| # | CCWG Agreement | Responsible | Current Status |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Charter Question #1** | | | |
| 1 | Leadership team to prepare a first draft in a google doc of the request that would go to ICANN org regarding what the expectations are of a cost-benefit analysis. CCWG members to participate in the drafting. | Leadership |  |
| 2 | Develop template/overview that captures the input received from the Board. CCWG to use template to carry out cross-check towards the end of the process to ensure that all input has been considered. | Staff | FAQ in development |
| 3 | For now, CCWG will keep all three options open (A, B and C) and will re-evaluate at the end of the review all public comments and further input requested whether any of the mechanisms should be eliminated from consideration. | CCWG |  |
| 4 | The group to formulate questions to ICANN Org or Board to ask for further clarifications, based on leadership recommendations. | Leadership |  |
| 5 | CCWG to review memo on the legal and fiduciary constraints and determine whether language that refers to ‘charitable organizations’ should be further clarified or specified based on the guidance provided. Also identify whether there are any further questions or clarifications from Org needed. | CCWG | Memo on legal and fiduciary constraints was re-circulated. FAQ in development – to be used by CCWG to identify any further questions or clarifications. |
| **Charter Question #2** | | | |
| 6 | CCWG to review the language of this recommendation (#2) to see whether it is overly broad, although the CCWG noted that the restraining factor of the ICANN's mission is already referenced. Also consider changing 'and' to 'or' to make clear that one of the objectives needs to be met, not all three. | CCWG |  |
| 7 | CCWG agreement: Review example list as well as guidelines and consider whether additional language should be added to reflects the above discussion. (Marilyn, Elliot, Jonathan, Alan and Maureen to develop draft language for inclusion). | Small group of volunteers |  |
| 8 | Leadership team to review the existing language and make a recommendation on whether or not further clarify the language. | Leadership |  |
| 9 | Review evaluation guidelines to make sure that sufficient reporting requirements are included. | CCWG |  |
| 10 | Request clarification from ICANN Legal whether there would be any constraints that would prevent this from being allowed (this being ‘to not disallow projects because they are collaborative with other entities’) | CCWG |  |
| **Charter Question #3** | | | |
| 11 | Add the following clarification to the Final Report “Neither the Board nor staff will be taking decisions on individual applications but will instead focus its consideration of the slate on whether the rules of the process were followed by the independent panel.” | Staff |  |
| 12 | Add ‘reputational risk’ to CCWG’s checklist as an important factor in designing the final mechanism as well as project evaluation. | Staff |  |
| **Charter Question #5** | | | |
| 13 | Update the recommendation by adding “at every phase of the process” so it would read: “Robust conflict of interest provisions must be developed and put in place \*\*\*at every phase of the process\*\*\*, regardless of which mechanism is ultimately selected”. | Staff |  |
| 14 | CCWG to consider adding further implementation guidance for the implementation team to ensure appropriate COI mechanisms are put in place. | CCWG |  |
|  |  |  |  |