

The WS2 SO/AC Accountability Progress Report

1. Executive Summary

The CCWG WS2 on Accountability of SO/AC has already held 10 meetings with an average of 15 to 20 participants.

The Group discussed the scope of activities as well as the tasks assigned to it by CCWG WS1 report.

The following course of actions has been taken so far:

- Four area of activities (tracks) were identified as:
 - Track 1: SOs/ACs effectiveness;
 - Track 2: Evaluating the proposed “Mutual Accountability Roundtable” to assess its viability and, if viable, undertake the necessary actions to implement it;
 - Track 3: Developing a detailed working plan on enhancing SO and AC accountability taking into consideration the comments made during the public comment period on the Third Draft Proposal;
 - Track 4: Assessing whether the Independent Review Process (IRP) would also be applicable to SO and AC activities.

Some preliminary discussion took place on Track 1- effectiveness - and the issue was divided into effectiveness of SO/AC Outreach and effectiveness of community representation in SO/AC decisions. With respect to the Track 2, the group also discussed the matter but it has not come to any conclusion yet due to divergence of views among participants.

As for Track 3, in order to enable the group to provide a work plan for it, the group established some questions to the SO/ACs communities to be forwarded through the chairs of SO/ACs. Regarding Track 4, the group has not discussed whether SO/ACs should be subjected to IRP.

2. General description of the SO/AC Accountability

The questions so far addressed by the group are:

- To whom SO/ACs are accountable to? And
- What are they accountable for?

The group discussed various scenarios. The scenario for which there seems to be general agreement is that SO/ACs should normally be accountable to

their stakeholder group (internal and external) as defined by the ICANN Bylaws. The group is examining a process through which SO/ACs will be asked to define their designated community. If their designated community is broader than what indicated in the Bylaws, necessary information on such broader community should be also provided.

The issue of accountability of SO/ACs with respect to each other and with respect to the global Internet users were also discussed but has not yet received strong support to be pursued.

Further discussion may hopefully help receiving support of the participant at the future meetings of the group.

The question of what SO/ACs are accountable for was addressed under Track 1, which includes efforts for outreach, removal of entry barriers, if any, and wider representation at the meetings and in decision-making process. This will be combined with questions addressed to SO/ACs about their existing and extended accountability mechanisms, to contribute to Track 3.

2.1 Current Status of activities

The WS2 SO/AC Accountability members have worked on some questions to be forwarded to the chairs of SO/ACs as a part of action to be taken under Track 3--The group as its next step of work will soon take up necessary actions on track 4 as outlined above.

2.2 Progress Report

See attached a work in process report.

3. Recommendation To be developed

3.1 Requirements for Recommendation

The group does not have any recommendations at this stage.

3.2 Rationale for Recommendation

Not applicable