#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 4:42:07 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 11:37:55 PM
Time Spent: 06:55:47
IP Address: 91.10.22.134

PAGE 1

Q1: **What is your name?**	Wolf-Ulrich Knoben

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 - Commercial Stakeholder Group - Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers

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	Support adoption
GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process	Support adoption
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
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
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?	Yes
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
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
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

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.

The ISPCP constituency is in support of this Initial Report.