

Change Area Requested	1 st Reading	2 nd Reading	Outcome
<p>Community Mechanism Escalation Process (Recommendation #2) and Board Removal (Recommendation #4): <i>The CWG-Stewardship recognizes that the escalation processes need to happen in a timely manner but they must also allow sufficient time to accommodate the diverse and complex makeup of SOs and ACs.</i></p>	<p>7 January – Escalation Timeframes</p> <p>5 January – Board Removal</p>	<p>14 January – Escalation timeframes</p> <p>12 January & 19 January – Board Removal</p>	<p>On escalation: removed the Conference Call stage and extended timeframes for SO/AC decision (21 day cycles with the longest possible time totaling 70 days).</p> <p>On Board Removal: Added requirements for dialogue and for a written rationale for Director removal. The CCWG concluded and instructed legal counsels to develop language for pre-service letters.</p>
<p>Budget (Recommendation #4): <i>[...] however, we require that the CCWG-Accountability proposal or the implementation process address the matters that are not sufficiently specified in the Third Draft Proposal (i.e., those relating to budget transparency, grounds for rejection of a budget/plan, timing of budget preparation and development of the caretaker budget, each of which were described in the Second Draft Proposal). In addition, we note, that the CWG-Stewardship (or a successor implementation group) is required to develop a proposed process for the IANA Functions Operations-specific budget review. We require that the proposal specifically acknowledge this.</i></p>	<p>7 January</p>	<p>14 January</p>	<p>This item is considered concluded in the CCWG-Accountability, but upon review in the CWG-Stewardship, a few items were identified as needing to be changed in order to meet the CWG-Stewardship requirements. Chuck Gomes sent feedback with areas where specific changes are required. To view this, please see: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/cwg-stewardship/2016-January/004610.html.</p> <p>To view the notes from the last CCWG-Accountability meeting on this item, see https://community.icann.org/x/HPVIAw.</p>
<p>Separation Process (Recommendation #4): <i>The community’s ability to reject ICANN Board decisions on Special IFR/SCWG recommendations, which would include the selection of a new IANA Functions Operator or any other separation process will meet the CWG-Stewardship requirements, provided that (i) the final version of the CCWG-Accountability proposal provide that the right to reject can be exercised an unlimited number of times</i></p>	<p>14 January</p>	<p>21 January (no link available yet)</p>	<p>On Separation Process, no comments in first reading, so changes expected for second reading. Below is an overview of the separation process proposal for the first reading (see page 24):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification that separation process applies only to domain name function of IANA. • Unlimited right to reject Board decisions relating to reviews of IANA Functions <p>Action for CWG-Stewardship: The CWG-Stewardship will need to stay involved in the Bylaw drafting process.</p>

IRP (Recommendation #7):

As we noted in our comment letter to the Second Draft Proposal, the Third Draft Proposal does not explicitly address the CWG-Stewardship requirement that an independent review process be available for claims relating to actions or inactions of PTI.

[12 January](#)

[19 January](#)

Agreed to inclusion of PTI actions or inactions with clarifications on scope of appeal being restricted to naming.

Action for CWG-Stewardship: Indicate preference to CCWG-Accountability and ICANN Implementation Staff on how best to achieve definition of standard of review. Two options previously identified by Sidley:

1. **[Bylaws Option]:** Provision could be added to the ICANN Bylaws that would require ICANN to enforce its rights under the ICANN-PTI Contract/Statement of Work (SOW), with a failure by ICANN to address a material breach by PTI under the contract being grounds for an IRP process by the Empowered Community (after engagement and escalation).
2. **[IRP Option]:** Expand and modify, as appropriate, the IRP process currently contemplated by the Third Draft Proposal to cover claims relating to actions or inactions of PTI, with the ICANN Bylaws and PTI governance documents expressly confirming that the IRP process is binding on PTI (which provisions would be Fundamental Bylaws that could not be amended without community approval).