Draft Principles for Cross-Community Working Groups

1. Scope of CWGs	Rationale
~~Limit purpose to~~a) Purpose:	
•i) To provide information and recommendations to the chartering organizations. ~~and/or the ICANN staff~~	To ensure community understanding about the specific role and purpose of CWGs
•ii) A discussion forum to achieve greater community understanding either prior to a PDP to help define issues and concerns, or following a PDP to provide implementation recommendations or related guidance.	To maximize sharing of expertise on new, emerging or complex issues that affect the community in general and not one SO or AC specifically and/or to provide community guidance and expertise to enhance the quality of later decision-making
•iii) In any event, Consensus Policy development must occur using current SO rules.	To harmonize existing PDP bylaws requirements
2. Operations of CWGs	
a) Formation of CWGs:	
•i) Apply appropriate SO WG Guidelines to all CWGs whenever possible.	For consistency, predictability
•ii) All participating SOs/ACs should approve a single, joint Charter [whenever possible] that defines the rules and procedures for the CWG.	For consistency, predictability, and to reinforce joint support of the scope and terms of each WG tasking
•iii) CWG Charters should include outcomes expected of the CWG and steps to be followed to review outcomes by chartering SOs and ACs.	For consistency, predictability and to reinforce joint support about the scope and terms of each WG tasking
b) Execution of CWGs:	
•i) CWGs should follow the approved charter and bring concerns back to all chartering organizations for resolution according to ~~WG Guidelines as appropriate~~their respective processes.	Helps ensure that concerns are addressed in a consistent way
•ii) SOs/ACs should solicit and consider the views of other SOs/ACs.	DT recognizes importance of identifying and considering the full diversity of views that may exist
•iii) CWGs should seek to accommodate diverging views where possible before finalizing positions.	This is always the goal in any consensus-based WG model
c) Outcomes of CWGs:	
•i) Policy recommendations should be considered for possible approval ~~and approved~~ through the appropriate Policy Development Process.	Assures consistency with ICANN bylaws
•ii) CWGs ~~should~~ must communicate Final Reports and Outcomes to chartering organizations ~~(only)~~ for review and ~~further~~ action.	For consistency, predictability, helps assure that the SO and AC views on CWG recommendations are fully understood and documented
iii) CWGs' output must not be taken as an expression of community consensus, except as it may be endorsed as such by its	A CWG's charter could override that provision, with explicit reference, giving people notice that unless they participated in the CWG, they'd risk losing opportunity to object. Limitations on the

chartering organization(s).	use of CWGs' output makes the groups themselves more flexible and easier to establish.
• iv) SOs/ACs should commit to timely review and finalizing of actions to avoid delays.	Assures expeditious treatment by all SO/ACs regardless of level of priority attributed by each