Charter Question #11	Should a review mechanism be put in place to address possible adjustments to the framework following the completion of the CCWGs work and implementation of the framework should changes occur that affect the original recommendations (for example, changes to legal and fiduciary requirements and/or changes to ICANN's mission)?
Initial Responses (summary – for full responses, see [here](#))	- Yes - having the agency within ICANN, at arm's length, literally, is the easiest way to solve that issue. - A review could be useful (in addition to external Audit) and it should - Reviews are important, as mechanisms to improve, be transparent and plan for future development. They offer opportunities for innovation, steer direction, fine-tuning strategy. A combination of internal and external reviews is desirable to capture a multi-faceted process. Review processes should not be used to change purpose without the support of the same community that provided the original mandate – if this is deemed necessary, a community process should be used. - Involving the community would be important. - This could very well be considered to apply as a 'safety mechanism'. It could serve as an intermediate quality-check which could result in immediate corrections, for example cancelling remaining grants.
Order in which this question should be dealt with	Response to this question will likely depend on preferred framework / mechanism.
Sub-questions or clarifications needed	
(External) Expertise required?	Legal and fiduciary requirements Audit requirements