
ANDREA GLANDON:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all. Welcome to the second webinar of the five mandatory ATLAS III webinars. Today's webinar will cover the introduction to the GNSO. Our presenter today is Steve Chan, GNSO Policy Director. We will not be doing a roll call for this webinar. However, we are taking attendance for the first ten minutes of this call. After that, your participation will not be a valid entry for the required attendance metrics. If you are only on the phone bridge, please join the Zoom Room as soon as possible, as this is an attendance requirement.

We have French and Spanish interpretations for this webinar, so a kind reminder to please state your name when speaking to allow for the interpreter to identify you in other language channels; as well as the transcription purposes. Please also speak in a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretations. All lines will be muted during the presentation and opened for questions and answers at the end of the presentation.

As you have noticed, we are running this webinar on Zoom. The features are similar to Adobe Connect, but in order to view the participants list and the chat pod, please click on the bottom of the screen. You will only be able to see the chat transcript from when you join the call. Nothing prior to that. To raise your hand, please just click on the "raise hand" icon. I will now hand the floor over to Alfredo Calderon, co-chair of the ATLAS III capacity start group. Over to you, Alfredo.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

Thank you, Andrea. This is Alfredo Calderon for the record. Welcome to all of you that are participating in this series of webinars. As you all know, the purpose of these webinars are to bring up to speed everybody that is interested in applying for the ATLAS III summit that is going to be held in Montreal at the beginning of November. The topic we are covering in this webinar deals with the concepts of GNSO will be the person that's going to talk to all of us about this.

I just want to remind everybody that this is the second webinar of a series of five. If you are taking, in case you are taking the LEARN courses, you don' have to participate in the webinars unless you feel that it helps you as well as the courses that are in the ICANN platforms. Having said that, everybody, I guess, knows Steve Chan, he is working with the GNSO and policy development and I'll just let him say something else about himself and proceed to the webinar. Steve, the floor is yours, please go ahead. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks very much, Alfredo and Andrea. So as they both mentioned, my name is Steve Chan. I am part of the GNSO; our generic names supporting organization, their support team. I've been with the GNSO support team for about four and a half years or so, so I'm glad to be here to help provide the introduction to the GNSO. So, thanks for having me. I get the privilege of taking the first person of this and Marika Konings, who is the team lead for the GNSO support team, she will take the second one on Thursday.

So, taking a look at the agenda, just a few items on this. The first will be an introduction to the Generic Names Supporting Organization, or the GNSO. The second item is talking about the policy development process, or the PDP. The third is Q&A, although I don't think we necessarily need to stick to that structure. If you have questions, please go ahead and ask them along the way, and I think we'll take a pause after the first item on the agenda.

So, moving in to the introduction for the GNSO. So there's a number of supporting organizations and advisory committees within the ICANN community, which all make up the multi-stakeholder model. Today we will be concentrating, of course, on the circled community. The Generic Names Supporting Organization. And so the role of the GNSO and what makes their role in the community especially important is that they have the singular and sole responsibility for developing and recommending policy recommendations as a regards to generic top-level domains. And so they have the sole responsibility within the ICANN community to be able to do that. And so that responsibility is derived from the ICANN Bylaws.

So, as noted, they have the sole responsibility for developing recommendations, but sitting above the GNSO is the GNSO council. And they're essentially the decision making body that governs the GNSO. So, when the GNSO develops policy, it would fall to the GNSO council to consider and potentially accept the recommendations as developed by GNSO policy development process working group. So the council itself is a represented structure. It includes 21 counselors from the six different constituencies and stakeholder groups, plus three non-named

community employees. Those combined make up the council. And so we'll look a little more in detail about how the GNSO is structured.

So, as noted at the talk you had at the GNSO council, but within the GNSO council, you have what we call a bi-cameral structure, which means there are two houses and so those two houses play into how voting takes place. In most cases, when things are being voted on, they need to pass by a simple majority. Which means that 50% or greater, each of the two houses must vote in favor of an item. But looking at the two houses, on the left hand side you have the contracted parties house. Which consists of both the registry stakeholder group and the registrar stakeholder group. And each of those two stakeholder groups each have three counselors on the GNSO council.

The right-hand side of this diagram, you have the non-contracted parties house, and that is made up of two stakeholder groups. One is the commercial stakeholder group, and within that there are three constituencies. One is the business constituency, the next is the intellectual property constituency, and the last is the internet service providers and connectivity providers constituency. Also in the non-contracted parties house, you also have the non-commercial constituency, or stakeholder group, sorry. And within that there are two constituencies. The first is the non-commercial users constituency, and the other is the not-for-profit profit upgrades and concerns constituency. And so, collectively, those two stakeholder groups make up the non-contracted parties house.

On the previous slide I had mentioned that there are also three nominating committee appointees for the council. One of those is

appointed to the contracted parties house which we see on the left hand side again. And then there's also one assigned to the non-contracted parties house which is on the right-hand side, and then there is a third nominating committee council that is not assigned to either of the two houses. And as a result they actually do not vote on anything at the council.

In addition, at the council level, you also have liaisons from and to both ALAC and GNSO. And as noted on this diagram they also do not vote.

So, currently, or actually just in general, the GNSO council leadership is comprised of a chair, and then also two vice-chairs. One of each comes from the Contracted Party House and one from the non-Contracted Party House. And so currently, for the chair, we have Keith Drazek and then as vice chair we have Pam Little from the Contracted Party House and then Rafik Dammak from the non-contracted parties house.

So, I think I mentioned that essentially the role of the council is to manage the decision making body for the GNSO. And part of that is serving up the manager of the pulse development process, or the PDP. And so the way that they work is that essentially they meet on a monthly basis. They work via formal motions and those motions must be submitted in ten days advance, and when the meetings do occur on the monthly basis that's when they are considered and are considered for adoption.

So the policy development work itself is generally undertaken in groups, in PDP working groups, and in most cases the PDPs are generally open to anyone who is interested in the subject, though with the recent

expedited policy development process, on the temporary specification there was actually a representative model that was undertaken for that particular working group. But in general, most PDPs within the GNSO are open to anyone who wants to participate.

So, I think I'd like to pause for a brief moment to see if there's any questions on the first part. If not, I'll proceed to talk about the PDP processes off more detail. So I'll just pause for a moment here.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Steve, this is Alfredo Calderon.

STEVE CHAN: Go ahead, Alfredo.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Yes, Steve. My question is regarding the organic grant that you shared with us regarding the liaisons. How influential are the liaisons within the GNSO council?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Alfredo. So, the liaisons to the GNSO council from the ALAC is currently Cheryl Langdon-Orr and I'm actually blanking on the name for the ccNSO liaison because they just joined and were just appointed. But they are invited to every single one of the council meetings. They're on the council mailing list. So, to the extent that if they want to bring up something that's important to them or the organization they represent,

they're free to do so. So, first they can't vote on anything, but to the extent, they have anything they want to bring up, they are more than free to do so, and whatever they bring up, it will be considered by the council in a respectful manner.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Thank you, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Alfredo. Is there any other questions at this time? So, otherwise we'll start discussing the policy development process. Okay. Moving on

So, this is a very high level diagram of the GNSO policy development process. And so I think a good way to think about this is there's three different phases within the policy development process. So the top section is mostly about issue scoping. So, once an organization within the community identifies an issue, that first top line is all about understanding the issue and investigating it. And so that begins with the request at the council level forms an issue report on a certain topic.

And so the responsibility for drafting that issue report falls to ICANN staff, and that issue report is published for public comment. So that public comment period, the second box on that top line, constitutes the first point at which the public is invited to provide their input to the topic. And so you'll see that seeking input from the community is a recurrent theme throughout this process and there's multiple points at which that input is sought from the community.

So, again, along the top of the line, once the issue report is drafted and put up for public comment, that comment of course is taking into account and to the extent and results changed to the issue report. There will be a final issue report that is again drafted by ICANN support staff. And that is presented to the GNSO council for their consideration. And so, what they are considering, then, is whether or not that issue warrants creating and initiating policies resulting in process. And so let's go ahead and assume that they do, which would take us down the downward left section of this diagram.

And, while all these lines are equivalent in length, this downward part of the diagram is where the bulk of the time within the PDP is spent. And so this is where the working group is formed. They do the substantive discussion and debate and analysis of issue. And so, I had mentioned before that in most cases, GNSO working groups have opened participation models, so that anyone who is interested in the topic would be able to participate. And so this is primarily where they would be put in effort and input.

So the biggest milestone, or I guess the first milestone that the working group is working towards is the initial report. And so, that is generally where you would have a set of preliminary recommendations, or even potentially a recommendation that have undergone a consensus call to determine the level of support for the recommendation. What else is also in the initial report is of course the analysis and research and background and arguments for why the working group came upon the recommendation that it put forth.

And so, at this point, it is, again, published for public comment and then this is at least the second time at which public comment is sought from the community. Once public comment is received, then of course the working group will fully consider the public comment received. And if any of you are participating in the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP, it's quite the undertaking to review all the public comment received because the GNSO does it so thoroughly.

So the outcome of course, after taking public comment, and then taking into account those discussions and new points and new arguments and concerns is that the working group will then seek to develop a final report which will have again recommendations, and at this point, must have consensus designations to determine how well supported the recommendations are. And that final report is delivered to the GNSO council for their consideration. And that's what takes us to the bottom line here, which is all about consideration of the final report and the recommendations that are contained in that report.

So, as I noted, the first step is for the council to consider that report and the recommendations. And assuming that they approve the final report and the recommendations contained, the ICANN support staff develops a recommendations report which is delivered to the ICANN board, which provides details and rationale for the recommendations. There is another public comment period before the board is tasked with considering those recommendations as passed over, or passed through the GNSO council.

Again, assuming the board adopts the recommendations, that is then passed on to the ICANN org. ICANN Org is directed to implement the

policy recommendations as developed by the GNSO. And so that's actually outside of the scope of this particular diagram, but the GNSO also watches carefully as the policy that it develops are implemented generally by the global domains division within ICANN, or the GDD.

So, I know that was a lot of information. Hopefully that made sense. But I guess a couple takeaways is that you'll see the people diagrams, and those are important parts of this process. And those represent the chances for public input to the process. And so even if you are not a member of the PDP working group, this still affords anyone who is interested in the topic, still to have the opportunity to provide their input to what's taking place in the PDP. And another element of this process is that, so even if let's say folks from the ALAC or the GAG participant in the PDP, that would not preclude those two organizations from still being able to submit formal advice to the ICANN board.

So hopefully that high level description made sense. I will move on to the next slide. So, that is looking at the process, hopefully that made sense. But what we're talking about now, or what we're talking about is policy in the abstract, and so what do we mean when we're talking about dissolving policy as it relates to generic top level domain names.

So in this context, what we mean is that the registrars and registries, those accredited by ICANN. Each of them has a contract with ICANN. And it contains a number of binding obligations of course, but in particular is an agreement to adhere to consensus policies which can be developed, and are developed, by the ICANN multi-stakeholder model within the GNSO. And so this is a bit of an interesting situation where there's a bilateral agreement within the registries and ICANN, however

additional legal binding requirements can be imposed on them through a community driven process, and so there's in place what are called limitations to that consensus policy process because of that unique nature, there needs to be some boundaries over what can and cannot be imposed on the registries and registrars.

So within the contracts of the registries and registrars as well within the ICANN Bylaws, it talks about what can and cannot be developed within the policy development process and then imposed to the consensus policy. And I'm actually going to move to the next slide because I think it's a clear graphic, I think. So we, colloquially or conversationally, call this the structure and scope around what can be turned into consensus policy is the picket fence. And it's just intended to be sort of a graphic, a metaphor for understanding that there are limitations to what can be imposed on the contracted parties.

And so some examples of what would fall within the picket fence are things like security of the DNS, Rights Protection Mechanisms, like the UDRP or Uniform Dispute-Resolution Policy, and things like that. And so something that would not fall within that picket fence is content regulations, so imposing comments on the registries or registrars in which they would have to monitor and take action based on content on the websites.

So, that is essentially, or I guess the boundaries upon which policy development takes place. And so the next thing I would want to talk about is just, once you're in a PDP, what does it look like? And the GNSO relies upon a working group model. There can be many flavors of

that, if any of you are familiar, there's the EPDP that was undertaken on the temporary specification.

That one was, I think I mentioned, was a representative model where different stakeholder groups, constituencies, and also supporting organizations and advisory committees are invited to provide representatives and so the membership is limited. But I think what I also mentioned is that most working groups are operating on the basis of open participation. So the subsequent procedures for new gTLDs, that one I mentioned, is an open structure. And the Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP working group is also an open working-group model.

And so primarily the way that these working groups operate is the tele-conference just like we're in this room for Zoom, the PDPs will conduct their meetings primarily on what was previously Adobe connect but now in Zoom. And that is primarily the way that they operate. But they also seek to make progress via the mailing list which is a great way to work between the meetings. In addition, of course, ICANN meetings take advantage of the fact that you're able to meet in person. So, at every single meeting, and especially at the upcoming meeting at Marrakesh, it's policy forum.

Sure. Let me just finish with this slide and we can return to the picket fence for a little bit.

As I noted, you can be in person and seek to make progress that way as well. And another important component of the PDP is of course the public comment. I mentioned that in the zigzag diagram of the process. And so the purpose of -- an important component of the PDP is to make

sure that the deliberations of the PDP are captured. So that can be done via the mailing list which is always public, documents that are drafted are always public, primarily a lot of that takes place in Google Doc these days, which is helpful for collaboration. But as a historical record, much of the details, meetings, memberships, a lot of those things are captured online via a Wiki.

And so some of the things that we do to try to make sure that the community is familiar with what's taking place in PDPs is to try to put out publications, oftentimes which take the place of, or, takes the form of newsletters. There's also briefings which could be delivered to the ALAC and the GAC, and then always before ICANN meetings, the policy team will do webinars and provide updates to make sure that we're doing as much as we can to make sure that the community is up to date with what's taking place.

So, there was a question about the picket fence. And I'm wondering if you might be able to give me a little more detail about what you want to understand about the picket fence.

I guess I'll just speak until I see a comment, but I guess in general, the idea is that because consensus policy is additional contractual obligations that can be imposed on the registries and registrars, the picket fence is intended to try to limit the scope in which, and I guess set boundaries upon, what can be opposed as additional obligations on the contracted parties. And I see you're referring to the part about [inaudible] ICANN. Okay.

But, as I noted, the GNSO is the party that is responsible within the ICANN community to be able to develop policy in relation to generic top-level domains, and that's written into the ICANN Bylaws. And so, the other part about the picket fence is those limitations, I think I mentioned, they are built in to the contracts of both the registries and registrars. But it's also written into the ICANN Bylaws.

And so, the GNSO, given the sole responsibility to develop policy as it related to gTLDs, they adhere to this picket fence concept to make sure that the policies that they develop and recommend to eventually be considered by the ICANN board, that they are falling within the structure, the limitations, and scope established by the ICANN Bylaws and contracts. So, I'm not sure if that helps? Hopefully it did. But if not, please go ahead and follow up with that. Otherwise I'll keep moving on through the slides.

Great, thank you, Vanda. And I'm not going to try that name, I don't want to embarrass myself.

So, there's another slide here about the participation. I think I've already touched on this in most cases, actually. Again, in most cases, the GNSO working groups are open to anyone who wants to participate. Another layer that we have within GNSO working groups is the ability to join in two different ways. One is as a member, which allows you to participate in all meetings, and also in the mailing list. Otherwise just joining as a subsequent member that wants to take part in deliberations, whereas an observer is intending just to be able to receive the mailing list traffic, although they are unable to actually post to the mailing list.

So while there is this differentiation between member and observer, it's really more about understanding the number of members available that are able to contribute to the process, and by that I mean that the limiting factor to become a member is simply that you complete a statement of interest. Or in other words, talking about your affiliation, who you might represent, what your interests might be. And so that is really the only thing that prevents you from becoming a member of the GNSO working group in most cases, is that you complete that statement of interest. So other participants are able to understand a little bit about you and your participation.

And I see a question from Vanda. Are members more committed to the work and -- oh, just statement. Members are more committed to the work and shall be committed to participate. Yeah, that's true. And the question from Alfredo, is can an individual begin as an observer and request to become a member? Thanks, Alfredo, for the question. And for the response, indeed you can switch between member and observer as the need arises. There's not really a limitation on timing. You can do that at the beginning, you can do that in the middle, and you can do that at the end.

Although, of course switching between the two and if you're missing parts of deliberations and discussions, and [inaudible -- 00:30:41] it alludes to. Joining throughout different parts of the life cycle can of course make it more difficult on you if you haven't followed on the deliberations that took place while you might have been absent. So the last couple points on this is just that most working groups meet on a weekly basis or bi-weekly basis, and it takes place, as I mentioned, at the teleconferences. The GNSO is meeting throughout the year and

while ICANN meetings might serve as milestones, primarily the work is taking place outside of those ICANN meetings.

And, so, finally just to look at some of the specific items that are being discussed in the GNSO, so we've talked about the GNSO broadly, we've talked about the policy development process at a high level and then we've also talked about consensus policy and what fits within that structure, or in other words, the picket fence.

So this last item is intended to look at the key topics that are currently under discussion within the GNSO. I think I've mentioned all the top three already. The first one is the expedited policy development process on the temporary specification, which is currently with the ICANN board, at least for the phase one aspect. Which is intended to replace the temporary specification. That EPDP is now transitioning in to second phase, which is concentrating on the access model to who is data that's available in the DNS.

The other one I had mentioned is the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. That one started I believe in 2015 and I'm pretty sure I saw Cheryl on this call, so she's one of the co-chairs. The other is, there she is. The other is Jeff Newman, so that has a set of co-chairs that help manage that PDP. And they're looking at seeing how to enhance and make improvements to the issues that were identified from the 2012 round. The third here is the review of Rights Protection Mechanisms and all gTLDs. That also started around the same time as the new gTLD PDP back in, I think, 2015.

That one currently is concentrating on the -- trying to remember the acronym -- the uniform rapid suspension. It's also looking at the trademark clearing house, claims and those things. So basically all the RPMs that relates to the new gTLD program. The second phase of that PDP is intended to focus on the EDRP.

On the bottom left we have the INGO access to procure Rights Protection Mechanisms. This particular PDP delivered their final report, actually to the GNSO council, back in 2018. I think in July of that year. That set of recommendations the council just considered them in their April meeting. They accepted four of the recommendations and referred one of the recommendations over to the RPMs in all gTLDs PDP for their consideration instead. So that one, number four, is near the end its life. And then on the bottom right there are actually a couple of items that are not necessarily specific PDPs but also looks at the GNSO is working on, and very important to what it is trying to accomplish.

So the fifth one is called PDP 3.0. And instead of recommendations or implementation recommendations that are intended to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the GNSO PDP, and much of that is focused around empowering the GNSO council to be able to better monitor the PDPs, and I had mentioned that the council serves as the PDP manager. So a lot of PDP 2.0s intended to better allow the council to serve in that role, so making sure that they have better project manager tools, better reporting from the PDPs to make sure they're on track, alerted to the fact that there's issues, and things like that.

And so finally, the last is related to the IANA transition and the [inaudible] improvements, and so the idea here is that some of the

templates and operating procedures and things like that require updates to be made consistent with the new Bylaws, and that is the last but not least a number of the GNSO projects underway. And I think I saw someone mention the Auction Proceeds, which is a community working group with the ccNSO.

And I'm not sure if there's other comments, but hopefully I'll raise it again if I missed it. And so I think that's actually it. I know this is dedicated question and answers, and I'm glad there's some that come along the way, but of course now would be a great time to ask additional questions. So again, I'll pause, and please let me know if I missed a comment or two in the chat, but otherwise, please go ahead and speak up as well. Thanks.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

This is Alfredo Calderon for the record. There's a question on the chat from Michel. And it says, "Certainly observers do not have the right to vote. What is the advantage of taking part in the process?"

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Alfredo. So the primary reason why observers, I think, join working group as an observer, again acknowledging that they do not have the ability to participate in the discussions, and they of course do not get to participate in consensus calls as it shows noted. So the reason why you'd want to still be able to receive the mailing list traffic is so that you can keep up to date and be current on what's taking place within the PDP working group.

Although I would note that actually, while that's beneficial, even if you don't want to take that step you can actually consult the mailing list archives which for every GNSO working group is always made public, so there's even perhaps a third share of leveled participation so that even if you don't want to receive additional mail traffic in your e-mail box you can still keep up to date on what's taking place within the PDP, but so hopefully that helps answer your question.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

Okay, thank you, Steve. I do have another question for you. You mentioned that Cheryl is a co-chair or co-leader in one or a few of the working groups within the GNSO. Is that because she is a ALAC liaison, or is it because she is a member of the GNSO as an individual as well?

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Alfredo. That's a great question. So it's because she volunteered graciously to help chair that working group. She actually served as a replacement who was actually Avri Doria and Jeff Newman at one point, but Aubrey has since joined the board. And Cheryl has graciously offered to assume co-chair duties. And so there's no limitations to who the leadership is from. It can be anyone who volunteers and is accepted by the working group, as well as eventually the GNSO council. So, I guess to answer your question, no it has nothing to do with her role as ALAC liaison, just anyone who puts their hand forward and is agreed to by the working group is eligible to take participation, or take place, and participate as leadership in GNSO PDP.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Are there any more questions from any of the participants in the webinar?

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Gunela, I had a question.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Yes, go ahead.

STEVE CHAN: I can read it out and, so the question from Gunela is, “Could you give examples of policies in our best practice that is outside the picket fence and is developed by the GNSO?” So that’s actually a really good point. I might struggle with actually coming up with an example, but it is important to note that despite there being a picket fence, that is mostly in reference to contractually binding elements or in other words, consensus policy.

So that is not intended to prevent GNSO PDP from developing things like best practices or other non-binding advice that the GNSO council could consider. And so as I’m speaking actually, I’m thinking of a good example that would be within the new detailed subsequent procedures PDP where a lot of elements that they’re looking at are intended and proved the implementation of that program.

So, some of the options that they’ve looked at recently related to systems and so how ICANN develops and employs it’s systems is not something that is relevant to consensus policies, but it’s something that

the PDP can recommend as implementation guidance for ICANN to take into consideration, so again, with that systems example, what the PDP is currently looking at, it's not settled of course yet, but what they're trying to do is make sure that the systems that are developed are secure and stable and they also recommend that visibility and user experience are emphasized in the development, so while those are not binding, contractual requirements for the contracted parties, of course, it's hopefully a good example of something that is non-binding and still something that is valid for a GNSO PDP to form as a recommendation.

Great. Love to answer your question, Gunela.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

Steve, I see there's another question from Michel that says, "Is the multi-lateral approach alive in your exchanges and teleconferences, and what is the participation rate at your meetings?"

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Alfredo. Thanks. So, I would say probably varies based on effort and level of interest on the particular topic. So, the EPDP has a good level of participation across the community because it's a subject of wide interest and I think the same applies to something like the subsequent procedures PDP where you have, which actually I would note has a sub-team devoted to geographic names, which I'm sure some of you are familiar are a topic that many folks in the community care about and so there's been a number of efforts that have looked at geographic names and come away unsuccessful.

And so there's actually a novel approach taken within subsequent procedures in that sub-team to have a shared membership model, or shared leadership model, where there's co-leads from each of the GNSOs, the ALAC, the ccNSO and the GAC, and part of the reason for doing so was indeed to try to promote some of that, or I guess enhance the level of participation across the community, and bring some of those additional voices into the process.

Again, like I said, it varies from group to group and topic to topic, and in many cases, like the new gTLD subsequent procedures, you're going to see quite a few people from the ALAC and even a number of members from the GAC which is sometimes a group that often is not even able to participate given time commitments and also the way that they do participate is they're not necessarily able to represent the views of the GAC, so we've been heartened, and I think I can speak for Cheryl for that group, that there's been such active participation in that group from across the community.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

Thank you, Steve. There's another question from Abdeldjalil Bachar that reads, "GNSO is business, but we are seeing in the non-contracted party some non-commercial constituency examples, and so you see that creates confusion with ALAC?" Basically I'm guessing that he's trying to understand why ALAC is involved with GNSO.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Alfredo. I will not profess to be able to answer about for the motivation of the ALAC, why they think it's worthwhile to participate in

a GNSO process. I think maybe Cheryl could probably answer that one. But I think it's important to note that they can. It's an important factor of a process that they have the ability to do so.

So I would note that, you know, of course there is the whole second bi-cameral non-Contracted Party House that is intending to look after, well half of that house is dedicated to non-commercial stakeholders, and I'm definitely not the person to try to detail the differences between the NCUC and the ALAC, or the NPOC as well, but I know there are differences and there's differences in their remit, their focus. But again, I think it's important to say that they're all able to participate and the motivations for them doing so is really for them to determine. I hope that sort of answers the question. I'm not sure if I did or not.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

Yeah I think, Paul, yes you did. This is Alfredo. Leah is also commenting that she thinks that she is asking the difference between NCUC and ALAC participation, as well as ALAC is an end-user community and not a non-commercial, non-constructed party organization within ICANN.

STEVE CHAN:

I am going to not answer that one because I don't think I'm in the best position to do so. I know that's actually something that those two groups spend a lot of time actually doing themselves, trying to make sure that those that are interested in either of those two communities are well aware the difference, and I don't think it's really for me to try to recite what they do because I'll probably get it wrong. I'm going to refrain from answering that,

ALFREDO CALDERON: No worries, Steve. I agree with you on that. Are there any more questions from the audience? [Inaudible] is asking for perhaps a brief explanation for the distinction between ALAC, the GNSO, UCs and SGs.

STEVE CHAN: Let me try. So the GNSO is made up of a number of different parties. Their responsibility is to develop policy as it relates to generic top-level domains. The ALAC is an advisory committee which gives them the ability to provide advice to the board. But that doesn't prevent them from also being able to participate in the GNSO PDP as well.

So, they have different responsibilities, different agreements under the ICANN Bylaws. But the ALAC is structurally not of course apart of the GNSO, and so the UC I think you're probably referring to the constituencies. All the constituencies and the stakeholder groups do in fact make up the GNSO and representatives from each of those groups then serve on the council which is of course the decision making body for the GNSO. So, hopefully that helps.

ALFREDO CALDERON: If there are any questions in French or in Spanish, please ask them. We have interpretation, so feel free to raise your hand and ask your questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alfredo, it's Cheryl here.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Yes, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Just to draw your attention. Those members who wish to explore the rational and the differences between what an ICANN advisory committee is and what a subcomponents of the GNSO must be, I've had a little go at it, but you hear in the world of ICANN about ACs and SOs, they are advisory committees, and support organizations such as the GNSO, the SO part of GNSO and the ccO, that's the SO part of ccNSO, have primary responsibilities for different parts of policy development, being those two examples, the CC space, the country code space, and the top-level generic names space, and the same can be said for the address, a support organization SO, they're being the same thing, but of course bringing the regional internet registry policy development aspects as they go on within our own ASO world. So, they are specific upper-level beasts, alright? At a particular line.

Now, within the various advisory committees, some have particular mandates; the government advisory committee has particular roles outlined in the Bylaws, the At-Large advisory committee, the ALAC has particular requirements and mandates outlined in the Bylaws, and to some extent, so do our RALOs.

That said, the GNSO, as Steve has very well described, got a particular make-up where it has the contracted and the non-contracted interest in two party houses. Within the non-Contracted Party House, remember the GNSO only focuses on the generic names space; within that non-

Contracted Party House we have something which is known as a stakeholder group, that's the SG part of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, and within that we have a number of constituencies, some that you're familiar with their name, which is the NCUC, and of course there is NPOC focusing less on the individual and more on the organizational. And they are the stakeholder groups and constituencies as part of the GNSO, which is a support organization.

I know that seems highly complicated, but ALAC and At-Large, through its structures, have the additional mandate compared to anything else in ICANN to have input that needs to act in the best interest of internet end users and individual main name registrants across everything ICANN does, whether it is the generic top level space, or not. Hopefully, that helps. Thank you.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

Thank you, Cheryl, for that. A great explanation. And I invite all the participants that have any questions or any doubts regarding what Cheryl just tried to explain in a nutshell, to review the ICANN learn, there's a couple of courses that drills down into all these constituencies and stakeholders within the ICANN world.

So I invite you to review those courses within ICANN learn at your convenience. They're not required in some cases but it's worthwhile looking at them so you can catch up and understand all the acronyms and all the constituencies and the stakeholders within the ICANN world. Thank you, Cheryl, and is there any further questions for Steve?

ANDREA GLANDON: Alfredo, we do have a hand who has his hand up and I believe he's going to speak through the interpreter?

ALFREDO CALDERON: Yes please, go ahead. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: We'll be just a moment.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Sure.

ETIENNE TSHISHIMBI: Etienne speaking. It is not a question, I just wanted to know during the first webinar, I haven't been able to get connected on Adobe Connect, so my participation was mistaken into account. I just wanted to the confirmation about that. That was my question. Thank you.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Etienne, basically what I can tell you is that if you couldn't participate in the webinar, you might look into the ICANN learn course that is the equivalent to that webinar. That's basically what I can tell you to do. Hope that helps, Etienne. Any other questions? French or in Spanish channels? Well, if there's no further questions, Steve, I just want to thank you for your presentation. It was great. I've heard you and seen you at the ICANN as a fellow in front of the fellowship programs, so I know you know your stuff, especially in the GNSO context.

Again, thank you for your aid in clarifying some of the questions that some of the participants have stated. Before we conclude this webinar, I would like to remind you that Thursday, May the 2nd at 12H00 UTC, we will have this webinar but with Marika calling as the speaker, so she will be presenting the same topic for those that haven't been able to take it at this time.

So without any further ado, thank you again for all your participation in this webinar, and thank you, Steve, again, for your participation. And thank you staff, Andrea, and Yesim, and whoever else is helping us out in this webinar. Thank you all and see you around next time. Bye to all.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]