

**GNSO Working Group Newcomer Webinar
2 February 2016
ICANN Transcript**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-newcomer-02feb16-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

Heather Forrest: Well hi there everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening as we say in ICANN land. My name is Heather Forrest. I'm currently one of the Co-Chairs of the GNSO and I have volunteered to lead this morning's newcomer open house session.

This is our first session. It's actually a two-part program, one part being the session that's very ably led by Nathalie and her team about how to use Adobe Connect, and the sort of nuts and bolts of the practicalities of how we work in the GNSO.

And if you haven't already attended one of those sessions I'd very much encourage you to do so. In the meantime you'll notice that Nathalie has put the instructions in the right hand box there of the Adobe Connect if you're on the Adobe Connect about how to connect your audio, and she said a few words about that as we just got started.

If you have any challenges with connecting your audio in the course of today's call, then send a quick message to Nathalie and she can help you out. She's fantastic with that sort of thing.

So that's the practicalities. I would suggest that if you haven't already go ahead and attend that additional session on how to use Adobe Connect and how to find you're away around because that really will.

You'll see today is about substance. That's the how and then that will really facilitate your participation. So we'll get started today and what I would like to do is in the beginning I'd like to turn it to Nathalie who's supporting our call today to give us a bit of an introduction again about the how to for who to talk to when you have a problem so over to you Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Heather. So this is Nathalie. I'm part of the SO/AC support team, which is in the GNSO which is part of the overall Policy team. Now you'll see quite a few of the names which are on the slides and on the following slide up here in the Adobe Connect room of your working group call.

And somehow it's sometimes difficult to know who to address with which question, so to put it more generally the names you see on the screen now, so Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffmann, Steve Sheng - these are all people who are more based in the content support.

So if you had any questions regarding substance for instance you could very easily email them. The email addresses are on the slide. More importantly all ICANN Staff email addresses are built in exactly the same way and is the first name dot their last name at ICANN dot org, so you don't need to have someone's email address.

You can infer it from their first and last name. On the next slide you have a few of my colleagues, so Glen Saint Gery and Terri Agnew. We are the SO/AC support team.

You can come to us for anything regarding admin, mailing lists, email address changes, wiki login but also anything technical regarding conference calls on Adobe connection issues.

That's it in a nutshell. Of course if you don't remember this you can email any one of us or any question and we'll direct you to the right person. Thank you very much and I'll hand it back over to Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Nathalie very much. Just a quick point. One of the reasons why I volunteered to hold these sessions is to take the opportunity to say how fantastic our support staff are in the GNSO.

We really have an excellent team of people and I encourage you - really two things. If you have questions about anything use those emails. Don't be afraid to use the emails.

Questions that you think are stupid or simple or these sorts of things - ICANN Staff, A, experienced those very same questions when they started within the ICANN environment; and B, answer them 50 times a day for all the people so by all means please take advantage of those emails that Nathalie has showed you.

You'll see our agenda on the slide today - broadly three substantive topics. So as I said there's a second session that goes along with this that's the how, how to use Adobe Connect and how to be connected.

Today is really about the substance and this is the scary stuff about the GNSO I suppose. We talk in the ICANN community about what a mess the GNSO is and how very complicated it is.

I'd like to try to unravel some of that complication today, bearing in mind that today is really and truly a crash course in how the GNSO works and why it works in the particular way that it does.

So with that in mind I know full well in advance -- Nathalie and I talked about this in preparing this session -- that today would be a bit of information overload.

But I hope there's a few key points that you can take away that will if you like begin to unravel the mysteries and point you in the right direction for questions that still linger.

On the topic of questions what I would like to do is we'll need to stop today at 10 till the hour. That I hope will still leave us time for some questions here on the call.

We'll take questions at the end. If you would like to type a question into the chat so that you don't forget it please go - feel free. Go right ahead to do that.

Any questions that we don't manage to get to today on the call itself, please send them to Nathalie or type them into the chat and we'll make a record of them and we'll follow up with them very soon after the call.

That way we make sure that we capture your questions and as I say please don't be afraid to ask. But in order to keep the momentum in the program what I suggest is that we put those questions to the end.

So with that in mind we have three substantive topics to talk about. We'll talk about the dreaded PDP, the GNSO Policy Development Process. We'll talk about ICANN consensus policy and what that phrase picket fence means.

And we'll spend the bulk of our time in Topic Number 3, which is GNSO Working Group Guidelines. The working groups are how the GNSO really gets its work done.

And so with that in mind - and I understand that many of you are new to working groups or planning on signing up to working groups or recently joined working groups.

With that in mind we'll spend some time there to discuss what happens and how that work happens, let's say how to best facilitate your engagement in the ICANN community and where to go with questions beyond that.

For our first topic logically a good place to start is with the structure of the GNSO. And we won't get into the nitty gritty here but I do think it's important to have a certain degree of understanding of the structure of the GNSO, because indeed that does affect how the GNSO functions.

Some time ago we changed the structure of the GNSO and what I'd like to do I suppose in this discussion and throughout today's discussion is to try and explain some of the terminology that we use.

You'll hear it very, very frequently within the ICANN environment around the GNSO and perhaps not know what it means, and I think that's really the ultimate goal of these sessions is to demystify some of that terminology.

You'll hear the terminology when referring to the GNSO Houses that the GNSO has two Houses. And you'll notice on the slide before you now in the Adobe Connect room that you'll see that there is this diagram that shows two entities surrounded by dotted lines.

Those are the two Houses of the GNSO. We have the Contracted Parties House and that is entities that have entered into a contract with ICANN, hence the name Contracted Parties House.

That's our Registries and our Registrars. And the other House within the GNSO is called the Non-Contracted Parties House. These are by contrast a - entities and groups and stakeholder communities that participate in the

ICANN environment but are not in contract with ICANN, hence the name Non-Contracted Parties House.

That group is made up of two very broadly categorized groups: the Commercial Stakeholders Group and the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group, whereas within the Contracted Parties House we have the Registry Stakeholder Groups and the Registrar Stakeholder Groups.

Smaller groups within these entities are often referred to as constituencies. For example you notice that there are three constituencies in the Commercial Stakeholder Groups and two constituencies in the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Groups.

The thing that I can emphasize to you after some time of experiencing the ICANN environment and how we do things is that I suppose a - the key message here is that the - some of these groups are not perfect fits.

Some of these groups do not reflect ICANN post-new gTLDs. These tensions make themselves known on a fairly frequent basis now, particularly in the context of forming working groups in terms of representation of the various areas of the GNSO community.

And so you'll hear frequently references to tensions of, you know, "Do you represent this group or do you represent that group? And that group has two people and this group has three people," and this sort of thing.

That's what this is fundamentally referring to. We do actually have live at the moment a review of the GNSO and that review did not cover the structure of the GNSO.

But there are groups within the GNSO that think it's time to discuss structure and how well or not well that works. In any event it's important to know - from the context of today's session simply to understand that broadly speaking

representation within working groups and within these mechanisms of how we get things done at ICANN often comes from this House structure.

So you'll have individuals that represent these various groups that you see on the screen in the - in that capacity working in working groups so that is something to keep an eye on.

And you'll also notice -- I'll say very quickly -- that these two Houses are overarched if you like by the GNSO Council. It's very hard to describe the GNSO Council as some sort of body with authority, and in a sense the GNSO Council is populated by representatives of these groups within the Houses that you see here in the diagram.

So for example I sit on the GNSO Council representing Intellectual Property Constituencies. We also have some NomCom appointed individuals, two of whom are voting; one of whom is not voting.

You see that voting structure and of course representatives of ALAC and the ccNSO that also reports or participate in these Council activities. So you see here that's a bit of a - a bit of an introduction to Council as well and who sends individuals to Council, and where those people come from and the interests that they represent if you like.

NCA stands for non - NomCom Appointees. Norbert thanks very much for the question. So that's individuals who sit on the GNSO Council who are appointed not by the Registries, the Registrars, the Commercial constituencies or the Non-Commercial constituencies but by the Nominating Committee, which advises the ICANN Board and is part of the ICANN corporate structure.

So if we move to our next topic we'll talk about policy development and particularly policy development within the GNSO has a very special title, and

the reason for that special title is that the role of the GNSO is derived from the corporate bylaws of ICANN.

If you're not already aware ICANN is incorporated as a public benefit nonprofit corporation in the State of California in the United States of America, and as a corporation it has bylaws as do other corporations in the world.

Our corporate bylaws in ICANN of course are rather different because of the nonprofit public benefit nature of what we do and because of the mission of ICANN.

So our corporate bylaws don't tend to say things about stakeholder voting and about proxy and this sort of thing. Our stakeholder or, excuse me, our bylaws describe the corporate structure of ICANN including the GNSO and including the role of the GNSO Council, which we've just discussed in relation to the previous slide on the structure of the GNSO.

And you'll see here I've included the language from - specifically from the bylaws in relation to this thing, the Policy Development Process. The bylaws empower the GNSO with the responsibilities to developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains.

That is the exclusive ambit of the GNSO and by exclusive ambit what I mean is the GNSO is the only body that's empowered with that language in the bylaws.

So when it comes to developing policy in relation to gTLDs that sits with the GNSO and exclusively so. I think the term exclusive is important here as well in a sense that all the GNSO is empowered to do, and the Council is the functional body that makes that happen.

It's not that Council is imbued with any sort of special powers. The Council is simply the administrative vehicle for how that happens let's say. We send representatives to the GNSO Council and they represent the communities that make up the GNSO in this business of developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies.

So when we refer to a PDP, capital P, capital D, capital P, we're referring to a Policy Development Process and what that signals, capital PDP, is that we're engaging in this business of developing and recommending to the Board policies - substantive policies in relation to gTLDs, generic top-level domains, as distinguished from ccTLDs, which are country code top-level domains.

So hence when we refer to the importance of the GNSO PDP what we're really looking at here is understanding that this is part of ICANN's corporate mandate.

This is part of ICANN's corporate structure but this is not an accident let's say that this is why the GNSO deals with these issues and why it addresses the policy that it does, and we'll come back later to this idea of the picket fence.

And the picket fence helps us understand the scope - by no means a clear thing. We have discussions quite frequently as to what's inside the picket fence and what's outside of the picket fence, and that's referring to coming back to this provision in the bylaws.

What is it that the GNSO, the Generic Names Supporting Organizations, is empowered to do? So hence the PDP is very important because this is how we are empowered under corporate law in the way that ICANN is structured to do things in relation to generic top-level domains.

With that in mind some of you may have seen this diagram, which we in the GNSO lovingly refer to as the snake. I think other communities - I forget. I

recently heard someone in the ALAC refer to it as something else, probably something awful although snake isn't a very pleasant image in and of itself.

What this diagram shows is the steps that occur in a PDP, in the Policy Development Process. And I'd like to emphasize a few of these steps and encourage you to follow up on this point in particular: knowing your way around a PDP; what's happening when.

There are a few key things that happen within a PDP that you'll have a general idea if someone says to you, you know, "This is happening." You'll say, "Oh I broadly understand where in the snake that is."

But I'll highlight a few things here to help you with that. In terms of the time I think it's important - one of the questions that's very, very frequently asked is how long does a PDP take?

And I suppose the answer in the GNSO is how long is a piece of string? There really is no set time limit in the ICANN bylaws to how long a PDP should take, and the very glib answer is a PDP takes as long as it takes to get through the snake, to get through all of the steps.

And we have to move through all of the steps again because these arise from the requirements in the bylaws and the GNSO Operating Procedures, which we'll talk a bit about in a moment.

One thing I would like to flag and perhaps try and avoid let's say terrifying you is we are in the process in the GNSO of discussing amendments to the snake and changing this process around.

We're going to park that idea for now and simply focus on the snake as it is, because it will take some time I think before we see changes to the snake if those indeed are coming.

So you'll notice the very first thing at the top left hand side of the - of this diagram of this (zeb) or this snake it says, "Request for an issue report," so the initiations of any Policy Development Process begins with this issue report.

And ICANN Staff put together a document that sets out if you like the particular challenges faced in relation to an issue, a problem, something that's happening within the ICANN community that is within this scope of what the GNSO is empowered to deal with.

And then we come back to that language in the bylaws about recommending policy in relation - substantive policy in relation to generic top-level domain. So you'll know at the time that Staff begins to speak about an issue report that we're at the initiation of a PDP.

Now the steps before the initiation of that issue report would be a vote from the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council would suggest that it's time to look into this issue.

It would discuss the issue in depth. It might make some recommendations as to what does need looking into. ICANN Staff are very good at liaising with the community to determine what may or may not be of interest in the context of a - in the context of an issue report.

So that essentially begins the process. When you hear the language in the GNSO issue report you know that a PDP has commenced and you know that we're underway in this process of the snake.

That preliminary issue report gets published and what happens, and you'll notice this mogul at various points in the snake, is we have this opportunity for public comment.

And this is the opportunity not just for the GNSO but for members of the ICANN community widely to comment on what has been published by Staff in this preliminary issue report, which gets finalized taking on board those comments from the public into a final issue report.

Once you see the final issue report you know that work is about to begin. So those of you who have recently joined a working group or about to join a GNSO Working Group - I encourage you - to the extent that you haven't already go back and read the final issue report that initiated your work.

Make sure that you have an understanding of what's happening in - what led to the formation of your working group and why it is that your group has been called together.

That will help you to understand what it is that your group is expected to do. You'll notice then that that middle part of the snake coming back down has to do with working groups, and we'll spend some time talking through those steps in a bit more detail in the next part of this presentation.

But you'll see that there's the formation of the working group. Part of that process in the formation of the working group will be setting the working group's basic working parameters, how things get done, how often meetings will take place, who has leadership roles within the working group and so forth and so on.

So we'll spend our time with working groups as a particular topic a bit later on in today's presentation. You'll notice that that working group phase if you like happens all the way down through that middle leg of the snake and it ends with the - or let's say it progresses through the same phases as the issue report - just to say that there's a preliminary or an initial report followed by public comments, the taking onboard of those public comments and then the publication of a final report.

What happens then is that final report goes to the GNSO Council and the GNSO Council will then deliberate in relation to any recommendations that come out of the working group's final report, and that deliberation is a necessary step before the recommendations are passed on to the ICANN Board.

And of course these things are recommendations and must be recommendations are not mandates or demands or anything like this simply because of that language that you saw in the bylaws in the previous slide, but what the GNSO is empowered to do is develop and make recommendations about substantive gTLD policies.

So those recommendations go to the ICANN Board. Again we have a round of public comment. The Board does not act on things simply from the GNSO alone, and then we have a vote from the ICANN Board of Directors.

And we see what happens in the next phase: implementation. Now I'll say as a - someone who's been around ICANN for a while that endpoint in the snake, somewhere between implementation and policies, is a gray area for many of us.

And you'll also hear sometimes with rolled eyes or hand gestures if you're in a public meeting this conflict between policy and implementation. And I say just as someone who struggled for a very long time to understand the concept and understand what all the big deal was about and often still don't quite grasp what all the big deal is about, we do have some challenges within the ICANN environment in the sense that you notice that the bylaws say that the GNSO is empowered to develop and recommend it and make recommendations about policy.

They're not empowered to implement policy and so we have this phase of implementations and it often falls on us to determine whether something is

policy or implementation, and we have a long history of challenges with that very question in the GNSO.

With that in mind I'd like to move into some specifics of this process, and so we'll move on to talk about some of these things in detail in relation to the working group.

You'll notice that we put on this slide here some basic requirements about how PDP working groups happen, how work gets done. And the first thing that will happen in the phase that many of you may be in because we recently commenced a number of PDPs is this idea of framing the scope of work.

What is it that the PDP is setting out to achieve? And much of that would be driven by the PDP Charter. So the PDP Charter will be something that comes to the working group from the GNSO Council. It's something that's discussed and worded in such a way that Council can agree upon. And that document will then be your reference document for the life of your working group. To the extent that you ever have a question, and I recommend to you, I do this.

Frequently I'm involved in various working groups. You'll get to a point further down the track where you forget really what your mandate is. You forget what's in the Charter and what it is you're supposed to be doing. And the mind place (unintelligible) and you get further on and think well I think we're doing X when in fact you're not doing X. You're doing Y.

So every once in a while, remind yourself and remind others within your PDP working group to go back to the Charter and just make sure we're still on track. Is that what we're supposed to be doing? And you'll notice there that the requirements for community input. The working group must seek dues from all of these various entities within the GNSO that you saw in that slide about structure and of course from other ICANN advisory committees and supporting organizations, what you'll often hear described as SOs and ACs.

So you'll see that those iterative community input phases throughout the PDP and that includes that working group phase. The feedback on recommendations of course is a necessary step that follows community input but what we see coming out of that public comment period, get plugged back into what the working group is producing.

But it's never the case that we empower these individuals in a working group to go off, work over some sort of period of time and come up with some sort of manifesto or policy that suits them. There's always this circulation back to the community, checking back with the community, how are we doing, are we, are we meeting expectations?

In my mind, I think that's a helpful, if you like, check and balance within the ICANN corporate structure in a sense that while it is the GNSO that's exclusively empowered to make the recommendations in respect to GTLD policy, the GNSO does not do that in a vacuum. The GNSO does that in communication with the ALAC, in communications with the (GAC), in communications with the ccNSO, with the (ACSO), these other organizations and stakeholders within the broad internet environment.

So it's not the case that the GNSO locks itself into a room and dictates. There is of course the flipside to that. Let's say it's the accountability requirements. The working group reviews all of the public comments it's received and it's increasingly becoming good practice within working group to acknowledge that particular, that all feedback that's been received.

And by that I mean to the extent that feedback is not taken onboard, there may be an explanation. We received this comment. We received a number of the same comments and yet we don't feel that it's appropriate to act on that comment because. So silence is not optimal in terms of accountability. The explanation may be very, very clear to you as to, as a member of a working group as to why a particular suggestion made in a public comment period wasn't taken onboard or was taken onboard but not acted upon.

But that needs to be made clear to the community as well. So hence, accountability is a very large part of what we do in GNSO PDP working groups. And then of course there's this ultimate goal. The ultimate goal is for production of some piece of output that goes to the community at large and that's the preparation of the final report which gets submitted to the GNSO Council for discussion.

Perhaps questions will come out of that that can be answered by member of the working group. So it's not uncommon at GNSO Council meetings we may have a representative from a PDP working group come to report to council and explain a particular piece of information or conclusion or recommendation.

So that's the basic requirements of how PDP working groups work. Let's talk now about this idea of consensus policy and the picket fence. The picket fence is a phrase that we use very, very often and I like the picture that we've included on this slide because it shows what we mean.

If you think about a house and a house that perhaps is on a small block and it has this little white fence that encircles the house and encloses the house in perhaps it has a gate. And we might think of things on the inside of the fence as belonging to the house. And on the outside of the fence as being other public or private property.

And that's the image that we're looking at here is that fence. We use the phrase picket because we refer to those little white stakes in the fence in the United States and other countries, other English speaking countries, as pickets. But unfortunately it's a phrase that we use and it doesn't translate very well to all cultures in all countries.

We're referring to a fence, referring to a fence that closes things in and on the flipside, keeps things out. The concept of the ICANN picket fence or the

GNSO and ICANN picket fence and consensus policy are interrelated. So we saw that what the GNSO does come from the requirements of the corporate dialogue of ICANN.

And you'll see here that we referred to in the structure slide to contracted parties. And we referred to registries and registrars. Those are the entries that have signed and entered into a contract with ICANN and are involved in generic top level domains.

So those bodies, their contract is a binding legal instrument. It's a legal contract and much of what is contained in that contract is what we refer to as consensus policy. Consensus policy refers to policy that is derived from these processes that happen within ICANN that are part of the ICANN mandate, that are part of what we do and go to the heart of that body, the registry or registrar carrying on its business consistent with the ICANN mission, consistent with the ICANN dialogue.

Consensus policy is policy that's agreed to by the ICANN community, by ICANN stakeholders. Now much consensus policy in the GNSO comes from the policy development process, comes from the PDP. Now these things are, from a legal standpoint to understand that these contractual terms which are, many of them not negotiable by the parties engaging in these contracts, entering into these contracts.

They come from the ICANN community and that's a bit of a legal oddity in terms of in a normal legal relationship, if you and I were to contract we might agree on selling a house, selling a car, something like this. And you and I would agree to the terms and if I didn't agree to your terms or you didn't agree to mine, we'd simply say no and go elsewhere.

Of course, that's not possible in the ICANN environment. So it is an interesting point to say that these entities, the registries and registrars have aspect of their contract, have provisions in their contract that they may not

necessarily wish to hang in that contract but they're there because they are derived from consensus policies, that they come from ICANN stakeholders and they're agreed by ICANN stakeholders as a whole.

Now you can imagine it's a fairly messy process. The GNSO is often very publically and very openly criticized for very messy policy development process and I hope that you can understand after seeing that really complex slide of the various interests involved in the GNSO and how those are represented in the corporate structure.

This is by no means an easy process. We have a number of entities and interests within the GNSO whose interests simply do not align. So engaging in the development of consensus policy is never an easy thing. The frontline of that, the trench of that of course is the working group and you will each experience that at some point.

The challenge is the difficulties of developing policy and coming to an agreement on consensus policy with the various input phases from the broader community with the various interests in the GNSO. I'm not entirely sure, I think it's a bit unreasonable that the community expects the PDP to be easy and pain free.

I don't think given the structure of the GNSO, I don't think it possibly could. So you'll see in our next slide we have this idea of what can be within consensus policy. What is consensus policy? And the policy, the restrictions around the policy that come again from the bylaws require that consensus policy cannot unreasonably restrain competition, a very basic legal requirement of, be it one difficult to interpret.

And you'll see here three sub-points as to the substance of the DNS, of the business of names and their use in the DNS and their operation by registries and registrars. The challenge here, there's always a debate as to whether we

show this language in a presentation like this. And I'm in favor of showing this language because it is complicated.

Your interpretation of uniform or coordinated resolution and what's necessary to facilitate interoperability what's necessary to facilitate technical reliability even what is technical reliability, your interpretation which may be different from mine which may be different from someone else's. And that is indeed the challenge of what we do, is that it's not always very clear whether something is the subject matter of consensus policy, whether it's appropriately within the scope of consensus policy.

So I like this complex language if only to demonstrate the challenges that you will see in a working group. There will be times where we all stop and take stock and say, is this appropriately part of consensus policy. Will this lead to consensus policy? And that gives us the idea of the picket fence.

The things that are within scope are within the picket fence. The things that are outside of scope are outside of the picket fence. I hope that helps in explaining the concept at least giving you an idea of what the concept is. I'll give you a very quick example. It's not easy to give an example of a picket fence only because you'll end up with a controversial topic.

But what I'll say is this. There were many things when we developed the policies (unintelligible). There were many things that we said inherently had to do with the functionality of what registries and registrars do. And one of those things that seems to be very clearly within (GULP) has to do with what data can be collected when someone purchases a domain name, when someone purchases a domain name.

We understand that as clearly within the picket fence. One of the things that receives a lot of publicity particularly in international media about ICANN and (question) and folks that aren't involved in the ICANN community is this idea

of content. Content on a Web site has always broadly understood to be outside of the picket fence. It's not part of ICANN's mandate.

So we can't have regulations inside a contract that or let's say to the extent that we have some sort of provision within a contract of a registry or a registrar and they go to content, there are some in the ICANN community that thinks that should be considered within the picket fence, that they read that complicated language that I showed you very clearly. And very clearly that content falls within the scope of one, two or three.

And then there are others within the ICANN community that say absolutely not. It's clear to me that the content of a Web site has nothing to do with one, two or three and therefore is not consensus policy and we can't as a community require that registries and registrars include that in their contracts.

I offer that as a complex, very messy, very uncomfortable example but hopefully by picking one of the worst, we give you some idea of the challenges faced in the picket fence. By no means if the picket fence clear, I think is what I'd like to illustrate to you in that example.

So let's talk now about working group guidelines and how working groups get things down. When we consider the broad aim of a working group, across the working group plays a critical goal in that policy development process. The PDP, the working group is actually the mechanism in how we come about achieving those recommendations and pass them onto Council.

The objective of the GNSO working group is guidelines which is separate documentation is to facilitate the work of the working group, is to try to make them effective, is to try to make them functional. And those working group guidelines which we'll give you a link to at the end of today's presentation and I encourage you to have a look at them deal with some topics that you think are very likely topics to be dealt with in such a document.

So we have the roles and responsibilities of various, of various aspects of the working group. We'll have comments in the guidelines about Chair and sub Chair of a working group and what their role is. And we see descriptions about sub-teams. As our PDP's become increasingly complex and perhaps have multiple parts or multiple issues to tackle, we may have sub-teams within our working group and how briefings take place, what happens if the working group requires some input from an external source, how to go about achieving that, achieving that advice.

Integrity is a big aspect of the working group's guidelines. It seems perhaps to many of us fairly self-explanatory what happens in a working group and how we should behave. But it's important to remember that ICANN is a multi-cultural organization. We're a global organization and there are aspects of culture and professional behavior that differ across the various cultures of the world.

ICANN sets as a baseline this idea of integrity that we have respect for everyone within a working group that we listen effectively. That we engage in appropriate behavior. We not engage in negative or disparaging behavior and discourage participation in the ICANN environment. These things are very important to what we do so hence you'll notice in meetings within the GNSO we remind ourselves of the, of our, the expectations that, if you like, of how we're meant to conduct ourselves in GNSO working groups and within Council as well.

Of course methodology is an important aspect, how do we move through various steps within the working group. That's very helpful in that it gives us a bit of a template for how we go about our work. There's information about appeals processes to the extent that there are different findings, minority opinions, decisions that are taken are there ways to reconsider those decisions.

And again, this idea of respectful behavior. From a personal perspective, as someone who's chaired working groups, I'll offer a few comments here and say three things that I suppose drive me crazy. The big one is folks who join a working group and then disappear. They may enter with lots of enthusiasm. They'll approach you in an ICANN meeting or perhaps by remotely by the phone or AC or the internet.

And are very keen to participate and then will tell us the folks that they're on a working group and you'll never see them. And that's a challenge for everyone involved. It's a challenge because to the extent that that person is meant to be representing some other community, that community is effectively unrepresented in the process and that's a breakdown in the process.

Secondly, of course, PDP working groups are there to get work done and to the extent we have someone claiming to be a member and not doing work then that's of course very challenging to everyone in the group. Negative behavior, there are sort of (unintelligible) in the background that aren't pleasant, aren't professional, polite and this sort of thing. That's never very helpful. It's not helpful in our day to day jobs and you can imagine it's particularly unhelpful in a remote environment without context within ICANN.

I think those are my two biggest (unintelligible) about working groups. Use common sense. I think that's really the best way to approach it. And this is really important when say we come to a final report, there may well be in that final report a minority opinion or a multi-minority view that are articulated.

There is of course an opportunity to do that and we describe our levels of support, the responsibility from managing, determining the level of support for particular concepts or decisions within the working group's work by these terminologies that you see here on the slides. Full consensus, consensus, strong support but significant opposition, divergence and minority view.

And I think the best way to describe these things is not so much in a vacuum but to see it happen. If you're early in a stage in a working group, you're probably not at a point of seeing this yet but you will come across this terminology and I'm afraid it's one of those things you tend to know it when you see it - what is strong support but significant opposition.

Again, there's no hard and fast definitions for these terms. We know that they exist. We use them frequently. And you'll come across them. And I'll make a point at the end about what to do if you're not sure what to do beginning with this slide here about additional tips. So I saw the question in the chat and thank you very much if it was Marika or Nathalie who are always absolutely fantastic at maintaining the backend of a presentation.

The acronym helps. So in ICANN I think it's possible to say an entire sentence with perhaps one or two words that aren't acronyms and the rest are acronyms. So use the acronym helper. It's on the GNSO home page. Unfortunately you may be disgruntled about the acronyms now but in a month or two, you'll be speaking in acronyms as well.

So somehow it always happens that we initiate new people into acronyms rather than them initiating us out of acronyms. A little more about ICANN generally. I can't say enough about ICANN Learn. You'll see the platform here, the URL. And there's a particular program within ICANN Learn called GNSO Learn.

I've gone through the GNSO Learn platform myself and found it illuminating about a community that I've been involved with for some time. And I encourage you to do both of those. It's very easy to do in your spare time. They take up very little bandwidth and you'll find things in there, little bits of information that are just much more detailed that we can get into here.

I encourage you to find a buddy. Find a buddy. Find a mentor. You know, sadly in ICANN these things don't happen when we have to have dedicated

programs for how this works within the GNSO. Unfortunately we find that the best programs tend to work organically. Please don't be afraid to approach someone whether it's in the Adobe chatroom and say well, you'll have a lot to say and you're really confident in a working group. I'd really like to know how to have that confidence.

Please do that. By all means, contact me. I'm very happy to do so, to talk to you, to give you whatever tips I can. I absolutely do not know everything that there is to know about the GNSO or the, or the ICANN environment. Slowly but surely I'm getting to know some of the people who do and my advice to you is ICANN staff know just about everything.

(Qwen) and her team and Marika and her team in GNSO, just amazing people. And I think, you know, I've asked a number of stupid questions over the years and I encourage you to take that opportunity. And (SOI) is another acronym we use. And you see the reference here on additional tips. Look up other working group members, statement of interest.

So we're required within the ICANN community to fill out a statement of interest and that essentially says, you know, what are you interested in? Or let's say, who are you interested in? Are you employed by a particular body? Are you paid by someone to engage in ICANN activities that gives you an idea of their personal and professional and financial interest in what they're doing? And that can be illuminating in terms of the comments in an ICANN environment.

Sometimes you'll hear someone say, you know, I'm speaking in my personal capacity rather than in the capacity of my employer. That's what that's referring to. All working groups will have a mailing list. Nathalie has covered the nuts and bolts of mailing lists and how to be engaged in the working group. And I encourage you again, if you haven't attended that presentation, by all means please do.

I am the poster child for jet lag. And I live in Tasmania which is a remote part of Australia. And so I'm really the champion for this business of be respectful of time zones and understand that we're a global organization and that meetings can't always happen in your time zone, wherever your time zone is. It's not at all uncommon unfortunately. It's the nature of what we do that meetings will happen outside of business hours or even uncomfortable hours.

I think the key to us as a global organization is making sure that they don't always happen in uncomfortable hours in the same time zone, that we all share the burden of being a global organization. Nathalie's given you the links here for the expected standards of behavior and again, I can't give you enough plugs for engaging with ICANN staff. They're really the most helpful resource that you have.

And I'm very happy to be a resource for you too. A list here of reference documents. And that gives you an idea of where to go find some of the information that's been referred to today. We have some further readings for you. Again, I point you to ICANN Learn. It's really a fantastic resource.

And with that, given the time, I'm afraid we'll have to close but as Nathalie says, the slides will be made available. Please do send your questions. Nathalie or Glen or Marika or I, we'll make sure that your questions gets answered and that will also get you into the habit of sending your questions on. And you'll see how friendly the answer is when it comes back.

So thank you very, very much for joining. Thank you very much to Nathalie for helping to run the backend of the presentation. You always do a fantastic job. Good luck to you in your working groups. I look forward to seeing many if not all of you in Morocco. Have a safe trip to Morocco and by all means, please come up and introduce yourself in Morocco in in an AEC chatroom and anything I can do, please let me know.

Thanks very much everyone. Have a lovely day. Bye now.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks very much all for attending. This concludes today's call. Operator, you may now stop the recording. Goodbye everyone.

Woman: Thanks Nathalie.

END