CCWG on Enhancing ICANN Accountability
Working Party 1: Community Empowerment | Mechanisms Comparison Table (v1 – 20 March 2015)

This table is a rough start at trying to compare the various Mechanisms prepared by WP1 on a number of dimensions. It has not been reviewed by WP1 and does not represent anything other than the Rapporteur's initial effort to try and understand what indicators to compare the mechanisms on and how they measure up against these.

Quality/Descriptor		Structure					Process	
		Permanent CCWG	Community Council	Supervisory Board	Statutory Delegates	Statutory Members	Existing SO/AC	Community Veto
From the "Assessment Sheet" (definitions as per that sheet)								
1	Transparency	High	High	High	Variable	Variable	Moderate	Moderate
2	Overall simplicity	Moderate	Moderate				High	
3	Synergy	Moderate	Moderate		Low/moderate	Low/moderate	Moderate	
4	Independence	Moderate/High	Moderate/High	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Low	Low
5	Consultation	Moderate	Moderate	Low/Moderate	Unknown	Unknown	Low/Moderate	Unknown
6	Stakeholder breadth	High	High	High	High	High	High	
7	Mitigates capture						Low	
From the "Assessment sheet" (contested) (defs as per that sheet)								
8	Legitimacy	Moderate						
9	Cost to operate	Moderate	Moderate	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Low	Low
10	Acceptability (recognition)	Moderate					Moderate	
Rapporteur's suggestions								
11	Scale of structural change of/in ICANN required	Moderate	Moderate	High	High	High	Low	Low
12	Involves / requires cross-community deliberation?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Possible	Possible	No	No
13	Legally plausible (to form the mechanism – not that it could be empowered)?	Unknown	Yes	Unknown	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unknown
14	Participants required?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Possible	Possible	No	No
15	Able to incorporate constituencies outside the existing ICANN SO/AC/etc?	No	Yes	Yes	Possible	Possible	No	Unlikely
16								