#43

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 14, 2015 8:22:17 PM
Last Modified: Monday, December 14, 2015 8:30:30 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:13

PAGE 2: Personal Information

Q1: **Name**	Mike Chartier
Q2: **Affiliation**	Intel Corporation
Q3: **Responding on behalf of**	Intel Corporation

PAGE 3: Recommendation 1

Q4: **Is establishing an Empowered Community for enforcing Community Powers a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please see Annex 1 - Recommendation #1: Establishing An Empowered Community For Enforcing Community Powers for more information)**	Yes, I support this recommendation., Comment Intel supports the CCWG 3rd draft report including the new means chosen for empowering the community. While we endorsed the Community Mechanism as Sole Member Model proposed in the 2nd draft, Intel recognizes and respects that the Community reached consensus on a Sole Designator model. We applaud CCWG for respecting due process and conducting an additional public comment on the new draft because of the substantial change, and believe it will result in a consensus proposal with broad community support. Intel would also emphasize the need for the Work Stream 1 and related transition activities process to be concluded (including implementing required bylaw changes, and executing SLAs) in a timely manner in order to reduce uncertainty and provide stability for the communities, for instance Numbers and Protocols.

PAGE 4: Recommendation 2

Q5: **Is empowering the community through consensus: engage, escalate, enforce a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please see Annex 02 - Recommendation #2: Empowering The Community Through Consensus: Engage, Escalate, Enforce for more information)**	*Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 5: Recommendation 3

Q6: Is redefining ICANN's Bylaws as 'Standard Bylaws' and 'Fundamental Bylaws' a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please see Annex 03 - Recommendation #3: Redefining ICANN's Bylaws As 'Standard Bylaws' And 'Fundamental Bylaws' for more information)	*Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 6: Recommendation 4

Q7: **Is ensuring community involvement in ICANN decision-making: seven new Community Powers a solution that is acceptable to you? (Please refer to Annex 04: Details on Recommendation 4: Ensuring Community Involvement In ICANN Decision-Making: Seven New Community Powers for more information)**	Yes, I support this recommendation.

PAGE 7: Recommendation 5

Q8: Is changing aspects of ICANN's Mission, Commitments and Core Values a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please refer to Annex 05 - Details on Recommendation #5: Changing Aspects Of ICANN's Mission, Commitments And Core Values for more information)	*Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 8: Recommendation 6

Q9: Is reaffirming ICANN's commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights as it carries out its Mission a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please refer to Annex 06 - Recommendation #6: Reaffirming ICANN's Commitment to Respect Internationally Recognized Human Rights as it Carries Out Its Mission for more information)	*Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 9: Recommendation 7

Q10: Is strengthening ICANN's Independent Review Process a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please refer to Annex 07: Recommendation 7: Strengthening ICANN's Independent Review Process for more information)	*Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 10: Recommendation 8

Q11: Is fortifying ICANN's request for reconsideration process a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please refer to Annex 08 - Recommendation #8: Improving ICANN's Request For Reconsideration Process for more information)	*Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 11: Recommendation 9

Q12: Is incorporation of the Affirmation of Commitments a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please refer to Annex 09 - Recommendation #9: Incorporation of the Affirmation of Commitments for more information)	*Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 12: Recommendation 10

Q13: Is enhancing the accountability of Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please refer to Annex 10 - Recommendation #10: Enhancing the Accountability of Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees for more information)	*Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 13: Recommendation 11

Q14: Is Board obligations regarding GAC Advice (Stress Test 18) a solution that is acceptable to you?(Please refer to Annex 11 - Recommendation #11: Board obligations regarding GAC Advice)

Comment
Intel would like to comment specifically on Recommendation #11, Board Obligations with regards to Governmental Advisory Committee Advice (Stress Test 18). 1. Intel continues to strongly support the requirement that GAC advice provided to the Board for consideration be based on the current understanding of consensus. 2. We can support the additional requirement that consensus advice only be rejected by a vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, however we recommend adding the words “and accompanied by rationale” to the bylaw, as shown below: 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. Any Governmental Advisory Committee advice approved by a full Governmental Advisory Committee consensus, understood to mean the practice of adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of any formal objection, and accompanied by rationale, may only be rejected by a vote of two-thirds of the Board, and 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. While the current proposal includes the requirement that ACs “make every effort to ensure that the advice provided is clear and supported by a rationale”, this still leaves it optional. And we believe making consensus and rationale mandatory, especially for the GAC, provides a reasonable balance to the 2/3rds majority requirement for the board. 3. Intel does not support the inclusion of the second paragraph regarding the GAC being able to specify how objections are raised. We believe the paragraph would be counterproductive; rather adding clarification, the language may lead to different interpretations. So we believe the proposal should only include the Bylaw text, without the inclusion of the second paragraph.

PAGE 14: Recommendation 12

Q15: Is committing to further accountability work in Work Stream 2 a solution that is acceptable to you? (Please refer to Annex 12 - Recommendation #12: Committing to further accountability work in Work Stream 2)

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 15: Additional Information

Q16: Please submit comments you have in addition to the information provided above, including on NTIA criteria, CWG-Stewardship requirements and Stress Tests.	*Respondent skipped this question*