GULTEN TEPE: I would like to start the recording and leave the floor to Julia Charvolen for her opening remarks. Julia, over to you.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you, Gulten. Hello everyone, my name is Julia Charvolen from the GAC Support Team. Welcome to the second GAC Introductory Webinar Series. The purpose of this pilot program is intended to provide basic information on a variety of substantive and operational topics, both inside and outside of ICANN.

Today we have the pleasure to welcome leaders and staff from the ICANN Generic Name Supporting Organizations, also known as the GNSO. This webinar will be divided in two parts, one will cover information on the GNSO and its structure, and the second part will focus on a case study of a specific policy development process with an overview on the practices and how SO/AC's can better engage in current PDP's.

This webinar will be lead in English, recordings and presentations will be posted on the GAC website page and I will add the link to the website page in the chat. Should you have any questions during the session, do not hesitate to add them in the chat log or raise your hand by clicking on the icon at the top of your Adobe Connect screen. With that, I will give the floor to Donna Austin, Vice Chair GNSO Council. Thank you and over to you, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you very much, Julia, and welcome everybody to this introductory webinar about GNSO and policy development process that is used by the GNSO. I'd like to recognize that Heather Forrest, the Chair of the GNSO is also on the call, and my Co-Vice Chair Rafik Dammak is also on this call as well. We've had a pretty busy schedule for the GNSO, so I'm taking over a little to give Heather a bit of a breather but Heather and Rafik if there's anything that you would like to add during the webinar, please just raise your hand and I can go to you at that time.

As Julia said, what we hope to provide you with as a result of this webinar is an understanding of the GNSO and the council's structure and the role we play in the policy development process and also more information about the policy development process itself. Please, if anyone has any questions along the way just raise your hand. I think it might be more helpful if we had a conversation around issues when they come up rather than wait for a Q&A session at the end, please feel free to raise your hand at any time.

That's our agenda for the webinar. How the GNSO policy development differs from other SO AC policy development. Firs we'll just go through the [AUDIO BREAK] ccNSO and the ASO, so the country code name supporting organization and the -- of course I can't remember what AS stands for at the moment Address Supporting Organization. Just in terms of the GNSO and the remit. The GNSO is responsible for consensus policies relating to generic top-level domains and that's the basis for which the policy development processes are done, it only relates to generic top-level domain. With a country code supporting organization it's a little bit different.

The ccNSO also have a formal policy development process, it's recognized in the bylaws but the scope for which those policies can be developed is very narrow. For example, delegation and redelegation and retirement of ccTLD's fits within that scope. One thing that's important to understand is that while the ccNSO can make policies, they aren't binding on the ccTLD in the same way that consensus policies developed by the GNSO are binding on contracted parties.

There's a couple of reasons for that but I won't go into it but essentially ccTLD's aren't contracted to ICANN, they have different forms of agreement with ICANN, so have a formal contract, some have accountability frameworks and some have exchange of letters, either a relationship and recognition between ICANN and the ccTLD is very different from the contracted parties of gTLD registries and gTLD registrars. Address Supporting Organization, the ASO, is representative of the Reginal Internet Registries and while they are part of ICANN, a lot of their policy development is done externally. I think there, somebody said that the last time they had a policy development process at ICANN was about six years ago, so they don't conduct as many policies necessarily as what the GNSO does. Do we have any questions on that? Is there anything that folks would like me to explain perhaps?

The GNSO and the GNSO Council, GNSO, its Generic Name Supporting Organization and the GNSO is responsible for policy development related to generic top-level domains. For many years we only had handful of gTLD registries, dot com, dot net and in the second wave and Jeff will pull me up here because I'll get this wrong, we had dot info, dot biz, dot pro, dot museum and then in 2012 ICANN through the new gTLD program saw the delegation of I think we're 1200 new gTLD's. We

have names like dot Amsterdam, dot Berlin, dot Melbourne, dot Sydney, dot app is one that Google has recently introduced so obviously there's a lot more gTLD's in the marketplace now.

The GNSO itself is made up of 21 counselors from six different constituencies, they call the groups and we also included history NON COM appointees. Just to represent a little bit clearer, the registries and registrars, the Registry Stakeholder Group and the Registrar Stakeholder Group appoint three members each to the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council is a bicameral structure and in one side of the house we have the contracted parties and the other side is the non-contracted party's hours. In the non-contracted parties house that's broken up into two parts, which the commercial constituencies and the non-commercial constituencies.

We have business constituencies, the intellectual property constituency and the ISP consistency. Just by way of example, I come from the Registry Stakeholder Group, Heather is from the Intellectual Property Consistency Group and Rafik is from the NCUC. The non-commercial constituency are made up of the NCUC and NPOC. We also have liaisons from the ALAC and the ccNSO. I think there is provision within our operating procedures that there could be a liaison from the GAC to the GNSO and I think many years ago that was the case but for whatever reason that is no longer the case. Now we have the opposite, the GNSO provides a liaison to the GAC and I must make apologies for Yule, who is our current liaison for the GAC he is unavailable to make this call because he's on a plane at the moment.

With the voting structure because it might look on paper there's an unequal balance but the voting is done at the house level, to ensure that there is parity between the contracted parties and non-contracted parties, despite the differences in representation. Any questions on that?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: I think there was a question from Horan in the chat on the Regional distribution within the GNSO Council and Heather provided a link to Horan in the chat as well. Do you want to add anything to this?

DONNA AUSTIN: Horan, I don't know what the reason of distribution is, I know from the contracted party side when we're looking at appointing new members take geographic diversity into account. The Registry Stakeholder Group currently has somebody from North America, Asia Pacific which is me and Ruben is from the Latin America Region but I notice that Heather is put a link into the chat which can give you a greater breakdown of that. Merik is saying in the chat that most groups have a requirement for geographic diversity when they select their representatives to the GNSO Council. Thanks Julia for that.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: I have another question for Donna. It's common great sided plans to how structured the GNSO Council.   The GNSO Counsel's vote independently or are the structured by their respective communities?

DONNA AUSTIN: That's a good question. From the registry perspective we do take the position of the stakeholder group. We can't vote independently. I think the registrars are the same. Rafik and Heather, if you wouldn't mind responding to this from your perspective because this different across the council so it might be helpful to hear from Heather and Rafik if they have something else to add.

HEATHER FORREST: Just checking in on this. Actually, it is fairly different and we three represent only three of the various groups within the GNSO. I would have to go back to IPC Charter to see exactly what's written there, so I certainly couldn't quote language off the top of my head but I do know that there is an explicit requirement for geographic diversity, particularly in relation counselor's it sits across for the leadership of the constituency.

Particularly in relation to counselor's and there is an effort, I believe that's in the language to rotate from the regions because we have only two counselors at any given time and you pointed to three from the Registry Stakeholder Groups, we certainly don't have one from each geographic region and hence that requires a bit of rotation. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Rafik, anything to add on this. I noticed you've put some information in the chat?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks Donna. At NCGNSO you have a requirement in our charter for gender and geographic diversity, so we cannot have more than two counselors from the same region and also to ensure the balance gender. Since we have six counsel I think it's easier to ensure that geographical diversity compared to maybe other stakeholder groups.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Rafik. I'll also mention too, we have a counsel leadership so there is always a chair and two vice chairs. The chair is elected by the council of the hall, it goes through two voting cycles and Heather was elected at the last IGM. The vice chairs are appointed by -- so I was appointed by the contracted parties house and Rafik was appointed by the non-contracted parties house, so that's how the leadership is selected. Are we clear of questions Julia? I'm forgetting about the chat box.

I'll take you through the GNSO policy development process now. This is referred to as the snake diagram. I understand that this webinar is being recorded and can be used by other GAC members. One of the things that I'll staff to make sure that's provided with is, is there is a more detailed explanation of the GNSO development policy process that's available and I think it might helpful if that's provided with this webinar as well. What you can probably take away is that there's a lot of steps in GNSO policy development process. What we're finding is that number of processes that we have underway at the moment are taking longer than usual and that is for a number of different reasons but that is maybe a conversation for another today, today we'll just go through the policy development process.

The first step in the process is request for an issue report. That can come from an advisory committee. Theoretically I guess one can come from the GAC but I don't think that's ever happened and that could possibly be because the GAC is relationship is more directly focused on the Board. Maybe it could come if the GAC has an issue that they would like considered as a policy, then maybe they make that request to the Board and it comes through that process.

The Board can request an issue report and the GNSO Council itself can request an issue report. We go into some detail in a minute about what fits within the bailiwick of what a policy can be developed on, so I'll go through that a bit later. There is a request for an issue report and that issue report is a preliminary issue report is prepared by Staff and that includes a draft charter.

One of the new initiatives, since 2015, the policy process also includes what we call a quick look mechanism for the GAC. The idea is that the GNSO, the liaison to the GAC informs the GAC secretariat following the adoption of a request for an issue report or the receipt for an issue request, an issue report request from the Board that the topic is coming up and the idea is that the GAC would then have a look at the topic or the issue to understand whether there are any public policy issues that might be raised in the course of the process and that is then fed into the and if I'm correct, that becomes part of the issue report.

This is a reasonably, as I said, it's only been around since 2015, so it's a recent initiative which was designed to ensure at least the GAC was aware, a issue report or a potential for a policy process that was coming

down the pipe and to have the GAC identify any public policy issues that needed to be considered in the process itself.

Request for issue report, publication of the preliminary issue report, gather public comments and publication of a final issue report. We don't have timelines on these but as you can imagine, that takes a reasonable chunk of time, it's not something that can be done within a two or three period. I think public comment periods now are at the minimum 40 days, that takes a reasonable chunk of time. Sorry, I'm pausing here because I'm trying to -- this doesn't necessarily have the steps in it where the GNSO council has a role in approving -- the council needs to sign off on the final issue report and then pass the motion to initiate the policy development process. I'm just noticing now that isn't necessarily spelled out in this diagram.

Additional notes that I'm suggesting be provided with this actually cover that off. It's important in the sense that it then shows the role of the GNSO Council and the management of PDP process. Initiate the policy development process and form a working group. Some of you may have some experience with the formation of working groups and I know that Jeff, he's going to go into some detail to provide you with a case study about the subsequent procedures PDP working group and I think that will be really helpful in trying to visualize some of these steps and particularly the formation of a working group.

The request for stakeholder group constituency statement, SO/AC inputs, so there are deliberate steps in the process to get input from the various stakeholder groups, not only within the council but also outside for the other SO's and AC's. Then there's an initial report and that goes

out to public comment. Again, another 40-day period. Then the working group final report.

Marika, I don't want to put you on the spot but I think it might be really helpful if you can just explain to folks, how long that process generally takes, notwithstanding the fact that we understand we're moving off some of the understood timelines of these processes take but I think it would be really helpful if you could explain just what the timeline from once you initiate the policy process to getting to that working group final report, how long that generally takes.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Donna. It's hard to put a fixed number on that. We actually have been tracking information and I can share the link in the chat on the timelines overtime and we have seen a significant increase in the time that is needed to get from the start of a policy development process to final report. There are numerous that we can point to, for example the complexity of issues that we're dealing with. The increase in participation, the more people around the table taking part in these conversation and probably more active engagements from other SO's and AC's in the policy deliberations, which means there are more views and perspectives that need to be factored in.

I think to give a rough number to get to initial report will likely be in the year and a half, two-year timeframe although I have to say for the groups that are currently running this is already a slightly longer. Then of course there's then the step to get to a final report which can take another six months to a year, again, completely dependent on the

number comments that are received and the additional work that is needed. I'll dig out now the link to the timeline document so you can actually have a look and see for all the different steps in the process, what this has taken in the different PDP that we either have completed or that are currently ongoing.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Marika. Julia, I believe there's a question that I've missed, could you read that out please?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Where does or can the GAC plug into this process? Do the bylaws govern that?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Julia and thanks for the question. The bylaws don't govern it. We have, when I say we, I've been on the council three years now and this is a common conversation that we have with the GAC when the council meets with the GAC at ICANN meetings. We understand that there are challenges for the GAC in participating in these efforts but it's not governed by the bylaws so anybody can participate in our GNSO PDP but there is a -- if I take subsequent procedures PDP working group, it's been broken down into five work tracks.

The time and effort required to participate in the PDP's is quite significant. At a minimum it's maybe a one hour call each week, over the lifetime of the PDP but there's also the prep work in understanding what the topic and what the discussion has been and staying informed.

Staff provides newsletters for most of the PDP efforts, so that's one way to try to keep up to date with what's going on.

The three PDP efforts that we have going at the moment, which is the subsequent procedures, the right to protection mechanism, the registration directory services, those three have all been going since early 2016, so it's a significant time commitment, not only on a weekly basis but to understand that it's over a long period of time. Participation is not mandated in the bylaws in anyway. Anybody can join a working group but it's important to understand what that time commitment is.

But we understand for the GAC and a lot of GAC members that is a real problem and to be fair, that kind of commitment is hard on other members within the community too. We're cognoscente of that and some of the work that the council's been doing since January and Marika hinted on some of this is that we are conscious that these efforts are taking much longer than we anticipated when we kicked them off and we're looking for ways to streamline of make the process more efficient. That's really a long-term game, it's not something that we can fix immediately. Julia, do we have any other questions? Anything else I've missed?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: We do not for now, thanks Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think where we got to in the snake diagram, is we got to the working group final report. That then goes to the GNSO council for deliberation and if the GNSO approves the final report, then the recommendation goes to the ICANN Board and the ICANN Board then issues another public comment period and then it goes to a Board vote and then it goes to implementation.

Now, that implementation there's an implementation review team that's put together. I'd say it's a Staff led effort but there are members of the community that are part of that implementation review team. Then there's another process that happens as part of implementation and that can take quite a period of time as well. I think we've only recently wrapped up implementation for the full names of Red Cross and some of the other IGO's that came out of a PDP that was finished some years ago.

Some of you may be aware that PDP itself has been reconvened to consider Red Cross issues in particular. That process in itself can take quite a period of time. I don't know that we touch on this really during a presentation but there is a sticking point here that some of you might be aware of and that is when council recommendation, through the PDP process inconsistent with GAC advice and that's something that we are looking for different ways to work through to try to avoid that situation. It something we're kind of addressing as we go. We know that with the [inaudible] IGO INGO PDP working group that we will have that sticking point and we're looking for ways to work through that with the Board and also the GAC. Any questions that I've missed Julia or are we right to go?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: No questions, thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you.   What is ICANN Consensus Policy?   All ICANN Accredited registrars and registries have contracts with ICANN that contain binding legal obligations.   Part of that obligation, when a registry or a registrar signs an agreement with ICANN there will be consensus policies already known and they're available on the ICANN website.   One of the better-known ones is UDRP, Uniform Dispute Resolution Process.

When a registry or registrar signs a contract, they understand what those are but they also acknowledge that over the time that they have the agreement or that they have a contract with ICANN, that there could be consensus policy processes that are undertaken through the GNSO and if there are recommendations that are approved by the Board and go through to implementation that at some point in time, the contracted party will be responsible for following those consensus policies as well.

When you think about it, when you sign up to a contract you generally understand those requirements are but contracted parties when they sign a contract with ICANN, they understand what some of those consensus policies are but they're also acknowledging that in the future, there might be consensus policies that are developed that they will need to abided by in the future. It's little bit interesting when you think that a contracted party is signing up for something that they're unaware of. GDPR could be one of those things but that's not something that's

been undertaken to the consensus policy process just yet, maybe that's conversation for another time but we will get to that point.

I think it might be helpful here just to focus a little bit on what we mean by consensus and this is something that's from council perspective becoming important to remind people that the GNSO policy development process is based on consensus. What we're trying to get to in the process, is for all parties involved in the PDP itself, to come to an agreement on a path forward.

Consensus policy doesn't involve voting, it is intended to be a correlating around ideas, so understanding that when you start a PDP process you will have people that have different views along of the continuum of possibilities and that the idea of consensus policy building is that everybody will come to understand the different points of view within the working group and then come to agreement on a common path forward.

You could its negotiation or whatever you like but the idea is that rather than go to a vote, to determine what the recommendation, there is agreement among the group as whole as to what is the best recommendation for the path forward. Heather and Rafik, I don't know if there's anything either of you would like to say on that?

I think it's a pretty important point. We talk about consensus policy a lot but what we're finding within the PDP's that are under operation, that are in train at the moment, is that perhaps we're losing sight a little bit of what consensus means and what the idea behind that PDP is. Heather and Rafik, not to put you on the spot but if there's anything

you'd like to add on that point, even Jeff if there's something you'd like to add on that point.

HEATHER FORREST: Actually, your additional comment there was what was on my mind. I think we have an opportunity to raise some of these points, particularly in context with the example of subsequent procedures and efforts that that group has already started to undertake to think about how to tackle some of the things that you're raising. Nothing further to add. I think Jeff's in context examples might be the most useful. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Heather. I think I've spoken to this a little bit, within the context themselves the registries and registrars agree to comply with consensus policies adopted by ICANN. There is a limitation on what the consensus policy itself can be about. We say broadly that it's related to gTLD registries but the policies themselves adopted by ICANN provided that such policies do not unreasonably restraint competition and the policies relate issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, technical reliability and or stable operation of the internet or domain name system.

Registry, registrar policies necessary to implement consensus policies relating to registrars, registries. Resolution of disputes regarding the registration or domain name as opposed to the use of such domain name. Obviously, we understand that what is within the bounds of what the policy can be developed on. There's a term that's used within ICANN which may not resonate to some, depending on where you come

from but it talks about the picket fence and that is really the picket fence is what's within and what's without.

What I just read out was about what was within the picket fence but things like -- ICANN can't develop -- consensus policies can't be developed on pricing, that will considered outside the picket fence. ICANN could establish policy and or best practices affecting issues outside the picket fence but they can't mandate registry and registrar compliance for such policies. The security framework that some of you in the GAC might be familiar with, that was a process that was developed by a working group of primarily the PSWG registrars and registries, that was framework, it was a best practice that was in response to -- it was something that was contained within the registry agreement but there was some -- there was a requirement for clarity.

That framework was developed to provide some guidance around that but it wasn't something that the registries in particular had to abide by, it's a framework, it sits outside that picket fence but it does act as a best practice. Any questions on that? Jeff, I don't know if you have anything to add here, it's probably something that you are more familiar with but if there's something that you wanted to add, feel free to do so.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Donna. I think it's probably better to just go through these and then as we come through examples with the PDP, that might be the most helpful and then we can work from there.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, terrific, thanks Jeff.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Donna, we have a question in the chat. Is there lesser topics that are documented to be considered outside of the picket fence, so to say? Donna, if you're trying to speak we can't hear you, you might be on mute.

DONNA AUSTIN: There is a list of topics, I see Marika has just put something within the chat that I won't try to read out but we will try to get you a list of what sits outside. Pricing is obviously one of those but I think there are some other topics that we can get to you as well.

                           What are the tools and mechanisms used? The tools are consistent with a lot of work that's done within the ICANN framework. Meetings in person and through teleconference. For the last, I think we're going into third policy forum, which many of you will probably understand that the idea behind a policy forum, with is the second ICANN meeting of the year, is to enable progress to be made of policy related issues.

                           The council we found is particularly helpful to be able to carve out substantive time during an ICANN meeting to have those face to face discussions for the PDP working groups. We're in that unusual situation where we have had four active PDP's going during that time, so that face to face opportunity has been really helpful for making substantive progress on the PDP's.

The public comment processes are critical and I think when you're looking for opportunities for GAC participation, this is one clear example of where responses from the GAC during a public comment period would be particularly helpful, not withstanding some of the challenges that are involved in being able to do that. Public comment processes are really important in guiding the next steps of the processes and so any engagement that the GAC can have during a public comment period is probably really important.

Online collaboration mechanisms. Obviously, mailing lists are really important to try to make progress on different topics. Jeff will talk about subsequent procedures but that's been broken down into five work tracks now. We've breaking down the topics into bite size chunks is helpful in trying to push forward on making progress on topics within the PDP itself before it comes to the working group as whole.

Regular publications and briefings. Staff does a really job before every ICANN meeting of providing an update of where the PDP efforts are and what you can expect coming up for discussion during a meeting. I've also mentioned newsletters that are provided as well. I'm not sure of the regularity of those, I think they might be on a monthly basis but they're also really helpful.

Then post ICANN meeting briefings as well. Webinars and updates. I'm very conscious Jeff and Cheryl do provide regular briefings to the GAC during ICANN meetings and I think some of the other PDP working groups have also done the same, so I think that's really helpful for the GAC in particular of tying to stay on top of some of the PDP working groups that are underway.

Important facts about the participation. I think there was a question earlier about whether it's in the bylaws about participation and it's not. As I said, anyone can participate in a GNSO PDP working if that's chosen model of the PDP team. Anyone can join a working group as a member or an observer.

The distinction there is that a member is actively involved in the PDP, has rights on the mailing list, so you can participate in the mailing list. The observer is generally you sign up as an observer on the list but you're not particularly or you're not active but there's nothing to stop you from if you want to move from a member to being an observer or vice versa, that's possible as well.

Participation in a GNSO currently remains open throughout the lifestyle of the project. Theoretically anyone can join a PDP working at any point in time but the longer you leave to join, the harder it is to catch up. There is an expectation that if join a PDP working group mid cycle that you will have done the homework and research to get up to date and understand what the current topics are under discussion but more importantly to understand how you got to that point. What we do find and what we do have challenges with, is people that join mid-stream and then open up discussions that's already happened previously and then resolved. If you want to join midterm, please do the work to understand how the working group has got to that point.

Most of the PDP work occurs regularly throughout the year not just at ICANN meetings. As I said, the subsequent procedures are the example meets pretty much on a weekly basis and has done throughout the two years it's been in operation. Some of that might be different work

tracks meeting during the month and the working as whole meeting maybe every two weeks but it is a pretty regular padded. You don't get much down time during the cycle of a working group.

While attending ICANN meetings is useful, the one valuable thing about ICANN and what I think they do really well is remote participation. If you can't make a face to face meeting the availability of remote participation generally means that you're not going to miss out on too much because you can always go back and listen to recording, review transcripts if they're available and read any documents or catch up on them on the mailing list. Julia, have there been any questions on that I may have missed.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: I have not seen questions so far, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thank you. PDP 3.0, we touched on this a little bit throughout this webinar. This is an effort that certainly Rafik, Heather and I as the leadership of the council feel quite passionate about I think and fits well within the bailiwick of the GNSO council's responsibilities, manager of the PDP. It's a little bit unusual that there are four PDP's that are operating in parallel at the moment, that's a considerable workload for the working groups and it's also a considerable workload for the council to manage and to understand where each PDP is at different points in time and also understand where some of the challenges.

EN

PDP 3.0 is during the council workshop that we had in January, we had some discussion around some of the challenges that are being experienced by the PDP's because one of the things we understand is that when we kick off these efforts we expect that on average they might go for two years. What we're seeing is that the longevity of the PDP goes much longer than that and we've very mindful that people can probably commit for two years of their time once things start to drag into three or four years, that become unattainable and then you start to lose people, so you lose the consistency within the process.

PDD 3.0 is an effort by the GNS council to address some of these issues head on and try to tackle them to extent that we can, not only in the short term but in the longer term. Our GNSO liaison to the GAC will be providing to the council a copy of the most current discussion paper that the GNSO council has put together and that's based on our discussions that we had in January and then also a follow up session that we had with the community, I was going to say San Yuan, I think it was just the last ICANN meeting.

Wolfe will circulate that to the GAC. We'd be interested to get your feedback but this discussion paper is not something that we're putting out to the community as a whole, we see this is something that council owns and the council will manage moving forward. Any questions on that? It might be a good conversation for another time.

When assigned more information, we've touched on some of these things. You can sign up to the various ICANN regional newsletters. I'm pretty sure that our Robin, Julia and the team are probably providing those to the GAC list anyway and if that's not happening then we can

certainly make sure that that information comes through to the GAC. You can sign up for the policy update webinars, they're a pretty consistent thing on the ICANN calendar, a week out from an ICANN meeting. You can also check out the GNS website for further information. We understand that something it's hard to understand where to find all this information, so if there's anyway that can make that easier for you, to provide it to you, certainly just let us know and we can do that. Julia, I think that's the end of -- not quite, I thought I was at the end.

Engagement, we know that SO's and AC's. We touched on this a little bit throughout the webinar. The GNSO council has the liaison from the ALAC, which is Cheryl Langdon Orr and Cheryl is on this call, hi Cheryl. We also one's from the ccNSO as well. Then we have Wolfe, is our GNSO for the GAC and the council has a liaison for the ccNSO. We have joint meetings with the council this is, has joint meetings with ccNSO and the GAC at ICANN meetings.

As we explained in the snake diagram there are numerous for SO/AC's to provide input to PDP's through specific inputs requested at the early stage of the process and also through the public comment period. Manal is very familiar with the specific mechanisms that were created to facilitate early engagement by the GAC in policy development mechanisms, which is the quick look mechanism that I spoke about earlier.

I think we probably have some more work in this regard to do but I think we're making progress. I think we need to be a little patient perhaps. None of these engagement opportunities negate other SO/AC's

performance, they're all as described under the bylaws. I think sometimes we probably get a little but hung up -- GAC provides advice for the Board and there's no mechanism for the GAC really to participate with the GNSO.

I think it would be helpful if we had an open conversation about how we could actually overcome that hump and have more conversation and dialog that would negate or mitigate at least some of the risks of GAC advice being inconsistent with recommendations that come up from a PDP working group. A shoot out to Jeff and Cheryl for the really good work that they do in engaging with the GAC with the subsequent procedures and the manner in which work track 5 in particular has been set up to overcome some of the challenges we expect, particularly on the topic of geographic name, so shoot out to them.

That is the end of my part of the presentation. Do we have any questions? Julia, have I missed anything in the chat?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: I didn't see any questions for Donna for now.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thank you. Jeff, I think I'll hand off to you if that's okay. Heather and Rafik, I'll check to you, is there anything that you'd like to add at this point?

JEFF NUEMAN: Sorry Donna, I'll let you finish.

DONNA AUSTIN: No problem Jeff, I'm just handing the baton to you. Thank you very much everybody.

JEFF NUEMAN: Hello everyone, good morning, afternoon and evening to everyone out there and thank you for the opportunity to present a case study or a little bit on the policy development process on subsequent procedure. I know Cheryl is on the line as well and is multitasking in a couple of meetings, Cheryl if you want to weigh in at any point, please let me know and we will get you in here and help us out.

The first thing I wanted to say is Donna did a great job on presenting the policy development process and some of the rules that apply but if you noticed as she was speaking and she did come up with a number of examples, there are many places in the policy development process that actually do have some flexibility and the subsequent procedures policy development process we've tried to take advantage of some of that flexibility because of the sheer number of issues that we're dealing with and also because of the known interest of a number of these new gTLD issues that many in the community have and want to participate and help the GNSO in developing the policies that are applicable to the next round or rounds of top level domains.

What is this policy development process about? In 2007 as most of you aware of the new gTLD process, the GNSO recommended a number of policies related to the introduction of new generic top-level domains. Around that same time the GAC had also recommended a number of

principles that would applicable to the introduction of new generic top-level domains and the ALAC and other groups have also submitted recommendations.

All of those recommendations were taken and used by ICANN as an organization to create the Applicant Guide Book, the first draft of the Applicant Guide Book was in 2010, maybe even the end of 2009 but ultimately ended up with the launch of the program in 2012. Shortly after the launch of the generic top-level domain process in 2012, the GNSO council had a discussion about the review of the new gTLD process as well initiating a new policy development process that would take the learnings of the 2012 round and try to come up with recommendations on how we can conduct future rounds or application windows for new gTLD's on an ongoing basis. The subsequent procedures policy development process was chartered and began it's work in early 2016. The link to the charter is in the presentation.

The policy development process, this PDP is structured in a very unique manner, as Donna was talking about because of the sheer number of issues that are involved and because we knew at the time that the number of the participants in the working group would be very large. This policy development process has two overall co-chairs, currently that's myself and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Many of you that have been involved for some time know that Avri Doria was a co-chair at the beginning but when she was subsequently nominated for the ICANN Board she stepped down and thankfully for me, Cheryl Langdon-Orr has stepped up to become the second overall co-chair. Third PDP has 40 separate topics. I would add that many of

EN

those topics have a number of subtopics as well and we decided early on to divide those topics into initially four work tracks as well as a number of topics that the overall working group would work on.

The four original work track were called work track one through four and they dealt with different aspects of the program which weren't the issues that were in the issue report and the charter into what we believed were manageable breakdowns of issues that seemed to be at time at least, related to each other in some sort of way. For example, work track two deals with the legal and regulatory issues that came out of the new gTLD process, so that involved things like the registry base agreement, issues on registry, registrar's separation, talked about the terms of conditions that applied to applications, etcetera.

We're finding out now as we are combining each of these work tracks or the outputs of each of these work track into an initial report, which we'll talk about in a few minutes, that seeing as these work tracks actually had inter related issues and so on a going forward basis after we get public comments into the initial report, we may or may not decide to organize the rest of the work in this same manner. That topic's still being discussed by the overall PDP working group as well as the leadership of that group.

Each of these work tracks that we created has two -- work tracks one through four, has two work tracks leads. Many of these leads that you see listed are first time leaders and so not only are we excited about the fact that we have so many different volunteers to help lead these groups but that Cheryl and I look at these leaders in a number of cases as being the next generation of GNSO leaders for many years to come.

EN

That's something that we are proud of and hopefully we'll reap of the benefits moving forward.

During the work on work tracks one through four, we also had as many of you may remember, a couple of different webinars on geographic names and there were some cross-community sessions during Johannesburg for example, that dealt with these issues of geographic names. We also were aware of work that was ongoing within the GAC that Olga was leading on geographic names and in addition to that, there was a cross community working group on the use of country and territory names at the top level.

There were a number of forums that were discussing the issues around geographic top-level domains and as a result of these webinars that were held in 2017, thought that it would be better for the community to divide out the geographic names and a create a new work track, which we now call work track five, that had a little bit different of a structure then the other work tracks. Because we knew that this was an important issue to not only the GNSO but the GAC and the ccNSO and the ALAC, we tried a new leadership structure, which I think and Cheryl can weigh in as well, I think it's worked out really well because we have leaders from each of the SO's and AC's that wanted to participate.

As you see here on the chart, we have Annabeth Lang participating from the ccNSO, Havier who is from the ALAC, Martin from the GNSO and Olga from the GAC. Each of these work track leads presents a very unique and different perspective on all of the issues that we're dealing and I know from my perspective and from Cheryl's perspective as well, we know that this has been vital in helping to shape the work of work

track five and some of you that have been participating may have been on call that was not even 12 hours ago of work track five.

As with all of the policy development processes, each of the work tracks report their findings and their conclusions to the overall working group. The overall working group will then send its findings to the GNSO council. We'll go into that in a little bit more detail through the slides that are coming up. Just trying to read the chat and while I do that I certainly want to express gratitude in the fact that we can use Adobe Connect again because I do believe that this a much better platform then the WebEx that many of you that have been participating working groups have been using for the last several weeks. Sorry, for the little delay, just trying to move the slides.

What's the role of the leadership? While Cheryl and I are the overall co-chairs of this working group, our role is really to make sure that the process of what's contained in the operating and working group guidelines are followed. Cheryl and I are expected to be neutral in the way that we operate and that we are supposed to ensure the view points of all of the different groups of all the different participants are being presented and that their idea and their questions and their proposals are being addressed.

In addition to that we also have the administrative tasks of scheduling meetings, presiding over the meetings and again, making sure that whatever the output is of the policy development process, that it's accurately presented to the community and to the GNSO leadership, so that when the GNSO council does get the final report eventually, that they can have confidence that the output is -- even if they don't agree

with every single recommendation that's contained within the final report, they can be ensured that the process is being followed.

As it says here on this chart, work track five is different then the other work tracks because of the nature of the work that it's doing and has been an experiment for us in the subsequent procedures working group and I think and I hope those of you that participate also think that this new leadership structure for that work track has been very successful in helping to get participation from different community members that may not otherwise have had the opportunity to participate in the past.

Like all policy development processes, the subsequent procedures PDP allows participation from anyone, from any community, whether it's in their individual capacity or on behalf of their business, their entity or organization. Currently we have in the overall policy development process working group, we have over 180 members and about 80 observers and that's just really work tracks one through four. If you add on top of that with work track five, we have 155 member and 90 observers, including what Cheryl and I are really excited about, 24 members from the GAC.

While we say this, we want to make it clear, as it's been made clear to us, that although there are members of the working group that also are members of the GAC, we completely understand that those that are participating are participating in their individual capacity and not necessarily even on behalf of their own government and certainly are not participating on behalf of the GAC as a whole. That is very clear to us and we operate everyday on that assumption but that being said, we very much appreciate perspectives that are brought to the group by a

number of members of the GAC and I see some of them on this call and so just a thank you to all of you that do participate and certainly anyone else that does want to participate in the future, you are more than welcome and very much appreciated for your time and your effort in those groups.

How do we operate? Like all of the PDP's we have a mailing list and in this case, we have a number of different mailing lists for each of the different work tracks. We also have very frequent conference calls for the overall working groups we have conference calls every other week, although recently we've been meeting every week. Work track five, which is dealing with geographic names issue, the currently meet every week as well, although when we started out, we meet every other week.

We also do convene face to face meetings at ICANN meetings and certainly had, at least with work tracks one through four, gosh I haven't gone back to figure out how many conference calls we've had but I think it has to well over a couple hundred calls in the last couple years. I think at some we'll do a tally of all the calls and the number of emails on these subjects but it's certainly a lot. We also have a wiki page that keeps all of the recordings and the transcripts and notes from every single meetings, whether they are meetings of the overall working group or any of the work tracks.

On top of that we have leadership calls of the co leads of each of the work track, even the co leads of work track five every week, in fact with work track five, leadership often holds a separate work track leadership on top of that. Many of those that are participating in leadership could

have multiple calls every week and so they really do work very hard on just setting the agenda and making sure all the view points are able to be expressed and that all the positions are represented.

We have also in the PDP have had already several public comment periods, even though they are not required by the operating guidelines or the bylaws. Each PDP is free to have additional public comment period then those that are required. For this working group we've had something that we've called Community Comment #1 as well as Community Comment #2 and we've also for work track five, have had webinars and cross community sessions that have been instrumental in providing feedback.

How do we engage with the community? In addition to what we've already talked about, we have newsletters that go out every month. Cheryl and I make ourselves available to the GAC at every ICANN meetings and more often if you'd like. We certainly appreciate the opportunity to be able to present and to listen to the GAC as often as we can, to make sure that we are thinking about all the potential issues and perspectives, even before we come out with our initial report. I know in the interest of time and to have some ability to take questions here, I'll move on to some of the next slides.

As we were talking about and as Donna said, there is a excellent initiative underway right now within the GNSO council on how to reform the PDP process into what we're now calling PDP 3.0. Some of the practices that have been discussed within the GNSO are based on some of the activities that have already been underway in the subsequent procedures policy development process and we're happy to

note that some of the experiments or things that we've considered experiments are possibilities for this next policy development process.

As far as the next steps for the subsequent procedures policy development process, we are working on an initial report that will be out for public comment hopefully within the next couple weeks, certainly before ICANN 62. That public comment period will be at least I believe it's required to be 40 or 42 days, of course with the ICANN meeting and with summer coming up and holidays, we are very likely to have a much longer public comment period. Once that public comment period is over, then each of the public comments will come back to the full working group so that we can begin working on addressing those comments and ultimately with the delivery of a final report.

That final report will then go to the GNSO council for their consideration and then ultimately to the Board. Just to note very importantly, the initial report that's coming out in the next of weeks is only on the overall issues and work tracks one through four. We are still in the fairly early stages of work track five and we do not anticipate an initial report coming out of work track five for a number of months.

Work track five, dealing with geographic names issue, is currently several months behind the rest of the working group, which works out well in one respect because we know that there are going to be a lot of issues that many groups, including the GAC would like to comment on in work tracks one through four, so we can get that comment period done before we start working on the comments for the work track five. There are a number of unique issues that can be dealt with separately.

At ICANN 62 there are several sessions that will be held on work tracks one through four and the initial report but also, at least I think according to the most current version of the schedule that I've seen, there are two sessions I think on geographic names at the top level in the schedule for ICANN 62 and we will have separate initial report on the geographic names issue that if I were to guess, would be in the fall, actually I shouldn't say that because that's only the fall in norther hemisphere, mostly likely in the months of September or later for the initial report of the work track five.

I think we went over what happens after the policy development process working group delivers its final report. Just to note that once the GNSO council sends the final report to the Board with it's recommendations, the Board is required to have yet another a public comment period. They're required to send the report to the GAC for it's consideration before the Board considers and addresses the GNSO final report.

After the Board approves the final report, then we will go into the implementation phase and that implementation phase will likely involve the creation of a revised Applicant Guide Book that will set the basis for the next round of new gTLD's.

Here are a bunch of resources that are about our policy development process on subsequent procedures. Has a copy of the newsletters, the mailing list archives and all of the other materials that the working group has produced. I apologize for going through that fairly quickly but in the interest of time and making sure that you all have an opportunity to ask any questions. Cheryl, if you want to add any words, please do so

now, otherwise we'll take a couple seconds to see if there are any questions or comments.

Cheryl says get on with Q & A, thank you Cheryl, for those of you following the chat, Cheryl says we should get on with questions and answers. Are there any questions? I don't know if Heather wants to add anything Rafik? I Donna had to leave, do you have anything you want to add? Nothing additional from Heather. Give a few more seconds for anyone else to type in any questions or comments. Okay, well I will turn it over -- I guess I don't know who I'm supposed to turn this over to.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: I see in the chat, there was recent change in the internal voting requirement in the GNSO to do with the empowered community, could you enlighten us about that?

HEATHER FORREST: I'm very happy to answer that. I'm the chair of the GNSO. That's a very good question. The result of a process that each of the SO's and AC's ultimately have embarked on following the transition, the IANA function transition and amendments that were made to the bylaws as a result of that process. The GNSO much like the ccNSO and other groups, embarked on a program evaluating those changed bylaws with our own responsibilities under the bylaws for the GNSO.

That meant a few keys things. One thing in particular that it meant is, when I say I'm the chair of the GNSO and we have Donna and Rafik on

the call or Donna's left the call, we are the members of the GNSO council. The GNSO council is really only one aspect of the GNSO community. The GNSO council has as it's primary function under the bylaws, particularly under the revised bylaws, simply managing the policy development process, the things we're talking about today and yet the new bylaws that we have following the IANA functions transition, give each of the communities within ICANN new responsibilities.

Those responsibilities were not entirely, let's say falling within or consistent with the notion that we had of the GNSO council as the manager of the policy development process, in other words, there were things that GNSO is required to do to carry out its responsibilities as a member of empowered community that have nothing to do directly with the policy development process. The very first critical question that we had to answer for ourselves was, what body is it within the GNSO or who is it within the GNSO that carries out some of these responsibilities that the new bylaws give us?

Ultimately after a great deal of discussion because there's not a complete agreement on this within the various parts of the community, it was determined that at this point in time it's best that some of those things being carried out by the GNSO council. If I can point to a specific example, the representative to empowered community from the GNSO is someone who is nominated by or selected by the GNSO council.

That selection of course has nothing to do with a policy development process, it moves the GNSO council beyond the responsibility that it had prior to those changed bylaws and the coming into existence of the

empowered community. At this present time the representative of the GNSO to the empowered community is the GNSO council chair, that's something that is selected on a ongoing basis, so when my term as GNSO chair ends in October, the council will go through that process again of selecting someone.

Now, very specifically there was an announcement that recently went around, maybe a week ago, to say that voting thresholds for the GNSO had changed and what that signifies is much of what we do in the GNSO is on the basis of consensus, everything we do on the basis of consensus but we require majority for most of the decisions that we make as a GNSO council and we believed as a community that the decisions relating to the empowered community were so important that simple majority was not sufficient. In our strategic planning session in January to consider that quite closely and come to the view that it was important, sufficiently important to us those sorts of decisions that they should be made by super majority rather than simply majority.

That is the change that you may have seen referred in ICANN announcements last week. The reason that it's taken us some time do that it twofold. Number one, we wanted to take some time to consider that very carefully. Super majority, I'll lean on Staff here to come up with a precise definition, forgive Raoul it's 1:30 in the morning my time and my brain isn't as sharp as it needs to be but we'll get a precise definition for you. Just finish off my explanation and not to run over time.

The reason that took some time and the announcement is just coming now, the GNSO put a significant amount of time into this in January at

its strategic planning session, in fact devoted an entire day to considering these issues and then it's take some time for that to be put to the Board. As we know the Board's been very busy lately with other matters. It's taken some time to work its way through Board approval. Hopefully that helps to answer your question. Again, I apologize if that was a bit fuzz, it's a very odd hour here in Asia Pacific. Thank you very much.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you very much Heather, sorry it's very late for you. I hope this answers your question, Raoul. Just want to check in the audience if we have other questions. Seeing none, we reached the top of the hour so I would like to thank you very much, Donna, Heather, Rafik and Jeff and I would also like to thank the GNSO Support Staff for this very informative presentation.

Thank you also for our GAC participates and GAC support staff, GAC support staff is very interested in your feedback we will likely reach out to you with a couple questions following this webinar for your feedback. Just to inform everyone that the next webinar for the GAC is scheduled on Thursday, 31st of May at 14UTC. ICANN Complaint Officer will share the purpose and objective of the office and how they can be a resource to the GAC. With that, thank you very much everyone for attending this webinar and I wish you a good rest of your day. Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]