Draft Uniform Framework CCWG Life Cycle Principles & Recommendations - RySG Comments

The gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) thanks the cross community working group for its excellent work over the last few years in developing a framework for CCWGs and appreciates the opportunity to provide the following feedback. Our comments are organized according to the document posted for public comment.

1.0 Introduction

Fundamental Concepts

The third critical point listed at the end of this section on page 2 says: "Consider if the participating organizations are able to collectively adopt the consensus output of the CCWG." What does 'collectively adopt' mean? Some clarification of this would be helpful.

3.4 Decision-Making and Closure of Cross Community Working Group (CCWG)

Paragraph 2 on page 11 ends with this sentence: "The Chartering Organizations will typically agree to formally close the CCWG once the final CCWG outputs have been received and a final decision has been rendered." Should the CCWG be formally closed before the recommendations are implemented? If so, it may be a good idea to at a minimum provide guidance as to how the CCWG or some of its members should participate in implementation efforts.

4.0 Conclusions and Open Questions

One of the topics that is missing from the framework is discussion of what should happen if any consensus policy development may be needed in follow-up to the CCWG recommendations. The RySG believes that it would be helpful to include some guidance in this regard in the framework.

The open questions asked in this section are printed in italic font below followed by the RySG's responses:

- *Should there be a requirement that all CCWG recommendations must be considered by the ICANN Board, if minimum requirements are met (similar to the GNSO Policy Development Process?*
    - It depends on the recommendations. If a CCWG wants the Board to consider any or all of its recommendations, it should state that in its report.

- *Should more formalized Operating Procedures be developed for CCWGs?*
    - No. CCWGs vary too much so considerable flexibility is needed.

- *Should additional mechanisms be developed to deal with situations in which Chartering Organizations may disagree or want to discontinue their engagement?*
    - Not at this time. If situations are identified going forward that are expected to recur multiple times, it could be useful to provide some guidelines for such situations.

- *Should there be a mechanism to close a CCWG if it is clear that it will not be possible to produce a final report or that circumstances have overtaken the need for a CCWG? (See Section 3.3.4 and 3.4.2 above)*
    - Yes.

- *For implementation and post-implementation of the CCWG output, what should be the role of the CCWG? Should the Charter template be expanded to include these details? How would the process be initiated?*
    - Please review the GNSO Policy & Implementation WG Principles and Recommendations that were approved by the Board. We strongly recommend that the CCWG framework include similar recommendations to the extent that they are applicable.

- *As the appointment mechanism for members varies across SO/ACs, how can CCWG leadership and support staff be kept informed of appointments and changes?*
    - Review member participation; identify repeated absences; and communicate with SOs and ACs.

- *Are uniform Statements of Interest, or something similar, beneficial to the CCWG process? (See section 3.2.7 above)*
    - Yes, but there is no need to be rigid in cases where there may be valid reasons why some participants may not be able to provide certain types of information. When it is not possible for someone to provide requested information, an explanation should be requested.

- *Should specific requirements be listed for the appointment of members?*
    - No. It should be up to SOs and ACs.

- *Who launches a call for volunteers/participants?*
    - The CCWG in cooperation with SOs and ACs.

Section IV: Membership, Staffing, and Organization

Membership Criteria

A maximum of 5 members may be too low for the GNSO as it is currently structured, especially in cases where it is helpful to have one representative from each constituency.

Volunteer Chairs have worked well for the most part in ICANN activities but it may not be necessary to exclude the possibility of considering a non-voluntary chair such as a chair who is compensated.

Special experts should not be limited to 'Expert Advisors'; in some instances it may be possible to enlist experts as members of CCWGs.

Section V: Rules of Engagement

Closure & Working Group Self-Assessment

Closure of a CCWG should never be considered without first deciding how the CCWG will be involved with implementation.