
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – Get Involved in ICANN Policy Development
Monday, June 13, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 AMS

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Hello, everyone. Can we start the recording, please? Thank you. Welcome, everyone, for the special session “Get Involved in ICANN Policy Development,” a special session for the Fellows at ICANN74. This is our second session with the Fellowship team here. We have a big room here, but I hope that we will manage to get a bit closer to each other.

We have great presenters today who will be talking about the importance of policy development and actually how the policy is working within different communities.

Our session today is really hybrid because one of the presenters, our friend and colleague Tomslin, will be joining us online. So, Tomslin, welcome and thank you for being with us. And whenever we call you for the presentation we’ll give you the floor to start speaking.

And my great pleasure also to introduce to you Joanna Kulesza who is one of the bright representatives of the Fellowship program. So once a Fellow, always a Fellow is what we used to say. Who is now representing ALAC in At-Large community. And also, she’s GAC, Governmental Advisory Committee, liaison from At-Large. So she will be speaking about her role and the role of

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.

ALAC in the policy development. And then we will give the floor to Tomslin while we are waiting for our third presenter. Joanna, it's my great pleasure to give you the floor.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Siranush. Thank you for having me here. It's a pleasure. First, it's a pleasure to see everyone face-to-face, even with the masks on. It's wonderful to be able to host, to be a part of a hosted hybrid meeting. Thank you, everyone, for joining us. And in particular, thanks to Siranush for giving me the floor today.

I see some good friends in the room, but I also see some new faces. Siranush kindly asked me to introduce the policy development processes within the At-Large community. Now with due regard to the new faces in the room, I'm going to start with a very brief description of how the At-Large community is structure, what it is composed of, just to give you a little bit of a background.

Now as for myself, as Siranush rightly noted, once a Fellow, always a Fellow. I do consider myself a Fellow and this trip across the ICANN community as a learning experience, and I believe that it will always remain one. So we are all in this process together, and I'm thrilled to be able to tell you a little bit about my experience and how hopefully we can share that experience together.

Now as some of you very well know, the At-Large community is structured to represent the Internet end users. We are structured through five regional communities, all of which are represented here. So whether you come from the EURALO, the NARALO, the APRALO, the LACRALO, or the APRALO, we all work together.

Whether you speak any of the ICANN languages, the At-Large might be the place for you because we operate with simultaneous translations. So even if you feel you are challenged to contribute to the policy development processes due to language issues, the At-Large facilitates that and all of our meetings are simultaneously translated.

Now we do work in the regions. There's a lot of work being done that reflects the needs of regional communities. The fundamental elements of the At-Large community are the ALSes which are the At-Large Structures. Now this could be your regional ISOC chapter as is the case for some of the cities in the community. This could be an NGO that you're running or that someone you know is running that feels strongly about representing the end users' interests within this complex and diverse community. This could be a small business that you're running and you are involved in the domain name industry. All of these are represented among the At-Large structures. They participate in all of the processes that that At-Large stands for.

Now you can work locally in your city or town. You can work in the region with the EURALO, NARALO, LACRALO, whatever your region is. I happen to work in EURALO, and I strive to best represent the interests end users. And I'm looking forward to question what these are, how we identify these, and how do we make the voices of end users heard.

I hope to be able to partially answer that question with the remaining part of this brief presentation. So when you do get involved with an ALS, with a regional structure, or with the At-Large as a whole, you might consider starting off with capacity building. Now we do devote a tremendous amount of time and effort to make sure that the end users who take the time to participate in these complex policy development processes are well facilitated.

We do this with our own resources. We have volunteers, people in place, community members who have been around for a long while. And this in-person memory that the community has is invaluable, and I have personally experienced great mentoring from community members who have been around much longer than myself.

But we also enjoy strong support from the Org team like Siranush here or Melissa here in the room who are always there to support us, to help us find consensus, build alliances, or understand the

processes that are behind the policy development here within ICANN.

So you might consider capacity building as the fundamental pillar for getting involved in policy development. Within the At-Large we do have a capacity building working group. If that's your fancy, if that's where you would feel most comfortable at this moment of your ICANN journey, you're more than welcome to join.

I'm going to paste two links into the chat in a moment, into the Zoom chat. One that will take you to the At-Large website where all of this information and lovely graphics can be found. And I'm also going to insert a link to the agenda of this meeting for the At-Large where I hope you will drop by, your schedules permitting. I know Siranush keeps you busy here, but maybe there's a chance for you to just take a peak into the At-Large, the ALAC room and see how we do the capacity building and policy development. So whether you do decide to work locally to get involved into capacity building, the At-Large will facilitate you to the best of our abilities.

But we are here to talk about policy development. Now that is a tricky question. First because that At-Large Structure is represented in this community through the At-Large Advisory Committee. It's not a policy development body in itself. It is an advisory committee. So by definition, we should only get involved

at the final stages of policy development and offer advice. We've tried that for a long time, and it has proven somewhat challenging. Coming in very late at the policy development process has proven to have more shortcomings than benefits. So we've adjusted.

Right now the At-Large hosts a consolidated policy development working group. A working group that meets once a week, every Wednesday. We rotate the times to make sure that we are able to accommodate to the needs of different communities operating in different time zones. And that is the main stage for policy development and policy advice within the At-Large.

So if you do feel you are ready to get involved in policy development or advice development within the At-Large, that's the place to be. We know that volunteering for ICANN is challenging time wise. That's why we've provided this condensed formula—90 minutes of your time once a week—where if you drop by, you will learn about where the At-Large stands on different policy topics.

What the Consolidated Policy Working Group does is reviews the open requests for comments, the open requests for policy input and we decide whether there is an At-Large perspective that we want to see reflected in those processes.

We do have policy leads. So if there is a topic you feel particularly strongly about and you want to get involved in like DNS abuse,

like privacy, security, human rights, whatever it is that you feel strongly about within the ICANN community and its policy development, we will help you find the avenue that will best cater to your interests and needs. Now if you do decide to focus on that specific topic, you might be a policy lead or you might support a small working group that will try to facilitate a given policy development process.

We do also, as Siranush kind mentioned, work through liaisons. Now I do happen to be the GAC liaison for the At-Large community. Together with my colleague and counterpart, the GAC liaison to the At-Large, we work to align the policies of these two communities. So we try to understand what are the needs of individuals as represented by the governments within the GAC but also as represented by the multistakeholder community within the At-Large.

We also have, clearly, a liaison to the GNSO. We have a liaison to the ccTLD community, to the organization for country code top-level domains. And these liaisons are the lines of direct contact with other communities. This is how we facilitate policy development within the ICANN community.

This is to say that should you wish to speak on behalf of Internet end users—and this is not an easy task coming back to my original provocative question—but if you feel that that’s the voice you

want to see heard within the ICANN community, we are able to offer different avenues to facilitate that aim, that goal.

Whether it is capacity building where you would like to share your expertise with others. Whether it is a dedicated policy topic like SubPro, like DNS abuse, like cybercrime or cybersecurity if for now DNS abuse sounds too ambiguous, the Consolidated Policy Working Group might be the place where you might want to start. Now again, keeping in mind the limited resources, these are weekly meetings that will give you a highlight on what we are working on with regards to policy.

Now I'm going to stop here. I am happy to share the floor with two other speakers who will show you what the policy development looks like in different constituencies. But I'm very much looking forward to questions. So if there is a specific topic that you're interested in and you would like to get involved with or if there's a specific formula that you would be interested in participating in, please feel free to chime in.

This room might not be the best suited for us to have a direct interaction. I'm still looking forward to questions. And I'm available throughout the week and so are my colleagues. So just please come up to us, ask questions, and we will try to make sure that we do our utmost to have the end user voice heard.

Thank you very much. I'm going to stop here. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Joanna. Thank you for an interesting introduction, and I'm looking forward to the questions after our two presenters will be completing their welcoming introductory speech. And with that, I would like first to introduce you that we have a guest here and the next speaker, Thomas Rickert, who is a representative of GNSO Council. But before we come to you, I would like to introduce one of our presenters who joined us remotely from Australia, Tomslin Samme-Nlar. And I would to give the floor and start with Tomslin. He is also a member of GNSO Council from civil society community. Tomslin, the floor is yours if you can hear us well.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I can, Siranush, and thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Excellent.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: And thanks for that introduction. And, yes, I'm also a Fellow. So since we always are Fellows, I wouldn't say I used to be a Fellow. So I still am one. But in addition to that, I am the council vice chair from the non-contracted parties house. We call it NCPH. I don't know how much time I have, Siranush, but I'll try to talk quickly

on things that I think might be helpful so that Tomslin has some time to speak as well.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yeah, so if you can do just introduction, Tomslin, for five minutes and then we'll get back with different questions at the end, that would be great. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Awesome, thanks. So I'll just quickly give a quick overview of the council itself. It's made of two houses: the non-contracted parties house and the contracted parties house. The contracted parties are those who have a contract with ICANN, while the non-contracted parties are those who do not.

And within the contracted parties house there are two stakeholder groups in there: the registries and the registrars. While in the non-contracted parties house there are four stakeholder groups. Three constituencies: the business constituency, the intellectual property constituency, and the ISP constituency. Then you have the non-commercial stakeholder group.

Now this is the civil society representation of the policymaking in ICANN, if you like. And the council is really made up of 23 councilors plus three liaisons like Joanna mentioned earlier. So we get liaisons from the different advisory committees, including

some we send to other parts of the community like to the GAC and to the ccNSO.

But in a nutshell, these councilors represent their constituencies and their stakeholder groups. And voting of issues of recommendations of policies are done by these councilors from representing the interests of their constituencies and stakeholder groups.

Now personally, I represent the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group in the council with other five councilors. So I'll often have to represent the views of the non-commercial constituencies in there. And the way we will do it is we meet as a stakeholder group and discuss the policy issues that are currently being discussed or are on the table in the council and we try to come up with policy positions and common positions for NCSG.

However, unlike most of the constituencies and stakeholder groups in the council, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group doesn't tell the councilors how to vote. The councilors choose how to vote, but the group nonetheless takes a common position on policy issues.

So I'll stop there and look forward to the questions that come later.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Tomslin. Thank you very much. And my great pleasure to introduce you also our third speak, Thomas, who also is GNSO Council. But he will tell more how he got to be in GNSO Council. So which community he represents and how the policy works there. Thank you, Thomas. The floor is yours.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you so much. Can I also say something about why you should get involved already, or is that for later?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: No, no, no. Start whatever you think that's important.

THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. Now thank you for the kind introduction. My name is Thomas Rickert, and actually I am on the GNSO Council and I've done it before. So I am criminal that's doing things again and again. So I'm sort of passionate about all this.

I got involved in ICANN at the end of the '90s when my former boss was actually quite instrumental in what's been called the DNSO at the time. So there was a Domain Name Supporting Organization, and then subsequently that has been split into two words. Namely, the GNSO for generic names and the ccNSO for country code names.

And so I got interested in ICANN at a very early stage. And I've also been working with the ECO association which is an Internet service providers association based in Germany, but they have members from more than 60 countries all around the world. So it's quite international.

So I was on the GNSO Council as a NomCom appointee from 2011 to 2015. And now I'm on the GNSO Council for the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers constituency, the ISPCP. Which is a difficult acronym but if you are not into acronyms, you shouldn't be at ICANN at all. So that's something that you should get familiar with.

And I always found it fascinating, maybe you don't, but I found it fascinating that we now have thousands of registries. We have tens of thousands of companies that are offering domain names, be it as accredited registrars or a number that's for more resellers down the chain. But still, if you want to transfer a domain name from one company to the other, it works smoothly. It works perfectly.

And why is this? It works because there are policies that are binding upon all those companies at the global level. And we don't have that in many other spaces. You have different protocols. You have different standards that are not compatible. But in this world, it works like sliced bread. I'm not sure whether

you use that in English, but that's a literal translation of what we would say in Germany.

And that is taking place in the GNSO. This is why I tend to call the GNSO the crown jewel of the ICANN community. And I'm sure that not everyone in this room would agree, but that's where the policy for generic names is made. The process is quite tedious. It's taking long because it's so inclusive.

You know, the PDP, the policy development process, is a process that's not completed in a year. Or it can be, but then everything must be very, very smooth. But typically, it's a longer process because the working groups form. Then they go for public comment. And then they work again. And then they issue another report. And then it goes to the GNSO Council where Tomslin and I are sitting. And then if we approve, then it goes to the Board and the Board takes another look at it.

But if the Board then approves, it becomes what we call a consensus policy. And this consensus policy automatically becomes a binding part of the contract that registries and registrars have with ICANN. So everyone that wants to offer generic domain name registrations needs to have a contract with ICANN. Be it registries, they need to have a registry agreement. Be it registrars, they need to have registrar accreditation agreement. They all have these contracts.

And the beauty of the consensus policy is that it is binding with immediate effect without the need for ICANN to change contracts with all those parties. That's happening nowhere else in the world. That's happening nowhere else. So if we do policy in the GNSO and if that's approved by the Board, it is a binding law, if you wish. Although, it's contractual for everyone.

And therefore, the GNSO has an awful lot of power and impact. We've seen policy going wrong. Some of you may remember the IRTP-C PDP a couple of years back. There was a flaw in this policy development, and that turned out to be very difficult because there was damage to registrants that could happen. That's to say that it's important work, and we need all of you.

And I'm not comfortable with being myself, but I'm sort of annoyed with primarily when I started working on this, this was even worse, but you have middle-age or now old white men that do this policy. So we need the diversity. We need diversity geographically. We need diversity in age. We need young folks as well as more experienced folks. We need diversity of gender.

But we also need diversity of skills. So even if you think that you don't have the skillset to contribute in a meaningful way to the policy development process, you are wrong. Everyone has something to offer. And sometimes we need a pair of fresh eyes on the documents. We need a completely different perspective to make the policies or the proposals for policies robust.

Because this is what it's all about. We don't vote on these things. I mean, we do at the GNSO Council. But in the working groups we work on a consensus basis. So almost everyone, we call that full consensus or rough consensus if not everyone totally agrees, but we are trying to get everyone on board and be happy with the policy that we're drafting. Or if we can't make everyone happy, we want to make everyone equally unhappy because that's also what makes a good compromise.

And therefore, you should be prepared to be involved in tedious work, long hours, a lengthy process. But I think it's very satisfying because we help make this tagline that ICANN uses—one world, one Internet—live by creating standards that are binding upon everyone around the globe. And that make this infrastructure that should be working at the global level to be inclusive so that folks that don't have access to information can get access to information. Folks that want to build their online business can do that with ease with standards that are globally applicable.

Over to you. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Thomas. We have a couple of questions from remote, and then we'll get back here. But please, please, please, if you want to ask a question, can you join the Zoom room and raise your hand so I can keep one line for the questions and it will be

easier to call here. If there is no option, then definitely I will come back to you.

But there is a question from Eric. He's from Kenya and Ireland at the same time. He is asking, "For those interested in participating in DNS security, do you need the technical cybersecurity skills or you can participate in developing cybersecurity standards or guidelines? Is there an avenue as such for volunteering for this type of professionals?"

JOANNA KULESZA:

I'm happy to start us off. Thank you very much. Thank you for the question, Eric. That depends where you want to get involved. But if that question was to address the At-Large community, we offer both the capacity building that might be needed to better understand how the security around the ICANN policies works and we would offer you an opportunity to liaise also with the SSAC. We do have a very experienced SSAC liaison, but I'm certain that Andrei would welcome any kind of support or participation.

So the answer to that question is yes for offering to you any kind of support that might be needed and no to the necessary requirement to get involved in policy development that regards cybersecurity. But that is accurate for the At-Large. If you wanted to get involved with other constituencies or communities on behalf of which I'm not authorized to speak, that might look a little bit different.

But I would grab the mic here just to support what Thomas said, if that's okay. I particularly appreciated you emphasizing why it's worthwhile to get involved. And I love the examples that you have given that are very business oriented.

But speaking on behalf of the end users, we just had a very relevant conversation—I happen to be European, the EURALO representative to the ALAC—around the Ukrainian crisis that I know is very close to the hearts of many in this room as well. Some of you are physically remote from that conflict, but I happen to live in Poland so that is my everyday reality, the aftermath of the war in Ukraine.

And there was a conversation about disabling access with ICANN policies to Russia and the end users in Russia. And we did have that conversation, and the policy that ICANN has in place has provided continuous access for end users around the globe. Which I think is an argument to the point that you were making. These policies remain in place because they are technical and they are in a way outside this political debate.

Now whether this is good or bad, whether you have an opinion or not, this is a forum where you can have your voice heard. We actually within the At-Large have a session dedicated to Internet governance in times of crisis. There is a lot of conversation going on around sanctions, Internet sanctions, Internet related sanctions, business sanctions where companies are reducing or

refraining from offering services in different parts of the world. That's a very political topic. We are here to talk technical standards, but somehow these two are very closely connected.

So if you're involved in that kind of narrative, if that is a topic that is close to your heart, this is where the decisions are being made. This is not to say that on Thursday we'll decide what happens with Internet access in that particular region, but this is the place where we try to understand what the best approach might be and how any kind of a similar decision might impact Internet access globally. So I just wanted to highlight that. Thank you for making that point, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Yeah, if I may just add to that because I think that's a very relevant point that you're making. A lot of what ICANN is doing is affecting individuals. So when I said that we need to do a good job, it's not to make businesses thrive. Although, that's also a good thing. But we need to make sure that this infrastructure serves the needs of individuals around the globe.

So when we are engaging in policy development we are putting a lot of time in also considering the impact on human rights. So does what we are doing adequately protect the privacy of users? Does it allow for freedom and diversity of speech?

For example, this whole debate about registration data. Registration data is the data that's associated with a domain name. That's not only technical data, name servers, and all that but it's also the name of the registrant or in certain cases the name of the technical contact and otherwise.

And so we are dealing with how to make privacy and proxy services work so that folks that want to have content publicized that is criticizing the local political regime or political views or speech on sexual orientation that might be problematic under certain jurisdictions, that these folks can do so without being under danger that their registration data can be revealed to unauthorized parties.

So that's something that may also trigger your interest in working in that because we even firmed that point up when ICANN became independent of the U.S. government. Because we had something on human rights that we should have a human rights framework to assess whether the policy that ICANN is crafting actually impacts the rights of individuals.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: You have talked, Thomas, about the consensus, and it's an important topic, actually. And we as a Fellowship team will have a special session with Melissa Allgood on how the consensus is being developed in ICANN. It's on Wednesday. But there is also a

question in the chat, “So it’s good that there is a consensus. But does anyone have a veto over policies?”

THOMAS RICKERT:

Shall I take that one? Let me take a first crack at it, and then Tomslin and you can add to that. Now it depends on the community that you’re looking at. In the GNSO we are using consensus. But our definition of consensus is different than the terminology that is used in the GAC, for example, in the Governmental Advisory Committee.

So in the GNSO we are looking at full consensus which means unanimity. Then we are looking at rough consensus. That’s where only a small portion of the participants does not support the recommendations. And then we have strong support with objection, I think—you guys need to help me with the exact terminology—with significant opposition. And then we have diversity, and diversity is actually that there is a lack of consensus.

In the GAC one veto or one opposition by any GAC member suffices in order to destroy the consensus. So the GNSO is operating differently, and I’m not going to speak to other communities. I’ll leave that to others to speak to.

But you still have an opportunity to make your voice heard. So whenever a PDP final report is published, you can publish a

minority statement with it. So if you object to parts of the recommendations or to all of the recommendations, you can write that up and it will be part of the report of the working group and it will be published. So those who are interested in the work of the PDP working group will be able to see why you were not in support of the recommendation. So it's quite a transparent and fair process.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. We have a question from Samwel. Can you, if you are in the room, you can come closer to the mic. Yes, please, Samwel.

SAMWEL KARIUKI: Thank you. Thank you very much. My name is Samwel Kariuki. I'm an ICANN Fellowship Fellow. I have two questions. One I would like to ask, what happens if the policy development process takes more time than expected? Is the process stopped? And my second question I would like to ask, I would like to be involved in the policy development process in capacity building, that is in cybersecurity. So what is the procedure that I should use to ensure that I get involved? Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much for the question, Samwel. I'm happy to pick that one up quite quickly if that's the process we want to implement. So your second question is easier to answer. The

most direct way would be just to join the meeting in the At-Large room, and you will see how this happens including the consensus building.

The more procedural approach is you might consider a) joining an ALS in your region. So the At-Large structure. It could be an ISOC chapter. Whatever you wish. We also offer individual participation, but that depends on the region. So there is a chance for you as an individual to get involved. So for example, in EURALO we have an end user association. You join that one. I'm a member of that one as well. And you start working.

And that's probably the crucial point there. So if you do become active and you do get involved and you participate actively, you organize meetings, sessions, whatever is your fancy. So we did, for example, host a number of meetings around the Ukrainian crisis and access to Internet. If that's something that you feel passionate about, that's something you can put on the table and offer your advice on. If you feel strongly about, as Thomas said, human rights, you start working in that area.

Formally, it's just a question of participating in an ALS or becoming an individual member. But it's probably more challenging to actually start doing the work, and capacity building is one of the avenues and the second one is policy development. Becoming a member of the Consolidated Policy Working Group is the formal path to do that latter.

And consensus building, I'll just very quickly try to address that from the At-Large perspective. But I'm certain that Thomas and Tomslin would have a better response because they are with the GNSO. Within the At-Large, indeed, consensus is built in the Consolidated Policy Working Group throughout the weekly meetings. It is a rough consensus. So we try to agree to disagree in the worst case scenario.

Within the At-Large we're relatively term limited because we need to submit the At-Large advice at a given time when the policy development process foresees for a deadline. And when a working group that we participate in takes longer, then we refer to the GNSO process and advice. My understanding is that we are more about the quality than the speed. So we try to ensure that the end product, the policy that is developed is sufficiently well drafted. That it serves the community.

And that's something that Thomas said. It can take time, but we want to make sure that all the parties are heard and that their contribution is reflected. And that's the process that the At-Large participates in through the dedicated working groups. And with that, I defer to my colleagues who are within the GNSO. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Can I say something there?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, I was going to ask you, Tomslin, if you want to add. Please, go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, please. Regarding the question, especially the question about what if it takes so long, I just wanted to say that in addition to what Joanna has said that the focus is on the quality. But there are also tools that the GNSO Council uses to manage the process as well.

For example, there could be a change request brought in. In the event that the project managers or the working group leadership believes that it might go beyond what they thought it would, they'll come. They have to let us know in the Council, and we take a decision. Or they may put a request if they want extra time or how they want to proceed with this. And the GNSO will talk about it and come up with a solution for it.

But the other thing too is that sometimes during the chattering of the group we try to make sure that we give the group itself some leeway to decide how long it might take. And they advise back to the council, and we use that to determine if it's all good then we know, obviously, that's how long is required to get that quality that we're after. And if it goes beyond, okay. We deal with that request for additional time as it comes. Thanks.

Oh, sorry. Regarding the skills or how you get involved in cybersecurity, I think you mentioned—was that DNS security? I forget what he said exactly. But for NCSG, and that’s the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, all you have to do is join the group and you can be part of any policy discussion. There is not any specific procedure.

Well, there are special ones where if we need someone to represent the group officially in a working group, then there’s usually a call out and there is a process there where we evaluate candidates. But if it’s to work within the NCSG on a policy subject, there is no official procedure. And I speak because I’m also the policy chair of the NCSG. So we don’t put any specific procedure or process for you to start working. Thanks.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks so much. And thanks, Samwel, for your question. You also asked whether a PDP can be stopped if there is no consensus. And I’m not aware of any PDP that has been stopped or that didn’t get finished. But I may be wrong so I stand corrected if somebody can remember a process that has been stopped.

What we’ve seen though is that one PDP might have a dependency with another PDP. So for example, when the GDPR, the General Data Protection Regulation, kicked in at the [U] level, that had an impact on other policy development processes. So a

PDP was then paused or the implementation of the results was paused. But I haven't seen any PDP that was stopped.

Sometimes they take longer than expected, but then it's primarily a matter for the chair to make sure that they wrap up at some point. And Tomslin mentioned that the GNSO Council has tools to monitor the progress in any given PDP. So there are time estimates and if you go over time, then you basically need to be accountable to the GNSO Council.

Because there's also money involved. Every PDP is supported by staff. They're putting a lot of effort in supporting the chair and the working groups in their work and in their efforts. And sometimes a deadline or the threat that a budget is exhausted works wonders. This community works best if it's under pressure. So a deadline in many cases helps to do the job in time.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. We have a hand raised by Herve Clement. Please, come to the mic. And if you can introduce yourself, where are you from, it would be great.

HERVE CLEMENT: No problem. Hello, everyone. I am Herve Clement, vice chair of the Address Supporting Organization (ASO). It's not a question but just to add complimentary information. It's for the discussion about consensus will make me think about that.

So of course, there is a policy development governing a domain name, resources, issues, management, etc., but there is another type of resources which are IP addresses. So it's a term of addressing. So for IPv4, IPv6 and addressing. So autonomous system numbers.

And so the policies for those resources don't take place with the ICANN or within the ACs and SOs or for the ICANN but within the different regions, the five regions which govern the IP resources. So ARIN for North America; LACNIC for Central and South America; RIPE NCC for Europe, [Asia], and Russia; AFRINIC for Africa; and APNIC for China, Australia, India, etc. And there are specific policies for each of the regions.

And what's important to say is that everybody, so everybody in this room, can be part of a community if his region and take part in the policy building. And there is still in this policy building with a term with a process of consensus. And I think there is a consensus about the consensus definition, but there are differences as well.

As far as I understand for consensus is so you have consensus when you can answer all the questions or the problem that can be held by the different members. So it doesn't mean that you have a certain number who are in favor of and a certain number of people who are against. But it's a discretion and so the goal is to answer all the issues you can have about that.

And so there was a question about to stop a policy or not. So a policy is not adopted if there is not consensus. But even if the consensus has been declared, there can be an appeal committee in some region, etc., which can discuss and even try to stop this process.

So that was just to give this regional information. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Herve. I see the hand and there are several questions also in the chat, but we will go to Shah Zahidur Rahman, please.

SHAH ZAHIDUR RAHMAN: Hi, everyone. This is Shah Zahidur Rahman, ICANN74 Fellow. I am from Bangladesh. My question is related to that non-commercial users from the end users' perspective relevant to the DNS transfers. Sometimes I see that some of the end users that do not know about who are the accredited registries or registrars, so they may be taking from the ISP the domain names. But they face year after year a problem to transfer their domain to another registry. So what kind of awareness from the NCSG does have that can [inaudible] the people or end users so that they can take from the accredited registries?

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you for that question, Shah. Well, I understand that what you're looking for is a platform to best facilitate end users interests in the broad spectrum of policy issues that might come up. Am I reading that question correctly?

SHAH ZAHIDUR RAHMAN: Exactly.

JOANNA KULESZA: All right, so as already noted, you might want to follow for the At-Large the Consolidated Policy Working Group. Be on the lookout for issues that you feel are relevant. Now we do tend to work in those, as already noted, policy leads or small working groups that reflect the ICANN terminology or the acronyms.

So you would have an EPDP small working group that would be devoted to what used to be the WHOIS or it now is devoted to SubPro depending on what your topic of fancy would be. We have this [light motif] of DNS abuse which sort of links cybercrime and cybersecurity. Although, that is not explicitly an ICANN working group.

So what I think might be relevant here is for you to listen in to the discussions that are going on, identify the issue that you are concerned with or that you feel strongly about, and see where and how you might want to contribute.

Now to me, this would probably be cybercrime, cybersecurity, and privacy. In ICANN speak, that's DNS abuse, right? They are not the obvious choice, but that's where I would see my place trying to speak about the threats that are for end users online and the ways we can mitigate them beyond just the technical administration of the Internet. So that's my approach to it, and that's something that I can share there.

I hope that answers your questions.

SHAH ZAHIDUR RAHMAN: Yeah, perfect. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: But if there is something else, then just let me know and I'm happy to address it.

SHAH ZAHIDUR RAHMAN: I have additional one more question just to give you [inaudible]. For the At-Large group ALS like ISOC from [inaudible]. I am a member of [inaudible]. So which of the organizations is that individual members can also be part of the At-Large and for the organization [inaudible]. So it is a little bit challenging for a new organization like my company XYZ working. So come to that At-Large group, is that the same procedure, [inaudible] procedure to maintain?

JOANNA KULESZA: Okay, so that's an easy question. Yes, indeed, that goes through the region. So there are regional procedures of how a new ALS is submitted. There is a due diligence process and there is a decision by the board of each regional organization, each RALO, that would admit such a new constituency. There sometimes are issues of location, so depending where the seat of the company is and where you operate your business that's something that gets revised. We're trying to be flexible as possible, so the easiest way would be indeed to follow the procedure that is in place in your region or your company or your NGO or your institution. I work at the university, so where your institution is seated. And following these regional procedures would give you a status of an ALS. Or just join a local ALS that has already been approved. So, yes, that's a simple question. A yes to the proposal that you have made in that question.

SHAH ZAHIDUR RAHMAN: Thank you. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. And there is a question from Andrey. One for Joanna, one for Thomas. But, Tomslin, if you want to add something, just raise your hand and I will see that you want to add something. So the question for Joanna, "Is there a liaison for intergovernmental

organizations and the IGF?” And the question for Thomas, “How to achieve the consensus bearing in mind the multistakeholder approach itself?” So please.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. I wanted to thank Andrey for giving me the easier question. I’m going to let Thomas think about that second one because that seems far more challenging, and I’m just going to address the first one.

Andrey, thank you. Just to clarify, the liaisons are the connecting points between different ICANN constituencies. So the GAC would be the place where intergovernmental organizations like, for example, the European Union or the Council of Europe would be represented. The IGF is composed of various stakeholders. So for example, there are individual community members who are on the MAG, the Multistakeholder Advisory Committee for the IGF. But there isn’t a direct link. So the GAC liaison, in this case myself, would be the link to the intergovernmental organizations. But that’s sort of just a reflection of the overall ICANN structure. The liaisons are the points of contact between different ICANN constituencies and depending on where the specific organization, institution, or constituency is located, they would be responsible for keeping the conversation going. And that is also facilitated by bilateral meetings, which you will have the opportunity to witness throughout ICANN74. So I hope that

answers your question, Andrey. But I'm happy to follow up if there is anything more to be said. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Yeah, thanks so much for the question. Actually, some IGO representatives such as WIPO are attending GAC sessions on a regular basis. So they're sort of embedded into the GAC structure. How to achieve consensus bearing in mind the multistakeholder approach. Now as Joanna said, this can't be answered in one sentence.

In the ICANN world we have the GNSO, ccNSO, ALAC, At-Large, and SSAD, SSAC, and RSSAC. So there are seven groups in total, and they all have—not all of them—but the GNSO and the ccNSO, for example, just using this as examples, they have their own policy development processes. They're following their own rules.

And in the GNSO, as Tomslin mentioned, we have the contracted parties house and then non-contracted parties house where each there are different constituencies and stakeholder groups in those. So they are sort of smaller multistakeholder universes where you have the various groups represented.

And so those are...or the GNSO is a multistakeholder community. And now you might ask, what about the GAC? What about ALAC? And we have an ALAC liaison, for example, in the GNSO Council and they also attend working groups.

But there is sort of a new trend in the ICANN world and that's cross-community working groups. So for things that are not just affecting generic names, for example, the auction proceeds. ICANN made a lot of money with auctioning contested domain names under the last new gTLD round. And the question was what to do with this money. And a cross-community working group was founded for that purpose.

Also, when it came to preparing for the IANA stewardship transition that led to the independence of ICANN of the U.S. government, that's something that doesn't affect only one of the groups in the ICANN ecosystem but that affects everyone. So a cross-community working group was formed.

And that's where you have the broadest possible representation of folks in the ICANN world. And for those cross-community working groups, the consensus definition of the GNSO applies. But they actually have representation not only from the GNSO.

And maybe it's also important to note that for every PDP working group that I've been involved in the chair has a very close look at who is speaking, who is contributing, and who is making themselves heard. So that it doesn't happen like I bring ten friends from the ISPCP and we all talk all the time and then we take over the policy development process. So it's the chair's duty to make sure that everyone is heard, that everyone gets an opportunity to speak.

So I was chairing a PDP many years back where one group just didn't show up. So we called them. We said, well, you should be participating. You should chime in. So it's a very inclusive process.

And then when it comes to the so-called consensus call where the chair will determine the level of consensus or the lack thereof if it is divergence, he would look at who says what and what is a fair reflection of the temperature in the room, so to speak, in terms of consensus.

But there might be instances where the chair gets it wrong. And in the rules for PDPs there's actually a process for objecting against the consensus determination conducted by the chair. So even there you have an appeals process, if you wish, if the chair gets it wrong.

So I think that the process on paper at least, some of you might say that in reality it's not fair, but I think it's very inclusive and very well thought out and implemented for the most part.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. And we have a question from Zaher. Zaher, please.

ZAHER QASSRAWI: Good morning and thank you. This is Zaher Qassrawi from Palestine. As a technical, and always I think from technical side, I didn't get in the presentation where is the technical side in PDP?

It's alongside with the process or in the implementation stage only? Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: That's an excellent question. And I think we need to take a look at what the subject of the PDP is. So there are PDPs that are policy in nature but that need some technical implementation. So that would then obviously the technical side of things would be dealt with in the implementation phase. But there are other PDPs such as currently there's a discussion on the transfer policy, the transfer PDP, and there you have the more technical people the companies and in the interested wider community that have those discussions. So I think there's no one size fits all answer to your question, unfortunately. So it depends on the topic at hand.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. We have a question from Svitlana, "Can ICANN Board refuse policy that was prepared by supporting organizations, and in both cases is it possible to do?" Can someone take this?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I can answer that.

JOANNA KULESZA: I think Tomslin might have an answer.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: [Thomas], you would like to take this question, please?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes. I just wanted to say that it is possible, and it's possible because in the policy development process there is a step where the Board has to vote for a policy that the council has agreed that it should be implemented. And what the Board simply does there is make a determination if that policy is in the interest or best interest of the ICANN community or the ICANN organization. And where it isn't in the best interest of either the community or the organization, then the Board could vote against that policy. And you'll have your instance where the policy was passed in the council but was not voted through by the Board. I hope that helps things.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Tomslin. We have Thomas and Tomslin, and I'm mixing sometimes. My apologies. But I will give the floor to Thomas to add.

THOMAS RICKERT: I think Tomslin gave a great answer. And actually, you can look up how this works in practice. For the EPDP, for example, on registration data the Board had some concerns with some of the

recommendations. And they actually put out a scorecard where they said, “Okay, this recommendation, no problem.” And then they had question on other recommendations. So it’s basically an iterative process. I haven’t seen the Board bluntly refusing a recommendation, but they would then engage with the GNSO Council.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. And we have a question from Chokri. Chokri, please?

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: Okay, I’m Chokri from Tunisia. First of all, I would like to thank you, Joanna, and all the ALAC team for the great job that you are doing. I’ve got the opportunity to follow the Consolidated Policy Working Group and their activity. There are a lot of things that I learned from this working group, and this group are very instructive. So I recommend to all my friends for those to follow this group.

I have a question in my mind about the involvement of technology and the impact on the DNS market and impact on ICANN activity. But if I may speak about new technology, I mean artificial intelligence, blockchain, and the emergence of blockchain DNS.

But we always [inaudible] response that it’s out of scope of ICANN. Somehow I understand that, for example, GNSO couldn’t

treat such requests. But I think that an advisory committee such as ALAC could interact with such request as you are other issues with DNS abuse or cybersecurity. So do you agree with me that it would be interesting that ALAC would create a working group, subgroup that would be interested in focusing on these emerging technology that somehow would impact the activity of ICANN?

I have another question too for Thomas. I think that you give the example of the policy development for the transfer policy working group. I personally as an observer of this working group think that a lot of for this first report, for its first report this work group have maybe only covered—this is a personal thought—is maybe only covered by the [inaudible] provided by this [inaudible] that is managing the work of this working group since a lot of issues that are not contained with this charter. So my question, who should contribute to this charter? It would be worth that community would be integrated to the development of this charter before the work of the policy starts.

Okay, I have lost hope for my friend Tomslin from Australia. Hope to see you again, Tomslin, in Africa. So peace for you. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So we'll start with Joanna, please.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Chokri. But first, thank you for being here and for being on the Consolidated Policy Working Group calls. They can get quite challenging in terms of the topics being discussed, but you're always there and your input is most appreciated. And I'm just going to take this opportunity to also highlight the two co-chairs, Jonathan and Olivier, who have been heading the Consolidate Policy Working Group tediously also throughout the pandemic.

As regards the AI working group, that's what you're proposing, that's what you're suggesting, there isn't a dedicated policy track within the ICANN policy development processes that is devoted to AI. But similarly to what I have responded to a previous question, there's absolutely no obstacle for you to review the policies as they stand and highlight the relevant AI issues as they pop up.

As already said, that's something that I do with regard to cybercrime. ICANN doesn't really do cybercrime as such. That's not the topic. That's not the theme that we have. There isn't a dedicated working group on cybercrime. But it comes up in DNS abuse. It comes up in different aspects of policy development.

So if you feel strongly about AI, there is absolutely nothing stopping you or likeminded individuals here in the room to try to trace those little bits of AI as they pop up in different narratives within the policy development processes.

But that is also to say that the At-Large offers a large spectrum of capacity building activities. And the AFRALO has been very active. I know you have been as well. There have been dedicated workshops, sessions. We try to work face-to-face as much as we can. But also throughout the pandemic there have been sessions organized by Hadia and others in your region that focus on issues like artificial intelligence. And they do happen in different languages which I think is an added benefit.

And because the At-Large Advisory Committee representing the At-Large community is different, is so unique we listen to the voices. That's part of this process of identifying end user interests and positions. And we do our best as a community to feed them into the policy narrative.

So there's absolutely a room for an AI discussion. Looking at the volunteer input, the limited human resources we have, I would probably not opt for a dedicated working group at this point. But if you can find the people and you can lead the work, I'm certain that there is a room that you would find a space to do that in.

So I don't have a direct response. I guess that's constituted and we'll start working. But I would rather encourage you and other members here in the room to seek out the policy narratives where AI or any other topic you feel passionate about is relevant. Thank you for that question though. I thank you for being here.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thomas, we can go for you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Sure. Thank you so much for the question. And I'm just looking at the GNSO website actually on how to contribute, and they basically have a section how to participate. So that's maybe a good resource to look into.

So you can make a public comment. You can volunteer for the working group. And I know that you mentioned that you're already part of that as an observer. Follow the mailing list, so you can subscribe to mailing lists for working groups. Attend meetings. And then there's something on forming a new constituency which is not applicable here.

But maybe the best way next to observing and also maybe raising your hand and speak during the sessions would be the public comment. I think that's a tool that we all need to evangelize more public comment is the opportunity for everyone to chime in on any given report that's being published. And there are different inflection points during the lifecycle of a PDP where the community is asked to give comment. And this is actually thoroughly analyzed. We're spending hours and hours to go through every comment that is received. So it's not a futile exercise. You know, you should actually consider publishing or submitting a public comment. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, please. Follow up just quickly, Chokri.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: I'm sorry. It's my fault. I think that I'm not targeting the issue very well. I'm speaking only for the step for developing the charter. So within the policy development process, the first step is to develop the charter for the work. Who should contribute on the development of the charter? What I am trying to say is that it would be better that we involve the community in the development of the charter. I gave the example of the transfer policy working group with which, in my opinion, the charter [inaudible] the work of this [inaudible].

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, sorry. I misheard your question. The charter is agreed upon and adopted by the GNSO Council when to the extent that it's a GNSO policy that's involved. To be perfectly honest, I don't know how folks that are not involved in any of the GNSO groups can chime into the drafting of the charter. But if you send me a note, I will find out with ICANN policy staff. But the way this works is that we get the trigger to start a PDP, and then there's a draft charter which is discussed in the GNSO Council, and then it's adopted there. But there all the councilors who are speaking for the various constituencies and stakeholder groups that they're

representing have an opportunity to chime in on and ask for amendments of the draft charter.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Can I add, Siranush?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, Tomslin. Yes, please.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, Chokri, nice to see you, and I'll see you back in Africa. So basically, in the chartering process because this is a policy which is related to the GNSO the process requires that the GNSO charts this group and then the community contributes to that. And you asked the question who should charter this. And I think it remains the GNSO who should be chartering this group.

And so how it's inclusive is that all the community participants, stakeholder groups, and constituencies that make up the GNSO participate in that chartering process. And the council might decide how it chooses to do that. And usually it will be through a small group which invites every single GNSO constituency or participant to have a councilor be a member of that group.

Oftentimes however, it will be that you might find that some stakeholder groups do not have interest in the topic, so they might not volunteer to be in that chartering group. But it's usually open that every GNSO constituency or stakeholder group should participate in the chartering process of any issue that needs to become a PDP. Thanks.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Tomslin. Thank you. And we have another question from Vladimer. Please come close to the mic.

VLADIMER SVANADZE: Vladimer Svanadze from Georgia. Thank you. Thank you for interesting discussion. Thank you for your presentation. My question is why ICANN does not work more actively with [inaudible] or some other organizations and [those that] are responsible for critical infrastructure. We know, for example, the standards of [ISOC], standards of [NIST or] standards of ISO 27000 or some other. But [on the initial level,] we don't know how it works with ICANN. These regulations, for example [SAC] regulations, [SAC] standards or something. Maybe it is the initial level is more a low [awareness] of ICANN activity in this. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you for that question, Vladimer. I'm happy to start us off with the gentlemen chiming in, in due course. That is an interesting question. So I would say the answer to your question would indeed very much depend on the region that we're talking about. Now in Europe I would say that the cooperation was necessitated by the NIS directive which addresses critical infrastructure including, for example, the TLDs registries.

So you might see a necessary collaboration there with maybe not the ICANN community as such with the end users taking the lead but ICANN Org providing information about how the proposed regulation might impact wherever ICANN community members are operating those critical infrastructures.

You would see, for example, RIPE also chime into that discussion being part of the plethora of groups we have in the region. I'm not very well aware of situations in different regions. I would understand that the collaboration on the ground would, for example, be quite good in NARALO. I'm not aware of the situation, for example, in AFRALO. So I'm happy to look into that.

But that brings me to say that we are indeed looking at tightening the relationships between on-the-ground community members across the silos. Just to give you an example, during the upcoming bilateral between the At-Large, the ALAC, and the GAC, we will be looking at specific good practice examples that address exactly the concern that you have raised.

So in this particular meeting, we have managed to obtain the participation from our friends in Finland. We will have the ISOC chair and we will have the GAC liaison, the GAC representative for Finland provide information about how that on-the-ground collaboration has been unfolding.

As already said, I would argue that the answer to your question would differ in different regions. Finland is an example that we're putting on the stage here and exemplifying how that works because it works quite well. We've done this exercise in different regions. In Europe it would probably be easier because of the European Union, because of the legislation.

But that's the second part of my answer to your question. There is this continuous discussion on the need to follow national and regional legislation, and it is primarily through legislation, which you have mentioned, that critical infrastructures are being governed. ICANN Org attempts to follow these processes quite closely, and you will see, for example, Veni providing updates on different UN processes that deal with different aspects of those critical infrastructure protection issues.

But the community itself also works on the ground trying to follow relevant legislation. We would definitely be eager to use more input. So if you're aware of something that is going on, on the ground in Georgia, and I know it's a challenging situation. I'm happy to follow up on that conversation as we proceed. I've had

joint endeavors with colleagues in Georgia. I know it's interesting. Whether the At-Large could do more in that region, I'm open to have that conversation.

And if we manage to find any kind of a narrative around representing those regional examples as an end user interest perspective in a policy development process, that would be perfect. So that is to say we see certain examples of that collaboration going, but we can definitely use more. So thank you for that question, and if there is a conversation to be had, please feel free to reach out. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thomas? Tomslin? Would you like to add something? Yes, please.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes, a few thoughts maybe. ICANN does have regional engagement people on the ground. So you should probably reach out to those. I'm based in Germany, and we are working quite extensively with [Gaby] and Chris Mondini to do local events for the local target audience. So that's a very easy way to get engaged with ICANN and get ICANN to provide speakers but also to maybe host or cohost sessions.

Then when it comes to regulatory initiatives, I agree that there is a need for ICANN to be on top of regulatory developments and be aware of that. Not to be caught cold or surprised by things that

are coming up. And we see more and more discussions in ICANN. And you mentioned these updates, so something is happening there. But there is a limit for ICANN because ICANN Org must not do lobbying. So there's a charter for ICANN's engagement with governments. So they must not lobby for positions.

And the third point that I want to make is that sometimes there are requests for ICANN to be more active in areas of IT security, fighting abuse on the Internet. And that is at times very difficult because ICANN must maintain its very limited technical mandate and not get involved with content regulation. So ICANN's bylaws are very strict on that. So sometimes we have to disappoint the requests by governments but also by others who say, "Well, ICANN being a global organization, they should fix this or they should fix that." But actually they can't. So I think it's on all of us to also manage expectations into what ICANN can and what they can't do.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Tomslin, would you like to add something? Or we can....

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No, I just wanted to add what Joanna mentioned earlier about regional engagement. Sorry, that was Thomas. About regional engagement, and that is really the point of contact for such

issues. And also to add that other than the domain name side, there are also the IP address management regional presence as well. So there are many other opportunities for ICANN to participate in that conversation locally as well.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Yes, Joanna, please.

JOANNA KULESZA: Just one more to add on top of that just to support everything Thomas has said. Indeed, so the local staff, the GSE staff are great. We've worked with them before. But I'm trying to address the community support for that initiative. So I just wanted to echo whatever arguments you have used there. Indeed, it is about getting the people on the ground involved.

And just to draw a line between lobbying and technical advice, the DSA in Europe would have impacted the way that the technical operations would run. So there is a certain room for us to have the ICANN perspective heard, not just through the staff input but also as community members. Not doing lobbying, but presenting the technical perspective with regards to proposed legislation as it might impact the actual policies and the technical operation. So just to highlight that. The staff are doing a great work, but we're trying to see whether the At-Large through online

structures, At-Large Structures could support those efforts.
Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. And we will take the last question from Benjamin. Benjamin, are you here in the room in person or you're virtually? Yes, Benjamin, please. Because I know I have seen you, but I was not able to see you in the room.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Mine is not so much of a question. It's just also trying to ask for people to join our community. That it's also a very good avenue for people to participate. Before you go to the policy level, you have to have a community where some things of interest are close to your heart. I belong to the NCUC, Non-Commercial Users Constituency, and we're passionate about a whole lot of other things that are reflected in the policy process.

Tomslin, as you've seen, is one of us. He used to be part of us. So you can also join us, and we need a lot of hands to participate and come around issues that are very personal to many of us but we don't see them until they become commercial issues. So in our constituency I like to say you are welcome. Bring your expertise because it comes at that level as well before it becomes a bigger and broader issue.

And for that reason I'm hijacking this mic to say please join the non-commercial constituency that is across the world and is beyond regions. So that's why I came here. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Benjamin. I know you would come and do some promotional non-commercial stakeholder group. But thank you for being here.

Thank you very much, Thomas and Joanna and Tomslin. I think that it was a great, encouraging discussion how the Fellows who are new to this world or are returning can feel comfortable to join to different development processes here.

Last call to action from all three of you. Call to action to the Fellows, the people who are coming here as the newcomers and then how they can get engaged further.

THOMAS RICKERT: I think I just have one sentence. If you bring half of the energy of Benjamin to the table, we're good to go.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So passion, enthusiasm, and willingness to be here.

JOANNA KULESZA: Follow your passion. So whatever it is that brings you here, just follow that one and we will do our best. And I believe I speak on behalf of all the constituencies to accommodate that passion and make sure that it gets heard. So thank you for being here, and just let us know if we could help you make your voice heard. That's it. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, I just wanted to say don't be afraid. And I say this seriously because I was a Fellow, and there is a tendency that you could want to wait until you've done three Fellowships before you participate. Or you're just reluctant that you're probably not too sure whether it's right, it is the right time. Just get in there.

And like Thomas mentioned earlier, one awesome way to get in without too much commitment is the public comments. And that is an awesome way to start if you are not so sure whether you are really good. Because you will do it with other members in your community. So you contribute to that. And you could do it as an individual, not necessarily as a community as well. So get in. Start doing the work. Don't wait until you know everything because you will not know everything. Thanks.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Thank you very much. And I would like to thank all three of you. Do you want to add something, Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: I just wanted to say that one motivation for you should be that this is the friendliest industry I've ever been in. I've spoken in other venues for other types of industries and you had folks where there was a lot of competition and folks wanted to self-promote themselves an awful lot. But here it's a very low hurdle to get in touch with people. So I've met a lot of friends, and I'm looking forward to these meetings because of the personal interaction. So this is not all about policy development or technical or other talks, but it's also about the human interaction and I think that's what makes ICANN great.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And on this positive note, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much for your participation.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]