To Dublin, and beyond...
Work plan

WP public comment assessment
• Summary of community feedback
• Proposed solutions
• Pursue discussions from LA

Dublin F2F time
• Refine proposals
• Engage Community

Finalize proposal
• Refine communication around proposal
• Document
• Public comment (if need be)

Deadline: Oct 12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>Community powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Forum &lt;= follow up from LA discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AoC reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Mission, Commitments, Core Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconsideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>SO/AC accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-WP</td>
<td>Stress tests and associated bylaw changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chairs</td>
<td>Overall remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work stream 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expectations for WPs by Oct 12

• For each topic :
  – Summarize input received by community into :
    • Areas of consensus
    • Areas needing refinement / further details
    • Areas of divergence
  – Identify potential options for CCWG consideration
  – Submit additional details on proposals when needed, for CCWG approval
Dublin F2F meeting outlook

• Morning:
  – WP reports: summaries & potential options

• Afternoon:
  – Decisions on key adjustments / refinements to be made
  – Approval of additional details provided by WPs

• More F2F time in Dublin might be necessary, including WP sessions.
Engagement with Chartering organisations, Board and other transition groups

• CCWG-Accountability is the last missing piece in the puzzle to enable transmission of a proposal to NTIA

• Communication about our progress is key to manage expectations and avoid tensions

• But:
  – CCWG-Accountability (and its subgroups) must remain the forum of substantial discussions
  – Time available for engagement is limited and must be managed efficiently
Engagement proposals

1. Engage directly with SO/AC leaders (using their regular calls), and invite leaders of other transition-related groups (ICG, CWG, protocol and numbering communities)

2. Ensure that Board briefings on CCWG are (also) provided by CCWG co-chairs

3. Reach out to experienced community members (such as Board members) to support the relevant work of WPs (ie Board Finance committee on Budget...) as CCWG participants

4. Substantive work:
   1. in sub-teams
   2. co-ordination by new small group (SO/AC reps, Board, Lawyers, ) to limit risk of friction, no decision making.
   3. decision-making by CCWG