

Answers to ICANN Accountability and Transparency Review Team

Q1:

Answer:

From its track record, we don't think ICANN was not fully accountable to all stakeholders. For instance, ICANN has not promptly responded the demands of IDNs from internet users with different cultures and languages worldwide. Furthermore, it is not convenience for non-English users to comprehend the information and documents on ICANN websites, which are originally presented in English. As a result of this inconvenience, any response to ICANN are hence delayed and lost in translation.

Therefore, to begin with, in order to increasing the accountability to all stakeholders, ICANN should improve the transparency and increase the participation of stakeholders. For example, ICANN could append multi-language versions of its website, a multilingual DAG4 and annual report of ICANN, which could greatly encourage the non-English speakers to participate in related activities.

Q2:

Answer:

It is with certain accountability, but not enough. The Community participants of ICANN have no clue of what the ombudsman have done, and would not believe the ombudsman could achieve the whole accountable works only by himself.

Regarding to the Board review, it is kind of less cost-effective; it is not possible that the Board will have to review everything. Independent review group is not a Permanent establishment which could not implement full accountability review.

In this regard, it is advised that ICANN set up a permanent establishment, which should be independent in ICANN and in collaboration with all present accountability mechanisms, to inspect the major works from all levels and to establish a comprehensive accountability framework.

Q3:

Answer:

It is not fully transparent. For instance, NomCom is a completely opaque group. According to the recommendations of question 2, an independent review group to review the process will greatly guarantee the transparency in ICANN.

Q4:

Answer:

There are two aspects to protect user benefits. One is to ensure the stability of the Internet. The other one is to respond to the demands of Internet users. We think that ICANN has still a large room to improve with regard to the second aspect.

For instance, Chinese Internet users keep on growing, who are paying more attention to the affairs of ICANN. However, most documents published by ICANN is in English now. It has led to a language barrier to participate in the affairs of ICANN for Chinese Internet users. As a vicious circle, it has inhibited the active participation of the Chinese users. Especially on the new gTLD project, this project has profound impact on both Chinese business users and Chinese individual users. However, almost all large Chinese enterprises have no knowledge on new gTLD project due to lack of promotion and information access by ICANN. It is unfair for them; it also poses a negative impact for ICANN and its mission to serve global Internet community.

Q5:

Answer:

It is not in-depth. Improvement program effects less.

Selection process is not transparent.

It is not yet diversified in terms of the composition of the Board members, which could not fully reflect the interests of Internet users worldwide.

It is not necessary. The Board, just like the football referee, albeit impossible to ensure right judgments for each affair, should be entitled the power to make decisions. In the meantime, a review mechanism on its accountability and transparency will largely ensure that ICANN Board will wield the power carefully.

Q6:

Answer:

The effectiveness of the Interactions is not obvious. The suggestions of GAC have not been paid enough attention.

With regard to the input on public interests, GAC should be the most appropriate entity to input on behalf of public interests.

Q7:

Answer:

It is indeed necessary. For instance, ICANN must reply the suggestions from GAC. Even though ICANN will not adopt it, it is still necessary for ICANN to reply the reason to GAC.

Q8:

Answer:

Not good enough. As mentioned before, there are not enough supports for the comment from the non-English speaking community. For more detail, please refer to answer to Q 1.

Q9:

Answer:

No. please refers to the answer to question 1 for more detail.

Q10

Answer:

Not all decisions have been supported or accepted by ICANN community, such as .com or .org agreement was not fully discussed by ICANN community.

Q11

Answer:

It is acceptable.

It is not prompt enough. But it's understandable that due to the Bottom-up PDP process, It is hard to make a policy in a swift manner.

Taking new gTLD process as an example, the interaction across the community is doing fairly good. Thanks to the participation and discussion, new gTLD process adopted inputs from all stakeholders. However, ICANN failed to take prompt action in the PDP, new gTLD process is so slow that even the EOI proposed by the community is still not included in the DAGs.