

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 be considered a trend.
 - 50% (with some discretion) or more in favour of an option should be 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.