To: Keith Drazek & RySG Members

On behalf of the GNSO Policy & Implementation WG we want to thank you for your response to the policy and implementation questions that you submitted in January of this year. The purpose of this communication is to give you a brief status report with regard to how the WG is using your input.

All of your input has been reviewed and is being considered as the WG deliberates on tasks to which it is related. Here are a few examples how your input is being applied or will be applied going forward:

* The WG is in agreement with the RySG statement that “Accountability does not end with policy development but continues through policy implementation efforts and follow-up evaluation.” In fact we have included the following as one of the principles underlying our work: “Implementation should be regarded as an integral and continuing part of the process rather than an administrative follow-on, and should be seen as a process that allows for dialogue and collaboration between those implementing the policy and those that developed it and/or are affected by the implementation.”
* In the next few weeks, the WG expects to start discussing the question about what guidance ICANN core values provide that relate to policy development and policy implementation so the RySG input in response to that question will be very useful in that regard. While all of your input on this question is pertinent, we particular appreciate the importance of your statement that “the process of seeking input from all impacted parties should not be bypassed because ICANN staff or the ICANN Board determine that a matter must be resolved in a more timely manner than the process allows.”
* The WG has not yet formulated any specific recommendations regarding the level of implementation detail that should be part of the PDP recommendations although the issue has been part of many other discussions we have had and the factors provided by the RySG will be very relevant when we get to that point.
* For the question “Does it matter if something is “policy” or “implementation”?”, regarding the roles of policy developers and policy implementers, the WG has come to the same conclusion as the RySG that “neither party functions independent of the other”.
* The WG has reached tentative consensus on this RySG point: “The methodologies may differ for policy development than for policy implementation, but ultimately the policy development body as a whole must confirm that policy is implemented as designed and intended.”
* The WG wants to particularly thank the RySG for this contribution: “It should not be a surprise when policy and implementation issues are confronted during the implementation process. Having established guidelines for dealing with such situations would be very helpful. Proposed guidelines would be a very helpful deliverable from the P&I WG for consideration by the broader community.” We have not yet reached the point where we will work on possible guidelines but it is included in our work plan.

Thanks again for your responsiveness. You were one of only three groups that provided feedback so we appreciate that very much.

Please continue to provide us input through your representative(s) on the WG and in response to future requests for comments.

Sincerely,

J. Scott Evans & Chuck Gomes (Co-Chairs), Michael Graham & Olévié Kouami (Co-Vice-Chairs)