YESIM NAZLAR:
Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Capacity Building Program 2017, our second webinar on the topic "At-Large Policy Advice Development Process" taking place on Tuesday, 28th of March, 2017, at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing the roll call as it's a webinar, but if I could please remind all participants on the phone bridge as well as computers, to mute your speakers and microphones when not speaking. Please do not forget to state your name before speaking not only for the transcription purposes but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the different language channels. We have English, Spanish, and French interpretation for this webinar. Thank you all for joining. I will now turn it back over to Tijani Ben Jemaa, the Chair of At-Large Capacity Building for [inaudible]. Thank you very much. Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:
Thank you very much, Yesim. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. As Yesim said, this is the second webinar for this year, 2017 and it is also about Policy Development but this time it will be about the part of At-Large.

Before we start the presentations, I will ask the staff back to make some housekeeping announcement and then we'll come back to the presentations.

Yesim.

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.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Tijani. Let's take a quick look at the housekeeping presentation. It's currently displayed on the Adobe Connect room. We will have a Question and Answer [part] during this webinar. As you see it's located on the left hand side of the AC room.

Okay, if we could please locate this modem noise. I think it's gone.

So if you have any questions we do encourage you to type them in here and they will be directed to the presenters. We also have a pop quiz section and I do see it will be located on the right hand side of the AC, and after the presenters'/speakers' presentations, please be ready to answer the questions posted in the [poll chart] and finally we will have a user experience part. There will be a seven-question survey at the end of the webinar so please stay around for extra three minutes or so to complete them. Back over to you, Tijani. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Yesim. Our presenters today are Alan Greenberg who is Chair of ALAC also who is one of the most contributers in the policy advice that ALAC and At-Large make for the Board. The second presenter will be Ariel Liang who is the staff member who is in charge of policy development and policy advice. I don't know who will start first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan is starting first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, please. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. This session is about At-Large policy advice development. The term "advice" is one we're going to have an interesting discussion about. In At-Large we consider our main task is to represent the interests of Internet users. The challenge, of course, is how does one do that? How do you represent all of these users and what tasks do we have to actually do that? The Bylaws offer us a little bit of guidance.

Next slide please.

The ICANN Bylaws about the ALAC – and the ALAC is the body within ICANN that actually takes action on behalf of At-Large – is, "We shall consider and provide advice on activities of ICANN insofar as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users. This includes policies created through the ICANN Supporting Organizations as well as many other issues on which community input and advice is appropriate."

So you see it's completely open-ended and it is very, very, clear that our job is to provide input and advice.

Next slide.

That's the same one with the words highlighted. And notice the words are used slightly differently in the two different cases. We provide advice on activities and we also can provide input on pretty much anything that is relevant.

Next slide.

When we use the term "advice," exactly what do you mean? If you give advice to someone, that typically means that you think you are wiser than them and telling them the right answer to some extent. They may choose not to listen to you but that's what the implicit meaning of "advice" is. "Input" is a softer term. That is, you are putting input into the process, not necessarily saying it is the right way although clearly it is what you believe.

In general within At-Large, when we give advice, it is a technical term and it is directed at the Board. We are telling the Board that At-Large and ALAC believe on behalf of Internet users that we think they should do something and the Board has an obligation to respond to that. And although earlier Boards certainly did not necessarily do that, the current Board does take that responsibility quite seriously.

When we provide advice, the question is, do we provide advice to other bodies? In theory, the Bylaws allow us to. In practice, we don't. Because if we are trying to influence the way decisions are being made in a relatively collegial manner, and multistakeholder process says we all go into this – in theory anyway – as equal people trying to find a compromise solution, then we don't treat that as advice. We treat it as input which will be considered and balanced and weighed. So although we could give advice to other parts of the organization, we generally do not. That's something we could do if we chose to. We do provide input to the other bodies and at times we provide input to the Board also. That is, when we think that we are not telling them they must do something unless they can explain why, but they're asking for input and the perspective of At-Large.

So the two words are used somewhat differently and we try to use them carefully.

Next slide please.

There's two primary paths. There, as I said, is the "advice" process. The other path we tend to use is to provide input into processes, and I refer to that as the "participatory" path. That is, we work with the groups, not necessarily as sages giving them advice, but try to come to a common path. And we'll talk about that a little bit later in this webinar but I'm going to first turn it over to Ariel who will discuss the process we go to – and it's a process that has evolved over a good number of years – of how we create advice and input when there's an appropriate opportunity for us to give input. So although we call this "advice," this is a softer advice. It's user input which could take the form of formal advice to the Board but very often is providing an At-Large perspective on something.

Ariel now, it's all yours.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Alan. Yesim, just double checking you can see my screen?

YESIM NAZLAR: Sorry, I was on mute. Yes, we can see your screen.   Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you. I'm sharing screen for this session because I will try to show you some web pages and we'll kind of go back and forth. So hopefully this will be helpful.

So echoing what Alan said, the ALAC often provides input to many, many, things and the major vehicle for the ALAC to provide input is by participating in the ICANN public comment process. But, of course, it's not the only way for the ALAC to provide the input. The ALAC does many other things, but because this is the main activity for input development, I will focus on this particular aspect.

I'm not sure how many of you know about what ICANN public comment is, but just as a general understanding, it's a vital element for ICANN's decision-making process. Maybe you have heard of the GNSO, they have those Policy Development Process Working Groups sometimes they will provide those deliverables like an issue report or sometimes ICANN staff department will produce reports, for example, the Fiscal Year Operating and Budget Plan. And then whenever they provide these reports and proposals or recommendations they will invite everyone to comment on these deliverables so that they will be able to take into account the multistakeholder interests when they produce the final product.

Then usually for each public comment period is at least for 40 days. So within that period, anyone individuals or organizations both internal and external to ICANN can submit comments to that process. And then after the comment period closes, the ICANN staff that's usually responsible for this particular public comment period will compile and

synthesize all the comments received and then deliver the final product at the end.

So if you can see on the slide, I have provided this URL called [icann.org/publiccomment-publiccomment]. So this is the main web page that gather all the ICANN public comments and I will put this link in the chat and you can take a look at this.

Just to help you navigate how this works, you can see the ones that are currently open at the first top part of this page and then you can see the open period when this public comment will close. They're usually ordered in the date order. The one that closes sooner will be ranked the first on this list, and then if you scroll down you can see the ones that are closed. That means the period is closed and then the staff is incorporating all the comments received to the final product.

And then just to show you how a page looks like, if you click on one and then this is how the page look like and you can see how many days left for this period and then if you look at the main text of this page you can read the background and some snippets of this particular topic, but the most important thing is to focus on Section 3, relevant resources, that report or whatever deliverable you need to focus on.

And then if you look the [lapse] navigation, you see there's a way for you to submit your comments to the public comment form is by clicking this link and it will give you a e-mail address that's the way for you to submit input.

This is kind of a quick overview of ICANN public comment. Let's go back to the presentation.

The ALAC usually has a process to respond to ICANN public comment and then this is a flowchart that illustrates this process. First there will be a wiki workspace set up and then the ALAC in consultation with the greater community will review this public comment an decide whether a statement is necessary and if necessary, a pen holder will be identified. I won't go into detail for each of the steps but here you can see this is the process flow for developing the ALAC input.

The first step is for At-Large wiki workspace to be set up. And just to give you an overall understanding, the ALAC use the community wiki very widely for any kind of collaborative work. So to develop the input, it needs broader consultation with the community as a whole and sometimes the drafter can be many people so that's why we need this web space platform to collaboratively develop this ALAC input.

Oftentimes this page will duplicate the content on the ICANN public comment page that I just showed you so that the drafters don't need to refer back to a different web page for all this information. And then at the same time this web page will illustrate the internal timeline for the ALAC to develop its response as well as who is responsible for drafting this response.

And then, of course, the most important thing for this wiki workspace is to publish the initial draft, final draft, and then the final submitted ALAC input to these public comment proceedings.

And then another very important function is to collect all the comments from the entire At-Large community for these draft responses. And once this wiki workspace is set up and the link is distributed to the

whole community, we have this [alac-announce-at-atlarge-list.icann.org] mailing list so that the entire community is informed that now we are in process to digest this public comment and produce the input.

And then just to show you what kind of e-mail you will receive if you are subscribed to this ALAC Announce mailing list, you will receive an e-mail look like this and the subject line is usually "New Public Comment" and then the topic of this public comment and then this is all the information you need to read and then the last URL is usually a wiki workspace to direct you to look at the public comment.

Now I'm going to show you an example of this At-Large wiki workspace. This is the landing page for the wiki workspace for At-Large develop input for public comment and I put the URL in the chat as well. And then the layout is somewhat similar to the ICANN public comment page and you can see the ones that are open on the top and then the ones already closed at the bottom. And then if you look at each of the cells, you will see when this public comment period will close. That's in the second column. And then the third column shows the status whether the ALAC is drafting input or whether the ALAC is voting on a drafting input. You can see what stage this input is being produced. And then the signee means who is drafting this input and also this [inaudible] after public comment open and public comment close these are the internal procedural dates. So that's how it looks like.

Then if you look at one example – so I will click on this one – on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators Definitions. That's a specific page for this ALAC input and you can see the content is duplicated from

the ICANN public comment page in this blue box. Then if you scroll down to the bottom of the page you will see the first draft is at the bottom here and then the final draft means when the community provided input, the pen holder will produce this final draft for ratification on this section and then the one on the very top is [when] this public input is submitted to public comment and the pdf is uploaded here. And if you want to look at the input received, these are at the bottom here just below comments and you can see these are the At-Large members that provided comments to the draft.

If you want to provide a comment yourself, you can just simply click on this little blank box and you can type your comment in. So that's how this wiki page works.

Next I will talk about the other staff thing is the process flow. In terms of how the ALAC review a public comment, it's not done in a single-handed manner. It's done by a broader consultation with the entire community. Usually the way to do it is the ALAC will in its teleconferences will do a review of all these open public comments and oftentimes the RALOs will have these public comment topics in their agenda and then they would discuss it as a group. Also we have many subject matter experts within the community so they will be consulted and then asked whether it's worth the time and effort for the ALAC to produce a comment to this topic. So it's done in a very bottom-up and consensus-driven manner, and when a consensus is reached and it's decided that the ALAC should respond to this public comment proceeding, then usually one individual or a group of individuals will be identified to draft an ALAC statement in response to a public comment and that's kind of ALAC statement, that's

the keyword here that's usually [the time to say] it's input from the ALAC.

If you recall recently that the public comment period for the At-Large Review draft report I think was open until last Friday and there are a group of individuals that are responsible for drafting a ALAC input so that's one recent example.

And then those drafters are called the pen holders and also one key thing that I want to stress is that you don't need to be a ALAC member or a liaison or a RALO leader to be a pen holder. In fact, anyone in At-Large community can be a pen holder and can draft something, draft a ALAC input on behalf of the ALAC but of course there's a caveat to it is, of course, this individual should consult with the broader community, consult with the subject matter experts, in order to make sure the input is truly representable and acting on the interest of end users and shouldn't just be input from his/her individual capacity. It shouldn't just be individual view. But regardless, anyone from the community can provide input and draft something for the ALAC.

Also, of course, the members that I mentioned earlier – the ALAC members, RALO leaders, and liaisons – they frequently track ALAC statements because of their knowledge and experience.

So what are the ways for you to get involved in this particular stage? First is if you want to become a pen holder one key point is you should participate in ICANN activities, especially those policy making activities. For example, the ones that are really active in At-Large that provide advice or input in public comment process are the ones usually active in

the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group or the ones that are closely following what's going on in certain other groups like ccNSO and GNSO and the ones that are kind of really active in different parts of ICANN. So without that participation, it's usually hard to provide very targeted and effective input by simply reading the public comment material. So one key thing is participating in ICANN and then you can provide those input in a very effective manner.

Second, of course, is once the public comment period is open, please read the materials, the deliverables that are soliciting input and so if you have done that you need to set the [inaudible] essential homework to do in order to provide advice.

The third way is to participate in those teleconferences in At-Large, especially the ALAC teleconferences and RALO teleconferences because the public comments will be discussed in those teleconferences and then you can provide your input there or just say, "I want to volunteer to be a pen holder," so make yourself known to these people and then that's a great way to consult with the subject matter experts on these topics.

The fourth way is when you receive a e-mail from ICANN staff – the one that I showed you about new public comments – if you want to become a pen holder, you can simply e-mail staff the e-mail address which I put on the slide, too, and then we can put you in touch with, for example, Alan or other subject matter experts so that you can start the drafting process for the ALAC input. These are the opportunities to get involved in this stage.

The next stage is the when the draft statement is posted what is going to happen next. So if you have seen earlier, the draft statement will usually be posted on this wiki workspace at the bottom here and then there's another e-mail will be sent to the ALAC Announce mailing list and it's usually something like "Call for Comments" and then that will be kind of a trigger that the community knows, "Okay, this draft is ready to be viewed by everyone and it's time to provide input to this draft." And then there will be a deadline usually in that e-mail tells you by when the pen holders will consider your comments on this draft.

Also another thing to stress here is you don't need to be a ALAC member or a RALO leader or a liaison to provide comments. Anybody in At-Large community are welcome to provide comments and this is really key for involvement. After this internal comment period close, the pen holders will consider all the input received, finalize the draft, and then post it to the wiki workspace again for the community to view.

So if you see this screen shot here, this is basically how this e-mail looks like. It's call for comments with the subject line above this public comment topic and the one that I highlighted in the text is usually the deadline by when you should provide your comments.

The ways to get involved is make sure to read the draft statement published on the wiki and then also very key is to use the comment function in the wiki to provide input. This is the best way to do it because everybody can see who commented and this is for transparency reasons and also it's easier for a pen holder to look at the comments received without searching on mailing lists or e-mails, and

it's too scattered. So this is the best way to consolidate all of the input here.

If you don't have a wiki account to use this comment function, you can always contact staff to do that. And then another two things is if you want to provide comments you can, of course, contact the pen holder directly to provide input or participate in the teleconferences to provide input verbally. But the best way is to provide input through the wiki workspace.

The next section is about ALAC ratification and submission. This is relevant to the ALAC members, not so relevant to everybody else in the broader community but this is important because it shows if the ALAC needs to provide input it needs to be approved by the group and then so the ratification is very key in that. It's usually conducted electronically through a vote and in big [inaudible] but sometimes it's voted in those teleconferences or face-to-face sessions and then we need to have a quorum for this vote. We have 15 ALAC members so at least eight members needs to vote and then the people that favor of ratifying the statement needs to be higher than the ones against. And then sometimes the ALAC vote on a statement after its submission because usually the public comment period has a shorter timeframe so that in order to be considered the ALAC input this is submitted earlier but then it won't submit a statement if it's not confident that the statement will pass ratification.

This is an important step in the process that is relevant to the ALAC members, not so relevant to the broader At-Large community but for information only this is to let you know this step.

Once the statement is submitted you can actually [find] that on the ICANN public comment page. Let me just show you one example. If we go to the Technology Identifier, this is a closed public comment period and if you want to review all the input received then you click on "comment forum" – this link – and then now you see all the people or groups that have submitted a comment here. And now you can see the ones submitted by ICANN At-Large staff as the ALAC statement. So now you can see the text of the e-mail and an attachment is what the ALAC statement look like. So that's how it's submitted.

And then lastly, if you want to find all the submitted ALAC statement to ICANN public comment, there's one really important page that you can bookmark is the one on the At-Large website. I will show you how to navigate to that. If you look at the top navigation, "Policy Advice" and then you click on that and then you can see all the submitted input from the ALAC and a lot of them are about ICANN public comment. I will put this link in the chat. And you can look at this also by filtering or searching keywords or based on the topics, so that's a good way to do that and then I'd like to take a look at one example here. If you want to read what the content is, you click on the title of this comment and then you would see this snippet or pdf document and you download [and] that's how you see this particular submitted statement.

That's the process how it goes and I will turn over the floor to Alan and he will continue on this subject.

Alan, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you, Ariel. Could we have my slides back up? We're starting on slide #9. Thank you very much.

As Ariel described the relatively complex process – it sounds more complex than it is because a lot of those steps even though there's many steps in the process, we go through most of them pretty quickly and then it comes down to just the essential work. However, very often there's work that has to be done prior to something coming to a public comment. In some cases, public comments come completely out of the blue from an At-Large perspective. That is, something is happening somewhere else in ICANN, we are not a party to that, and something comes up and they want to ask some questions or want input and a public comment is open. In many cases however, there are steps before that that could involve us should we choose to be involved. Certainly if we're looking at things like a GNSO PDP, a ccNSO PDP, a Review Team, the CCWG, there's all sorts of activities going on in ICANN where when they come up with a recommendation it goes out to public comment but there's huge amount of work that goes on before that producing the statements and the recommendations or the report that is the subject of the comment. And in many cases, we have an opportunity to participate in that and to go forward.

Next slide please.

As I said, is participation always possible? No. Sometimes things just happen. A few months ago there was a public comment on a new Registry Agreement that had been the subject of private discussions between ICANN and the registries for close to two years we're told, but that was all happening without anyone knowing. And in fact, part of our

response to that was it shouldn't have happened like that. We should have had a heads-up, at least and know the discussions were going on even if we weren't party to them. But in some cases there are things that come up that just come out of the blue for one reason or another and we are not a party to those, and therefore we need to quickly get up to speed and try to understand what the issue is, does it impact end users, and if so, what are we going to do about it?

Another example, for instance, is the Business Constituency within the GNSO has rewritten its charter. That's a completely internal matter, but once they do that, they look for input from other people. So when the issue comes up, we then have to try to get up to speed quickly and Ariel went into a fair amount of detail about how we solicit input, how we decide things. Very often if there's an ALAC Leadership Team meeting, we will do a first pass on it and decide, "No, it probably doesn't look like there's anything needed," and we'll suggest that to the ALAC to the next ALAC meeting that we not go ahead with it or we may decide it's clear we have to and we start looking for pen holders.

Next slide.

If there is indeed something going on that we are allowed to participate in that we know about, how do we do that? Typically there'll be a solicitation, a call for volunteers, to work in some working group. It might be a GNSO Working Group, a ccNSO one, a Cross-Community Group, a call for participation in a Review Team of some sort, so there's all sorts of methodology that goes out that can call for volunteers. In many cases, the call is open-ended. That is, anybody who chooses to learn enough so the subject makes sense to them and is willing to

devote the time to participate in meetings which might be, some meetings meet once a month, some meetings meet once every two weeks, once a week, and some oftener than that. If you're willing to get up to speed and to learn what's going on enough that you can either just listen to the call so you understand or actually participate in it, then there are many that have completely open-ended participation.

There are other groups that have different classes of participation. For instance, right now we are just starting a process to decide how to use the money that ICANN has. The new gTLD process, if there were multiple applicants for a single gTLD string and if they could not come to an agreement on who would get it, then the string could be auctioned off and in some cases that auction money went to ICANN. Currently, we are sitting on close to $240 million worth of   auction proceeds and we decided – we/ICANN decided a long time ago – this money would be used for good things, not our normal business. And now we are just starting a CCWG – a Cross-Community Working Group – to decide what is the process we'll use for actually giving out money. So this is not the giving out of the money but deciding how we're going to give out the money and the ACs and SOs have the right to name formal members – and ALAC has named five members – but other people can participate as well. And for all intents and purposes, everyone participates at the same level. That is, although formal members have certain rights, they're not rights that matter a lot in most cases and anyone can participate. And, in fact, At-Large has in addition to its five members, about five or six other people who are participating or will be participating in this working group. It's just starting out.

For areas where there's great complexity or great import on users – that is, it's an important issue that we don't feel that just the few people who are actually participating and can devote the time to participate are sufficient – in cases like that, we tend to form our own working group that shadows it and that gives people who don't have the stamina to go to many meetings a month and follow the mailing list in detail, an opportunity to hear what's going on and to provide input into our representatives on the group so that they can make sure that when they're intervening, it's not just on their own personal behalf but representing the issues that are important to At-Large. So the shadow working groups are very important ones.

The most critical one we have today is the ICANN Evolution Group. That started off as the group that was supporting the IANA Stewardship Transition. It moved on to the Accountability CCWG and is now looking at the Accountability Work Stream 2 issues and we renamed it because the old name just didn't make any sense anymore.

We have two other working groups, both of which are not very active right now but we are in the process of reactivating them. One is looking at gTLD issues and specifically the issues surrounding the last round of gTLDs and what will be an upcoming round or some way of making more gTLDs available in the future. There is a GNSO Working Group going on on it and this will be the shadow group. And there's another working group that looks at registration issues – things like WHOIS and registrant rights – and those are very important issues because many of our users are, in fact, registrants and the ones who aren't registrants depend on domains staying there. There was an issue just raised a couple of days ago by someone of someone who lost a website due to

some happenings and that's the kind of issue that this group can look at. And so we are going to be reactivating these working groups and if you have interest in either of these areas, then certainly that's a good way to get involved without making the full commitment of working in the original working group itself.

Webinars like this are another opportunity – on a regular basis when there is some important issue, we try to put it into terms that people who are not heavily embedded in it can understand, and discuss it. That alone may get you up to speed to allow you to participate if you want to. And of course, at ICANN face-to-face meetings there are many presentations that summarize where we are in different activities, and even if you can't attend the ICANN meetings, all of these have remote participation and are often great ways of quickly getting up to speed of where a particular process is.

Next slide please.

If you do any of these things, you're now in a position to help draft statements. You may contribute it typically on a crucial issue or a complex issue we will very often solicit input, then someone – one or more people – will draft a statement, then we then go out to comment on it. So there are many steps at which you can participate even if you're not the main person. But they're all driven by getting enough information ahead of time so that the topic makes sense to you. And, of course, we are looking for co-Chairs of working groups periodically and, as Ariel said, we certainly are looking for people to draft or co-draft statements.

Next slide.

That sort of goes full circle. We started off saying that our job is to represent the interests of users. We do that by commenting and providing input. And it's only with wide contributions and wide participation that we can really make sure we're representing the needs of users. If I'm the only one to comment, I may be wise and I may have gotten it right, but I may also be doing it from my personal perspective and not seeing how the issue impacts people in different parts of the world, in different circumstances, and it's really important that everyone get involved or that a lot of people get involved so when we say we're representing the interests of users, we can really do that with some level of confidence.

That's about all I have and I think we'll open it for questions and comments at this point. Do we have any hands? Were there any questions in the chat that I missed along the way?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. And thank you Ariel, too, for your presentation. We have here our two presenters so please, if we have questions to Alan and Ariel, don't hesitate to raise your hand or speak up if you are not on the Adobe Connect.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see one question in the chat, at least at the bottom of the chat, saying when we talk about input to other bodies, who are we talking to?

We only really have standing within ICANN, so At-Large is not in a position to make a statement on behalf of ICANN to somebody outside of ICANN. I suppose we could, but it's not clear that we are authorized to do that and we certainly don't speak on behalf of the wider ICANN in doing that. So in general when we're talking about "to other bodies" we mean other bodies within ICANN. That may be an SO – a Supporting Organization – or an Advisory Committee, it may be a working group, or some other task force that has been asked to do something within ICANN. But usually we're talking about things within ICANN.

Back to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Any other question? Any other hand?

ARIEL LIANG: I saw that Glenn McKnight asked a number of questions in the chat. First one: "How do we find out how our RALO ALAC members have been active in the policy statement?"

If you recall, if you look at the wiki workspace for the At-Large website and there is a section on the page that shows who the signee or pen holder is and then usually mentions the name of the person and then I think on the wiki you can click on the name of the person and check the background of this person, which RALO this person belongs to, or do a quick Google search and understand [people who have] background. So that's one way to look at it and of course on the wiki workspace, if you provide comments to a draft statement your name will be shown and

then your profile is linked to so others can see who you are and what RALO you belong to. So that's one way to do that.

And then Glenn also has another question: "Do we have purpose calls on specific policy issues to garner broad community participation?"

For certain ALAC input in the past, we do have some kind of single purpose call with special briefings. For example, when the IANA Stewardship Transition was going to, the ALAC provided extensive and very profound input in the process and when the draft statement was completed and there was a briefing call on that so that the community can understand better the input and provide more comments to it. However, this is not done for every single statement, but of course in the future if we have opportunity that would be a great way to solicit input from the broader community.

I may have missed other questions in the chat. There's a lot of conversations going on. But I see Alan also raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I wanted to address Glenn's question, the original question, because it's a really good one of how do we know that people are contributing and how do we know who they are? Sometimes we know who they are because they're around often enough and we simply know them. Other times we have people starting to participate and, to be honest, we don't even necessarily know where they're from. Are they from an ALS? Are they an individual member in some particular RALO? And it's a really challenging issue and it's one that we think. As we are trying to get more and more people involved, tracking that and

understanding where the contributions are coming from is going to become more of a challenge and we do need to find some methodology, and in fact, we are in the process of building a new program for engagement with ALS members right now and one of the tasks within that process is to figure out how do we track people's involvement? How do we know if we're succeeding if we don't know who the people are? That's really a real challenge but we certainly cannot demand from all of our ALSes their full membership list. So it's something we will be looking at and if people have ideas, that's another area you can contribute. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I think that before I give the floor to Glenn I think that a good question to ask is how to make our ALSes and RALO members participate more in this effort of advices and inputs.

Glenn. Go ahead please.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. Hi. Thank you, Tijani. I believe Alan picked up the point I was trying to say. I think it's important to get a diversity of opinions rather than just the same old same old people. I'm not diminishing the huge contribution of the people who are very dedicated, but what we're trying to do with NARALO – at the inspiration of EURALO – we are trying to tap into what our ALS expertise is so that we can find who actually has an expertise on particular issues and we're trying to map that and we hope at our General Assembly we can inspire more people if they have an expertise on WHOIS or Privacy or Net Neutrality, we want to

hear from them. We want to engage them. We want to encourage them to comment so that we can have this diversity of opinions. That's it, Tijani. Thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Glenn. Thank you for this clarification and I think we are all on the same page. Any other questions?

Yes, Alberto. Go ahead please.

ALBERTO SOTO: We are, as a matter of fact, a survey is went on the road, we are asking the members – I don't remember if it was RALOs or our RALO only – we are asking some questions to [wish] to know their profile and to know the expertise, the knowledge they have, so we may go to them when we need them. That would be another form. Not just to start looking at a certain point in time but to have an inventory of expertise or knowledge so as to resort to that person when the time comes.

At the meeting in Copenhagen somebody said that, for instance in the Caribbean, how can the Caribbean participate more in the Fellowship and somebody said we cannot go and look for people to work. And I think it's the other way around. If we need someone, we have to go to that person and ask them to come. It would be another way of providing input. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alberto Soto.

Alan, or Glenn. Glenn [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. In that vein, one of the challenges that's become clear is when we are surveying for the skills that our ALSes have, it's becoming more and more important that we not just look at the skills of the ALS representatives – the person who normally we trade e-mail with – but the skills that are present deeper within the ALS so we can draw upon them. And that right now is a challenge and again, we're looking for ways of going forward with it. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thanks a lot, Alan. Next one is Yrjö.

ALAN GREENBERG: Notice Yesim has her hand up also.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yesim. Before you, Yrjö, please Yesim, go ahead.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Tijani. We have a couple of questions from the Question and Answer poll. The first question is from Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. He says, "What is between policy advice development process and policy development process?" And his second question is, "As we are representing the needs of end users, how can we advise the Internet users about our decisions to advise the Board?" Thank you. I

will wait for the answers and if it's okay with you I can read the other questions from Amal Al-Saqqaf. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, Yesim. We will answer the question and then we will go to Yrjö and come back to you. Thank you very much.

Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm afraid I didn't hear that first question and it's not in the pod that I'm looking at.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The first question is: "What is the difference between policy development and policy advice development?"

ALAN GREENBERG: From the perspective of At-Large, we do not do policy development. Policy development is done within the Supporting Organizations within ICANN. So all we do is contribute to that policy development by participating or by making comments or by giving advice to the Board. So they're two separate processes that go on in parallel.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. The second question. Shall you answer it?

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, if you repeat it to me.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The second question I don't remember it. The interpreter, can you please repeat the second question?

YESIM NAZLAR: Tijani if I may, I will be reading the second question. The second question is: "As we are representing the needs of end users, how can we advise the Internet user about our decisions to advise the Board?" Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. I'll take an answer. We can only involve end users who are active within At-Large and who have an interest. So any time we do something such as give advice, we make public statements about it, it's well-documented on our website, we often send out e-mails on it, so for someone who's involved within At-Large they certainly know about that or can know about it if they choose to look. People outside of our environment – and, of course, the vast majority of Internet users know nothing about ICANN – do not get involved about it because there's no real methodology to force feed them to make sure they know. But people within our environment, it's all pretty well-documented.

Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you, Alan. May I add something about that?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Certainly.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	All our advice or our, if you want, point of view, that we draft and we send it as an advice or as an input, they are all sent on the largest e-mail list on which there is everyone who have been at least once at ICANN meetings and who have subscribed to those lists. So we don't have any other means to go larger than and wider than that.
	Bachar, if you have a means to make better it will be good that you advise us because I don't see how we can make it better. Thank you very much.
	Yrjö now, please.
YRJO LANSIPURO:	Thank you, Tijani. In EURALO we tried to identify who are the experts on various about 30 different subject matter areas in the ALSes. It was a [survey] but not just sending one e-mail to everybody, rather [personified] targeted e-mails to all ALSes and we got a fairly good response rate. Now we have assembled all that information into a Google document like a living document with the ALSes can update and maintain themselves. And now, of course, the test of this thing is that when we start getting opportunities for using that expertise that we

indeed remember all those people and have actually asked for their advice. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much for this information. It's very helpful. I will advise AFRALO to do the same. I think it is a good way to have a documented list of people, of experts, in our communities so that we can make use of them every time we need them and every time the At-Large need them. Thank you.

So back to you, Yesim, for another set of questions.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Tijani. Now I have two more questions and they are both from Amal Al-Saqqaf. Let me first read the first question: "Does the advice ALAC provides advice whenever it sees it's needed or when the Board asks for it? Can any RALO raise an issue or a policy to give an advice on even if it has been approved?"

Amal is addressing his question to Alan. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Alan, can you answer this question? Alan? If you can't I can… Can you hear me, Alan?

We lost Alan, it seems. Okay, no problem. Yes, we can make advice to the Board about things that are not subject to public comment or that are not policy development issue made by an SO. Any RALO can raise a

point to [inaudible] if ALAC see it interesting to make a specific advice or specific input to the Board about this issue, of course we can do that. This is our role, in fact. Our role is to make advice and to give input to the Board about anything which impacts the end users, which is in the interest of end users. This is our role.

If Alan is here, if you want to add something.

Yes, Yrjö. You have your hand up. Do you want to speak? Otherwise, I will give the floor to Ariel.

Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Tijani. I just want to add on what Tijani said. For example, the ALAC have provided the Board advice on the Public Interest Commitments. It's not something [triggered] by a public comment period. That was a topic that's been going on for a couple of years or more, but then one year thinking in Los Angeles in 2014 the ALAC provided this statement or formal advice to the Board in the Public Forum in that meeting and that's something kind of the ALAC sees very important and necessary so that provided this advice without the Board asking for it.

So if you're interested in reading this, I put this link in the chat and you can download this statement from the At-Large website and then there's also follow-up advice on that topic. So just to provide you a little detail on the [inaudible] and providing these for examples. That's all the comments I have.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much. I would like to add that any RALO also can give input to the Board. This is what AFRALO do on a regular basis. Each time we have an ICANN meeting we make a meeting of the whole African community and we issue a statement about a subject in discussion in ICANN. We send it to the Board. But this kind of input doesn't have the same weight as input that is given by ALAC because ALAC is an Advisory Committee and so they have the power to give advice to the Board. And an advice, for your information, is for the Board to implement or to respond saying, "We don't implement it because of this and that." But unfortunately it is not done like this, but it is intended to be like this. If it is sent by an Advisory Committee. And a RALO is not an Advisory Committee, but this is to tell you that anyone can make input to the Board. This is the bottom-up process, if you want. It is the multistakeholder, bottom-up, process in ICANN.
	Yesim, do we have another… I see Marita. Marita, please go ahead.
	Marita?
MARITA MOLL:	Sorry. I just had to unmute. Yes, at one point I think it was Alan who said if you're interested in a Policy Development Process – as a person who's keeping track about looking at At-Large, if you're interested in a Policy Development Process – you should join the GNSO group that's working on that. So you should be involved both in the GNSO Policy Development Group and what's going on in At-Large? Did I understand that correctly?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. If Alan is not available I will answer this question because I don't see him on the Adobe Connect.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm here.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I've been moved up to a host. I'm at the top.

The answer is yes. If you have enough interest in the topic to put the time in, then yes we welcome anyone around getting involved in the processes. Typically that means joining the working group, listening until the point comes where you feel comfortable in being able to contribute, and contributing. So certainly. And at that point you now become also a resource to the At-Large process that either discusses it in one of the shadow groups or is called upon to help draft statements.

MARITA MOLL: Just as a follow-up, I guess I've always kind of understood that these two groups were somehow separate – GNSO and At-Large. But they're not?

ALAN GREENBERG: They are very separate but virtually all of the GNSO processes are open to participants from anywhere. You can participate as an At-Large member. You can participate as an individual with no affiliation to ICANN if the topic is the one that happens to interest you. So there's no restriction on participating in the GNSO processes. You don't get to vote when they make a decision in the Council itself, but you're an equal participant in the working group when it's doing its deliberations.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Marita, if I can add something. You said that if you want to participate in the policy development, you have to join the GNSO group. You may join also a ccNSO group if it is about a ccTLD or you can join the ASO group if it is about the IP addresses. So the policies are developed in the three SOs and you may join one of the working group of those SOs to participate in making policy. Thank you very much.

Any other questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, if I may further on that. You said "join the group." What we're talking about is joining the working groups, the Policy Development Groups. Depending on what you do for a living, you might also join some GNSO groups as a member. We have people in At-Large who are also members of the Intellectual Property Constituency because they

happen to be Intellectual Property lawyers in their own right. But what we're talking about here is joining the working groups.

One last comment, the ASO only does policy that spans all of the five regional address registries. The actual policies within each of the regions are developed within the RAR process, and that's yet another process that anyone is open to join. It's outside of ICANN but affiliated with ICANN. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Yesim, Back to you.

YESIIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Tijani. I will be reading out the second question from Amal Al-Saqqaf, and this question is also directed to Alan: "Does ALAC consider distributing or forwarding some surveys to ALSes and the individual members on policies or advices to guarantee better representation of Internet users' interests?" Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Good question. The answer is yes. We regularly distribute – not often do we distribute surveys, although on occasion we do – we regularly distribute questions and asking solicitations for input. We don't have the mechanism to directly send this to members of ALSes. We do send it to ALS representatives and they have the ability of redistributing the question to their members and we will be strengthening that process as we go forward in the next couple of

months. But we do regularly ask input from our ALSes. We rarely get any, to be quite honest, but we certainly are looking for it. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Any other question, Yesim, from Amal?

YESIM NAZLAR: No. That was the last question. Thank you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much, Yesim. And thank you very, very, much Amal Al-Saqqaf. Amal is a relatively newcomer and as you see, she is interested and she is participating and I hope that she will be one of the main contributors at At-Large.

Any other question? We still have time.

I don't see any hand. If we want to be more efficient, we will go to the Agenda #4 which is the pop quiz. So Yesim, the pop quiz please.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Tijani. Yes we have some pop quiz questions for our participants. I will be reading out the questions for you.

The first question is: "The ALAC can give advice to… Is it the GNSO? Is it the Board? Is it ccNSO? Or all of the above?"

All please cast your votes now.

	Alan, would you like to give us the correct answer?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yes. The correct answer is all of the above. We can give advice to all of the above. A more interesting question might be "Do we?" Let's go onto the next question.
YESIM NAZLAR:	Thank you very much. Moving on to the second question. The second question is: "The ALAC generally gives advice to… Is it GNSO? Is it Board? ccNSO? Or all of the above?"
ALAN GREENBERG:	And this, of course, is the complement to the previous question. And the answer is generally if we give advice, we give it to the Board. As in the previous one, we are allowed to give advice to other groups, but generally we do not.
YESIM NAZLAR:	Thank you, Alan. And moving on to the third question.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Moment please. Alan, when you that we may give advice to the other constituency, with the other SOs for example, they are not bound to listen to them or even to read them. The one who is bound to do so is the Board. So that's why the answer for the first question in my point of

view is not all you can't give the advice to anyone you want. If he or she don't listen to them it is useless. You understand my point?

ALAN GREENBERG: On the other hand, parents give advice to children all the time but you don't necessarily listen. Just for the record, the Board is not bound to follow our advice. According to the Bylaws, the Board is required to consider and answer. That's all they're required to do. And that's actually a new Bylaw. Up until recently they weren't even, according to the Bylaws, required to answer but now they are.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. Yesim, go ahead.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, Tijani. I'm moving on to the third question.

The third question is: "Is it better to A) Just wait and give advice to the Board if we don't like something, B) Don't participate in GNSO activities but make public comments if we don't like something, C) Contribute to forming policies to maximize chances of getting something we like." Only three options for you.

Please cast your votes now.

And I will again ask Alan to give us the correct answer please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly if there's an opportunity to contribute to policy formation, then that's the best option – the third one. It's interesting that, although that sounds logical, up until recently for the first 15 years or so of the GAC's existence they largely only did the first one. That is, they were not active in developing the policy but if after it was decided they didn't like it, they would tell the Board that and the GAC has recently changed its methodology and is now much more active in the Policy Development Process so that they can influence where it goes and if they don't like the result in the end, they can go to the Board but hopefully we don't have to. So #3 is the best option if we have that choice. We don't always have the choice, however.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Alan. Moving on to the fourth question.

"Do you need to be an ALAC member, an ALAC liaison, or a RALO leader to draft an ALAC statement on behalf of the ALAC?" Is it yes or no?

And I will ask Ariel to give us the correct answer for this question.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Yesim. I think the majority have put no. That's the right question. I apologize there's so many ALAC [inaudible] question. It can be anyone in the At-Large community to draft a statement on behalf of the ALAC, but of course this input needs to get bottom-up, consensus-

driven, input so that it's not just representing the individual's opinion. It should act on the interest of the end users and with the endorsement of the group. So anybody can be a drafter, a pen holder, and you don't need to be an ALAC member or a RALO leader to do that. And I guess we can move on to the next question. And I think it's the last one.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thanks, Ariel.

Our last question is: "Which is the best way to provide input on draft ALAC statements? A) E-mail comments directly to the pen holders, B) Provide input via the comment function on the At-Large wiki workspace, C) Send comments via an At-Large mailing list, D) Provide comments verbally during an ALAC or RALO teleconference."

Please cast your votes now.

And I will again ask Ariel to give us the correct answer please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Yesim. And the correct answer is C) Provide input via the comments function on the At-Large wiki workspace because that's the best way to aggregate all the comments in one centralized place for our drafter to review and also it's for transparency reasons others can see what your input are and then can react to that or follow up on that. So that's the best way to do it.

Of course, the other ways that listed in this question are also feasible but you can of course e-mail the pen holder directly or provide input

verbally in a teleconference, but then the best way to capture all these is C. And then if you don't have a wiki account to use that comment function, please contact staff and then we can set it up for you. Thanks very much, Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Ariel and this was the end of the pop quiz questions. Yes. Back to you, Tijani. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Yesim. And thank you, Alan and Ariel. As Ariel said at the end, please use any of the ways you see best for you to participate because we have a big need of your participation. Don't limit yourself to going to the wiki and put your comments there if you prefer another way. Send it by e-mail. Use any way you have to make your input right to the pen holder so that it can be taken into account. Thank you very much.

Any other questions? We still have time.

If there is no question, I will ask Yesim to go to the evaluation questions.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Tijani. And moving on to our first question on the evaluation part.

The first question is: "How was the timing of the webinar for you? Is it too early, just right, or too late?"

Please cast your votes now. Thank you very much.

I will be moving on to our second survey question which is: "How was the technology used for the webinar? Is it very good? Is it good? Is it sufficient? Bad? Or very bad?"

Please cast your votes now. Thank you very much.

Let's move on to our third question: "Did the speakers demonstrate mastery of the topic? Is it extremely strong? Strong? Sufficient? Weak? Or extremely weak?"

Please cast your votes now. Thank you very much.

Let's move on to our fourth question then. Our fourth question is: "Are you satisfied with the webinar? Extremely satisfied? Satisfied? Moderately satisfied? Slight satisfied? Or not satisfied at all?"

Please cast your votes now. Thank you very much.

Quickly to our fifth question now. Our fifth question is: "What region do you live in at the moment? Is it Africa? Is it Asia, Australia or Pacific Islands? Is it Europe? Is it Latin America and the Caribbean Islands? Or is it North America?"

Please cast your votes now. Thank you very much.

Let me move on to our sixth question. Our sixth question is: "How many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community? Is it less than one year? One to three? Three to five? Five to ten? Or more than ten years?"

Please cast your votes now. Thank you very much.

And our last but not least question is: "What topics would you like us to cover for the future webinars? Please don't forget to write your answers in the blank space and don't' forget to click on the icon next to it so we can receive your answers."

And I will leave this page open until the end of this webinar so we can get more answers. And this was the last question of our survey evaluation part. Tijani, it's all back to you. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Yesim. Thank you for this evaluation questions.

Please for this last question, if you have any suggestions, an idea about the topic that you see or you believe it is interesting to put it on our program in the future, please don't hesitate either to fill the page on the Adobe Connect or send an e-mail to me or to Ariel or to staff and give the list or even if it is only one topic that you want us to address, please send it to us. Please. It is really very helpful because each year we make a survey inside our working group to try to find the most interesting topics to address for the year, and we will appreciate very much if you participate in this effort and in each webinar we do, give us your other topics that you need or you want them to be addressed during those webinars.

Thank you very much. We still have one minute. I will give you a last call for question if you have a very quick question, otherwise we will adjourn the webinar.

Any other question? Any other remark?

I don't see hands. So thank you very much. Thank you our interpreters. Thank you for our staff. Thank you, the two presenters, Alan and Ariel. And thank you all for joining us and for participating.

This webinar is now adjourned.

YESIM NAZLAR: This meeting is now adjourned so you will now be disconnected. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]