Re: Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups

Name: Seun Ojedeji
Profile: https://ng.linkedin.com/in/seunojedeji
Declaration: Irrespective of the hats I wear, I am writing on my personal behalf

1. Is there a consideration to re-open already closed CCWG (as the flow-chart did not enumerate such scenario). I am looking at a situation where a topic already worked on by past CCWG comes up again. Perhaps there should be a way and process to re-kickstart such CCWG without having to go through the CCWG development process again.

2. On Adoption of Final Report by Chartering Organizations and Closure of CCWG:
There are instances where the charter may require monitoring of implementation of CCWG recommendations and i don't think that is adequately covered yet; the lifespan of the CCWG should be based on the terms of the charter and not when the recommendation is approved. (The post-closure trys to address the implementation phase but did not link it to the actual CCWG).

To be more specific, the flow-chart(ref:page4) seem to imply there won't be CCWG during implementation phase as the CCWG would have been dissolved/closed? Nevertheless, i note that an IRT is proposed (ref: page 12). While that may suffice i think it may be more effective to have the particular CCWG follow through with implementation. They may however form an IRT within themselves (while incorporating staff/board accordingly).

3. Specifically on implementation review team(IRT) ref:page12: It is not clear what the default composition distribution will look like. Since this is a group that will not operate by the CCWG charter, it is then important to have an idea of how the group will operate (unless the intent is that they will develop their charter as well?). Questions like the following comes to mind:

- How many representatives will be required from each chartering organisations(CO) and should there be requirement that such reps be selected from CCWG members/participants from each CO?
- Should non-CO but SO/AC should be part of the IRT?
- Should there be a staff, community ratio?
- Should board be required be part of the team (Liason role)
- Should there be a termination indicator

4. On Conclusion(ref page 13): I think review after 3 CCWG may be too small as CCWGs may finish within a year (imagine a review done last year because the 3years requirement was done and then 3 CCWGs finishing the next year). Also 3 CCWG may not provide enough information to warrant a review. I will suggest putting this figure at 5, that way there will be adequate data source for the review and one is almost sure of at least 2.5years before next review. That said, sticking with just years and not considering the number of CCWGs would be preferred as i think its neater that way.

Find response to your specific questions below:

- 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?

Considering that every CCWG will require certain resources(including financial cost) and may

ultimately require implementation. My Answer will be Yes.

• Should more formalized Operating Procedures be developed for CCWGs?
Not really, but for the IRT yes there should be. Although i would note that some minimum/maximum timelines should be set for CCWG formation/closure.

• Should additional mechanisms be developed to deal with situations in which Chartering Organizations may disagree or want to discontinue their engagement?
No, that should be covered in the charter of each CCWG

• 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 and i guess this also re-echo my reponse to the second question

• 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?
Yes i have made comments about this above.

• As the appointment mechanism for members varies across SO/ACs, how can CCWG leadership and support staff be kept informed of appointments and changes?
I am not sure i got the question but overall principle should require each CCWG charter to indicate how their memberships/participants can be changed by appointing/representing SO/AC.

• 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?
No it should be within the remit of each CCWG charter

• Who launches a call for volunteers/participants?
You mean when the CCWG is formed? depending on the nature of the CCWG; if members based then i think each CO should make their calls independently and only send nominations to staff. If its an open CCWG then calls can be made by staff at a global level.

General Comments:
- Please consider using paragraph numbers in future documents for easy referencing (I particularly appreciated it for the CCWG-accountability/ CWG)
- The option to submit comments through a form seem to be a good thing to maintain (having options of sending mail and filling form is a good thing)