Here is what we proposed in CCWG first draft report:

The CCWG-Accountability proposes a response to Stress Test 18 to amend ICANN Bylaws such that only consensus advice would trigger the obligation to try to find a mutually acceptable solution. The proposal is to amend ICANN Bylaws, Article XI Section 2 clause j as seen below. (Addition here **bold, italic and underlined**) Clause k is also shown for completeness but is not being amended.

> j: *The advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies. In the event that the ICANN Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with the Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall so inform the Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice.* **With respect to Governmental Advisory Committee advice that is supported by consensus**, *the Governmental Advisory Committee and the ICANN Board will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution.*
>
> k: *If no such solution can be found, the ICANN Board will state in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory Committee advice was not followed, and such statement will be without prejudice to the rights or obligations of Governmental Advisory Committee members with regard to public policy issues falling within their responsibilities*.

The CCWG-Accountability proposes a response to Stress Test 18 to amend ICANN Bylaws such that only consensus advice would trigger the obligation to try to find a mutually acceptable solution. The proposal is to amend ICANN Bylaws, Article XI Section 2 clause j as seen below. (Addition here **bold, italic and underlined**) Clause k is also shown for completeness but is not being amended.

> j: *The advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies. In the event that the ICANN Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with the Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall so inform the Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice.* ***With respect to Governmental Advisory Committee advice that is supported by GAC's defined level of consensus****, the Governmental Advisory Committee and the ICANN Board will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution.*
>
> k: *If no such solution can be found, the ICANN Board will state in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory Committee advice was not followed, and such statement will be without prejudice to the rights or obligations of Governmental Advisory Committee members with regard to public policy issues falling within their responsibilities*.

Bylaws Core Value 11, as proposed in 3-May first draft, page 27:

. While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities in accordance with the Bylaws and to the extent consistent with these Fundamental Commitments and Core Values.

As proposed for CCWG 2nd draft:

While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy [within their jurisdiction] and duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities that are consistent with these Bylaws.

Proposed Core Value 5, from the AoC review of new gTLDs:

> Ensuring that any expansion of the top-level domain space will adequately address issues of competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection.