Draft compilation of trends in the GAC comments from Buenos Aires for the Paris meeting of the CCWG

15 July 2015
Background and definitions

• There were a total of 30 respondents.
• Not all respondents replied to all questions.
  • % are therefore calculated per question.
• Not all responses could be qualified as trends. This in no
  implies that those responses are invalid or less worthy of
  consideration.
• Classification
  • 20% (with some discretion) or more in favour of an option should me
    considered a trend.
  • 50% (with some discretion) or more in favour of an option should me
    considered a major trend.
Process

• Staff analyzed and classified all responses.
• Those categories representing more than 20% of responses are presented in this document.

• Notes
  • CEM = Community Empowerment Mechanism
  • CEM + = CEM + CSC and IFR
Question 1: How will public policy issues be dealt with in the enhanced accountability framework?

• 97% responded to this question.

• Major Trends
  • 52% of those supported the status quo of GAC advice to the Board.

• Trends
  • None

• Notes
  • Answers to the next questions added to this in considering how the GAC should participate in Community Empowerment Mechanisms (see next slides).
Question 2: What role does GAC and its members wish to have in the new framework so that it can provide advice on public policy issues?

• 90% responded to this question.

• Major Trends
  • 67% of those recommended that the GAC should maintain its current role post transition

• Trends
  • 19% responded that the GAC should participate in the CEM via non-voting liaisons.

• Notes
  • drafting note - many similarities to first question noted by respondents - some replies difficult to qualify.
  • Answers to the next questions added to this in considering how the GAC should participate in Community Empowerment Mechanisms (see next slides).
Question 3: Does GAC want to continue to have an advisory role (as of today) with respect to the ICANN Board?

• 97% responded to this question.

• Major Trends
  • 79% of those supported that the GAC should continue to only have an advisory role as it is currently defined.

• Trends
  • None

• Notes
  • None
Question 4: Does the GAC want to participate in a membership-based community empowerment mechanism?

• 97% responded to this question.

• Major Trends
  • 48% did not support participating in the CEM.

• Trends
  • 28% had no comment on this question.
  • 28% responded that not supporting this option at this time did not preclude possible future participation in CEM.
  • 21% Supported non-voting liaisons to the CEM (which would include the CSC and IFR)

• Notes
  • It seems that some respondents did not consider non-voting liaisons complete participation in the CEM.
Question 5: Does GAC wish to exercise any of the proposed community powers with regard to ICANN, and if so which ones; and how to participate?

• 93% responded to this question.

• Major Trends
  • None

• Trends
  • 36% supported this (many without any details about how to do so)
  • 32% had no comment
  • 29% Did not support this.
  • 29% supported liaisons to the CEM (including CSC and IFR)
  • 29% Noted that if there was not support to do so currently this did not preclude possible future participation.
  • 21% recommended that GAC advice to the CEM should be treated as GAC advice to the Board.

• Notes
  • No clear consensus – Pro, Con and NC essentially cancel themselves out.
Question 6: In what ways would the proposed improvements to IRP be satisfactory for public policy and Governments’ needs, e.g. in terms of increasing transparency, increasing focus on process and/or substance, binding/non-binding nature, etc.?

• 93% responded to this question.

• Major Trends
  • 63% of those supported an improved IRP. The basis for these improvements, if present, varied significantly.

• Trends
  • 20% of respondents had no comments.

• Notes
  • Responses varied significantly making it difficult to categorize these
  • Difficult to identify any major consensus beyond general support for an improved IRP.
Summary

• Major trends
  • GAC should maintain its role of providing advice to the ICANN Board on public policy matters under the current arrangements.
  • Should not completely participate in the CEM+ at this time.
  • General support for an improved IRP but significant divergence on how to improve it.

• Trends
  • GAC should reserve the right to participate in the CEM +, in a form to be determined, at a later date.
  • Support for non-voting liaisons to the CEM (including the CWG CSC and IFR)
  • GAC should provide advice to the CEM + which should be handled with the same requirements as GAC advice is handled by the ICANN Board.
End of presentation

Thank you.