

There are three issues for the CWG-Stewardship to address:

### **Issue #1: Thresholds**

For the CSC Charter, the CCNSO and GNSO Councils must approve amendments. The DT leads noted that the intention is that the respective Councils (ccNSO and GNSO) would vote to ratify any proposed charter amendment/s and the threshold would be in accordance with their respective methods of operation. However, the current responses further suggest that, “supermajority of both Councils would seem appropriate if this can be accommodated.”

Staff would like to note that supermajority may not be consistent with current practice in the GNSO and CCNSO Councils. In the case of the GNSO, the default voting threshold is simple majority of each house. Should a supermajority vote be deemed appropriate for this purpose, the relevant section in the ICANN bylaws that details voting thresholds that differ from simple majority, would need to be updated.

Does the CWG want to define a higher threshold for the CCNSO and GNSO councils or proceed with existing operating procedures within the Councils?

### **Issue #2: Timing of the first IANA Function Review**

Paragraph (194) of the CWG Final Proposal provides that the IFR “will not commence” until two years after this date, but Paragraph (301) provides that the initial IFR must be completed by this 2-year anniversary

Current response: Paragraph 301 being focused on the IFR while Paragraph 194 being a timetable makes Paragraph 301 the determining one. However, Paragraphs 267/268 seem to confirm the ambiguity. Separately, Paragraph 194 does allow, however for a Special IFR sooner than 2 years if needed.

CWG needs to choose:

1. The first IFR will not commence until two years after the Transition
2. The first IFR will be completed by the 2-year anniversary of the Transition

### **Issue #3: Use of the Empowered Community mechanisms for the Special IFR**

The CWG needs to consider specifying a forum and process for the Special IFR. Paragraphs (125) and (303) of the CWG Final Proposal provide that consideration of whether to trigger a Special IFR “may” include a public comment period but is silent on who determines whether there should be a public comment period.

If the CWG-Stewardship adopts the Empowered Community mechanism of the CCWG-Accountability, then the process for escalation includes a discussion forum. Would that be sufficient? If not, the CWG-Stewardship could mandate a standard ICANN public comment period before triggering a Special IFR.