

Dear Ka trina, Dear Colleagues,

Thanks for kicking off this conversation. This is indeed a useful way to test our internal processes. Since it would be dangerous to consider our process as “tested and approved” unless there is some debates and comments, let me offer a couple of (minor and personal) feedbacks on the proposal itself. They could reasonably be framed as suggestions for improvement rather than concerns or issues.

First, I do not think it had been identified in the drafting of the new Bylaws that the way the Board organizes its work (into various Committees for instance) to deal with the various accountability mechanisms should be a “Fundamental” Bylaw. As a consequence, for greater flexibility in the future, instead of the proposed changes in the Bylaws (consisting in replacing the name of a committee by another committee name), I would suggest that the reformulation enables the Board to form or designate a committee to handle these requests. Instead of “The Board has designated the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee to review and consider Reconsideration Requests.”, we could have : “The Board designates a Committee to review and consider Reconsider Requests. For the purpose of this section, this designated Committee is referred to as “The Board Accountability Mechanism Committee”.

Second, regarding the draft Committee Charters, I find strange that the BGC remains in charge of the Ombudsman “own motion” investigations. I would find it more appropriate to transfer this responsibility to the new Accountability Mechanism Committee, because the Ombudsman is one of the Accountability mechanisms in place at ICANN.

These would be my two cents at this point, bearing in mind that I fully support the general direction of the proposal which is to better organize the workload within the Board.

Best

Mathieu