

[CCWG-ACCT] On behalf of Cochairs - SCWG - References

Alice Jansen alice.jansen@icann.org

Mon Aug 31 07:57:15 UTC 2015

- Previous message: [\[CCWG-ACCT\] Blog: The IANA Transition: The Work Ahead](#)
 - Next message: [\[CCWG-ACCT\] Notes-Recordings-Transcript links for CCWG Meeting with Advisors - 31 August](#)
 - Messages sorted by: [\[date \]](#) [\[thread \]](#) [\[subject \]](#) [\[author \]](#)
-

On behalf of CCWG Cochairs

Dear all,

On call #50, we briefly discussed the separation cross community working group (SCWG) recommended by the CWG-stewardship.

Background

* The CWG-stewardship report<<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=53779816>> <<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=53779816>> states: if the IANA Function Review (IFR) determines that a separation process is necessary, it will recommend the creation of a Separation Cross Community Working Group (SCWG). This recommendation will need to be approved by a supermajority of each of the GNSO and the ccNSO Councils, according to their normal procedures for determining supermajority, and will need to be approved by the ICANN Board after a public comment period, as well as a community mechanism derived from the CCWG-Accountability process. A footnote is included: This community mechanism could include ICANN membership, if ICANN were to become a membership organization per the CCWG-Accountability work efforts. In addition the CWG-stewardship recommends that the entity that would perform the IANA naming functions following a separation process will require community approval through the established mechanism derived from the CCWG-Accountability process.

* Annex L of the CWG-stewardship report (see p. 94) suggests that the SCWG will follow the overall guidelines and procedures for ICANN Cross Community Working Groups and establishes a proposed composition of the SCWG with a footnote that if this composition diverges from the recommendation of the Cross Community Working Group on Principles for Cross Community Working Groups, the structure in this proposal shall prevail. The CWG-stewardship specifies that each group will be responsible for appointing its own representative to the SCWG based on the proposed SCWG composition.

* In Annex L, the CWG-stewardship flags the following as a key item: approval by a community mechanism derived from the CCWG-Accountability process to approve the final selection of the SCWG (if this tenet of the CCWG-Accountability proposal is not implemented a new approval mechanism will have to be put in place.

* The ICG draft report<<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iana-stewardshp-proposal-31jul15-en.pdf>> <<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iana-stewardshp-proposal-31jul15-en.pdf>> considers the following to be a CCWG-Accountability dependency (see p.14) : the empowerment of the Special IFR to determine that a separation process is necessary and, if so, to recommend that a Separation CrossCommunity Working Group (SCWG) be established to review the identified issues and make recommendations. Note: this is the ICG's assessment and it was not discussed with the CWG.

* The CCWG-Accountability second draft proposal<<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=53783460>> suggests (see p.14) that the incorporation into the Bylaws of the procedure to implement a Separation Process should it arise from a Special IANA Function Review, including

provision for the creation of the Separation Cross-Community Working Group (SCWG), its functions and voting thresholds for approving the end-result of the SCWG process (which could include a separation) is agreed on. Its specifications will be based on the requirements detailed by the CWG-Stewardship and the Bylaw drafting process will include the CWG-Stewardship.

We agreed with the CWG-stewardship leaders that the above should be discussed within our group.

We consider two options as possible:

1. Clarify that the CCWG would be set up per current procedures I.e through Chartering Organizations;
2. Elaborate a specific process in final recommendations.

Views were expressed on call #50. While some believe that no further work should be undertaken, others believe the CCWG should put suggestions in writing for the CWG-stewardship's consideration and request whether any further assistance is needed. We wish to continue the dialogue and will resume the discussion on call #51 (1 September) to confirm the approach to use. In the meantime, we encourage you to send your thoughts to the list.

Thanks

Best regards

Thomas, León, Mathieu

----- next part -----

An HTML attachment was scrubbed...

URL: <<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/attachments/20150831/c601425f/attachment-0001.html>>

-
- Previous message: [\[CCWG-ACCT\] Blog: The IANA Transition: The Work Ahead](#)
 - Next message: [\[CCWG-ACCT\] Notes-Recordings-Transcript links for CCWG Meeting with Advisors - 31 August](#)
 - **Messages sorted by:** [\[date \]](#) [\[thread \]](#) [\[subject \]](#) [\[author \]](#)

[More information about the Accountability-Cross-Community mailing list](#)