Draft compilation of major trends in the CWG Public Consultation

21 May 2015

Response types

- 44 responses were received as of the deadline. These included:
  - CCTLD - 11
  - ALAC/Civil Society/Academia - 10
  - GNSO/Private sector - 9
  - No affiliation - 6
  - Technical/Ecosystem - 5
  - Government - 3

Regional breakdown of responses

- Europe/Middle East - 11
- Non-Applicable - 11
- Asia/Asia Pacific - 9
- North America - 8
- Africa - 3
- Latin America - 2

Process

- This is only an initial assessment of the replies
- Staff analyzed and classified these into 46 categories based on sections of the 2nd draft
- Those categories representing more than 10% of responses are presented in this document.
- Each slide is color coded, Green suggests general support and Orange suggests there is no general support or that there are issues.

IFRT

- General concept of the IFRT 48% support vs 2% against
- Specific recommendations for implementation of the IFRT 18% support vs 25% against.
  - Many of the rejections were from registry operators who did not agree with the proposed composition (seeking more ccTLD representation).

CSC

- 41% support vs 7% against
  - Several questions about where the CSC would be housed.

PTI Model

- 36% support vs 32% against.
  - Most of the against do not want IFO separated from ICANN. Many of these hinted that they could live with it under certain circumstances and provided input on other parts of the proposal.
  - A minority of the against reject the proposed separation because they seek to have PTI completely independent of ICANN.

NTIA Authorization Role

- 23% support with some concerns but no outright rejections.

Composition of the PTI Board as an 'insider' Board

- 23% support vs 25% against
  - As noted in the previous slide many of those rejecting the PTI concept would acquiesce with an ICANN selected, "insider", Board for PTI for accountability reasons.
  - Most want small Board
  - Most of those against want some or all multistakeholder selected Board members for the PTI Board

Root Zone Maintainer role

- 21% of respondents had concerns about the transition of the RZMaintainer role given there is no information available about this. Many concerned that this could prevent the transition (**Note that this does not affect CWG proposal given it is outside the scope of the CWG**).

Jurisdiction of PTI incorporation

- 16% of respondents had concerns about the jurisdiction of incorporation of PTI and many suggested a neutral jurisdiction.
- A majority of respondents discussed the incorporation of PTI in the USA as a fact without making any statement that this was a requirement.

Escalation Mechanisms

- 16% of respondents supported the proposed escalation mechanisms vs 2% against.

PTI Budget

- 14% of respondents supported budget transparency for the PTI with none against.
- Note - 7% of respondents were recommending that the CWG implement a mechanism to insure PTI funding beyond annual budget cycle commitments inICANN.

Linkage between the proposals for the three communities

- 14% of respondents have concerns that there was no clear linkage between the three proposals.

Proposed separation Mechanisms

- 2% of respondents supported the proposed separation mechanism while 14% were against. Many of those against were concerned that there was not enough information available or were seeking lower thresholds.

Public Comment on Completed Proposal

- 11% of respondents formally requested a public consultation on the completed proposal which would include details of the linkage with the CCWG proposal. Many suggesting that this public consultation should be held simultaneously with the next CCWG public consultation.
  - Note - most respondents noted that they could not properly comment on the proposal because it was incomplete or made this comment regarding specific sections of the proposal.
  - Note – many complaints that the consultation period was too short and did not provide translated materials.

Updating of SLEs prior to transition

- 11% of respondents in favour vs 11% against.
- Responses seem quite polarized on this point.
- Several respondents who did not respond on this point noted that given the user community satisfaction with the current IFO that the CWG should aim to change as little operational elements as possible for the transition.

End of presentation

Thank you.