

This document contains respondents between 4 and 4 inclusive.

1. Do you support the idea of placing relevant stakeholders at the heart of the policy advisory process?

Yes

No

2. Do you support the PAB's proposal for the creation of issues groups to develop policy recommendations in response to stakeholder proposals?

Yes

No

3. Do you agree with the PAB's outline for issues groups (open membership, stakeholder led, time-limited, with a requirement to prepare an impact assessment, and working by consensus)?

Yes

No

Do you have any comments on the way that issues groups might work?

Primarily online but with the option of occasional face to face meetings if thought necessary.

4. What mechanism should there be for selecting members of issues groups?

In particular, how might we ensure effective participation from Nominet members to bring necessary expertise into the discussions?

I feel that most issues groups should be open to all interested parties to participate online. If a face to face meeting is thought beneficial then some kind of selection procedure will be necessary. I'd suggest identifying categories of participant (Nominet member, Registrar, Govt bod, Business bod, IP lawyers, etc - as relevant to the issue in hand) and asking each constituency to nominate a rep.

I have no idea how Nominet members in particular are going to be motivated to participate.

5. Do you agree that "permanent" groups might be needed in certain cases?

Yes

No

What issues might benefit from this approach?

Relationships with other Registries, with particular reference to any rule changes that may be introduced by Nominet or another Registry.

Intellectual Property Rights issues/DRS.

Any issues that involve possible changes in the law of the land/relationship with regulatory authorities.

6. Do you agree that “closed groups” (i.e. groups with invited membership) should be set up when this is necessary?

- Yes
 No

What issues might benefit from this approach?

Phishing and other related (possibly) criminal activity.

Stance towards pornography with particular reference to child pornography.

In general any issue that could include the participation of people/bodies who require an element of discretion as to what is being discussed/planned.

7. Do you agree that a standing committee is necessary to provide some form of independent assessment of, and support for, the issues groups?

- Yes
 No

8. Do you agree that the tasks identified by the PAB for the standing committee are appropriate?

- Yes
 No

9. Do you agree with the range of stakeholders identified by the PAB for the membership of the standing committee?

- Yes
 No

How should members of the standing committee be identified?

In particular, how should Nominet member participation of the standing committee be chosen, bearing in mind the importance of ensuring balance representation?

Members of the Standing Committee external to Nominet should be appointed by the Board.

Nominet members should be 50% appointed (hopefully including one rep of a large Registrar) and 50% elected on a OMOV basis.

10. Do you support the proposal for an enhanced secretariat taking an active role in the standing committee of stakeholders and for engaging with external stakeholders?

- Yes
 No

11. Do you have any further comments on the proposed new policy advisory process?

Make it happen sooner rather than later?

12. Please give us your contact details

Name

Hazel Pegg

Company name/Organisation name

Glastonbury Online Ltd