**#48**

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 15, 2015 9:25:11 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 15, 2015 11:34:49 AM
Time Spent: 02:09:37

PAGE 2: Personal Information

Q1:	**Name**	Seun Ojedeji
Q2:	**Affiliation**	ALAC
Q3:	**Responding on behalf of**	Open Source Software Foundation for Nigeria

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.

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)

Yes, I support this recommendation.,

Comment
I do support most of the powers but I do not support veto/reject on IANA budget, I also have some concern on ICANN budget veto as well. I believe such acts could cripple the organization and make it less proactive to issues requiring urgent attention.

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)

Yes, I support this recommendation.

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.,

Comment
My comment on recommendation 2 applies. In addition, I have the following comments on board removal: 1. I suggest the threshold to remove nomcom appointed members be set to 4/5 (if 5 are participating) as opposed to the proposed 3/5 since those board members are "somewhat" appointed by the entire community. 2. I again do not support the ability for appointing SO/AC to solely remove their board members. 3. I suggest that the threshold to spill the entire board be absolute! i.e 5/5 OR 4/4 (if 4 SO/AC are participating). Spilling the entire board is a Plutonic act which has strong possibilities of breaking the organization. Every part of the community has to take that responsibility of whatever consequences that occur.

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)**

Yes, I support this recommendation.,

Comment
I support the need to ensure clarity in ICANN mission as much as possible, I strongly support and suggests that board's comments on the mission statement sent to the CCWG Nov 19 should be given adequate consideration as i believe they are quite clear and reasonable, especially if the goal is to ensure clarity and efficiency. URL to the comment: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2015-November/008166.html I support the recommendations on commitments and Core values

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)**

No, I do not support this recommendation.,

Comment
Since there is no conditional support option, I am putting a NO to this one. I believe the legal advice should be taken into account here. I am a fan of human rights, but I do have huge concern about introducing HR clauses into ICANN governing documents whose role is technically oriented. Saying ICANN would respect internationally recognized human rights is quite board a statement as the word "respect" could have different commitment meanings likewise the phrase "internationally recognized" could pop-up multiple frameworks/documents that have international attached to them. Nevertheless, will look forward to actual wording/development that will be done during WS2.

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)**

Yes, I support this recommendation.

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)**

Yes, I support this recommendation.

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)**

Yes, I support this recommendation.

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)**

Yes, I support this recommendation.

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)**

Yes, I support this recommendation. ,

Comment
If GAC is fine with this then so be it. However, it may have been good to apply such requirements (the 2/3 votes to reject GAC adice) to all AC advices as well.

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)**

Yes, I support this recommendation.,

Comment
I'd suggest that implementation of WS1 is seen to be well operational before going deep into WS2. I do suggest that CCWG consider a timeline that is more flexible as there is really no deadline to beat in WS2.

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.**

Even though I am member of the CWG-Stewardship, I am speaking on personal basis; I have concern about the community power to reject the IANA functions budget. Overall i believe this exercise has been quite productive and i do hope that the board, the NTIA will ensure to do their part in good faith as envisaged.