#12

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 4:55:48 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 9:59:05 PM
Time Spent: Over a week
IP Address: 129.242.250.148

PAGE 1

Q1: **What is your name?**	Amr Elsadr

Q2: **What is your affiliation (e.g. name of ICANN Supporting Organization, Advisory Committee, Stakeholder Group, Constituency, individual)**

	Affiliation
Please select from the drop-down menu	GNSO - Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group

Q3: **Are you completing this survey on behalf of your group? If yes, please specify which group if different from your listed affiliation.**	Yes

PAGE 2: Working Definitions & Principles

Q4: **The Working Group developed a number of working definitions (see section 3 of the Initial Report). Please rate whether you consider these definitions useful in the context of this report.**	Very helpful
Q5: **The Working Group has developed a set of proposed Policy & Implementation Principles (see section 4 of the Initial Report) that it recommends are adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board to guide any future policy and implementation related work. Do you support the adoption of these proposed principles by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board?**	Yes

PAGE 3: Proposed Additional New GNSO Processes

Q6: As outlined in section 5 of the Initial Report, the WG recommends the creation of three new GNSO processes, namely a GNSO Input Process, a GNSO Guidance Process and a GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process. Please rate each of these processes.

GNSO Input Process	Support adoption
GNSO Guidance Process	Would support adoption if changes as outlined below are made
GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process	Would support adoption if changes as outlined below are made

Please provide further details if you have responsed 'do not support adoption' or 'would support adoption if changes are made'

Support of the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) is provisional to the GNSO Council voting threshold to initiate such a process being a supermajority vote in favor of initiation of a GGP. This is important in order to keep the voting threshold low enough for a minority of GNSO Council members to reject initiation of a GGP in favor of a more exhaustive traditional Policy Development Process, should such a decision be deemed to be necessary. Furthermore, A GGP is not intended to be used when the expected outcome may result in new contractual obligations to contracted parties. Similarly, the NCSG feels it is important that the prerequisites for not using a GGP explicitly include that there will also be no new obligations (contractual or otherwise) on registrants. Examples of obligations on registrants that may not require changes made to contracts between ICANN and registries or registrars include changes to the UDRP or URS. Such changes should be made using another process, preferably a traditional PDP. Support of the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) is provisional to the same change in voting threshold being required for initiation of the process as the GGP, and for the same reasons. Additionally, Annex E #4 of the report states that "At the request of any Council member duly and timely submitted and seconded as a motion, the Council may initiate the EPDP by a Supermajority vote of the Council in favor of initiating the EPDP. A motion which fails to carry a Supermajority vote of Council may be resubmitted at the same Council meeting as a motion to initiate a GNSO Guidance Process". In the event that a vote confirming the initiation of an EPDP fails, it would be necessary for the voting threshold required to initiate a GGP be a supermajority vote in favor, also for the reasons mentioned above. Furthermore, the NCSG believes that an EPDP should not be used to reopen a policy that had previously been deliberated upon, and rejected. To reconvene a discussion on a previously rejected policy, an issue scoping phase of a PDP (not included in the EPDP) should be included to scope the policy issue in order to determine wether or not there are new circumstances that have been recognized that require that a policy issue be revisited and reversed. This additional criteria for applicability does not conflict with those already being recommended in Annex E of the report.

Q7: In the Initial Report the WG recommends that Advisory Committees and the Board could request a GGP but only the GNSO Council would have the authority to actually initiate a GGP. Should an Advisory Committee or the Board have the ability to initiate a GGP (similar to their ability to do so for a policy development process - i.e. the GNSO Council would be required to commence a GGP)?	No, Please provide further details on the conditions that should be met The NCSG believes that the ICANN Board and Advisory Committees should be free to make requests to the GNSO in any way and format they see fit regarding questions on gTLD policies, including what processes they believe appropriate for use in response to their requests. These would ideally be supported by their reasons in requesting a specific process be used. However, as suggested in the initial report's recommendations, the GNSO Council should maintain the authority to make the final choice of complying with or rejecting the suggested process being used in favor of another process the Council believes is more appropriate.
Q8: For an EPDP, it is currently proposed that only the GNSO Council can initiate this process, although an AC/Board could request the GNSO Council to consider doing so. Do you agree?	Yes, Please provide further details on the conditions to be met The same reasons provided in the answer to question 7 apply here.
Q9: The proposed voting threshold for initiating a GGP is the same as for initiating a PDP (an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House). Do you agree?	No, Please provide further details on the conditions to be met The voting threshold for initiating a GGP should be higher than that required to initiate a PDP, in order to enable a minority of councillors to require a more traditional and exhaustive PDP be launched to answer a question if deemed appropriate. The NCSG suggests a supermajority vote of the whole council be required to initiate a GGP. In creating new processes that will allow the GNSO and GNSO Council the flexibility to manage their work more efficiently, the new processes being suggested should not be created as procedural barriers prohibiting initiation of PDPs when/if necessary, but rather additional tools at the disposal of the GNSO to assist in carrying out its duties only when the circumstances are appropriate.
Q10: The proposed voting threshold for approving a GGP is a supermajority vote of the GNSO Council. Do you agree?	Yes

Q11: **For a PDP vote, if these are not adopted by the GNSO Council by a supermajority vote as defined for the GNSO Council, there is a lower threshold for the Board to overturn these – should the same apply for the GGP or if there is no supermajority support, the GGP Final Report fails?**	No, if there is no supermajority support, the GGP Final Report fails , Please provide further details on the conditions to be met A possible reason why a supermajority of the GNSO Council might not support the recommendations made using a GGP may be that new contractual obligations for contracted parties may indeed be necessary, or that new obligations are identified for registrants as a result of the GGP recommendations. This would require another process be used. The ICANN board should be required to respect the GNSO Council's decision in such an event.
Q12: **Termination of a GGP – it is proposed that a simple majority Council vote as defined in GNSO procedures is sufficient to terminate a GGP prior to delivery of the Final Report (compared to a supermajority vote that applies in the case of the PDP). Do you agree?**	Yes

PAGE 4: Implementation Related Recommendations

Q13: **The Working Group recommends that the PDP Manual be modified to require the creation of an Implementation Review Team following the adoption of PDP recommendations by the ICANN Board, but allow the GNSO Council the flexibility to not create an IRT in exceptional circumstances (e.g. if another IRT is already in place that could deal with the PDP recommendations). Do you agree?**	Yes, Please provide further details on the conditions to be met A decision to not create an IRT should be limited to the GNSO Council, and not the ICANN Board. In consideration of not creating a new IRT, but instead adding to the implementation review work to an existing IRT, the GNSO Council should be required to consider the composition of the existing IRT, and wether its membership includes all those required for the new policy implementation process. This should also take into consideration stakeholder group/constituency representation.

Q14: **The WG recommends that the principles as outlined in Annex H of the Initial Report are followed as part of the creation as well as operation of IRTs. Do you support the adoption of these proposed principles?**	Yes, but taking into account the comments / proposed edits outlined in the comment box. , Please provide your comments / proposed edits. With respect to Annex H, Section V(E), in the event that a disagreement between an IRT member and GDD staff prove to be irreconcilable (even after mediation is performed by the Council liaison), the NCSG does not believe that an assessment of a level of consensus among the IRT members is necessary for the Council liaison to raise the issue to the GNSO Council for consideration. A reference for this would be the appeals process in section 3.7 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, in which no such consensus call is required either.

PAGE 5: Other Comments

Q15: **If you have any other comments, proposed edits or questions you would like to put forward to the WG in relation to the Initial Report, please use this comment box to provide that information.**

Annex E, section 4 (on page 69 of the initial report) refers to the ICANN bylaws in Article X, Section 3, paragraphs 9(d) to (f) as a reference for the voting threshold required by the GNSO council for an affirmative vote approving EPDP recommendations. These sections of the bylaws are relevant for approving PDP charters, not recommendations. The NCSG believes Article X, Section 3, paragraphs 9(h) to (l) would be more appropriate in this context.