

## **SUMMARY OF THE LIFECYCLE OF A TYPICAL CCWG:**

### **1. Initiation of CCWG**

Two or more Supporting Organization(s) and/or Advisory Committee(s) make a determination that a CCWG is the proper vehicle to resolve the issue that has been identified.

Questions to ask in this phase include:

- is the issue within the scope of policy development for a specific SO or within the specific remit of an SO/AC;
- does the issue cut across different SO/ACs;
- is there broad community interest to engage on this topic;
- whether resolving this issue will have a substantial budgetary impact;
- are there sufficient community and staff resources available to form and support a CCWG;
- are the deliverables intended to be submitted to the ICANN Board for action.

### **2. Formation of CCWG**

Following interest from at least two or more SO/ACs, Drafting Team is formed to develop a draft Charter.

DT to be kept small, composed of representatives from interested SO/ACs.

Only after adoption of the Charter by at least two or more SOs/ACs is the CCWG created and the SOs/ACs who adopted the Charter deemed to be its Chartering Organizations.

### **3. Operation of CCWG**

Work plan developed and shared with Chartering Organizations.

CCWG is expected to provide regular updates to the Chartering Organizations (may be via appointed members).

Once CCWG has consensus on proposed final deliverables (in accordance with the decision-making process in the Charter, these are submitted to each Chartering Organization for approval/adoption/support/non-objection (as appropriate).

### **4. Decision Making by a CCWG**

Decision making methodology (including the definition and designation of “consensus”) to be set out clearly in the CCWG Charter.

Voting and final decisions are to be taken by appointed members (not observers or non-member participants) of a CCWG (though CCWG Chair(s) should have flexibility and authority to obtain the views of non-member participants and observers in the process.

## **5. Adoption of Final Recommendations by Chartering Organizations and Closure of CCWG**

Chartering Organizations review CCWG output to determine whether it can approve, adopt, support and/or (at minimum) not object (each in accordance with its own rules and processes).

Only after these decisions by the Chartering Organizations have been made can further steps (e.g. implementation, submission of recommendations to the Board) be taken.

CCWG normally closed once the final CCWG outputs have been formally accepted by the Chartering Organizations (but note that CCWG may have role in implementation, if specified in final recommendations and accepted by Chartering Organizations).

*Alternative 1: The CCWG may close once the Chartering Organizations have taken a final decision that the final CCWG output cannot be approved/supported, with the co-chairs of the CCWG informed accordingly.*

*Alternative 2: In the event the Chartering Organizations are informed by the Chair(s) of the CCWG that the CCWG is not able to reach a consensus position on a key deliverable, the Chartering Organizations may close the CCWG.*

## **6. Post-Closure of CCWG - Implementation**

Implementation monitored against the success criteria identified previously by the CCWG (if any).

In developing the criteria, CCWG should, if appropriate, adopt the 2015 GNSO Policy & Implementation Principles that were developed by the GNSO and approved by the ICANN Board in 2015, to the extent they are applicable.

CCWG to specify in its output if it believes it needs to be involved in implementation, and how; this must be accepted by all its Chartering Organizations who should request a timeline and specific task list.