

To: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben and ISPCP Constituency 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 May 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:

- With regard to the ISPCP statement that 'Clear definitions are necessary', one of the first tasks that the WG undertook was to identify key terms, develop definitions of key them, and seek community feedback. The list of definitions will be visited again after we come closer to finishing our work.
- The WG has briefly discussed whether Implementation Review Teams (IRTs) should be required; early WG discussions are in line with the ISPCP input, i.e., that it may depend 'on the various PDP subjects and the parties concerned'. We are not yet at the stage of developing final recommendations so this will be considered further in the future.
- Although we have not yet finalized our response as to whether or not it matters whether an issue is 'policy' or 'implementation', we have developed some proposed principles that would help to answer that question and as we move to finalize our answer we will definitely consider your statement that it might matter 'regarding responsibilities and legal consequences'.
- We have spent quite a bit of time recently talking about '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?' The issue of Council voting thresholds comes into play in this regard and that is presently part of a very lively discussion. The ISPCP input that this should happen 'Only in cases the GNSO community and their respective Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies have agreed to' has been advocated very strongly in the WG.
- Consistent with ISPCP input, the WG has pretty much concluded that the GNSO should continue to be involved throughout the implementation process including but not limited to the two examples cited by the ISPCP examples, i.e., when policy adjustments are needed and in making sure that policies are implemented as intended.

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)