**Motion expressing support for continued ICANN community engagement in Internet Governance activities appropriate to ICANN’s mission, withdrawal as a Chartering Organization from the CCWG-IG and request for a proposal for a new structure for GNSO Council consideration by ICANN61**

WHEREAS:

1. The GNSO Council adopted the charter for a Cross Community Working Group to discuss Internet governance (CCWG-IG) issues affecting ICANN and make recommendations to the chartering organizations on these issues on 15 October 2014, and as such became a Chartering Organization.
2. The GNSO Council adopted the "Uniform Framework of Principles and Recommendations for Cross Community Working Groups" (CCWG Framework) in October 2016. The CCWG Framework details the lifecycle of a CCWG including initiation, operation, decision-making, and closure, and the GNSO Council has observed that the CCWG-IG, whose formation predated the adoption of the CCWG Framework, does not follow this lifecycle or some of the principles outlined in the CCWG Framework.
3. The GNSO Council recognizes the importance of a continued discussion of the topic of Internet governance within an ICANN context, and the continued participation by the GNSO in this discussion.
4. The GNSO Council has shared its concerns with the ccNSO Council and representatives of other SO/ACs on the current scope of the CCWG-IG and the appropriate vehicle through which ICANN SO/ACs may continue to participate in Internet governance discussions within the ICANN context.
5. During its meeting on 7 November 2016, the GNSO Council confirmed it would continue to participate as a Chartering Organization for the CCWG-IG. However, this participation was conditioned upon a comprehensive review of the CCWG-IG Charter by the CCWG-IG, in accordance with the CCWG Framework, including the possibility that another vehicle may be more suitable for cross community discussions on the topic of Internet governance ([http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/uniform-framework-principles-recommendations-16sep16-en.pdf)](http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/uniform-framework-principles-recommendations-16sep16-en.pdf%29).
6. On 11 March 2017, the CCWG-IG submitted a revised charter to the GNSO Council (<https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/council/2017-March/019819.html>) for its consideration.
7. The GNSO Council reviewed the charter and discussed it during a number of meetings as well as in its meetings with the ccNSO Council. These discussions highlighted remaining concerns over the group’s compliance with the CCWG Framework as well as its accountability vis-à-vis the Chartering Organizations.
8. During ICANN 59 in Johannesburg, the CCWG-IG held a face-to-face meeting that included members of the ICANN Board’s Internet Governance Committee. There was discussion about the future of the group, challenges with the ongoing nature of Internet Governance, and the constraints imposed by the community-developed requirements for CCWG structures. Members from multiple SOs and ACs recognized the challenges and generally agreed that a CCWG is not a required vehicle for the important and legitimate work of the group, provided the group is able to continue its engagement with adequate ICANN support and resources and there is no gap between the retirement of the CCWG-IG and the establishment of its successor.

Resolved,

1. The GNSO Council expresses its gratitude to the CCWG-IG for its work in ensuring that discussions on Internet governance take place within the ICANN context.
2. The GNSO Council emphasizes that it fully recognizes the importance of the continued involvement of the ICANN community in Internet governance-related activities that are appropriate to ICANN’s mission.
3. The GNSO Council requests that members of the CCWG-IG and others interested parties come together to explore a framework / model that more fully addresses the concerns that have been expressed by the GNSO Council, and submit this framework / model to the GNSO Council for its consideration at the Council meeting mid-way between ICANN 60 and ICANN 61 (insert date if we have one, January or February seem appropriate).
4. To facilitate the work as requested under Resolved clause #3, allowing for a reasonable time to coordinate with other SOs and ACs to develop a new structure, and to ensure there is no gap between the retirement of the CCWG-IC and the establishment of its successor group, the GNSO Council shall withdraw as a Chartering Organization from the CCWG-IG effective at the conclusion of ICANN 61 in San Juan, expecting that a replacement structure will be ready for approval by the Council at that time.
5. The GNSO Council emphasizes that its planned withdrawal as a Chartering Organization from the CCWG-IG reflects solely the Council’s conclusion that, based on the reports it has received from the CCWG-IG, a CCWG is not an appropriate vehicle for the CCWG-IG’s work, and the GNSO Council’s decision on this narrow point is not intended to prevent any GNSO community members who have been participating in the CCWG-IG from continuing to participate in the group’s activities should they decide to do so.
6. The GNSO Council requests that the GNSO Secretariat communicate this decision to the CCWG-IG and the other Chartering Organizations.