


#51



COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Started: Friday, December 18, 2015 10:20:28 PM

Last Modified: Friday, December 18, 2015 10:47:50 PM

Time Spent: 00:27:22

PAGE 2: Personal Information

Q1: Name	Russ Housley
Q2: Affiliation	Vigil Security, LLC
Q3: Responding on behalf of	Vigil Security, LLC

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 The new proposal, while not perfect, is an improvement over the previous proposal.
---	---

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 The current proposal focuses on dialogue and negotiation instead of lawsuits. This is a significant improvement over the earlier version.
--	--

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.,

Comment

Structuring the ICANN Bylaws as 'Standard Bylaws' and 'Fundamental Bylaws' is fine, but I have significant concerns with some of the draft text. The bylaws need to state what ICANN does. Paragraphs 205, 214, and 220 include text that describes what ICANN does not do. Please choose words that sates the mission and scope of ICANN by clearly stating what it does, which will make it unnecessary to try and generate an (unbounded) list of things that ICANN does not do.

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)

No, I do not support this recommendation.,

Comment

During public comment period on Draft 2, the IAB requested that protocol parameters decisions be excluded from the IRP mechanism; however, Draft 3 does not do so. I hope this was an oversight. If the protocol parameters are excluded from the IRP mechanism, then I could support the seven new Community Powers described in Draft 3.

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.

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)

Yes, I support this recommendation.

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)

No, I do not support this recommendation.,

Comment
Please see my comment regarding Recommendation 4. If protocol parameters are excluded from the IRP mechanism, then I can support it.

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.,

Comment
A functional reconsideration process is a vital accountability mechanism.

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.

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.

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