Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez

PERSONAL comments on the Draft Uniform Framework for a Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) Life Cycle: Principles and Recommendations

I want to thank and recognise the work of the Working Group on this important issue.

I have been active part of advice and early warnings to the Board in GAC, member of 2 AoC Review Teams, Non-voting councillor of the GNSO and also Co-Chair of one ccNSO-GNSO CWG on the UCTN. I'm conscious of the constraints formal proceses and silo structures impose on the advance of new ideas and may disincentive participation in the community.

But while I think CWGs have a role to play as more informal and open place to float and exchange new ideas, it should be always "before" more formal established procedures are chosen or proposed. I see it as a fast track to move initiates forward, but not as a fast track to replace formal procedures of individual SOs/ACs. So in my view it is necessary to explicitly exclude some posible situations from this CWG proposal: at least it should be clear that they are not here to replace or shortcut formal joint SOs/ACs procedures (the sole designator comes to my mind) or individual SOs/ACs procedures (PDPs), or to fast forward recommendations to the Board with a lower level of representation and/or consensus. Worse case, the proliferation of CWGs may draft resources form other weaker volunteer efforts.

From another perspective, I recognise that while SOs/ACs are looking forward for equal right s and powers under the new ACCT framework, not all were born equal and have different levels of resources and more or less dedicated volunteers. CWGs are of course good platform to advance ideas to a broader community. Cooperation between SOs/ACs may leverage weaker parts of the community. But if we are trying to address structural problems, we should have a deeper discussion on how to guarantee a level playing field for all SOs/ACs under all circumstances and not let it to the luck a individual CWGs to redress those structural deficiencies. I would strongly recommend considering the evaluation if all SOs/ACs are on level playing filed, both today and tomorrow in the post IANA transition.

As far as the questions are concerned

• Should there be a requirement that all CCWG recommendations must be considered by the ICANN Board, if minimum requirements are met (similar to the GNSO Policy Development Process? **NO. If the conclusion is that the Board should be informed, communication should go through the formal chances of the chartering organisations. In no standard case the CWG should issue its own "recommendations".**

• Should more formalized Operating Procedures be developed for CCWGs? **YES, particularly to facilitate access to support resources from the Corporation and guarantee transparency.**

• Should additional mechanisms be developed to deal with situations in which Chartering Organizations may disagree or want to discontinue their engagement? **It is very**

hard to foresee future disagreements, but from my personal view such a disagreement would mean a failure of the objectives of the Group all together and it should be dissolved sooner rather than later.

• Should there be a mechanism to close a CCWG if it is clear that it will not be possible to produce a final report or that circumstances have overtaken the need for a CCWG? (See Section 3.3.4 and 3.4.2 above) **YES, so as to avoid   misallocation of scarce resources.**

• For implementation and post-implementation of the CCWG output, what should be the role of the CCWG? Should the Charter template be expanded to include these details? How would the process be initiated? **The process would be initiated by the recognition of the wide community that the CWG did indeed found some issues and the proposed output is worth pursuing. The community wide consultation should always ask that specific question.**

• As the appointment mechanism for members varies across SO/ACs, how can CCWG leadership and support staff be kept informed of appointments and changes? **Create another wiki I guess…..**

• Are uniform Statements of Interest, or something similar, beneficial to the CCWG process? (See section 3.2.7 above) **YES**

• Should specific requirements be listed for the appointment of members? **A request to include with the SOI a specific mention of background or interest in the issue at hand**

• Who launches a call for volunteers/participants? **The call for volunteers is the first effective test of the cross-relevance of the issue at hand. The call should be formally launched at least by the Chairs of the Chartering Organisations with a request of support to the Corporation for staff and resources.**

San José, March 31 2016