCWG-Accountability should not cover ccTLD delegation / re-delegation issues as these are expected to be developed by the ccTLD community through the appropriate processes." As requested by the CWG-Stewardship, decisions regarding ccTLD delegations or revocations would be excluded from standing, until relevant appeal mechanisms have been developed by the ccTLD community, in coordination with other interested parties.](#)

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

135 **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

136 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) proposals in terms of standard of review are as follows:

- Broaden the types of decisions, which can be re-examined to include [Board](#)/staff action/inaction against ICANN's mission or core values (as stated in [Bylaws](#) / Articles).
- Provide more transparency in dismissal process
- Provide [Board](#) with reasonable right to dismiss frivolous requests, but not on the grounds that one didn't participate in ICANN's public comment or on the claim one is vexatious or querulous, which is too subjective.
- Propose to amend Paragraph 9 on BGC summary dismissal as follows:

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

137 The [Board](#) Governance Committee shall review each Reconsideration Request upon its receipt to determine if it is sufficiently stated. The [Board](#) Governance Committee may summarily dismiss a Reconsideration Request if: (i) the requestor fails to meet the requirements for bringing a Reconsideration Request; (ii) it is frivolous ~~querulous or vexatious~~; or (iii) ~~the requestor had notice and opportunity to, but did not, participate in the public comment period relating to the contested action, if applicable.~~ The [Board](#) Governance Committee's summary dismissal of a Reconsideration Request shall be **documented and promptly** posted on the Website.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

138 **COMPOSITION**

139 The group considers there is need to rely less on the legal department (who holds a strong legal obligation to protect the corporation) to guide the BGC on its recommendations. More [Board](#) member engagement is needed in the overall decision-making process.

140 Requests should no longer go to ICANN's lawyers (in-house or out-house) for the first substantive evaluation. Instead, the Requests could go to ICANN's [Ombudsman](#) for a first look, who could make the initial recommendation to the BGC. The Ombudsman may have more of an eye for fairness to the community in looking at these requests. Note the [Bylaws](#) charge the BGC with these duties, so BGC would utilize the Ombudsman instead of its current practice of ICANN's lawyers to aid the BGC's in its initial evaluation.

141 All final determinations of reconsideration requests are to be made by the entire [Board](#) (not only requests about [Board](#) actions as is the current practice).

142 **Amend Paragraph 3:**

c. The [Board](#) has designated the [Board](#) Governance Committee to review and consider any such Reconsideration Requests. The [Board](#) Governance Committee shall have the authority to:

- Evaluate requests for review or reconsideration;
- Summarily dismiss insufficient requests;
- Evaluate requests for urgent consideration;
- Conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;
- Request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from other parties;
- Make a final determination on Reconsideration Requests regarding staff action or inaction, without reference to the [Board](#) of Directors; and
- Make a recommendation to the [Board](#) of Directors on the merits of the request, as necessary.

143 And delete Paragraph 15 since the [Board](#) will make all final decisions regarding requests related to staff action/inaction:

144 **DECISION-MAKING**

145 Transparency improvements are needed regarding the information that goes into the [Board](#)'s decision-making process and the rationale for why decisions are ultimately taken. Recordings / transcripts should be posted of the substantive [Board](#) discussions on the option of the requester.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 6:57 PM

~~Deleted: <#>For all Reconsideration Requests brought regarding staff action or inaction, the Board Governance Committee shall be delegated the authority by the Board of Directors to make a final determination and recommendation on the matter. Board consideration of the recommendation is not required. As the Board Governance Committee deems necessary, it may make recommendation to the Board for consideration and action. The Board Governance Committee's determination on staff action or inaction shall be posted on the Website. The Board Governance Committee's determination is final and establishes precedential value.~~

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

~~Deleted: CCWG~~

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

~~Deleted: Thursday~~

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

~~Deleted: April 30~~

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

~~Deleted: ,~~

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

~~Deleted: 21~~

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

~~Deleted: 2~~

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

~~Deleted: 98~~

146 Provide a rebuttal opportunity to the BGC's final recommendation (although requesters can't raise new issues in a rebuttal) before the full Board finally decides.

147 Adding hard deadlines to the process, including final determinations of the Board issued within 120 days from request. [although a request for reconsideration will not stay the effect of Board actions]

148 Propose to amend reconsideration rules as follows (in red):

149 The Board Governance Committee shall make a final determination or a recommendation to the Board with respect to a Reconsideration Request within thirty days following its receipt of the request, unless impractical, in which case it shall report to the Board the circumstances that prevented it from making a final recommendation and its best estimate of the time required to produce such a final determination or recommendation. In any event, the BGC's final recommendation to the Board shall be made within 90 days of receipt of the Request. The final recommendation shall be promptly posted on ICANN's website and shall address each of the arguments raised in the Request. The Requestor may file a rebuttal to the recommendation of the BGC within 15 days of receipt of it, which shall also be promptly posted to ICANN's website and provided to the entire Board for its evaluation.

150 The Board shall not be bound to follow the recommendations of the Board Governance Committee. The final decision of the Board and its rationale shall be made public as part of the preliminary report and minutes of the Board meeting at which action is taken. The Board shall issue its decision on the recommendation of the Board Governance Committee within 60 days of receipt of the Reconsideration Request or as soon thereafter as feasible. Any circumstances that delay the Board from acting within this timeframe must be identified and posted on ICANN's website. In any event, the Board's final decision shall be made within 120 days of receipt of the Request. The final recommendation shall be promptly posted on ICANN's website and shall address each of the arguments raised in the request. The Board's decision on the recommendation is final.

151 ACCESSIBILITY

152 Extend the time deadline for filing a Reconsideration Request from 15 to 30 days from when Requester learns of the decision/inaction.

153 Amend paragraph 5 as follows:

1. All Reconsideration Requests must be submitted to an e-mail address designated by the Board Governance Committee within fifteen 30 days after:
 - a) for requests challenging Board actions, the date on which information about the challenged Board action is first published in a resolution, unless the posting of the resolution is not accompanied by a rationale.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

- In that instance, the request must be submitted within 30 days from the initial posting of the rationale; or
- b) for requests challenging staff actions, the date on which the party submitting the request became aware of, or reasonably should have become aware of, the challenged staff action; or
 - c) for requests challenging either Board or staff inaction, the date on which the affected person reasonably concluded, or reasonably should have concluded, that action would not be taken in a timely manner.

154 **DUE PROCESS**

155 ICANN's Document and Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) should be improved to accommodate the legitimate need for requesters to obtain internal ICANN documents that are relevant to their requests.

156 Provide all briefing materials supplied to the Board to the Requester should be provided so that they may know the arguments against them and have an opportunity to respond (subject to legitimate and documented confidentiality requirements).

157 Final decisions should be issued sooner – hard deadline of 120 days.

158 Requesters should be provided more time to learn of action/inaction and to file the request.

159 Transparency improvements throughout the process are called for, including more complete documentation and prompt publication of submissions and decisions including their rationale.

160 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES**

161 5) Do you agree that the proposed improvements to the reconsideration process would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

162 Are the timeframes and deadlines proposed herein sufficient to meet the community's needs?

163 Is the scope of permissible requests broad / narrow enough to meet the community's needs?

2.6 Community Empowerment

2.6.1 Mechanism to empower the community

164 Initial legal advice has indicated that the set of powers proposed in this report can be reserved to the ICANN multistakeholder community. More specifically there are approaches we can take

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:46 PM
Deleted: made available
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

within ICANN to make these powers legally available and enforceable.

165 As overall comments, the CCWG-Accountability is largely agreed on the following:

1. To be as restrained as possible in the degree of structural or organizing changes required in ICANN to create the mechanism for these powers
2. To organize the mechanism along the same lines as the community – that is, in line and compatible with the current SO / AC / SG structures (without making it impossible to change these in future)

166 The subsections below explain the CCWG-Accountability's reference proposal for the Community Mechanism and the major alternative considered to it (2.6.1.1), and the proposed participants in the mechanism and their levels of influence (2.6.1.2).

2.6.1.1 The Community Mechanism: SO/AC Membership Model

1. In its deliberations and in discussion with its independent legal counsel, it has become apparent that ICANN as a non-profit corporation organized under California law is able to reserve the multistakeholder community the powers the CCWG-Accountability is proposing for the community. To secure the delivery of these powers, however, ICANN needs to make use of membership or designator roles.
2. While the status quo has elements of a designator model, efforts to simply expand the powers of the multistakeholder community through the Bylaws would be insufficient because such Bylaws would be unlikely to be enforceable to the degree the global multistakeholder community - or this CCWG-Accountability - would expect. In preparing for the environment that emerges following the end of the post-NTIA contract, our task as a CCWG-Accountability is to strengthen ICANN's accountability, not to allow it to be weakened. So the status quo is not an option.
3. California law, similar to the law of many other jurisdictions, allows for membership of non-profit corporations. Members have certain powers provided by law that may be expanded upon through Articles and Bylaws in a manner that is enforceable.
4. The CCWG-Accountability proposes a the creation of a formal membership body called the "SO/AC Membership model. This is the approach that, based on analysis so far, fits requirements best. This model, referred to here as the Reference Mechanism would have the following key characteristics:
 - a. The ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees would each become a "Member" of ICANN, and through organization as unincorporated associations they would exercise the community powers proposed in this part of the Report.
 - b. In their role as Members, they would exercise the new community powers set out in 2.6.2-2.6.7 below. Our legal counsel have advised

- Deleted: durable
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
- Deleted: CCWG
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:46 PM
- Deleted: should be organised
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:02 PM
- Deleted: existing
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
- Deleted: CCWG
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:44 PM
- Deleted: 6...6.1.1), and the prop... [10]
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:38 PM
- Deleted: Reference Mechanism
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:47 PM
- Deleted: clear ...pparent that ... [11]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
- Deleted: CCWG
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:12 AM
- Deleted: All the group's requi... [12]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:46 PM
- Deleted: ,
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:48 PM
- Deleted: the best we could do... [13]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
- Deleted: CCWG...CWG-... [14]
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:15 AM
- Deleted: Under the designat... [15]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:49 PM
- Deleted: a range of powers ... [16]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
- Deleted: CCWG
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:50 PM
- Deleted: has therefore decide... [17]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:01 PM
- Deleted: Reference Mechanic... [18]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:50 PM
- Deleted: n SO/AC Membersh... [19]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:02 PM
- Deleted: e
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:52 PM
- Deleted: form unincorpor... [20]
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:56 PM
- Deleted: and through ... [21]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:53 PM
- Deleted: members
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:39 PM
- Deleted: 6...6.2-6 ... [22]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:53 PM
- Deleted: The lawyers are ... [23]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
- Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account... [9]

that the powers we are proposing can be realized and enforced through this Membership model.

- c. All of the existing functions and work of the SOs and ACs would continue being done within the framework of the ICANN Bylaws. It is only the new accountability powers that would require use of the unincorporated associations.
- d. There would be no need for individuals or organizations to change the ways in which they participate in ICANN or the SOs or ACs to create the new "Members" or "unincorporated associations." Community participants would have the choice of opting in and participating in this new accountability system, or to simply keep on doing what they do today in an ICANN that is more accountable than it is today.
- e. Our legal advisors have advised that through this structure, there would be no material increase in the risks and liabilities individual ICANN participants face today. In fact, in some respects individual participants would be safer from hostile legal action than they are today.
- f. A set of practical questions and answers regarding unincorporated associations is also available in Appendix H (Sidley and Adler & Colvin Memo (Unincorporated associations))

5. The powers proposed can be implemented under the Reference Mechanism, and it has advantages in terms of enforceability. Because, according to legal counsel, the Membership model provides the clearest path for the community to exercise the six community powers explicitly sought by the CCWG-Accountability, it is our reference mechanism at this time.

In arriving at this SO/AC Membership Model, the primary alternative the CCWG-Accountability has investigated is a model based on "designators" – an SO/AC Designator Model.

Designators are a construct in California law that can achieve reliable enforcement of four of the six community powers sought, specifically with respect to community approval or blocking of changes of Bylaws and the selection and removal of Board Members. There is concern however, regarding the ease and reliability with which the other two community powers sought (approval of budget and strategic plan) can be enforced once created under the designator model, according to legal counsel. Legal counsel further advises that the SOs and ACs should organize themselves into unincorporated associations in both corporate governance models, whether a designator or membership structure, to ensure their ability to enforce their rights.

6. Legal Counsel advise that the Membership model creates the most straightforward mechanism for the community to attain the proposed powers to hold the ICANN Board accountable. In preparing for the environment that emerges following the end of the

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:53 PM
Comment [10]: 10This bullet wasn't in the Report legal counsel reviewed

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:54 PM
Deleted: they participate in to do anything that they currently do within ICANN

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:39 PM
Deleted: Our legal advisors are clear that under California law through this structure, there would be no material incre... [25]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:55 PM
Deleted: All the group'sCCW... [26]

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:39 PM
Deleted: the reference

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:55 PM
Deleted: SO/AC Membership Model

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:40 PM
Deleted: mechanism

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:56 PM
Deleted: the tightest control c... [27]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:40 PM
Deleted: has been suggested... [28]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:03 PM
Deleted: -

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:03 PM
Deleted: -

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:40 PM
Deleted: Reference Mechanism

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-... [29]

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:42 PM
Deleted: In this part of the ref... [30]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:04 PM
Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:56 PM
Deleted: 2

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:51 PM
Deleted: Designators are a c... [31]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:57 PM
Deleted: tightest control on... [32]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account... [24]

post-NTIA contract, our task as a [CCWG-Accountability](#) is to strengthen ICANN's accountability, not to allow it to be weakened. So the status quo is not an option and the community should select either a membership model or an empowered designator model to achieve that accountability.

7. Variations of these mechanisms were also discussed:
- a. The notion of creating a permanent [CCWG-Accountability](#) or a Community Council that was the sole “member” or “designator” was considered but rejected mainly because it created additional accountability problems and offered no accountability advantages compared with the Reference Mechanism;
 - b. The notion of all SOs and ACs collectively creating an unincorporated association that would be the single member of ICANN. However this model “would add only complexity without contributing real advantages”.
 - c. The notion of a first step of change (in a timeframe consistent with [Work Stream 1](#)) focusing on changes in the [Bylaws](#) and current mechanisms only, while assessing the opportunity to go one step further as part of [Work Stream 2](#).

8. None of the mechanism possibilities should be considered “off the table”. The work of the [CCWG-Accountability](#) has proceeded quickly, and our counsel are rapidly becoming familiar with the complexities of ICANN’s history and current approach to dealing with many of these matters.

9. That said, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) is clearly of the view that the [SO/AC Membership Model](#) is the currently preferred approach, and relies on this in much of what follows.

10. [How the Reference Mechanism operates \(whether the votes are “cast” by the SOs and ACs as organized through a Membership model, or there is some community group where there are representatives, and/or model rules for the unincorporated associations\) is an important implementation detail that will be developed by the CCWG-Accountability and open for thorough community consultation in our second Public Comment report.](#)

11. [Please see the additional detail that explains this model set out in Appendix H.](#)

QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES

6) Do you agree that the introduction of a community mechanism to empower the community over certain [Board](#) decisions would enhance ICANN’s accountability?

7) What guidance, if any, would you provide to the [CCWG-Accountability](#) regarding the proposed options? Please provide the underlying rationale in terms of required accountability features or protection against certain contingencies.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:43 PM

Deleted: true

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:43 PM

Deleted: Reference Mechanism

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:43 PM

Deleted: Reference Mechanism

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:58 PM

Deleted: SO/AC Membership ... [34]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:59 PM

Comment [11]: 11Add appendix #

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:06 PM

Comment [12]: 12Comment from Jordan Carter: This needs fixing.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:00 PM

Formatted: Not Highlight

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:00 PM

Deleted: [Legal Assessment - Executive Summary, Summary Chart and Revised Governance...]. Key pieces of legal advice that helped the CCWG arrive at this Reference Mechanism are also available [on the wiki at / attached as Appendices # &.]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:00 PM

Formatted: Not Highlight

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:00 PM

Formatted: Not Highlight

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:17 PM

Deleted: .

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Accour... [33]

2.6.1.2 Influence in the Community Mechanism

170 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) considered the decision weights of the various parts of the community within the [SO/AC Membership Model \(or the Designator model\)](#). The following table sets out the Reference Option, which was the most supported approach among [CCWG-Accountability](#) participants:

| Community segment | Reference Option "votes" |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| ASO | 5 |
| ccNSO | 5 |
| gNSO | 5 |
| At Large | 5 |
| GAC | 5 |
| SSAC | 2 |
| RSSAC | 2 |

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:08 PM
Deleted: mechanism
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:21 PM
Comment [13]: 13Table needs to not break across pages.

171 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) also discussed two [further](#) approaches, neither of which [received](#) significant support:

1. Alternative A - Each SOs receives 4 "votes"; each AC receives 2 "votes"
2. Alternative B - Each SO and AC receives 5 "votes"

- a. The rationale for the Reference Option is that it gives the bulk of influence on an equal basis between the three SOs for which ICANN deals with policy development and the two ACs that are structurally designed to represent stakeholders (Governments and Internet users, respectively) within ICANN, while still guaranteeing a say for the other ACs.
- b. The reasons to allocate a lower number of "votes" to SSAC in the Reference Option is that it is a specific construct within ICANN designed to provide expertise on security and stability, rather than a group representing a community of stakeholders
- c. For RSSAC, the reason is slightly different but relies on the limited size of the community of root server operators as well as the strong focus of their mission on operations (compared with ICANN's mission being focused mainly on policy).
- d. The rationale for Alternative A is that it gives the bulk of influence to the SOs, while guaranteeing a say for the ACs on an equal basis between them. It is therefore more closely aligned with the existing structure of ICANN. It is therefore more closely aligned with the existing structure of ICANN.
- e. The rationale for Alternative B is to give equal influence to each of the seven SOs and ACs.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:03 PM
Deleted: alternative
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:40 AM
Deleted: 1
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:53 PM
Moved (insertion) [64]
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:00 PM
Deleted: and in keeping ICANN rooted in the private sector.
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

- f. The logic for 5 “votes” in the Reference Option for the higher number is to allow for greater diversity of views, including the ability to represent all the ICANN regions in each SO. The logic for 4 “votes” in Alternative A is to allow for appropriate coverage across SGs in the GNSO.
- g. The Reference Option emerged as part of Work Party 1’s deliberations following up on the [CCWG-Accountability](#)’s discussions in Singapore. Alternatives A and B emerged recently in deliberations and of the whole [CCWG-Accountability](#).
- h. The subsidiary option discussed in Istanbul of 2 votes for the first five SOs and ACs, and one vote for the remaining two, has not been pursued.

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:53 PM
Moved up [64]: It is therefore more closely aligned with the existing structure of ICANN and in keeping ICANN rooted in the private sector.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:44 AM
 Deleted: ~~↔~~The CCWG is interested in community views on the relative influence particular SOs and ACs, or classes of these, should have.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG

172 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:**

173 8) What guidance, if any, would you provide to the [CCWG-Accountability](#) regarding the proposed options related to the relative influence of the various groups in the community mechanism? Please provide the underlying rationale in terms of required accountability features or protection against certain contingencies.

[2.6.1.3 Governance models and community powers](#)

Please refer to appendix H, produced by the legal firms.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:59 PM
 Deleted: J

2.6.2 Power: reconsider/reject budget or strategy/operating plans

174 The right to set budgets and strategic direction is a critical governance power for an [organization](#). By allocating resources and defining the goals to which they are directed, strategic/operating plans and budgets have a material impact on what ICANN does and how effectively it fulfills its role.

175 Today, ICANN’s [Board](#) makes final decisions on strategy, operations plans and budgets. While ICANN consults the community in developing strategic/business plans, there is no mechanism defined in the [Bylaws](#) that requires ICANN to develop such plans in a way that includes a community feedback process. Even if feedback was unanimous, the [Board](#) could still opt to ignore it today.

176 This new power would give the community the ability to consider strategic & operating plans and budgets after they are approved by the [Board](#) (but before they come into effect) and reject them based on perceived inconsistency with the purpose, mission and role set out in ICANN’s [Articles and Bylaws](#), the global public interest, the needs of ICANN stakeholders, financial stability or other matters of concern to the community.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
 Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
 Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
 Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
 Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
 Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
 Deleted: 98

177 Time would be included in planning and budgeting processes for the community to consider adopted plans and decide whether to reject [such plans](#) (timeframe to be determined). These processes would also need to set out the required level of detail for such documents. [Note that improvements to the community's input into these processes are for consideration by the CCWG-Accountability as part of Work Stream 2 efforts.](#)

178 If the community exercised this power, the [Board](#) would have to absorb the feedback that came with the decision, make adjustments and pass amended plans. The planning process should be structured so this can be done before there was any day-to-day impact on ICANN's business arising from the power being exercised.

179 In a situation of significant and sustained disagreement between the community and the [Board](#) regarding a proposed annual budget, ICANN would temporarily continue to operate according to the previous year's approved budget. The [Board](#) must however resolve the situation of not operating with an approved budget. Eventually it will have to reconcile itself to the community's view. If the [Board](#) is unable or unwilling to do so, other mechanisms (as set out in this part of the First Public Comment Report) are available if the community wanted to take the matter further.

180 This power does not allow the community to re-write a plan or a budget: it is a process that requires reconsideration of such documents by the [Board](#) if the community feels they are not acceptable. Where a plan or budget has been sent back, all the issues must be [raised](#) on that first return. That plan or budget cannot be sent back again with new issues raised, but the community can reject a subsequent version where it does not accept the [Board's](#) response to the previous rejection.

181 As this power would become part of existing planning processes (incorporated into the [Bylaws](#) as required), it does not raise questions of standing in respect of someone raising a complaint.

182 At the appropriate point in the planning cycle the challenge period would be open, and any participant in the community powers mechanism would be able to raise the question. A 2/3 level of support in the mechanism would be required in the mechanism to reject a first time: a 3/4 level of support for subsequent rejection/s.

183 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:**

184 9) Do you agree that the power for the community to reject a budget or strategic plan would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend amending these requirements.

2.6.3 Power: reconsider/reject changes to ICANN "standard" [Bylaws](#)

185 This section applies to "standard" [Bylaws](#) [all those bylaws that are not Fundamental Bylaws \(see 2.6.4 below\).](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:49 PM

Comment [14]: 14Addition by Jordan Carter

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:01 PM

Comment [15]: 15May have already been address by changing to "raised"

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 5:57 PM

Deleted: tabled

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:07 PM

Deleted: [\[Sidley Note: "Tabled" is unclear. Does tabled mean "explicitly raised" or "presented formally for reconsideration"\]](#)

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:45 AM

Deleted: Would it better to focus on ensuring community input is duly taken into account in the development process leading up ultimate adoption of the budget or strategic plan by the board? .

Adam Peake 4/28/2015 11:21 PM

Formatted: Font:(Default) Helvetica, 11 pt, Font color: Auto, Highlight

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:50 PM

Comment [16]: 16Addition by Jordan Carter

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:49 PM

Deleted: .

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

186 ICANN's [Bylaws](#) set out many of the details for how power is exercised in ICANN, including by setting out the company's Mission, [Commitments](#) and Core Values. Changes to those [Bylaws](#) are generally the right of the [Board](#). It is possible for the [Board](#) to make [Bylaws](#) changes that the community does not support. For example, the [Board](#) could unilaterally change the ccNSO's Policy Development Policy, or the SG structure of the GNSO, or the composition of the Nominating Committee.

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:57 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

187 This power would give the community the right to reject proposed [Bylaws](#) changes after they are approved by the [Board](#) (but before they come into effect). This would most likely be where a proposed change altered the Mission, [Commitments](#) and Core Values, or had a negative impact on ICANN's ability to fulfill its purpose in the community's opinion, but would be available in response to any proposed [Bylaws](#) change.

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:57 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

188 The time required for this power to be exercised would be included in the [Bylaws](#) adoption process (probably a two-week window following [Board](#) approval). If the community exercises this power, the [Board](#) would have to absorb the feedback, make adjustments, and propose a new set of amendments to the [Bylaws](#).

189 It would require a 3/4 level of support in the community mechanism to reject a proposed bylaw change. Note that for the [Board](#) to propose a [Bylaws](#) change requires a 2/3 vote in favor.

190 This power does not allow the community to re-write a proposed [Bylaws](#) change: it is a rejection process where the [Board](#) gets a clear signal the community is not happy. There is no limit to the number of times a proposed change can be rejected, but the threshold for sending one back is a supermajority in the community mechanism set out in 2.6.1 above, to limit any potential for abuse of this power.

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:08 PM
Deleted: elsewhere in this First Public Comment Report

191 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:**

192 10) Do you agree that the power for the community to reject a proposed bylaw change would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:07 PM
Deleted: that are created as "fundamental"

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

2.6.4 Power: approve changes to "Fundamental" [Bylaws](#)

193 As outlined [in section 2.3](#), the [CCWG-Accountability](#) is proposing that some core elements of the [Bylaws](#) be defined as "fundamental". [Fundamental Bylaws](#) will be harder to amend or replace, and through a different process, than the rest of the [Bylaws](#). The intention is to make sure that matters like critical aspects of the powers and processes required to maintain ICANN's accountability to the community, and the organization's purpose and core values, are highly unlikely to change.

194 This power would form part of the process set out for agreeing [to any](#) changes of the
"fundamental" [Bylaws](#). Through the community mechanism, the community would have to give
positive *assent* to any change *before* it was finalized, as part of a co-decision process between
the [Board](#) and the community.

195 Such changes would require a very high degree of community assent, as the purpose of this
power is to make changing items in such [Bylaws](#) possible only with very wide support from the
community

196 The threshold of support in the community mechanism to approve changes to "fundamental"
[Bylaws](#) is set out in section 2.3.3 of this First Public Comment Report, where we set out what the
"fundamental" [Bylaws](#) are alongside the process for their creation and amendment.

197 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:**

198 11) Do you agree that the power for the community to approve any fundamental bylaw change
would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this
recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

2.6.5 Power: [Removing](#) individual ICANN [Directors](#)

199 The [Board](#) is the governing body of ICANN, [with main responsibilities that include](#) employing the
[President and CEO](#), [appointing the Officers](#), overseeing organizational policies, making decisions
on key issues, defining the organization's strategic and operating plans and holding the staff to
account for implementing them.

200 Directors are currently appointed for a fixed term and generally are in office for the whole term
they are appointed - by their SO/AC, by the Nominating Committee. [In addition the Board appoint](#)
[the President and CEO \(confirmed each year at the AGM\)](#). The power to remove individual
directors of the ICANN [Board](#) is [available](#) only to the [Board](#) itself, and can be exercised through a
75% vote of the [Board](#). There is no limitation⁴ on the types of situation for which the [Board](#) can
remove a director.

201 This power would [clarify that](#) the community [organizations that appointed a given director may](#)
end their [service in office](#), and trigger a reappointment process. The general approach, [consistent](#)
[with the law](#), is that the appointing body is the removing body.

01 _____

02

03

04

⁴ There are escalation paths, up to and including removal from the [Board](#), for [Board](#) member
violations of the Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Policies, but the [Bylaws](#) do not currently
require such a violation occur prior to [Board](#) removal.

- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:48 AM
Deleted: Recalling
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:48 AM
Deleted: d
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 7:01 PM
Deleted: or by
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 7:01 PM
Deleted: (in the case of the
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:11 PM
Deleted: Chief Executive Officer
- Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 7:02 PM
Deleted: and relating to their status as an employee).
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:05 PM
Deleted: allow
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:05 PM
Deleted: to
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:05 PM
Deleted: term
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:54 PM
Deleted: of a director
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:54 PM
Deleted:
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

202 For the seven directors appointed by the three Supporting Organizations or by the At-Large community (or by subdivisions within them e.g. within the GNSO), a process led by that organization or subdivision would lead to the director's removal.

203 For the directors appointed by the Nominating Committee, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) seeks the community's views about how to allow for removal. Following the principle of "the appointing body is the removing body", it does need to be the NomCom [that](#) takes the decision to remove one of these directors. Consistent with the Reference Mechanism outlined above, the NomCom will need to obtain legal structure to be able to remove directors - but it will also need this to appoint directors.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

204 Our initial view is that such a removal process should only be triggered on the petition of at least two of the SOs or ACs (or an SG from the GNSO). Such a petition would set out the reason/s removal was sought, and then the NomCom would consider the matter.

205 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) sees two options ([either of which is legally viable](#)) for the composition of the NomCom when considering removal of a director.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

1. It could simply be that the NomCom members at the time of a petition being lodged would decide.
2. Alternatively, a special committee of the NomCom could be established to deal with removal petitions when they arise. [This is likely to only rarely be used. The composition of such a special committee has not been determined, and input is welcome.](#)

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:52 PM
Deleted: . Such a "Recall Committee" would have as chair a previous NomCom Chair and would otherwise be formulated on the same basis as the regular NomCom

206 The advantage of such a separate committee is that it avoids burdening the ordinary NomCom with such matters. The disadvantage is that it would require a new set of volunteers to populate it, as it would be preferable for the personnel of the two groups to be separate.

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:22 PM
Deleted: Either option is legally viable.

- Whether the decision-making body is the SO/AC or the NomCom, removal would require a **[75%]** level of support (or equivalent) to decide in favor of removal.
- The petitioning threshold to start the NomCom consideration of removing a director should be set at least at a majority of the SO/AC's governing body/council

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

207 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:**

208 12) Do you agree that the power for the community to remove individual [Board](#) members would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

2.6.6 Power: Recalling the entire ICANN Board

209 There may be situations where removing individual ICANN directors is not seen as a sufficient remedy for the community: where a set of problems have become so entrenched that the community wishes to remove the entire ICANN Board in one decision.

210 Beyond the power set out above to remove individual directors, this power would allow the community to cause the removal of the entire ICANN Board. The community would initiate use of this power on the petition of two thirds of the SOs or ACs in ICANN, with at least one SO and one AC petitioning.

211 After a petition is raised, there would be a set period of time for SOs / ACs to individually and collectively deliberate and discuss whether the removal of the Board is warranted under the circumstances. Each SO and AC, following its internal processes, would decide how to vote on the matter.

212 It would be preferable for a decision of this sort to be the result of cross-community consensus. Where this consensus is not apparent, a suitably high threshold for the exercise of this power, [75%] of all the support available within the community mechanism would have to be cast in favor to implement it. This ensures that non-participation does not lower the threshold required to remove the Board.

213 This threshold was chosen to stop any particular SO or AC being able to prevent the recall of the Board, but to be as high as possible without allowing that to occur. The requirement on all recordable support/opposition to be counted was to avoid non-participation reducing the effective threshold for decision.

214 An alternative option for the threshold is to set it at 80%. This alternative is being considered, but as it would require a unanimous vote by the community, save for one SO or AC. Such a threshold is seen as too high.

215 Ongoing work in the CCWG-Accountability will flesh out how to deal with transitional matters raised, including at least the following:

1. The need to ensure ICANN does have a Board in place after the removal (whether there is:
2. A phase of “caretaker” behavior by the outgoing Board while new members are elected, or
3. A need to elect alternate Board members in each Board selection process, or
4. A pre-defined subset of the community that could function as an interim Board;
5. Continuity in the role of Chief Executive were the Board to be removed;
6. “Caretaker” conventions for the CEO to follow in a situation where the Board had been removed.

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:49 AM

Deleted: [85%]

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:50 AM

Deleted: prevent

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 9:50 AM

Deleted: removal

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:12 PM

Deleted: An alternative option of 80% for the threshold in such a case is also being considered, but would require a unanimous vote by the community, save for one SO or AC. [Adler Note: is the only difference in this alternative the different threshold? This needs to be clarified.] -

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

p16 It should be noted that legal advice has confirmed that a caretaker [Board](#) mechanism was achievable.

p17 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:**

p18 13) Do you agree that the power for the community to recall the entire [Board](#) would enhance ICANN's accountability ? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

2.7 Incorporating AoC into the ICANN [Bylaws](#)

219 The Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) is a 2009 bilateral agreement between the US government and ICANN. After the IANA agreement is terminated, the AoC will become the next target for elimination since it would be the last remaining aspect of a unique United States oversight role for ICANN.

220 Elimination of the AoC [as a separate agreement](#) would be simple matter for a post-transition ICANN, since the AoC can be terminated by either party with just 120 days' notice. The [CCWG-Accountability](#) Stress Test Work Party addressed this contingency since it was cited in prior public comments. The [CCWG-Accountability](#) evaluated the contingency of ICANN unilaterally withdrawing from the AoC against existing and proposed accountability measures, including:

221 Preserving ICANN commitments from the AoC, including sections 3,4,7, and 8 as well as commitments cited in the section 9 reviews.

222 Bringing the four AoC review processes into ICANN's [Bylaws](#).

223 All of the other sections in the AoC are either preamble text or commitments of the US Government. As such they don't contain commitments by ICANN, and so they cannot usefully be incorporated in the [Bylaws](#).

224 Each of the above measures is addressed below.

225 The AoC-based reviews and the commitments ICANN has made are being added to the ICANN [Bylaws](#) as part of the IANA Stewardship transition process. It is possible that once adopted as fundamental [Bylaws](#), ICANN and the NTIA could consider mutually agreed changes to or ending of some or all of the AoC, since in some respects it will no longer be necessary.

p26 In reviewing this suggested approach to incorporating the AoC commitments in the [Bylaws](#), the community should consider the degree to which it finds the suggestions implementable and reasonable. The concepts outlined through these changes, rather than the specific drafting quality or precision, are the points to consider at this stage in the [CCWG-Accountability](#)'s work.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

Preserving ICANN Commitments from the AoC

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:09 PM
Deleted: 2.7.1

227 **[Note: All bylaw text will need significant attention from the Legal Team once the mechanism and power have been decided upon. Legal counsel has not taken on review of this text at this time.]**

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:19 PM
Deleted: We will not take

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:20 PM
Deleted: such

| ICANN COMMITMENTS IN THE AOC | AS EXPRESSED IN ICANN BYLAWS |
|---|---|
| <p>228 3. This document affirms key commitments by DOC and ICANN, including commitments to:</p> <p>229 (a) ensure that decisions made related to the global technical coordination of the DNS are made in the public interest and are accountable and transparent;</p> <p>230 (b) preserve the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS;</p> <p>231 (c) promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace; and</p> <p>232 (d) facilitate international participation in DNS technical coordination.</p> | <p>233 In revised Core Values:</p> <p>234 <i>Proposed core value 6 (with additional text)</i></p> <p>235 Ensure that decisions made related to the global technical coordination of the DNS are made in the global public interest and are accountable, transparent and should respect the bottom-up multistakeholder nature of ICANN.</p> <p>236 <i>Proposed core value 5 (with additional text):</i></p> <p>237 Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment that enhances consumer trust and choice.</p> |
| <p>238 4. DOC affirms its commitment to a multi-stakeholder, private sector led, bottom-up policy development model for DNS technical coordination that acts for the benefit of global Internet users. A private coordinating process, the outcomes of which reflect the public interest, is best able to flexibly meet the changing needs of the Internet and of Internet users. ICANN and DOC recognize that there is a group of participants that engage in ICANN's processes to a greater extent than Internet users generally. To ensure that its decisions are in the public interest, and not just the interests of a particular set of stakeholders, ICANN commits to perform and publish analyses of the positive and negative effects of its decisions on the public, including any financial impact on the public, and the positive or negative impact (if any) on the systemic security, stability and resiliency of the DNS.</p> | <p>239 In revised Core Values:</p> <p>240 <i>Proposed new Section 9 in Bylaws Article III Transparency (with additional text)</i></p> <p>241 ICANN shall perform and publish analyses of the positive and negative effects of its decisions on the public, including any financial or non-financial impact on the public, and the positive or negative impact (if any) on the systemic security, stability and resiliency of the DNS.</p> |
| <p>242 7. ICANN commits to adhere to transparent and accountable budgeting processes, fact-based policy</p> | <p>243 in revised Core Values:</p> <p>244 <i>Proposed insertion of new section 8 in Article III</i></p> |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>development, cross-community deliberations, and responsive consultation procedures that provide detailed explanations of the basis for decisions, including how comments have influenced the development of policy consideration, and to publish each year an annual report that sets out ICANN's progress against ICANN's Bylaws, responsibilities, and strategic and operating plans. In addition, ICANN commits to provide a thorough and reasoned explanation of decisions taken, the rationale thereof and the sources of data and information on which ICANN relied.</p> | <p><i>Transparency</i> (this is AoC para 7 in its entirety including additional text):</p> <p>245 ICANN shall adhere to transparent and accountable budgeting processes, providing [reasonable] [adequate] advance notice to facilitate stakeholder engagement in policy decision-making, fact-based policy development, cross-community deliberations, and responsive consultation procedures that provide detailed explanations of the basis for decisions, including how comments have influenced the development of policy consideration, and to publish each year an annual report that sets out ICANN's progress against ICANN's Bylaws, responsibilities, and strategic and operating plans.</p> <p>246 In addition, ICANN shall provide a thorough and reasoned explanation of decisions taken, the rationale thereof and the sources of data and information on which ICANN relied.</p> |
|---|--|

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| ICANN COMMITMENTS IN AOC | AS EXPRESSED IN ICANN BYLAWS |
|---|---|
| 247 8. ICANN affirms its commitments to: | 249 In revised Core Values: |
| 248 (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; | 250 <i>Propose inserting 8(a) in full as a new core value in the Bylaws</i> 251 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. |
| 252 (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 | 253 The nonprofit commitment in 8b is reflected in ICANN's ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION: a. "3. This Corporation is a nonprofit public benefit corporation and is not organized for the private gain of any person. It is organized under the California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law for charitable and public purposes. " |
| | 254 A change to the Articles would require 2/3 vote of the Board and 2/3 vote of the Members. |
| | 255 The ' headquartered ' commitment in 8b is already in current ICANN Bylaws , at Article XVIII Section 1: |
| | a. "OFFICES. The principal office for the transaction of the business of ICANN shall be in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, United States of America. ICANN may also have an additional office or offices within or outside the United States of America as it may from time to time establish." |
| | 256 While the Board could propose a change to this Bylaws provision, Members/Designators could block the proposed change (75% vote). [Note: Have thresholds been determined?] |
| | 257 The CCWG-Accountability is considering whether Bylaws Article 18 Section 1 should be keep its current status or be listed as "Fundamental Bylaws ". In the latter case, any Bylaws change would require approval by Members/Designators (75% vote). |
| 258 (c) to operate as a multi-stakeholder, private sector | 259 Propose inserting 8(c) in full as a new core value in the Bylaws (including additional text): |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:10 PM
Deleted: "not-for-profit"

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:20 PM
Deleted: or 80%

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:20 PM
Deleted: [\[Note: why is 80% used?\]](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>led organization with input from the public, for whose benefit ICANN shall in all events act. ICANN is a private organization and nothing in this Affirmation should be construed as control by any one entity.</p> | <p>260 Operating as a multi-stakeholder, bottom-up private sector led organization with input from the public, for whose benefit ICANN shall in all events act.</p> |
|--|--|

| ICANN COMMITMENTS IN THE AOC | AS EXPRESSED IN ICANN BYLAWS |
|--|---|
| <p>261 9. Recognizing that ICANN will evolve and adapt to fulfill its limited, but important technical mission of coordinating the DNS, ICANN further commits to take the following specific actions together with ongoing commitment reviews specified below:</p> | <p>262 See Section 2.6.2 of this document for Bylaws text to preserve commitments to perform these ongoing reviews.</p> |

263 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:**

264 14) Do you agree that the incorporation into ICANN's [Bylaws](#) of the AoC principles would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

2.7.2 AoC Reviews

265 Suggestions gathered during 2014 comment periods on ICANN accountability and the IANA [Stewardship Transition](#) suggested several ways the AoC Reviews should be adjusted as part of incorporating them into ICANN's [Bylaws](#):

- Ability to sunset reviews and create new reviews
- Community stakeholder groups should appoint their own [Members](#) to review teams
- Give review teams access to all ICANN internal documents
- Require the ICANN [Board](#) to [consider approval](#) and [begin implementation of](#) review team recommendations, including from previous reviews. [The Board's decision would be subject to challenge through enhanced Reconsideration and IRP processes.](#)

- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 2:34 PM
Deleted: the
- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 2:33 PM
Deleted: approve
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

266 In [Bylaws](#) Article IV, add a new section for **Periodic Review of ICANN Execution of Key Commitments**, with an overarching chapeau for the way these reviews are conducted and then one subsection for each of the four current Affirmation Reviews.

267 These proposals are presented beginning on the next page.

268 **POSSIBLE BYLAW THAT PROVIDES A CHAPEAU FOR ALL PERIODIC REVIEWS**

269 All of the reviews listed in this section 2.6.2 would be governed by the following:

| PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT | COMMENT |
|---|---|
| 270 ICANN will produce an annual report on the state of improvements to Accountability and Transparency. | 272 This is new. It is a recommendation based on one in ATRT2 and becomes more important as reviews are spread further apart. |
| 271 ICANN will be responsible for creating an annual report that details the status of implementation on all reviews defined in this section. This annual review implementation report will be opened for a public review and comment period that will be considered by the ICANN Board and serve as input to the continuing process of implementing the recommendations from the review teams defined in this section. | |
| 273 All reviews will be conducted by a volunteer community review team comprised of representatives of the relevant Advisory Committees, Supporting Organizations, Stakeholder Groups, and the chair of the ICANN Board . The group must be as diverse as possible. | |
| 274 Review teams may also solicit and select independent experts to render advice as requested by the review team, and the review team may choose to accept or reject all or part of this advice. | |
| 275 To facilitate transparency and openness in ICANN's deliberations and operations, the review teams shall have access to ICANN internal documents, and the draft output of the review will be published for public comment. The review team will consider such public comment and amend the review as it deems appropriate before issuing its final report and forwarding the recommendations to the Board . | |
| 276 The final output of all reviews will be published for public comment. The Board shall consider approval and begin implementation within six months of receipt of the recommendations. | 277 AoC requires Board to 'take action' within 6 months |

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| PROPOSED BYLAWS TEXT FOR THIS AFFIRMATION OF COMMITMENTS REVIEW | NOTES |
|--|---|
| 278 1. Accountability & Transparency Review. The Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN's execution of its commitment to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that the outcomes of its decision-making will reflect the public interest and be accountable to all stakeholders. | 281 This commitment is reflected in Bylaws Core Values |
| 279 In this review, particular attention should be paid to: | |
| 280 (a) assessing and improving ICANN Board governance which shall include an ongoing evaluation of Board performance, the Board selection process, the extent to which Board composition meets ICANN's present and future needs, and the consideration of an appeal mechanism for Board decisions; | |
| 282 (b) assessing the role and effectiveness of GAC interaction with the Board and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS; | 287 Rephrased to avoid implying a review of GAC's effectiveness |
| 283 (c) assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input (including adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof); | |
| 284 (d) assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are embraced, supported and accepted by the public and the Internet community; and | |
| 285 (e) assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations, and effective and timely policy development. | |
| 286 The review team shall assess the extent to which the Board and staff have implemented the recommendations arising from the reviews required by this section | |
| 288 The review team may recommend termination of other periodic reviews required by this section, and may recommend additional periodic reviews. Note: should not include ability to terminate IFR. | 289 New |
| 290 This periodic review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the Board received the final report of the prior review team. | 291 AoC required every 3 years. |

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| PROPOSED BYLAWS TEXT FOR THIS AFFIRMATION OF COMMITMENTS REVIEW | NOTES |
|--|--|
| <p>292 2. Preserving security, stability, and resiliency.</p> <p>293 The Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN's execution of its commitment to enhance the operational stability, reliability, resiliency, security, and global interoperability of the DNS.</p> <p>294 In this review, particular attention will be paid to:</p> <p>295 (a) security, stability and resiliency matters, both physical and network, relating to the secure and stable coordination of the Internet DNS;</p> <p>296 (b) ensuring appropriate contingency planning; and</p> <p>297 (c) maintaining clear processes.</p> <p>298 Each of the reviews conducted under this section will assess the extent to which ICANN has successfully implemented the security plan, the effectiveness of the plan to deal with actual and potential challenges and threats, and the extent to which the security plan is sufficiently robust to meet future challenges and threats to the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet DNS, consistent with ICANN's limited technical mission.</p> | <p>299 This commitment is reflected in Bylaws Core Values</p> |
| <p>300 The review team shall assess the extent to which prior review recommendations have been implemented.</p> | <p>301 Make this explicit</p> |
| <p>302 This periodic review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the Board received the final report of the prior review team.</p> | <p>303 AoC required every 3 years.</p> |

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| PROPOSED BYLAWS TEXT FOR THIS AFFIRMATION OF COMMITMENTS REVIEW | NOTES |
|--|--|
| <p>304 3. Promoting competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice.</p> <p>ICANN will ensure that as it expands the top-level domain space, it will adequately address issues of competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection.</p> | <p>305 This commitment will be added to Bylaws Core Values</p> |

| PROPOSED BYLAWS TEXT FOR THIS AFFIRMATION OF COMMITMENTS REVIEW | NOTES |
|--|--|
| <p>306 The Board shall cause a review of ICANN's execution of this commitment after any batched round of new gTLDs have been in operation for one year.</p> <p>307 This review will examine the extent to which the expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice, as well as effectiveness of:</p> <p>308 (a) the gTLD application and evaluation process; and</p> <p>309 (b) safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the expansion</p> | <p>310 Re-phrased to cover future new gTLD rounds.</p> |
| <p>311 The review team shall assess the extent to which prior review recommendations have been implemented.</p> | <p>312 Make this explicit</p> |
| <p>313 Subsequent rounds of new gTLDs should not be opened until the recommendations of the previous review required by this section have been implemented.</p> | <p>314 New</p> |
| <p>315 These periodic reviews shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the Board received the final report of the relevant review team. [Note: CWG-Stewardship contemplates first IANA Function Review at 2 years post-transition and then periodic reviews every 5 years thereafter.]</p> | <p>316 AoC also required a review 2 years after the 1 year review.</p> |

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:46 PM
Deleted: IRE
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | |
|---|--|
| 317 <u>4. Reviewing effectiveness of WHOIS/Directory Services policy and the extent to which its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement and promotes consumer trust.</u> | |
| 318 <u>ICANN commits to enforcing its existing policy relating to WHOIS/Directory Services, subject to applicable laws. Such existing policy requires that ICANN implement measures to maintain timely, unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete WHOIS information, including registrant, technical, billing, and administrative contact information.</u> | |
| 319 <u>Such existing policy also includes the requirements that legal constraints regarding privacy, as defined by OECD in 1980 as amended in 2013. "</u> http://www.oecd.org/sti/ieconomy/oecdguidelinesonthe protectionofprivacyandtransborderflowsofpersonaldata.htm http://www.oecd.org/internet/ieconomy/privacy-guidelines.htm | 321 <u>New</u> |
| 320 <u>The Board shall cause a periodic review to assess the extent to which WHOIS/Directory Services policy is effective and its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement and promotes consumer trust.</u> | |
| 322 <u>The review team shall assess the extent to which prior review recommendations have been implemented.</u> | 323 <u>Make this explicit</u> |
| 324 <u>This periodic review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the Board received the final report of the prior review team.</u> | 325 <u>AoC required every 3 years.</u> |

326 The CWG-Stewardship-Stewardship has also proposed an IANA Function Review that should be added to the ICANN Bylaws, as a Fundamental Bylaw.

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:13 PM
Deleted: PROPOSED BYLAWS TEXT FOR THIS AFFIRMATION OF COMMITMENTS REVIEW [35]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:26 PM
Deleted: periodic r
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:13 PM
Comment [17]: 17Comment from Jordan Carter: This has to be consistent with the list of fundamental bylaws in 2.6.? and with the introductory text...
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:26 PM
Deleted: . Note that CWG recommends this review be a "
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:53 PM
Deleted: "
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

JANA FUNCTION REVIEW

327 The [CCWG-Stewardship](#) Stewardship recommends that the SOW review be done as part of the IANA Function Review (IFR). The IFR would not only take into account performance against the SOW, but would be obliged to take into account multiple input sources into account including community comments, CSC evaluations, reports submitted by [the Post-Transition IANA entity](#) (PTI), and recommendations for technical or process improvements. The outcomes of reports submitted to the CSC, reviews and comments received on these reports during the relevant time period will be included as input to the IFR.

328 The first IFR is recommended to take place no more than 2 years after the transition is completed. After the initial review, the IFR should occur every 5 years.

329 The [IFR](#) should be outlined in the ICANN [Bylaws](#) and included as a [Fundamental Bylaw](#) as part of the work of the [CCWG-Accountability](#), and would operate in a manner analogous to an Affirmation of Commitments (AOC) review. [The Members](#) of the IANA Function Review Team (IFRT) would be selected by the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees and would include several liaisons from other communities. While the IFRT is intended to be a smaller group, it will be open to participants in much the same way as the [CCWG-Stewardship](#).

330 While the IFR will normally be scheduled based on a regular 5 year cycle with other ICANN reviews, a Special Review may also be initiated following the CSC raising concerns with the GNSO and/or the ccNSO or by concerns raised by TLDs directly with the ccNSO or the GNSO. In the event of a Special Review being proposed, the ccNSO and GNSO should consult with both [Members](#) and non-member TLDs, in the light of the consultations, the Councils can decide by a supermajority to call for a special review.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:27 PM

Deleted: PERIODIC ...ANA FUN... [37]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM

Deleted: CWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:15 PM

Deleted: IANA Function Review... [38]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account... [39]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:15 PM

Deleted: These "fundamental bylaws" would be ICANN bylaws that would require the approval of the multistakeholder community to amend. The approval of a fundamental bylaw could also require a higher threshold than typical bylaw amendments, for example, a supermajority. ...he m ... [40]

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 8:59 PM

Comment [18]: 18 Text to be refined to state that recommendation.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM

Deleted: CWG...WG-Stewardshi... [41]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:16 PM

Deleted: members

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM

Deleted: Bylaws

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 2:36 PM

Deleted:

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM

Deleted: Bylaws

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account... [42]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account... [36]

331 QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES:

332 17) Do you agree that the incorporation into ICANN's [Bylaws](#) of the AoC reviews would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

2.8 [Bylaws](#) changes suggested by Stress Tests

333 **[Note: Sidley Austin LLP and Adler & Colvin are not reviewing bylaw text at this stage of review.]**

334 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) Charter calls for stress testing of accountability enhancements in both [Work Streams](#) 1 and 2. Among deliverables listed in the charter are:

335 **Identification of contingencies to be considered in the stress tests.**

336 Review of possible solutions for each Work Stream including stress tests against identified contingencies.

337 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.

338 The CCWG-Accountability Stress Test Work Party documented contingencies identified in prior public comments. The Stress Test Work Party then prepared a draft document showing how these stress tests are useful to evaluate existing and proposed accountability measures.

339 The exercise of applying stress tests identified changes to ICANN Bylaws that might be necessary to allow the CCWG-Accountability to evaluate proposed accountability mechanisms as adequate to meet the challenges uncovered.

2.8.1 Forcing the Board to respond to Advisory Committee formal advice

340 Several stress tests indicate the need for a community power to force ICANN to take a decision on previously-approved Review Team Recommendations, consensus policy, or formal advice from an Advisory Committee (SSAC, ALAC, GAC, RSSAC).

341 The CCWG-Accountability is developing enhanced community powers to challenge a Board decision, but this may not be effective in cases where the Board has taken no decision on a pending matter. In those cases, the community might need to force the Board to make a decision about pending AC advice in order to trigger the ability for community to challenge the decision via Reconsideration or IRP processes.

342 Recommendation 9 from ATRT2⁵ may answer this need:

9.1. ICANN Bylaws Article XI should be amended to include the following language to mandate Board Response to Advisory Committee Formal Advice:

01 _____

02

03

04

5 See page 11 of this PDF: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-recommendations-15oct13-en.pdf>

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:50 PM
Deleted: -Accountability
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:50 PM
Deleted: -Accountability
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

The ICANN [Board](#) will respond in a timely manner to formal advice from all Advisory Committees, explaining what action it took and the rationale for doing so.

343 This ATRT2 recommendation has not yet been reflected in ICANN [Bylaws](#), so this change should be required before the IANA stewardship transition. In addition, there is a question as to whether a [Board](#) "response" would be sufficient to trigger the RR and IRP review mechanisms in this proposal. The [CCWG-Accountability](#) and [CWG-Stewardship](#) are waiting on legal advice as to that question.

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board
- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 2:37 PM
Deleted: , however
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

2.8.2 Require consultation and mutually acceptable solution for GAC advice that is backed by consensus

344 Stress Test 18 addresses ICANN's response to GAC advice in the context of NTIA's statement regarding the transition: "NTIA will not accept a proposal that replaces the NTIA role with a government-led or an inter-governmental organization solution". This Stress Test was applied to existing and proposed accountability measures, as seen below:

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|--|--|--|
| 345 18. Governments in ICANN's Government Advisory Committee (GAC) amend their operating procedures to change from consensus decisions to majority voting for advice to ICANN's Board . | 347 Current ICANN Bylaws (Section XI) give due deference to GAC advice, including a requirement to try to find "a mutually acceptable solution." | 350 One proposed measure would amend ICANN bylaws (Article XI, Section 2, item 1j) to require trying to find a mutually agreeable solution only where GAC advice was supported by GAC consensus. |
| 346 Consequence: Under current Bylaws , ICANN must consider and respond to GAC advice, even if that advice were not supported by consensus. A majority of governments could thereby approve GAC advice that restricted free expression, for example. | 348 This is required for any GAC advice, not just for GAC consensus advice. 349 Today, GAC adopts formal advice according to its Operating Principle 47: " <i>consensus is understood to mean the practice of adopting decisions by general</i> " | The GAC could change its Operating Principle 47 to use majority voting for formal GAC advice, but ICANN bylaws would require trying to find a mutually agreeable solution only on advice that had GAC consensus. |

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>agreement in the absence of any formal objection⁶.” But the GAC may at any time change its procedures to use majority voting instead of its present consensus.</p> | <p>351 GAC can still give ICANN advice at any time, with or without consensus</p> |
|--|--|---|

352 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) proposes a response to Stress Test 18 to amend ICANN [Bylaws](#) such that only consensus advice would trigger the obligation to try to find a mutually acceptable solution. The proposal is to amend ICANN [Bylaws](#), Article XI Section 2 clause j as seen below. (Addition here ***bold, italic and underlined***) Clause k is also shown for completeness but is not being amended.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

353 j: *The advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies. In the event that the ICANN [Board](#) determines to take an action that is not consistent with the Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall so inform the Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. **With respect to Governmental Advisory Committee advice that is supported by consensus**, the Governmental Advisory Committee and the ICANN [Board](#) will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution.*

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

354 k: *If no such solution can be found, the ICANN [Board](#) will state in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory Committee advice was not followed, and such statement will be without prejudice to the rights or obligations of Governmental Advisory Committee members with regard to public policy issues falling within their responsibilities.*

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

355 Note that the proposed [Bylaws](#) change for stress test 18 does not interfere with the GAC’s method of decision-making. If the GAC decided to adopt advice by majority voting or methods other than today’s consensus, ICANN would still be obligated to give GAC advice due consideration: “advice shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies.”

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

356 Moreover, ICANN would still have to explain why GAC advice was not followed: “In the event that the ICANN [Board](#) determines to take an action that is not consistent with the Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall so inform the Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice”

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

01 _____

02

03

04

⁶ ICANN Government Advisory Committee (GAC) - Operating Principles, October, 2011, at <https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Operating+Principles>

357 The only effect of this [Bylaws](#) change is to limit the kind of advice where ICANN is obligated to “try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution”. That delicate and sometimes difficult consultation requirement would only apply for GAC advice that was approved by consensus – exactly the way GAC advice has been approved since ICANN began.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

358 NTIA gave specific requirements for this transition, and stress test 18 is the most direct test of the requirement to avoid significant expansion of the role of governments in ICANN decision-making. Unless and until there are other proposed measures that address this stress test, the proposed [Bylaws](#) change should remain in consideration as an important part of the community’s proposal.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

359 **QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES;**

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:42 PM
Deleted: N

360 18) Do you agree that the incorporation into ICANN’s [Bylaws](#) of the above changes, as suggested by stress tests, would enhance ICANN’s accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:42 PM
Deleted: :

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:41 PM
Deleted: w

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:41 PM
Deleted: s

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:50 PM
Deleted: -ACCOUNTABILITY

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:48 PM
Deleted: -Accountability

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

3) Stress Tests

Introduction

361 An essential part of our [CCWG-Accountability](#) Charter calls for stress testing of accountability enhancements in both [Work Streams](#) 1 and 2. ‘Stress Testing’ is a simulation exercise where a set of plausible, but not necessarily probable, hypothetical scenarios are used to gauge how certain events will affect a system, product, company or industry. In the financial industry for example ‘stress testing’ is routinely run to evaluate the strength of institutions.

Purpose & Methodology

362 The purpose of these stress tests is to determine the stability of ICANN in the event of consequences and/or vulnerabilities, and to assess the adequacy of existing and proposed accountability mechanisms available to the ICANN community.

AMONG DELIVERABLES LISTED IN THE [CCWG-ACCOUNTABILITY](#) CHARTER ARE:

- 363 Identification of contingencies to be considered in the stress tests
- 364 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

1. Analysis of potential weaknesses and risks
2. Analysis existing remedies and their robustness
3. Definition of additional remedies or modification of existing remedies
4. Description how the proposed solutions would mitigate the risk of contingencies or protect the organization against such contingencies

365 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.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

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

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:48 PM
Deleted: -Accountability

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

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

367 Also, note that the CCWG-Accountability charter does not ask that probability estimates be assigned for contingencies. The purpose of applying tests to proposed accountability measures is to determine if the community has adequate means to challenge ICANN's reactions to the contingency.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

368 CCWG-Accountability 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+Tests+Work+Party>

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

369 We consolidated these into five 'stress test categories' listed below, and prepared draft documents showing how these stress tests are useful to evaluate ICANN's existing and CCWG-Accountability's proposed accountability measures.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

I. Financial Crisis or Insolvency (Scenarios #5, 6, 7, 8 and 9)

370 ICANN becomes fiscally insolvent, and lacks the resources to adequately meet its obligations. This could result from a variety of causes, including financial crisis specific to the domain name industry, or the general global economy. It could also result from a legal judgment against ICANN, fraud or theft of funds, or technical evolution that makes domain name registrations obsolete.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

II. Failure to Meet Operational Obligations (Scenarios #1, 2, 11, 17, and 21)

371 ICANN fails to process change or delegation requests to the IANA Root Zone, or executes a change or delegation over the objections of stakeholders, such as those defined as 'Significantly Interested Parties' [<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi-final-07oct14->

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

[en.pdf](#)

III. Legal/Legislative Action (Scenarios #3, 4, 19, and 20)

372 ICANN is the subject of litigation under existing or future policies, legislation, or regulation. ICANN attempts to delegate a new TLD, or re-delegate a non-compliant existing TLD, but is blocked by legal action.

IV. Failure of Accountability (Scenarios #10, 12, 13, 16, 18, 22, 23, 24 and 26)

373 Actions (or expenditure of resources) by one or more ICANN [Board](#) Members, CEO, or other Staff, are contrary to ICANN's mission or [Bylaws](#). ICANN is "captured" by one stakeholder segment, including governments via the GAC, which either [is](#) able to drive its agenda on all other stakeholders, or abuse accountability mechanisms to prevent all other stakeholders from advancing their interests (veto).

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM

Deleted: Board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM

Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:21 PM

Deleted: is

V. Failure of Accountability to External Stakeholders (Scenarios #14, 15, and 25)

374 ICANN modifies its structure to avoid obligations to external stakeholders, such as terminating the Affirmation of Commitments, terminating presence in a jurisdiction where it faces legal action, moving contracts or contracting entities to a favorable jurisdiction. ICANN delegates, subcontracts, or otherwise abdicates its obligations to a third party in a manner that is inconsistent with its [Bylaws](#) or otherwise not subject to accountability. ICANN merges with or is acquired by an unaccountable third party.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM

Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM

Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM

Deleted: board

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

375 Applying Additional Stress Tests

376 Public comment participants may conceive of other contingencies and scenario risks beyond the 26 stress tests identified in this section. In that case, we encourage commenters to apply their own stress test analysis. To do so, a commenter can examine ICANN's present accountability mechanisms to determine whether they adequately address the contingency. Then, the commenter can examine the proposed accountability enhancements in this document, and assess whether they give the community adequate means to challenge [Board](#) decisions and to hold the [Board](#) accountable for its actions.

377 For example, the stress test team evaluated contingencies that could generally be described as external events (cyber attack, financial crisis, etc.). We discovered that while some risk mitigation

was possible, it became clear that no accountability framework could entirely eliminate the risk of such events nor thoroughly alleviate their impact. Instead, it was critical to explore the ability of the community to hold ICANN Board and management accountable for their preparation and reaction to the external events. The proposed accountability measures do provide adequate means to do so.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

378 Note that we cannot apply stress tests definitively until CCWG-Accountability and CWG-Stewardship have defined mechanisms/structures to test. This draft applies stress tests to a 'snapshot' of proposed mechanisms under consideration at this point in the process.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

379 Also, note that several stress tests can specifically apply to work of the CWG-Stewardship regarding transition of the IANA naming functions contract (see Stress Tests #1 & 2, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24, 25)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 1:24 PM
Deleted: WS1

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

380 The stress test exercise demonstrates that Work Stream 1 recommendations do enhance the community's ability to hold ICANN Board and management accountable, relative to present accountability measures. It is also clear that the CWG-Stewardship proposals are complementary to CCWG-Accountability measures. One stress test regarding appeals of ccTLD revocations and assignments (ST 21) has not been adequately addressed in either the CWG-Stewardship or CCWG-Accountability proposals, awaiting policy development from the ccNSO.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

381 The following table shows the stress test scenarios for each of our five categories of risk, alongside existing accountability mechanisms and measures and proposed accountability measures. Conclusions have been drawn after discussion and exploration of each hypothetical situation, and the table also lists whether a) if the 'threat' is or is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship; b) if and to what extent existing measures and mechanisms are deemed adequate; and c) the adequacy and effectiveness of any proposed measures or mechanisms.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

382 Public comment participants may conceive of other contingencies and scenario risks beyond the 26 stress tests identified in this section. In that case, we encourage commenters to apply their own stress test analysis. To do so, a commenter can examine ICANN's present accountability mechanisms to determine whether they adequately address the contingency. Then, the commenter can examine the proposed accountability enhancements in this document, and assess whether they give the community adequate means to challenge Board decisions and to hold the Board accountable for its actions.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

383 For example, the stress test team evaluated contingencies that could generally be described as external events (cyber attack, financial crisis, etc.). We discovered that while some risk mitigation was possible, it became clear that no accountability framework could entirely eliminate the risk of such events nor thoroughly alleviate their impact. Instead, it was critical to explore the ability of the community to hold ICANN Board and management accountable for their preparation and

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

[reaction to the external events. The proposed accountability measures do provide adequate means to do so.](#)

384 Note that we cannot apply stress tests definitively until [CCWG-Accountability](#) and [CWG-Stewardship](#) have defined mechanisms/structures to test. This draft applies stress tests to a 'snapshot' of proposed mechanisms under consideration at this point in the process.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

385 Also, note that several stress tests can specifically apply to work of the [CWG-Stewardship](#) regarding transition of the IANA naming functions contract (see Stress Tests #1 & 2, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24, 25)

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

386 [The stress test exercise demonstrates that Work Stream 1 recommendations do enhance the community's ability to hold ICANN Board and management accountable, relative to present accountability measures. It is also clear that the CWG-Stewardship proposals are complementary to CCWG-Accountability measures. One stress test regarding appeals of ccTLD revocations and assignments \(ST 21\) has not been adequately addressed in either the CWG-Stewardship or CCWG-Accountability proposals, awaiting policy development from the ccNSO.](#)

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 1:24 PM
Deleted: WS1
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

387 The following table shows the stress test scenarios for each of our five categories of risk, alongside existing accountability mechanisms and measures and proposed accountability measures. Conclusions have been drawn after discussion and exploration of each hypothetical situation, and the table also lists whether a) if the 'threat' is or is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship; b) if and to what extent existing measures and mechanisms are deemed adequate; and c) the adequacy and effectiveness of any proposed measures or mechanisms.

Stress test category I: Financial Crisis or Insolvency

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|--|--|---|
| 388 5. Domain industry financial crisis. Consequence: significant reduction in domain sales generated revenues and significant increase in registrar and registry costs, threatening ICANN's ability to operate. | 393 ICANN could propose revenue increases or spending cuts, but these decisions are not subject to challenge by the ICANN community. 394 The Community has input in ICANN budgeting and Strat Plan. | 397 One proposed measure would empower the community to veto ICANN's proposed annual budget. This measure enables blocking a proposal by ICANN to increase its revenues by adding fees on registrars, registries, and/or registrants. |
| 389 6. General financial crisis. | | 398 Another proposed mechanism is community challenge to a |
| 390 7. Litigation arising from private | 395 Registrars must approve | |

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:22 PM
Deleted:
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>contract, e.g., Breach of Contract.</p> <p>391 8. Technology competing with DNS.</p> <p>392 Consequence: loss affecting reserves sufficient to threaten business continuity.</p> | <p>ICANN's variable registrar fees. If not, registry operators pay the fees.</p> <p>396 ICANN's reserve fund could support operations in a period of reduced revenue. Reserve fund is independently reviewed periodically.</p> | <p><u>Board</u> decision using a reconsideration request and/or referral 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 Reconsideration or IRP mechanisms <u>may be able to reverse that decision unless it was deemed vital to ICANN.</u></p> |
| <p>399 Conclusions:</p> <p>400 a) This threat is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship.</p> | <p>401 b) Existing measures would be adequate, unless the revenue loss was extreme and sustained.</p> | <p>402 c) Proposed measures are helpful, but might not be adequate if revenue loss was extreme and sustained.</p> |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:21 PM
Deleted:

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:22 PM
Deleted: could

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:22 PM
Deleted: .

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|---|--|--|
| <p>403 9. Major corruption or fraud.</p> <p>404 Consequence: major impact on corporate reputation, significant litigation and loss of reserves.</p> | <p>405 ICANN has annual independent audit that includes testing of internal controls designed to prevent fraud and corruption.</p> <p>406 ICANN maintains an anonymous hotline for employees to report suspected fraud.</p> <p>407 ICANN <u>Board</u> can dismiss CEO and/or executives responsible.</p> <p>408 The community has no ability to force the <u>Board</u> to report or take action against suspected corruption or fraud.</p> | <p>409 One proposed measure is to empower the community to force ICANN's <u>Board</u> to consider a recommendation arising from an AoC Review. An ATRT could make recommendations to avoid conflicts of interest. An ICANN <u>Board</u> decision against those recommendations could be challenged with a Reconsideration and/or IRP.</p> <p>410 Another proposed measure would empower the community to veto ICANN's proposed annual budget. This measure enables blocking a budget proposal that is tainted by corruption or fraud.</p> <p>411 <u>If ICANN's Board were involved, or if the Board did not act decisively in preventing corruption or fraud (for instance by enforcing internal controls or policies), a proposed</u></p> |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | measure empowers the community to remove individual Directors or recall the entire Board. |
| 412 Conclusions: 413 a) This threat is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship | 414 b) Existing measures would not be adequate if litigation costs or losses were extreme and sustained. | 415 c) Proposed measures are helpful, but might not be adequate if litigation costs and losses were extreme and sustained. |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Stress test category II: Failure to Meet Operational Expectations

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|---|--|---|
| 416 1. Change authority for the Root Zone ceases to function, in part or in whole. | 419 Under the present IANA functions contract, NTIA can revoke ICANN's authority to perform IANA functions and re-assign to different entity/entities. | 421 The CWG-Stewardship proposal includes various escalation procedures to prevent degradation of service, as well as a plan (operational) for the transition of the IANA function. |
| 417 2. Delegation authority for the Root Zone ceases to function, in part or in whole. | | |
| 418 Consequence: interference with existing policy relating to Root Zone and/or prejudice to the security and stability of one or several TLDs. | 420 After NTIA relinquishes the IANA functions contract, this measure will no longer be available. | 422 The CWG-Stewardship proposes that IANA naming functions be legally transferred to a new Post-Transition IANA entity (PTI) that would be a subsidiary of ICANN. |
| | | 423 The CWG-Stewardship proposes a multistakeholder IANA Function Review (IFR) to conduct reviews of PTI. Results of IFR are not prescribed or restricted and could include recommendations to the ICANN Board to terminate or not renew the IANA Functions Contract with PTI. An ICANN Board decision against those recommendations could be challenged with a Reconsideration and/or IRP. |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>424 The CCWG-Stewardship proposes the ability for the multistakeholder community to require, if necessary and after substantial opportunities for remediation, the selection of a new operator for the IANA Functions.</p> <p>425 Suggestions for Work Stream 2:</p> <p>426 Require annual external security audits and publication of results.</p> <p>427 Require certification per international standards (ISO 27001) and publication of results.</p> |
| <p>428 Conclusions:</p> <p>429 a) This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p> | <p>430 b) Existing measures would be inadequate after NTIA terminates the IANA contract.</p> | <p>431 c) Proposed measures are, in combination, adequate to mitigate this contingency</p> |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|---|--|---|
| <p>432 11. Compromise of credentials.</p> <p>433 Consequence: major impact on corporate reputation, significant loss of authentication and/or authorization capacities.</p> | <p>434 Regarding compromise of internal systems:</p> <p>435 Based upon experience of the recent security breach, it is not apparent how the community holds ICANN management accountable for implementation of adopted security procedures.</p> <p>436 It also appears that the community cannot force ICANN to conduct an after-action report on a security incident and reveal that report.</p> <p>437 Regarding DNS security:</p> <p>438 Beyond operating procedures,</p> | <p>442 Regarding compromise of internal systems:</p> <p>443 No measures yet suggested would force ICANN management to conduct an after-action report and disclose it to the community.</p> <p>444 Nor can the community force ICANN management to execute its stated security procedures for employees and contractors.</p> <p>445 Regarding DNS security:</p> <p>446 One proposed measure empowers the community to force ICANN's Board to</p> |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>there are credentials employed in DNSSEC.</p> <p>439 ICANN annually seeks SysTrust Certification for its role as the Root Zone KSK manager.</p> <p>440 The IANA Department has achieved EFQM Committed to Excellence certification for its Business Excellence activities.</p> <p>441 Under C.5.3 of the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has undergone annual independent audits of its security provisions for the IANA functions.</p> | <p>consider a recommendation arising from an AoC Review – namely, <i>Security Stability and Resiliency</i>. An ICANN Board decision against those recommendations could be challenged with a Reconsideration and/or IRP.</p> <p>447 A proposed Bylaws change would require ICANN Board to respond to formal advice from advisory committees such as SSAC and RSSAC. If the Board took a decision to reject or only partially accept formal AC advice, the community could be empowered to challenge that Board decision to an IRP.</p> <p>448 Suggestions for Work Stream 2:</p> <p>449 - Require annual external security audits and publication of results.</p> <p>450 - Require certification per international standards (ISO 27001) and publication of results.</p> |
| <p>451 Conclusions:</p> <p>452 a) This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p> | <p>453 b) Existing measures would not be adequate.</p> | <p>454 c) Proposed Work Stream 1 measures, in combination, would be helpful to mitigate the scenario, but not to prevent it. W2 suggestions might provide risk mitigation measures.</p> |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 1:25 PM
Deleted: WS1

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|---|---|---|
| <p>455 17. ICANN attempts to add a new top-level domain in spite of security and stability concerns expressed by technical community or other stakeholder groups.</p> | <p>457 In 2013-14 the community demonstrated that it could eventually prod ICANN management to attend to risks identified by SSAC. For example: dotless domains</p> | <p>459 One proposed measure is to empower the community to force ICANN's Board to respond to recommendations arising from an AoC Review – namely, 9.2 Review of</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>456 Consequence: DNS security and stability could be undermined, and ICANN actions could impose costs and risks upon external parties.</p> | <p>(SAC 053); security certificates and name collisions such as .mail, .home (SAC 057)</p> <p>458 NTIA presently gives clerical approval for each delegation to indicate that ICANN has followed its processes. NTIA could delay a delegation if its finds that ICANN has not followed its processes. Not clear if that would/could have been a finding if ICANN attempted to delegate a new TLD such as .mail or .home.</p> | <p>Security, Stability, and Resiliency. An ICANN Board decision against those recommendations could be challenged with a Reconsideration and/or IRP.</p> <p>460 A proposed Bylaws change would require ICANN Board to respond to formal advice from advisory committees such as SSAC and RSSAC. If the Board took a decision to reject or only partially accept formal AC advice, the community could be empowered to challenge that Board decision to an IRP.</p> |
| <p>461 Conclusions: 462 a) This threat is partially related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p> | <p>463 b) Existing measures were adequate to mitigate the risks of this scenario.</p> | <p>464 c) Proposed measures enhance community's power to mitigate the risks of this scenario.</p> |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:49 PM
Deleted: -Stewardship

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|--|--|--|
| <p>465 21. A government official demands ICANN rescind responsibility for management of a ccTLD from an incumbent ccTLD Manager.</p> | <p>470 Under the present IANA contract with NTIA, the IANA Department issues a boilerplate report to the ICANN Board, which approves this on the Consent Agenda and forwards to NTIA, which relies on the Board's certification and approves the revocation, delegation or transfer.</p> | <p>474 From the CCWG-Stewardship draft proposal: "CCWG-Stewardship recommends not including any appeal mechanism that would apply to ccTLD delegations and redelegations in the IANA Stewardship Transition proposal."</p> |
| <p>466 However, the IANA Functions Manager is unable to document voluntary and specific consent for the revocation from the incumbent ccTLD Manager.</p> | <p>471 There is presently no mechanism for the incumbent ccTLD Manager or the community to challenge ICANN's certification that process was followed properly.</p> | <p>475 From CCWG-Stewardship co-chair correspondence on 15-Apr-2015: "As such, any appeal mechanism developed by the CCWG-Accountability should not cover ccTLD delegation / re-delegation issues as these are expected to be developed by the ccTLD community through the appropriate processes."</p> |
| <p>467 Also, the government official demands that ICANN assign management responsibility for a ccTLD to a Designated Manager. But the IANA Functions Manager does not document that: Significantly Interested Parties agree; that other Stakeholders had a voice</p> | <p>472 See GAC Principles for delegation and administration of ccTLDs. GAC Advice published in 2000 and updated</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>in selection; the Designated Manager has demonstrated required capabilities; there are not objections of many Interested Parties and/or Significantly Interested Parties.</p> <p>468 This stress test examines the community's ability to hold ICANN accountable to follow established policies. It does not deal with the adequacy of policies in place.</p> <p>469 Consequence: Faced with this re-delegation request, ICANN lacks measures to resist re-delegation while awaiting the bottom-up consensus decision of affected stakeholders.</p> | <p>in 2005 specifically referenced to Sections 1.2 & 7.1</p> <p>473 See Framework of Interpretation, 20-Oct-2014</p> | <p>476 Regarding CCWG-Accountability proposed measures:</p> <p>477 One proposed CCWG-Accountability measure could give the community standing to request Reconsideration of management's decision to certify the ccTLD change. Would require a standard of review that is more specific than amended ICANN Mission, Commitments and Core Values.</p> <p>Another proposed CCWG-Accountability 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 took action to revoke or assign management responsibility for a ccTLD, the IRP mechanism might be enabled to review that decision. Would require a standard of review.</p> |
| <p>478 Conclusions:</p> <p>479 a) This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p> | <p>480 b) Existing measures would not be adequate.</p> | <p>481 c) Proposed measures do not adequately empower the community to address this scenario until the appropriate processes develop appropriate mechanisms.</p> |

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:57 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:33 PM
Deleted: At this point,
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:33 PM
Deleted: p
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

Stress test category III: Legal/Legislative Action

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|--|---|--|
| <p>482 3. Litigation arising from existing public policy, e.g., Antitrust suit</p> | <p>485 The community could develop new policies that respond to litigation challenges.</p> <p>486 An ICANN Board decision</p> | <p>489 After ICANN Board responded to the lawsuit (litigating, changing policies or enforcement, etc.) the</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 483 | In response, ICANN Board would decide whether to litigate, concede, settle, etc. | (litigate or settle) could not be challenged by the community at-large, which lacks standing to use IRP. | community would have several response options: |
| 484 | Consequence: significant interference with existing policies and/or policy development relating to relevant activities | 487 Reconsideration looks at process but not substance of a decision. 488 ICANN must follow orders from courts of competent jurisdiction. | 490 The community could develop new policies that respond to litigation challenges. 491 Another measure would give the community standing to file for Reconsideration or IRP, based on amended Mission, Commitments and Core Values. 492 Another measure would allow each AoC review team to assess implementation of prior recommendations, and renew the recommendations. An ICANN Board decision against those recommendations could be challenged with a Reconsideration and/or IRP. |
| 493 | Conclusions: | | |
| 494 | a) This threat is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship | 495 b) Existing measures are inadequate. | 496 c) Proposed measures would help the community hold ICANN accountable, but might not be adequate to stop interference with ICANN policies. |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:58 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:58 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 497 | 4. New regulations or legislation. | 501 The community could develop new policies that respond to new regulations. | 505 After ICANN Board responded to the regulation (litigate or change policy/implementation), the community would have several response options: |
| 498 | For example, a government could cite anti-trust or consumer protection laws and find unlawful some rules that ICANN imposes on TLDs. That government could impose fines on ICANN, withdraw from the GAC, and/or force ISPs to use a different root, thereby fragmenting the Internet. | 502 An ICANN Board decision on how to respond to the regulation (litigate or change policy/implementation) could not be challenged by the community at-large, which lacks standing to use IRP. | 506 The community could develop new policies that respond to regulation. |
| 499 | In response, ICANN Board would decide whether to | 503 Reconsideration looks at process but not substance of a decision. | 507 Another measure would give the community standing to file for Reconsideration or IRP, based on amended Mission, Commitments and Core |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| litigate, concede, settle, etc. | | Values. |
| 500 Consequence: significant interference with existing policies and/or policy development relating to relevant activities | 504 ICANN must follow orders from courts of competent jurisdiction. | 508 Another measure would allow each AoC review team to assess implementation of prior recommendations, and renew the recommendations. An ICANN Board decision against those recommendations could be challenged with a Reconsideration and/or IRP. |
| 509 Conclusions: 510 a) This threat is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship | 511 b) Existing measures are inadequate. | 512 c) Proposed measures would be an improvement but might still be inadequate. |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|--|---|---|
| 513 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. | 516 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 US Government. [pending verification] | 522 While it would not protect the root zone maintainer from lawsuits, one CCWG-Accountability proposed mechanism is community challenge of ICANN decision to re-delegate or its decision to acquiesce or litigate the court order. This challenge would take the form of a Reconsideration or IRP. |
| 514 In response, ICANN Board would decide whether to litigate, concede, settle, etc. | 517 However, the IANA stewardship transition might result in root zone maintainer not operating under USG contract, so would not be protected from lawsuits. | 523 After ICANN Board responded to the lawsuit (litigating, changing policies or enforcement, etc.) the decision could be challenged via Reconsideration or IRP, based on standard of review in amended Mission, Commitments and Core Values. |
| 515 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. | 518 A separate consideration: 519 An ICANN Board decision (litigate or settle) could not be challenged by the community at-large, which lacks standing to use IRP. 520 Reconsideration looks at process but not substance of a decision. 521 ICANN must follow orders from courts of competent | |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:58 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|
| 524 | Conclusions: | jurisdiction. | |
| 525 | a) This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship | 526 b) Existing measures might not be adequate. | 527 c) At this point, CCWG-Stewardship 's recommendations are still in development. |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

| | STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 528 | 20. A court order is issued to block ICANN's delegation of a new TLD, because of complaint by existing TLD operators or other aggrieved parties. | 532 Before delegation, the community lacked standing to object to string similarity decisions. Reconsideration requests looks at process but not at <i>substance</i> of the decision. | 536 Preventive: During policy development, the community would have standing to challenge ICANN Board decisions about policy and implementation. |
| 529 | For example, an existing gTLD operator might sue to block delegation of a plural version of the existing string. | 533 An ICANN Board decision (litigate or settle) could not be challenged by the community at-large, which lacks standing to use IRP. | 537 A future new gTLD Guidebook could give the community standing to file objections. |
| 530 | In response, ICANN Board would decide whether to litigate, concede, settle, etc. | 534 Reconsideration looks at process but not substance of a decision. | 538 Remedial: After ICANN Board responded to the lawsuit (litigating, changing policies or enforcement, etc.) the community would have several response options: |
| 531 | Consequence: ICANN's decision about how to respond to court order could bring liability to ICANN and its contract parties. | 535 ICANN must follow orders from courts of competent jurisdiction, and may consider factors such as cost of litigation and insurance. | 539 One measure would give the community standing to file for Reconsideration or IRP, according to standard of review in amended Mission, Commitments and Core Values. |
| | | | 540 One proposed measure empowers the community to force ICANN's Board to consider a recommendation arising from an AoC Review – namely, <i>Consumer Trust, Choice, and Competition</i> . An ICANN Board decision against those recommendations could be challenged with a Reconsideration and/or IRP. |
| 541 | Conclusions: | | |
| 542 | a) This threat is not directly | 543 b) Existing measures would be | 544 c) Proposed measures would |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:58 PM
Deleted: Guarantees

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| related to the transition of IANA stewardship | inadequate. | be an improvement but might still be inadequate. |
|---|-------------|--|

Stress test category IV: Failure of Accountability

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|--|---|---|
| 545 10. Chairman, CEO or officer acting in a manner inconsistent with the organization's mission. | 548 As long as NTIA controls the IANA functions contract, ICANN risks losing IANA functions if it were to expand scope too broadly. | 551 One proposed measure empowers the community to veto ICANN's proposed strategic plan or annual budget. This measure could block a proposal by ICANN to increase its expenditure on extending its mission beyond what the community supported. |
| 546 24. An incoming Chief Executive institutes a "strategic review" that arrives at a new, extended mission for ICANN. Having just hired the new CEO, the Board approves the new mission / strategy without community consensus. | 549 The Community has some input in ICANN budgeting and Strat Plan, and could register objections to plans and spending on extending ICANN's mission. | 552 Another 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. The IRP decision would be based on a standard of review in the amended Mission Statement, including "ICANN shall not undertake any other mission not specifically authorized in these Bylaws" |
| 547 Consequence: Community ceases to see ICANN as the community's mechanism for limited technical functions, and views ICANN as an independent, <i>sui generis</i> entity with its own agenda, not necessarily supported by the community. Ultimately, community questions why ICANN's original functions should remain controlled by a body that has acquired a much broader and less widely supported mission. | 550 California's Attorney General has jurisdiction over non-profit entities acting outside Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation. | |
| 553 Conclusions: | | |
| 554 a) This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship | 555 b) Existing measures are inadequate after NTIA terminates the IANA contract. | 556 c) Proposed measures in combination are adequate. |

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| 557 12. Capture by one or several | 559 Regarding capture by | 560 CCWG-Accountability |

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Bboard
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:36 PM
Deleted: , based on standard of review in amended Mission, Guarantees and Core Values.
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:36 PM
Deleted: Another proposed measure is a proscriptive restriction on ICANN's activities, as part of the Mission Statement in amended ICANN bylaws.
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>558 groups of stakeholders.</p> <p>Consequence: major impact on trust in multistakeholder model, prejudice to other stakeholders.</p> | <p>governments, the GAC could change its Operating Principle 47 to use majority voting for formal GAC advice, but ICANN Bylaws would require due deference only to advice that had GAC consensus.</p> | <p>proposals for community empowerment rely upon supermajority to veto ICANN budgets and strategic plans, to remove ICANN Board director(s). A supermajority requirement is an effective prevention of capture by one or a few groups, provided that quorum requirements are high enough.</p> <p>561 Each AC/SO/SG needs accountability and transparency rules to prevent capture from those outside that community.</p> <p>562 To prevent capture by governments, another proposed measure would amend ICANN Bylaws (Article XI, Section 2, item 1j) to obligate trying to find a mutually agreeable solution only where GAC advice was supported by GAC consensus.</p> |
| <p>563 Conclusions:</p> <p>564 a) This threat is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p> | <p>565 b) Existing measures would be inadequate</p> | <p>566 c) Proposed measures would be adequate.</p> |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
 Deleted: bylaws
 Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
 Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
 Deleted: bylaws

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|---|---|---|
| <p>567 13. One or several stakeholders excessively rely on accountability mechanism to “paralyze” ICANN.</p> <p>568 Consequence: major impact on corporate reputation, inability to take decisions, instability of governance bodies, loss of key staff</p> | <p>569 Current redress mechanisms might enable one stakeholder to block implementation of policies. But these mechanisms (IRP, Reconsideration, Ombudsman) are expensive and limited in scope of what can be reviewed.</p> <p>570 There are no present mechanisms for a ccTLD operator to challenge a</p> | <p>571 CCWG-Accountability proposals for community empowerment rely upon supermajority to veto ICANN budgets and strategic plans, to remove ICANN Board director(s). A supermajority requirement is an effective prevention of capture by one or a few groups, provided that quorum requirements are high enough.</p> |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG
 Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
 Deleted: board
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
 Deleted: Thursday
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
 Deleted: April 30
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
 Deleted: ,
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
 Deleted: 21
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
 Deleted: 2
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
 Deleted: 98

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | revocation decision. | <p>572 Each AC/SO/SG needs accountability and transparency rules to prevent capture from those outside that community.</p> <p>573 However, some CCWG-Accountability proposals may make redress mechanisms more accessible and affordable to individual stakeholders, increasing their ability to block implementation of policies and decisions.</p> <p>574 It should be noted that proposed measures for Reconsideration and IRP include the ability to dismiss frivolous or abusive claims and to limit the duration of proceedings.</p> |
| <p>575 Conclusions:</p> <p>576 a) This threat is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p> | <p>577 b) Existing measures seem to be adequate.</p> | <p>578 c) Improved access to Reconsideration and IRP could allow individuals to impede ICANN processes, although this risk is mitigated by dismissal of frivolous or abusive claims.</p> |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:37 PM
Deleted: The standards of review may need to be adjusted based on whether the community or an individual sought the review /redress.

Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:38 PM
Deleted: c) Proposed measures may need to distinguish community powers from those available to individuals.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|--|--|--|
| <p>579 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, giving grants for external causes.</p> <p>580 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-</p> | <p>581 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 in order to retain IANA contract with NTIA.</p> <p>582 Community was not aware of ICANN Board's secret resolution to initiate negotiations to create</p> | <p>586 One proposed measure is empowering the community to veto ICANN's proposed strategic plan and budget. This measure could block a proposal by ICANN to increase its expenditure on initiatives the community believed were beyond ICANN's limited mission. However, this would be an extreme measure since the entire budget would have to be vetoed.</p> <p>587 Another proposed mechanism</p> |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>related cause seeking funding sources.</p> | <p>NetMundial. There was no apparent way for community to challenge/reverse this decision.</p> <p>583 The Community has input in ICANN budgeting and Strat Plan.</p> <p>584 Registrars must approve ICANN's variable registrar fees, though Registrars do not view this as an accountability measure.</p> <p>585 California's Attorney General has jurisdiction over non-profit entities acting outside Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation.</p> | <p>is a challenge to a Board decision, made by an aggrieved party or the Community as a whole. This would refer the matter 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 enables reversal of that decision.</p> <p>588 Another proposal is to amend ICANN Bylaws to prevent the organization from expanding scope beyond ICANN's amended Mission and Core Values.</p> <p>589 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>590 Conclusions:</p> <p>591 a) Threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p> | <p>592 b) Existing measures are inadequate.</p> | <p>593 c) Proposed measures in combination may be adequate.</p> |

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|---|--|---|
| <p>594 18. Governments in ICANN's Government Advisory Committee (GAC) amend their operating procedures to change from consensus decisions to majority voting for advice to ICANN's Board.</p> | <p>596 Current ICANN Bylaws (Section XI) give due deference to GAC advice, including a requirement to try and find "a mutually acceptable solution."</p> | <p>599 One proposed measure would amend ICANN bylaws (Article XI, Section 2, item 1j) to require trying to find a mutually agreeable solution only where GAC advice was supported by GAC consensus.</p> |
| <p>595 Consequence: Under current Bylaws, ICANN must consider and respond to GAC advice, even if that advice were not supported by consensus. A majority of governments could</p> | <p>597 This is required for any GAC advice, not just for GAC consensus advice.</p> <p>598 Today, GAC adopts formal advice according to its Operating Principle 47:</p> | <p>The GAC could change its Operating Principle 47 to use majority voting for formal GAC advice, but ICANN bylaws would require trying to find a mutually agreeable solution</p> |

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 2:46 PM
Deleted: sed measure
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws
- Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 2:47 PM
Deleted: , Guarantees
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| | thereby approve GAC advice that restricted free online expression, for example. | "consensus is understood to mean the practice of adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of any formal objection." ⁷ But the GAC may at any time change its procedures to use majority voting instead of consensus. | 600 only on advice that had GAC consensus. GAC can still give ICANN advice at any time, with or without consensus |
| 601 | Conclusions: | | |
| 602 | a) This threat is not directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship | 603 b) Existing measures are inadequate. | 604 c) Proposed measures are adequate. |

| | STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 605 | 22. ICANN Board fails to comply with Bylaws and/or refuses to accept the decision of a redress mechanism constituted under the Bylaws . | 607 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. | 611 One proposed measure is to change the standard for Reconsideration Requests, so that substantive matters may also be challenged. |
| 606 | Consequence: Community loses confidence in multistakeholder structures to govern ICANN. | 608 Aggrieved parties can ask for Reconsideration of Board decisions, but this is currently limited to questions of whether process was followed. 609 Aggrieved parties can file for IRP, but decisions of the panel are not binding on ICANN. 610 California's Attorney General has jurisdiction over non-profit entities acting outside Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation. | 612 Another proposed measure empowers the community to force ICANN's Board to consider a recommendation arising from an AoC Review – namely, the <i>Accountability and Transparency Review Team</i> . An ICANN Board decision against those recommendations could be challenged with a Reconsideration and/or IRP. 613 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 |

01
02
03
04
7

⁷ ICANN Government Advisory Committee (GAC) - Operating Principles, October, 2011, at <https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Operating+Principles>

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:28 PM
Deleted: [\[Sidley is something missing here?\]](#)
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:23 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | comply with its Bylaws , the IRP mechanism enables a reversal of that decision. |
| 615 Conclusions: | | |
| 616 a) This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship | 617 b) Existing measures are inadequate. | 614 If the ICANN Board were to ignore binding IRP decisions, another proposed measure would empower the community to force resignation ICANN Board member(s). 618 c) Proposed measures in combination are adequate because the community has power to spill the Board . |

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|---|--|---|
| 619 23. ICANN uses RAA or other agreements to impose requirements on third parties, outside scope of ICANN mission. (e.g. registrant obligations) | 624 During policy development, affected third parties may participate and file comments. | 629 A proposed measure to empower an aggrieved party (e.g. registrants and users) to challenge a Board decision, referring it to an Independent Review Panel (IRP) with the power to issue a binding decision, based on standard for review in the amended Mission, Commitments and Core Values. |
| 620 Affected third parties, not being contracted to ICANN, have no effective recourse. | 625 Affected third parties may file comments on proposed changes to registry and registrar contracts. | 630 Another 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. That IRP decision would be based on a standard of review in the amended Mission statement, including "ICANN shall not undertake any other mission not specifically authorized in these Bylaws." |
| 621 Contracted parties, not affected by the requirements, may choose not to use their ability to challenge ICANN's decision. | 626 Affected third parties (e.g. registrants and users) have no standing to challenge ICANN on its approved policies. | |
| 622 This issue occurs in policy development, implementation, and compliance enforcement. | 627 Affected third parties (e.g. registrants and users) have no standing to challenge ICANN management and Board on how it has <i>implemented</i> approved policies. | |
| 623 Consequence: ICANN seen as a monopoly leveraging power in one market (domain names) into adjacent markets. | 628 If ICANN changes its legal jurisdiction, that might reduce the ability of third parties to sue ICANN. | |
| 631 Conclusions: | | |
| 632 a) This threat is not directly related to IANA transition | 633 b) Existing measures are inadequate. | 634 Proposed measures would be adequate. |

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 4:58 PM
Deleted: Guarantees
- Steve 4/29/2015 10:21 AM
Deleted: Another proposed measure is to amend ICANN bylaws to prevent the organization from expanding scope beyond what is needed for SSR in DNS operations and to meet mission and core values of ICANN.
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws
- Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 5:38 PM
Deleted: Another proposed measure is to amend ICANN bylaws to prevent the organization from expanding scope beyond what is needed for SSR in DNS operations and to meet Mission, Guarantees and Core Values of ICANN.
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|--|--|--|
| 635 26. During implementation of a properly approved policy, ICANN staff substitutes their preferences and creates processes that effectively change or negate the policy developed. Whether staff do so intentionally or unintentionally, the result is the same. | 637 The reconsideration review mechanism allows for appeal to the Board of staff actions that contradict established ICANN policies. However, reconsideration looks at process but not substance of a decision. 638 An ICANN Board decision could not be challenged by the community at-large, which lacks standing to use IRP. | 639 If the staff action involved a Board decision, there are proposed improvements to challenge a Board decision by reconsideration or referral to an Independent Review Panel (IRP) with the power to issue a binding decision. |
| 636 Consequence: Staff capture of policy implementation undermines the legitimacy conferred upon ICANN by established community based policy development processes. | | |
| 640 Conclusions: 641 a) This threat is not directly related to IANA transition | 642 b) Existing measures are inadequate. | 643 c) Proposed measures would, in combination, be adequate. |

Alice Jansen 4/30/2015 2:48 PM
Deleted: On 12-March, this additional stress test was added to category IV: Failure of Accountability

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Stress test category V: Failure of Accountability to External Stakeholders

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|---|---|--|
| 644 14. ICANN or NTIA choose to terminate the Affirmation of Commitments. (AoC) | 646 The AoC can be terminated by either ICANN or NTIA with 120 days notice. | 649 One proposed mechanism is community standing to challenge a Board decision by referral to an Independent Review Panel (IRP) with the power to issue a binding decision. If ICANN canceled the AoC, the IRP mechanism could enable reversal of that decision. |
| 645 Consequence: ICANN would no longer be held to its Affirmation commitments, including the conduct of community reviews and required implementation of review team recommendations. | 647 As long as NTIA controls the IANA contract, ICANN feels pressure to maintain the AoC. 648 But as a result of IANA stewardship transition, ICANN would no longer have the IANA contract as external pressure from NTIA to maintain the AoC. | 650 Another proposed measure is to import AoC provisions into the ICANN Bylaws , and |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>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.</p> <p>651 If ICANN's Board proposed to amend the AoC commitments and reviews that were added to the Bylaws, another proposed measure would empower the community to veto that proposed Bylaws change.</p> <p>652 Note: none of the proposed measures could prevent NTIA from canceling the AoC.</p> |
| 653 Conclusions: | | |
| 654 a) This threat is directly related to IANA transition | 655 b) Existing measures are inadequate after NTIA terminates the IANA contract. | 656 c) Proposed measures in combination are adequate. |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|---|---|---|
| 657 15. ICANN terminates its legal presence in a nation where Internet users or domain registrants are seeking legal remedies for ICANN's failure to enforce contracts, or other actions. | 659 As long as NTIA controls the IANA contract, ICANN could risk losing IANA functions if it were to move in order to avoid legal jurisdiction. | 662 ICANN's present Bylaws include a commitment to maintain headquarters in California with offices around the world. |
| 658 Consequence: affected parties might be prevented from seeking legal redress for commissions or omissions by ICANN. | 660 Paragraph 8 of the AoC requires ICANN to remain headquartered in the US, but the AoC can be terminated by ICANN at any time | 663 If ICANN's Board proposed to amend this Bylaws provision, one proposed measure would empower the community to veto that proposed Bylaws change. |
| 664 Conclusions: | | |
| 665 a) This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship | 666 b) Existing measures are inadequate once NTIA terminates IANA contract. | 667 c) Proposed measures improve upon existing measures, and may be adequate. |

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

| STRESS TEST | EXISTING ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES | PROPOSED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES |
|--|---|--|
| <p>668 25. ICANN delegates or subcontracts its obligations under a future IANA agreement to a third party. Would also include ICANN merging with or allowing itself to be acquired by another organization.</p> <p>669 Consequence: Responsibility for fulfilling the IANA functions could go to a third party that was subject to national laws that interfered with its ability to execute IANA functions.</p> | <p>670 The present IANA contract (link) at C.2.1 does not allow ICANN to sub-contract or outsource its responsibilities to a 3rd party without NTIA's consent.</p> <p>671 NTIA could exert its control over ICANN's decision as long as it held the IANA contract. But not after NTIA relinquishes the IANA contract.</p> <p>672 Nor would NTIA's required principles for transition be relevant after transition occurred.</p> | <p>673 The CWG-Stewardship planning the IANA stewardship transition could require community consent before ICANN could sub-contract or outsource its IANA responsibilities to a 3rd party.</p> <p>674 The CCWG-Accountability is proposing to empower 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 enables a reversal of that decision.</p> <p>675 Note: This would not cover re-assignment of the Root Zone Maintainer role, which NTIA is addressing in a parallel process.</p> |
| <p>676 Conclusions:</p> <p>677 a) This threat is directly related to the transition of IANA stewardship</p> | <p>678 b) Existing measures would not be adequate after NTIA relinquishes the IANA contract.</p> | <p>679 c) Proposed measure are adequate to allow community to challenge ICANN decisions in this scenario.</p> |

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:41 PM
Deleted: w

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:41 PM
Deleted: s

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

4) Items for Consideration in Work Stream 2

580 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) Charter states that:

581 In the discussions around the accountability process, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) will proceed with two [Work Streams](#):

- Work Stream 1: focused on mechanisms enhancing ICANN accountability that must be in place or committed to within the time frame of the IANA Stewardship Transition;

- Work Stream 2: focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation may extend beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.

682 While Work Stream 2 is not necessary to be implemented or committed to before the transition takes place, the Charter insists that they should remain firmly within the scope of the [CCWG-Accountability](#). The items listed below should therefore be considered as no less important than the Work Stream 1 items.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Commitment to Work Stream 2 proposal consideration

683 However, concerns were raised within the [CCWG-Accountability](#) about the incentives for ICANN to implement Work Stream 2 proposals when they are finalized after the transition has taken place. The [CCWG-Accountability](#)'s recommendation to achieve sufficient commitment from ICANN is to rely on an interim Bylaw provision, noting that such provisions have been successfully used in the past.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account... [44]

684 ICANN has, where appropriate, used transitional articles within its [Articles within its Bylaws](#) to identify issues that are necessary to address on a transitional basis, but will expire upon the occurrence of another event. The broadest use of a transitional article was in 2002, after the large ICANN Evolution and Reform effort, which made commitments to future occurrences such as a new MoU between ICANN and a group of Regional Internet Registries at the time when new obligations would come into force for the ASO, or obligations that would be taken on by the ccNSO once formed. See <https://www.icann.org/resources/unthemed-pages/Bylaws-2002-12-15-en#XX>.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws...rticles within it ... [45]

685 There is also precedent for the use of transitional terms after the GNSO was restructured, and the [Board](#) seat selected by the At-Large Community was implemented.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

686 To ensure the [Board](#)'s due consideration and implementation of the outcomes of Work Stream 2 accountability mechanisms, the proposal [would not](#) require [the level](#) of the complexity [of](#) the 2002 reform effort.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:24 PM
Deleted: To account for somethir ... [46]

687 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) recommends that the [Board](#) adopts a transitional article in its [Bylaws](#) which would commit ICANN to [implement the CCWG-Accountability recommendations](#), and task the group with creating further enhancements to ICANN's accountability including, but not limited to the following list of issues (see below). [This transitional article must be incorporated in the Bylaws as part of Work Stream 1 - prior to the IANA stewardship transition](#).

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board...oard adopts a ... [47]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:58 PM
Comment [19]: 19 Addition + Comment from Jordan Carter: I think we have to be totally clear that this is WS1 and not optional...

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account... [43]

Items for consideration within Work Stream 2

588 During the course of its deliberations, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) encountered several items [that](#) it considered [should be resolved](#) as [part of](#) Work Stream 2. The list of items considered for Work Stream 2 [at the date of this report](#) is the following:

1. Enhancements to ICANN's accountability based on the law(s) applicable to its actions;
2. Alternative options for ICANN's jurisdiction (understood as 'place of legal establishment') based on possible accountability limitations related to the current jurisdiction of [ICANN](#);
3. Enhancements to the Ombudsman's role and function;
4. Limiting ICANN's ability to deny transparency / disclosure requests;
5. Improvements to ICANN's budgeting and planning process that guarantee the ability for the community to have input, and for that input to be given due consideration;
6. Define security audits and certification requirements for ICANN's IT systems;
7. Institute a culture of default transparency at ICANN, including guidelines for when it is acceptable to classify information, requirements for logging decisions to classify information and procedure for de-classifying information;
8. [Improve diversity in all its aspects at all levels of the organization](#); [and](#),
9. [Enhancements to ICANN's whistleblower policy](#).

589 [Proposed additional paragraph: The CCWG-Accountability will take into account the community's feedback arising from this report and the ongoing analysis of ICANN's accountability as it continues to develop Work Stream 2. It is important to note that as a result, the above list of topics for Work Stream 2 is not fixed and additional issues may be dealt with in Work Stream 2.](#)

590 [QUESTIONS AND OPEN ISSUES](#):

591 19) The [CCWG-Accountability](#) seeks input from the community regarding its proposed work plan for the [CCWG-Accountability](#) Accountability Work Stream 2? If need be, please clarify what amendments would be needed.

5) Implementation Plan Including Timing

5.1 Timeline

592 The timeline below is a combination of the [CWG-Stewardship](#) and [CCWG-Accountability](#). The reason for combining both is that the completion of the [CCWG-Accountability's](#) Work Stream 1

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:55 PM

Deleted: which

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:25 PM

Deleted: the Corporation

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:25 PM

Deleted: .

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:25 PM

Deleted: should be made

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:25 PM

Deleted: -

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:55 PM

Deleted:

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:56 PM

Comment [20]: 20Addition by Jordan Carter

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM

Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM


Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

effort is an essential component for the IANA Stewardship Transition to occur. Note that this timeline only focuses on Work Stream 1 and its corresponding implementation. Work Stream 2 remains in basic form until there is more clarity on what accountability mechanisms will make up its scope.

CCWG Timeline – 30 Apr 2015



A full view version of this timeline exists on the [CCWG-Accountability wiki](#).

5.2 Next Steps

The first Public Comment Report sets out the CCWG-Accountability's initial thinking. After the Public Comment period closes, the CCWG-Accountability will reconvene and continue its work, aiming to finalize Work Stream 1 proposal(s) for submission to Chartering Organizations and eventually to the ICANN Board. Key milestones include:

- ❑ CCWG-Accountability reviews Public Comment #1 and adjusts proposal as agreed
- ❑ CCWG-Accountability prepares materials in preparation for ICANN 53 and hosts several sessions to further inform the community of its progress and understand the community's views on its proposal(s). The CCWG-Accountability will hold a full day of face-to-face meeting on 19 June.
- ❑ CCWG-Accountability prepared its second draft proposal and readies it for a second public consultation. This second consultation will focus on outstanding issues, provide further details regarding the Work Stream 1 proposal(s), and will highlight any changes to proposal(s) arising from the feedback received in the first Public Comment consultation.
- ❑ CCWG-Accountability reviews Public Comment #2 and refines its proposal to prepare the final version
- ❑ CCWG-Accountability delivers the final proposal to SOs/ACs for approval
- ❑ CCWG-Accountability delivers the final proposal to the ICANN Board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 1:25 PM
 Deleted: (WS1)
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:57 PM
 Deleted: t...ansition to occur. [49]
 Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 1:25 PM
 Deleted: WS1
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:57 PM
 Deleted: ... Work Stream 2 rema... [50]
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:57 PM
 Comment [21]: 21Comment from Jordan Carter: reiterate my suggestion that this chart be broken into three or six month chunks so that people can actually read it in this version of the document.
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG
 Alice Jansen 4/29/2015 10:03 AM
 Deleted: a second public comment would be issued after ICANN53, focused on any outstanding issue and providing additional details on the proposed work stream 1 mechanisms.
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:01 PM
 Deleted: At the time of this publication, this document will undergo its first... [51]
 Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
 Deleted: Board
 Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 2:14 PM
 Deleted: .
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG...CWG- [52]
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG...CWG- [53]
 Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 2:13 PM
 Deleted: <#>CCWG prepares... [54]
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG...CWG- [55]
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG
 Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
 Deleted: Board
 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
 Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Accour... [48]

- Upon proper notification, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) begins Implementation Oversight of Work Stream 1 and on or around this time begins its work [on](#) Work Stream 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG- ... [57]

5.3 Implementation

695 The [CCWG-Accountability](#) views the oversight of Work Stream 1 implementation [as](#) crucial to its mandate. Work Stream 1 accountability changes with either have to be implemented or committed to before any transition of JANA Stewardship from NTIA can occur. At the time of this publication, it is difficult to provide details of the effort required for Work Stream 1 implementation, and it is not possible to provide an exact timeline or duration beyond the information below and in the timeline in section 5.1 of this report. However, the [CCWG-Accountability](#) roughly estimates nine months for implementation understanding that several tracks of effort and change will be required, some of which will require multiple public comment periods. The [CCWG-Accountability](#) has tentatively outlined the following six tracks for implementation of Work Stream 1:

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Account ... [58]

- Revised [Mission, Commitments and Core Values](#)
- Fundamental [Bylaws establishment](#)
- Independent Review Panel enhancements
- Community empowerment [mechanism establishment & powers incorporation in Bylaws](#)
- AoC reviews transcription into the [Bylaws](#)
- Reconsideration process enhancements

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:33 PM
Deleted: m...ission, c...ommi ... [59]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:08 PM
Deleted: changes

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

696 As the [CCWG-Accountability](#) progresses closer to its final Work Stream 1 Proposal, implementation planning will become clearer. Once approval has been obtained, implementation can begin.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

697 A significant number of [CCWG-Accountability](#) Accountability [Work Stream 1](#) recommendations involve updating the ICANN [Bylaws](#). A best case timeline for implementation can be found below. About 105 days appear necessary until approval of the Bylaw changes, which appear as a key milestone.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 1:25 PM
Deleted: WS1 ...ork Stream 1 ... [60]

698 **STEP 1 – ESTABLISHMENT OF BYLAW PROPOSALS – AROUND 45 DAYS**

699 Assuming that lawyers have very clear direction and guidance, the legal work of preparing proposed amendments to ICANN's [Articles](#) and [Bylaws](#) could be accomplished in as little as two weeks. However, in the drafting process issues may become apparent that have not been anticipated and need additional guidance, which would slow the drafting process down.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:33 PM
Deleted: articles ...rticles and by ... [61]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Accour ... [56]

700 Similarly, assuming clear direction and guidance on the ACs/SOs and assuming that these entities do not have assets or revenues, the documents for the unincorporated associations (assuming 6) could be drafted in another two weeks.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 1:26 PM
Deleted:

701 Thus, the drafting of amendments to the core ICANN governance documents and creation of basic streamlined unincorporated association documents should take about four to six weeks total, to have solid first drafts for review.

702 **STEP 2 – POSTING AND APPROVAL OF BYLAWS – AROUND 60 DAYS INCLUDING 40 DAYS PUBLIC COMMENT**

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: BYLAWS

703 The general process for the posting and approval of Bylaws amendments is as follows:

❑ The Board considers the proposed revisions for posting for public comment. The Board typically receives items for consideration approximately 7 calendar days before action. Given the import of the CCWG-Accountability work, a special Board meeting, could be called (upon proper notice - 48 hour minimum) in order to address the implementation work.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board...oard consid ... [63]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

❑ So long as the Board approves the posting, staff can prepare the posting as soon as possible. We could aim at making sure that any public comment opening text would be completed no later than the day the Board is scheduled to consider the posting, so that there is no undue delay.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:34 PM
Deleted: the always is the possibility of... special Board...oard ... [64]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board...oard approv ... [65]

❑ Public comment is typically for 40 days. There is the opportunity for a shorter period of time, though practice has been to never go below 30 days for Bylaws changes, and particularly in the case of Bylaws revisions. ICANN would only shorten that period if there were community consensus that a 30-day window was more appropriate.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:34 PM
Deleted: ...here is the oppor ... [66]

❑ The public comment would have to be considered and provided to the Board for consideration and approval. We could work to identify what types of timeframes would be appropriate for this, though typically there is a need for at least two weeks to prepare the matter for the Board's further consideration/approval, depending on the complexity of the comments.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board...oard for ... [67]

❑ Assuming there is nothing within the public comment that requires substantial modification (which could require further public comment), once the Board considers and approves the revisions, they are made effective immediately.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

❑ What this means is that from the time the Bylaws are provided to the Board for consideration for posting for public comment, we're looking at approximately 60 days (assuming a 40 day public comment and that Board meetings are convened as needed for this purpose) to implementation.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws...ylaws are ... [68]




704 **STEP 3 – SETTING UP THE MECHANISMS - DURATION DEPENDS ON SO/AC PROCESSES**

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Accour ... [62]

705 In terms of regulatory filings, with both the designator and Membership models all that is required is that the new Articles of Incorporation be filed with the State of California. There is no approval process to factor in at the state or federal level.

706 Each SO/AC would need to make appropriate arrangements to fully participate within the community mechanism.

707 In terms of setting up the IRP, a process to nominate, select and confirm the initial panelists would have to be convened. The engagement of International Arbitration Bodies and the nomination phase of this process could actually start before approval of the relevant Bylaws. However, the launch of an IRP is likely to take 3 to 6 months.

| 708 The following tables suggests implementation milestones and dates for Work Stream 1 recommendations | | Complete | ✓ or  | xx |
|--|------------------------------------|--|--|-------|
| | | Progress | ○ or  | xx In |
| | | Planning | ◇ or  | xx In |
| CCWG-Accountability-ACCT Rec # | Description/Implementation Summary | Milestones, Completion Dates (See Executive Summaries for additional details) | Expected Implementation Date after Approval | |
| 709 | Community Empowerment | 710 | | |
| 711 | | 712 | 713 | 714 |
| 715 | Review & Redress | 716 | | |
| 717 | | 718 | 719 | 720 |

6) Public Comment Input

721 Do you believe the set of Work Stream 1 proposals in this interim report, if implemented or committed to, would provide sufficient enhancements to ICANN's accountability to proceed with

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:35 PM
Deleted: membership

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:37 PM
Deleted: articles

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:09 PM
Deleted: i

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:37 PM
Deleted:

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:37 PM
Deleted: (The bylaws need not be filed to become effective, but will be publicly disclosed to California and federal government agencies in due course.)

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:07 PM
Deleted: -

Jordan Carter 4/30/2015 6:29 PM
Deleted: <#>In terms of community powers, each SO/AC would additionally need to, according to their processes, select their representatives into the community mechanism described in 2.6.1. -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 1:26 PM
Deleted: WS1

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

the IANA Stewardship transition? If not, please clarify what amendments would be needed to the set of recommendation.

722 Do you have any general feedback or suggestion on the interim Work Stream 1 proposals?

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:42 PM

Deleted: w

723 Insert deadline + practical suggestions here.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:42 PM

Deleted: s

724 Revised Mission, Commitments & Core Values

1. Do you agree that these recommended changes to ICANN's Mission, Commitments and Core Values would enhance ICANN's accountability?
2. Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would amend these requirements.

725 Fundamental Bylaws

3. Do you agree that the introduction of Fundamental Bylaws would enhance ICANN's accountability?
4. Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation, including the list of which Bylaws should become Fundamental Bylaws? If not, please detail how you would recommend amending these requirements.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM

Deleted: Bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM

Deleted: Bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM

Deleted: bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM

Deleted: Bylaws

726 Independent Review Panel Enhancement

5. Do you agree that the proposed improvements to the IRP would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

727 Please refer to Appendix I – Independent Review Panel Enhancement – Questions & Open Issues

728 Reconsideration Process Enhancement

6. Do you agree that the proposed improvements to the reconsideration process would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements. Are the timeframes and deadlines proposed herein sufficient to meet the community's needs? Is the scope of permissible requests broad / narrow enough to meet the community's needs?

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

729 Mechanism to empower the Community

7. [What guidance, if any, would you provide to the CCWG-Accountability regarding the proposed options related to the relative influence of the various groups in the community mechanism? Please provide the underlying rationale in terms of required accountability features or protection against certain contingencies.](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

730 **Power: reconsider/reject budget or strategy/operating plans**

8. [Do you agree that the power for the community to reject a budget or strategic plan would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend amending these requirements.](#)

731 **Power: reconsider/reject changes to ICANN "standard" Bylaws**

9. [Do you agree that the power for the community to reject a proposed bylaw change would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.](#)

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: bylaws

732 **Power: approve changes to "Fundamental" Bylaws**

10. [Do you agree that the power for the community to approve any fundamental bylaw change would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.](#)

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:39 PM
Deleted: m

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:39 PM
Deleted: Board

733 **Power: Recalling individual ICANN Directors**

11. [Do you agree that the power for the community to remove individual Board Members would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

734 **Power: Recalling the entire ICANN Board**

12. [Do you agree that the power for the community to recall the entire Board would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.](#)

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

735 **Incorporating AoC into the ICANN Bylaws**

13. Do you agree that the incorporation into ICANN's Bylaws of the AoC principles would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

14. Do you agree that the incorporation into ICANN's Bylaws of the AoC reviews would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

736 **Bylaws changes suggested by Stress Tests**

15. Do you agree that the incorporation into ICANN's Bylaws of the above changes, as suggested by stress tests, would enhance ICANN's accountability? Do you agree with the list of requirements for this recommendation? If not, please detail how you would recommend to amend these requirements.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
Deleted: Bylaws

737 **Items for Consideration in Work Stream 2**

16. The CCWG-Accountability seeks input from the community regarding its proposed work plan for the CCWG-Accountability Accountability Work Stream 2? If need be, please clarify what amendments would be needed.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:42 PM
Deleted: w

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:42 PM
Deleted: s

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

Glossary

738 See also <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/glossary-2014-02-03-en>

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 739 Advisory Committee | 740 <u>An Advisory Committee is a formal advisory body made up of representatives from the Internet community to advise ICANN on a particular issue or policy area. Several are mandated by the ICANN Bylaws and others may be created as needed. Advisory committees have no legal authority to act for ICANN, but report their findings and make recommendations to the ICANN Board.</u> | Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:55 PM Moved (insertion) [1] |
| 741 Affirmation of Commitments Reviews | 742 <u>The Affirmation of Commitments contains specific provisions for periodic review of four key ICANN objectives. These reviews provide a mechanism to assess and report on ICANN's progress toward fundamental organizational objectives; they are: 1) Ensuring,</u> | Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:55 PM Deleted: - Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:55 PM Moved (insertion) [2] Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:55 PM Moved (insertion) [3] |
| 743 ALAC – At-Large Advisory Committee | 744 <u>ICANN's At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) is responsible for considering and providing advice on the activities of the ICANN, as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users (the "At-Large" community). ICANN, as a private sector, non-profit corporation with technical management responsibilities for the Internet's domain name and address system, will rely on the ALAC and its supporting infrastructure to involve and represent in ICANN a broad set of individual user interests.</u> 745 <u>On 31 October 2002, the ICANN Board adopted New Bylaws that establish the ALAC and authorize its supporting At-Large organizations. (Article XI, Section 2(4) of the New Bylaws.) The New Bylaws, which are the result of ICANN's 2002 reform process, went into effect on 15 December 2002. ALAC is to eventually consist of ten members selected by Regional At-Large Organizations, supplemented by five members selected by ICANN's Nominating Committee. To allow the ALAC to begin functioning immediately, the Transition Article of the Interim Bylaws provides for the Board to appoint ten members (two from each of ICANN's five regions) to an Interim ALAC.</u> 746 <u>Underpinning the ALAC will be a network of self-organizing, self-supporting At-Large Structures throughout the world involving individual Internet users at the local or issue level. The At-Large Structures (either existing organizations or newly formed for this purpose) will self-organize into five Regional At-Large Organizations (one in each ICANN region – Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe, Latin America/Caribbean, and North America). The Regional At-Large Organizations will manage outreach</u> | Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:56 PM Comment [22]: 22Needs to be finished Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:56 PM Deleted: - Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:56 PM Moved (insertion) [4] Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:56 PM Moved (insertion) [5] Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:56 PM Deleted: - Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:56 PM Deleted: - Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:57 PM Moved (insertion) [6] Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM Deleted: CCWG Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM Deleted: Thursday Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM Deleted: April 30 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM Deleted: , Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM Deleted: 21 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM Deleted: 2 Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM Deleted: 98 |

and public involvement and will be the main forum and coordination point in each region for public input to ICANN.

747 **ASO – Address Supporting Organization**

748 The ASO advises the ICANN Board of Directors on policy issues relating to the allocation and management of Internet Protocol (IP) addresses. The ASO selects two Directors for the ICANN Board.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:57 PM

Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:57 PM

Moved (insertion) [7]

749 **Bottom-up Processes**

750 A fundamental principle of ICANN's decision-making processes is that policy analysis and decisions progress from a stakeholder level (made up of directly affected parties, Internet users, companies and anyone else who wishes to participate in the process) to the ICANN Board level. The process provides the opportunity for open and equal participation at all levels, as practical and possible.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:58 PM

Moved (insertion) [8]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:58 PM

Moved (insertion) [9]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:58 PM

Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:58 PM

Deleted: -

751 **ccNSO – The Country-Code Names Supporting Organization**

752 The Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) is a body within the ICANN structure created for and by ccTLD managers. Since its creation in 2003, the ccNSO has provided a forum for country code Top Level Domain (ccTLD) managers to meet and discuss topical issues of concern to ccTLDs from a global perspective. The ccNSO provides a platform to nurture consensus, technical cooperation and skill building among ccTLDs and facilitates the development of voluntary best practices for ccTLD managers. It is also responsible for developing and recommending global policies to the ICANN Board for a limited set of issues relating to ccTLDs, such as the introduction of Internationalised Domain Name ccTLDs (IDN ccTLDs). Membership in the ccNSO is open to all ccTLD managers responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain.

753 **ccTLD – Country Code Top Level Domain**

754 Two letter domains, such as .uk (United Kingdom), .de (Germany) and .jp (Japan) (for example), are called country code top level domains (ccTLDs) and correspond to a country, territory, or other geographic location. The rules and policies for registering domain names in the ccTLDs vary significantly and ccTLD registries limit use of the ccTLD to citizens of the corresponding country.

755 Some ICANN-accredited registrars provide registration services in the ccTLDs in addition to registering names in .biz, .com, .info, .name, .net and .org, however, ICANN does not specifically accredit registrars to provide ccTLD registration services.

756 For more information regarding registering names in ccTLDs, including a complete database of designated ccTLDs and managers, please refer to <http://www.iana.org/cctld/cctld.htm>.

757 **CCWG-**

758 The Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM

Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM

Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM

Deleted: 98

Accountability

Accountability (CCWG-Accountability) that was convened to design a proposal that ensures that ICANN's accountability and transparency commitments to the global Internet community are maintained and enhanced in the absence of the historical relationship with the U.S. Government

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:50 PM
Deleted: Accountability
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Consensus

761 Consensus is a form of decision-making employed by various supporting organizations within ICANN. The method to establish whether one has reached consensus differs per supporting organization, for example, the following method is used in the GNSO:

762 Full consensus - when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as Unanimous Consensus.

763 Consensus - a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree.⁸

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:59 PM
Moved (insertion) [10]

Consolidated RIR IANA Stewardship Proposal Team

765 The Consolidated RIR IANA Stewardship Proposal Team (CRISP Team) was established by the Internet Number Community through the Regional Internet Registries to produce a proposal for IANA activities related to the allocation of blocks of Internet Number Resources, the IANA Number Registries, administration of the special-purpose "IN-ADDR.ARPA" and "IP6.ARPA" DNS zones, and other related registry management tasks.

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:59 PM
Deleted: -

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:59 PM
Moved (insertion) [11]

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:49 PM
Deleted: -Stewardship

CWG-Stewardship

767 The Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) main goal is to produce a consolidated transition proposal for the elements of the IANA Functions related to the Domain Name System.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:49 PM
Deleted: -Stewardship

Designator

769 A person who is given the power in the Articles of Incorporation and/or Bylaws to fill one or more seats on the Board of Directors. Generally, a designator also has the right to remove the directors it designated with or without cause. Designated directors cannot be removed by the Board or members without the designator's consent. Designators may also be given the right through the Articles or Bylaws to consent to any changes in those governing documents. California corporate law is unclear

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:59 PM
Deleted: -

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

01 _____
02
03
04

⁸ For those that are unfamiliar with ICANN usage, you may associate the definition of "Consensus" with other definitions and terms of art such as rough consensus or near consensus. It should be noted, however, that in the case of a GNSO PDP originated Working Group, all reports, especially Final Reports, must restrict themselves to the term "Consensus" as this may have legal implications.

whether a designator must be a legal person (an individual or entity that is recognized under law such as a corporation or an unincorporated association); however, unless a designator is a legal person, it will not be able to enforce any rights in court.

770 **DNS – Domain Name System** 771 The Domain Name System (DNS) helps users to find their way around the Internet. Every computer on the Internet has a unique address – just like a telephone number – which is a rather complicated string of numbers. It is called its "IP address" (IP stands for "Internet Protocol"). IP Addresses are hard to remember. The DNS makes using the Internet easier by allowing a familiar string of letters (the "domain name") to be used instead of the arcane IP address. So instead of typing 207.151.159.3, you can type www.internic.net. It is a "mnemonic" device that makes addresses easier to remember.

772 **Five-Year Operating Plan** 774 Five Year Operating Plan is a means of planning and executing portfolios of ICANN work in alignment to the strategic objectives and goals articulated in the Strategic Plan. This plan serves as a link between strategy and the one year operating plan and budget, setting out planned outcomes (key success factors), means of measuring progress (key performance indicators), operational risks, dependencies and resources needed to accomplish goals.

775 **Fundamental Bylaw** 776 The concept of fundamental bylaw is used to represent a bylaw provision which the community wishes to protect from change by requiring a higher standard of community approval and ICANN Board voting threshold before it can be changed or removed.

777 **GAC – Governmental Advisory Committee** 778 The GAC is an advisory committee comprising appointed representatives of national governments, multi-national governmental organizations and treaty organizations, and distinct economies. Its function is to advise the ICANN Board on matters of concern to governments. The GAC will operate as a forum for the discussion of government interests and concerns, including consumer interests. As an advisory committee, the GAC has no legal authority to act for ICANN, but will report its findings and recommendations to the ICANN Board. The Chairman of the GAC is Thomas Schneider of Switzerland.

779 **GNSO – Generic Names Supporting Organization** 780 The GNSO is the successor to the responsibilities of the Domain Name Supporting Organization (DNSO; see below) that relate to the generic top-level domains.
781 The GNSO is the body of six constituencies, as follows: the Commercial and Business constituency, the gTLD Registry constituency, the ISP constituency, the non-commercial constituency, the registrar's constituency, and the IP constituency.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:00 PM
Moved (insertion) [12]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:00 PM
Moved (insertion) [13]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:00 PM
Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:00 PM
Moved (insertion) [14]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

782 **gTLD —
Generic Top
Level Domain**

783 Most TLDs with three or more characters are referred to as "generic" TLDs, or "gTLDs". They can be subdivided into two types, "sponsored" TLDs (sTLDs) and "unsponsored TLDs (uTLDs), as described in more detail below.

784 In the 1980s, seven gTLDs (.com, .edu, .gov, .int, .mil, .net, and .org) were created. Domain names may be registered in three of these (.com, .net, and .org) without restriction; the other four have limited purposes.

785 Over the next twelve years, various discussions occurred concerning additional gTLDs, leading to the selection in November 2000 of seven new TLDs for introduction. These were introduced in 2001 and 2002. Four of the new TLDs (.biz, .info, .name, and .pro) are unsponsored. The other three new TLDs (.aero, .coop, and .museum) are sponsored.

786 Generally speaking, an unsponsored TLD operates under policies established by the global Internet community directly through the ICANN process, while a sponsored TLD is a specialized TLD that has a sponsor representing the narrower community that is most affected by the TLD. The sponsor thus carries out delegated policy- formulation responsibilities over many matters concerning the TLD.

787 A Sponsor is an organization to which is delegated some defined ongoing policy-formulation authority regarding the manner in which a particular sponsored TLD is operated. The sponsored TLD has a Charter, which defines the purpose for which the sponsored TLD has been created and will be operated. The Sponsor is responsible for developing policies on the delegated topics so that the TLD is operated for the benefit of a defined group of stakeholders, known as the Sponsored TLD Community, that are most directly interested in the operation of the TLD. The Sponsor also is responsible for selecting the registry operator and to varying degrees for establishing the roles played by registrars and their relationship with the registry operator. The Sponsor must exercise its delegated authority according to fairness standards and in a manner that is representative of the Sponsored TLD Community.

788 **IANA —
Internet
Assigned
Numbers
Authority**

789 ICANN has performed the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Functions on behalf of the global Internet community since 1998. The IANA functions have historically included: the maintenance of the registry of technical Internet protocol parameters; the administration of certain responsibilities associated with Internet DNS root zone and the allocation of Internet numbering resources.

790 **JANA**

791 The IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG) was formed

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:01 PM
Moved (insertion) [15]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:01 PM
Moved (insertion) [16]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:01 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:01 PM
Deleted: -

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:01 PM
Moved (insertion) [17]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:01 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:01 PM
Moved (insertion) [18]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM
Moved (insertion) [19]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG)

to coordinate the development of a proposal among the communities affected by the IANA functions. The creation of the ICG was initiated and facilitated by ICANN, and the membership of the ICG has been defined by the Internet communities participating in it. The groups' sole deliverable is a proposal to the NTIA recommending a transition plan of NTIA's stewardship of IANA functions to the Internet community, consistent with the key principles outlined in the NTIA March 14 announcement.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:01 PM
Deleted: -

792 ICG's proposal will combine recommendations developed by the three operational communities affected by the IANA functions: the IANAPLAN WG representing the protocol parameters community, the Consolidated RIR IANA Stewardship Proposal Team (CRISP Team) representing the IP address communities, and CWG-Stewardship for the Naming community.

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
Deleted: CWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:49 PM
Deleted: -Stewardship

793 The ICG is focused on delivering a proposal to transition the stewardship of the IANA functions to the multistakeholder community.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM
Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM
Moved (insertion) [20]

794 **IANAPLAN Working Group**

795 The IETF established the IANAPLAN Working Group (IANAPLAN WG) to produce a proposal for the transition of IANA functions related to the maintaining of the codes and numbers contained in a variety of Internet protocols developed by the IETF.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM
Moved (insertion) [21]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM
Deleted: -

796 **ICANN — The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers**

797 The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is an internationally organized, non-profit corporation that has responsibility for Internet Protocol (IP) address space allocation, protocol identifier assignment, generic (gTLD) and country code (ccTLD) Top-Level Domain name system management, and root server system management functions. Originally, the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) and other entities performed these services under U.S. Government contract. ICANN now performs the IANA function. As a private-public partnership, ICANN is dedicated to preserving the operational stability of the Internet; to promoting competition; to achieving broad representation of global Internet communities; and to developing policy appropriate to its mission through bottom-up, consensus-based processes. The DNS translates the domain name you type into the corresponding IP address, and connects you to your desired website. The DNS also enables email to function properly, so the email you send will reach the intended recipient.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM
Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM
Moved (insertion) [22]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM
Moved (insertion) [23]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM
Deleted: -

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: Thursday

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: April 30

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: ,

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:11 PM
Deleted: 21

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 9:02 PM
Deleted: 2

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:10 PM
Deleted: 98

798 **IETF — Internet Engineering Task Force**

799 The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) is a large open international community of network designers, operators, vendors, and researchers concerned with the evolution of the Internet architecture and the smooth operation of the Internet 2. It is open to any interested individual. The IETF develops Internet Standards and in particular the standards related

to the Internet Protocol Suite (TCP/IP).

800 Independent Review Process Panel 801 Independent Review Process Panel (IRP Panel), is an independent panel of neutrals which shall be charged with comparing contested actions of the Board to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and with declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

802 Internet Protocol (IP) 803 The communications protocol underlying the Internet, IP allows networks of devices to communicate over a variety of physical links. Each device or service on the Internet has at least one IP address that uniquely identifies it from other devices or services on the Internet. An IP address is the numerical address and DNS naming uses user-friendly names to locate the devices and services.

804 Member 805 A person who under the Articles of Incorporation and/or Bylaws of a nonprofit corporation has the right to vote to elect one or more directors. Members have extensive rights and protections under California corporate law, including the collective rights to amend the Bylaws, approve any amendment to the Articles of Incorporation, and approve the disposition of substantially all the corporation's assets or any merger or dissolution; the class right to remove directors they elected; and the individual right to inspect certain corporate records. In addition to the rights members have under law, the law permits the Articles and Bylaws to specify additional corporate governance rights that may or must be exercised by the members. Members may be divided into classes with different voting and other rights. Members must be legal persons, and they have standing to enforce their rights.

806 Multistakeholder Approach 807 The Multistakeholder Approach is an organizational framework or structure for governance and policymaking which aims to bring together all stakeholders to collaborate and participate in the dialogue, decision-making and implementation of solutions to identified problems or goals.

808 The Multistakeholder Model at ICANN, is comprised of a diverse set of stakeholders with an interest in Internet numbering, naming and protocols from around the world who have organized into various Supporting Organizations, Constituencies and Advisory Committees, and agree to operate in an open, bottom-up, consensus-driven, and transparent manner.

809 NETmundial Principles 810 The NETmundial meeting, which took place in Sao Paolo, Brazil on 23-24 April 2014, was the first multistakeholder-designed event to focus on the future of Internet governance. NETmundial identified a set of common principles and important values that contribute to an inclusive, multistakeholder, effective, legitimate, and evolving Internet governance

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM

Deleted: -

León Felipe Sánche..., 4/30/2015 5:02 PM

Comment [24]: 24Same comment

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM

Moved (insertion) [24]

León Felipe Sánche..., 4/30/2015 5:02 PM

Comment [23]: 23I would say that if we speak about a process then its not a panel as a panel is a body as opposed to a mechanism. I would change it to read Independent Review Panel only.

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:02 PM

Deleted: -

León Felipe Sánche..., 4/30/2015 5:02 PM

Comment [25]: 25The IRP will not only review if the Board and Staff have complied to the Bylaws but it also will review the substance of the issue. This is key to our proposal as the current IRP(rocess) takes care of procedu... [20]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Moved (insertion) [25]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Moved (insertion) [26]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Moved (insertion) [27]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Moved (insertion) [28]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Moved (insertion) [29]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Deleted: -

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Moved (insertion) [30]

Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM

Moved (insertion) [31]

Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM

Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Accour... [69]

framework, and recognized that the Internet is a global resource which should be managed in the public interest.

811 Nominating Committee

812 The Nominating Committee (NomCom) is an independent committee tasked with selecting eight members of the Board of Directors, five members of the At-Large Advisory Committee, three members of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), and three members of Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO). (See Bylaws Article VII, Section 1.)

813 NTIA

814 The U.S. Department of Commerce National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) is the Executive Branch agency that is principally responsible for advising the President on telecommunications and information policy issues. NTIA maintains a contract with ICANN for the technical coordination of the Internet's domain name and addressing system.

815 Ombudsman

816 The ICANN Ombudsman investigates and addresses complaints brought by the ICANN community. The Ombudsman is independent, impartial, and neutral, a reviewer of facts and an investigator of complaints about unfairness.

817 PDP – Policy Development Process

818 A set of formal steps, as defined in the ICANN Bylaws, to guide the initiation, internal and external review, timing and approval of policies needed to coordinate the global Internet's system of unique identifiers.

819 Reconsideration Process

820 Reconsideration Process is a mechanism to challenge staff action taken against ICANN policies, or Board actions taken without consideration of material information or based upon false or inaccurate information.

821 Registrar

822 Domain names ending with .aero, .biz, .com, .coop, .info, .museum, .name, .net, .org, and .pro can be registered through many different companies (known as "registrars") that compete with one another. A listing of these companies appears in the Accredited Registrar Directory.

823 The registrar you choose will ask you to provide various contact and technical information that makes up the registration. The registrar will then keep records of the contact information and submit the technical information to a central directory known as the "registry." This registry provides other computers on the Internet the information necessary to send you e-mail or to find your web site. You will also be required to enter a registration contract with the registrar, which sets forth the terms under which your registration is accepted and will be maintained.

824 Registry

825 The "Registry" is the authoritative, master database of all domain names registered in each Top Level Domain. The registry operator keeps the

- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM
Moved (insertion) [32] ... [72]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM
Moved (insertion) [33] ... [73]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Moved (insertion) [34] ... [74]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Moved (insertion) [35] ... [75]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Moved (insertion) [36] ... [76]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Moved (insertion) [37] ... [77]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Moved (insertion) [38] ... [78]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Moved (insertion) [39] ... [79]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Moved (insertion) [40] ... [80]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Moved (insertion) [41] ... [81]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Moved (insertion) [42] ... [82]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:04 PM
Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [43] ... [83]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Accour... [71]

master database and also generates the "zone file" which allows computers to route Internet traffic to and from top-level domains anywhere in the world. Internet users don't interact directly with the registry operator; users can register names in TLDs including .biz, .com, .info, .net, .name, .org by using an ICANN- Accredited Registrar.

826 [Review Mechanisms](#) 827 [A review mechanism is a process to assess how a decision or policy is being put in place. ICANN has a series of review mechanisms mandated in its Bylaws to ensure its accountability and transparency.](#)

828 [RIR – Regional Internet Registry](#) 829 [There are currently five RIRs: AfriNIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC and RIPE NCC. These non-profit organizations are responsible for distributing and managing IP addresses on a regional level to Internet service providers and local registries.](#)

830 [Root Servers](#) 831 [The root servers contain the IP addresses of all the TLD registries – both the global registries such as .com, .org, etc. and the 244 country-specific registries such as .fr \(France\), .cn \(China\), etc. This is critical information. If the information is not 100% correct or if it is ambiguous, it might not be possible to locate a key registry on the Internet. In DNS parlance, the information must be unique and authentic.](#)

832 [Root Server System Advisory Committee](#) 833 [The role of the Root Server System Advisory Committee \("RSSAC"\) is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System.](#)

834 [Root Zone](#) 835 [The root zone is the central directory for the DNS, which is a key component in translating readable host names into numeric IP addresses. For more information see: \[www.iana.org/domains/root/files\]\(http://www.iana.org/domains/root/files\).](#)

836 [SO – Supporting Organizations](#) 837 [The SOs are the three specialized advisory bodies that will advise the ICANN Board of Directors on issues relating to domain names \(GNSO and CCNSO\) and, IP addresses \(ASO\).](#)

838 [SSAC – Security and Stability Advisory Committee](#) 839 [The President's standing committee on the security and stability of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. Their charter includes a focus on risk analysis and auditing. SSAC consists of approximately 20 technical experts from industry and academia as well as operators of Internet root servers, registrars, and TLD registries.](#)

840 [Stakeholders](#) 841 [A stakeholder has been defined as any individual or group affected by the actions of the organization. Stakeholders at ICANN include Country Code top level domain name registries; generic top-level domain registries and registrars; regional internet registries who manage the regional distribution of Internet number resources including IP address and Autonomous System Numbers; the thirteen root name server operators; commercial interests - including those representing large and](#)

Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [44] ... [85]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [45] ... [86]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [46] ... [87]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [47] ... [88]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [48] ... [89]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [49] ... [90]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [50] ... [91]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [51] ... [92]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [52] ... [93]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Moved (insertion) [53] ... [94]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:05 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
Moved (insertion) [54] ... [95]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
Moved (insertion) [55] ... [96]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
Moved (insertion) [56] ... [97]
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
Deleted: -
Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
Moved (insertion) [57] ... [98]
Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Accour... [84]

small businesses, intellectual property interests and providers of internet and other communications services; non-commercial interests – including non-commercial users and not-for-profit organizations; governmental interests – including national governments, multi-national governmental organizations and treaty organizations, and distinct economies; technical experts from industry and academia; and representatives of Internet users worldwide.

842 **Stress Test**

843 Stress Testing is a simulation exercise where a set of plausible, but not necessarily probable, hypothetical scenarios are used to gauge how certain events will affect a system, product, company or industry. The CWG-Stewardship is using stress tests to analysis certain ICANN and DNS ecosystem risks or contingencies can be mitigated by applying the accountability mechanisms available to the CCWG-Accountability.

844 **TLD – Top-level Domain**

845 TLDs are the names at the top of the DNS naming hierarchy. They appear in domain names as the string of letters following the last (rightmost) ".", such as "net" in "www.example.net". The administrator for a TLD controls what second-level names are recognized in that TLD. The administrators of the "root domain" or "root zone" control what TLDs are recognized by the DNS. Commonly used TLDs include .com, .net, .edu, .jp, .de, etc.

846 **Work Streams**

847 Work Stream 1: focused on mechanisms enhancing ICANN accountability that must be in place or committed to within the time frame of the IANA Stewardship Transition.

848 Work Stream 2: focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation may extend beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.

- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 8:13 PM
- Deleted: noncommercial...on- ... [100]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Moved (insertion) [58]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Moved (insertion) [59]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:33 PM
- Deleted: CWG...WG-Stewardst... [101]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Moved (insertion) [60]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Moved (insertion) [61]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Moved (insertion) [62]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Deleted: -
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Moved (insertion) [63]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:06 PM
- Deleted: -
- León Felipe Sánche..., 4/29/2015 7:55 AM
- Comment [26]: 26I would say that if we speak about a process then its n ... [104]
- León Felipe Sánche..., 4/29/2015 7:55 AM
- Comment [27]: 27Same comment
- León Felipe Sánche..., 4/30/2015 3:44 PM
- Comment [28]: 28The IRP will ... [105]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:58 PM
- Deleted: - ... [102]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 4:55 PM
- Moved up [1]: <#>An Advisory ... [103]
- Hillary Jett 4/30/2015 5:03 PM
- Moved up [25]: <#>Internet P... [106]
- Grace Abuhamad 4/30/2015 7:32 PM
- Deleted: CCWG...CWG-Accour... [99]