

October 2015

---

**TERRI AGNEW:** Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large capacity program 2015, ninth webinar on the topic, "Working Groups for At-Large, ALAC working groups and CCWG, on Wednesday the 7<sup>th</sup> of October, 2015 at 20:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call as it is a webinar, but if I could please remind everyone on the phone bridge, as well as computer, to mute your speakers and microphones, as well as state your name when speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channel.

We have English, Spanish, and French interpretation. Thank you for joining. I'll now turn it back to our moderator, Tijani Ben Jemaa. Please begin.

**TIJANI BEN JEMAA:** Thank you very much Terri. Tijani speaking. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. This is the second webinar in the second part of the 2015 capacity building program. Today we speak about the working groups, the At-Large working groups and the cross community working groups.

We will have two presenters, Heidi, our director for At-Large, and Marika for the GNSO staff. First we will start our session by housekeeping items, and this is Ariel who will do that. So Ariel, please go ahead.

---

*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.*

October 2015

---

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks very much Tijani. I just have two quick housekeeping items. First is, in this AC room you can see that we have a pod called Q&A, and it's towards the right bottom corner off of the Adobe Connect room. And during the webinar, if you have any questions, feel free to type in your questions in that pod, and staff will take notes on that and we'll convey that to the presenters.

And then towards the end of the webinar, they will choose the questions to answer. And if we run out of time to answer all of the questions, we will, we'll try to provide a written answers later on, and will publish them in the Wiki page for this webinar.

And on the second housekeeping item, it's about the evaluation survey at the end of the webinar. We will implement a different pod in the AC room, so that the audience can check your answers and provide your evaluation on the spot. And Terri will coordinate that and go through the survey questions.

So that's it for the housekeeping end. I will turn the floor to the speakers. I guess Heidi will start first.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Ariel. And welcome everyone. I'm very happy to be able to present today on the At-Large working groups. So I would like to make this somewhat interactive. And we're very fortunate to have some very experienced working group chairs on the call today. So please, feel free

October 2015

---

to come on in and be part of this presentation. And following that, we'll have Marika present on the cross community working groups, and then we will take questions. And stay tuned, because following that there will be a pop quiz with some exciting questions and answers.

So to begin, I'm going to be talking about the At-Large working groups. And as an overview, I'd like to be covering five issues today. The first one is to give an overview of At-Large working groups, and that includes some general issues about a little bit of a background, and what the primary activities are, etc. Then I'll go through the introduction to At-Large working groups, and talk a little bit about the types of working groups we have.

Then I will continue on to working methods. Some of the ways that the At-Large working groups work, followed by how to join. And some logistical, and just some suggestions on how to join the working groups. Let's begin with an overview of the At-Large working groups.

So much of the work of the ALAC and At-Large takes place within some type of At-Large working group. The majority have members from all of the five At-Large organizations or RALOs. And this really allows, shows the strength of the globally diverse At-Large community and At-Large policy making.

The primary activity of At-Large working groups includes several [inaudible] versus development of policy advice that feeds into ALAC statements. Secondly, provisions of advice of the ALAC on specific projects or ongoing process related activity. Thirdly, an oversight of At-

October 2015

---

Large on ongoing processes. And we'll talk about those a little bit later, but those are. And then finally, carrying an actually delegated by the ALAC related to policy process or outreach and engagement.

Now given all of these activities, the working groups generally have very close relations with the ALAC. And indeed, a lot of the working group chairs are ALAC members. Even those that aren't [inaudible] coordinate with the ALAC. Then there has been significant growth in At-Large working groups, and particularly following the first At-Large summit that took place in Mexico City in March 2009.

Now prior to that summit were just a handful of working groups, it was before my time. I don't believe that they met that often, but others can comment on that who were there at that time. Now in the run-up to the first summit, there were about five working groups created to plan the work of the summit, and following the successful summit, there were even more working groups created to handle the growth of work by the At-Large following the summit, in terms of policy work, outreach engagement and process.

Now this has resulted in, for example, the huge increase in the last several years of At-Large statements. At one point, there were over 50 statements per year. Now currently there has been a fewer amount, but again, the quality of these statements has really influenced by the shrink of the working groups that helped develop a statement.

So currently there are 19 active At-Large working groups, and several more RALO space working groups active. So where do you find them?

October 2015

---

Well we have made this, hopefully, as easily as possible to find, and that on the working group portal, and on the slide you'll see that there is a purple gateway box. And in that box, there is a direct link to what we call the working group portal. And [inaudible] posting that onto the chat.

And this portal includes a link to all of the active working groups. So this is really your one stop place to find the At-Large working groups. And just a comment before I continue, in terms of the working language. Primarily the working groups of At-Large is English. Now the exception, obviously, are the LACRALO working groups, which operate in English and Spanish.

Now there is an exception. If there are three or more people requesting interpretation for the working groups, then interpretation in Spanish and French may be offered. So moving on to the types of working groups, there are several types. The first one is a subcommittee. And these specifically have an ongoing task that requires formal ALAC motions in voting.

For example, the ALAC subcommittee on finance and budget. And this one works on the annual process for the development of ALAC special request for the budget. And also, it reports back to the ALAC on details of the overall ICANN budget. The second type are standing working groups. These are generally work on ongoing or long term issues.

And these make up approximately half of the At-Large active working groups. Next comes ad-hoc working groups. And these are working

---

October 2015

---

groups that the ALAC as well as RALOs may form to address specific projects or reach specific goals. And more recently, another type has been created, and these are taskforces. And these really are temporary in nature. They have a mandate to accomplish a particular project in a short timeframe.

And finally, archive working groups. These have been deemed by the ALAC as being inactive, or having completed their mandate. However, once they are archived, they are not gone. They're basically inactive, and whenever the ALAC have reason to come back, then they will, the ALAC will ask for it to be reactivated.

Okay, moving on to requirements. So these are based on the ALAC rules of procedure. So there are several points that it must have before it becomes a working group. The first is that they have to set out a terms of reference or a charter, which then the ALAC reviews. It needs to be clear in its expected outcomes. Then in terms of method of selection, this will determine it is opened or by membership only, and whether there needs to be a need for regional balance.

And in the call for members for each new working group, that will be very clearly specified. Then also, there is an identification of an interim chair, and how the permanent chair is to be selected. And normally what happens is on the first call of a working group, the permanent chair will be selected by the members of that working group.

October 2015

---

And then finally, [inaudible] the group, is to be a subcommittee, a standing committee, or, sorry, standing working group or an ad-hoc working group or taskforce, will be set out in the terms of reference.

Okay. So I'd like to now move on to the introduction of At-Large working groups. And I've sort of made these into three types and I've color coded them. So the next several slides will see the color matching the types. And again, these categories were very open to discussion. Dev and I have already engaged in a couple of exchanges on Skype, whether working groups are based within one or the other categories, and perhaps they [inaudible]. So that's open for discussion as well.

So the first one are the policy based working groups, and the primary activities of policy based working groups includes several points. First development of policy advice and recommendations for the ALAC. Secondly, analysis of a specific policy and how it might impact the best interests of the Internet end users. And thirdly, promotion of knowledge on a specific policy issue to the wider At-Large community.

So they're the ones that really help in terms of the statement development. Secondly, in the dark blue, the outreach and engagement based working groups. And these have really grown in numbers. I would say that this type has really seen the biggest growth in recent years. And primarily the work on the development and implementation of activities focusing on the increasing At-Large membership through outreach.

October 2015

---

And also increasing the participation of current At-Large members, through engagement activities such as training and accessibility to meetings through tools. So this is what basically At-Large calls in-reach to get current people more active. And then finally in the orange, we have the process based working groups, and these primarily work on the provision of an [inaudible] ALAC on a specific project or an ongoing process related to an activity.

And again, as I mentioned earlier, it would be the subcommittee on finance and budget, for special budget requests, the ALAC At-Large organizational reviews, and the process required by ICANN for certain programs, for example the community regional, the CROPP, we'll mention that very shortly.

Okay. So moving on to the first policy based working groups. The first one is the At-Large... So I wanted to just preface this before I move on. The next several slides will be walking through the various working groups, and I've used basically a template and that includes basically just going over their mission, their leadership, meeting schedules, and achievements.

And on the achievements, I will really ask that the chairs that are on the call to add to that. It's really their working group, and they might see something slightly different type of activity. Okay. So first one is the At-Large ad-hoc working group, on IANA transition and ICANN accountability. And this one we've seen that the mission really is to discuss the transition of the US government stewardship of the IANA function.

---



October 2015

---

And they've really been doing the lead of the whole transition work that has been the main, really the main activity of ICANN over the last year or so. And they've been holding weekly calls. Just back up a little bit. The chair is Olivier Crépin-Leblond, but currently it's being sort of co-lead with Alan Greenberg as well.

The membership of this is open. And the achievements have been that they have been the key group that has contributed to the ALAC statements on the IANA transition, CWG, and the ICANN accountability process. And they'll be meeting in Dublin as well. The second one is IDN policy working group, and this group's focus is on the ICANN internationalized domain name, or IDN TLD program, developments and provides community input and feedback via ALAC statements and engagement.

Their leadership is currently Edmund Chung and Satish Babu, as co-chairs. Meeting schedule is as required. They have not met in the recent past, but they have been active in other groups that ICANN has on IDNs. And achievements, in the past they've helped developed in the development of 31 ALAC statements IDN.

And three or four years ago now, they've worked with ICANN on the ccTLD IDNs, which first entered the root zone in May 2010. Okay, next one is the new gTLD. This group had a mission, or has a mission of all of the developments related to the implementation of new gTLDs. And actually in the run up to the roll out of new gTLDs, they were very heavy in the development of the policy on that.

October 2015

---

Leadership is currently to be determined. And the meeting schedule is as required. In the past, they've met very frequently, but now it has been a little less. And achievements really a huge number of statements, 64 statements in the past related to the development of the new gTLDs. And more recently, they've really been behind the At-Large work on the public interest commitments or the PICs, leading to the discussion with the Board new gTLD program over the last year.

So quite an achievement for that, that working group. Continuing on with the policy based working groups. We have registration issues working group. And their mission has been to review the entire scope of the registrar accreditation agreement, on the RIAA. And it also looks at challenges faced by registrants, and seeks to make recommendations to the ALAC to amend those challenges.

This group also has some co-chairs, Holly Raiche and Carlton Samuels. And they meet as required. Achievements, they've contributed two statements on registration and WHOIS issues, and in the last nine months or so, they've held several successful and well attended meetings on this issue at ICANN meetings. And technical issues. This group [inaudible] on the stability, safety, and security of the domain name system or DNS.

And provides ALAC with advice on DNSSEC and the implementation of IPv6. And the interim chair is Olivier Crépin-Leblond. And meeting schedule is as required, but again, this group has not met recently. And their achievements in the past, they have kept a watch over any issues

October 2015

---

of DNS stability [inaudible] and [they have] also brought input into any topics related to the work that SSAC does in the ICANN.

Okay moving to the outreach and engagement working group. The first one is the Academy working group. Now again, this group started first in At-Large, and now it's basically has aspects of a cross community working group, but it does not have a charter, it's not a formal cross community working group, but it does include members from the various ACs and SOs.

So this group assists in the organization of the very successful leadership training program that takes place the week prior to the ICANN annual general meeting. The next one will actually begin this next week in Dublin. And it promotes the concept of the ICANN Academy within ICANN. The leadership is Sandra Hoferichter, and the meeting schedule is as required.

It normally picks up in terms of meetings as they plan the development of the leadership training program. And as mentioned, one of the key achievements of this group to date has been the concept of the leadership training program. They've developed it. They were successful in bringing it to a pilot, and they now they've incorporated into the core budget of ICANN.

So some real achievement for that group. Then moving on, we have the ATLAS 2 implementation taskforce. And this group was developed after the second At-Large summit, that took place in London in June 2014. And this one facilitates the implementation of the recommendations

October 2015

---

within the ATLAS 2 declaration. And the leadership is again Oliver. This group now, since the last, oh I think it's actually since ICANN 53 in Buenos Aires, this group has been meeting very regularly, weekly, for 90 minutes and go over in great detail the various recommendations.

And they also meet at ICANN meetings. And the achievements have been defining and leading the process on the implementation of the ATLAS 2 recommendations, and I expect a lot of activity on this topic in the upcoming meeting in Dublin. The next one is the capacity building working group, and this really has brought you the series of capacity building webinars.

The mission of this group is to coordinate the development and implementation of At-Large efforts related to training and capacity building. Now they coordinate the RALO activities as well. So any kind of training and activity related to raising awareness within the current At-Large members, the coordination takes place by this capacity building working group.

And the leadership is Tijani Ben Jemaa. They meet as required, and particularly more as they're planning their scheduling of capacity building webinars, and they also meet at ICANN meetings. And achievements, Tijani feel free to add to this, but my view is that they have developed and implemented a series of capacity building webinars, now in its second year, and they also have organized in the past, capacity building sessions, face to face sessions at ICANN meetings that have been very successful as well.

October 2015

---

Then moving on to another group that has gone from being initially an At-Large working group to moving on more to a cross community group and that is the accessibility, the cross community committee on accessibility. And their mission is to advance accessibility issues within ICANN by reviewing and saying that particularly needs in populations who face challenges to participate in ICANN's police development work.

And leadership is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who is on the call today with us. Their meeting schedule is approximately monthly, as well as very lively sessions at ICANN meetings. And achievements, they have championed the successful approval of the captioning projects in this current fiscal year, and they've also gained the support of ICANN staff on the importance of accessibility issues.

So Cheryl, again, feel free to add to that list. I'm sure it will be growing in the future. Okay. Also now the next group that is also led by Cheryl is the subcommittee on metrics, and that group has a mission to create, develop, and propose to the ALAC metrics and measurements, measures of performance expectations of ALAC members and those representing At-Large in ICANN activities as described in the ALAC rules of procedure.

The meeting schedule is as required. And the achievements have been solid progress on the development of metrics. Okay next one is the subcommittee on outreach and engagement. And Dev, you're on the call, on this one. The mission of that group is to oversee and coordinate the outreach and engagement efforts of the At-Large committee at its local, national, and regional level.

---

October 2015

---

And it also aims to build awareness of ICANN recruitment members and increase the engagement of current members. Now this one, again, has seen some growth. It was originally just the outreach subcommittee. And recently the ALAC asked it to take on the mission engagement issues as well. As mentioned, Dev Anand Teelucksingh is the chair, and he is also one of the five RALO co-chairs.

So it has a really good, reasonable balance as well. They meet biweekly, and at ICANN meetings as well. And their achievements have been to develop the outreach strategies for each RALO as per the requirements for the CROPP. They've also developed and maintained group calendars to track outreach engagement events in each of the regions.

Okay, the final two outreach and engagement working groups. One is actually, I will give credit to Ariel Liang for promoting this. This is a social media working group, and this group discusses outreach strategy and review performance metrics via social media. They also experiment with social media collaboration tools, and they are very active in At-Large meetings to solicit and organize At-Large volunteers for social media activities during ICANN meetings.

The community leader is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. So another one of his working groups. And they schedule monthly teleconferences. And achievements have been primarily we have seen a real significant increase in At-Large social media presence, both intersession, and very much so at the At-Large meetings. So much so that the ICANN social media organizers now really depend a lot on what At-Large is Tweeting and putting on Facebook, etc. for their work.

---

October 2015

---

So a real success there. And then also another one of Dev's groups is the technology taskforce. And this one is, the mission is to evaluate and review ICT tools that can help At-Large that are able to accomplish its goals within ICANN. And they meet monthly or biweekly. And they're very active in terms of evaluating various technology tools that have been used by At-Large.

And frequently they invite ICANN, IT specialists on their calls to help them explain or work with them on developing more technology for At-Large. Okay finally moving on to the third part, the process phase working groups. We have the ALS criteria and expectations taskforce. I believe this is the newest of the At-Large working groups. And this really grabs a need to look a little bit deeper into At-Large structures and what their application processes are, how to really ensure that the ALSs that At-Large has are actively engaged.

So their mission makes recommendations to the ALAC, regarding the criteria and expectations for ALSs and their activities. And the taskforce is divided into four teams, each with their own leader. And those are firstly the application process. Secondly, ALS criteria. Thirdly, ALS operational expectations. And fourthly, individuals.

And the overall chair is Alan Greenberg, who is the chair of ALAC. They are on a very tight schedule. They're trying to accomplish their work in a short timeframe. They are meeting approximately weekly, and they'll be meeting at ICANN meetings. And their achievements, again, they're relatively new, they discuss [inaudible] broad implications for ALSs and individuals.

---

October 2015

---

So very much tuned for that group, see what their achievements are. So one of their achievements is actually working in part or in line with the upcoming At-Large review working party, which is the next group. And this group's mission is to lead the At-Large process for the At-Large review that is taking place between 2015 and 2019.

Their leadership is Holly Raiche. And their meeting schedule is as required and at ICANN meetings. But again, since the At-Large review, which is a required organizational review, is going to be picking up now, there will be a significant increase in this group's activities, following ICANN 54. Their achievements to date, they have been working very closely with ICANN strategic initiative department on the initial At-Large review activities.

So once this group, once the strategic initiative's department handles the first process, they'll sort of hand over to this working party, and what happens after the review is completed and approved by the Board, then this party will be archived, and a new working party that will work on the implementation of the At-Large review recommendations as well, will likely be created to work on those requirements.

Okay then we have the regional outreach pilot program review team, or the CROPP review team. And their mission is to coordinate and manage At-Large efforts related to the CROPP, in which each of the five RALOs can apply for funding for up to five regional outreach trips. And again, these trips are for outreach and engagement activities. Their leadership is Dev Anand Teelucksingh.





October 2015

---

And their meeting schedule is as required. Now their achievements have been outstanding in terms that they, I believe At-Large is the group that has the highest number of CROPP applications, which is an excellent way to ensure that this program continues.

Okay moving on. The next group would be the subcommittee on finance and budget. This is one of the old subcommittees, and Cheryl might know when that exactly started, but their mission has been oversight on issues related to the development of ICANN fiscal year budget. [Inaudible] review and recommendation for the ALAC and At-Large session requests.

Leadership is always the ALAC chair, currently Alan Greenberg. And their meeting schedule is as required, but again, their meetings pick up as they have the process of, the ICANN policy process which usually begin about this time, and it picks up over the December/January timeframe.

And this is one of the groups, as well as the CROPP one I just mentioned, those are by appointments only. Most all of the other working groups are open, but this one is by appointment only. The next one is the At-Large ad-hoc new meeting strategy working party. And this is again, a relatively new working party with a mission to lead the development of the ALAC and At-Large schedule under the new meeting strategy.

For those who are not familiar with what this new meeting strategy is, very, very briefly, ICANN in a very bottom up fashion, developed a new plan or new strategy for meetings. ICANN meetings. And the first one

October 2015

---

will start next March, the ICANN 55 in Marrakesh. And there will be three types of meetings. A, B, and C. The B one is a very short one, it's four days long. And that one is meant to focus on policy development, while meeting A, I believe are six days, and meeting C, which is the annual general meeting, which is seven days.

So a very long meeting because of all of the activities associated with the AGM. The leadership of this one is Beran, who has been doing a fantastic job to bring this schedule, the ALAC schedule to a slight, but ALAC can be looking at it in Dublin. And they have been meeting biweekly since ICANN 53. And there is also a subgroup that's looking at the plan for meeting B.

Achievements, again as I've mentioned, significant progress of the At-Large draft schedule, which will be presented for, to the ALAC in Dublin. There is also a small working group, just a few people. And this one again is by appointment. And this one is the ad-hoc website revamp. And their mission is to collaborate with ICANN digital engagement team in the revamping of the At-Large website, which will be launched, the beta will be launched in Dublin.

This one is led by our staff, Ariel Liang, policy analyst. And they have been meeting as required. Even when they don't meet, Ariel does a really good job of keeping everyone up to date on what is going on with the website. And [inaudible] vastly improved website that we're going to have a first glimpse at, the beta, in Dublin, and then the final launch towards the end of the year.

October 2015

---

Okay. In addition to those At-Large working groups, we also have a number of RALO working groups. And these are, again, relatively new groups. And I'm going to be really brief on those. Silvia Vivanco, manager of the regions, handles all of these working groups. So if I miss anything, Silvia I'm sure will be able to fill you in on this.

So there are three RALOs that have working groups currently. The first one is AFRALO. And they have two. They have the AFRALO rules of procedure review, which is working on updating AFRALO rules of procedure, including individual membership which is a requirement of the first At-Large review. And Tijani is the chair of that group.

The second group is the taskforce on more African representation in ICANN leadership positions. And their work is to encourage an increased number of African members within ICANN leadership positions. And that group, I believe, started this past year. [Inaudible] so you see, is the chair of that group.

APRALO also has a couple of working groups. The first one is the APRALO rules of procedure review. And they developed APRALO's revised ROP. And leadership is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And I believe connected to that working group is the APRALO individual member review. And again, all RALOs are being asked to develop rules to include individual members.

This group also works on that for APRALO. And Cheryl is also leading that group. And LACRALO, they have a few. They have the LACRALO ccTLD working group, which works toward developing the strategic and

October 2015

---

regional of ccTLDs. And the leadership of that is Sergio Sallinas Porto. And they also have a LACRALO governance working group, which worked on harmonizing the English and Spanish versions of the LACRALO rules of procedure, which were approved in the second At-Large summit in London.

And Sergio is also the chair of that. Now in addition to these active working groups, there are a significant number of archived working groups. And as I've mentioned, even though they are not currently active, and that they are archived, whenever necessary, the ALAC can bring them back. And there is a list of there.

I'm not going to go over them given the time. Okay. So moving on to working methods. So there are several ways that At-Large working groups work. First is face to face. Many working groups hold face to face meetings at ICANN public meetings. And most of these face to face, at the ICANN meetings do have interpretation in French and in Spanish.

And active working groups, even when they do not meet as a group at ICANN meetings, will provide face to face updates to the ALAC during ICANN public meetings. And these are normally about 15 minutes or so, just to provide an update there. The second way are through teleconferences. So active working groups hold regular teleconferences to conduct business.

And I've mentioned some of them are so active as to weekly meetings for about 90 minutes. So very active. Good advice, if you're planning

October 2015

---

on being a very active member, invest in a good headset, because you're going to be on a lot of teleconferences.

And staff will generally send two announcements, if not more. Terri can correct me on how many they send, but they will include information on the agenda, and how to dial in for their working groups. They are, teleconferences are primarily 60 to 90 minutes in duration, sometimes they go over. And given the global nature of calls, times can be challenging.

So there is going to be several time zones where it will be the middle of the night, or very early in the morning. And we're all very thankful that you're able to make the effort to join these types of working groups. And what we do, as those of you who are in today's Adobe Connect room, all working groups will have Adobe Connect rooms.

And it's basically a virtual meeting room used during teleconferences, and they allow for chats, such as this presentation, for chat, so people can comment during the teleconference. Staff will note action items. At times there are user polls or even pop quizzes being used for these activities.

Another way of working method is Wiki workspaces. And all working groups have individual Wiki workspaces. And I've shown earlier where you can find them on the working group portal. And each one, and this is an example on the slide here, of the CROPP review team. And each one is basically setup in a somewhat similar template that includes information on the membership of that group, their mission, the

October 2015

---

meetings, past meeting, the next meeting, and also reference documents, etc.

So again, if you are planning on becoming involved, get to know that working group's workspace, and really most of the information that you will need will be on that space. And they also now increasingly have our forum for comment. A forum for discussion. And at the bottom of each Wiki space, there is a button you can click on, add your comment, and people who are watching that page will be able to see comments as they are posted.

So a very useful way to discuss activities and working groups there. And finally the mailing lists are very active. So each working group will have their individual mailing list. And a lot of activities done on these, you know, via email on these lists. And if the working group is open, anyone can subscribe to the mailing list. And I pointed out where it's basically on every workspace, there will be an area under contacts, that not only leads that support, but also the mailing list. And you can subscribe to that.

Or you can ask staff to add you to that list. So, how to join. So logistics. Some housekeeping events. As I mentioned, there either opened by appointment, the vast are open. So we very much encourage you to join any of the groups that is of interest to you. Then also, even if they are by appointment, as members you can still participate as a participant, which basically you to engage in the discussions. It's just that if there is a vote required, then you would not be able to vote.

October 2015

---

To join, again, you just describe on the Wiki page, or contact the working group chair or At-Large staff. And then, as I've mentioned, they'll be meeting invitations sent out that provide all of these on how to join the teleconference of the working group. And there will also be, when a new group is created, they'll be a call for membership posted by At-Large staff giving a deadline, or whether it is open membership.

So how to become active. And again, you know, this is, you can be as active as you wish. And for some, it might take a while to get familiar with the discussions going on. But really the best way is just to join the discussions, ask questions. Ask questions of the chair, to the members, to the people in your region, that you might know a little bit better.

Just ask any kind of questions you might have on the topic. And then also contribute your expertise. Every individual with a unique background, unique expertise, and the working groups will become that much stronger as you contribute that information. Be curious. You know, why are these groups existing? Why are they going along the path that they are?

And ask those kinds of questions. And finally, have fun. As you sit on many hours of teleconferences, it just needs to be fun, otherwise I'm not sure it's really going to be a long-term effort.

Okay. And that is it on my part. So I think, Tijani, I think you'd like to have everyone hold their questions....

October 2015

---

**TIJANI BEN JEMAA:** Thank you very much Heidi for this comprehensive and detailed presentation. I think that you'll have several questions, but this will be after we listen to Marika, who will make the presentation about the cross community working groups. So Marika is from the GNSO staff, and she will make this presentation for you. Thank you. Marika?

**MARIKA KONINGS:** Hi Tijani, and hi everyone. Thank you very much for inviting me. So my name is Marika Konings. I'm a senior policy director and team leader for the GNSO, and I've been asked to present to you concerning the topic of cross community working groups. And just to know, there are probably a lot of similarities to some of the aspects that Heidi has described. For example, working methods, participation, but there are some significant differences and those are the ones I would like to focus on.

Because as you note there, as Heidi mentioned as well, there in ALAC and similar in GNSO policy, that many working groups that have cross community participation, but that doesn't necessarily make them cross community working groups, or at least I think is considered within the ICANN context, a cross community working group. And I think it's important to highlight as well, that this has a developing concept.

I think cross community working groups are actually used for quite some time, and some of the ones that I found actually date back to, for example, the work on the internationalized domain names, the fast track work, whether it was adjoined and work between the GAC and the



October 2015

---

ccNSO, which I think has also been referred to as a cross community working group, to the cross community working groups that we know today.

And many of you may be involved in, for example, the work of the cross community working group on accountability and the IANA stewardship transition. So think as part of that evolution of cross community working groups, there has been, you know, development of what people understand to be a cross community working group, what is the purpose but also which are the principles under which these groups operate.

It is worth probably highlighting that in this case, there are no formal rules as such, well there is actually a cross community working group looking at formalizing, and maybe even to a certain extent, standardizing what a cross community working group should look like, and what some of the basic principles of such a group should be.

So what you see here on these slides and what I'll be talking about...

...has engaged... Yes?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, you were cut. Now you're okay. Go ahead please.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Okay. Sorry about that. So what I wanted to say, I think a lot of the experience that you see on the slide had, for example, been gained

---

October 2015

---

from the recent initiatives related to the transition, where a lot of efforts have been put in around forming these groups, and looking at what rules and principles would apply to those.

So we'll first look at the purpose, what is the current understood purpose of cross community working groups? First of all, it's important that it deals with a topic that cuts across difference supporting organizations and advisory committees. So it should be a topic that appeals too many, and it's not solely within the remit or responsibility of one supporting organization or advisory committee.

This closely links as well to the point three here on this slide, it should be the topic that is in specific scope for supporting organization policy development. This groups may discuss that topic, but the only way to develop policy, as we know, capital P, is through a policy development process.

Fourth, of course it's important that there is actually a desire of multiple groups to work on the topic. The cross community working group does require a lot of investment and resources, both from the staff perspective, but also very importantly, from a community perspective. So there needs to be a clear desire to invest this time and resources to work on the topic.

And the fifth point I put here on this slide, and I put it here with a question mark, I think it's something that has developed with our recent experiences. I think there is also a sense that the time and resources invested in the CWG may only make sense if those recommendations

October 2015

---

are intended by Board actions. If the group has another purpose, for example, if we tend to generate discussions, generate ideas, facilitate conversations, maybe another vehicle is more suited for that kind of conversation, is that of a cross community working group. Like I said, that is not a formal definition or formal restriction, I think it's more something that we've seen developing over time with the cross community groups, which specifically come together, different organizations within ICANN, to develop recommendations that they would want to put forward to the ICANN Board for their consideration.

So now looking at some of the current principles. And again, this is really based on a recent experience with cross community working groups, and the expectation is as well, as some of it will be reflected in the work that is ongoing on developing a framework and guiding principles for cross community working groups that hopefully will be agreed to and adopted by the all the ICANN supporting and advisory organizations.

And it's of course, very important that there is a common understanding of how these groups are expected and anticipated to work. So first of all, very important, there is identical charter that is adopted by all supporting organizations and advisory committees. And on our next slide, I will talk to you a little bit more about what a typical charter contains.

This is really the guiding document for the CWG which is outlined. What is the specific scope of the group? How can you participate? So it's really important that, of course, this document is the same for each

---

October 2015

---

supporting organization or advisory committee that signs off on the charter. And it means that everyone agrees on the purpose and the way things are being done.

What we've currently seen as well, and again, I think that is a development that crystalize in relation to the cross community working groups, the relation to the transition, is that chartering organizations are responsible for appointing a fixed number of members. So chartering organizations appointing members who have a very specific role in the cross community working group.

Their role is really to make sure that the chartering organization, and the chartering organizations we're referring to those organizations that have adopted the charter. So it can be any supporting organization or advisory committee. But each chartering organization is kept up to date with the activities of the cross community working groups.

And if there is any kind of formal position by the chartering organization, that these members can take that position to the chartering organization, to the cross community working group, and speak on behalf of the chartering organization. There is, as well, in the charter, but again, it's something that I think is there as a matter of principle, but it's not being used in practice.

There is, I think in the recent two cross community working group charters, the concept that for a consensus call, it would also be the members who would convey the position of the chartering organizations. But which the cross community working group that are

October 2015

---

currently operating, they're all aiming to operate on consensus by the whole working group.

So not only members but also participants. But in the charter, it does speak about the fact that members are, at least for those that are and expected to convey the position of a chartering organization on a certain proposal. Of course the logic behind that is that at the end of the day, the chartering organization will need to approve the recommendations before these are submitted to the Board, so in order to get a sense of where our chartering organization makes it, or what their concerns may be.

A chartering organization appointed member has this role to share that viewpoint with the cross community working group. And noted in point three, all cross community working groups is a thing that we have currently operating are open to anyone interested to participate on an equal footing. There is a difference between chartering organizations appointed members, but in the daily operation of a cross community working groups, participants and members have the same abilities and same rights and responsibilities to participate.

And it's also worth mentioning, especially for those of you that may not have the ability or availability to participate in a cross community working group, that there is also the opportunity to participate as an observer. Observers are signed on to the mailing list, so they receive the messages, but they're not expected to participate at the meetings, and nor are they able to post to the mailing list.

October 2015

---

It's just a mechanism for people to follow conversation without having to go to the mailing list archive, or for actively or follow up on some other items.

Another point that I think is shared with many of the cross community working groups, is that there has to be meaningful opportunities for public comments. So I think it started in early [phase] stage, where there is specific outreach done to be sure people are aware of the effort to sign off as members, participants, or observers, but also throughout the process, opportunities are identified, where public comment entries provided, or active engagement is perused.

And I think you've all seen the public comment periods that have been opened, meetings that take place at ICANN meetings where public input is solved, and communication as well through the different chartering organizations to their respective membership. Another characteristic is that endorsement or approvals, each through their own respective mechanisms, by each of the chartering organizations, is required before the cross community working group final report or recommendations are submitted to the ICANN Board.

And I think the current charters foresee as well, like what happens if one of the chartering organizations does not approve the final recommendations, there are specific processes in place that allow for further consultation and possible changes that may result in adoption by everyone.

October 2015

---

But if at the end of the day, there are a number, one or more chartering organizations that do not accept the end report, the final report is not submitted as a cross community working product to the ICANN Board. There may be opportunities or possibilities for chartering organizations to adopt them as their own work product, but it will be considered a cross community working group product.

And that is well what we've seen, and again, this is not any kind of formal requirement at this stage, more an expectation that if a cross community working group comes to consensus, and those recommendations are then adopted by the all of the chartering organizations, and forward to the ICANN Board, that the Board will consider those final recommendations.

And actually, in the case of the cross community working group on accountability, the Board formally adopted a process by which they have committed to consider those recommendations. So it will be interesting to see whether that may be the common standard for a future cross community working groups, because one point maybe important as well, at this stage, cross community working groups do not have any kind of formal standing, neither under the ICANN bylaws, nor any of the supporting organizations or advisory committees, as I am aware.

Each of them will have their own rules and procedures for their respective working groups, but nothing like that is currently in existence for cross community working groups, and hence the importance of the work that is being undertaken to document and hopefully formalize as well, a broad framework for how cross community working groups are

October 2015

---

expected to operate, to make sure that there is a joint understanding and expectations are managed when it comes to forming as well as managing and running these groups.

So I mentioned before, in the current format, the rules for each cross community working group are documented in the charter. As I said here, we need to ensure that there is a common understanding of the scope as well as the working methods. So some of the elements that a charter will contain is, what is the purpose and the problem statement. What is the working group trying to solve for?

What are the goals and the objectives? Are there any limitations to their scope? Are there certain things that are not supposed to be considered? And the charter typically outlines, well what the expected deliverables are. Are there any specific timeframes that are involved? And what is the expected reporting from the cross community working group?

And all of that is expected to be translated by the cross community working group in an effective work plan. So the chartering organizations have an ability to review that work plan, and confirm whether or not that aligns with what they have set out in the charter. The charter also typically outlines the rules for membership, the staffing as well as organization.

And what are the expected rules of engagement? And very important as well, what are the rules for decision making? And that for it to know again, that as each supporting organization and advisory committee has



October 2015

---

their own rules for decision making, in their own working groups, there are sometimes different approaches or understandings of, for example, what does the term consensus mean?

So it's really important that in the charter, it's clearly outlined, what the rules for decision making are, and what definitions are used in the context of the cross community working group. It typically also outlines its provision for how to deal with the modification of a charter, so that at any point in time, needs to make changes to the charter. What is the process for doing that?

And then of course, outlines the process for the adoption of the output and how to address problems and issue escalation? And what other resolution mechanisms that are in place, should there be any issues encountered either for the workings of this cross community working group, or in the case that one of the chartering organizations does not adopt the recommendations? Or in the case that the Board does not adopt the recommendation.

And again, if you look through the recent charters, you may see also a lot of similarity as well, through some of, so the ALAC procedures but also GNSO procedures. Because a lot of different elements are blocked together in these charters, so that it is a document that [inaudible] and to recognize themselves and the work that needs to be undertaken.

So typically the charter is developed by a drafting team, and recent practice has been that each of the supporting organizations and advisory committees have extracted interest in becoming a chartering

October 2015

---

organization, that they designate a small number of representatives. And remember, you're talking about two, three people, to come together to prepare a first draft of such a charter.

And the desire has been to keep those groups relatively small, and really the focus is on the charter and not on doing the actual work. And that has sometimes actually been one of the challenges, where groups tend to run ahead and to deal with the issues, while the real work in the drafting team is developing the charter, and defining the scope and working methods.

So once the drafting team is happy with what they have produced, and again, normally there are already consultations as part of that process with the different chartering organizations, the charter is then passed back to the different supporting organizations and advisory committees, committees for adoption. And this happens through the respective processes of each of those groups, therefore dealing with the adoption of things like this.

And again, I think the practice has been to date, that charters have been adopted by all of the groups without any concerns, but one of the things that probably needs to be factored in the work that's being done on developing a framework is, what happens if one of the chartering organizations does not adopt the charter? Or suggest specific changes?

Does it mean that everyone needs to go back to the drawing table? And then adopt it again, which of course, can create multiple cycles of review and adoption. But again, it's probably one of the issues that

October 2015

---

needs to be factored in as cross community working group, all cross community working groups have done this work.

Following the adoption of the charter by the different charting organizations, a call for volunteers goes out to join the cross community working group. And again, depending on the membership based, or how membership is defined, it may involve appointment by the chartering organizations of a specific number of appointed members to the cross community working group, in addition to an open call for volunteers to participate or observe the cross community working group proceedings.

So just wanted to give you a couple of examples of these cross community working groups. And this is definitely not intended to be an exhaustive list. These are just some of the more recent ones and the ones that are actually still active, but you will only be familiar with joined DNS security and stability analysis working group. There is also the joint applicant support through cross community working group, and I already mentioned before, then the IDN fast track cross community working group.

But the ones you see on the screen here, are the ones that are currently in operation. So the two transition related ones, the cross community working group on stewardship transition, and the accountability one. As well as the cross community working groups, somebody has spoken about. And then there is also a cross community working group that is looking at country and territory names as TLDs, which has been formed

October 2015

---

between the CCNSO and the GNSO to look at the specific topic, as it is an area that effects both ccTLDs as well as gTLDs.

I think that brings me to the end of the slides that I've provided. As I've noted, of course there are a lot of similarities on the actual working level to, where Heidi has spoken about, cross community working groups tend to meet at least on a weekly basis, although with the recent transition related efforts, that intensity can increase quite significantly. They use mailing lists, they use Adobe Connect, they use the Wiki space.

So I think from that perspective, you will find a lot of elements that are, the different groups have in common. As I've tried to explain in my presentation, there are also some significant differences, although it's important to highlight that these are based on current practice, and work is actively is undergoing to translate these into principles and a framework that hopefully will be agreeable to the whole community, so one can work from those same principles and requirements in a future state of cross community working groups.

So I think that's all I had to say, and I'll guess I'll give it back to Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Marika for this presentation. I think you said everything about the cross community working groups, and thank you for the clarity of your presentation. I think, I hope you'll have a lot of questions.

October 2015

---

And now it is time to ask questions, so please if you have questions to Marika or to Heidi, please speak up now. You can raise your hand on the Adobe Connect, or if you are not on Adobe Connect, you can speak up.

This part of the webinar is very important. Your questions are very important. This is how you will perhaps have more clarity on the presentations, and this is a way to understand better what is presented. So please, if you have questions, don't hesitate.

I don't see a lot of hands. So if you... There is a hand already. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Tijani. So my question to the working group chairs, and past chairs that we have on the call, and I'm just wondering on what you have found to be some of the strengths that encourage better discussion, and good discussion, and more vibrant discussions on the working groups?

So how can we encourage that to happen on all of the working groups? So there are more regular calls, or more active inputs that feeds into the ALAC policy making process. Thank you Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Heidi. And being one of the chairs of those working groups, I would like to ask all these people who are attending this webinar, to join the capacity building working group if they want to do. It is very

---

October 2015

---

easy, and it would be very helpful because this working group we are defining the topics to be addressed. We are discussing the tools to be used for the capacity building.

So it is very interesting, and I invite you to join our working group. Just send an email to the staff, saying that you want to join the capacity building working group.

So any questions? We have no questions. So Marika, I will not ask a question, but I will make an intervention, if you want. I will discuss with this issue. The cross community working groups now are formalized, more or less. So we have, more or less, something harmonious, or whatever the cross community working groups have the same way to work.

What is now more clear and more defined, if the decision making inside the cross community working groups. Before, it was not so formalized, so everyone participating in the cross community working group can participate in decision making. And this was the case for the [inaudible] working group for example.

Now it is more precise that only the members who are appointed by the chartering organizations can participate in the decision making process. But the decision making process is made very, how to say, very democratic, since the consensus is privileged. Cross community working groups have to take decisions by consensus, but in some cases where there is no way to have a full consensus, a call for consensus will be done by the chair, but among the members only.

October 2015

---

So I think this is a good evolution in cross community working groups, and I hope it will be the... It is not included in the rules, but I think it will be the rule for the future. So I have two hands. Dev, go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Tijani. This is Dev Anand speaking. So to try to answer Heidi's question, I think it's good for working groups to have like some work objectives, or some planning to say to have some idea of what they want to accomplish. Because that then sets up a series of goals that they can accomplish, and once you have a to-do list, or a work plan, you know, then you can schedule a call say, okay, how are we going to achieve these work items?

And then tackle those work items most expeditiously as possible. And it's a challenge because there are lots of things to do. And the second thing is to really try to engage as much persons in working groups as possible. One of the ways I have tried to do it as chair of working groups, is to try to have co-chairs to share the work load, and to try to balance, to allow a little bit closer collaboration with the co-chairs in between meetings or conference calls.

So those are probably two key ideas for working groups. And my question to Marika actually is regarding GNSO working groups. The GNSO working groups have interpretation because, well the At-Large community is diverse. From the Latin American and Caribbean community, Spanish is a common language, so that is my question.

October 2015

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Marika, do you want to answer this question Marika? Before I give the floor to Cheryl?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes. So this is Marika. So GNSO working groups currently operate in English only. I know that as part of the GNSO review, there are some recommendations to look at how that can be more inclusive, and what options are there for interpretation and translation, but currently working groups operate only in [inaudible] key documents of a force or part, exactly the summary report that I put out for public comment in the five UN languages, the language for working groups deliberation is English.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Marika. Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I was going to speak and I had a frog in my throat. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr, I do apologize for that growly start. First of all, to talk Heidi's question, and I certainly support what Dev has answered. I've been around for a little while, and have attended to one or two working groups. The ones that are most successful, in my very personal view, are the ones that are flexible enough to recognize that we are working with volunteers, and volunteers do in fact have real lives beyond ICANN.



October 2015

---

And that the systems are setup as such that there are multiple opportunities of equitable input of opinions and feedback. And I'll go into some detail in just a moment on that. The other thing, of course, is to support what Dev has said in terms of work plans, to have clear objectives.

We often find in working groups that there is a waxing and waning of attendance and input, and that's often tracking as to whether or not there is an important bit of work being done. Whether we have, for example, gone into a final drafting mode on something, or whether we've come out of a public comment period and we are doing public comment reviews.

Now going back to the first point, we do, I think in certainly some of our joint work groups, if not cross community working groups, although in recent times, it has been a good practice, if not a standard operational procedure, seeing that there is a sensible method of allowing for at least second, if not, third readings on things. So that community members who may miss a meeting, especially if they are running at a very high frequency of meeting, as sometimes happens, some of these working groups at some point in their cycling, may run upwards of two if not more times a week in calls.

It's very easy for subject matter to move past you with that sort of frequency, but many working groups take practice of no decision is made at any one meeting. That these need to go through a multiple, often first and second, but an occasionally up to third readings of things. We also tend to find, I think, better efficiency where the guidelines that

---

October 2015

---

are being put together through the GNSO on, good guidelines for the operational of working group, recognizing that they are particularly obviously policy focused.

But there are some excellent pieces of guidance in that guideline, and I think working practices or operational practices that are predictable, familiar, and have some sense of authoritative guide, if not reference, are important. And that allows us to do things like not go back and restart material that is, has been substantially discussed and decided upon earlier on in a process.

But of course, will allow by review and revisit should new information or new inputs, or indeed, just agreement of a group, come to the table. It's very easy to hijack the forward progress of a working group, if people constantly drag everybody back to an earlier point in the project planning, and that's where Dev's point on objectives and projects are flexible project plan is very important.

I'm also a great advocate of the use of, if not co-chairs, of sub teams, and of having penholders, and breaking up work groups into small operational pieces, which do the hard work, and which share the workload, and drafting, and then come back to the committee of a whole for group discussion and ratification.

And I think that's a practice that is to be recommended. It is desirable, absolutely, as Tijani said, for us to work on consensus, and it's my experience that consensus is far easier brought when more people are involved in the development of the material you are looking to get

October 2015

---

consensus on. And finally, because I could go on for some time, as some of you know, on these and other topics, I think we need to recognize that the role of the chair, in particular, needs to be very specifically [inaudible] and mutual.

If you get a chair of a working group which starts to act as primary penholder, or as not so much as a [inaudible], or someone who is gathering and reporting and facilitating, but a strong opinion builder, that is probably the quickest way of getting people with diversity of views annoyed with you and your working group, and stop contributing, and is also the fastest way, in my view, to get quite valid criticisms of biased and non-consensus outcomes.

That's it for me.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Cheryl. Thank you very much for this intervention. Very useful. We are running out of time. So Heidi said in her presentation that working group is also about fun. So we will have fun now, and Terri will present us the pop quiz. So Terri, please take the floor.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you Tijani. We'll go ahead and begin our pop quiz. The screens have now changed and the pop quiz questions now will appear at the bottom right hand corner. Our first pop quiz, how many At-Large wide

October 2015

---

active working groups are there? Zero to five, six to 10, 11 to 20, or over 20? The polls are open, please cast your votes now.

Again, how many At-Large wide active working groups are there? Please cast your vote now.

And Heidi, if you can go ahead and provide us with the answer.

HEIDI ULLRICH: All right. The answer is 19 active working groups at the moment. Terri, how did people do?

TERRI AGNEW: And I've broadcasted the results. So six were voted 11 to 20, and two had thought between six and 10. Overall, it's pretty good.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, indeed.

TERRI AGNEW: Our second pop quick question. What are the working methods for At-Large working groups? Face to face, teleconferences, Wiki workspaces, mailing lists, all of the above, or none of the above? Please cast your vote now.

Once again, what are the working methods for At-Large working groups? The polls are open.

October 2015

---

Heidi, if you could please provide us with the answer.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Terri. The answer is all of the above.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect, we're at 100%.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Excellent. I'm glad everyone is listening.

TERRI AGNEW: Our third pop quiz question, what is not an example of recent CCWGs? CCWGs on CCWGs, CWG on country and territory names as TLDs, CCWG on new gTLDs, CWG stewardship, CCWG accountability. Polls are open. Please cast your vote.

Once again, what is not an example of recent CCWGs?

Marika, if you could please share the answer.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks Terri. So actually we are probably... Either I wasn't clear, or people weren't paying attention, more people thought that there is not a cross community working group on cross community working groups, but actually there is. There is specifically the cross community working

October 2015

---

group that is looking at set of common principles under a framework for cross community working groups.

The effort that is not a cross community working group is on new gTLDs. There are efforts ongoing in the GNSO, but as gTLDs are specifically within the remit of the GNSO to develop policy on, this is likely to happen on a policy development process.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you everyone for participating in our pop quiz questions today. Tijani, I'll turn it back over to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Terri. So now we had fun with this quiz, now I think that our work is finished. Thank you very much. We have another call in a few minutes that we are obliged to finish on time.

Thank you very much. I hope that this was useful for you. Thank you Heidi for your presentation. Thank you also Marika for your presentation. And thank you all for your participation, especially the working group chairs that participated. Thank you all and bye-bye.

TERRI AGNEW: And this is Terri. For those that can stay on, in the voting area, in the poll question, we just do have five basic questions regarding today's webinar. And I'll quickly go through all five questions for you to answer. Thank you everyone.

October 2015

**EN**

---

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**