EN

YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the second webinar of the five mandatory ATLAS III webinars, and today's will cover an introduction to the GNSO.

Our presenter today is Marika Konings, Vice President for Policy Development Support, GNSO. We will not be doing a roll call for this webinar, however, we are taking attendance for the first ten minutes on this call. After that, your participation will not be a valid entry for the required attendance metrics.

If you're 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 interpretation for this webinar.

A kind reminder to please state your name when speaking to allow for the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels, as well as for transcription purposes.

Please also speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. All lines will be muted during the presentation, and opened for questions and answers at the end of the presentation.

If you have noticed, we running this webinar on Zoom. The features are similar to Adobe Connect, but in order to build the participants list and chat pod, please click on the bottom of the screen. You will only be able to see the chat transcript from when you joined the calls, nothing prior to that.

To raise your hand, please just click on the "raise hand" button. I will now hand the floor over to Alfredo Calderon, co-chair of the ATLAS III capacity subgroup. Over to you, Alfredo.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Thank you. I want to welcome everybody to this second session of the introduction to the GNSO webinar, which is part of the series of webinars that all the intended applicants to ATLAS III are required to take. I would like to emphasize that if you're not able to participate in one of the webinars, you can actually take the online course within the ICANN Learn platform as well, complete the whole process and get the certificate, which is part of the evidence that we'll be using to certify you as a bona fide applicant for the ATLAS III [inaudible].

I would like to also welcome Marika, who is an expert in GNSO policy development. She will walk us through how does GNSO work and how can we as Internet end users and At-Large participants can contribute to what GNSO does.

So welcoming Marika, I hand the floor over to you. Welcome.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thank you very much, Alfredo and Yesim, for the warm welcome. As you've already said, my name is Marika Konings, and I'm Vice President for Policy Development Support for the Generic Name Supporting Organization, also known as the GNSO. And I'm with you here today from Costa Rica where I'm currently based.

So today, I hope to cover in my presentation a broad overview of how the GNSO is structured, how it operates, how the GNSO's policy development process – or PDP – works and how interested parties can participate in that process. and hopefully, at the end of the presentation, we'll also have some time for any questions you may have after my presentation.

So as you're hopefully aware, the GNSO's part of the ICANN ecosystem that consists of ICANN's supporting organizations which are responsible for policy development in their respective area, and advisory committees which are responsible for providing advice to the ICANN board on areas within their remit.

You see here a bit of a compilation of that. I'm assuming that you are getting presentations in a similar way about the other supporting organizations and advisory committees, so I won't cover those in my presentation. But of course, if you have any questions about those, I'm happy to try and answer those.

The role of the GNSO is exclusively stated in the ICANN bylaws. In it there, it says the GNSO shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the inner critic board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains. And I think within this, you can see the remit of the activities of the GNSO, as well as the mechanism by which that's done. It's done within the GNSO, but ultimately, the ICANN board has the oversight and the responsibility for either adopting or rejecting recommendations that are adopted by the GNSO through its respective processes and procedures.

As noted, the GNSO is that part of ICANN that is responsible for the development of policy recommendations in relation to generic top-level domains, or gTLDs.

The GNSO council's main role in that – and you see a picture of the council in its current composition here on the screen – is that of the manager of the policy development process. So they are responsible for overseeing the policy development process and making sure that all the required steps are met.

The council represents the GNSO community and consists of 21 council members that hail from the different GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies, as well as three Nominating Committee appointees.

In addition, there's also representatives or liaisons from a number of groups. Amongst others, the At-Large Advisory Committee has a liaison on the GNSO council. I think you can see Cheryl here somewhere in the middle of the picture.

So you may have heard GNSO community members referring to their house. The GNSO council or GNSO structure consists of two houses, one of which house is members of the contracted party house, which are selected by those entities with whom ICANN has contracts, namely gTLD registries and ICANN accredited registrars, and there is a noncontracted party house, which consists of the stakeholders that do not have any contracts with ICANN but whose interests can be divided into, on the one hand, commercial interests, and those are housed in the commercial stakeholder group. That consists of the Business Constituency, Intellectual Property Constituency, and the Internet

EN

Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency, and noncommercial interests which are housed in the so-called Noncommercial Stakeholder Group which consists of the Noncommercial Users Constituency and the Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Constituencies.

Each of these groups appoint representatives to the GNSO council, which in turn then makes up the council's composition. The house structure is also important to keep in mind when it comes to voting at the GNSO council level, because the balance of power is basically divided along the structure of the houses, with each house basically having equal voting power on the GNSO council.

As I mentioned before, there are also three Nominating Committee-appointees, one of which is allocated to each of the houses, and there's also what we're referring to as a homeless or nonvoting NomCom appointee.

And as I said, this division as well of Nominating Committee appointees is especially important when it comes to certain voting thresholds as they factor in the house structure and Nominating Committee appointees can kind of make the balance between a vote passing or not.

If we then look at the council leadership – and again, this is our current leadership – the council leadership exists of a council chair and one vice chair that's selected for each house.

At the moment, Keith Drazek who comes from the Registry Stakeholder Group serves as the GNSO chair, and Pam Little who's a member of the RrSG serves as the vice chair for the contracted parties house, and

Rafik Dammak is another vice chair for the noncontracted parties house, and he hails from the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

As mentioned before, the GNSO council is expected to serve as the manager of the policy development process. As such, it oversees the policy development activities and considers the final recommendations as they are provided by the relevant working groups.

As part of its consideration of these recommendations, the council is expected to review whether the relevant processes and procedures have been followed prior to approving the recommendations. They're not expected to review the substance or redo recommendations, but – I think we have an open mic again. Okay.

So the way they normally take care of that oversight is that they meet on a monthly basis in the form of a two-hour conference call, during which they consider policy development activities, but also other topics that may require their attention. As you may know, there are currently broader responsibilities for the different groups as part of the new structure of the empowered community and responsibilities that the different groups have in ensuring accountability of the overall ICANN structures and decisions that are taken.

The council typically takes decisions through formal motions. As I mentioned before, some of those have specific voting thresholds associated with them in the case of policy development activities, and those voting thresholds are defined in the ICANN bylaws.

There are specific requirements as well in relation to the submission of these motions, for example when it comes to timeline, those need to be

EN

submitted ten days in advance in order to allow for sufficient time for stakeholder groups and constituencies to consider these and instruct their council members accordingly. And again, that refers back to the structure I was talking to you about before. Even though the different groups have representatives appointed to the GNSO council, it's very important for them to consult with their broader groups. And in certain cases, council members are actually instructed on their votes by their respective groups, so it's important that sufficient time is available for that consultation to take place.

However, the actual policy development work is undertaken by GNSO teams or working groups. It's important to remember – and most of these groups are open to anyone interested to participate in the activity, and there's no requirement that you are a member of a GNSO stakeholder group or constituency, the only requirement or formal requirement that currently exists is that a statement of interest is provided in which members declare their affiliation and interest. And again, this comes from the notion that it's okay to have an interest in the topic that is being debated, as long as you declare it up front and people are very much aware of what your interest is and who is potentially paying you to participate in those activities.

I'll talk a little bit more a little bit later about some developments that have happened recently in which we are seeing a shift or alternatives to the open working group model, but as I said, I'll talk to you about that a little bit more.

I'm just seeing a question in the chat asking about are motions voted by simple majority, i.e. half of the councilors plus one? That is the default

voting threshold. So if a voting threshold is not specifically defined in the ICANN bylaws, then the simple majority voting threshold applies. But it's important to know that in relation to policy development-related votes, almost all of those are defined in the ICANN bylaws as they have different voting thresholds associated with them.

In the case of initiating a policy development process, requesting an issue report, there's typically a lower voting threshold. I think it's [inaudible] that it should be possible to at least discuss the issues and there shouldn't be any immediate ability to block consideration of an issue. However, the further along you go in the process towards for example final adoption, the higher voting threshold applies, in this case of a GNSO supermajority vote to really make sure that any policy recommendations that are adopted enjoy the broad support of the GNSO community. And again, I'll talk a little bit more about that later in the presentation when we come to the concept of consensus policies in the GNSO context.

So next, we will briefly look at the GNSO policy development process or PDP. On this slide, you'll see the different steps of the PDP, and we sometimes refer to this graphic as [the snake.] As we don't have time today to go into all the details of the policy development process-, I would just like to emphasize the robustness and firm requirements that are associated a PDP.

As you can see here, there are numerous opportunities for public input and consultation which are an inherent part of the process as a PDP team moves through the different steps in its deliberations in the aim to get consensus on its recommendations.

EN

As such, it's important to understand that policy development in a multi-stakeholder bottom-up process is not a sprint but much more like a marathon. And usually – and I always say this jokingly – a good result is when everyone is equally unhappy with the outcome. It basically means that a balance was found and no one stakeholder got everything they wanted and others got nothing.

So if we look at the next slide – and I've mentioned this term before – in order to develop a GNSO consensus policy – and it's important to remember here that a capital C capital P Consensus Policy is not the same as a little P policy that has been adopted by consensus.

The term "consensus policy" has a very specific meaning in a GNSO context as the contracts that ICANN has with ICANN-accredited registrars and gTLD registries have a clause that describes a consensus policy which are requirements that are broadly supported by ICANN's stakeholder groups through the PDP and which contractually bind the contracted parties to this consensus policy.

As you can imagine, this is as very unique situation, as it basically means that contracted parties sign an agreement with ICANN, of which terms can change as a result of a process that is not fully within the control of the parties to the contract but involve the multi-stakeholder community.

And as you can imagine, that's quite different from how a normal contract works where terms are negotiated between two parties, and there's usually no involvement of third parties that may have a say in that.

EN

I see a question in the chat asking about review team there any differences of how policy development processes take place in other supporting organizations?

The answer is yes and no. There are a lot of similarities in the steps that are taken, I think especially if you look at for example the ccNSO policy development process, but there are also some important differences, and I think it especially comes with the scope of topics that can be addressed and the venues where policy development takes place.

For example for the GNSO, all policy development takes place at the ICANN level. The contracts that ICANN has with contracted parties, with registrars and registries, they define the topics that fall within the scope of policy development in the context of gTLDs. But there's no other venue where such policy development takes place.

If you compare this to the ccNSO, most policy development for ccTLDs actually takes place at a national level. There are a limited number of topics for which the ccNSO as the overseeing body develops policy at an ICANN level. and again, those topics are defined in the ICANN bylaws, but the majority of policy development really happens at the ccTLD or the national level without any kind of involvement or oversight from ICANN.

Similarly for the ASO or the numbering community, they basically do all their policy development at the regional level. Only if and when a global policy is agreed to by all the regional Internet registries, only then does it come to ICANN for a board approval. So those are a bit of the nuances and differences between the different groups.

I also see a question about how many policy development groups are currently active and how long does policy work take. We'll actually get to that a little bit later, but as I said before, it's really important to keep in mind that policy development is really a marathon and not a sprint. It takes a lot of time for different groups to come together, deliberate the issues, understand them, make sure there's an opportunity for input from others, review that input before a group comes to conclusions.

As I said before, there are certain requirements that need to be fulfilled before something is to become consensus policies. For example, the relevant provisions in the different agreements stipulate that a consensus policy may not unreasonably restrain competition, and it prescribes which topics are considered to be within scope for consensus policy development. And some examples of those you see here on the screen.

You can see as well that the topics are described in a relatively broad manner, so usually, a first step in the policy development process is actually to understand what the topic actually entails and to determine whether or not it fits within these categories.

If it doesn't fit within these categories, it doesn't mean that there cannot be any kind of policy development, it just means that at the end of the day, when it has gone through all the different steps, that if it's not part of the set of topics, it is not possible for ICANN to enforce any kind of requirements on those. So there may be situations where for example the community desires to develop best practices on certain topics that do not fall within the remit for policy development, which is perfectly fine and could still of course have an important impact, but it

EN

does mean that it's not possible to enforce those requirements on contracted parties as a new addition to their contractual agreements.

I also wanted to briefly mention the concept of the picket fence. This is a term that you may hear used in the context of GNSO policy conversations, and it's intended to describe the policymaking authority that has been granted to ICANN to preserve the stability and security of the DNS through consensus policy development.

But this authority is limited in scope, as I just mentioned, hence the picket fence that marks that authority. So I want to emphasize again, anything outside that scope is not necessarily off the table. ICANN could establish small P policy and/or best practices on those kind of topics, but it would not have the ability or authority to mandate that gTLD registries or ICANN-accredited registrars comply with such policies or best practices.

So again, I think it's a very important concept within the GNSO context to be able to understand how policy development works and the role it plays within ICANN's authority.

I'm seeing another question in the chat, and I'm sorry if I'm missing any, and for those who may have joined late, we will have time at the end for Q&A, but I'm trying to do integrate the questions I see popping up in the presentation. So, who's able to initiate a new policy?

The first step in the policy development process is a request for an issues report, and the request for an issue report can come from a GNSO council member, an ICANN advisory committee, or ICANN board.

Those are the three paths by which the first step of a policy development process commences.

An issue report is really a first step. It's a staff-written document that aims to outline the issues that were flagged by the requester. It aims to gather all the relevant information, it aims to address some of the questions around does it fall within the scope, within the picket fence, is it a topic that the GNSO has authority to work on? And that is an opinion that we obtained from ICANN's general counsel's office. And that kind of outlines the scope of the issue, and that report then gets submitted to the GNSO council which will then make a determination on whether to move ahead with the next step or not. And that is the case if it 's requested by a council member or by an advisory committee. In the case of the ICANN board, they actually come in with a bit of a higher authority. The issue actually moves straight through to the commencement or formal commencement of the policy development process.

So if we then look in a little bit more detail to the tools and mechanisms that exist for policy development support and the role that ICANN staff plays here, myself and my team, is to support the GNSO community in its policy development activities.

So we facilitate and support policy development activities through our support for working groups, for the GNSO council, which on the one hand consists of making sure that people understand and follow the required steps in the process, but also very on-hand support in helping the chair, developing agendas, developing supported documents, drafting, and providing expertise if and where needed.

As I mentioned before, the preferred model at the moment is the GNSO working group model which is open to anyone interested to participate in, and it may be worth providing you with a little bit of history on that. Originally, at the start of ICANN, we had the so-called task force model, in which each group represented on the council was able to appoint a member to the task force. But that effort was really kind of limited to GNSO participants. There was no ability for outsiders or other advisory committees or supporting organizations to participate in that process, apart from public comments.

So as a result of one of the previous GNSO reviews, it was decided that there was a need to broaden that up and allow for broader participation, as of course, GNSO policies have a wide-reaching impact, not only on GNSO stakeholders.

So the working group model was introduced, and everyone interested is able to sign up and join, and the only requirement is that you provide a statement of interest to ensure that everyone's aware of what your background is and what your interest in the process is.

However, that has [seen as an effect that of course] with many more people around the table, many more voices to be heard, it often results as well in more time being needed to complete policy development.

So there is some thinking happening on the GNSO council level, and you may have also heard that mentioned, which is GNSO PDP 3.0. The council is trying to think through what kind of improvements or enhancements could be thought of to ensure the efficiency and

effectiveness of the PDP, without of course losing the requirements for transparency, accountability, participation and representation.

And I'll talk a little bit more in a second about one specific group where a new model has been applied, and again, I think where the direction we're seeing is that the council [will probably] decide on a case by case basis, evaluating the needs for that specific topic, what the best approach is to make sure that the work is done, again, with assuring that those that have an interest in the topic are able to have their voice heard and participate in some shape or form.

So, how do working groups typically engage? It's mostly through teleconference. Most groups meet on a weekly basis for an hour or 90 minutes. Some groups may also have subteams. We recently had a group that met twice a week as they were working on a specific timeline. But again, that's their main mode of operation, which also hopefully facilitates participation in policy development as there's no requirement to show up on a weekly basis for physical meetings.

Groups usually do take advantage and meet in person at ICANN meetings if there's critical mass – and again, for those meetings, a remote participation is made available, and again, for all meetings, we circulate notes, action items, meetings are recorded and transcribed for anyone to review. So there's always an opportunity for people to weigh in.

I saw before a question about how does ALAC participate. For ALAC members, there are different ways to participate. Either they can participate and sign up as an individual and participate in the

deliberations if the model that's chosen [for the effort] supports that, but there are also for example the recent group, the expedited policy development process where the ALAC had a specific number of designees to that effort. So again, I presume you use your own mechanisms for select those representatives, and that's also a formal voice by which the ALAC view is heard.

And similarly – and it's the next bullet here – public comment is critical. So even if you're not actively participating on weekly calls, there are regular intervals and required intervals at which a public comment is solicited. First of all, at the start of a policy development process to make sure that all views are heard and understood, then at the stage of the initial report where proposed recommendations are put forward, so again, people can make their voice heard on whether they support recommendations, did the group miss anything important, and that information is then reviewed by the group and recommendations adjusted as deemed necessary. And then there's another public comment opportunity prior to the ICANN board consideration of the recommendations.

I also noted someone asking about conflict resolution, what [inaudible] situation of conflict? Really good question. As you can imagine, sometimes discussions do get heated, people do not always agree on how an issue should be resolved or dealt with, so we thankfully have very skilled chairs in place to manage that.

There are also the GNSO working group guidelines [inaudible] specific conflict resolution mechanisms, so there are a number of escalation paths. I also forgot to mention actually previously the way in which the

GNSO council facilitates its role as a manager of the process. they assign a liaison to every PDP team, which also means that the council is able, through its liaisons, to kind of oversee any kind of such situations and provide guidance to the chair, and in the formal dispute resolution process, it also has a formal role to kind of mediate between parties that are disagreeing or in conflict with each other.

I also see a question [inaudible] assessment tools for members. Not exactly sure what is meant with that, so maybe Michael, you can provide a little bit more detail on that. There is a mechanism to help monitor the evolution of the activities. As said, the GNSO council as the manager of the process does like to keep a close eye over the status and progress of working groups. So there are a number of tools that are used for that. Each PDP team has its work plan against which it tracks its work and provides a regular update to the GNSO council on where they stand on delivering on their milestones. Similarly, we have a GNSO project list that is provided to the council prior to either every GNSO council meeting – so on a monthly basis – in which we also track the latest status of the different groups, and then the chairs of each effort meet on a regular basis either with council leadership or the full council to provide an update on their status of work, and that is another opportunity for either the council to flag or raise issues, or for the PDP chairs to indicate that they're struggling [inaudible] certain issues for which they may need assistance from a council level.

To facilitate his kind of dialog that I said mainly takes place in the virtual space through conferences, through the mailing lists, we do use online collaboration mechanisms. Previously, the Adobe Connect room and now the Zoom room is an important feature of that. The Wiki space is

another vehicle that we use to make sure that information is broadly shared. And again, that information as well as the mailing list, they're all publicly archived, so anyone that's interested to see what's happening, they can see that basically live and follow those conversations.

In addition, we have the ability for observers to sign up to the different efforts, which means you're getting all the e-mails so you can see what's happening. You're just not invited to join the calls or you're not able to engage through the mailing lists.

So again, this is all done in a very open and transparent manner to really make sure that everyone's able to see what's going on and what's happening.

In addition to that, we also aim to provide regular briefings. We do that in the form of the GNSO policy briefings. That's a staff-led effort to help prepare those attending ICANN meetings for the different topics that are being discussed and making sure that they're up to speed as to where a certain effort is at. So we publish the GNSO policy briefings usually right before an ICANN meeting together with the general policy support which covers at a more higher level the different initiatives, but [inaudible] policy briefings, those are also posted on a website, really go into the details of each effort and hopefully in a clear manner describe as well where they're at and how you're able to participate, what the next opportunity for engagement and input is.

As I said, we also have our policy update webinar which also takes place prior to ICANN meetings and for the policy forum, we typically also have a dedicated GNSO policy update webinar. The main target audience for

that is the council to really make sure that they're up to speed, but we usually open those up as well for others that are interested to basically know what topics are to be discussed at the ICANN meeting and what can be [inaudible].

I see another question that says, "Do councilors who have a direct conflict on a specific motion abstain from voting?" [inaudible] understand what is a direct conflict here. as I've stated before, in the GNSO world, it is perfectly fine to have an interest, which some would say is a conflict, as long as it's declared up front. And in most cases as well, council members are actually directed on their voting, so they're not making a personal assessment, but they're voting as they are being directed by their groups.

So there is an ability for councilors to abstain and make a statement in that regard, or assign a proxy to someone else, but it's usually not as a result of a so-called conflict, because the role of the council to start off with is to oversee the process. they're not actually making the policy itself. And as I said, they have a representative role, so they're usually directed [by their groups] in the way they vote.

I think most of this I already covered. I'll just briefly go through it. As I said, in most cases – we've seen some exceptions recently – anyone can participate in a GNSO working group. Of course, it does require time and effort. And here I think it's important to mention again the notion that policy development is typically really a marathon and not a sprint.

And someone asked a question before, how long does a policy development process typically take? I think if you look at recent

initiatives, the working group phase, so the part of the PDP where people are expected to come together for weekly meetings, can span up to a year and a half to two or even three years depending on the scope of work and the time and effort it takes to digest the issues and get to a final report.

But of course, there are some steps that precede the working group from forming, and there are also some steps that occur after the working group has finalized its work, for example the form of the council consideration of the topic. And it gets into the ICANN board who also deliberates on the issue.

So the overall timeline can definitely span a couple of years, and then once the ICANN board has adopted recommendations, they actually need to be implemented. And again, that usually goes as well through a kind of community process. ICANN staff is responsible for implementing the recommendation, but there's usually an implementation review team that works in close collaboration with ICANN staff to make sure that the implementation is done [conform] the intent of the original policy recommendations.

I mentioned before as well, policy development is really not focused on ICANN meetings. ICANN meetings are more of an opportunity to take advantage of, but most of the bulk of the work really takes place between ICANN meetings through conference calls and mailing list conversations. And we've also started making extensive use of for example Google Docs which facilitate online collaboration and the ability for interested parties to come together in that way and work on documents or positions.

EN

Then, what are some of the topics under discussion? The first [inaudible] here is the different policy development processes that are currently underway.

You may have heard about the first one because it has been fairly high-profile, and as I said, active ALAC participation in that effort. That group was in its phase one focused on the temporary specification for gTLD registration and data as a result of the GDPR coming into force, and ICANN board adopted the temporary specification which then the GNSO was tasked to review and determine whether or not it should be adopted as a consensus policy in its existing form or whether changes needed to be made.

And as I mentioned, that is a group because it had a one-year timeline associated with it, and that's not the result of the term "expedited," but that was really the result of the adoption of the temporary specification which according to the ICANN bylaws only take one year for that determination to be made. So that group had a very tight timeline, and as such, the council discussed, how best could that be achieved?

And they decided that instead of an open working group model where anyone can show up and participate, it would work better to have more of a representative model whereby each of the ICANN stakeholder, supporting organizations and advisory communities were invited to join and each assigned a specific number of members and alternates to conduct the work.

And this is also actually the effort where observers were also able to subscribe to the mailing list, so again, it's not that the work is done in

any kind of secrecy, it's just that active participation is limited to representatives of different groups to make sure that their views are taken into account and factored in.

However, that doesn't take away that there are also opportunities for public comments where anyone interested in this topic was able to express their views and perspectives.

Then the second PDP focuses on the new gTLD subsequent procedures. This PDP is to determine what, if any, changes may need to be made to the existing introduction of new generic t op-level domains, policy recommendations that date from August 2019.

The original policy recommendation as adopted by the GNSO council and the ICANN board were designed to produce a systemized and ongoing mechanism for applicants to propose new top-level names.

So they're working towards a final or proposed final report, and again, if you're interested in that topic, you can subscribe to the mailing list and follow their conversations in that way.

Another policy development process that's ongoing deals with the review of rights protection mechanisms in all gTLDs. That work is broken up in two phases: currently focusing on any RPMs specifically related or coming out of the new gTLD program, and in phase two of their work, they will focus on the review of the UDRP.

A fourth PDP which is nearing its completion phase focused on the access to curative rights for IGOs and INGOs to protect the rights they may have in their names. That is an effort that recently submitted its

final report to the GNSO council and adopted most of the recommendations which will now make their way to the ICANN board.

I already mentioned before the PDP 3.0, an important initiative that the council is focused on, enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the GNSO PDP by looking at improvements that are to be applied or can be applied to either existing or future PDPs, and a small group of council members is engaged on that together with staff to further develop those improvements to a state that they can actually be applied and implemented.

And then there's also some ongoing work in relation to reviewing GNSO process and procedures to make sure that they're ready and up to date for the post-transition world. As I've mentioned, in the new environment where the GNSO is a member in the empowered community, there are some new roles and responsibilities that have been assigned and we'd just need to make sure that the appropriate processes and procedures are in place so that if a situation should occur where the GNSO needs to act, they're able to do so.

I see another question in the chat, and I think I'm getting to the end of my slides, so you can get ready with your hands and your questions. What can be the value add of ALAC participation to working groups? Very good question. I think this is also one where, again, in a GNSO policy development process, it's really important to understand the different perspectives of an issue and be able to understand the potential impact of recommendations on different groups. And of course, the end user community is a really important part of that, so being able to have the [ALAC] voice or perspective is an important

EN

component of that, and I'm happy to report that ALAC both in kind of a formal capacity but also individual ALAC members have been very active participants in GNSO policy development activities.

And similarly, I think on most PDPs, the ALAC has always submitted formal statements as well to make sure that their perspectives are heard and dealt with.

I see another question, it says, "Does the GNSO also undergo a review process? If yes, how often is it done, and when did the last review take place?"

Yes, both at a structural level, similar to I think all ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees, I think apart from the GAC, the bylaws [inaudible] that a review needs to be undertaken – and I believe the current timeframe for that is every five years.

I think there was one review in 2004. I think that was followed by a review that commenced, I want to say 2012, and I think that one recently completed its work. Of course, the review commences, there are quite a number of [inaudible] needs to go through, and I think you're probably quite familiar as well, the ALAC review which I think followed a very similar approach compared to the last GNSO review where a community working group is assigned to actually implement the recommendations, and that process was recently completed.

I'm drawing a blank here when our next review starts, but I'm guessing it's not too far away.

EN

In addition, it may also be worth mentioning, in addition to kind of GNSO structural review, also, policies that are adopted are reviewed on a regular cycle. This is part of the overall policy development process. At the end of it, you also need a review to first of all make sure that the policy achieved the result it originally set out to do and to provide the ability to carry out any kind of corrections that may be needed, if there are issues identified, or it's actually not doing what you originally set out to do.

Another question, did the EPDP experience show it would be useful to limit working group processes in time? My personal answer there is yes. the group had a very firm deadline, and it meant the work needed to get done, otherwise temporary specification would end its validity and there would be basically nothing in place, or at least it would fall back to the original WHOIS requirement that [would deem not to be all of them] GDPR complaint. So that did definitely help in the different groups coming together and working under that firm deadline.

The question is, of course, is there a way to replicate that any timeline that may be imposed to a certain degree is artificial unless there's some kind of external facing factor.

I can give you one example where there was a PDP on vertical integration, so the question of whether registries could also be registrars and vice versa, and which rules would need to be in place to make sure that that wouldn't create some kind of dominance or unforeseen situations.

The board actually tried to put a firm timeline in there with also kind of requirement like if you don't deliver by this date, this is what's going to happen. And actually – and again, I'm giving my personal assessment here – that resulted in some preferring the outcome that the board had put on the table, and not necessarily a driving factor for everyone to come together and come to agreement, which meant that that PDP in the end failed, and I think actually, the board didn't go with what they had [inaudible] they in the end adopted something similar, but not exactly the same.

But again, it needs to be given careful thought what kind of forcing mechanism you put on the table. But at least from the council conversations, they are [inaudible] to be more firm on timeline, but also at the same time, then of course, to work closely with PDPs and PDP chairs to make sure that they have the tools and the resources and support to be able to deliver on those timelines, because it's not helpful either to set a firm timeline where up front, you know that it's just simply not feasible based on the work that needs to happen and the time that you have available.

I think that is all I had, so I think we're at the question and answer part of our session. I hope I did already answer many of the questions that came up on the chat, but of course, if there are any other ones, I think – Yesim, I don't know if you're managing this or Alfredo. I'm happy to hand it to whoever is taking it from here.

ALFREDO CALDERON:	Yes. Thank you, Marika, for the presentation. It was clear, I guess, to most of the participants. I want to invite those that are in the French or Spanish channel, if they have any questions, please feel free to raise your hands and the interpreters will help us out with that. So I'll give a couple of seconds for those that are interested in asking questions and feel that English isn't their first language so they can ask their questions.

In the meantime, I want to remind everybody that next week, we have our third week of webinars where we're going to have Joke Braeken and Bart Boswinkel speaking on the ccNSO onboarding based on the onboarding course that they have in ICANN Learn how the ccNSO takes care of their policy development process and how are they organized.

The timeframe for those sessions will be Tuesday, May 7th at 21:00 UTC, and on Wednesday, May the 8th at 12:00 UTC. So we'll follow more or less the same sequence that we followed this week, except that it'll be on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 7th and May 8th of next week.

Are there any questions from the audience in the French and Spanish channels? Yesim, is there anything else we have to take care of?

YESIM NAZLAR:	Hi, Alfredo. I'm looking at the chat with our interpreters, and I don't see anything, any message from them, so I think no one has a question to ask for now. Thank you.

ALFREDO CALDERON:	Well, having said that, I want to again thanks Marika for her interesting presentation, and thank all of those participating in the session, and

staff as well for helping us in managing this webinar. I hope to see you all next week in the third webinar that we're going to have [inaudible].

With this, I conclude this webinar, thanking all of you for your participation. Thank you, have a great day.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Alfredo. Thank you very much, Marika. This webinar is now ended, and one last thank you to everyone who has joined us on today's webinar. Thank you all. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]