ICANN | ISPCP
Internet Service Providers & Connectivity Providers

ISPCP Comments on Recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability

The Internet Services Provider and Connectivity Provider Constituency (ISPCP) respectfully submit the following comments.

We acknowledge the thorough evaluation of the CCWG-Accountability of the three defined tracks of work.

With respect to Track 1 "Review and develop recommendations to improve SO and AC processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture" we have reservations only to "Rec. 4 under Transparency":

> Meetings and calls of SO/ACs and Groups should normally be open to public observation. When a meeting is determined to be members-only, that should be explained publicly, giving specific reasons for holding a closed meeting.

We are in full agreement to this recommendation on SO/AC level. On SG/C level we recommend this being applied just in case of F2F meetings. SG/C calls should usually deemed as members-only since at almost every call sensitive commercial or private information is been shared. Each call could be determined by the chair in advance as being open.

Regarding Track 2 "Mutual Accountability Roundtable" we agree in principle to the WG recommendation to leave the decision of holding such a roundtable at the AGM to the SO/AC chairs. In addition, we suggest to investigate this question in more detail when it once comes to a more holistic review of the organisation.

With respect to Track 3 "Assess whether the Independent Review Process (IRP) should be applied to SO/AC activities" we fully support the CCWG recommendation that "the IRP should not be made applicable to SO/AC activities, because it is complex and expensive, and there are easier alternative ways to challenge an AC or SO action or inaction".

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben

ISPCP Chair