## **Draft Recommendation 15**

À

**Draft Recommendation 15** 

That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP.

| Working Party (initial assessment of feasibility and usefulness): | CG - Accept as is.  |
|---|---|
| Staff (initial assessment of feasibility and usefulness):         | Accept As-Is Accept With modification Reject Rationale: MK: Accept as-is.       |
| Basis for Assessment:   |   |
| Work in Progress:   | In progress, see also Policy & Implementation recommendations re. Expedited PDP |
| Expected Completion Date for Work in Progress:                    | Ongoing [to be expanded to include phases, timing and deliverables]             |
| Milestones:   |   |
| Responsibility:   | GNSO Council/Staff  |

## **Public Comments Received**

| C o m m e nt # | Submitted<br>By  | Affiliation                                 | Comment  |  |  |
|----------------|--|---|--|--|--|
|                | Recommendation 15 (Continuous Development): That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP. |   |  |  |  |
| 19             | Paul Diaz  | gTLD<br>Registries<br>Stakehold<br>er Group | (Support)  |  |  |
| 56             | Osvaldo<br>Novoa   | ISPCP                                       | (Support) Concerns over the timeliness of the PDP were raised within the ATRT2 GNSO PDP Evaluation study in 2013 with recognition of the need to balance thoroughness and speed. It is disappointing that such little headway has been made on such an important issue. The ISPCP fully supports the need to address this with some urgency.   |  |  |
| 120            | Will Hudson  | Google                                      | If adopted would add greater accountability to the policy development process, increase metrics-driven policy decisions, and increase the efficacy of the process by leveraging the services of professional moderators, especially in circumstances where working group members may be conflicted. Additionally, we believe it is crucial that the GAC be involved earlier in the process.                |  |  |
| 177            | Laura<br>Covington, J.<br>Scott Evans,<br>Marie Pattullo   | Business<br>Constitue<br>ncy                | We agree that the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP noting that it is a question of doing it right: neither too fast nor unnecessarily (nor artificially) slow. As such the BC is concerned that rather than reducing complexity, some of the Recommendations set out in the Draft Report may serve to complicate the PDP process even further. |  |  |
| 252            | Greg Shatan  | IPC   | (Support) While certain expediency measures employed on a trial basis, such as inclusion of a draft Charter into an Issues Report, have caused initial confusion within the community, they have also made a notable impact on improving timeliness of policy development.   |  |  |
| 298            | Amr Elsadr   |   | The GNSO Policy and Implementation WG has already recommended the creation of three new processes including the GNSO Guidance Process and Expedited PDP (currently under board review and consideration) as well as the GNSO Input Process, which has been included in the updated GNSO Operating Procedures.  |  |  |
| 326            | Olivier<br>Crepin-<br>Leblond  | ALAC  | (Support) The ALAC supports this recommendation.   |  |  |