
MARRAKECH – At-Large Capacity Building Workshop – An Introduction to Policy Development at ICANN
Tuesday, June 25, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

JOANNA KULESZA: My name is Joanna Kulesza, the Capacity Building Working Group co-chair together with Alfredo, who could not join us during this meeting.

The agenda for today is first to give you a brief introduction of how policy development works. I have here during this panel with me today Jonathan Zuck who's co-responsible for policy development. He'll give us a brief introduction into all the different ways in which policy gets made within At-Large.

Just to give you a little bit more background, or at least information on where to find that background, Evin has kindly agreed to give you a very brief presentation, just a few slides on when to find the resources that have been developed thus far. So we will look into the Wiki, we will look into all the pages where At-Large policy processes and results are being presented, and then we have two case studies just to tell you about the most contentious issues that are being discussed by the community right now. We have two excellent speakers, At-Large outreach into working groups. It's Holly and Justine who will introduce the topics as we move on. I don't want to take up too much time.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

We have reserved roughly half an hour for discussion, so we are very much looking forward to your comments and questions. The suggested way to proceed is for us to have the presentations or the discussion points presented first. Please kindly note your questions and we will be happy to take those at the end of the presentations. The agenda is available on the screen behind me on the website. The presentations that will accompany our speakers are also available on that website right there.

And do keep in mind this is an At-Large meeting, so you might need your headphones as we do speak all the ICANN languages in this room.

Without further ado, I'm happy to give the floor to Jonathan Zuck, codirecting our policy development work here within At-Large. Jonathan, the floor is yours.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Just one small clarification. Joanna said that I was responsible for policy development in the At-Large. I'm not sure that I'm ready to take that on my shoulders. In fact, what I'd like to do is begin by talking about the growing problem of trash accumulating in the oceans, if that's alright with everybody. Because I didn't think agendas were relevant, so I thought I'd just bring up something random.

But ICANN policy development, how to get on board? This is a topic that can be discussed quickly or slowly in a lot of different ways, and I wanted to – I'll say that policy development – I guess go to the next slide – is a bit like a train. Maybe this isn't quite a fair analogy. Maybe go to the next slide.

It's a little bit slower train, I guess, than the previous one, but it's sort of the way that policy development works inside of ICANN. So there are two main ways that something can get initiated inside of ICANN. One is by the GNSO, or the Generic Name Supporting Organization. I've said the acronym so many times I've forgotten it. They can initiate a policy development process.

Or under a much more rare circumstance, the board itself can start something called a cross-community working group. That's their method of getting a process of policy development started. But it's far less frequent and in many respects outside the norm for a reason. The GNSO policy is supposed to be – [inaudible] policy is supposed to be generated through the GNSO.

But when we've had really big issues to discuss, like an accountability framework for ICANN as part of its transition for example, that was done through the CCWG just to make it more obvious that everyone was included and everyone could participate on equal footing, the board might create its own group.

But more often than not, what will happen is that the GNSO will launch initially into a policy plan. So if we think about it – next slide – there's a lot of different stops along the route for the train. There's a lot of opportunities to get on the train as it's developing policy.

And it starts at GNSO council. Next slide. The first stop very often is the staff, where the staff are asked to create something called an issue report. They go out and try to understand what the scope of the problem is, what the reality of the problem is, and that's often done via consultation with the community, reaching out to various groups, doing some polling, doing some research, etc. So that's one opportunity at the very ground level to be engaged in ICANN policy development, is to be engaged in a conversation with the staff to help them understand, who in turn are trying to help the GNSO council understand the scope of the problem and how many people are kind of suffering from it, etc. so that that forms the basis, the definition of the problem, if you will, that then is intended to be solved in the next phase.

So once that issue report is received, the GNSO council decides, okay, this looks like a big enough problem, we're going to go ahead – next slide – and launch a policy development process working group.

So the idea here is that I'm going to form a little subcommittee whose job it is to go solve this problem and make recommendations back to the agenda so council. So that's what a PDP is, a policy development process. And right now the very nature of how those working groups should do their job is being discussed inside the GNSO with something they call PDP 3.0 and we'll be hearing about that periodically from Cheryl, our liaison to the GNSO council. But they're trying to figure out what the best processes overall going forward.

But that results in an open call for participation. So even though we're not in the GNSO, there's nothing preventing us from twisting the arms of some of our fellows here to go and participate on that work group. And so that happens with some frequency.

For example, Cheryl is on the subsequent procedures. Working Group that was initiated by the GNSO, and has somehow chairing that working group too. So there wasn't really any ceiling that was keeping an At-Large representative from playing a very significant role in that working group. And it's a fairly substantial commitment of time. It varies from group to group. Usually the GNSO will try to manage expectations and let people know what that level of commitment is, but it's a series of meetings. Most often these meetings are taking place here at ICANN meetings

and then a series of phone calls that will take place to discuss these issues, propose solutions that will then result in recommendations back to the GNSO council. So that's the first stop at which you can board this policy development train. Next slide.

The next stop on the train is a public comment. So generally speaking, when a PDP working group reaches what it believes are a good set of findings and recommendations to give back to the GNSO council, they'll then put out questions to the public. In other instances they may even put some questions out to the public before they begin. So both of those are possible. But the most frequent thing is that at the end, they'll say, "Here's what we found and here's what we think will fix the problem. What do you think?"

So this is the most popular place to board the train for folks that are not regularly engaged in ICANN policy development. So you'll often just see corporations or trade associations sort of from the "outside world" that see this policy is affecting them and then they'll choose that opportunity to submit comments.

Ironically, it's also the case that groups that are involved in the PDP development process submit comments as well, which is funny because you would think that most of those comments would have made their way into the process in the first place. So

it gets to be an interesting dynamic where you'll have members of the Business Constituency or members of the At Large that have participated in the PDP process, and then we still are producing a comment to submit as part of the public comment process.

So there can be some benefit for that in that now that we've had a chance to look at the overall package, you know, here's some viewpoints on it or reprioritization, etc. but really –and Cheryl, back me up on this –the best place is from within that working group to make that case, which is why I continue to believe it's imperative for us to try and reach consensus and send our representatives into those working groups with things we want them to come away with. Here's ten things we're going to be working on, here's the to that end users care about, and here's the outcome that we want. Go in and just talk about those two things. And I think that that's the process that we want to try and engage in most often, but we have this ability to comment

And not only do organizations have the ability to comment during these public comment processes, but more often than not, individuals are more than willing, more than able to comment as well. So if you have a view that you think is divergent from the consensus position of the At Large, which is perfectly reasonable to have happen, then this is another opportunity for you to make

those views heard by a broader audience, is by participating in these public comment processes. Next slide.

So then the next step is that the the working group takes on those comments and analyzes them. If something interesting comes out of them, they'll incorporate some changes into the recommendations that they've made and ultimately produce a final report, which is handed over to the board as a recommendation for policy.

And in almost every instance, the board will in fact turn that final set of recommendations around and do another round of public comments. So there's another bite at the apple, as we say in English sometimes, because I made comments, they made some changes based on my comments, but not all of them, or they misunderstood them and their rationale was flawed, etc., there's a way to go back in when the board is trying to consider this policy and help inform their decision whether to accept these recommendations.

Now, that said, ideally the board's job is only to evaluate whether the process of policy development was here to. I think what we really want to do is in every instance that we can, avoid putting the board in the position of having to split the difference or resolve conflicts that the community is unable to resolve itself. From the Bible, Solomon splitting the baby. The people that are

most likely to come up with the best answer is the community, not the board.

So when we give them an unresolved question and say “Here, you decide,” then that's really abdicating our responsibility to reach consensus policy within the ICANN community so that the board’s physician can simply be, “Were all voices heard? Was the process followed? Etc. Is the integrity of the organization still preserved as a result of this process?” That should be their criteria for accepting those recommendations, not the substance of them, if it can be avoided.

But board public comment is another opportunity to engage, and so sometimes the At Large is engaged in this process, sometimes because we believe the process wasn't well performed. So we've had conversations about the EPDP and other areas in which we believe that our voice and the message that we were trying to deliver was not taken into consideration for one reason or another. Whether it is the chair, whether time ran out, whatever that may be, this is the time to bring up those kinds of topics that says, well, this process was flawed, and here's why we think so, or why things should be taken back for consideration.

Ideally, that would bump things back to the GNSO council, not asking, again, the board to overrule or make its own ruling in this particular case. And then finally, next slide, We're in a special

position where if we want to, we can just drop in advice from nowhere. We can just float advice down out of the ether into the middle of any process and advise the board. And ironically, that's what we're established to do.

But as you now understand the process – and I don't know how many folks here don't already understand the process. For everyone who does, I apologize for boring you with this presentation. But for everyone that understands the process you can easily see why participation in the course of the process is ideal, rather than dropping advice at the end, and that's something that has plagued the Government Advisory Committee for many, many years because they would wait until this entire discussion had completed both inside the working group and amongst the public, and then advise the board on what they thought about it.

And so then they kept themselves out of the development process, but, in so doing, keep the community out of the resolution process by waiting until the very end to make their voice heard. And the GAC has actually gone a long way toward trying to engage earlier in the process, and I think that that's wise on their part and equally wise on our part to use these other earlier opportunities, whenever possible, to engage in the process of ICANN policy development.

So I have two minutes I guess if anybody has a quick question or clarification. Otherwise, we should move on. Yes, sir.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Just a comment quickly. Thanks a lot for that. And in terms of your first stops of the train, of course, GNSO policy and also top down board policy, but now we have this interesting way to do things, which is really GNSO policy, but you have Cheryl in charge there in PDP and then you have something like were tracked five with a cross community type of leadership, which feels like a cross community type of working group, even though it's not. So it covers the bases and it's a great way of doing things without having this top down board type of thing. So it's good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Javier.

JOANNA KULESZA: Great. Thank you, Javier. [Javier is] involved in the Work Track 5 working group, so that's experience speaking. Thank you, John, for that insightful introduction. I know you hate process, so thank you for taking the time to explain how the process works, because it does tend to have tangible outcomes, and John was very specific in explaining how that works. Jonathan co-leads the

Consolidated Policy Working Group, so it's not his personal responsibility.

Now for a very brief intro into the Wiki that we have. Over to Evin just to give you a little bit of a background on the procedures, not topics but procedures that Holly and Justine will be discussing in the further parts. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you. This is Evin Erdogdu, and I'm policy development senior coordinator for ALAC and At-Large, so staff support. We just thought it would be useful to show everyone in the room where to find At-Large and ALAC resources related to policy development. So first, I'll show you the At-Large website. It should load on the screen there shortly.

So this is the main page of the At-Large website, and if you go to the top, there are two sections. You can either go to policy – well, actually, let's go ahead and go there first. And this brings you to a page where you can search for all policy comments and advice that have been created by the ALAC and At-Large over the years, so that's over ten years. And there's a very handy search filter.

To the right, it shows you all that's in progress currently, and then the most recent ones that were ratified by the ALAC. But to the left, if you'd like to search for specific keywords for a statement or

a specific penholder, someone that's drafted a statement, or frequent topics that the ALAC comments on, you can select the boxes and it'll automatically sort them. So then the results will come up immediately there.

So this is very handy if you're interested in a certain topic or you're interested in ALAC's stances on policy in the past. And that's our main database there. Oh, I should show you one more thing. If you go to a statement for instance that's been recently ratified, for instance evolving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, you can see at the top here the topic it's related to, the penholders that drafted it, the background of it, and then the document itself, which you can download and then you can review, and you can also see the work process, and this links to the Wiki workspace, which is what I'll show you just in a moment.

So going back to the agenda, and this is all linked to the agenda, so if you'd like to follow with me, you're more than welcome to. And then the At-Large policy advice development page. So this is the main Wiki workspace where a lot of our work gets done by the community, and this is the multi-stakeholder advice development graphic, and it shows if you click on it the advisory committees' role in the policy development process at ICANN, and ALAC is there on the left.

Jonathan just provided a nice little overview, but this is also a nice little infographic you can share over social media or just have as a reference for yourself. And then scrolling down, there are some historical documents that you can look at for just getting started. The ICANN website itself has a public comment page where they publish all public comments and it'll show you when it opens and when it closes.

And what I do on the staff side for At-Large specifically is create pages here on the Wiki space so that the At-Large community can reference each comment and see laid out on the table who's the staff contact for this, when does it close, and just have links to any resources. Let me see. Okay, and there's also an At-Large document reference system, which is just handy to know how we title documents and how they're stored.

Each submitted statement has an ALAC code on it, which is usually dated by month and year that it's submitted, and there are several quick links you can go to. This initial page shows all open policy comments and advice, but you can also go to 2017, 2010 through 2016, 2018 and 2019 if you'd like to get a specific year, and then we also have a specific page for the EPDP.

But right now, for instance, it's showing all the comments, and there are quite a few that came out recently, just before this meeting, that the ALAC have not yet decided if they would like to

comment on. So those are marked as to be confirmed, the TBC gray. But there are others that they have decided they'd like to comment on or develop advice for, and those are currently in drafting mode. And the CPWG, the Consolidated Policy Working Group discusses these every week.

You can also scroll down and see recently closed policy comments and advice, whether they're submitted or adopted. Just a quick note, if they're submitted, sometimes outside of the formal ICANN public comment process, there are certain community groups that are working on things internally and just want informal feedback. So sometimes the ALAC will also provide informal feedback. But otherwise, to an ICANN public comment, they will submit something formally and also launch a ratification vote for all of the ALAC to approve of this statement.

You can review from each page if, again, we go to multi-stakeholder model, you can see on here the workflow and resources that went into developing this statement. So there were references. For instance we had both Greg and Marita present on this multiple times throughout the Consolidated Policy Working Group meetings, and so you can see their presentations here.

You can also see the brief overview from ICANN itself, a background on this topic, and then these are the drafts, the

versions that were submitted, with the most recent one, that was submitted, the final version at the top for reference.

And then oftentimes – if we scroll a little further down the comment section – we’ll also have many comments from the community, for instance, that are taken into account when developing this statement. So it’s a great resource to show what went into developing this statement and the bottom-up multi-stakeholder process behind this.

Also, every statement has a cover letter which shows the workflow – so I can just click on this and it should pop up – and it gives background. This has the bar code at the top right showing the statement, whether or not it’s ratified, and then the dates and what happened behind the drafting of this statement. And then afterwards, you can see the statement itself.

So that’s just a basic overview, and if you have any questions or if anything is difficult to find, please don’t hesitate to contact staff and let us know how to improve this process. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Perfect. Thank you very much, Evin. So the rule of thumb is that if you find one of the themes that you find interesting, you want to get involved and you want to work on, either as a penholder or supporting the penholder, reach out to us, either to Jonathan,

Olivier, the staff or myself, and we'll be happy to get you more involved if you know that there's something you feel passionate about.

Speaking about passionate, people, we have two lovely ladies here who feel very passionate about two specific procedures as opposed to topics. So this is just to give you an example of the issues that are being tackled right now. The way to do it has been described by Jonathan. The background to all of those narratives and stories, you can find on the website.

And just to show you what is the actual policy work that is being done, we have with us Justine Chew and Holly Raiche. We will start off with Justine Chew who will give us a brief introduction into what is called SubPro. But I'm not going to explain what SubPro is, I'm just going to swiftly hand over to Justine, who'll try to explain what that is to the newcomers in the room. And to those advanced in policymaking, will try to explain where we stand, what are the challenges, and how we could use your help in that discussion. I hope I'm not putting words into your mouth, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: I can clarify [inaudible].

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, please. Thank you so much, Justine. Over to you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Joanna. I'm from APRALO, Asia Pacific region. I'm an individual member of that region, but I'm also an active member of the Consolidated Policy Working Group, the CPWG.

I've been asked to speak on my experiences with drafting policy statements, because I've done quite a few – lost count – but I'm going to touch on two particular ones, which is related to the area that I'm very active in, which is subsequent procedures.

Just briefly, for the benefit of people who do not know what subsequent procedures is, or short form is SubPro, so when you hear people say SubPro, it means subsequent procedures.

Basically, subsequent procedures is the set of rules and procedures that is meant to apply to the new round of new gTLD applications, which by the way haven't opened yet because the policy development process for that particular round is still in progress, and I'm going to be talking about how ALAC and At-Large has been involved in that through policy statement development. Next slide.

Thankfully, Jonathan has covered some bits of it, and Evin has too, so I can jump into the sexy stuff. I don't know if it's sexy, but

... So I'm going to be touching on participation challenges, the approach and mechanics for actual policy advice development, and using the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group – my experience on that [as] a case study.

I've already spoken about subsequent procedures. You see the three little dots at the bottom, the four dots I think. We've actually produced three statements in this area of SubPro, but I will be sort of flying through one and going into more substantively in the second one. And I'm not going to touch on the third one, because this one's got to do with Work Track 5. Next slide, please.

Okay, so we've gone through what ICANN public comment is. That's the URL link at the bottom if you want to find this page. Next slide, please.

Evin has touched on this. That's the URL link to get to this particular ICANN public comment opportunities webpage. Next slide, please.

Okay, so just a few points about participation challenges. I've heard people who are eager, they want to get involved, but they always say they don't know how, and from my experience, it's more or less you just jump into it.

You really need to just jump into it. You can't wait for – you'd be lucky if you get a mentor. You can try and find one, but I would

suggest that you actually just jump into it and just find your way around, because that's the way to do it, because you'll be forced to do things that you need to do, rather than waiting for somebody to tell you what to do. But I will touch on how I approach what I've done with SubPro for At-Large.

In terms of newcomers, where to start, I would suggest that if you have – you really ought to have interest, passion, and preferably knowledge, because without any of those, you're possibly not going to get very into things, you'll just be sort of hovering on the peripheral. And if that's what you're comfortable with, then that's fine, but we would encourage people to actually get involved, get their hands dirty to experience what it is to speak on behalf of the interest of end users. This is what it's about. It's part of what it's about, to have a role in At-Large.

The next thing you could do is have a look at the working groups that are available, the working groups set up through ICANN. There are numerous, a huge number of them, and most of them run simultaneously. So I would really suggest that you go and understand what the charter is for each of the working groups, and then pick one that you think the charter matches your interest and your passion, because I can tell you for a fact that I was on two PDP working groups – I still am – but I've had to drop

off one because of the load that I'm taking on for SubPro. So I would really suggest that you pick and choose and focus on one.

And even with SubPro, because we cover such a huge array of topics, the other thing you could possibly do is also look at the topics as covered by SubPro as an example, look at the topics that are covered by a particular working group, and then if you see one or two topics that you're particularly interested in, then join at that time or join the calls at that time.

The staff for the working groups typically publish agendas ahead of time, so you'll know when certain topics come up for discussion through the working group. So that's your cue to join if a particular topic interests you.

There is no way around the need to read. I can tell you for a fact that if you're not going to spend a little bit of time reading, you're going to be lost. It's the fact of the matter.

This is my bible for SubPro. This is only part of it. This is the AGB. If you're in SubPro and you haven't read the AGB, then I'm sorry, you're not really in SubPro.

HOLLY RAICHE:

What does AGB stand for?

JUSTINE CHEW: Applicant guidebook. Thank you, Holly. Sorry, we have a tendency to use acronyms. So yeah, please interrupt me by all names. AGB stands for applicant guidebook, that's the embodiment of the rules and procedures, or most of it anyway, that applies to applications for new gTLDs.

As I said, after you read, listen in, and then read some more, because if you're going to be constructive in the way you're going to contribute, then you need to be prepared for meetings, you need to be prepared for calls. If I miss a call, I spend time actually listening to recordings so that I can catch up what I've missed. I'm not suggesting that you need to do for every call, but I'm the liaisons for subsequent procedures for At-Large, so it's my job to know what's going on in subsequent procedures so I can report back to At-Large what's going on.

And the last one is if you can find a mentor, by all means do. It will help.

Once you become a more regular participant, you need to watch out for things like – at the end of the day, we're all volunteers, so we've got time commitments, and some of them are probably close to burnout. So you have to watch yourself, pace yourself. I'm doing a bad job of it.

But the thing is if there's more of us doing these things, then there's more hands on deck, more people to share the load. And sometimes there's also ability to go and create small little focus groups where you can talk to people who are in the know about certain things.

Once you become regular and you're comfortable, then we would hope that you would step up and it's not leading certain discussions, building consensus, and then writing actual statements or volunteering to write or co-write, what we call penhold or co-penhold statements.

My experience is a lot of the work that I do is through the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group, CPWG. I'm going to have to fly through. Next slide, please.

I thought it was important to spend a bit more time on the challenges just to make you aware of what it involves. So moving on to the actual process for policy advice development in ALAC. Next slide, please.

Evin's covered this cute littler – what I call MAD graphic, multi-stakeholder advice development. That's my term of endearment for this MAD graphic. So I'm not going to touch on it –

JONATHAN ZUCK: This quite literally puts the At-Large in a box. that we don't need to be in.

JUSTINE CHEW: Next slide, please. So just pulling out the column that relates to ALAC and At-Large, and putting it in context with the Consolidated Policy Working Group – okay, I'm going to start using acronyms, otherwise I'll run out of time. CPWG.

So a lot of the policy discussions and deliberations that result in a statement – or not – is [inaudible] CPWG. Next slide, please.

Typically, we would follow a nine-step process, and this is available on the ICANN At-Large website. The URL is at the bottom. I'm not going to – you can read what the nine steps entails, I'm going to – next slide, please – be touching on certain parts of this process relating to what I've done, so I can show you, you can try to visualize what it means. Next slide, please.

Okay, the first thing that we look at is when a public comment comes up for public comment, for comment. We look at it – typically, we have volunteers that will look at it, and we have to decide whether At-Large or ALAC should produce a statement to address that or to submit for them through the public comment process.

The first thing you need to do is figure out whether there is a necessity for this advice. And when I say necessity, we're talking about, does this topic or area actually impact the interest of Internet end users? Because if it doesn't, then we're not going to waste our time and our scarce resources on something that doesn't affect our remit.

So if the answer to the question is yes, then we have to figure out how those interests are impacted, whether it's positively or negatively, because then we can start looking at creating policy inputs that will either strengthen the positive aspects of prevent or lessen the negative impact. So that's how you would approach a particular public comment.

And sometimes, we come across a topic that may have such a grave impact that we would consider advocating our position beyond just submitting an advice through public comment. So for example, ALAC advice to the board. Now, if the answer to the question is no, then as I said, we just forget it and move on to the next thing. On that note, can I have the next slide, please?

So I'll come to the mechanics of the ALAC policy advice. Who volunteers as penholders, or who should volunteer as penholders? Ideally, these are the people who are At-Large community members who have preferably relevant knowledge, expertise, or experiences are already active members of relevant

working groups, will spend time reading associated materials, supporting documents, [inaudible] statements and the repository for [inaudible] statements has already been pointed out to you by Evin.

And then from that, you need to understand what are the issues as they relate to end users. Preferably, the volunteers for penholders should also be strong communicators, because they have to present things that are going to go into the statement, and they actually have to end up writing it.

And often, but not necessarily, they come from amongst the ALAC members or ALAC appointees, At-Large leaders or liaisons, and depending on the workload, this volunteer could act singularly – I have done that – or they could work in small teams. Why? Because of what penholders are expected to do, which is in turn dependent on workload. Next.

Okay, so what do penholders actually do? As I said, prior to drafting any statement, you have to identify the issues as they relate to need users. And then you have to, where possible, present arguments or points raised or identified by other parts of ICANN community, or those that are in the relevant fora, and then solicit inputs from At-Large members – and we utilize a number of tools for that, including mailing lists, weekly CPWG calls, Google docs.

And from the input, then we look at developing positions, then we present those positions to solicit feedback, at the same time hopefully establishing consensus for some of these positions, the new start drafting a statement. Next, please.

Okay, so what happens after a draft statement is published, we would typically put it out for call for comment, then people will kind of proof read and see if there's anything missing that they would like to see in the statement, and again, try to establish consensus for positions that did not enjoy consensus before, so sort of maneuvering to see whether we can come back and produce a statement with one voice rather than one statement with a couple of, “Yeah, maybe this group prefers this or this group prefers that,” because it’s always stronger to have a united voice and a single statement rather than two positions in a statement. And you just go to as many rounds as time permits for you to come to the statement.

Next. Okay, so I think what I'll do is I'll jump on to the second – remember I said I was going to touch on two examples. I think because of time constraints, I'm just going to speak on one. Can you just keep scrolling until I tell you to stop, please?

Okay, this is all about SubPro. I think you probably know SubPro by now. Just to say that we had over 40 topics to consider in SubPro.

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible]

JUSTINE CHEW: No, not yet. The second example is the [inaudible]. You stopped my train of thought. Stop here, okay. So as I said, SubPro covers over 40 topics, so you can imagine the breadth of topics that we've had to discuss. The working group has been working since February 2016, so it's been more than three years that it's been going on, and at some point in time, in 2018 and one early this year, the working group produced initial reports. One initial report and one supplemental initial report, and once another supplemental initial report on Work Track 5. So there's three. I'm going to be touching on the second one. Next slide, please.

Okay, so this was the webpage for the public comments call initiated by GNSO. Next slide, please.

And once a call is put out, then At-Large staff would create a Wiki page, so this is the Wiki page that relates to that particular call, and you can see that basically, staff puts in all the pertinent information. So this is a good place to get started, so to speak, if you want background information and list of documents to read if you want to participate in the At-Large process. Next slide, please.

Okay, so that's just a bit more magnifying into the same page. Next slide, please.

Okay, so what I did was – I was the sole penholder for this particular statement, because it covered only five additional topics, so it was manageable in that respect. So what I did was exactly what I described earlier, I looked at the supplemental initial report, and based on that, I pulled out the pertinent points that I thought had end user impact that At-Large would want to comment on, and I basically created a presentation in order to present those points to CPWG calls. Next slide, please.

So yeah, that's my little cover page for my presentation. Next slide, please.

This is an example of what I think that – you pick out the key policy issues in a particular initial report or report that's out for public comment, and then you try to distill the issues that you want feedback on from CPWG or At-Large members [through] CPWG.

In this particular instance, the supplemental report, as I said, it touched on five topics. So these are the five topics, and as you note, as I said before, you of course have to ask whether there is an end user angle to any of these topics.

For this one, we didn't comment on the registrar support for new gTLDs, the one in blue, because we didn't think that that had a direct impact on end users. So we looked through the other four. Next slide, please.

Okay, so this goes down into pulling out the topics for one of the topics, pulling out the points from [one of the] topics. Next slide, please.

Okay, so delving a bit more. Next slide, please.

Again, there's a fine balance in terms of needing to provide sufficient information for people to digest, because you'll have to assume that some people don't read the reports, and they will rely on you for questions that you want answered. That's my experience anyway. So this is what I had to resort to. Next slide, please.

Right. After the first round of soliciting inputs on the questions that you've posed, you'll draft a first statement. Next slide, please.

In this case, we used a Google doc to prepare the draft statement. Next slide, please.

And then after the first draft, I had to present what was agreed upon, and as I said, then you take the opportunity to see if you

can get consensus on anything that wasn't agreed upon earlier. So this was my second presentation. Next slide, please.

From here, you can see that I was able to establish or ascertain that we had already reached consensus on certain things. So for example, the top one, auctions, there was no consensus in the first round, but there were consensus on the green topic and the orange topic. So that's great. Next slide, please.

Alright, so this is what I attempted to do to try and get consensus for the auctions topic that didn't have an agreement, proposed statement, and then people would look at it and say, "Okay, maybe we should adopt this," or, "Maybe we should try and propose something else," and then see what the group says, whether they agree with you, whether they still don't agree with you, that sort of thing. Next slide, please.

I think in order to train people's attention to what you're trying to describe, I try to rely on diagrams. This is how I try to get people's attention to come to a consensus position with auctions. Next slide, please.

And then after that, you draft a second statement. Next slide, please.

And you come up with the final statement, which is endorsed by ALAC. Next slide, please.

So in summary, since early 2018, all major policy deliberations under At-Large have been conducted by the CPWG, the approach is typically always the same. You identify, you scope, and then you develop.

The mechanics, again, public comment are typically open for about 40 days, so that's the time period that we have to work with. The number of penholders depends on the size of the workload and whoever wants to volunteer, and use of tools, yes, I've already talked about the Google doc and the Wiki page, and we also have very good staff support from the At-Large staff, Evin in particular, to help us through the process.

I think that's the end of it. Yes. Thank you very much.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you so much, Justine. That was most useful. Yeah, that deserves a round of applause, I think. For anyone who wants more information, first of all, the presentation is available on the website. If you have trouble finding it, just let us know and we will share it. Second of all, I think that's the most thorough presentation of policymaking in At-Large coming from first-hand experience. So Justine has as lot of experience there.

I know we started a bit late. That's why I'm trying not to rush our speakers. We still have half an hour, so if you manage to fit

somewhere between 15 and 20 minutes, that would be perfect, giving us a chance to talk.

HOLLY RAICHE: [I'm willing to be flexible.

JOANNA KULESZA: Wonderful, thank you. And I note that there are questions being raised both in the Zoom room and on the floor. I would like to hear Holly first with the presentation, and then we can get – yes, I have a list so that is noted. I see the questions coming. I'm glad there are questions coming. But I would like to have the presentations first, again, giving us an insight into another area of policymaking within At-Large that Holly has hands-on experience in. And then we will move on to the discussion, which I'm really excited about. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I trust this is my presentation. May I have the second slide, please? The reason I chose competition, consumer trust and consumer choice is that a lot of the issues that we've had to deal with that we're still dealing with, we dealt with some time ago – Jonathan's sitting here remembering when he was chair of the working group – but it's a way of going back and saying

“We've actually said a lot. We actually should remember what we've said, because if we're going to form policy, we don't start with a blank page. we actually start with a lot of policy statements before us. So let's actually go to the next slide.

Now, I want to spend a little bit more time with this because this is the process. This is what we do. Some of this is Evin – and thank you very much, Evin, for talking about this. There's a Wiki page, review for public comment. The decision for whether an ALAC comment is necessary comes from the CPWG when people have actually read some of the material, thought about it, talked about it, and at that point, it's, “Are we going to comment?” And then we call for comments, and at that point, also call for somebody to be a penholder, which is the term we use.

The penholder is the one who actually does the first bit of drafting. I've done the reading, I've identified the issues more fully, and I set out, this is what I think we need to talk about. Now, that's not to say other people should not do the reading themselves and come up with other issues. They'll be resolved in the CPWG meetings, and in fact, Jonathan's done a process I like where you present few dot points and you have a discussion, and that's really the beginning of the process [inaudible] started now.

I have to say prior to Jonathan, this isn't what we did, and possibly what we should have done. But [inaudible] penholder

then, comments are received once you've actually done a bit of drafting, final statement is done – and Justine has spent a good amount of time explaining how that's done. You'll all be familiar with the voting, and then we submit the comment and you've all seen Justine's slides as to what that looks like. So that's sort of the process. Next slide, please.

And I'm really going to absolutely support what Justine said, what's the first thing you do, and it's read, read, and read again. There are always documents you should be reading at the least. There's background documents. If you're familiar with the PDP process, what happens is the staff prepare sort of an issues report, and usually, when it's a GNSO PDP process, you will go on the website, there will be links to background documents that you can read – should read.

And actually, there are two – we should talk about the PDP process, because it's two parts, not one. For the original WHOIS process, there was just a charter working group, “What the hell are we going to do?” And yours truly chaired through that one.

That just means you refine what it is you're going to do in the actual working group, and I also stress you need to listen to Jonathan, [participating] in these groups.

Anyway, if this is ALAC and it's "Read, read, read," you look at the actual PDP page, it will have the issue statement, it will have links to background documents. It's all there, and you really need to read them.

Also – and thank you, Evin – ALAC has said a lot in the past, and we need to either reflect what we've said or find a good reason to say we got it wrong. But we need to look at the policy statements of the past, and what we've said – and then whether we're going to continue to say those things or not – the issues, what are they? And again, this is the sort of CPWG process. You talk about the issues, and after a discussion, you've identified them.

[What are the impact] on end users, because that's the focus. After the decision is made as to whether there's a statement or not, then a penholder actually drafts a statement based on the agreement as to what the issues are and why we've taken a position.

So that's just the beginning of the process, just a way of my saying Justine got it absolutely right. But I'm trying to reinforce what she's saying. Next page, please.

Okay, this is the topic I've chosen, and the reason I've chosen this particular topic that we commented on is it is the precursor to subsequent procedures. A lot of the heartache that we went

through reading, responding to the competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, all those issues were identified very early in the piece, and we mustn't lose sight of them, because a lot of them have not been resolved.

So when we talk about what starts the process, normally, yes it is the GNSO. In this case, this came from what was called the affirmation of commitments, which was the ICANN agreement with the NTIA on the management of IANA. Part of the agreement was – and this is clause 9.3 of the agreement – “The preamble recognizing ICANN will evolve and adapt to fulfill its limited but important role, commits to the following.”

What we committed to in the promotion of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice with the introduction of new gTLDs – and I've just highlighted what's important – will be adequately addressed prior to implementation, and probably the ALAC position was [they weren't.] It will organize a review, which is why this review takes place and why other reviews have taken place, the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted the three elements, competition, consumer trust and consumer choice.

That was, if you will, the mandate of the PDP that had to look at that, and I think the conclusion was we actually haven't

addressed everything that the recommendations were. Next slide, please.

Now this is a screenshot. It's a screenshot simply of where you go in the first place to find documents? You go to the ICANN page, you type in the search function, and up will come the sort of background documents that you need to look at. Certainly in this case, you can bring up all of the documents about consumer trust and the background documents. So that's where your document search has to start. Next page.

This is the page that Evin talked about. We now have on our policy page some very convenient things. We have a list of not only comments, but on the left-hand side, we have a list of topics that we've made comments on, and we've got a search function.

Unfortunately, when you look at the list of topics, Ariel didn't include competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, but if you put those terms in the search function, what we've said comes up. So if you have to find out – which you do – what we've said, this is the second place you need to go, and you need to read what we've said. Next slide, please.

There were three reports on this particular issue as a result of the ICANN agreement with NTIA in terms of the affirmation of commitments. The first was in March 2017. Actually, I'm going to

back up. Leave the slide, but there was a lot of work that happened beforehand and I'm not going to have time to talk about it, but the first thing we had to do was develop metrics. How do you measure competition, consumer trust, consumer choice?

We spent a lot of time on that in ALAC, we came up with some suggestions that Jonathan's probably going to put his nose up, but we won't talk about that. There were a lot of measures, but some of the issues actually are just very difficult to measure. So if you actually read some of the metric stuff, we were not comfortable with the adequacy of the measures. So I haven't put the metrics up there, but that was a first step before the reports. Okay, the next time, please.

Now, there is no way on earth I can possibly list everything that was recommended. In fact, the initial report from the working group had probably close to 60 recommendations.

What was asked for first was better data, and some of that data is in respect of the actual competition, who's out there, how effective are they, and some of the other issues were certainly – some of it was actually, are these new gTLDs being used or not? Are they being what's called parked? I.e. when you go to the website, there's nothing there, or there's only ads there, or

perhaps something is being used for, let's say, nefarious purposes?

There were certainly policy issues. The next slide will show what some of the issues were that we raised. No, go back. Thank you. There were reforms in relation to the transparency of data collection, and in fact, there were some recommendations about the data that should be collected that isn't available. [We kind of liked all three of them.]

There was a particular concern with the fact that ICANN Compliance really did not have adequate data to make judgments about a lot of the topics that were supposed to be raised in terms of the competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. Okay. Next slide.

We looked through the report. A lot of it, we liked. Some of it, we didn't. And although you might say, "Why are we worried about competition?" There were some issues that may have been addressed in competition, but actually impacted on end users. So we focused on the end users based not on the topic but actually the impact.

Our first concern was how on earth do you define consumer trust. This is something that report itself raised as a difficult issue. We had some suggestions for metrics. I'm not convinced they were

terrific metrics. But in the end, we still have to grapple with what you mean by consumer trust.

Now, parked domains. First of all, there was a very interesting divergence in geography. In the Asian region, there was a very high percentage of new gTLDs that were parked, and we suspect that was because it was being treated as a property asset.

In other areas, that was not the case, but parked new gTLDs were an issue because in fact, there was nothing there,. there were ads, or perhaps it was just plain criminal behavior.

There was a lack of data, again, on customer confusion. What on earth were these new gTLDs? And there's just a few sentences in there, probably about page 65 or whatever, that said the expectation of consumers is that there will be a relationship between the new name and what's on the website.

Now that's given rise to a lot of discussion about an issue called PICs, or public interest commitments. What is it that the provider of the new gTLD actually commits to? And that remains an issue. PICs are still an issue.

Another issue we've identified, we're talking about applicants the global south – and there weren't many – and then we actually supported recommendations for further research on parked domains, about how you ascertain consumer choice and trust,

and public interest commitments, which we still talk about. Okay, next slide, please.

There were new sections in the report which we also commented on about the need for more rigorous research on parked domains. There was a lot of discussion about DNS abuse. And if you want to know why Jonathan goes on about DNS abuse, read the additional sections in the November 2017 report. There's a lot of material on why they're necessary and what should happen.

Some discussion on trademark issues, more on parked domains, and suggestions on negotiations to change the agreements with the registries and registrars to prevent specific systemic use by registrars, and particularly their resellers in relation to DNS abuse, and there was an additional – I'm putting Jonathan Zuck's name there because in fact, he recommended this additional requirement for WHOIS information to list publicly the resellers and their association with registrars so that we can identify who the bad guys are.

I've probably got 30 seconds, so we'll have the next slide and I'll be really quick. These were the new sections that we responded to those recommendations, we supported them. We supported particularly the remarks about DNS abuse, and there were several recommendations there, and for an additional requirement for WHOIS information. Next slide, please.

And the final report – and again, I'm not going to go into all of the recommendations. There were 66 of them, but the ones that we're particularly interested in are along the lines that I've discussed up to date, and finally, next slide, because this is what we agreed to, this is what we supported. It was about data-driven, more data about particularly recommendations on understanding consumer choice, realizing we'd have to wait until the GDPR was over, not realizing that was [20 years down the track.]

Consumer trust, safeguards and evaluations. So in fact, it's probably been a three- or four-year process. It's raised a lot of issues, and I would say that probably heading into the new gTLDs [inaudible] subsequent procedures, you should be going back and reading all three reports.

Any questions?

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Holly. I've reserved 15 minutes for questions, so we're good. Thank you very much to both of you, all of you, for those very informative presentations. Just please let me know. The purpose of this exercise is twofold. On one hand, we want to get you more involved.

I've been looking at the audience. I hope this was useful. If you have questions or if you want to reach out directly to us, please feel free to do so. But this is the nitty gritty of policymaking within At-Large, so it is a tedious process, and it comes down to a group of interested individuals doing a lot of reading and then putting that forward.

But the second purpose of this exercise was to ensure what Cherine called this morning effective transparency. So we want to show you how this is done, and this is how we do it. So if any of the newcomers in the room found this tedious or tiring – I've been looking at your faces – I understand that. But this is how we do it.

So it's a group of individuals that actually sit down, do the reading, produce a statement, then there is that group of interested individuals that fight that over – and I'm certain that's something that Holly, Jonathan and Justine will strongly support – and then we come up with a statement, and that is proceeded with a vote.

So that's how we do it. If you want to get involved – and we hope you do – just find your topic, reach out to us, and get ready for all that tedious work that the ladies have been discussing here.

I have a short list here. I've seen Sébastien raising his hand in the Zoom room, if that's still relevant. You were the first one to do so.

Then I have John, and then I have a gentleman at the back of the room. I don't see any other flags raised, but we do have 15 minutes, so I welcome questions and comments.

Thank you very much, Eduardo. I'm adding you to the list. If your flag is still up, Sébastien, in the Zoom room, you have the floor, sir. I would like a timer of two minutes if possible. It's all my fault because we started late, so I realize it's all my fault, and I take responsibility, but I would like to hear back from the room. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Thank you very much for the presentation. When Justine showed us the big folder that she had, very thick folder, Justine, when you showed us the big folder you had, you have to know that you have versions in foreign languages and it's not the final versions [that was translated.]

If you want the document that is the right one, it's the English version that is going to be legally binding, and it is the last one. Later on, there will be more translation, but if you read something, read – unfortunately – only in English.

JOANNA KULESZA: [Thank you for the] comment, Sébastien. We're actually thinking about turning this presentation into an ICANN Learn course. If that happens – and we hope it does – it would be wonderful to have that course, that presentation in various language versions. So your concern is duly noted.

Swiftly handing the floor over to John. Do keep in mind the two-minute timer, John.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. I'd like to see a show of hands. If you've ever been a penholder on a policy issue, please raise your hand. For those of you who have your hands down and are interested in policy, find one of these people with their hands up, and talk to them. Also, talk to staff. Give them your name, tell them you're interested in policy. And this is my hat as vice chair for policy. Get involved. Find someone who already knows something and learn from them, and give your name to staff so they can put you in touch with someone as well.

Secondly, I wanted to just take a quick note on Holly's comment that tomorrow there's a session with Compliance, so that sort of dovetails with the work she did before, and yeah, that's all I've got. Thank you very much.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, John, for encouraging the pl in the rom to take active participation. I can do nothing but second that. Sir, the floor is yours. You had a question. Please feel free to use one of the mics on the table. Thank you so much.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I first of all want to thank the two presenters for the wonderful presentation, and I have four questions and one comment.

I want us to go back to slide 11. I wanted to probably confirm that that is the process for the policy development process, and also on slide 13. For us, I want to find out who determines those criteria and who evaluates those criteria you have on slide 13.

Then do you need to demonstrate those criteria before you can be probably penholder? And I want to also ask a question. How long does it take for one to become a penholder?

Then the third question is you mentioned the fact that it's a volunteer process, and that especially when you [inaudible] the criteria on slide 13, what do you do or how do you become a penholder?

Finally, I want to I've the comment, and this is just me sharing my own experience as one of the penholders. The policy

development process is an important aspect of the At-Large process. I also want to tell newcomers that it's not an easy process. It's a process that we say is transparent, but from my experience, sometimes it's very opaque, and we need to be careful, especially in encouraging newcomers in participating, because from my own experience, I found the process sometimes very opaque and we're not sticking to the rules, and there will be times – there'll be attempts, based on your views, people will try to shut you down, bully you. Well, the process is an important process, and we should not allow that to happen. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Abdulkarim. Those are relevant concerns. And would you be kind enough to direct your question? You referred to slide 13, was that Justine's presentation? Was it Holly's?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes, sorry, Justine.

JOANNA KULESZA: Justine. So I'm going to start off with Justine, trying to ask her to pick up on that question. But if anyone has comments, I think there's a very quick question response to the question, how quick does one become a penholder. But I'm going to leave this to our

speakers to try and cover. What's the process? Who defines the process? How do we make sure that the process remains transparent? And how quickly does one become a penholder? Those are my main takeaways from your questions. I'm happy to hear your comments on this.

So I've been delegated to try and respond to that, so I'm going to try and do that really quick. So becoming a penholder is instantaneous. You apply and we usually trust you to do the work, and we hope you do. I think it's the same process throughout ICANN, I believe. So every constituency, every community struggles with having effective penholders, and if you do really well, you end up on this panel telling others how to do it. So it's really quick, and we trust you to do it. We need people to do the work.

In terms of process, I understand that this is a consensus policy, so we've been doing this for a while. Holly wants to chip in. Please do, the floor is yours, ma'am.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I would say there's a little bit of caution there. To become a penholder, it would be good if you have actually contributed to, understood, been involved in discussions and so forth. You don't become a penholder never having involved in the process.

that's not to discourage people, but it is to say it's best if you, first of all, participate in the calls, start to contribute comments and so forth, and you will be designated a penholder if – we're always looking for more penholders, and if we can see that you've been active and contributed and so forth, fine. It's just that right off the bat, if you've never done any of this, you're probably going to actually be turning to people. But all of us are quite happy to help people on the road.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Jonathan, go ahead. I just want to note Cheryl probably also speaking on that point, so we'll start off with Jonathan and then over to Cheryl.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes. We're in the process of trying to refine what the process [of] policy development looks like inside of the CPWG, and trying to incorporate a kind of ramp-up. Historically, it's begun with the identification of a penholder, and that's not the way that we've been proceeding. We've been trying to evaluate the end-user implications, try to get some topline message points that we want to deliver, and only when we've kind of agreed on what we want to say do we actually assign a penholder to try and put that down on paper.

So that's the process that we're trying to go through, and with John's session coming up, we're trying to also work on a communication channel to actually, when there's enough time – there isn't always – to take that initial set of messages and pass them back through the RALOs down to the ALSes, get some feedback and come back to refine those talking points as well, and only then, identify a penholder to actually write the prose.

So I would suggest that the most important part of participation in the policy development process is prior to that, in helping to have the discussions and to arrive at those core messages that we want to deliver. That's where the contention is, that's where the work is, that's where a lot of the reading is, is coming up with an informed viewpoint and swaying the group toward a particular set of messages.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Jonathan. I'm going to take a response to Cheryl, and then go back to Abdulkarim.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's go back to Abdulkarim first of all.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I just want to ask [inaudible] question. ICANN is supposed to be bottom-up approach. And if you decide to change a process, it's supposed to be bottom-up, not top-down. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right, but we're sitting at the bottom, Abdulkarim, let me assure you of that. So if anything, we changing our processes is about as bottom as it gets. This is not the ICANN board, this is where the rubber hits the road as far as processes for things like ALAC – that's the At-Large Advisory Committee – policy development processes. So this is the bottom. So I hope that's clear.

I think Jonathan raised an important point, and that is the whole concept of how we do things now is in sudden flux and change. And for all the better, since we worked with the Consolidated Policy Working Group, this is an improved process.

I'd also stop talking about penholder and encourage people to consider penholders, plural, because the role is to be little more than a secretariat role. You capture as effectively and as efficiently what the group discussions are, and you put them into a draft document which then the group will tear apart into small shreds and then we will put it back together again.

So don't think of it as the role of a rapporteur in a sort of UN context, but rather, someone who is essential to the process – or someones that are essential to the process – but I think it's time – and Jonathan alluded to that – for us to look at how we do what and when. But it is not a matter of one or two or three people's voices going out, being put up on a billboard in the equivalent of a desert, and the ALAC voting on it to endorse it.

And if you want to take a look at how you present to the Consolidated Policy Working Group a set of “This is what I've heard, this is how I think it can be presented, and how can you look at this in any other way” slides, then the types of things that Justine presented during some of her recent work with subsequent procedures is an example, and I'd be certainly putting that in as an example in any training.

And while I've got the floor, we need to train penholders.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. I have Eduardo and Jonathan. I would like to ask for a one-minute timer. No, I'm not brave enough to put Cheryl on a timer yet, but I'm going to put the gentlemen on a timer. We have just three minutes, so if you could make that question into a comment or otherwise, that would be appreciated. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just want to thank you for this. I think this was very good. I'm just wondering if there's a process in place when we do advice directly to the board, not policy things. Are we planning to use something similar to this? [Just for the board.]

JOANNA KULESZA: I think that's a question for Jonathan, who has now the floor. Thank you very much, Eduardo.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We do a very similar process, and we don't do advice very frequently, simply because like the GAC, it's much less effective if we wait until the very end, the whole entire rest of the community has agreed to something and we drop advice in. But we do, from time to time, do it, and the process that we're trying to engage in is very similar to develop that advice.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. We have one minute. I have Amrita. I'm sorry, I need to close the queue because we're out of time, but you're more than welcome to stay with us, we're here until Friday, so you can come and join and talk to us. Sorry, Thursday.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Tuesday next.]

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks, Joanna. Hearing Holly and Cheryl speaking, for a newcomer, it's definitely intimidating getting into a penholder position, so perhaps if someone is very interested, obviously being observer into the various working groups, making comments that make sense, and if someone is more interested, perhaps they can share a paragraph too on the particular piece they want to be penholder. Perhaps then seniors could help them and guide them, "Well, this is how you can go about or this is how not now but in future you can go." Perhaps that would help in the next levels, because if you honestly ask me, I would be intimidated being a penholder now.

JOANNA KULESZA: You might want to, for the newcomers in the room, join the CPWG first. I'm going to give Holly the last word, because we're out of time. Thank you, everyone, for participating. Holly, the floor is yours for a conclusion.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm really sorry if it sounds to be intimidating. That's not the purpose. The purpose is to say, "Yes, it's a lot of work, but if you're really interested in the topic and you just talk to any of us and participate." All of us started somewhere and not being very good at it, and just getting better at it. And everybody has to start somewhere.

Certainly, the last thing we want is for people to feel that they can't do it. You can, and all of us are here to help you through that process. Jonathan always gets the last word.

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, Jonathan, the last word. There you go.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I didn't mean to have the last word. Sorry. When Justine held this up, I was intimidated. The truth of the matter is you don't need to have read this entire document to participate in the subsequent procedures working group, because there's lots of little subgroups within it that you could work on those. And within that little subgroup, there's different issues and you could focus on one of those issues.

And that's true inside of just our own working group as well, the CPWG. You can get on a call and be focused on a particular aspect

of what we're talking about, make that your pet topic and talk about it. And later on if someone else is the penholder and they haven't adequately addressed that topic, then of course, submit a paragraph to that topic.

It's not like you can go from never hearing about ICANN to having to produce a document like this. I think that's the wrong way to think about it. The way to think about it is just start getting on calls, start listening to the conversations, and then find the thing that's most interesting to you and focus on making a comment about that, writing a paragraph about it, an e-mail about it, etc., and that will also translate into the working groups around the ICANN community as well. It's okay to specialize.

And if nothing else, At-Large as a whole is working on specializing more, because the more you specialize, the better, and the more effective your communication will be. So don't be intimidated.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. This is to be taken offline. Thank you, everyone, for participating, and come talk to us if you have questions. Thank you so much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Joanna, I'm just going to announce the next few meetings coming up. So just to let you know, this is the last At-Large meeting for the day. We do have two HIT sessions.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]