

## Questions to the GAC

- Is the advice which the GAC makes coherent? We've seen that the GAC considers almost anything to be advice but the Bylaws do seem to require certain steps to be taken, even if there is no definition of 'advice'.

- Is GAC advice adequately dealt with by the Board? The answer seems to be 'no'. Why is this? What can be done to improve this state of affairs given that there is already a JWG working on the matter?

- Why has the GAC never initiated a PDP on public policy issues even though it is empowered in the Bylaws to do so? Does this mean the GAC is purely reactive to policy issues arising elsewhere in ICANN?

- How significant is the issue of sovereignty as a limitation on GAC effectiveness?

- Which examples of problematic or positive interactions between the GAC and the Board/ICANN constituencies would we like Berkman or ourselves to explore in more detail?

- Are the steps which the GAC is taking to engage other ICANN constituencies directly on public policy issues 'constitutional'? Or are they effective evolutionary contribution to ICANN's policy processes?

- Should the GAC be empowered to make its advice available to other ICANN constituencies horizontally or only vertically through the Board?

- Do we think changes to the Bylaws are needed to improve the GAC's effectiveness as a public policy adviser?

- Does the work of the JWG in reviewing the role the GAC meet ICANN's commitment in the AoC 'to ensure that the

outcomes of its decision-making will reflect the public interest and be accountable to all stakeholders by...(b) assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC and its interaction with the Board and making recommendations for improvement...'?