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Comments by Region

North America: 29 comments
Europe: 21 comments
Asia Pacific & Oceania: 13 comments
Latin America & Caribbean: 5 comments
Global: 13 comments (Includes ICANN SO/AC, Constituencies, etc.)
## Stakeholder Distribution of Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Category</th>
<th>Comments Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccTLDs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors to the CCWG-Accountability</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chartering Organizations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC, ALAC (and AFRALO), NRO (for ASO), and parts of GNSO (RySG, NCSG, ISPCP, BC, IPC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWG-Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Community:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTR, ICANN Board, IAB Board, NRO, JPNIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jan Scholte, Willie Currie, Nell Minnow, Lee Andrew Bygrave
Our overall assessment at this stage is that there is significant support and appreciation for the CCWG’s work and its goals.

There was broad support for:
- Request for Reconsideration
- Fundamental Bylaws
- Power to approve and reject Standard Bylaws
- Power to remove individual Board Directors
- Diversity
- Items identified as part of WS2

Further details or clarifications required on:
- Independent Review Process
- Sole Member Model
- Power to veto the Budget, Operating and Strategic Plans
- Power to recall the entire Board
- Human Rights
On Independent Review Process

Support for IRP enhancements

Need for further detail on process elements such as scope, timing, and standard of review
On Sole Member Model

- Support and appreciation for the community enforceability
- Comments reinforced preference for simplicity
- Lack of consensus on the voting allocations, and composition of the community within the Model (e.g. role of Advisory Committees)
- Comments expressed concern over the possible duality of the governmental role in the Model
- Further detail needed of the process surrounding the Community Forum
- Indications from commenters that full support and, in some cases determining a position, would not be achievable until further detail and clarification were provided.
On Human Rights Language

- Support for inclusion of language on Human Rights
- Lack of consensus on what version and source of the language to include
- Questions on whether to include in WS1 or WS2
On Stress Tests

An essential part of the CCWG-Accountability Charter requires stress testing of the recommended accountability enhancements. The purpose of these stress tests is to determine the stability of ICANN in the event of consequences and/or vulnerabilities, and to assess the adequacy of existing and proposed accountability mechanisms available to the ICANN community.

- Of the Stress Tests, ST18 received the most comments.
Q: Do you agree that the CCWG-Accountability proposal enhances ICANN's accountability?

Conclusion:
Of the responses, there was agreement that the CCWG-Accountability Proposal enhances ICANN's accountability.
Q: Are there elements of this proposal that would prevent you from approving it transmission to Chartering Organizations?

Conclusion:
Of the responses, it seems that the CCWG-Accountability proposal could be forwarded to the Chartering Organizations should some outstanding issues and details be addressed.
Q: Does this proposal meet the requirements set forward by the CWG-Stewardship?

Conclusion:
Of the responses, including that of the CWG-Stewardship, there was consensus that the CCWG-Accountability report meets the CWG-Stewardship requirements.