

## Minority dissent relative to the NCSG & NCUC comments on CCWG Accountability Rev 3

---

Hi,

This is a personal comment of minority opinion with regard to the NCSG & NCUC comments on the CCWG Accountability rev 3. I am submitting these separately as neither the NCSG nor the NCUC review included a provision for the inclusion of dissenting viewpoints.

1. I personally support Recommendation #1, inclusive of an equivalent role for Advisory Committees (AC) including the GAC. I do not accept the argument that indicates that this gives ACs responsibilities beyond what is merited by their role as advisory. First I argue here is very little difference between recommendations that can be rejected and advice that can be rejected; the discrimination that is often made about SOs being more responsible for policy at ICANN than ACs is not well founded. SOs and ACs should be equivalent as they have complimentary sets of responsibilities, both of which are essential to the ICANN organizational structure. Beyond the lack of real difference among the importance of SO and AC roles and responsibilities, community powers are new powers that are not directly dependent on the specific issues for which SOs are responsible. These are new powers that should be available to all AC and SO equally. The powers should only be exercised when the entire ICANN community is in near consensus, and that consensus cannot be found without inclusion of all those ACs willing to participate in caring for the well being of ICANN and its responsibilities toward global public interest(s).

2. I am in full support of Recommendation #9. I think it is critical to include all of the AOC based reviews in the Bylaws. The CCWG has already compromised since Rev 2, in that the reviews are no longer Fundamental Bylaws and thus are easier to change if need be. If the AOC reviews are not included, I think it would be inappropriate to terminate the AOC agreement with NTIA until a new method of insuring sufficient review mechanisms were established.

3. I support the compromise reached in Recommendation #11. Due to political imperatives in the US as well as the rest of the International Community, this is a difficult issue that can only be resolved through compromise.

4. While I support the intent of Rec #10, I do agree with NCSG that the process should be bottom up. I also believe that it should be outward directed and should be equivalent for all SOs and ACs, including the GAC.

Avri Doria  
Personal Comment