**P&I WG Initial Report Public Comment Survey – Gomes edits – 16 Jan 15**

Text edits are redlined.

Introduction

Mainly as a result of discussions stemming from implementation related issues of the new generic Top-Level Doman (gTLD) program, there has been an increased focus on which topics call for policy and which call for implementation work, including which processes should be used, at what time and how issues which are the subject of diverging opinions during the implementation process should be acted upon. Following several discussions, including the publication of a staff discussion paper and a community session during the ICANN meeting in Beijing in April 2013, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council decided in July 2013 to form a Working Group (WG) which was tasked to provide the GNSO Council with a set of recommendations on a number of questions that specifically relate to policy and implementation in a GNSO context. The WG has now published its Initial Report for community input. To faciliate public comments, the WG has developed this survey to facilitate input and feedback on the Initial Report and its recommendations. Please review the Initial Report before completing the survey below.

Note that each survey item contains a box for written comments. Also note that public comments may be submitted in a more traditional manner using a template that is linked on the public comment page. The WG requests that commenters complete the survey first, entering in the survey as applicable. If additional comments are desired, please use the template to submit those.

Item 2, Affiliation

I suggest we provide a drop down box on this if possible. If not possible, we should show as many organizational names as possible plus an other option.

Item 7

**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)?**

Header for comment box: “Please provide further details on the conditions that should be met”

I know that we asked commenters to read the Initial Report and hopeful some will. But we can count on many not doing that or just not wanting to take the time to go back to the report to see the descriptions of the GIP, GGP or EPDP. Therefore I think it would be a good idea to include abbreviated descriptions of these at appropriate place for each in the survey.

Item 11

“**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 EPDP or if there is no supermajority support, the GGP Final Report fails?**”

We should make a PDF version of the survey available so that it will be easier for people to get feedback from their groups as applicable.