

**Reviewing the CEP
CCWG – Accountability
Work Stream 2**

Interviews conducted by Anna Loup and Edward Morris

Interview number 4

Board / Staff Community Member

Observations:

- CEP is not an independent mechanism. It must serve the needs of the IRP
- Must be a “continuous stream” CEP to IRP
- Should there be a third party in the room?
 - Who would it be
 - Would need independent judgement
 - Fear is the addition of a 3rd party would inhibit the ability of parties to talk candidly and reach agreement
- Question: What are we hoping to accomplish with the CEP?:
 - Settle disputes, or
 - Issue definition for an IRPObjective needs to be clearly defined
- Formality versus informality: fear that formal rules for informal process will hurt the informality (which is considered a positive)
- Confidentiality of proceedings: standards?
- The more formality the greater the need for formal transparency
- What are the appropriate timelines? A balance needs to be struck: need end point deadlines but perhaps flexibility to waive with consent of all parties. Do not want any party to use the CEP as a “perpetual settlement phase”
- Recognize that ICANN has the fear of being declared in bad faith if it forces a CEP to close.
- Do we still need a CEP with the new IRP?
- In the best sense the CEP could be a fact sharing exercise
- First thing to do with CEP: create a statement of purpose