

Draft Principles for Cross-Community Working Groups

Scope of CWGs	Rationale (all new draft text – post 10 Nov. call)
Limit purpose to:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide information and recommendations to the chartering organizations and/or the ICANN staff. 	<u>To ensure community understanding about the limited specific role and purpose of CWGs</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<u>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</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In any event, Consensus Policy development must occur using current SO rules. 	<u>To harmonize avoid conflict with existing PDP bylaws requirements</u>
Operations of CWGs	
Formation of CWGs:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply appropriate SO WG Guidelines to all CWGs whenever possible. 	<u>For consistency, predictability</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All SOs/ACs should approve a single, joint Charter <u>whenever possible</u>. 	<u>For consistency, predictability and to reinforce that there is consensus of about the scope and terms of each WG tasking</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWG Charters should include outcomes expected of the CWG and steps to be followed to review outcomes by chartering SOs and ACs. 	<u>(same as above)</u> <u>For consistency, predictability and to reinforce that there is consensus about the scope and terms of each WG tasking</u>
Execution of CWGs:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWGs should follow the approved charter and bring concerns to all chartering organizations for resolution according to WG Guidelines <u>as appropriate</u>. 	<u>Helps ensure that concerns are addressed in a consistent way</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOs/ACs should solicit and consider the views of other SOs/ACs. 	<u>DT recognizes importance of identifying and considering the full diversity of views that may exist</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWGs should seek to accommodate diverging views where possible before finalizing positions. 	<u>This is always the goal in any consensus-based WG model</u>
Outcomes of CWGs:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy recommendations should be considered and approved through the appropriate Policy Development Process. 	<u>Assures consistency with ICANN bylaws</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWGs should communicate Final Reports and Outcomes to chartering organizations (only) for review and further action. 	<u>For consistency, predictability, helps assure that the SO and AC views on CWG recommendations are fully understood and documented</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOs/ACs should commit to timely review and finalizing of actions to avoid delays. 	<u>Assures expeditious treatment by all SO/ACs regardless of level of priority attributed by each</u>

Edits as of 10 November DT meeting