

This document contains respondents between 3 and 3 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

**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?**

Membership of issues groups must be voluntary - if there is any coercion they will not work. Once the need for the issues group is established a call for participation should be circulated and volunteers should be selected from responses on a random basis. The groups should have a maximum size (TBD - maybe 12 or so?) and no one person or organisation (Nominet aside) should be represented on more than 2 groups at any one time.

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

- Yes
- No

**What issues might benefit from this approach?**

- 1. Dispute resolution
- 2. Intellectual property issues
- 3. SLD management

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

- Yes
- No

**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?**

The standing committee is unnecessary.

**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?**

It seems unwieldy in comparison to the current system, which has a very simple single point of contact for all interested parties (ie. the PAB). If I have a concern about policy I raise it with the PAB who debate it (presumably) and then make a recommendation - swift and uncomplicated. The reason for the change doesn't seem clear or compelling. Is something so inherently wrong with the current PAB system that it needs replacing?

**12. Please give us your contact details**

Name

Pete Houston

Company name/Organisation name

Openstrike