


#64



**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)

**Started:** Thursday, December 10, 2015 2:21:50 PM

**Last Modified:** Monday, December 21, 2015 10:16:34 AM

**Time Spent:** Over a week

---

PAGE 2: Personal Information

---

Q1: Name	Olivier Muron/Alain Bidron/Malcolm Hutty
Q2: Affiliation	GNSO/ISPCP
Q3: Responding on behalf of	ISPCP

---

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

Yes, ISPCP support this recommendation. The sole designator model is seen as an acceptable compromise to offer to the community enforceable powers as defined in the proposal, while avoiding potential side effects for the organization.

---

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

Yes, ISPCP support this recommendation. The new decision-making model of “Engage, Escalate, Enforce”, encouraging community disputes with Board decisions to be solved through ongoing dialogue at all stages of the process is a good improvement. ISPCP also support the replacement of the voting process by consensus decision-making.

---

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 Yes, ISPCP 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 Yes, ISPCP 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)**

Yes, I support this recommendation.,

Comment  
Yes, ISPCP support this recommendation. ISPCP believes that ICANN's Mission must be limited, and any changes to the Mission must only be made with the express consent of the multi-stakeholder community. Accordingly, the terms of ICANN's Mission must not be open to ICANN to expand its own scope through other means. ICANN should be precluded from entering into agreements that would cause it to undertake activities or pursue objectives outside its Mission or inconsistent with its Core Values. CCWG Recommendation 5 / Annex 5 satisfies this essential requirement.

---

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.,

Comment  
Yes, ISPCP support this recommendation. ISPCP note that the amendments to the proposed Draft Bylaw aim to prevent Mission expansion or 'Mission creep' by stating that ICANN's commitment to respect internationally recognized Human Rights is conducted "within its mission and in its operations".

---

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.,

Comment

Yes, ISPCP support this recommendation, which we consider one of the essential elements of this proposal. ISPCP believes an acceptable level of accountability is only achieved if there is fair and effective review and redress for breaches of ICANN's Bylaws. A materially affected party alleging such a breach must have access to a fair and independent review body to arbitrate such claims. The right of access to this process must be guaranteed, with the possibility of enforcement in the event that ICANN seeks to avoid it. The review body must have the power to issue binding decisions, enforceable in court if necessary, including the power to cause continuing breaches to cease. CCWG Recommendation 7 / Annex 7 satisfies this essential requirement.

---

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 Yes, ISPCP 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.,

Comment Yes, ISPCP 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.,

Comment Yes, ISPCP 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)**

Comment  
Ispcp do not object to recommendation 11 Some members of the ISPCP remain reluctant to support this aspect of the Report, and only do so to avoid blocking what is, as a whole, a Third Draft Report that we wish to support as a package. These members expressed concerns about the inclusion under this Recommendation of a provision by which GAC advice approved by a full consensus would be accepted by the Board unless rejected by a two thirds majority. These members think that the adoption of this rule could alter the the relationship between the ICANN Board and the GAC including, in particular, the understanding that individual Board members have about their role, and the expectations of governments.

---

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  
Yes, ISPCP support this recommendation and is in agreement with the list of items currently listed as to be addressed in Work Stream two.

---

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.**

ISPCP believes the NTIA criteria are reasonable and consistent with the multistakeholder model ICANN is built on and has refined over its 17 years of existence. ISPCP believes that the CCWG proposal is in full accordance with the NTIA criteria.