

Affirmation of Commitments
Accountability and Transparency Review Team
Questions for the ICANN Community

In the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC), ICANN commits 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.

The AoC Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT) is in the process of analyzing stakeholder and community input that has been submitted on these topics prior to the AoC (i.e., comments on Improving Institutional Confidence, submissions to the NTIA NOI on expiration of the JPA, etc.). However, the ATRT would also like to understand if there are new inputs or changes in stakeholder views since the establishment of the AoC. With that context in mind, please provide responses to the following questions:

1. Do you think ICANN is accountable to all stakeholders? Can you identify a specific example(s) when ICANN did not act in an accountable manner? If so, please provide specific information as to the circumstances and indicate why you believe ICANN's actions were not taken in an accountable manner.
2. Do ICANN's accountability mechanisms, including the Ombudsman, the Board reconsideration procedure and the Independent Review Panel provide meaningful accountability and, if not, how could they be improved?
3. Do you think ICANN's processes and decision making is transparent? Can you identify a specific example(s) when ICANN did not act in a transparent manner. If so, please provide specific information as to the circumstances and indicate why you believe ICANN's actions were not taken in a transparent manner. Are ICANN's transparency mechanisms robust and how could they be improved?
4. What is your general assessment of ICANN's commitment to the interests of global Internet users? Can you provide a specific example(s) when ICANN did not act in the interests of global Internet users? If so, please provide specific information as to the circumstances and indicate why you believe ICANN's actions were not taken in a manner consistent with the interests of global Internet users.
5. What is your assessment of the ICANN Board of Directors' governance with respect to the following factors:
 - ongoing evaluation of Board performance,
 - the Board selection process,
 - the extent to which Board composition meets ICANN's present and future needs , and
 - whether an appeal mechanism for Board decisions is needed?

6. What is your assessment of the role of the GAC and its interaction with the Board? How do you view the role of the GAC within the overall ICANN process?
 - What is your assessment of the interaction between the GAC and the Board?
 - Should the GAC be viewed as the body best placed to advise the Board on what constitutes the "public interest" regarding the coordination of the DNS?
7. Are additional steps needed to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS? If so, what specific steps would you recommend?
8. What is your assessment of the processes by which ICANN receives public input? What is your assessment on how ICANN receives input of English-speaking and non-English speaking communities? Can you identify a specific example(s) when ICANN did not adequately receive public input from English or non-English speakers? If so, please provide specific information as to the circumstances and indicate why you believe ICANN's actions were taken without adequate public input.
9. 8. Does ICANN provide adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof? Can you identify a specific example(s) when ICANN did not provide adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof? If so, please provide specific information as to the circumstances and indicate why you believe ICANN's actions were taken without adequate explanation of decisions taken and the accompanying rationale.
10. What is your assessment of the extent to which ICANN's decisions are embraced, supported and accepted by the public and the Internet community? Can you identify a specific example(s) when ICANN decisions were not embraced, supported and accepted by the public and the Internet community? If so, please provide specific information as to the circumstances and indicate why you believe ICANN's actions were taken without adequate support and acceptance by the public and the Internet community.
11. What is your assessment of the policy development process in ICANN with regard to:
 - facilitating enhanced cross-community deliberations, and
 - effective and timely policy development

Can you identify a specific example(s) when the policy making process in ICANN did not facilitate cross-community deliberations or result in effective and timely policy development? If so, please provide specific information as to the circumstances and indicate why you believe the policy making process in ICANN did not facilitate cross-community deliberations or result in effective and timely policy development.