responser/responses	Section	Comment	Response
AFNIC	Main Recommendations	Afnic welcomes the recommendations on Guidelines for standards of conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising removal of individual Directors of the ICANN Board (Guidelines for Good Faith or GGF). These recommendations provide the required clarification on what constitutes Good Faith within the new Community power framework.	Support noted.
AFNIC	Stand-Alone Recommendations	Afnic's support includes support for the stand-alone recommendations. Extending the purpose of these guidelines to any discussion regarding the exercise of Community powers appears not only sensible, but also necessary.	Support noted.
AFNIC	Other	Finally, we would like to make two extra suggestions, directed to other aspects of the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2. First, the enhancement of SO/AC accountability may also benefit from considering how this type of Good Faith guidelines may be included in a set of SO/AC best practices. Second, we believe similar Guidelines may also be considered by the Staff accountability working group, if issues of Good Faith were raised as part of its issue identification effort.	These suggestions will be forwarded to the SO/AC Accountability and Staff Accountability subgroups for their considerarion.
GNSO-BC	Main Recommendations	The BC endorses the draft recommendations on Guidelines for standards of conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising removal of individual Directors of the ICANN Board. This comment was approved in accord with the BC charter.	Support noted.
Sam LaFranco	Main Recommendations	For the process to be fair and manageable as good faith conduct it is essential that "A standard framework be developed" and that "that the guidelines as...apply to all discussions even if not covered by...Article 20". A standard framework is essential for a fair and manageable process, and minimizes complications that could arise on procedural grounds. Also the "scope of application" should be as wide as possible in order to avoid different standards for addressing different issues within ICANN. This would minimize complications and delays resulting in struggles over-appropriate frameworks in particular cases. I would be tempted to see these as among first principles with regard to the task at hand.	Support noted however this suggestion goes beyond the cope of the working group on good Faith Guidelines.
National Internet Exchange of India	Main Recommendations	Petitions for removal: a. may be for any reason: The phrase "may be for any reason" is too wide and has to be interpreted to include reasons like the director has involved in actions of moral turpitude, acted against the interests and goals of ICANN; has committed grave offence of severe magnitude which in the reasonable opinion of the ICANN or SO/AC has reasons to believe that the said director is not eligible to continue as a director. .... In other words the said guidelines must strike a balance between actions of good faith and bad faith. Guidelines must also stipulate whether indemnity afforded to the indemnified party should be allowed to continue if bad faith or mala fide intent is discovered on the part of the indemnified party. (long - see comment for full text)	the "may be for any reason" was a specific requirement in the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 recommendations. Section 7.2 (f) (i) of the Bylaws states "As a condition to sitting on the Board, each Director other than the President ex officio shall sign a pre-service letter pursuant to which such Director: (i) acknowledges and agrees to the EC's right to remove the Director at any time and for any reason following the processes set forth in these Bylaws;" and any limitations to this would go against the Bylaws.
National Internet Exchange of India	Main Recommendations	Refer to Page 4: Para (d): Rationale for Recommendations: The recommendations in this paragraph stipulate that different guidelines / different internal standards can be framed for each SO/ACs. Though the reasoning provided in the said Para supports such recommendation in a good perspective taking into account the non interference in decision making process of the individual SO/ACs, it must be noted that such differences should not become a legal impediment or hurdle in future that a defense is raised or set back caused for the process of removal that different standards and guidelines are in place for SO/ACs. Also as a matter of abundant caution, uniform guidelines may be put in place which is approved by consensus of all SO/ACs. This may certainly be time consuming process but uniform guidelines are the key for such crucial/critical process of removal of directors to avoid any legal objections later.	Uniform guidelines for removal would go against the Bylaws which clearly stipulate that each SO and AC which is a member of the empowered community shall develop its own processes and procedures. (please see sections 3.1 (a) and 3.2 (a) of Annex D of the Bylaws).
Jason Schiller	Main Recommendations	(Extract from full response) While removal of director(s) can be without cause, I would prefer the document more clearly indicate that the rational is intended to be useful to prevent malicious and/or capricious removal of director(s). ..... My concerns generally are around specific phrases that have been used and likely connotations that may be problematic, and potentially complicated for the ASO. This can be generally summed up as 1. "representing the communities", 2. "membership of the SO", what a 3. "community process" connotates, a 4. "recommended standard framework", and 5. the requirement that the process be imitated by the So chair. 1. "Individuals who are representing their communities" "Individuals who are representing their communities" (p.2) is contrary to the norms of RIR process..... 2. II.a.2. Review by the entire membership of the SO/AC There a two issues here. The first is that it seems there is a recommendation that SOs have a Procedure for each of the types of Board removal..... 3. Similar concerns apply to page 4 (III.a.2.d) where it states a recommendation for documentation of a "community process" for how the decision to remove the ICANN director was reached. 4. Similar concerns apply to the recommended "standard framework" (p.4, III.b.1.). Application of such a framework may not make sense in the case of the ASO AC.If the framework does consider that accountability, transparency, and community involvement are all handled in the RIR system. Furthermore some of these tasks may be delegated to the ASO AC, and some may remain with the NRO EC. In these cases it may not make	(we should list which changes are being proposed to address these concerns)