**SO/AC Accountability**

During the first public comment period on the CCWG draft document, several comments addressed SO/AC accountability and how the proposed mechanisms, so far, centered their impact only on ICANN’s Board of Directors.

As new institutional arrangements increase community powers in ICANN, legitimate concerns arise regarding the accountability of the community (organized as SOs and ACs) in enacting those powers. In other words,“Who watches the watchers?”

In address these concerns, the CCWG established WP3. On the matter of SO/AC accountability, WP3 divided its work into the following steps:

1. Identify the existing accountability mechanisms in place for SO/ACs.

2. Review existing mechanisms in order to assess whether and how they address the concerns expressed by the community during the first public comment period.

3. Build a list of steps to enhance SO/AC accountability that should be taken respectively in WS1 and WS2.

The reviewed documents were:

1.  [ICANN bylaws](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en)

2.  [The Affirmation of Commitments](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/53782997/affirmation-of-commitments-30sep09-en.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1435911624000&api=v2)

3.  [ATRT 1 recommendations](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/53782997/final-recommendations-31dec10-en.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1435911759000&api=v2) and [ATRT 2 recommendations](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/53782997/final-recommendations-31dec13-en.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1435911871000&api=v2)

4, Operational rules and procedures of the various SOs/ACs

A first review of existing ICANN documentation shows that there are almost no provisions that oblige SO/ACs to be held accountable to their constituents or the larger internet community with regard to their actions, decisions or advice.

An inventory of existing accountability mechanisms shows that documents reviewed include the following mechanisms:

**Affirmation of commitments.-**

The AoC includes some key commitments that, while oriented to ICANN as an organization, should also be seen as applicable to the SO/ACs.

The identified mechanisms or criteria by which SO/ACs should conduct their work in relation to the DNS are:

a) AoC paragraph 3.

b) AoC paragraph 9.

**ATRT**

No direct recommendations with regard to SO/AC transparency or accountability have been made by the ATRT.

**Bylaws**

ICANN bylaws state that each SO/AC shall establish its own charter and procedural documents. It is also important to review whether SO/ACs should be added to specific sections in the bylaws as subject to provisions applicable to ICANN as a corporation. For example, it should be reviewed and discussed if Core Values should be applicable not only to the corporation’s actions, but also to SO/AC activities.

**SO/AC Documents**

Further research needs to be done at SO/AC level to verify existing accountability mechanisms put in place for each SO/AC. An initial partial review suggests that statements of SO/AC operational procedures include little explicit account of SO/AC accountability practices.

**Recommendations**

Having reviewed and inventoried the existing mechanisms related to SO/AC accountability, it is clear that current documents do not adequately address the concerns raised by the larger community on this issue. Therefore, WP3 suggests that the CCWG includes the following points in its amended proposal:

1. Commit that future periodic structural reviews of SOs and ACs will include a review of their respective accountability mechanisms as these relate to their respective Constituencies, Stakeholder Groups, RALOs, etc.

2. Affirm a commitment to develop a detailed working plan on enhancing SO/AC accountability as part of WS2, to include consideration of the following proposals:.

(a) to have each SO/AC review its chárter and statement of operating procedures in order to include an explicit account of its internal accountability practices (as relates to transparency, consultation, evaluation and redress)

(b) to include SO/AC accountability in the purview of the ATRT process

(c) to evaluate the proposed “Mutual Accountability Roundtable”.

 (d) to assess whether the IRP would also be applicable to SO/ACs activities.