

## 5A) Community Mechanism as a Sole Member Model

Draft: Version 1 (25 July 2015 @ 0300 UTC)

Author: Jordan Carter

### 5A.3 The ICANN Community Assembly (ICA)

**NOTE:** This section sets out the proposed ICANN Community Assembly (ICA). The section number is coopted from a section currently called "Governance models and community powers" which just links to an appendix.

In developing the **Sole Member Model**, the CCWG-Accountability has been careful to specify that any decisions made by the Member are simply decisions by those SOs and ACs who have votes within it (as set out in section 5A.2 of this report). Those SOs and ACs make their decisions as to how to allocate their votes internally.

Alongside the powers granted to the community through the **Sole Member Model**, the CCWG-Accountability has determined there needs to be a forum where the use of any of the powers is discussed across the whole ICANN community – **before** any of the powers are exercised. Such a forum can also be the structure through which the proposed **Public Accountability Forum** discussed elsewhere in this report can be organized.

The CCWG-Accountability therefore proposes the creation of the **ICANN Community Assembly** or ICA. It would be a grouping formed under the ICANN bylaws consistent with the matters described below.

The ICA would have the following **purposes**:

- To be a discussion forum where the whole community, **utilizing its existing SO and AC structures**, discusses and considers matters before any particular Community Power is exercised.
- To be the basic structure through which **the Public Accountability Forum is organized**.
- (**Any other functions** set out in this report for the ICA need to be listed.)

The ICA would have the following **working methods**:

- The ICA is **advisory and discussion** based – it has **no** decision-making rights other than to select a Chair among its members, and to agree matters related to its own operation as a group.
- In giving effect to its main purpose**, the ICA would be convened with one week's notice after a successful petition is made to exercise **one** of the community powers set out in this report.
- All proceedings of the ICA will be open to any and all members of the ICANN community and the public, whether conducted electronically or face to face.
- The ICA is expected to meet face to face at general ICANN meetings, and would

**Comment [DK1]:** This is covered below in the "participation" section, but I think it's worth being explicit here that we're relying on ICANN's existing community structures, not creating something brand new from scratch. Keith

**Comment [AG2]:** I find it EXCEEDINGLY confusing to be using the terms "Public Accountability Forum" plus "ICANN Community Assembly". If we need both (and I don't really see why), the PAF should not have upper case letters as a defined term.

**Comment [JTC3]:** Good point. My **intent** was to propose the ICANN Community Assembly as the body that organized a meeting that did what was suggested for the "Public Accountability Forum" but the language doesn't work.

Question is – are we happy folding the latter into the ICA?

Seems like common sense to not create an alternative structure.

**Comment [AG4R3]:** "Question is – are we happy folding the latter into the ICA?" Yes

**Comment [AG5]:** Since some petitions require the cooperation of more than a single SO/AC, wouldn't the ICA be the logical place to raise the issue and solicit that support. If not, we are saying that we must use private communications for that phase, directly the opposite of the intent of the next clause.

**Comment [JTC6]:** It would be the logical place. Do we need to spell that out as a working method? If so, easy to add another bullet above this one: "The ICA would maintain a mailing list where SOs and ACs could communicate on matters relevant to the ICA's purpose, including for example seeking support for a petition to exercise a community power." Or similar.

**Comment [AG7R6]:** Optional

otherwise work electronically unless four of the seven participating SOs and ACs called for an out-of-cycle face to face meeting<sup>1</sup>.

The ICA would have the following participation:

- a) Each ICANN SO or AC would be asked to nominate between one and seven people to participate in the ICA – this is to ensure that there is at least some presence from each part of the community in the ICA, and some likelihood that its activities and discussions will include a wide range of perspectives.
- b) The ICANN Board would be asked to nominate between one and three members to participate in the ICA.
- c) The ICANN President and CEO would be invited to participate in meetings of the ICA, along with up to two ICANN staff members selected by the President and CEO. ~~chosen through some open method involving ICANN staff.~~
- d) Any ICANN participant or member of the public will be able to subscribe to the email list, or attend virtual sessions of the ICA.
- e) ~~If and when new community structures (SOs or ACs) are established and reflected in the ICANN bylaws, they would be incorporated into the ICA.~~

The CCWG-Accountability believes that the establishment of this body will help ensure that the use of the accountability powers set out in this report are done in a way that is of benefit to the whole ICANN community, and will help support and sustain cross-community dialogue and discussion not only on accountability matters, but more broadly.

**Comment [AG8]:** This is using the term “participation” in exactly the opposite meaning to that used in the CWG/CCWG.

**Comment [JTC9]:** How about “composition”?

**Comment [AG10R9]:** ok

**Comment [AG11]:** Are these people selected when there is a petition, or annually. I suggest the latter, since there will not likely be time for the former.

**Comment [AG12]:** Do they need to designate which of the seven are the five who could travel?

**Comment [JTC13]:** Selected annually or at the relevant SO/AC’s discretion? And yes the SO/AC would have to choose who could travel.

**Comment [AG14]:** See previous comment – “people” in the previous section, “members” but not “Members” here.

**Comment [JTC15]:** I meant “between one and three of its members” or “between one and three Board members” – referring to Board members, not referring to people in the ICA as Members of the ICA.

**Comment [JTC16]:** CEO selection fine with me – how did participation by staff liaison Sam Eisner happen in CCWG?

**Comment [DK17]:** I’d expect the CEO to be able to select the ICANN staff he/she wants to include in the proceedings. I don’t think we need to impose an “open method” of selection. The staff reports to the CEO, so it’s reasonable to expect he/she would simply appoint them. No need for complexity here, IMO. Keith

**Comment [DK18]:** We should be explicit that this proposed model is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the evolution of the ICANN community and its structures. Keith

<sup>1</sup> In such event, ICANN would pay for travel and attendance of up to five representatives of each SO and AC on the same basis as it has supported participation in the CCWG-Accountability.