**Question 9 – Reconsider/Reject Changes to Standard ICANN Bylaws**

**Summary:**

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

18 comments suggested **agreement;** 8 comments noted **concerns**.

There were no **confusion** rated comments.

There were no **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:**

* More time needed for community review process – 2 weeks is too short.
* Impact on ICANN’s operational effectiveness arising from this power

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

* Approval of any numerical change to SO-AC structure should require super-majority vote (292)
* Recommends a longer period for community review. Extend from 2 weeks to 30 days. (293)
* Encourages CCWG to further explore and explain member structure. (294)
* Make ICANN’s mission, commitments and core values fundamental bylaws. (295)
* Recommends a longer period for community review. Extend from 2 weeks to the end of next ICANN meeting beginning no sooner than one month before posts notice of adoption. (296)
* Recommends a 60-day window for community review. (299)
* Recommends a 2/3 majority vote instead of 3/4. (299)
* Concern about a procedural impasse; recommends introducing a consultation stage. (301)
* Recommends a longer time period for community review. Extend from 2 weeks to 30 days. (301)
* Recommends a 2/3 majority vote instead of 3/4 for first rejection. (301)
* Raises concern that a community approval/rejection process could cause ICANN to delay introduction of proposed bylaws changes. (305)
* Recommends creating a limit on the number of times the community can reject changes. (306)
* Recommends a longer period for community review. (307)

**Proposed CCWG response/approach to resolution**

* CCWG will consider extending the community review period from 2 weeks to a longer timeframe TBD.
* CCWG will continue to explore and explain member structure.
* CCWG will consider lowering the vote threshold from 3/4 to 2/3.
* CCWG will consider mechanisms for limiting procedural impasse and possible delays.
* CCWG will consider a cap on the number of times this power can be utilized. Further clarification needed.