


#79



COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 21, 2015 3:51:15 PM
Last Modified: Monday, December 21, 2015 4:00:02 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:46

PAGE 2: Personal Information

Q1: Name	Athina Fragkouli
Q2: Affiliation	RIPE NCC
Q3: Responding on behalf of	ASO

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 We find the Sole Designator Model in the third version to be an adequate model.
---	--

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 community mechanism described is reasonable and ASO intends to participate in it.
--	--

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 In general there are no concerns with the CCWG proposal. With regards to the proposal to add in the Fundamental Bylaws IANA related issues, such as "The IANA Function Review, Special IANA Function Review and the Separation Process required by the IANA Stewardship Transition proposal", it is our understanding that this refers to the Names Functions. We would be against including the Numbers Function.
--	---

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

There are no concerns with the CCWG proposal and ASO intends to participate in the decision-making mechanism described.

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

We support the current text in the third Draft Report. In particular it is important for us to maintain the reference to the ASO MoU in the description of ICANN's role with regards to the Internet number resources. On other parts of the Mission, we would like to refer to the requirements of the NRO statement of 7 November 2015 on this matter: <https://www.nro.net/news/the-nro-ec-recognises-that-the-icann-mission-statement-is-currently-under-review-by-the-ccwg>. It is our understanding that the current text is in line with these requirements.

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

There are no concerns with the CCWG proposal.

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

We support the current text in the third Draft Report as it reflects our position that disputes relating to Internet number resources are out of scope.

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

The current text includes the following sentence: "Disputes related to Internet number resources are out of scope of the IRP". It is our understanding that the intention is to exclude disputes related to Internet number resources from the scope of the Reconsideration Process, as this section is about the Reconsideration Process and not about the IRP. A correction to clarify this would be appropriate.

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

There are no concerns with the CCWG proposal.

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

There are no concerns with the CCWG proposal.

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

In general we find the current text acceptable. Additionally we would like to make the following remarks: We would support a text that clarifies today's practices and does not substantially change the GAC's role and how its advice is treated by the Board or substantially strengthen obligations for the Board to consider the GAC advice. We would not support a text that cannot be acceptable by the NTIA.

PAGE 14: Recommendation 12

CCWG-Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations

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

There are no concerns with the CCWG proposal.

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.

The ASO representatives would like to thank the CCWG for the opportunity to deliver the RIR community input on the CCWG third Draft Report. The survey is filled out based on feedback received from discussions on the CCWG report at recent RIR meetings, comments on the RIR community mailing lists, and observations of the NRO EC. □□

Overall we support the third Draft Report. We are very pleased with the work delivered by the CCWG and we are confident that the proposed amendments are positively contributing to the accountability of ICANN.
