* **Removing the ICANN Board of Directors**: Which standards is the decision examined against?

 The proposal says: "It is proposed that there is a subjective standard........"

I don't understand how we accept to remove the board on subjective considerations because:

* + - removing the board is a very serious decision and its consequences might be disastrous for ICANN
		- accept to recall the board according to such reasons?
		- As Jordan said rightly the removal of the Board would be because the loss of confidence from the board. And there are always objective reasons that make you loose confidence, not subjective ones.

I don’t ask to list the objective standards because any list wouldn’t be comprehensive. We just mention “objective” in stead of “subjective”.

Another issue regarding removing the board is leaving ICANN without board for a relatively long period (time necessary for electing directors selected by the SO/ACs and time for the nomcom to find and select the other members).

In my opinion, ICANN can’t live one day without Board. That’s why I propose that the bylaws be changed so that each entity appointing or selecting the Board members appoint or select 2 persons: a Board director and an alternate one. If it happen (and I hope it will not) that the community remove the Board, the alternates will form the replacement board for the remaining term period of the outgoing board, or for an interim period till the process of selecting/appointing a new board.

* **Community entity(s):** How many

I support having a unique community entity (council or whatsoever) for all the accountability mechanisms except for recalling the board which is in my opinion a special decision, and should be taken directly and formally by each community constituency (SO:ACs). This goal can be reached by 2 ways:

* Make recalling the board a special mechanism separated from the others and make the decision taken directly by the SO/ACs not through their representatives in the community entity
* Use always a unique community entity for all mechanisms including recalling the board, but for this case of recalling the board, the representatives of the SO/ACs will have the role of reporting the decision that their respective SO/ACs have taken according to their respective rules in a transparent manner.
* **Block adoption by ICANN Board of strategic plan or budget:**

My comment this morning wasn’t well understood. I didn’t mean to give an information about the current consultation that the Finance department is making with the community. I was proposing that the power we want to give the community to reject the budget be used to make the current consultation compulsory and the community opinion binding early during the budget development. This will raise the problems early in the process and give time to the finance department to make the necessary modifications before it goes to the board for approval. As it was presented, the community would reject the budget adopted by the board, and as the board approves the budget at the end of the fiscal year, we will have to start a new year without budget.

This can be done for other mechanisms every time an interaction with the community could be done during the process not at its end.