

[comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15]

[<<< Chronological Index >>>](#) [<<< Thread Index >>>](#)

Comments

- *To:* comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15@xxxxxxxxxx
- *Subject:* Comments
- *From:* "Sue Randel" <suerandel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date:* Wed, 3 Jun 2015 23:44:49 +0200

```
<html><head></head><body><div style="font-family: Verdana;font-size:
12.0px;"><div>
<style type="text/css"><!--P { margin-bottom: 0.08in; }
--></style>
<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"><font face="Liberation Serif, serif">I applaud
the work of the ccwg-accountability team and appreciate the opportunity to
comment.</font></p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">&nbsp;</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"><font face="Liberation Serif, serif">Your
proposal to replace the current US government backstop on IANA function
oversight by empowering ICANN's current membership structure is both simple
and efficient.</font></p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">&nbsp;</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"><font face="Liberation Serif, serif">The past few
years of mismanagement inside ICANN have demonstrated a necessity to place such
overriding powers outside of the management and board.</font></p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">&nbsp;</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"><font face="Liberation Serif, serif">Your
framework offers a mechanism to not only fix the problems of inexperienced or
mismatched (with mission/core values) management but to also shine a brighter
light on internal operations to improve much needed transparency.</font></p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">&nbsp;</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"><font face="Liberation Serif, serif">From the
inside looking out, ICANN's failures all seemed to be due to the general
lack of experience with the community and Internet governance diplomacy from
those at the helm.</font></p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">&nbsp;</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"><font face="Liberation Serif, serif">This has led
to multiple breaches and errors in judgment and short sighted decisions that
have caused the exodus of key talent from IANA operations and a &quot;circle
the wagons&quot;, &quot;hire only [inexperienced] friends&quot;,stop work,
&quot;hide everything&quot;; disease in the organization - instead of
transparent and responsible operations.</font></p>
```

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">Current articles on ICANN's strong push to get the IFO assigned to it forever should give us all pause. This odd behavior is in line with what I had observed inside.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">With the ability to recall the board or dismiss individual board members as well as directly effect board/management/staff decisions on strategic plans and budget, the community will finally have an effective recourse to such self-serving behavior.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">Furthermore, enshrining a mechanism for the community to veto or approve ICANN's bylaws, mission, commitments and core values is an excellent way to ensure ICANN only attracts the right talent in the board and executive levels.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">Your detailed work on the bylaws is most welcome as they have long needed updating to align with what ICANN actually does and be strengthened to limit mission creep...and to ensure ICANN's decisions are for public benefit - not just a particular set of stakeholders or ICANN itself.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">I believe your proposals made in the Report will solve the numerous problems extending up and down the current and future management chains, ensuring accountability, and going a long way to making the multstakeholder experiment succeed and become a model for others.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">Now for the Questions.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">1a yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">1b yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">2 I believe the thresholds proposed are sufficient at this time.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">3a yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">3b yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">4a yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">4b yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">5a
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">5b
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">6
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">7
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">8
YES</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">9
none</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">10 para 191
is reasonable as a start. We should have the ability to change later.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">11a
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">11b
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">12a
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">12b
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">13a
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">13b
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">14a
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">14b
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">15a
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">15b
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">16a
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">16b
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">17a
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">17b
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">18a

yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">18b
yes</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">19
none</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"><font face="Liberation Serif,
serif">paragraphs:</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">406 Although
it may be out of scope, a 6th stress test category might be capture of root
zone by ITU or other body. As there is no legal or technical barrier to such an
event - only reputation and political (e.g. arising from para 499). Thus far
the US government has provided political cover from this. I see para 596
attempts to address but may be insufficient.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">452-454 PTI
should be forced to publish any audit results in full (e.g.SOC2) and have
separate legal advisors from ICANN. e.g., para 549.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">581, 657 -
and reputation loss that could lead to capture.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">585
YES!</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">613 From
past community discussions, if community driven, an "ICANN
foundation" may be a desirable outcome.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">663
YES!</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">707,708
YES!</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"> </p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in"><font face="Liberation Serif,
serif">Regards,</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">Sue
Randel</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">Former
contracting staff in fear of retaliation.</p>

<p style="margin-bottom: 0in">(A whistle blower protection element in the Bylaws would force much greater transparency into the organization as well.)</p>

<div> </div>

<div> </div>

</div></div></body></html>

[<<< Chronological Index >>>](#) [<<< Thread Index >>>](#)
