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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | Name of Mechanism | **Existing SO/AC Processes (SOAC)** |
| Description | Each Power available to the Community as a result of the CCWG’s work would be exercised by each SO or AC allocating its “votes” as set out below. These would be determined by each SO or AC individually. |
| Category (check & balance, review, redress) | **Not Applicable (N/A)**  The categories apply to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| Is the mechanism triggered or non triggered ? | **N/A**  This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| Possible outcomes (approval, re-do, amendment of decision, etc.) | **N/A**  This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| **Standing** | Conditions of standing (ie « last resort », type of decision being challenged, …) | **N/A**  This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| Who has standing (directly or indirectly affected party, thresholds…) | **N/A**  This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| **Standard of review** | Which standards is the decision examined against (process, principles, other standards…) | **N/A**  This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| Which purpose(s) of accountability does the mechanism contribute to ? | **N/A**  This applies to the powers exercised by the community, not the mechanism itself. |
| **Composition** | Required skillset | Not applicable. |
| Diversity requirements (geography, stakeholder interests, gender, other…) | Not applicable. |
| Number of persons (approximate or interval) | SOs and ACs would have notional “votes” available under this mechanism, available as follows:   * Five votes for each of the following community bodies:   + ccNSO   + GNSO   + ASO   + ALAC   + GAC * Two votes for each of the following bodies:   + SSAC   + RSSAC |
| Independence requirements | Not applicable. |
| Election / appointment by whom ? | Not applicable. |
| Recall or other accountability mechanism | None: this would simply have the same accountability as SOs and ACs generally have. |
| **Decision making** | Is the decision mandated or based on personal assessment | **Mandated** by definition, since it is a casting of votes by the SO or AC as an organisation, no individuals being appointed. |
| Decision made by consensus or vote ? | **N/A**  This would be specified for each of the powers exercised by the community, not as part of this mechanism itself. |
| Majority threshold (if applicable) | **N/A**  This would be specified for each of the powers exercised by the community, not as part of this mechanism itself. |
| **Accessibility** | Cost requirements | The cost of whatever secretariat services required to collate votes. |
| Timeframe requirements | To be implemented before IANA stewardship transition (i.e. WS1). |
| Language requirements | As general in ICANN – translated into the usual languages. |
| **Implementation** | Potential means to implement | To implement this approach, the relevant powers would need to be set out in the bylaws along with voting thresholds etc.  A separate section of the bylaws would need to describe the generic process and assign notional “voting weights” as proposed here or as amended, to each SO/AC. |