All,

I have compiled the bylaws comments we have gotten so far with some responses. Please see below.

**The general issues**

**NCSG Charter change**: As raised by Avri, NCSG charter might go under review. What should we do if this happens, especially as we have tried in this new version to align NCUC charter with NCSG?

Suggestion by FB: I thought if this happens, instead of going through a whole bylaws change procedure again, we could predict somewhere that if NCSG charter changes and the changes affect NCUC charter, then NCUC charter can be changed without having to go through the whole bylaws amendment process. We could just have the members vote on the specific changes. But we might not be allowed to do this.

**Definition of “Active Members” and “Members in good standing”:** Avri suggested that we use NCSG definition. NCSG defines inactive members as: 2.2.8. Inactive Membership

Before each annual election, the NCSG Chair shall send an email to all members, active or suspended, asking them to update their contact information before the election. If no response is received by the requested deadline, an attempt will be made to reach the member by other means, e.g. telephone calls or requests though other contacts. If, after reasonable attempts fail to reach a member or its representative and confirmation of contact information cannot be completed, that member will be moved to an inactive members list and an announcement will be made on the public discussion list. Once on the inactive members list, the inactive member will not be included in the membership count required to establish election results.

An inactive member can be removed from the inactive members list by updating its contact information. An inactive member can remain on the inactive list indefinitely. https://community.icann.org/display/gnsononcomstake/Charter

-FB: I think we should define active and inactive as well as members in good standing.

**Accountability of NCUC and NCSG:** Mathew Shears believes we need to address this in the bylaws

**Incorporating changes to NCUC bylaws considering the new ICANN bylaws and empowered community :**  We should discuss this and make additions to the bylaws

**Specific Issues**

**Criteria for appointing the PC members**: What sort of qualifications, activities, etc. should they have?

- FB: They should be active in at least one working group, familiar with writing and submitting public comments and have enough time to actively identify policy issues that need NCUC attention.

**How many PC members?:**  We have a limitation of 10 PC members in the bylaws. But Avri says we already be over ten if we include everyone in the categories ( council members, chair, etc.). What to do?

**Leaving Office:** Under Leaving Office, Avri suggests: shouldn't you include your new procedure for removing officers for conflict of interest, for some definition of COI?.

FB suggestion: I think we should take up this suggestion and have a procedure. But I am not sure if we should do this in the bylaws.

If an EC member has a conflict of interest, the issue can be raised by NCUC member or any other ICANN participant ( because this could be an accountability issue for us). The EC should submit a notice of i

**Additional Rep cannot vote**: Avri raises the point that if the official rep is absent additional rep should be able to vote.

-FB: the additional rep paragraph is the same as NCSG charter. Could we take into consideration this suggestion?

**Active members for vote threshold**: Avri suggests we include Active Members in 10% threshold. " Propose bylaw amendments. A petition of five (5) percent of the then-current members shall be sufficient for putting a bylaw amendment on the ballot for consideration at the next regular election."

**Eligible individuals I(2):** Avri asks how we are defining "noncommercial aspect" in

“2. An individual Internet User who is primarily concerned with the noncommercial aspects of domain name policy, and is not represented in ICANN personally or by his or her employer through membership in another Supporting Organisation or GNSO Stakeholder Group”

III(I)(3): Ayden doesnt like how the paragraph reads and he suggests : I don't really like how this is worded; I would rather it read, "an individual Internet user who is employed by, or a member of, a noncommercial entity who wishes to participate in the noncommercial aspects of domain name policy in their personal capacity, and not on behalf of said entity" or something to that effect. I don't think we need to define the organisation (as this has happened in earlier paragraphs) and I don't think we should restrict the reasons for why an organisation might not wish to join the constituency but the individual might.

**NCSG chair on NCUC EC:** Avri believes NCSG chair being on non voting capacity at NCUC can affect neutrality.

**Regional EC representatives:** treasurer is mentioned which does not have anything to do with regional reps. suggest moving it to an appropriate place.

**Communication:** IX. A. Ayden suggests that: Should we say that posting [to the mailing list] is restricted to EC members, but that browsing of communiques will be open to all members?I agree with this and we should certainly change.

--

Farzaneh