**Question 10 – Reconsider/Reject Changes to Standard ICANN Bylaws**

**Summary:**

There were **nineteen** comments in this section.

18 comments suggested **agreement;** 4 comments noted **concerns**.

There were no **confusion** rated comments.

There was one **divergent** rated comments.

There was **broad agreement that this power would enhance ICANN accountability**, but **moderate concern** that this power would have to be implemented in a way that does not compromise ICANN’s effectiveness.

The **main issue/s or concerns:**

* Impact on ICANN’s operational effectiveness arising from this power.

**Specific** concerns or suggestions for further follow up and WP1/CCWG discussion:

* Emphasizes the need to empower the community when amending fundamental bylaws. (310)
* Cites the likelihood that enforcing this power will require a membership structure; calls on CCWG to further explore and explain membership.
* Recommends that ICANN’s mission, commitments and core values be made fundamental. (314)
* Cites concern regarding a potential trade-off between accountability enhancement and the ability for ICANN to complete its mission. Recommends further work in WS2 to amend or augment list of fundamental bylaws. (317)
* Supports consideration of new or amended fundamental bylaws in WS2. (318)
* Concern that the current proposal does not include a well-defined list of requirements in Sections 5.4 and 3.2.3. (319)
* Concern that insufficient detail is included in Sections 5.4 and 3.2.3. Calls for greater specificity. (322)
* Concern that adding a new approval layer may seriously hamper process flow. (325)

**Proposed CCWG response/approach to resolution**

* CCWG will continue to explore and explain member structure.
* CCWG will continue its work to augment and clarify Sections 5.4 and 3.2.3.
* CCWG will consider mechanisms for limiting procedural impasse and possible delays.