
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to today's pre-ATLAS II Webinar on the topic of Policy Development Process on Monday, 5 May 2014, at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call as it is a webinar. If I could please remind everyone to mute on the phone bridge, as well as your computer, to mute your speakers or microphone, as well as state your name when speaking not only for the recording and transcription purposes but to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels. We have Spanish and French interpreters today.

Thank you everyone for joining and back over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Terri. I'm standing in for Tijani Ben Jemaa, who is traveling again today, so he was unable to join the call and therefore to facilitate the call that we're having.

Welcome, everybody. This is indeed the fourth Capacity Building Program conference call that we have leading up to the At-Large Summit in London. Today, we are going to be speaking about the Capacity Building Program and policy development at ICANN.

As you know, a significant part of ICANN's work is policy development, and it takes place in a very interesting manner which is called bottom-up and multi-stakeholder, as well. All of these terms are going to be explained to you today.

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.

In fact, we have joining us two people who will be able to take us through this. First, Marika Konings, Senior Director for Policy Development Support at ICANN. We also have Thomas Rickert, who is a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) counselor. He's also a lawyer, which helps in those cases. Both of them are going to be able to tell you what happens in the other parts of ICANN. I'll be speaking to you about how policy development takes place in At-Large.

Without any further ado, I think we can probably start with the first slide. I think that is Marika who's going to be taking it – or, in fact, ICANN to start with, since we're dealing just with the overall ICANN-sphere. If we could have the first slide, please?

MARIKA KONINGS: I think we're here okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Over to Marika. Go ahead, Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thank you very much, Olivier. Thank you everyone for joining today's webinar. As Olivier said, my name is Marika Konings and I'm a Senior Director for Policy Development and Team Leader for the team that supports the Generic Names Supporting Organization (also known as the GNSO). I'm a Dutch national but based in the ICANN offices in Brussels, Belgium.

Just a little housekeeping item: in order to ensure that there is sufficient time at the end of our presentation, we would like to propose that you hold off any questions you may have or that you may want to ask in person until the end of the slide deck. However, we would like to encourage you to post any questions you may have throughout the presentation in the chat pod, and we'll do our best to answer those already.

As Olivier said, the focus of today's webinar is on policy development at ICANN. As confirmed by the ICANN bylaws, part of ICANN's mission is to coordinate policy development reasonably and appropriately, related to the technical functions of allocating and assigning the unique identifiers for the Internet. Which, as you may know, are the names part which is the domain names as well as numbers which includes the Internet protocol (or IP) addresses and autonomous system (or AS) numbers, as well as protocol port and parameter number.

In this session, we'll first focus on reviewing the ICANN policy development as well as Advisory Structures as well as looking at their remit and role within the ICANN policy development ecosystem, followed by some further information on how you can participate as well as stay up-to-date on these activities. But first, I'll hand it over to Olivier to have a closer look at ICANN's multi-stakeholder model.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Olivier, if you're speaking, you're on mute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not speaking, no. I'm letting Marika go through the slides. I think she can probably push forward and go through the first part.

MARIKA KONINGS: Olivier, I thought you wanted to take these two slides on the ICANN multi-stakeholder model.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'll take them, then. Basically, the next slide is a model which I think we've already shown in the past. This is the whole ICANN structure with the supporting organizations and the advisory committees. I've mentioned this in the last webinar.

If we move on to the slide after that and do what so many people would love to do, which is to get rid of the Board of Directors – but of course, we're not going to do such a thing. But if we do, then we see that we have many multi-stakeholder models in ICANN, including in the Address Supporting Organization that deals with the Regional Internet Registries. Policy development takes place in the Regional Internet Registries.

Then we've got the GNSO (the Generic Names Supporting Organization). We're going to hear about it in a moment. In the ccNSO, the policy takes place at country-code operator level. Often, there are multi-stakeholder processes taking place in order to design the policy. Then, of course, I don't need to speak to you about At-Large, as we know that's also multi-stakeholder.

Governments, obviously not multi-stakeholder, but they're there for a specific reason since they are not present in many of the other parts. In

theory, they should not be present in any other parts of ICANN. In practice, governments are sometimes present in the ccNSO as sometimes it is governments that run country top-level domains.

That's the structure in itself. I hand the floor back now to Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Olivier. Now we start looking at some of the details of the graphics that Olivier just has showed you focusing on the ICANN supporting organizations (also known as SOs), which have an operational responsibility for developing policies each within their specific remit and through their own processes. While advisory committees (or ACs) have an influential advisory role. they provide advice directly to the ICANN Board and ICANN community.

Some of those also participate actively in the process of the supporting organizations, and the At-Large Advisory Committee is an obvious example of that. As we go through the presentation, we'll go into further detail for each of these supporting organizations and advisory committees.

As you probably all know firsthand, policy development activities in ICANN are carried out by volunteers, supported by ICANN policy staff. In this slide, we just tried to capture the different levels of participation and involvement that currently exist within ICANN. With approximately 300 core volunteers which includes, for example, those volunteers that serve on the different councils or supporting organizations or ex coms of advisory committees.

Right about 1,600 working community members which participate by serving as member of a working group or submitting comments on policy proposals. And a community of approximately 5,000 members who can be considered directly impacted by policy development activities. If you think, for examples, of vendors or contracted parties.

Then, with around that, of course, there's a circle of all Internet users who may be indirectly impacted by the outcomes of ICANN policy development activities. Maybe just to know that these are our very rough estimates purely intended to provide you with an illustration of the different spheres of participation as we currently see them.

First we'll turn to the ICANN supporting organizations who, as mentioned before, have an operational responsibility for developing policy recommendations, which are in turn then submitted to the ICANN Board for its consideration.

First off is the Generic Names Supporting Organization (or GNSO). With that, I'll hand it over to Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks so much, Marika. Thanks to ALAC for having me. I will talk a little bit about the Generic Names Supporting Organization's Policy Development Process.

I hope to be able to avoid acronyms in order to make it a little bit more user-friendly to follow. But basically, having worked in the ICANN ecosystem for a couple years now, you could easily have a chat with one

of your colleagues only using acronyms without any real words. That's certainly something that we should avoid here.

But I should also say as an encouragement that even those that have been working with ICANN for quite some time don't know all acronyms. Don't get too frustrated if you don't know them by heart instantly.

Now, as Olivier mentioned in his opening remarks, GNSO stands for Generic Names Supporting Organization. That's the other part of the domain name compared to the ccNSO, which are the country codes. The Generic Names Supporting Organization (or GNSO) or gTLDs that are the likes of .com, .net, .info, .museum, .pro, and all the new TLDs that are now subsequently being introduced under the ICANN New gTLD Program.

We have a little bit over 20 councilors in the GNSO that come from different constituencies or stakeholder groups. Also, there are NomCom appointees, which are called NCAs. As you well know, the NomCom provides an opportunity for community members to put in an SOI and then be selected for one of the leadership positions that ICANN has available in its multi-stakeholder model.

If you look at this chart, the green figure that you see on the left-hand side of the slide, that's me. That's me. I'm the NCA, the NomCom appointee, who is actually allocated to the contracted parties house. There's another NCA allocated to the non-contracted parties house. Then we have another NCA – which is colored red – which is non-voting. Also there you find your ALAC colleague, which is Alan Greenberg, and then a representative from the ccNSO.

Now, having said that, what you see here is a bicameral system. You have the registries and the registrars. Those are those that have contracts with ICANN. No group on this side has concluded contracts with ICANN, which is why they are called the non-contracted parties house and these are called the contracted parties house. It's the registries that are the operators of a TLD. Then it's the registrars who can actually offer registrations to end-users. Those are in this house.

Then in the other house, we have, again, a little demarcation here between the commercial users and the non-commercial users. This is where you find the business users, the representatives of the intellectual property community, and the connectivity and Internet service providers. You find them here. This is where you find the non-commercial users (NCUC) and NPOC.

I guess that's an important thing to take away, that we have a bicameral system that is the contracted parties and the non-contracted parties.

Now, in this slide, you basically see the same structure again. We have the registries, the registrars. Those are both stakeholder groups. Then you have the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and the Commercial Stakeholder Group. You see, this is a reflection of the slide that we saw here a moment ago. In the registry stakeholder group, we find another funny acronym, which is NTAG. That is the New TLD Applicant Group.

I guess that's important for you to bear in mind, as well, i.e., that those who have applied for their own top-level domain but those who don't yet have a contract with ICANN, they have found their home in the Registry Stakeholder Group in the NTAG because, since they don't yet

have a contract with ICANN, they are not a contracted party. Therefore, they can't be a formal member of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

I should also say that you've seen that there were voting NCAs and non-voting NCAs, as well as your ALAC representative doesn't vote in the GNSO Council. There are those who say that, "Well, if you can't vote, then you don't really have a weight in such a structure." I would strongly disagree with that.

What's important is the deliberations. It's important to be able to influence the process of decision-making. Then, in many instances, the decisions, they do find their origin in the deliberation. If you provide good-quality input into the deliberations, then what you say does have a weight. Alan Greenberg – who is also on this call – will hopefully be able to confirm this. Even if you don't vote, you do have a say and you can influence what's actually been agreed and voted upon in the GNSO Council.

I guess I should also mention that the GNSO Council is just the steward of the Policy Making Process in the GNSO as such. That's also maybe something that you could take away from this call, is that the GNSO (the Generic Names Supporting Organization) with all these groups inside it is a very big and powerful source of information, knowledge, and expertise. The GNSO Council should just ensure that the policy making that is done inside the GNSO does follow certain structures, ensures that everybody is heard, and so on and so forth.

Also on this slide, you see the NCUCs (the Non-Commercial Users Constituency), as well as NPOC (which is the Not-For-Profit Operational

Concerns Constituency), which is maybe a little bit difficult to remember. But you can go to ICANN's website and look up all the acronyms and the microsites or websites of these groups.

Inside the Commercial Stakeholder Group – just for sake of completeness – you see the BC (that's the Business Users Constituency), the ISPCP (the Internet Service Provider and Connectivity Providers Constituency), and then the IPC (which is the Intellectual Property Constituency).

Now, this slide sums up the process that has sometimes been called very cumbersome and lengthy. That is, the Policy Development Process in the GNSO. As you will learn and as you've heard in the remarks that have been made earlier, the various groups have their own Policy Development Processes. For the gTLDs, for the generic namespaces, the Policy Development Process of the GNSO would apply.

You should look at the fine print here. This is actually true that even though this might already look confusing to some of you, this is just an abbreviated version of a process that is a little bit more elaborated. But I guess this will help us to get a basic understanding of what is done.

It starts up here. The Policy Development Process starts with a request for an issues report. You might ask yourself, "What is an issues report?" That's basically a report where the authors ask themselves, "Is there an issue that has to be resolved? Is there smoke or is there fire?" Also, they would look at whether this is a subject that is within the remit of ICANN and the GNSO. The GNSO couldn't start making policy on things that they are not responsible for.

This also helps the GNSO but also the wider community understand what we're actually trying to tackle. Because it's very important for the working group that will subsequently be formed – after the initiation of the Policy Development Process (or PDP, as we call it) – to know what issue they have to work on and what they have to resolve. The issues report is an important milestone, an important paper, to understand what actually needs to be done. To give guidance to those that are working on inside the working group.

There's public comment gathered at this stage of the PDP. You will note that we see these funny folks here, we see them here, and we see them here. While everything else changes, right? The wording changes. We have three opportunities – and actually there are more opportunities in the whole process – but there are multiple opportunities to provide public comment. This is important.

You will remember that I said earlier that it does make a difference if you chime in and make yourself heard even if you don't have a vote, right? This is everybody's opportunity to participate. You don't have to go to ICANN meetings. You don't have to attend phone calls or webinars such as this one. But what you need to do is if you want to make yourself heard and let those that are working in the PDP know what your views on specific issues are.

Before the issues report is actually passed on to the stakeholder groups and constituencies for their statements, for them to provide feedback, to obtain their views on what they think a solution to an issue might be the public is heard first.

If you go to ICANN.org, on the home page, if you scroll down the home page, you find links to currently open public comment fora. That's very easy to find. You find the currently open public comment fora there. You can review all the comments that have been made. You can also look at archived, older public comment periods.

Now we're moving to the top right of this diagram. That's the request for statements from the various groups, because all the groups inside the GNSO are being asked on their view in response to the issue at-hand.

Then, the working group produces an initial report. That's basically the first phase of a report that shall then become the working group final report. Between here and there, usually there's a couple of months' worth of work.

Working groups are meeting regularly. They're having telephone conferences or face-to-face meetings at ICANN meetings to discuss the issue brought to them and to work on the charter that they have been given by the Council so that they can actually do their work.

Between here and here, as I said, is a couple months' work. Before final report is actually finalized, again there's the opportunity to provide public comment.

I think it's important to mention that these public comments are actually being heard. There have been allegations a few years back that if you participate in public comment fora, it's more or less like throwing ideas into a black hole. You will never see them again.

These days, working groups actually do have something which we call the Public Comment Review Tool. All the public comment that is received is individually looked at and discussed by the working group. It's discussed whether the report has already been considered.

Action is taken if fresh ideas are in there that haven't yet been incorporated into the working group's work or a comment has been made that no action is needed for whatever reasons the working group might then give to the original commenter. That's all going into the final report.

At that point in time, if a final report is made and if the working group has made its so-called consensus call – the working groups are working on a consensus-driven model. In an ideal world, they would all think that the working product, i.e., the recommendations that they will pass on to the GNSO Council, are carried by everybody.

This is certainly not the case in all scenarios. You can easily imagine that there are a lot of subjects where the interests of non-commercial users and business users are different from the ones of the contracted parties. But the aim is to reach consensus.

Now, consensus in the world of ICANN's policy making can have different levels. You can have full consensus, which means that there's actually unanimity of all the participants. Everybody says "yes" or "no" to something.

Then you can have consensus or rough consensus. That's only where a few people think that it's not a good idea but the predominant view of

the working group members is that the recommendation should be supported.

Then you have strong support but significant opposition. That's less than consensus.

Then you have divergence, i.e., where everybody has their own views but the group can't really come to consensus on a specific item.

I guess that's important to bear in mind, that the working groups strive at coming to conclusions that are actually consensus conclusions or that are as close to consensus as can be because only those items that have strong community support will be successful. I think we see that in many areas of life. It's the same here.

Once the final report is adopted, it goes to the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council will then deliberate on it. If the GNSO Council adopts the recommendations that have been made by the working group, then it passes on the recommendations to the ICANN Board of Directors. Again, public comment is asked for. Then, the Board takes a vote.

It usually happens that the Board will adopt the recommendations that have been made by the GNSO and its Council. Actually, the bylaws of ICANN do say that the Board needs pretty good reasons to vote down policy recommendations that have been made by the GNSO. The voting threshold that they need to vote down GNSO policy recommendations depends on how strong the GNSO has actually supported the recommendations.

Which means that if there's very strong support for recommendations in the GNSO, then it's very hard for the Board to turn them over. They only can do so if, let's say, the Internet is at-risk. I'm paraphrasing, here. But that says something. If the GNSO does its homework well and the more it comes to consensus, the harder it is for the Board to vote down the GNSO's recommendations.

After the Board has adopted them, they are being implemented. Now we'll talk about implementation a little bit more as we move on.

TERRI AGNEW: Excuse me, Thomas? This is Terri from staff. It appears that we've lost our interpretation. Do you mind just pausing for a moment so we can get that reestablished?

THOMAS RICKERT: Sure, sure.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. One moment, please. I do apologize, everyone. It'll be just a moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just to let everyone know, during the last webinar we did lose the interpretation for a short while. It just takes them a time to get back online.

But as Thomas is going through this long diagram of Policy Development Process, you will note several moments where public comments are being gathered. That's something which I will be speaking about shortly. Of course, public comments is one of the locations where At-Large members are asked to bring input, the other one being when the GNSO invites people from around ICANN to join the GNSO Working Group.

As Alan mentioned in the chat earlier, all it takes is commitment and an effort to the process – a commitment of time. It doesn't cost anything, but it takes your time because these are complex issues which require sometimes a lot of conference calls. That's a little interlude, in the meantime. Are the interpreters back on?

TERRI AGNEW: I believe we're still working on that. So sorry for the delay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll continue ad-libbing in the meantime, just to fill the gaps. How many PDPs are in operation at the moment, Thomas? Policy Development Processes are in operation at the moment?

THOMAS RICKERT: I'm afraid for the exact figure, we would need Marika's advice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are we looking at one, two, ten, twenty?

MARIKA KONINGS:

I can answer that question. We currently actually have 11 Policy Development Processes in various stages of the process. I think as Thomas pointed out, there are a number of different steps that need to be taken.

For example, there are currently three of those which are in the issues scoping phase. There are three that are actually in the working group phase; one that's under Board consideration, partly still under Board consideration; and four that are actually in the phase of being implemented.

Again, overall, there are 11, but the phase in which we actually have active community engagement and participation through working groups, that's currently four. One is open for public comment, and three that are in the working group phase.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That's great, Marika. Thank you. As you can see, At-Large colleagues, there are a lot of processes going on in parallel. That is just the Generic Names Supporting Organization.

Now you will start understanding why there's a flood of e-mails that arrives sometimes in your mailbox. Of course, it's pretty much impossible for everyone to follow the flood that comes in. You have to carefully pick what you are interested in and what you can contribute to and what you know about, as well.

I guess part of the work of the At-Large Summit will be to bring you up-to-date with many of their things that are taking place in the GNSO. Part

of this conference call at this very moment is to tell you the processes, because they are complex.

By having so many public comments, for example, that ensures that there is a constant feedback loop from those people that are affected, from the rest of the community. Feedback loop into the process for the people conducting the policy development to take this input in and amend the policy accordingly. Thomas, please correct me if I'm not saying the right thing, here. It's a case of the interpretation of this.

I wondered, do we have the interpreters back now or should we continue? Because I wondered if we could perhaps have a few questions if we can't have the interpreters yet.

TERRI AGNEW: A few questions would be excellent at this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Still no French interpretation. Okay, let's open the floor for questions, then. Just a limited time. Perhaps regarding this diagram or anything that has been covered so far.

TERRI AGNEW: I [hand it] to you if we could open up all phone lines at this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's a note from Carlos in the chat, Carlos Dionisio Aguirre. "It seems to me it's very difficult for newbies" – "newbies" being new people – "to

understand in a complete way what is meant by the PDP and its complex procedure. I think we need more than one webinar.”

Well, certainly, there might be another webinar. Well, there will be another webinar in the future. We might cover this again when we are face-to-face, but it’s good to have a first go.

Garth Graham has a question: “In ALAC, what is the reasonably relevant balance between the community that an ALS represents to the user engagement level and ICANN’s internal communities? Or put that another way, what’s the push/pull in the identification of policy issues from the viewpoint of ICANN’s expectations and what’s in the real world?”

Wow, what a question. Very, very good question indeed. Marika, you put your hand up. Can you tackle this one?

MARIKA KONINGS:

I actually have as well a response to Carlos’s question. I just wanted to note as well that, in addition to the webinar we’re doing here, the GNSO is as well trying to be more proactive in welcoming newcomers and being able to take them through some of the processes and procedures, as we understand that these are complex and may be overwhelming at first.

We actually have a monthly webinar we call an Open House Working Group Newcomer Webinar – and I’m hoping that [Matthieu] may post a link to the invitation for that – which is really intended as an open house. Anyone can show up and ask any questions they may have on

GNSO Policy Development Processes. Really intended to make sure that people feel that they have tools and information that they need to start working in these groups.

To Garth's question, if I understand it correctly in relation to identification of policy issues – and Thomas may have touched upon that as well – but if not I'll just emphasize it again. But the request for an issue report is not only limited to those that are within the GNSO, so GNSO constituencies or stakeholder groups. Advisory committees or the ICANN Board also have the ability to request an issue report, which is the first step in a Policy Development Process.

For example, the At-Large Advisory Committee has done so I believe on two occasions already where they actually flagged an issue that they believed was not being addressed of specific interest to end-users. As such, those topics got addressed.

Just to note that of course, as well, within the GNSO there are also end-users active. As I said, the ALAC actively participates, either through the participation in working groups and you have Alan as an acting liaison to the GNSO Council who, on a regular basis, will also raise specific issues that are of interest to your respective communities.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marika. The operators, I'm told, are still not on. Alan, did you wish to add anything at this point, actually, as being the ALAC GNSO liaison?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, I think Marika has pretty well covered it. Participation in the working groups is open and for anyone who's prepared to do a little bit of homework and actively participate, you have just as much of a voice as any of the formal constituencies.

In terms of raising issues, a single person cannot just raise an issue and unilaterally get it adopted. But if you get communities behind you and convince other people that there is an issue that needs to be addressed and it's within scope, then it can happen. It has. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. That was Alan Greenberg, our GNSO liaison. Now, are we back online? I know the Spanish interpreters are back on. We're still waiting for the French interpreters. Apologies to everyone. These are technical issues that we sometimes have. We are having these calls interpreted simultaneously in Spanish and French. Of course, that introduces one additional technical loop. We just have people from around the world, so that's one of the things you will find sometimes in At-Large.

The technical issues which unfortunately because we are conducting so many calls and so many conference calls with people joining worldwide. We have a very good supplier and a back channel person in the name of Gisella, who does amazing work in coordinating people have dropped and so on. But when the interpreters drop off, that obviously is a problem for all of us.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Olivier, I just wanted to add that I guess that I wouldn't that much make a distinction between ICANN's expectations and other groups' expectations, as Garth Graham put it. I guess it's a matter of where you see issues. Then you can try to find fora or others to support you with your aim. Or you look at your areas of expertise or interest, and maybe that helps you find the topics that you wish to work on.

If you have a technical background and if you've always wondered why it is so easy to transfer a domain name from one registrar to the other, then you might wish to look at those areas.

If you are interested in free speech, then you might want to learn more about and help shape the parameters under which privacy and proxy service providers will have to operate in future.

There's no obligation for you to deliver, let's say. You can read reports. You can respond by e-mail if you want to. You can participate in a working group. It's all for free. You even get dial-outs if you want to be dialed-out to. I guess there are ample opportunities, depending on your area of interest, to make yourself heard and to get your policy points across.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Thomas. That's a very good point indeed. In fact, you mentioned the p-word, the "policy" word, and that's something which is particularly important because that's the part that will, at the end of the day, affect the 2.6 billion Internet users out there.

This is where the real problem lies: how to involve the Internet end-user early enough so that they are able to bring the inputs – either in the public comments or actually starting in the working group itself – so as to have a policy that will serve the Internet end-user and that will be fair for the Internet end-user at the end of the process. Remember, once it's reached policy, it's very difficult to come back to the drawing board because that gets implemented worldwide.

One of the problems that we have found – and this is just a personal comment I'm making – but one of the problems I have found is the fact that some of these processes take place so quickly because there is a time pressure to have policy implemented as soon as possible.

Now, the whole process – from the beginning of the GNSO PDP to the end of the GNSO PDP – might be several years. It's sometimes several years of very hard work. If you're not there early enough, you will have a real problem being able to catch up in order to reach the end of this. As a result, we've sometimes found that people arrive too late to change the policy because the Policy Development Process is already at its latter stage of development. That's often a problem.

How to get more people involved early? You will sometimes hear some call for people to join a GNSO working group. As ALAC Chair, now putting back my hat on, I have found we've had some poor response – for several reasons, I guess. One of them is the time that it takes. Can you commit to a conference call once a week for the next couple of years or the next year or so? Many people can't. That becomes something a bit more difficult for people to pursue.

Then there's also the lack of understanding in the issues themselves. Hopefully, we'll be able to do a better job at explaining the issues and maybe bringing you some interest for these issues.

What's important, really, to note in this is that this is bottom-up, multi-stakeholder policy development on a global scale that leads to operational policy, as opposed to theoretical and academic discussions that sometimes take place in other fora. The IGF, for example: a lot of theoretical and academical and principle discussions, but there's no actual policy development. It's mostly policy shaping, not policy making.

There we are. I see in the chat that we will start the call again without French interpretation. Apologies to the people on the French channel for the time being. You can listen to the presentation on the Adobe Connect in English. Then, as soon as French interpretation is back on, staff will be putting details in the chat. I hand the floor back to you, Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks so much, Olivier. So sorry for the French-speaking participants. Unfortunately, my French is not good enough to do the presentation in French. Je suis desole, that's what I wanted to say and that's almost where my French capabilities end.

Talking about end, I will have ended my short intervention about GNSO Policy Development Process in two or three minutes, so we've almost discussed everything that we have prepared.

We're now coming to the point where we answer the question that you will all have asked yourself, and that is: Why do we need policies? Why are we going to go through all of that? Are those policies binding or are they non-binding? What are they good for? Are they just recommendations? You heard me use the word "recommendations" earlier. What does it really mean?

In that regard, you should try to remember the phrase "consensus policy," because the outcome of a PDP (of a Policy Development Process) in the GNSO, once the recommendations that are the outcome of the PDP have been adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors, they become consensus policies. From a legal perspective, they are powerful and a beautiful tool.

Because as you heard earlier, you will remember the bicameral system inside the GNSO. We have the contracted parties and the non-contracted parties. Just imagine a policy that deals with requirements to be fulfilled by registry operators. As I mentioned, the registry operators are under contract with ICANN. In the offline world – so to speak – ICANN would need to go to its contractors and ask them to change the contract. If you go to your landlord and you want to have your lease agreement changed, you need to change that, right?

With consensus policies, it's different because all the registries and the registrars do have provisions in their contract whereby they have to follow whatever consensus policy is ever adopted.

Basically, with the adoption of the policy recommendations by the ICANN Board of Directors, you have changed all the existing contracts in

no time. It's not only for the future. Not only for new gTLDs with new contracts or upon contract renewal, but all the existing contracts are also automatically changed.

That leads us to another interesting subject, the picket fence subject. I can assure you that I've been sitting in ICANN meetings wondering why these guys and ladies are talking about picket fence. Are we working on a farm now? I really couldn't understand what we were talking about.

Basically, there is this ambiguity in the contracts where the registries and the registrars claim that certain things are to be negotiated between them and ICANN as a matter of contract and that the community doesn't really have a say on all the contractual arrangements that they might have. But what's inside the picket fence, there's an area of the contract that can be altered, amended, or changed by consensus policies. That's actually where the freedom to negotiate contracts ends.

Inside the picket fence, the consensus policies do have a say. That is primarily to ensure that we have a stable and secure Internet. Also that all the registries and registrars are working along the same standards for WHOIS, which is the database in which you can find domain-related data, such as the owner data, [inaudible] data, or the [inaudible] data.

Examples of these policies are the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy which, again, are multiple policies that have to do with the transfer of domains between registrars. Then the UDRP, which is a [success story] to resolve clear-cut cases of trademark infringement. Every user that registers a domain name has to accept the UDRP. All the registrars are, by

consensus policy, required to incorporate that in their terms and conditions or make reference to the UDRP and also implement the panel decisions that are made under the UDRP.

Now I come to the last of one slide: How can I participate in the GNSO? Do make public comments. Follow mailing lists. Join a stakeholder group or constituency. Volunteer to join a working group. Again, you don't necessarily have to speak there or to contribute at a large scale. You can try a working group and then listen in to start with to acquaint yourself with all the processes and procedures. You can attend the GNSO Council's meetings if you want to.

Again, these are subjects that are currently being discussed. If you look at the second point, we also have a PDP on requirements for privacy and proxy services at the moment. A lot of wrongdoers are using privacy and proxy services to hide their identity when they're committing crimes online. Therefore, there shall be more harsh requirements for privacy and proxy services.

I guess the community needs to ensure that the privacy and proxy services are operating in the fashion that also helps protect the identity of registrants that want to use their right of freedom of expression so that they're not jeopardized that their data will too easily be revealed.

As you can see, this is all multifaceted. Even though the privacy and proxy topic might look somewhat technical, there's a real-life impact of that. This has to deal with Internationalized Domain Names. Let's say, how shall we deal with Chinese characters or other scripts that are non-ASCII? This is a current topic where we are looking at ways to not make

policy decisions in a vacuum but actually obtain real-life data to support the deliberations that we have.

The Policy and Implementation Group is dealing with the question on: What is policy and what is implementation of existing policy? That would be a rather long discussion, but let me confine myself to one remark, here.

As you can imagine, policy recommendations tend to be somewhat general and short. When they are being implemented, usually you need to add more detail to it. There is disagreement on when a change or when an implementation is, again, policy making or when it's merely implementing an existing policy.

This is where you find more information about what we discussed. With that, I'd like to hand back over to Olivier or Marika. Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Thomas. I think it's back to me. As we're just slightly running out of time, I'll try to cover the rest of the slides in a short time. But I'll try not to speak too fast.

Next, we will basically look at the Country Code Supporting Organization, also known as the ccNSO. The ccNSO is a body within the ICANN structure that was created for and by country code top-level domain managers (or ccTLD managers). Since its creation in 2003, the ccNSO has provided a forum for country code top-level domain managers to meet and discuss topical issues of concern to ccTLDs from a global perspective.

As such, the ccNSO provides a platform to nurture consensus, tactical cooperation, and skill building among ccTLDs and facilitates the development of voluntary best practices for ccTLD managers.

It's also responsible for developing and recommending global policies to the ICANN Board for a limited set of issues relating to ccTLDs such as, for example, the introduction of Internationalized Domain Names ccTLDs (also known as the IDN ccTLDs).

The ccNSO Policy Development Process itself is managed by the ccNSO Council, which consists of 18 councilors: 15 elected by the ccNSO members and 3 appointed by the ICANN Nominating Committee. The ccNSO activities are mostly organized through working groups, such as for example, the Strategic and Operational Planning (or SOP) Working Group or the Technical Working Group.

Through the ccNSO, ccTLD managers are also working together with other stakeholders and communities within the ICANN structures, such as the Governmental Advisory Committee (or the GAC), as well as the GNSO, which you heard Thomas speak about before.

Currently, the ccNSO has 149 members spread over the five geographic regions as they have been defined by ICANN. As I noted before, and an important focus of the ccNSO is to meet and discuss issues that are of common interest, which they do in the form of exchanges of information, for example, during what they call a Tech Day at ICANN meetings or the networking events that take place then.

Furthermore, through the ccNSO, the ccTLD community works together to represent ccTLD community interests in ICANN through the development of common positions and input on core ICANN activities.

If you compare the ccNSO to the GNSO, a much smaller part of the ccNSO time and resources are actually dedicated to policy development, as most of the policy development activities for ccTLDs actually take place at a local level. Many of you may have participated in such activities for your local ccTLD.

While policy development for the GNSO is as broad as policy topics related to generic top-level domains – although as Thomas noted, there may be certain limitations when it comes to looking at what qualifies for consensus policies – the topics that are actually within the remit for the ccNSO Policy Development Process are much more limited and very specifically defined in Annex C of the ICANN bylaws.

As said, the scope for the ccNSO Policy Development Process is fairly restricted. Which, as a result, has translated in a very limited number of ccTLD Policy Development Processes to-date. I believe the ccNSO is currently only in its second PDP (or Policy Development Process) ever, which focuses on Internationalized Domain Names (or IDNs). A third PDP is planned to address the retirement of ccTLDs.

However, in addition to formal Policy Development Processes, the ccNSO also undertakes policy related work, which has focused on topics such as the use of country and territory names as top-level domains as well as delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs.

Membership of the ccNSO is limited to ccTLD managers. However, most of the meetings that they host at ICANN meetings are open to the public. As mentioned before, at a local level, there may be additional opportunities to get involved in ccTLD policy development activities.

For further information about the ccNSO, here's some links where you can find more information about their organization as well as the specificities of their Policy Development Process. You may note that there's some similarities but also some differences between how GNSO and ccNSO Policy Development Processes are run.

Next up is the Address Supporting Organization (or ASO). In order to understand the role of the Address Supporting Organization, I'll also need to explain the roles of the Regional Internet Registries (or RIRs) as well as the Number Resource Organization (or NRO).

The Regional Internet Registries, of which there are currently five representing each ICANN region – which is AfriNIC for Africa, APNIC for Asia-Pacific, ARIN for North America, LACNIC for South America, and RIPE for Europe – these Regional Internet Registries cooperate through the NRO (or the Number Resource Organization). In turn, the NRO provides the secretariat support for the ASO.

In addition, the Regional Internet Registries delegate joint operational and external activities to the NRO. The NRO may also enter into cooperative agreement on behalf of all the RIRs with international/national public sector organizations. One of the core functions of the NRO is to promote and protect the bottom-up Internet

resource Policy Development Process that they use for the development of their policies.

In turn, then, the ASO (or the Address Supporting Organization) is the ICANN-facing body while the Number Resource Organization (the NRO) is the Regional Internet Registry-facing body. The two bodies are connected but have different responsibilities.

The purpose of the ASO is to review and develop recommendations on a global Internet resource policy and to advise the ICANN Board accordingly. The functions of the ASO are carried about the ASO Address Council, which consists of the members of the NRO Number Council. The NRO members are elected and appointed by their respective Regional Internet Registry communities.

What are those global policies that the ASO is responsible for reviewing and developing recommendations on? Like the ccNSO, there are many regional addressing policies that are developed by Regional Internet Registries through their own respective Policy Development Processes. Again, many of you may have already participated in some of those.

However, there are only a few of those policies that actually affect IANA. Those only are called global policies. Before those policies move up to the ASO, an identical version of the proposed policy first needs to be ratified by each of the Regional Internet Registry communities.

An example of such global policy is the one on the recovered Internet protocol (or IPv4) address space post-exhaustion. This policy actually enables IANA to handle recovered IPv4 address space and allocate

smaller blocks than before, which was adopted by the ICANN Board in May 2012.

As you can imagine, as global policies really need to rise to the level of all Regional Internet Registry's agreeing to such a policy, there are only a limited number of policies that are typically adopted or implemented over the course of the years.

[Check into] about the ASO. As I said, there are probably many more opportunities to participate actively in their development at the regional level. But here you can find a link to the ASO, and you can find more information about the organization there.

Now, looking at the ICANN advisory committees. ICANN advisory committees (or also known as ACs) are the formal advisory bodies within ICANN that are made up of representatives from the ICANN community to advise ICANN on a particular issue or policy area. Currently, there are four of these advisory committees. To talk more about the At-Large Advisory Committee (or ALAC), I'll hand it back over to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marika. At-Large is something I've already covered in the past webinar, but we'll go through this very quickly. It's a community of more than – I think we're now more than 160 At-Large Structures since we've seen a large number of At-Large Structures join recently.

The At-Large Structures are any type of group – computer clubs, associations, learning centers, etc. – that have something in common in that they really are working directly with individual end-users. As you know, they are active throughout the world. As you can see in our webinar list of attendees, you are joining us from everywhere around the world.

The ALAC (the At-Large Advisory Committee) itself does several things. The first is to issue comments in response to the ICANN public comment requests. You will have seen, the GNSO generates a lot of public comment requests, but we also have the other parts of ICANN sometimes issuing public comment requests. Of course, the ICANN Board also issues public comment requests.

At-Large is able to comment on everything and anything that is ICANN-related. It will issue not only comments for all of these public comments requests, but it will also issue comments on any subject, process, policy, or topic that it thinks or deems important to comment on in ICANN. That also will include the budget, the strategy of ICANN, these overarching processes that are taking place in ICANN for ICANN's future and for the future of the Internet and the DNS.

The At-Large Advisory Committee also has the possibility to issue comments on anything outside of those public comment processes. At any time, the ALAC is able to comment on things. It can comment on external processes that are linked to ICANN or linked to the ICANN mandate in one way or other and which, of course, affect Internet end-users.

For example, in the past when there was a renewal of the U.S. government contract with ICANN for the running of the DNS root, which is at the top of the Internet Domain Name System, the ALAC submitted a comment to the U.S. government about the views of the Internet users that were part of our membership.

Then, of course, it takes part in the cross-community working groups within ICANN. That's a special type of working group where more than one of ICANN's supporting organizations or advisory committees comes together and work jointly on a topic. It also, of course, is one way to come into the policy process. We've heard from Thomas earlier, the other way is for the ALAC to send people to the GNSO Policy Development Process.

Then, a couple more things that At-Large does. Of course, we have to relay the ICANN message to Internet users around the world. That's really information from ICANN to the rest of the world. Thankfully, because of our large footprint, we are able to cover most – if not all – of the parts of the world. It's important. This is really important that you, as an At-Large Structures representative, are able to understand the issues that take place in ICANN and relay those to your local Internet users because these issues affect them directly – completely, in fact.

Then finally, one of the things that the At-Large community was given, one of the mandates it was given is to coordinate the filing of objections to the new generic top-level domains which were being created. This process is now finished, because the objections time period has closed.

At-Large has filed objections against three applications for the string .hell. They went through the overall policy and the external examiners that looks at the objections. At the end of the day, these objections were rejected for several reasons that I'm not going to go into right now because we don't have the time, but what's important is that we do have the ability to file those objections.

In future rounds of new top-level domains that will be created, I would say that the ALAC will continue retaining this ability and perhaps change the process by which it will be able to file those objections. Next slide, please.

Organization diagram for At-Large, I think we've all seen this in the past – the five regions. Each region selects two people that goes to the At-Large Advisory Committee.

Big difference, yeah: At-Large is the overall community around the world; At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) is just the 15-member committee that we have. Two people from each region are selected by each one of the regional At-Large Organizations. We've got Africa (AFRALO), Asia-Pacific (APRALO), Europe (EURALO), etc. Then one person is selected on that committee by the Nominating Committee, which is a separate committee that appoints people.

You've heard earlier, Thomas tell us about the Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO. Well, there are also Nominating Committee appointees to the ALAC. That really brings an essential element of additional people that would brought in perhaps sometimes to counteract any gender imbalance or any geographical imbalance.

Well, in our case, we're not really geographically imbalanced because we do have the five regions, but in some cases. It also fills imbalance. If we are in the ALAC in need of a very strong need for a specific skill, we are able to call the Nominating Committee and they will find someone that has those skills so that for the ALAC to have that skill set.

Then the ALAC selects – along with the Chair of the different regional At-Large Organizations – one person who goes over to the ICANN Board. Who doesn't represent At-Large anymore, because once you are on the ICANN Board, you can't represent the interests of your community specifically but you have to represent the interests of everyone. But because that person is selected by the At-Large community, it is fair to assume that that person will have strong links with our community and will also have very similar views to what our community's views are.

The last two years, we had Sebastien Bachollet, who was on the ICANN Board selected by At-Large. Starting from the end of this year, there will be Rinalia Abdul Rahim who will take over from him. Next.

Oops, there was a jump. Here we go.

At-Large is all bottom-up. It's all bottom-up in that you've got the At-Large Structures at the bottom of the pyramid. The At-Large Structures, when they have an issue with something, can discuss the issue with their regional At-Large Organizations.

If two or more regional At-Large Organizations believe that there is something that is of importance, they can inform the ALAC. The issue can go all the way – very quickly – from an At-Large Structure and be discussed on the ALAC. Then the ALAC can proceed forward with making

a decision as to how this problem needs to be tackled. Next slide, please.

Of course, one of the ways to tackle those procedures is to create a statement. This is a quick diagram on how a statement gets built when taken from an At-Large Structure. First, the discussion takes place in the RALO. If there is consensus at the RALO level, the RALO engages with other RALOs. If there's consensus across the RALOs – or at least more than one RALO – then the discussion is engaged across all of the different RALOs and moves over to the ALAC level.

If there's consensus on the ALAC – and often, as I told you, from here to here, it might be just a matter of a couple of days if the subject, the topic is very important – then what happens is that the ALAC decides to go for a statement and basically creates a first statement.

Someone picks up the pen, basically. The first statement is being drafted. That's put on the wiki page. Then there's a request for comments, again. You will have noted these coming onto the ALAC Announce list asking for comments.

With the comments, the statement is being amended. Once the statement is amended, then the ALAC issues an actual statement – a final copy, if you want – of the statement. Then the statement needs to be ratified by the 15-member ALAC through a vote. Once the vote is affected, then the statement is released and sent to the people in charge.

Of course, that's if the vote actually passes with a majority. Nine times out of ten – in fact, so far, I think it's happened on every time – by the

time we've reached, really, the issuing of the statement phase, it really means that consensus has been achieved. It's very unlikely that the ALAC will vote against it.

In fact as the Chair, I've noted that if there has been no consensus, then we basically have ended up not having a statement released because there was no consensus. Or in some cases, we've shown the two points of view – often it is a contrast between two points of view in the ALAC – and sent this over to the Board or to the GNSO Working Group. Which has therefore shown the working group that the community is split on the issue.

Now, the next slide is when we are responding to a public comment request. On here, what we have is ICANN sends a note and asks for public comment. There is a discussion that takes place both on the ALAC but also in the regional At-Large Organizations and on the At-Large mailing list. At-Large Structures are invited to provide input and comment. If there is an interest, a comment is required from the ALAC, then someone is asked to pick up the pen.

I have to remind you here, that person, that penholder can be anyone. It does not need to be an ALAC member. It doesn't need to be someone from a RALO leadership. It can be any At-Large Structure representative that will pick up the pen and draft that statement.

The first draft is drafted. If some of you are interested in drafting statements, please volunteer. Don't be scared. If it's your first statement, we could have some people help you. In fact, there can be more than one author. Sometimes we have two, three, or four authors

that work together to produce a statement which is sometimes just a paragraph in length; sometimes it's several pages in length. It really all depends about the message that we wish to send forward.

The first draft is put on the wiki page. People are asked to comment on it in the comment thing at the bottom of the page. If there consensus on this, then the ALAC issues the statement, which then needs to be ratified in the same way as it's done in the previous process I showed you. Then the statement is released and sent to the Public Comment Process.

The only problem that we have here is that from this point (the very beginning) to this point (the very end) we have 21 days, and 21 days is not very much time. It's a constant struggle for time to be able to go from the top of the pyramid all the way to the At-Large Structures, all the way back to the top. We are in discussions with ICANN and with the policy development side of ICANN to try and soften this 21 days.

The way a public comment works is 21 days initial public comment, then 21 days reply period. That's 42 days in total. Quite often, we have sent an electronic mail to the staff member in charge of the Public Comment Process telling them that we will not be able to provide a statement in the first 21 days, but we will be providing a statement in the second part of the 21 days.

But it's always a struggle. When you comment, please be as quick as possible. Be very proactive. When ICANN comes up with an issue, in the first week it's worth looking at the issue. If you want to bring your comments then, please, bring them as early as possible.

Three important links in At-Large: the correspondence page. That's where all of the At-Large and ALAC statements are stored once they have been sent out. Not only do we have statements, we also have correspondence, which are just e-mails but which did not undergo the ratification vote or underwent a very limited consensus call – sometimes on the ALAC call, sometimes on the Leadership Team call. But 99% of our correspondence is actually statements.

Then we've got the policy development page. That's the set of wiki pages, the master table, which has got all of the work that we are currently doing in policy. That page – as far as I'm concerned – is something I consult every day. I hope that many of you will be able to follow this closely, because that's also the way that you can see if there is something going on at the moment in At-Large that you would like to be involved in. That's quite important.

On an ongoing basis, we've got the At-Large working groups. As I said, it's impossible for any one person to be able to follow absolutely every single topic that is taking place in ICANN. As far as the working groups are concerned, they focus on specific topics.

There are some working groups on the new generic top-level domains. There is a working group on the Internationalized Domain Name policy, so that's the non-Latin character sets like Arabic, Chinese, and Hebrew, and all of the Cyrillic characters, and so on. Then you've got other working groups. One of them deals with the finance and budget. Anyway, it's all on that working group page. That's it for me. Back to Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Olivier. I'll briefly take you through the remaining advisory committees, noting that we're running short on time and I think we still want to leave a couple of minutes at least to allow for questions and answers.

The Governmental Advisory Committee (or also known as GAC) is an advisory committee that is comprised of appointed representatives of national government, multi-national governmental organizations, and treaty organizations. Its function is to advise the ICANN Board on matters of concern to governments. GAC typically only meets at ICANN meetings. However, an increased workload and topics of interest to the GAC has meant that the work is now also being undertaken inter-sessionary. The GAC currently consists of over 130 members plus 30 observers. You can find a link here if you will learn more about the GAC.

Then there's also the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (also known as the SSAC), which is the standing committee that advises the ICANN community and ICANN Board on the issues related to the security and stability of the Internet Naming and Address Allocation Systems. Their charter also includes a focus on risk analysis and auditing. Their group currently consists of 38 members. Again, more information about the SSAC and as well how you can apply for membership, you can find on their website.

Last but not least, there's the Root Server System Advisory Committee (or RSSAC), which provides advice on the operational requirements of root name servers. The RSSAC typically meets at meetings of the

Internet Engineering Task Force (or IETF), but at the recent ICANN meeting in Singapore, they gathered there. I believe it's also foreseen that they will hold a public session at the ICANN meeting in London.

Very briefly, how can you stay up-to-date on the activities of all these organizations that focus on policy development in ICANN? As noted before, there are many opportunities to engage directly in policy development activities, either through participation or membership of some of the entities we discussed today or by providing input through public comment forums or participation in public sessions or webinars like these.

But in addition, there are also a number of tools that the ICANN policy staff provides to facilitate staying up-to-date, such as our monthly policy update newsletter, which covers all main policy development activities of all supporting organizations and advisory committees in ICANN. This publication is available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. To subscribe at no cost, you can go to the link that's displayed here and sign up.

We also host a policy update webinar prior to every ICANN meeting, which is really intended to provide participants with a preview of the policy topics that they can expect to see discussed at the ICANN meeting by the different supporting organizations and advisory committees. It's our hope that that webinar will actually aid in the preparation for the meeting itself so participants can read up on some of the topics that will be on the discussion and as well plan their calendar accordingly.

We host two identical sessions during two different time zones of the day to maximize the opportunity for participation. In addition, the webinars are recorded and transcribed so people can also review those after the date.

I think I'll skip the last part of the slides that just focus on a bit of background information on the policy staff – who we are, what we do. But as it's in the slide deck that has been posted, I think you can review that probably at your leisure. That will leave us still a couple of minutes for questions and answers. With that, I'll hand it back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marika. I've got the good news that since we were delayed a little bit, we have ten more minutes. If you want to just quickly go through that last slide that would be helpful. I often get asked the question and saying, "Well, what is all of this policy staff? Who are they? What do they do?" Perhaps you can go back to the slide.

MARIKA KONINGS: Alright, let me just pull that back up. I had to release the presentation.

We currently see here the global distribution of the policy staff. We currently have 24 members in the Policy Team, which are spread over 9 countries, 5 time zones, and I think between us we cover approximately 12 languages.

As many of you may have experienced firsthand, the support we provide may consist of secretariat support, system support, scheduling and organizing meetings, as well as subject matter support, as well as

facilitation of meetings. Again, it highly depends on the need and the requirement of each of the supporting organizations and advisory committees on how that support is provided and structured.

Now as such, the role of the Policy Team is really to help and support our community as well as assist in managing the processes that go with the policy development activities at ICANN. As such, we would like to encourage you all to feel free to reach out to us at any time with any questions you may have in relation to policy development activities. We'll do our best to support you in those efforts.

Then just a note, just a brief overview of all the names and all the staff members supporting. You can also see which of the communities we specifically support. Some of us may support various communities. You'll see us definitely around at ICANN meetings.

I think with that, I've covered the slides on the policy staff and I can leave this up. Hopefully, many of these names will be familiar to you. I think that's all I have to contribute, Olivier.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS:

I see that Olivier has dropped off the call, and they're calling him back. Maybe that's a good moment for all of you to start thinking about your questions and raising hands if there are any questions you would like to add to the conversation.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. At this time, as a reminder, all lines are now open. Please ask your questions as needed at this time. Again, please try to state your name for transcription and interpretation purposes. Also as a reminder, you can also type chat your questions, as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think I am back on.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, Olivier, you are. We just encouraged people to raise their hands if they have questions, but I think we've provided them with so much information that they're still in the process of digesting all of that before being able come to questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marika. Yes, I see people putting their hand up. I was going to say if you have a question, you can either type it in the chat or you can raise your hand and then we will give you the floor.

Just the first question I noted on the chat, the question with regards to the actual presentation itself. The presentation is linked to the agenda page. If I can ask staff to remind everyone the agenda page on the chat. I, myself, had a small problem to find it just a moment ago. It's under – you have action items, chat, recording, transcript, and then presentation underneath that with the EN, meaning the presentation is in English. That's where the link is to download the presentation.

Now the floor regarding questions. First, we have Mercy. Mercy, you have the floor.

MERCY MOYO:

Hi, this is Mercy from South Africa. Thank you, Olivier. I didn't get a clarification on the difference between IANA and GNSO. Would you mind clarifying that briefly to me? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Mercy. I wonder who would like to answer this one. I could take a stab at it, but perhaps one of my colleagues has a better explanation to it. Marika? Thomas? Okay, I'll take a stab at it.

The IANA is the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority. That's the part of ICANN that is an operational part that assigns Internet numbers – so the IP address – and also deals with the coordination of the protocols. In order for two computers to talk to each other, they need to follow a certain number of protocols, otherwise they wouldn't be speaking the same language. You wouldn't have a communication between the two.

There are more functions to the IANA, but they're all operational functions. Whilst all of the other parts of ICANN are not operational, as such. They are all policy functions, and they design the policy for the operations.

That's why there has been a discussion whether the operational functions of ICANN should be completely separated from ICANN, whether there should be no link between the two. That's an ongoing discussion.

Until now, the overall supervisory role for whatever was going in through IANA – so that was the IP address policy and the domain names that were being added to the root, the top part of the pyramid in the dynamic naming system – that oversight role is now being given away by the U.S. government and transferred to something new, which needs to be designed: a new process, a new system, maybe a new organization. The discussions are only starting now at ICANN-wide level and also at Internet-wide level.

The end of the contract that the U.S. government has with IANA is at the end of 2015 – I think it's October 2015. You can think there's still plenty of time, but in order to be able to build something that will assume the same sort of oversight as the U.S. government did – something that is multi-stakeholder, that does not involve just one category of stakeholders, and that is not controlled by government. It's important to note the U.S. government said, "We don't want anything to take over that will be controlled solely by government." That's going to take a lot of discussion and a lot of time.

Otunte Otueneh?

THOMAS RICKERT: Can I?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, Thomas. Yeah, if you want to add to this.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, I'd just like to add that the one function that is mostly discussed these days is the root zone management. That is basically the function that makes top-level domain names accessible. That would apply for both ccTLDs, i.e., the country code top-level domains, as well as generic top-level domains.

The IANA function is a little bit more general than what the GNSO does. The GNSO tries to develop roots to the [game] for the generic names only. The IANA function, for example, would include adding a new top-level domain name to the root zone so that you can access domain names thereunder when you go onto the Internet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Thomas. Now we have Otunte Otueneh. You have the floor. Is it *7 to unmute? You are on the phone, it's *7 to unmute. Otherwise, if you are on the Adobe Connect, you need to connect your microphone. There is a way to connect it. You have the little handset at the top of your screen, it says, "Connect My Audio." You need to connect that. You also need to make sure your microphone works.

At the moment, I'm unable to hear you. Go ahead. No? Okay, let's move on to the next person and then we'll get back to you, Otunte, and try and see if staff can work out the sound issues with you. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I was just going to add, I guess, a summary to the issue of IANA and the GNSO. IANA essentially implements policies related to the management of the DNS and protocols that are created either by ICANN or by IETF and IAB.

The GNSO sets policies related to gTLDs, some of which translates into tasks for IANA. Much of it, however, is implemented purely within ICANN, relating to the management of gTLDs, rules guiding registrars and registries, and stuff like that. There's an intersection, but it's a relatively small intersection. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. Sebastien Bachollet. Sebastien, it appears that we're not able to hear you, either. I gather you are on the Adobe Connect, but it's not working at the moment. I note that Sebastien Bachollet has put the IANA functions link. There is a link in the chat about those functions. If you are interested in more information about IANA, then please go to that page.

Sebastien is on Adobe, but it doesn't appear to work at the moment. At least, I can't hear him. Okay, we'll try another way.

Let's try back again with Otunte Otueneh. No luck at the moment. If you want, Otunte, please put your question in the chat. We will be reading it to the record and trying to get an answer.

Any other questions from anyone on the call? I note we are nine minutes past the official end of this call, but since we had a bit of

technical problems in the middle, we are afforded another couple more minutes.

Seeing no more questions, I guess it's a lot to take in. It's a lot to be able to digest. Just to tell you, Ariel Liang has very kindly [blown] the presentation that we are using in the agenda page that I provided links to. You'll be able to download it from there. I think, seeing no more questions and seeing that everyone is probably pondering and thinking, "Wow. What a big new world."

I hope this has been very helpful. I would like to thank both Marika Konings and Thomas Rickert for joining us and for creating this fantastic presentation. Thank you, Marika. Thank you, Thomas. Do you have anything else you'd like to cover?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Just to thank everyone for participating. If you do have any further questions that may come to mind after you had a chance to digest the information, please feel free to reach out to us. As I said, our e-mail address is at the end of the slide presentation. We're here to answer any further questions that you may have.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much, Marika. Thomas, as you know, is in the GNSO Council, so he is always available for chat and for discussion if you have any questions.

Now we are finishing this webinar. We have a webinar next week, which is going to be about – I'm looking at the right page, here we go – which

is going to be part two of the Future of Internet Governance. Like we had last week, we will have Nigel Hickson who will be joining us and myself.

We will be looking specifically at what happened at NETmundial. We'll have a report to you about this and maybe some of the feedback after NETmundial. I think that seeing that there have been some questions about the NTIA, then we might wish to touch on the NTIA discussions. As you know, it's a process that is starting up now. The whole function is a complex function, indeed, that will affect a lot of people around the world.

I remind you all that all of the webinars that we have had so far – and this is the fourth one – all of these webinars are stored and we have the recording. I understand that the transcripts of the webinar are also coming out. The master page for all of these webinars is here; I've just put it on the Adobe chat. You can also listen to recording and download all of the presentations that have been presented to you.

Of course, share them with your community. It's great to see many people on the call here, but it's also greater when these webinars go viral and get shared with people outside of ICANN. It's really a great opportunity to be able to take part in those processes. I hope that you'll have more and more people who will be actively involved in those.

I'm not sure if I've missed anything. Staff, is there anything else that I need to cover, since I'm just standing in for Tijani? There might be other announcements?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi, Olivier. Just a quick note that – as I put it into the chat – please, if you can take a few moments to complete the evaluation form for this call. That will be able to provide staff and the presenters with information to improve future webinars of this sort. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That's great. Thank you very much, Heidi. That's what I forgot. The feedback: How well or how badly did we do on this occasion?

With this, I thank you all and look forward to speaking to you next week. For those of you who are already involved in some of the working groups, as you know, we'll probably speak later on this week – or later on today, who knows. Thanks and good-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]