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 Recommendations Report for community input. To facilitate public comments, the WG has developed this survey to facilitate input and feedback on the Initial Recommendations Report and its recommendations. Please review the Initial Recommendations Report before completing the survey below (see http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-initial-recommendations-19jan15-en.pdf).

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.

*1. What is your name?

*2. 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	

Other (please specify)

3. Are you completing this survey on behalf of your group? If yes, please specify which group if different from your listed affiliation.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If yes, please specify which group if different from your listed affiliation.

Working Definitions & Principles

4. 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.

- ◯ Not helpful
- ◯ Somewhat helpful
- ◯ Helpful
- ◯ Very helpful
- ◯ No opinion

If you have responsed not helpful or somewhat helpful, please provide any suggestions you have to improve these definitions here.

5. 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
- ◯ Yes, but taking into account the comments / proposed edits outlined in the comment box.
- ◯ No
- ◯ No opinion

Please provide your comments / proposed edits.

Proposed Additional New GNSO Processes

6. 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.

	Do not support adoption (please outline reasons below)	Would support adoption if changes as outlined below are made	Support adoption	No opinion
GNSO Input Process	◯	◯	◯	◯
GNSO Guidance Process	◯	◯	◯	◯
GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process	◯	◯	◯	◯

Please provide further details if you have responsed 'do not support adoption' or 'would support adoption if changes are made'

In relation to these three proposed processes (GNSO Input Process - GIP, GNSO Guidance Process - GGP, GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process - EPDP), the WG identified a number of specific questions which it would like to obtain input on.

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)?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ Yes, but only if the conditions listed below are met
- ◯ No
- ◯ No opinion

Please provide further details on the conditions that should be met

8. 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
- ◯ Yes, but only if the conditions below are met.
- ◯ No
- ◯ No opinion

Please provide further details on the conditions to be met

9. 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
- ◯ Yes if the conditions outlined below are met
- ◯ No
- ◯ No opinion

Please provide further details on the conditions to be met

10. 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
- ◯ Yes if the conditions outlined below are met
- ◯ No
- ◯ No opinion

Please provide further details on the conditions to be met

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?

- ◯ Yes, the same should apply
- ◯ Yes if the conditions outlined below are met
- ◯ No, if there is no supermajority support, the GGP Final Report fails
- ◯ No opinion

Please provide further details on the conditions to be met

12. 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
- ◯ Yes if the conditions outlined below are met
- ◯ No
- ◯ No opinion

Please provide further details on the conditions to be met

Implementation Related Recommendations

13. 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
- ◯ Yes, if the conditions outlined below are met.
- ◯ No
- ◯ No opinion

Please provide further details on the conditions to be met

14. 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
- ◯ Yes, but taking into account the comments / proposed edits outlined in the comment box.
- ◯ No
- ◯ No opinion

Please provide your comments / proposed edits.

Other Comments

15. 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.