Change Area Requested	1st Reading	2nd Reading	Outcome	Comments
Community Mechanism Escalation Process (Recommendation #2) and Board Removal (Recommendation #4): *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.*	7 January – Escalation Timeframes 5 January – Board Removal	14 January – Escalation timeframes 12 January & 19 January – Board Removal	**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). **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.	
Budget (Recommendation #4): *[…] 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.*	7 January	14 January	Following comments from CWG-Stewardship, the budget document received additional edits. The latest document is available here, but there are still some items that need to be cleaned up before considered final.	
Separation Process (Recommendation #4): *The community's ability to reject ICANN Board decisions on Special IFR/SCWG*	14 January	21 January	On Separation Process, no comments in first reading, so changes expected for second reading. Below is	

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			an overview of the separation process proposal for the first reading (see page 24): • Clarification that separation process applies only to domain name function of IANA. • Unlimited right to reject Board decisions relating to reviews of IANA Functions	
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	Agreement to move forward with a combination of solutions to address the IRP scope issue with PTI: include general provision regarding ICANN's obligation to cause the PTI to fulfill its obligations (the failure to do so would give rise to a standard IRP) and text to address SLA failures, etc. with an operational (rather than constitutional) standard of review.	