|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question # | Question | Sub-question | ISPCP Input | P&I WG Draft Response |
| **1** | **What guidance do the ICANN core values (Bylaws Article 1, Sec. 2) directly provide with regard to policy development work and policy implementation efforts? (e.g., multi-stakeholder participation).**  |  | **To our understanding, this article makes reference on how policy development work (4., 7., 11.) should be worked on. There’s 1 hint (8.) on implementation: « …applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.”** **The WG should discuss whether this covers the requirements satisfactorily.** | **Input noted.**  |
| **2** | **What guidance do other ICANN core values provide that relate indirectly to policy development and policy implementation? (e.g., effective and timely process).**  |  |  **As outlined under the article the core values are expressed in very general terms. As usual in these cases there is room to understand indirect guidance to policy development and policy implementation being associated with some of the terms used – depending on where the reader is coming from.** **E.g. core value 9. Elaborates on « acting » which includes « policy making and implementation ».** | **Input noted.**  |
| **3** | **“Questions for Discussion” contained in the Policy versus Implementation Draft Framework prepared by ICANN staff. (See,** [**http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/policy-implementation-31jan13-en.htm**](http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/policy-implementation-31jan13-en.htm)**).**  |  |  **In general agree to the existing separation of policy development (GNSO) and implementation (staff) but see potential for improvements regarding the communication during the implementation phase. Whether a mandatory community implementation review team would be the best solution depends on the various PDP subjects and the parties concerned. Potential benefits of such a model should be investigated by the WG.** | **Input noted. The model of a mandatory community implementation review team to be investigated.** |
| **4** | **What lessons can be learned from past experience?**  |  |  |  |
|  **4a** |  | **What are the consequences of action being considered “policy” vs. “implementation”?**  | **Consequences could be found in the responsibilities allocated (see [response to Question] 3).** |  |
|  **4b** |  | **Does it matter if something is “policy” or “implementation”? If so, why?**  | **Maybe regarding responsibilities and legal consequences.** | **See Q3 above** |
|  **4c** |  | **Under what circumstances, if any, should the GNSO Council make recommendations or state positions to the Board on matters of policy and implementation as a representative of the GNSO as a whole?**  | **Only in cases the GNSO community and their respective Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies have agreed to. Details to be discussed.** | **Under discussion in relation to the proposed PGP & PIP** |
|  **4d** |  | **How do we avoid the current morass of outcome-derived labeling (i.e., I will call this “policy” because I want certain consequences or “handling instructions” to be attached to it?)**  | **Clear definitions are necessary.** | **WG has developed working definitions** |
| **7** | **What is the process by which this identification, analysis, review and approval work is done?** |  |  |  |
|  **7a** |  | **How are “policy and implementation” issues first identified (before, during and after implementation)?**  | **Before and during.** | **Under discussion**  |
|  **7b** |  | **What is the role of the GNSO in implementation?**  | **- Readjustments of policies which appear hardly to [be] implement[ed]** **- Check against the policies intended for implement[ation]** | **Under discussion** |
|  **7c** |  | **In order to maintain the multi-stakeholder process, once policy moves to implementation, how should the community be involved in a way that is meaningful and effective?**  | **e.g. public comment periods after certain milestones TBD** | **To be discussed** |
|  **7d** |  | **Should policy staff be involved through the implementation process to facilitate continuity of the multi-stakeholder process that already occurred?**  | **As long as the expert knowledge related to the policies already worked out is needed policy staff should definitely included.** | **Input noted** |