

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'd like to welcome you to the webinar on the topic of the GNSO policy development process. This is a subject that's near and dear to my heart. I spent a good part of my recent life as the ALAC liaison to the GNSO and I've participated in more GNSO policy development processes than I think I can count anymore.

It's a subject that's really important to the ALAC. The largest single part of the ALAC function in a steady state world that is without the IANA transition is in fact participating in and commenting on GNSO policy development processes. So it's really important for people within At-Large to understand how the processes work, how they can participate, and actually to participate.

I cannot think of a single other way that the ALAC can prove both its worth and its importance to the ICANN ecosystem than by being able to bring the user perspective into the GNSO policy process.

The two speakers we have today, Mary Wong and Amr Elsadr, both have lots of experience in policy development processes. Mary, not only as an ICANN staff member who's worked on a number of them, but prior to that, as a GNSO member who was also active, very active for many years. So we have a really good team of people to talk to us today and I'm looking forward to see what I can learn from it.

And with that, who is going to be leading? Is it Mary or Amr?

Mary Wong:

Hi, Alan.

---

*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.*

---

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Sorry. Someone else was talking.

TERRI AGNEW: Just very quickly [inaudible].

MARY WONG: Terri, you go ahead.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Very quickly, we'd just like to go over the housekeeping items. Ariel, I'll turn it to you for that.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you very much, Terri. Very quickly, during this webinar, we will use the two parts in the Adobe Connect room. One is the Q&A part and is at the bottom right corner in the Adobe Connect. And if you have any questions for the speakers, please feel free to type your question in the Q&A part and from staff, I will keep track of the questions and the speakers who answer them probably at the Q&A session towards the end of the webinar.

And on the second part, we're going to use is a pool part that we will utilize that for a pop quiz after the speaker finish in their segment, and I think we have one pop quiz today, and then we'll also use the part for doing evaluation at the very end of this webinar, which will only take three minutes or so.

---

So just to make sure everybody knows how to use the pool part, as you can see, I indicated the location of it. It's at the bottom right corner and we have the first question up for practice. So the question is how is the timing of the webinar for you? And please click at the radio button and make sure you know how to use it. So we will use that for the pop quiz and on the evaluation at the end of the webinar.

And that's it for the housekeeping notes, and I will turn the floor to Mary.

MARY WONG:

Thank you very much, Ariel, and apologies to all for the slight talking over everybody a few minutes ago. This is my first time doing this webinar because a lot of my work is primarily with the GNSO, but I do recognize a lot of friends, colleagues, and also working group members from various PDPs, including Alan, [inaudible], and others [inaudible] and that wasn't me – for that lovely, introduction, Alan.

We are very privileged today to have, as the main [inaudible] a GNSO Council member who is on the GNSO representing the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, Amr Elsadr from Egypt. I've had the pleasure of getting to know Amr the last few years and starting from the time before I joined [inaudible] staff member and so he and I and the many others, including some on this Adobe Connect, have made that stakeholder journey together, including participating as community members before we became Council members in a number of GNSO policy development processes, or the PDP.

---

So let me just give you a fairly general overview of the topics that we hope we can cover while allowing time for Q&A today in our 90-minute session. Here, you see the various topics. What we would like to focus on is the first topic in blue, which is about the GNSO PDP, what it is, how it works, and then to have the other [inaudible] three topics feed into that because, of course, the GNSO PDP does develop policy that you may have heard talked about as consensus policy, so we might have time to spend a few minutes on that.

But because the GNSO PDP is conducted through a working group and there are guidelines within the GNSO that govern not just how a PDP is run, but how a working group functions, again, as time permits, Amr is going to spend a little bit of time not so much going through the guidelines but giving you a few pieces of information about how those work and, perhaps most important for your purposes, how you can join a working group.

So on that note, I would like to pass things over to you, Amr, to take us through the GNSO PDP [inaudible] first step.

AMR ELSADR:

Okay. Great. Thank you, Mary. This is Amr, I hope you can all see me [inaudible] hear me well. I do not hope that you can see me right now. My understanding is that we have quite a few interpreters on this call, so I'm guessing I should probably speak at a relatively slow pace to help them. Am I correct in this?

Okay. I'm going to just try to not speak too quickly. All right. Great. Okay. So like Mary said, I'm going to be talking about the GNSO policy

---

development process and I'd like to thank you all for having me here on this At-Large call. And Alan a little earlier mentioned how important it is for At-Large to participate in the GNSO process. I would also like to reciprocate that sentiment by saying it is also very important for the GNSO to have other parts of the ICANN community, including the At-Large, participate in our process. Thanks to folks like Alan, Olivier, and Cheryl, Holly, Carlton, and many, many others from the At-Large community, we really do have quite a fantastic At-Large presence in GNSO policy development.

So, yeah, looking at the slide we have on the screen right now, this is just to very quickly sort of just go through the structure of the GNSO so you understand what it is we're talking about when we say GNSO. The GNSO is made up of four stakeholder groups that are divided into what we call houses.

So on the left of your screen here, you can see the registries and the registrars, which are two of the stakeholder groups, and they belong in the contracted parties house, which means that they are entities that have contracts with ICANN, they enter into contract with ICANN.

On the right side, you have the non-contracted parties house, which is the half of the GNSO that I belong to. I'm a member of the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group, which has two constituencies in it, the NCUC and NPOC. And there's the Commercial Stakeholder Group with three constituencies, the business constituency, the intellectual property constituency, and the Internet service providers and connectivity providers constituency. So this is the side of the GNSO where you have the stakeholders who are not contracted with ICANN.

---

This construct of the two houses, and I may go over this a little bit more later in the presentation, but the relevance of the structure is really – is limited maybe to a few items, most notably I think is the voting thresholds we have to, in terms of the GNSO Council voting, to adopt GNSO working group recommendations, and I will go over a little while later.

But the houses are also responsible for selecting vice chairs to the GNSO Council and they also help to select board members to the ICANN Board. So you have one Board representative from the GNSO who represents the contracted parties and you have another Board member who is selected by the non-contracted parties' house. So those, at least to me, those are the most important things in terms of why we have houses in the GNSO.

Terri, can we please get to the next slide, please? I probably should have mentioned in the last slide that we also do have an ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council and then, right now, the liaison is Olivier Crepin-Leblond, who I see he's in the Adobe Connect room, that's cool. Hi, Olivier. Cheryl briefly served in this role, as well. Alan [inaudible] served in this role. So we've had great participation on the GNSO Council from At-Large.

The document you see or the figure, the picture you see in front of you right now, I think this is really the most important diagram you need to know when thinking about the GNSO's process to develop gTLD policy. This is really a way to just sort of like walk through the entire process by just taking a look at one picture.

---

Any PDP, which is the acronym we use for policy development process, that is used to develop what we call consensus policy, policies that will impact contractual obligations on registries and registrars, who I mentioned earlier on the contracted parties, have to go through this process. And this is the GNSO's own bottom-up multi-stakeholder policy development process.

So this begins, it goes through different stages, let's start by saying that, and along several of these stages, there are multiple opportunities for public comment, and I will mention those as we move along them.

The first stage of the GNSO policy development process, which we call the issues scoping phase, and this phase is basically after someone has requested from ICANN staff, and this someone could be either the GNSO – the GNSO Council can request ICANN policy staff to develop an issues report to scope an issue to determine what are all the different issues that may impact a policy that the GNSO Council may want to look into.

But the GNSO is not the only entity that can request the issues reports. Any advisory committee can also request an issues report. So for example, the ALAC can request an issues report on a certain topic or policy. The issues report, once staff are asked to draft an issues report, they draft a preliminary issues report, which is followed by a public comment period, where anyone can provide input to it and sort of like flag maybe issues, okay, this is something that may impact this policy and it wasn't mentioned in the preliminary issues report. We'd like to include it in the final issues report, so that that's the first public

---

comment period that we go through in a GNSO policy development process.

Following the issues report, the final issues report, the GNSO Council will then determine whether they want to launch a PDP or not, and this is really in the case of an issues report that was requested by either the GNSO or any of the ICANN advisory committees. The only exception to this rule is if the ICANN Board requests an issues report. In that event, when the ICANN Board requests an issues report, then the GNSO Council doesn't make a determination or decision on whether this proceeds to a policy development process or not. It automatically does proceed to that.

The only decision the GNSO Council would make in this situation is whether there are any revision on the charter of the PDP working group. To date, if I am not mistaken, I believe there have only been – there's only one running Board-initiated GNSO PDP, which is the privacy and proxy services accreditation issues, and that's one of the GNSO PDPs that has a number of At-Large community members participating in it.

And right now, the GNSO is in the process of launching another PDP, the next generation registration directory services, and that is another Board-issued PDP, and I believe that will be the second Board-initiated PDP that the GNSO will go through.

So like I said, after we get through the issues scoping phase and move on to the PDP working group phase, and this is one of the phases that I think should be of special interest to the At-Large community. GNSO

---

working groups, whether they're PDP working groups or non-PDP working groups, and maybe I'll try to explain a little later what non-PDP working groups are, but those working groups are completely open to anyone who wishes to participate.

When I mean open, I mean full membership as opposed to, for example, cross-community working groups where the charter organizations appoint members, and then there are others who participate as participants. GNSO working groups are open to membership to anyone, so you don't have to be a member of a GNSO stakeholder group or constituency to join a GNSO working group.

You don't even have to be a member of any of the ICANN structures, such as At-Large or maybe the ccNSO or the GAC. You don't have to be a member of any one of the structures in the ICANN community to join a GNSO working group. Like I said, anyone may join those and anyone, in joining a GNSO working group, you are part of the consensus that the GNSO working group develops. All you need to do is file a statement of interest on the GNSO webpage, and you're good to go.

So right now, we're at the stage of the PDP working group where, as I said, anyone may join. This is the stage where all the real work actually happens, this is a process that may last possibly longer than a year where the members of the working group thoroughly discussed a policy issue and more or less governed by the charter that scopes the issue and determines what the scope of the discussion should be. So the PDP working group would go through this in great detail. PDP working group apart from being comprised by members, whether the GNSO and other groups. The GNSO working group is also expected to solicit input from

---

other parts of the ICANN community at an early stage to make sure that input is provided and considered and discussed as part of its work.

So for example, once a PDP working group launches and the work has begun, then you'll probably find the e-mails coming on behalf of the working group, asking, for example, the At-Large community to provide inputs to, for example, like the charter questions on a specific group and what the specific policy issues may be, and this will allow the GNSO working group to consider the input of, for example, At-Large, the GAC, the different stakeholders groups of the GNSO, in the course of developing the policies that they have been set out to develop.

At the end of the work of a GNSO working group, and once they would – a working group would develop an initial working group report and recommendations. And again, this would go out for public comment, and when I say go out for public comment, of course, this public comment is not limited to the ICANN community but to the global public at large, and anyone can provide input. The working group is expected to provide the public comments, and address them.

There's this really nifty public comment review tool that ICANN policy staff helps working group members go through all the comments and make sure that they've all been addressed and considered in some cases, the initial recommendations made by the working group will change and be altered in response to some of the comments that are received. This will be reflected in the working group final report and recommendations as well as in the public comment review tool, which is I believe normally attached to a working group's final report.

---

Once you move past the PDP working group and the final report, the final report and recommendations is then sent to the GNSO Council. And at this point, the GNSO Council's job is mainly to determine that the procedures have been followed accurately and the working group guidelines, the GNSO operating procedures, that everything's happened the way it's supposed to take place, and that a certain level of consensus has been achieved within the working group, and the GNSO Council will then either adopt or not adopt working group recommendations. If they do adopt them, then they would send these recommendations, they would forward them to the ICANN Board and the ICANN Board would then need to, again, launch a public comment period before considering adopting the GNSO recommendations and making them ICANN policy or not.

That's, in a nutshell, that's what this diagram says. Actually, I think this may be a good time to stop and answer any questions if there are any, and I see there is a question from Wafa: "Please, could you tell me what those acronyms in the first slide stand for, like the NCA and the others?"

Okay. That's a good question. I probably should have gone over that. NCA stands for NomCom Appointee. Just like the ALAC, the At-Large Advisory Committee, the GNSO Council has the appointees to it by the NomCom, the Nominating Committee, the ICANN Nominating Committee.

And those, we have one voting NomCom appointee to each house, and Mary, maybe you can correct me, if I'm not mistaken, and then there's a non-voting NomCom appointee to the GNSO Council, as well. So that's who these folks are. The GNSO Council also has liaisons from the ALAC,

---

as I mentioned a little earlier, so Olivier's currently the ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council, and we also have a liaison from the ccNSO [Council]. So we have those two liaisons.

Recently, the GNSO also is going through a pilot project of having what we call a reverse liaison from the GNSO to the Governmental Advisory Committee, the GAC, so a member of the GNSO community made some calls serving that capacity right now in trying to assist the GAC with earlier engagement in the GNSO's policy development process.

I'm not sure if there are any other acronyms on here that I may need to clarify. I'm guessing folks here know what ALAC is, ccNSO is the Country Code Names Supporting Organization, NCUC and NPOC are the two constituencies in the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group. NCUC stands for Noncommercial Users Constituency and NPOC is Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency.

ISPCP I mentioned a little earlier, it was the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency, that's one of the constituencies in commercial stakeholder group. The Intellectual Property Constituency is the IPCU, that one doesn't show on the screen here, the BC, the Business Constituency. All constituencies in the non-contracted parties house of the GNSO.

By the way, we love our acronyms in the GNSO. We don't really love them, but we use them a lot, and I'm sure they are quite confusing to many, but please, at any point if I do use an acronym and forget to explain what it means, please just stop me and ask me to elaborate on it.

---

Terri, I think we can move on to the next slide. Okay. Are there any questions on the actual process that I've described? It's a lot to take in, I know it is. I think the main takeaway you need to take from it is that you have these different stages in the process, you have the issues scoping phase, you have the PDP working group phase, and then you have the GNSO Council considerations and the ICANN Board considerations, so we have these four stages of along the process.

You have multiple public comment periods in the process, one at the beginning during the issues scoping phase, you have another public comment period following the initial report of a PDP working group, and the last public comment period is when the ICANN Board is considering GNSO policy recommendations.

And the other opportunity for the At-Large, at least it provides input in the PDP, as I mentioned earlier, is not exactly a public comment period, but this is sort of just like when a PDP working group is first established, it is mandated to seek input from the broader ICANN community at an early stage. So although this isn't really a public comment phase, but it is an opportunity where At-Large can provide input and ALAC has been consistently providing input to PDP working groups, which has been very helpful to the GNSO in development of its policies.

Okay. I just got a note saying that I may be speaking a little too quickly for the interpreters. I will try to slow down. Okay. So yes, the slide in front of us right now outlining a few of the PDP requirements, PDP, again, being policy development process. The first one is the point that I had just been mentioning. Formally seeking inputs from the broader ICANN community, the different SOs and ACs of ICANN. And this really

---

helps a PDP working group sort of develop an early direction on the work that it needs to do.

Another one of the requirements listed here are the roles of the working group chairs and members in the working group guidelines. There's, in general, there are a few documents that govern how the GNSO works. One of them is the PDP manual, and [inaudible] of the ICANN bylaws, and there are also the – those are included I believe in the GNSO operating procedures, but there are also the GNSO working group guidelines, which really specifically spell out the role of the different members of the working group.

So yeah, I see here it says specific roles for the working group chairs and members. I think it's also noteworthy to mention that there's also a GNSO Council liaison to each GNSO working group, and that the Council liaison also has some specific roles apart from the working group chair and the other members.

Another one of the requirements, one that I mentioned a little earlier is publication of the initial report for public comments. This is the second public comment period during a policy development process, and this is the one during the PDP working group phase. This public comment period specifically is between the publication of the initial reports and the final publication of the final reports.

So before a working group develops its consensus on final recommendations, they do need to consider the public comments provided on the initial recommendations, the initial reports. Okay. I see

---

some other question from Garth Graham. “In general, where does input to PDP from outside ICANN come from?”

Well, in my experience, input to PDP from outside of ICANN is mostly from individuals who have an interest in some of the PDPs that take place. Most of the input that comes in during public comments is actually from the ICANN community, from members of the ICANN community, and sometimes from different SOs and ACs, as well, so you can have a formal, for example, ALAC input to a PDP.

In one case, the privacy proxy services accreditation issues, which is one of the ICANN Board-initiated PDPs, I think there were thousands and thousands of public comments provided to special circumstances surrounding those. But generally, I’m not sure if there’s any sort of uniform set of folks who provide inputs from outside of ICANN community to a GNSO PDP working group.

I see Mary’s got her hand up, if she would like to add to this point or any other. Please go ahead, Mary.

MARY WONG:

Thanks, Amr, and thanks for the question, Garth. So just to add on to what Amr is saying, the reports and other documents are published, and if you note that when we say public comment, it’s probably not aimed at just the ICANN community. One of the things that we have noticed, particularly with recent efforts in one of the privacy proxy accreditation PDP that Amr just mentioned, is that various participants within the ICANN community, including stakeholder groups, constituencies, At-Large structures, and so forth, do a lot of their own outreach and

---

engagement and so when there is an issue that a particular [inaudible] community, for example, might feel is interesting or impactful for people that they represent, then there is some outreach there and there is obviously dependency on the nature of the topic.

So you might see some more technical groups get more interested in more technical issues whereas you might see more civil society participants be more interested in different issues that may have particular free speech indications.

The other thing I wanted to add is that in the various public comment periods, we have noticed that there are comments that come in from both individuals as well as from groups. And also, in some cases, individual governments or government agencies, and some of these really are not regular participants in the ICANN process or the PDP, so that's actually very, very helpful.

There's obviously more that all of us in ICANN and our community can do to make sure that information about pending policies get out there, but so far, we have noticed that there are [people] outside the ICANN community that are paying attention. I hope that's helpful. Thanks, Amr.

AMR ELSADR:

Thank you, Mary, and I hope that answer was helpful, Garth. Okay. I think we can move on to the next slide. Yeah, these are just some quick links to some of the documents that I had mentioned a little earlier that govern the GNSO's policy development process. So we have an [inaudible] of the ICANN bylaws, the PDP manual, and PDP overview. I guess this is a link to [inaudible] explains what consensus policies are.

---

I think I did mention this a little earlier but consensus policy is really a technical term that we use in terms of gTLD policy and – oh, cool. So that’s the next topic here. Yeah, consensus policies are policies that are developed by the GNSO and then adopted by the ICANN Board, and those policies are, when I say it’s a technical term, it’s really because that means a consensus policy is a policy that would impose a contractual obligation on gTLD registries and registrars, the contracted parties of the GNSO.

Yeah, so here we go. ICANN accredited registrars and registries are bound to ICANN by contracts, and the consensus policies are what change the contents of those contracts. Next slide, please.

Okay. This is a little bit of text on the background of where consensus policies come from and the original agreements between ICANN and registries and registrars. I’m not going to get too deep into this unless someone wants me to. So maybe you can just skip to the next slide, please.

Okay. Picket fence. This is a term that was used to describe what is within the remit of ICANN and sort of what ICANN has the authority to influence or what kind of policies ICANN has the authority to enforce through its contracts with the registries and registrars.

And I’m not sure if that description does picket fence justice. I don’t know if Mary or Alan or Cheryl would like to elaborate on what picket fence is in the ICANN context. Of course, picket fence is, as you see in the picture, it’s just a white fence that surrounds a home, for example,

---

but the ICANN context has a bit of a different meaning. Mary, you want to go ahead?

MARY WONG:

Actually, I will cede to Alan, who actually has far greater experience than I do. I just wanted to make a note of what you just said that the picket fence is probably a very American term and that's probably why the picture is there. It basically indicates an order of a marked-off area, if you like, and so what this slide is trying to show by that is that within that sense, it's the area in which ICANN has the authority to make policy, and when we talk about consensus policy, those are mandated for the contracted parties, such as the registries and registrars who agree by their contract with us, that's why the contracted parties have to comply with them.

Alan probably has an even better explanation. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Mary. Actually, I think what is in the slide is wrong, but it's wrong from an interesting perspective. ICANN has a fair amount of authority in making policy, and it's wider than what is referred to as the picket fence. The picket fence refers to – and specifically things that are eligible for Consensus Policy, and those are capitalized words.

Within the registrar agreement and within the registry agreements, there is a specific list in each case of subjects that are eligible for Consensus Policy, and those are deemed to be within the picket fence. Those are subjects which, if ICANN makes a new policy through a PDP or

---

similar process, those contracts immediately get modified. So even though the contract may have been signed four years ago, if ICANN decides that something – WHOIS is an example of things that are within the picket fence.

If ICANN decides the rules should change for how WHOIS is managed, then those new rules apply essentially as soon as the policy is adopted by the Board with an implementation period allowed.

So the picket fence refers to parts within the contract that can be changed by the GNSO policy development process without renegotiating the contract. And the reason I said that the slide is still somewhat in error is there are other things that are within ICANN's jurisdiction but they can't change them unilaterally on the contracted parties just by doing a PDP.

So it's a subtle difference but I think an important one. Mary, is that close to cover it? Or Amr.

AMR ELSADR:

Oh, yeah, Alan. Thanks. That was fantastic.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you.

---

MARY WONG: Alan, we've noted, and I think the [inaudible] probably the update it to make it more technically accurate the way that you've just described. Thank you very much.

AMR ELSADR: Yeah. Thanks, Alan. That really was a fantastic description of what should be considered [inaudible], I guess. Terri, can we please move to the next slide? Thank you. Okay. Here we have another quick [inaudible] about consensus policies. And now the GNSO working group guidelines. Okay. This is GNSO working group guidelines is a document that you can find. I'm guessing there is a link provided to it somewhere here, but if not, you can find it on the GNSO's page, and this really has the sort of spells out the rules and norms of how a GNSO working group functions, and that's whether it's a PDP working group, a working group that is developing consensus policies, or a non-PDP working group.

And I mentioned this earlier and I said I would explain what it is. So a GNSO non-PDP working group is a working group that is basically working on something that is not a consensus policy. So in recent history, I can think of two examples of non-PDP working groups. One was the GNSO Policy and Implementation Working Group and I worked very closely with both Alan and Cheryl on that working group.

And this was a working group that helped devise new processes and new ways for the GNSO to tackle policy questions. So although this working group wasn't actually developing a policy that registries and registrars would need to abide by, it was more discussing process issues

---

and this is something that is also within the mandate of the GNSO, but it makes it a non-PDP working group.

Another non-PDP working group was the recent Data Metrics on Policy Making Working Group, which was a working group sort of trying to come up with ways where empirical data can be used to assist the development of gTLD policies in the GNSO. So yeah, those are the two different types of working groups in the GNSO, non-PDP working groups and PDP working group groups.

Okay. So we see on the slide here, GNSO working group guidelines are supposed to assist a GNSO working group in its mandate to either develop a policy or to do whatever it is it's supposed to be doing, if it's a non-PDP working group. It's got all the sort of, like I said, the rules and norms of [inaudible] it also has the [inaudible] the functions and the responsibilities of a working group chair, as well as a Council liaison to a GNSO working group. So those are all in there.

Some of the important things that are also in there are sort of what a working group is expected to do, for example, in terms of this early outreach to the other ICANN SOs and ACs. Some of the other things include sort of like the different designations of consensus levels that a working group is meant to reach at the end of its work, and I believe we are going to go over those a little later in this presentation.

So yeah, I see a checklist here, main elements of importance to working group numbers. So yeah, I have a first meeting of the working group, and when the GNSO Council launches a working group and sends an announcement that a working group is being formed and asking for

---

volunteers to join, the GNSO Council also appoints a Council liaison to the working group, and the Council liaison will take up the role of the working group chair up until the working group actually decides on who the permanent chair of the working group will be.

Some of the other rules include the use of subteams, certain rules are on the constitution of subteams, and this may fall under the mandate of the working group chair, participation representativeness. This includes some rules that the GNSO and the GNSO working group have to at least, as reasonably possible trying to abide by in terms of, for example, geographic representation, representation of the different special interest groups or stakeholder groups of the GNSO. So the GNSO Council and the GNSO working group chair need to be sure that all efforts within reason have been made to make sure that this representativeness is present in a GNSO working group or even on subteams within a working group.

So you have things like process integrity behavior and [inaudible] decision making appeal process. There is an appeal process within the working group involving the working group chair. If there are differences between the working group chair and a member of the working group, for example, one example that is provided in the working group guidelines is if a working group member feels that his or her views are consistently being ignored by the working group, there is a process by which the Council liaison to a working group can try to assist in settling a dispute, and this may actually result in elevation of the disagreement to the GNSO Council.

---

But what I really want you all to take away from this is that the GNSO working group guidelines is a pretty good document to go through if you're going to join a GNSO working group just to understand what some of the – how a GNSO working group is meant to behave and how it's meant to work to develop gTLD policies. Terri, can we move to the next slide, please?

Okay. These are the consensus levels that I have just briefly mentioned a little earlier. The designations we have one full consensus, meaning that there is no dissenting or no members of the working group who disagree with the working group's recommendations. Consensus means that there is a majority, supermajority of the working group members who agree with the working group recommendations, but there may be a minority that disagrees.

Slightly less consensus, and that would be the third designation, which is strong support/significant opposition. So [inaudible] would be more of a significant opposition, it wouldn't be such a very small minority anymore. Divergence is where you have no agreement amongst working group members, so we have several different views and there's no obvious majority of working group members who support one view over another.

And then the minority view is pretty much what would be included under the second check, which is consensus, so you'd have consensus to have a majority who have reached consensus on recommendations and a minority who disagree.

---

It's probably also noteworthy to mention here that any minority view in a GNSO working group can and should be included in a working group's final report. So if the working group does not achieve full consensus, the minority view should be explicitly expressed in the working group's final report. Terri, next slide, please.

Before I move on, Mary, your hand just came up. Please go ahead.

MARY WONG:

Yes, Amr. Thank you. And I just wanted to, I guess, highlight the point that you've made about participation in a working group about the opportunities to provide input, and that after a working group member, there is a fairly robust [inaudible] of guidelines in the working group guidelines that helps people through the process. What kinds of norms of behavior for a couple, what can you do if you feel that your view may not be given as much airtime or respect as others?

But ultimately, this leads to the consensus-building process that, in the end, culminates in the recommendations. And as you said, Amir, the final report will have all those recommendations and proposals and indicate the level of consensus for each, including, in some cases, a minority view.

So if you add that all together, participating in a working group, whether as an individual or as an individual representing your employer or a trade group or any kind of association, it does mean that you have the ability to not just contribute to the process, but also to indicate at the end of it all what is the level of community consensus, which the GNSO

---

Council and the ICANN Board will then look at because that will be in the report. Thanks, Amr.

AMR ELSADR: Thank you, Mary. Yes. Everything that I have said so far about the GNSO process and all the really cool stuff Mary's been adding to it, I guess it would be honest of me to say that I'm very much an enthusiast of the GNSO.

TERRI AGNEW: Amr has disconnected but we are redialing him at this moment. One moment, please.

AMR ELSADR: Hello, can anyone hear me?

MARY WONG: Are you back, Amr?

AMR ELSADR: Hi. I just plugged in to the audio of the Adobe Connect room. I don't know if it's working very well or not.

MARY WONG: I think [inaudible].

---

AMR ELSADR:

Okay. Good. Great. I apologize, everyone. I just dropped off the phone bridge. Okay. Yeah. I guess before I was disconnected, I was just saying that I'm very much of an enthusiast of the GNSO's process. I think it's a great process. I think it really allows for solid participation from anyone who wants to be a part of the process and part of the consensus building and part of the actual decisions and policies being developed.

And like I said, and Mary also stressed, you don't have to be a member of the GNSO's stakeholder groups or constituencies. You don't even have to be a member of the ICANN community at all. Just be willing to participate.

Okay. Do we have more slides? Tips and tricks. I don't know if I know any tricks, but – okay, these are just resources for folks to access information regarding the GNSO structure, how the work is being done, the master calendar is a great place for people who are on several groups at one time to sort of try to work out their week and what calls they need to get on.

Yeah. One of the things I should have probably mentioned earlier on how GNSO working groups do work is that they usually get on weekly calls, usually between one to two hours, and that's where the majority of the bulk of the work happens. During those calls and on the working group mailing lists, these GNSO working group calls are always recorded and transcribed.

I'm sorry. Am I still there? Am I on audio? Can you all hear me?

---

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, Amr. We can still hear you.

AMR ELSADR: Okay. Thanks, Terri. Yeah. So these calls are all transcribed and recorded transcribed and published for public access. You can actually access those from the GNSO's calendar so you can go back to any working group meeting or call and check the transcripts or recording. The working group e-mail lists are also publicly archived, so anyone who needs to sort of catch up and try to find out what's going on with any working group can [inaudible] that by going through the archives.

The GNSO working groups have wiki pages, dedicated wiki pages, for each working group where all of the sort of the work that is being done is captured and also published. This includes living documents, different versions of documents, attendance records for working group members, links to their statements of interest. So all of the information you might want on any GNSO working group, you can find from a GNSO working group's wiki page. And there are links to those all from the GNSO's main website under this really cool, new link on the main website, which is quick info, and that's a relatively new page and it takes you to a lot of very fascinating information about the GNSO.

Terri, can we please move to the next slide. I'm sorry. I see we have a question from Glenn McKnight: "What percentage of policies completely through the sausage maker? How many policies are kicked out the process due to out of scope?"

Glenn, to be honest, I don't know if I could answer that question. I haven't seen any policies that have been thrown out because they were

---

deemed out of scope. Like I mentioned earlier, the scoping of a certain policy development process is determined during at an early stage of a PDP, and that's one of the issues [inaudible] reports are being published in a working group charter, which very clearly states what the scope of the working group is.

If a working group feels that there is something they would like to tackle in the process that may be out of [inaudible] you can always request the GNSO Council to make changes to the charter and there's a process to go through for that. I don't know if Mary or – I see Alan's got his, Alan, if you have an answer to this question, I'd appreciate it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Mary and I both answered in the chat. There is a concept of out of scope, but that doesn't stop the GNSO from starting a PDP anyway. It just has a higher voting threshold to approve it, to get it started.

Once a PDP is started, it doesn't stop because something is out of scope. As Amr mentioned, if the PDP working group itself determines it wants to work on something that was not within the charter, then it can ask the GNSO to expand the charter, and the GNSO may or may not, depending on its will.

The PDP, however, will go on until it completes or it could stop if it's deadlocked, or there are now provisions that will allow a PDP to be canceled if it's just no longer relevant, which has happened on rare occasions. But the concept of being stopped because it is out of scope is not really applicable. Thank you.

---

AMR ELSADR:

Yeah. Thanks, Alan. Okay. I think we need to try to wrap up this [inaudible], actually, certain how many more slides we have left. I think we're almost done. Okay. Yeah. Okay. ICANN Learn is definitely something you might want to look at. There's the link on the slide here. So there is a section of ICANN Learn dedicated to GNSO, so you can learn more about the GNSO there. Terri, can we move on to the next slide, please?

Okay. The reference [inaudible] more links. Again, we have more information about the GNSO, central materials, [inaudible] operating procedures, working group guidelines, and PDP manual. Yeah. If you're a process junkie kind of like I am, you'll probably know those fairly well. The procedures that govern the GNSO in the second bullet on the slide in front of you are, they're not [inaudible], they're continuously updated. For example, the policy and implementation working group that I mentioned introduced a few new processes entities. GNSO has a committee called a standing committee on improvements implementation. So when the GNSO Council feels that there's something in the GNSO operating procedures or working group guidelines that may – well, it could be, perhaps, updated or there might have been a situation where difficulty was faced because of a procedure that wasn't very – the procedure didn't really help what was practically required at the time so they can ask the SCI, the Standing Committee on Improvements, to look into it and suggest changes.

Current GNSO projects in the third bullet, so that's a link to some of the active projects going on, and then the one-stop shop for GNSO

---

[inaudible]. This is just good links to more information, if you need them. Terri, next slide, please.

Okay. So, yeah. Here are just some of the, I think, some of the things that a working group member needs to be aware of when working with a working group. So yeah, their e-mail invites, dialing in to the bridge, just a few things you need to remember like providing your full name. If you're not going to attend a working group meeting, it's probably best to send them an apology just because, like I said, working group member attendance is recorded, and it's freely available on the wiki for every working group.

Logging in to the Adobe Connect room in the chat. There are sort of rules for behavior and conduct that you need to say yes, I agree to them, you probably agreed to those before joining this webinar. Also, very important, something that – problems that occur on a regular basis are folks who do not mute their lines when they're not speaking. And so you have some noise and it may be a little disruptive during working group calls. So always a good idea to mute and unmute your lines when you need to. And using the Adobe Connect room is a great way to sort of do this and to use some of the other nifty features like raising your hand and developing a queue. So those are just some practical tips.

[inaudible] working group. Terri, are there more [slides]? No [inaudible]. All right. I think we're done. I think I'm going to hand this back over to either Mary or Terri. Yeah, go ahead, Terri. Thanks.

---

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much, Amr. At this time, before we take questions, we'd like to go ahead and conduct a quick pop quiz on the presentation. As a reminder, the pop quiz is now in the bottom right hand corner of your screen. There will be four questions altogether.

The first question. Can there be a GNSO working group chartered for other topics besides consensus policy? Yes or no? Please answer now. And Amr, if you could please provide the answer to us.

AMR ELSADR: The answer would be yes, and I see that the majority of responders got that right. This is what I mentioned in terms of a non-PDP working group. So those are working groups that are working on things other than consensus policies.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. We'll now move on to pop quiz two. Must you be a member of a GNSO SGC or an ICANN SO/AC to join a GNSO working group? Yes or no? Please answer now. And Amr, if you can please provide us the answer.

AMR ELSADR: Okay. Again, yeah, the correct answer to this would be no. You do not have to be a member of the GNSO stakeholder group and constituency or an ICANN SO and AC to join a GNSO working group. I see there were still a few folks who got the answers to this wrong, and that might be that I just didn't make that as clear as I should have. But I would appreciate any feedback on this later after the webinar.

---

Terri. You want to go ahead with the third question?

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Pop quiz question three. Do working groups only meet face-to-face during an ICANN meeting? Yes or no? Please answer now. And Amir?

AMR ELSADR: Glad to see that – yeah, thanks, Terri. The correct answer to this would be no. Working groups do not only meet during face-to-face meetings in ICANN meetings. Like I said earlier, they do have either weekly calls or calls once every two weeks, perhaps.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And our final pop quiz question. Are there opportunities for other SO/ACs and the general public to comment on PDP before the final report is completed? Yes or no? And Amir, if you could share the answer?

AMR ELSADR: Okay. The correct – thank you, Terri. The correct answer to this is yes. There are opportunities for other SOs and ACs and the general public to comment on a PDP before the final report is completed. The general public, their opportunity to comment would be limited to the public comment period that takes place when an initial report was published. Other ICANN SOs and ACs have the opportunity to comment during that public comment period as well as during the early stages of a working

---

group's work when a working group is required to reach out to the ICANN SOs and ACs to seek input.

So I guess for ICANN SOs and ACs, there are probably two opportunities while for the general public, there would be only one, which is a public comment period before the initial and final reports are staged. So thanks.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you very much for taking part of our pop quiz portion.

AMR ELSADR:

Okay. If there are any questions for me, I think I'm [inaudible] thank you, Terri, this is Amr again. I'm guessing I'm done here unless there are folks who have any questions. I'll mute myself and I guess I'll hand this over back to Mary. Thanks.

MARY WONG:

Thanks, Amr. Thanks, everybody for being here and participating. I think, as Amr said, if you have other questions, please either type them or raise your hand, and I do see Alan's hand is up, and I think you're on deck as they say in the United States, is it baseball? For next step. So I think I'll just hand it over to you. I don't know if you have a question, a comment, or you want to [inaudible] into agenda item five.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

No. I have a comment but I think we'll stay open for questions for a little while and see if anyone has any. I'm going to make a comment now, I guess, which could go with the title of what the other people didn't tell you.

One of the strengths of the PDP is that anybody can participate, but in English, there's an expression of something called two-edged sword. And what it means is it's talking about something which has both benefits and liabilities and negatives. And the fact that anybody can participate in a GNSO PDP, or any GNSO working group for that matter, is both a plus and a minus, because although anyone can participate, you can't force anyone to.

And there is a cost to participating. It's not a money cost, it's a time cost. It's a cost to attend the meetings, it's a cost to learn about the subject so that you can talk intelligently about it. And those are not trivial costs. And therefore, if a PDP is going to be about a subject which is important to some people, let's say it's going to be important to registrars because depending on the outcome of the PDP, they may have to spend money. They may have to spend a lot of money. And clearly, this is going to be of great interest to them and they will participate.

The downside is if people representing users, such as the noncommercial people in the GNSO, such as the At-Large, do not participate, then we don't act as the counterbalance to the interests of the contracted parties, and the outcomes may not be particularly balanced.

---

So it is really, really important that user representatives actively get involved despite the cost to them of time and having to learn, and participate actively in these processes to make sure that the results that come out of it are indeed balanced. And that's why we're having this webinar and that's why people like me are preaching to say start getting active, please. And that's my only comment. So we're now open to questions for anyone else.

And Mary has a question. Go ahead, Mary.

MARY WONG:

Actually, I don't for once, I suppose, but I did want to follow up on what you said, which in turn, I think, emphasizes a lot of points that Amr has just highlighted in his presentation. Then going back, the question of working group meetings, I think that for those of you on the call today that may not have participated in a working group or familiar with the GNSO, you see that the work is actually spread out and mostly done either through Adobe Connect and calls like today.

So while it's helpful, certainly, to attend an ICANN meeting, there is an element of, I guess, time management for each person, but then finding the topic that you would be most interested in or are most likely to be engaged with, as Alan, I think, has alluded to, is the most important first step, and then when the working group meets for the first meeting, as I think Amr has discovered, sorry, described, that's when the group discusses issues of who's going to be the chair, for example, but also the frequency and when they're going to meet.

---

So you do have a sense from early on of what your time commitment is on a regular basis. And there are people, obviously, who for various reasons, which may be personal or professional or just a question of time, come in and out of working groups, for example, and there's no penalty for doing so because there's always a mailing list and, of course, all the recordings and the calls that are transcribed, so you do have the opportunity to keep up.

And I see Alan's got his hand up again, so I'm going to stop talking and pass it back over to you, Alan, who may, I guess, correct me or add to what I'm saying. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Mary. I just wanted to point out when I started saying I'm going to tell you what they didn't, that was really a joke, and I don't think there was any attempt to masquerade it, but Mary is right. It's a time-consuming process but you can manage a lot of it yourself, and it really is important to find something that you find somewhat interesting and get involved.

And it can be fascinating because you can learn all sorts of things you might never have known about. So something I've done a lot of. When earlier in the webinar, it was said that anyone can participate. It's not only anyone can participate, we have had several chairs of PDP working groups who have been At-Large members.

It's not just you can participate. You can run the thing if you have the interest and, hopefully, the skills. Cheryl.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. I was doing my best not to say too much during it because Amr and I had a little chat before this all started, and I promised to behave, unlike I do in the working groups. That was a joke, for the record. I just wanted to pick up on something Mary just said about the variability and the self-management of how one can contribute, and just share with those on this call who may be thinking about dipping their toe into the wonderful world of working groups, and I would encourage you all to do so.

And that is that one of the particularly important pieces of work, in fact, one of the reference materials that we look at here, which is the guidelines for GNSO PDP, PDP working group. And one of the major contributors to that never attended a single teleconference. She was unable to due to the nature of the work she was doing at the time, and yet using the list and e-mail, she contributed I would say absolutely equitably to the highest level contributors, those of us who were attending every [inaudible].

So there really is, providing you have the interest and the inclination, very little barrier to you being able to make a really positive contribution. But also, getting to know some amazingly interesting people. And after a decade or so like Alan, I count amongst my good acquaintances, if not my good friends, some people I would never have got [inaudible] if I haven't been butting heads and having conversations in some of these work groups.

---

So I strongly encourage you to dip your toe in the water and use Olivier and Alan and people like me to help you through and make you feel comfortable. They don't bite and there are plenty of onboarding and assistance [inaudible] that are in place now that weren't around a while back. So it's easier now than ever before. Thank you.

MARY WONG:

Thank you so much, Cheryl. And yes, there are more webinars and training materials, and some people may be overwhelmed by them but I think that's where [inaudible] more than happy to take inquiries and queries and just try and to help you find the most relevant information that you might need at any point in your journey in the working group.

I see that Alberto has his hand up. Alberto, are you able to speak? If so, please let us know what your thoughts are.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you. What Cheryl just said is related to a question I had, I had prepared in advance. And the question is, can you participate in a working group as a learner, so to speak? Can you sit in on a working group and learn the ropes? Because maybe we have knowledge of a subject but we do not know exactly the dynamics of this policy development. Thank you.

MARY WONG:

Thank you very much for the question, Alberto. That's an excellent question, which reminded me that maybe we should have put in a slide

---

for that. The short answer to your question is yes, and I will ask Amr, Alan, and others to chime in, if I am not explaining it fully.

But you can join the mailing list for a working group as an observer. That means that you would follow on the mailing list in all the active discussions in real time, as they say. You would not participate in the call, but, of course, all the calls are recorded and transcribed.

That's a relatively new mechanism that the GNSO [inaudible] use to try to have people who may not want to fully commit all the time to the calls, for example, or who might want to, as you say, use the knowledge they have to fully decide if they want to participate fully in the group.

Having said that, though, I think I should also say that you could join not as an observer to the mailing list, but as a member of the working group, and just start by coming to the meeting and reading or looking at the reference documents that are always provided at the very start of a working group. And, of course, by talking to the staff supporting that group as well as the working group chairs of that group at any point to clarify any questions you may have.

So what I'm saying is that just because you're [inaudible] fully familiar with maybe the history of that topic, should not stop you from joining a working group, but at the same time, there is this mechanism of being an observer to the mailing list that some people have found quite helpful, as well. And so now I pass it over to Alan again.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Not a lot more to say. Of course, if you're only going to listen, and then you can listen to the recordings afterwards, and you're not committed to doing it at the time the meeting is held. But if you do want to call when the meeting and not speak, that's completely allowed, it also allows you to ask a question if a particular question is on your mind.

And very often, at the beginning of a PDP or a non-PDP working group, there's some effort spent to try to get everyone up to speed and to help make sure everyone is at the same level and can participate, so that also can be very useful. I did add in the chat something that is perhaps humorous or perhaps not humorous. There are people who join calls and speak a lot, even though they don't know anything about the subject. We really don't recommend that. We really think you should be quiet until you do have a good grasp of what's going on because that can sometimes be a very disruptive element.

But it's up to you to decide when you know enough. No one else is going to be the judge of that. Thank you.

MARY WONG:

Thanks, Alan. And I see that we're almost at 20 past. But we're also having a good conversation, so let me just ask the participants again if you have any questions, you can raise your hand, Adobe, or let us know through the phone or through the interpreter.

And while you're thinking about that, Alan, I note that you had said earlier we would just keep it open and someone may have a further

---

question, but in the meantime, if you wanted to start the next steps, please go ahead if you like.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Mary. The next steps, really, are watching [inaudible] has come out for working groups, and joining. And as Cheryl said, there are [inaudible] who have participated in lots of [inaudible] and have a lot of experience, and all of us are quite willing to help you [inaudible] might be good for [inaudible] some of them have been mentioned [inaudible] me, Cheryl, Olivier, Holly, and people like Amr who, although he's not part of At-Large, [inaudible] to advise people as to whether something fits or not.

The method going forward is to start doing something. You may pick a first working group and you find out after a few weeks it's not really of interest to you, you can drop out. There's no reason. You're not committed for life to it. So the recommendation is to start dabbling in it, start listening, start talking, and become part of the voice that can change the outcome of these PDPs, and in our case, to make sure that user issues are addressed. And I don't think I have a lot else to say on that subject, and I will turn it back over to Terri for the evaluation.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you very much. At this time, if we could ask everyone to stay on just a few moments, we do have five follow-up evaluation questions regarding today's webinar. If you could please answer. Again, the follow-up questions are in your bottom right hand corner. How is the

---

timing of the webinar for you? Too early, just right, or too late? Please answer now.

Our second question. How is the technology used for the webinar? Very good, good, sufficient, bad, or very bad? Please answer now.

Question three. Did the speakers demonstrate mastery of the topic? Extreme, strong, sufficient, weak, or insufficient? Please answer now.

Question four. Are you satisfied with the webinar? Extremely, satisfied, moderately, slightly, or not satisfied? Please answer now.

And finally, our last question. What topics would you like us to cover for future webinars? And you can type your answers in the slot. Again, we thank you very much for joining today's webinar and appreciate everyone's time.

This does conclude the webinar for today. Thank you very much. And please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Have a wonderful rest of your day.