
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – How It Works: ICANN Policy
Saturday, March 7, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

FERNANDA IUNES

Hello and welcome to How It Works - ICANN Policy. My name is Fernanda Iunes and I am Participation Manager for the session. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in the session. I will also be posting them in the chat for your reference. During the session, questions will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for the session will include English, Hindi, and Spanish.

If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Only questions posted in the Q&A pod -- oh, please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I'll now hand the floor over to Siranush.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you, Fernanda. Siranush for the record, and again, we are back to how policy works in ICANN. And it's my pleasure to

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.

introduce my colleagues, Carlos Reyes and Ozan Sahin, who will speak and tell us how policy works. And we also will appreciate your questions after the presentation. And without further ado, Carlos, the floor is yours. Thank you.

CARLOS REYES

Thanks, Siranush. Hi, everyone. For a few years now, Ozan and I have joined this session, and it's always good to be back. We'll provide an overview today of ICANN's policy and advice work, but mostly interested in answering any questions you may have. So, to get started, I was wondering what questions you have at this point about policy, that way we know where to focus our presentation and remarks. Yes.

ROHAN SACHDEVA

I was thinking -- sorry, my name is Rohan Sachdeva. Before coming to ICANN, I was thinking about this question in my mind that global institutions and organizations, some countries are pulling away from them. So where does ICANN stand in this? And even other bodies like IANA, what happens if there's no consensus? If somebody doesn't want to agree, what happens then? Thank you.

CARLOS REYES

Thank you. Any other questions? Yes.

PETER JIA WEI CUI

Hello, I'm Peter. I'm from Taiwan and my focus will be during the policy formulations and the implementations, they're going to always be the benefits, contradictions between different stakeholders. So, how to solve these kinds of frequent frictions and strike a balance. I think strike a balance is never an easy issue. So how to coordinate every effort from different stakeholders and even find out the consensus from board members or from different institutions and agencies can be a very challenging work.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Any other questions? Whatever you want to learn about policy, what is important to you so you want to learn about this? Yes, please.

BERNHART FARRAS SUKANDAR

Hello, greetings. I'm Bernhart Farras from Indonesia. So, basically, I know about ICANN since 2012, but the thing is, I didn't know about At-Large committee and those like really, really represent the end users. So, like in the policy process, like even people like me who knows ICANN since 2012 and doesn't know about how the policy works and the others, what is the current programs that make sure that the end user is involved? And what is the challenges?

That why it's so hard to like make sure that every single voice is heard, is there any mechanism that already being discussed or any framework? I think that's my question. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you. Idil?

İDİL KULA

Hello, it's Idil from Turkey for the reference. I would like to ask about climate and sustainability. I care about ecology and I am involved in sustainability entrepreneurship. But the thing is, what can we do to make sure of carbon emissions and deploy good ECG practice throughout all ICANN stakeholders from academia to the registrars and registries, private sector and also to the government institutions? For example, if I want to make a policy development and implementation about climate or green internet governance, how can I start it? Yeah, thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Okay, Millenium?

MILLENIUM ANTHONY

Hi, my name is Millenium. I'm an ICANN85 fellow and my question is, how does ICANN ensure that there is a balance of interest? Because ICANN is a multi-stakeholder platform and we have different groups, stakeholder groups like the technical communities and civil societies and all. Like how does it ensure that there's a balance and not everyone is fighting for what they think is right? Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Doreen, you had your hand raised.

DOREEN NANDUTU NABUZALE Thank you. I am Doreen Nandutu Nabuzale from Uganda. For me, I would like to know, how does the ICANN measure the effectiveness of a policy once it has been approved? Yeah.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN Samira Ali?

CARLOS REYES Sorry, sorry. Could you repeat what about effectiveness, please?

DOREEN NANDUTU NABUZALE I wanted to know, how does ICANN measure the effectiveness of a policy once it has been approved? Yes.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN Samira, please go ahead.

SAMIRA ALI DANBURAM Thank you very much. My name is Samira, ICANN85 fellow. So, I have the same question as Millenium. Then I also want to ask, is it the GAC that is solely responsible for the policy development in ICANN or other stakeholder groups as well? Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN There is a question over there. Yes, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

I'm from Myanmar for the record. So, my question is that, so ICANN is a multi-stakeholder community and when it comes to policy deployments, some of the issues might be overlapping for different sectors. So, how does the coordination work for the policy deployment across the sector? Thank you.

ABDULRAHMAN ABOTALEB

Thank you. My name is Abdulrahman Abotaleb, ICANN85 fellow. My question is, how much effective is the bottom-up decision-making and policy development within ICANN?

And did ICANN evaluate this system so they can find any aspect of this process to make it faster and more effective? Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Yes. Please go ahead.

MOHAMMAD BINSELIM

Yes. With you, Mohammad Binselim from Saudi Arabia, ICANN85. I have a question regarding, when we do a review for policy, is it on a monthly basis, yearly basis? If something happened in that policy, do we interrupt immediately and review that policy? Thank you.

SURYA V S

Hi, my name is Surya and I wanted to ask, how does ICANN ensure that there is a good representation of people coming from marginalized communities while making decisions in the organization?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

One last we'll take? Carlos, one last? Please, go ahead.

RUPAM BARUI

My name is Rupam and my question is a follow up on the question that Surya asked that like in some places, people do not even get to know about ICANN and what ICANN is doing. And like they are unable to take advantage of the things that ICANN are providing for them. Like, how does ICANN solve that issue?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

If you can switch off the mic there, that would be good. And the last question I will take from remote participant, what are the biggest challenges in reaching consensus in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model?

CARLOS REYES

That's a lot of good questions. I have a long list here to get through. So, what I think we'll do is, we may not really spend too much time on slides because I think you have some very good questions. I'll take the clicker. Thank you. You're always welcome to reference our slides. These can be shared.

So, we have a few slides here about the ICANN mission and how it breaks out into different thematic areas, and then our commitments. But I don't think we need to spend too much time on that and I'd like to spend more time on sort of the community groups and how these groups get their work done. And then we can start answering some of these questions that you raised.

And I guess I'll begin a little bit with what multi-stakeholderism means and within ICANN, it reflects to all of those different sectors and the balance of views and perspectives that most of you actually referenced in your framing of these questions. So it's something that you're already aware of and I don't think we need to spend too much time on that. It sounds like you're interested more in the interplay of these different sectors and communities and their interests, and I think we can get to that in our slides here.

So, as you know, all of these different perspectives participate within ICANN and there's a lot of different backgrounds, private sector, technical community, civil society, governments, end users. And those are some of the main groups that you'll be meeting with this week and you'll see them conducting work in the different sessions happening during the meeting.

We'll talk a little bit about the GAC. I know there was a question about the role of the GAC and then there was also a question about how does coordination happen? And any impacts on sort of the speed of policy development and the effectiveness of policy development and the effectiveness of those policies and how we

review policies? So, there's a lot of good questions and we'll start a little bit about how we're organized.

We have supporting organizations which develop policies and advisory committees which provide advice to the supporting organizations, to the ICANN board, and to the ICANN community. A good way to think about the supporting organizations is to focus on the specific remits of the supporting organizations. Each one handles policies related to different areas of ICANN's mission.

There's the gTLDs, generic top-level domains, there's country code top-level domains, and then there's number resources. So those are both the names and the different variations of names from generic names to country codes, and then the numbers. So, the policy development actually happens in those organizations, not the advisory committees.

There was a question about the role of the GAC and if policy development is limited to the GAC, and actually that's not the case at all. The GAC is not involved in policy development. It provides input to policy development, but the GAC only advises on issues as they relate to the interaction between the ICANN mission and public policy issues. So, that's a good approach to thinking about the different supporting organizations. Let's move on to the next slide.

All right. So, this is very repetitive. That's essentially what I just covered now is that policy recommendations comes from the different supporting organizations and the advisory committees

provide input from their remit as well. We have the At-Large Advisory Committee, they provide input from end users. The Governmental Advisory Committee, which provides input from governments. SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, they provide input from sort of the security perspective and security experts.

And the Root Server System Advisory Committee about the operation of the root server system. So those are the groups again, and the supporting organizations, we already went over that. I don't necessarily want to get into too much about sort of the different composition of the groups because your questions are more high level. So, if we have time, we can come back and look at the composition of the groups.

But one thing to keep in mind is that the supporting organizations, they all maintain their own policy development process. So, how a supporting organization develops a policy, it goes into basically a handful of different phases. There's a scoping phase where a supporting organization evaluates an issue and determines how to structure the work around it. And then there's a working group phase where the community actually gets to work and starts proposing solutions to some of the challenges that they've identified.

And then the council of that supporting organization will have to approve the recommendation and then it goes to the board. That's roughly what every supporting organization does. Slightly

differently for each of them, but that's more or less the core of their work.

So, this week in particular, you'll see a lot of sessions dedicated to, for example, DNS abuse. That is a topic that the Generic Name Supporting Organization identified within its remit, and they are now working on that issue and they've scoped it out. There's specific questions that they're answering through the working group. There's going to be two working groups eventually, but the first working group is getting started now.

And Ozan can provide a little bit of insight into how one of the advisory committees is structuring their work and their input into the policy development process for that issue. So, it's actually a pretty good example that you'll see this week, a new policy issue that is now underway.

So, let's talk a little bit about the -- let's see. I like the question about the different balance and interests and different representation. And I think the GNSO is probably a good example of that and then I'll let Ozan talk to the At-Large example.

The GNSO, as I mentioned, is the supporting organization that's focused on generic top-level domains, so gTLDs. And if you think about gTLDs as a policy issue and all the different questions that emerge from policy issues around gTLDs, there's a lot of different inputs and interests there.

There's the commercial interest, there's non-commercial interests, there's operators, and obviously governments also have an interest in some of the gTLDs. So, balancing all of those issues, actually, the GNSO Council has few different ways of doing that.

They have different models for establishing their working groups. They have allocation based on how the GNSO has structured itself. There are two houses within the GNSO and then some of those groups break down even further into different stakeholder groups and constituencies. You'll be meeting with most of them throughout this week as well.

So, they all participate within the GNSO policy development process and by design, the GNSO Council ensures that there is representation. And there are a lot of battles, if that's a good word to use, for representation.

As you might expect, a lot of groups are passionate about these issues, and they want to ensure that there's equal representation across constituencies and stakeholder groups, et cetera. So, the structure of a working group from the beginning is to ensure that there is an opportunity for all those different perspectives to be reflected in the work itself.

And then the other ICANN community groups, either supporting organizations or advisory committees, they have their own ways of engaging with a policy development process. Sometimes it can be through an official liaison relationship. Other times the council may actually have representation in the working group and other

times it's public comment or other mechanisms. So, it just really depends on how the GNSO council decides to structure that particular work effort.

There's always going to be representation from the GNSO itself and then how it engages with the other groups and how the other groups choose to engage with that work just varies on the issue. Ozan, do you want to talk a little bit about how the At-Large is thinking about participating in the DNS abuse work?

OZAN SAHIN

Sure, thank you, Carlos. For the record, I'm Ozan Sahin and I'm a member of the ICANN policy development support team and based in Turkey. So Carlos already introduced this infographic and the post-development process for the three supporting organizations that we have. And I know it's a bit hard to read on the slide, but I already put in the chat a link to the actual infographic. So, I'm also adding a link to the advice development infographic in the chat. And let's go to the slide.

We have four advisory committees. One is the At-Large Advisory Committee for the end users. We have Governmental Advisory Committee composed of representatives from the governments. And root server operators have their group Root Server System Advisory Committee. And the Security and Stability Advisory Committee has technical experts in it.

So, this infographic is about the advice development of these four advisory committees. And although the advice development process differs slightly between these groups, there are common themes in each of these advice development processes. So, if you take the example of At-Large Advisory Committee, there's a phase that we call the identification of the issue as the first step. And then we have scoping the issue and then, you know, development of the advice and the ratification phase.

Any At-Large member can bring up an issue in the first step, in the identification of the issue and then the At-Large community composes a group, a small group, to look at the issue that's being brought up. If this is a public comment that is open, for instance, this small group would review the documents that are related to this public comment. And then take the perspective of the end users and start creating some bullet points to present to the working group within At-Large that is specifically working on the policy development.

So, this group presents their views to this working group called Consolidated Policy Working Group and then makes a recommendation on whether to develop an ALAC statement on the issue or not. At this point, after discussing with the Consolidated Policy Working Group, the At-Large community may decide to leave it and not develop a statement. Or they can prefer to go forward with drafting a statement.

So, a team, which is typically this small team that has already reviewed the public comment, starts drafting a statement. And then once they draft one, they present it to the Consolidated Policy Working Group again and then the broader group starts commenting on it and making the draft final.

So once there is a final ALAC statement, it goes for ratification through the ratification process and the ALAC members start voting on it. And if ratified by the ALAC, then ALAC publishes a statement and submits this input to the public comment process. So that's how from the identification of the issue step, through the ratification step, how it works within the At-Large group.

And as Carlos said, you know, this advice statement development is one part of how the group can contribute to policy and advice development process. Another way would be directly joining the working groups that are being convened.

So, one current example is the DNS abuse mitigation policy development process that the GNSO community initiated and At-Large already appointed members and participants and observers to this process as it was defined in the charter of the policy development process.

And this morning, before the lunch break, there was a discussion in the At-Large session on the charter of this DNA abuse mitigation policy development process. And the representatives to this group presented what the charter is, what the At-Large position should be, and what they should really bring up during the working group

discussions. So that's another way to participate in the post-development process. Shall we continue, Carlos?

CARLOS REYES

So, I think hopefully that gives you some insight into some of the coordination that happens. A lot of these community groups within ICANN will usually form some sort of team or working group and invite their membership to provide their input and shape that perspective.

Some of them have rules or guidelines that go further and that actually direct their representatives into working groups or sometimes even direct the votes of their council members. So, each group approaches it slightly differently, but the intent is always to ensure that there is their perspective in the work.

Ozan talked a little bit about the broad work of At-Large and how that informs the work of the Consolidated Policy Working Group, the CPWG, within the At-Large, and then how that can help shape ALAC advice. And then ultimately that can inform either a GNSO PDP or a public comment, et cetera.

So, there's always some sort of organizing mechanism, some sort of coordination mechanism within a community, and then how the different community groups relate to each other and how they interact with each other. They also have their own processes for that, either, as I mentioned earlier, a liaison role, or they often

invite input into their work from different groups if that liaison relationship does not exist.

But as you might imagine, when you have all these different perspectives, it is challenging to achieve consensus. And this is where the bulk of the work happens to navigate these issues and to find agreement that works for as many people as possible. Each community actually defines consensus differently. Sometimes it may not be obvious to all of us, but each community defines or has different expectations for how they define consensus and they often have to remind each other of that.

And ultimately, I think, a bit -- what's a good word for this? A sort of casual way of thinking about it is, if there's a lot of people who are upset about something, then that's probably right. Because consensus requires give and take and concessions and agreements. So, you know, if everyone is not necessarily happy with the final outcome, but it is an outcome, then that means that there was a lot of give and take and discussion and deliberation and debate and agreement and disagreement.

And I think ultimately, consensus product actually requires a lot of discussion and a lot of commitment by everyone to reach that outcome and then also to support it afterward. Because you know think about your parliament at home or your congress, et cetera, or however your city is organized, you elect representatives and they are there to represent your interests. And a national policy may not be exactly what you want, but it does advance the issue forward.

So, in that sense, I think ICANN is very similar in that all of these different constituencies and communities have their own interests and voices, and they all commit to addressing a challenge. But they will have to learn to work with and to support the ultimate consensus outcome, whatever that solution is. So I think, hopefully that answers a lot of the questions about balancing the different interests and representation and challenges with reaching consensus and the different roles of the group and groups and how they coordinate and how they solve some of these frictions because they do exist.

They exist across the groups and they exist within the groups. You're dealing with a global good, the internet, and everyone relies on it and uses it differently and everyone has a lot of different opinions about it.

So, I think with that, I'll pause here to see if there are any clarifying questions about what we covered. And then we can get to some of the broader questions about, like there was a question about withdrawals from international organizations or sort of the green initiatives and sustainability and also reviews of policies. But I think hopefully we addressed a lot of the work mechanisms and policy development issues. Any clarifying questions about how the work happens and how these groups interact with each other? Yes.

ABDULRAHMAN ABOTALEB

I have a question. My name is Abdulrahman Abotaleb. I'm not sure if it is direct related, but how does ICANN ensure -- I mean, given

the increase in geopolitical pressure everywhere, how does the ICANN ensure the balance of the multi-stakeholder model not to be dominated by a specific stakeholder in the ecosystem? Thank you.

CARLOS REYES

So ultimately, every group, including the ICANN board, usually takes it upon themselves to ensure that there's other input into their work. For example, when the GNSO Council recommends a policy, the ICANN bylaws require that the board consults with anyone who may be impacted by that policy. The GNSO Council already did that work as well and that's why the GNSO Council is structured in a way that all these different interests are represented.

So, just from a process perspective, ICANN's very deliberate about ensuring that there's a step for checking with other groups who may be impacted. And ultimately, it comes down to conducting those processes faithfully. And, you know, that ensures that when the board makes a decision, it knows that or it can be assured that different groups have been consulted along the way.

And like I said, the GNSO, every group has that to some extent. I don't think you would ever see any sort of policy development without input from the public at a minimum, but there are different ways for them to consult each other and different perspectives. Ozan, is there anything you'd like to add there?

OZAN SAHIN

I think the part of the question was also how ICANN tracks the different geopolitical developments in the world and how it adjusts. So, the ICANN community and organization and the board are following the discussions about the, you know, role of the technical community in the internet governance. And recently participated in these discussions that were happening in the -- for instance, one that has recently happened and happening is in the United Nations.

So, we have a department team that's closely following that and then informing the ICANN community about it and encouraging the ICANN community to also take part in these discussions. So again, the board organization and the community are closely following that and participating in the discussions that are happening outside of ICANN and in the broader internet governance forum.

CARLOS REYES

Any other questions? Yes.

PETER JIA WEI CUI

Yes, and thanks for sharing and my question will be, because current technology developments and also the policy developments is getting faster and faster, so does these kind of fast changing contexts actually trigger the discussions about more responsive and more efficient policy developments?

Or that ICANN believe that the current systems and institutions can still deal with the fast-changing backgrounds? Considering the

technology, like emerging technologies, like disruptive technologies, like AI or geopolitical engagements, for example, the current crisis or conflict between different countries or other issues.

CARLOS REYES

I think by design, a lot of institutions are meant to be deliberate and not necessarily immediately responding to emerging technologies or any other issues. That's not to say that those conversations don't happen.

I think if you look at, for example, different namespaces that have emerged, a lot of communities within ICANN have taken interest in that. Whether it's registries who are thinking about providing new services or the Security and Stability Advisory Committee that's looking at how to integrate some of these emerging technologies into the DNS.

So, they all do it within the scope of their remit, but ICANN's mission and the mission of all of the supporting organizations and advisory committees, they're all very specific. And by design, they will look at issues from that perspective and they will, over time, adapt, but it's not something that happens, I think, certainly not at the speed that we're used to now in day-to-day life, I think.

You know, things move very quickly and that's not to say that ICANN cannot react or doesn't react. I think a good example would be the 2017-2018 General Data Privacy, GDPR. I forgot GDPR.

Protection, yes. General Data Protection Regulation out of the European Union, the ICANN community had to undertake policy efforts to modify the registry agreement and other areas.

There was an immediate mechanism that the board has the power to do through a temporary specification so that we would be in compliance with it, with the GDPR. But then the community had to mobilize around how do we update our policies? So, there's always a bit of a give and take.

There may be an issue emerging, there are certain steps that ICANN can take immediately, but then there's always a broader conversation about, let's make sure we do this in a bottom-up way. In a way that reflects our values and commitments. Yep.

PETER JIA WEI CUI

So, I want to have a follow-up question because I wonder if these kind of policies they're dealing with, the emergency issues in a very short time, is there any mechanisms about recognitions by the communities or other kind of mechanisms to fulfill the legitimacy of the policies?

CARLOS REYES

The legitimacy of policies, yeah, that's a good question. It sort of gets to there was an earlier question about effectiveness of policies. And I think the effectiveness of policy is something that a lot of organizations, I think -- well, it's a challenge, even for governments, right? Like, how do you determine a policy as being

effective? And ultimately, it comes down to, are the people who are affected by the policy positively or negatively, or just generally, what is their experience?

And there are specific reviews that ICANN conducts around policies just to make sure that they're still fit for purpose. And sometimes that means a policy can be revised and sometimes the community says, "Well, you know what, it's working so we don't necessarily need to change."

Even, I think the advisory committees, especially the more technical ones, the Root Server System Advisory Committee and the SSAC, for example, they may revise publications as trends shift or new technology emerges or different expectations on different parts of the internet community. So, there's always an effort to be introspective and to improve. And I think that's very much part of sort of the ICANN ethos. Anything you'd like to add, Ozan? No? Great. We'll just start from over you, yes, and then we'll work our way this way.

MUTEGEKI CLIFF

Thank you. My name is Mutegeki Cliff for the record and I'm an ICANN85 fellow. My question is about how does ICANN handle policy development of issues that cut across the three supporting organizations and the four advisory committees?

CARLOS REYES

That's a good question. So ultimately, the way ICANN community work is currently structured, an issue has to fit, if you will, within one of the communities, but then that community can invite the other groups to participate. Occasionally, you do see issues that, I guess, have more interest more broadly.

In the past, we had a period of time where we had cross-community working groups, working groups that were by design incorporate, that would incorporate the different supporting organizations and advisory committees, but those have to be very specific purposes.

We had two cross-community working groups around the time of the IANA stewardship transition, for example, when the oversight of the IANA functions went from the U.S. government and the contract that we had with the U.S. government to the multi-stakeholder community. So there were two cross-community working groups. One that was looking at the actual transition of those functions and then one that was looking at the accountability of ICANN around those issues.

So, those were two cross-community working groups that were undertaken, but usually they've been very high-profile issues. But since then, a lot of policy issues have actually been handled within the GNSO, ccNSO, or ASO and then those groups will then reach out to different groups as needed. Yes.

DOREEN NANDUTU NABUZALE Thank you. This is Doreen Nandutu Nabuzale. ICANN fellow for the record. For me, I'm wondering, are there instances where, say there is no consensus within a working group and if such an instance happens, how does the board or the community handle that instance?

CARLOS REYES Ozan, is there an example from At Large or ALAC about when? Okay. So typically, I think there are always issues that don't necessarily reach consensus. And one of my working groups, for example, sometimes a working group will reach a point where we made progress on seven issues and two issues just did not get there. I think that's okay. That's part of the process.

What usually happens is the recommendations will go to the board or the council, et cetera. And the areas that do not reach consensus, it's good to know because that just means there's future work. Either a separate working group that the council will have to develop or establish or, you know, the board will have to consider. But it's good to know where there is agreement and where there is no agreement.

So typically, that just means, as I said, there's going to be future work and then the council or the board, depending on where the issue finds itself, will focus on the recommendations that have been approved and what to do next with those.

So, if a working group reaches consensus on, like I said, seven issues out of nine, then they will move those recommendations to the council and then they'll decide how to address the remaining two. So, that's generally what happens, but it does happen, so. Yes.

ABDUL MANAF SULEMANA

Hello, my name is Abdul Manaf Suleman, an ICANN fellow. Are there examples where community feedback stopped or changed your policy, any ones you can [inaudible - 00:48:43]?

CARLOS REYES

People change reports.

OZAN SAHIN

Yeah, thanks for the question. So, we talked about the public comment process and there are some guidelines driving this process. When a public comment is open about an issue, a post-development process, groups or individuals may submit comments and inform the process. So, that's usually a working group seeking the input of individuals or groups who may have already participated in the post-development process. Or who may prefer staying outside, but you know wanted to submit their input at the time of the public comment.

So, the working group at the end of the public comment process reviews all the comments submitted, and then makes a determination whether to update the report based on the public

comments received or proceed as it is. And then they usually publish a report that summarizes the comments received and the kind of actions taken against these comments. And you'll be able to read these summary reports, which are also published after the public comment process.

CARLOS REYES

If you want a really good example of this right now, I recommend going to the public sessions that the ASO is leading, the Address Supporting Organization.

They're currently working on a governance document. It's not policy as the ASO defines it because it's not about internet number resources, but it is an important issue. And they're looking at some of the governance issues of the RIRs and they've done a really good job I think of tracking how input during the three different consultations within the RIR communities and within the ICANN community, how that has shaped the development of this document.

And you can review the first version, the second version, and the next version that are coming up and really track the issues. But most groups, as Ozan said, will have that, either through public comment or just their own deliberations of a working group. You'll see the different drafts of the document archived and you can see how something developed. If we do anything at ICANN really well, it's documentation. Yes.

SRIJAN RAI

Hi, my name is Srijan and I'm a public policy student and an ICANN NextGen fellow. I had some questions on the working group and like just deep diving on it. The first part of the question was, I was curious as in, like what would be a broad criteria to determine whether a policy issue goes to the working group or not? And which specific working group would it go to? So, what would be some broad criteria to look at there?

Secondly, I think echoing a previous question, how would a working group say whether it's within the ALAC or whether it's in the Government Advisory Committee, how would it differ?

And lastly, I just wanted to understand if, say, the policy issue was immediate, but consensus takes time so are there any broad guidelines for timelines there? I'm not saying to skip discussion overall, but just some broad guidelines into, what is the maximum time that the working group can take to decide upon the issue?

CARLOS REYES

I think groups are getting a lot better about setting timelines or expectations for when they would like to see some sort of product from a working group. But that really just varies on the issues and how they make progress and how they determine that they're ready to make some sort of consensus call and then send the recommendation on to their chartering group.

But yeah, there's no set timeline for a policy. It's just there's more and more effort underway to have some sort of project plan for issues. So I think you're seeing that trend within the ICANN community now, being more disciplined about how to allocate the resources of their volunteers, right, the time and their expertise.

But it's not like putting together IKEA furniture, right? Like, usually, if you read the instructions, it says, you know, this may take you an hour or two, depending on how many different parts you have and if you have the right tools, et cetera, I don't think policy is that prescriptive. The first part of the question, please?

SRIJAN RAI

So, the criterion in terms of deciding whether a policy issue should go to a working group and which group should it go to?

CARLOS REYES

Ozan, do you want to take that?

OZAN SAHIN

Sure. So, in the identification of the issue and scoping phases, this is where actually the groups and the councils come into play and determine whether the issue is within their remit and scope or not. So these groups have clear descriptions of their remit in their charter's bylaws and this is really up to the groups and their leaderships and their councils to determine whether this is within their remit to look at and then form a working group or not.

At this phase, they can determine that it does make sense to move forward with forming a working group and then working on the issue. Or they can just say, you know, this is not within our remit, so we will not be looking at this issue by forming a working group.

Thank you. I see this hand, but I also see two questions in the chat. So, let's go to these questions first and then come back to you if that's okay. Can you read the first question, Sira?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Yes. So, Akhtar, a fellow from NIXI is asking, for newcomers interested in contributing from an end user perspective, how does At-Large community typically engage with ongoing policy discussions? are there particular working groups where new participants can meaningfully contribute?

OZAN SAHIN

Yeah, thank you for the question, Akhtar. I think we briefly spoke to this. In the At-Large community, it's really, as Carlos said, they have some representatives following different supporting organizations, advisory committees, and the policy development processes within these groups. So when there's a potential policy issue, policy development process, these liaisons or representatives would inform the At-Large community and make potential recommendations.

The other way is appointing representatives, again, members to the working groups that are being formed. I gave the example of

the DNS abuse mitigation policy development process that was recently chartered by the GNSO and the At-Large community already appointed participants and members and observer to this process.

Another part of the question is the working groups within At-Large. There are actually two working groups that are looking at issues. One is called Consolidated Policy Working Group or CPWG that are following the post-evaluation processes at ICANN and then developing ALAC statements for these.

And the other one is called Operations Finance and Budget working group, or OFB and this group is mainly developing statements for operational issues. Like when there's a public comment out for the ICANN operations, and then budget is for when the ICANN budget is out for public comment and finance.

So, this group also looks at some of the governance issues, like when there is a governance document is out for public comment, again, it's the Operations Finance Budget working group working on this.

Carlos mentioned the ASO review process on the internet coordination policy two for the regional internet registries. So, this is the group actually that looks at these kind of governance documents and then drafts the ALAC statement for submission.

And, of course, as participants, you can take part in these working groups, take part in the small groups that are drafting the views for

CPWG and OFB to review later on, and then for ALAC to ratify in the end. And I hope that answers the first question. We have one more I think, Siranush?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Yes, there is one more. So, many technical standards affecting domain name system operations originate from the Internet Engineering Task Force. When such standards have policy implications for domain name registries or registrars, how does ICANN coordinate between the technical community and policy bodies such as GNSO, Generic Name Supporting Organization?

CARLOS REYES

It's actually timely. There's a lot of conversations underway right now about coordination between the IETF, the technical community, the Internet Engineering Task Force, and ICANN. Usually what happens is there's a lot of practical operational issues that can generally be addressed by some of the standard setting organizations.

If those experiences then have an impact on policies that have been approved, that have been developed through consensus process and approved by the ICANN board, then that's an area where for potentially one of those reviews, policy reviews would happen where there are experience-based learning or knowledge that will now have to inform how those policies have to adapt. And there

would be some sort of policy development effort of updating those policies.

So, it's sort of a give and take, really whether it's an emerging technology or new standards, how the ICANN community updates their policies to be relevant is just through the usual process. Ozan, is there anything you'd like to add?

OZAN SAHIN

I have nothing to add, but I think we had another question.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Yes, Melanie, you had a question. Please, go ahead.

MELANIE ALDUNCE

Thank you. I'm Melanie from Chile for the record. And I was thinking based on their questions, specifically about DNS abuse because it's a transversal topic, like a cross-cutting thing, if it is being worked in a specific group right now or just the board? Thank you.

CARLOS REYES

So, there's a new DNS abuse mitigation policy development process within the GNSO. And Ozan mentioned a lot of different groups are interested in this work. So, they may have their own DNS abuse working group, either to inform the policy development process of the GNSO or to discuss the issue within their own group.

So, the Consolidated Policy Working Group of At-Large, there's a, I'm trying to think, DNS Abuse Standing Committee within the ccNSO that looks at ccTLDs and how they respond to DNS abuse. The GAC discusses DNS abuse issues at the GAC level. So, every group does it a little bit differently, but because it is a cross-cutting issue, a lot of groups do take interest in that and they're trying to inform that policy development process in the GNSO. There was a question?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Yes, and then we'll come to you. Okay, Zulkar and you.

ZULKAR

Hi. I'm Zulkar, I'm an ICANN85 fellow. I just wanted to ask a follow-up question to what Melanie was asking on DNS abuse. So, we formed Internet Society, Ontario chapter last year and we recently, just a couple of months ago, we created an At-Large structure, part of the At-Large structure.

So, we have started training anti-phishing, you know, digital abuse awareness training for senior citizens in Ontario, Canada. So, what we have been noticing is that like DNS abuse has been so prevalent. There have been, you know, government websites, the phishing websites that revolve like every 48 hours.

And so, my question is, like the people who are on the ground, like the community organizations, whenever they see the DNS abuse new patterns, emerging patterns, how can they involve the

decision-making team in this? How can they be part of the decision-making? Because what I'm seeing is that, the people who are seeing these issues the most, they're the furthest from the, you know, decision makers. So, any advice on that?

CARLOS REYES

I think there's always a little bit of tension as you describe it. I saw recently a conversation within one of the ICANN SOAC groups. They had a very deliberate conversation about who their representatives were going to be in the DNS abuse mitigation PDP working group because they wanted people in the room who had operational experience with these issues.

So, I think a lot of the community groups are aware of that and that's usually why they will scan their membership to make sure that they appoint or elect the person who can best inform that work and that can advocate those different perspectives. So, I think ICANN community groups are mature in how they appoint people to these working groups. Yes.

ROHAN SACHDEVA

Hi, my name is Rohan Sachdeva. My question is, why does GNSO play a central role in policymaking? Why is it not other committees that form policies and then seek advice from other committees via GNSO? Thank you.

CARLOS REYES

I think it just comes down to the size of the gTLD namespace, right? So, there's a lot of issues there. ccTLD is just by scale, the scale is different and a lot of the ccTLD experiences are actually handled through just the best practice sharing across the ccTLD members, ccNSO members who are the ccTLDs. So, I think that's part of it.

Also, it's an evolving space. So, if you look at the number side of things, we have IPv4 and IPv6 address space, the address space has been pretty stable. There are issues within IPv4, excuse me, IPv6 deployment or even the IPv4 marketplace, but those are usually handled at the regional level, not at the global level. And ICANN, the ASO policy remit within ICANN is at the global level.

So, again, it just depends on how each supporting organization has interpreted its remit and what that remit is as provided by the bylaws.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Yes, please go ahead.

ILHAM SUTOYO

Thank you. My name is Ilham from NextGen. So, I do have like a couple of questions, but I mean, I think some of the questions already been asked by our colleagues here, but I just want to like reiterate just like simple quick questions. So basically, based on the slides, there are like four different working groups, right? So, out of my curiosity, so basically, they try to create like policy consensus to be implemented in the community, right?

But when they decided to do it, is there any platform for like a representative from like any different working groups to come up together to make sure that the policy that's going to be implemented to the community like align with each other? Or it's like literally working separately towards their different goals or subjects or missions? Thank you.

CARLOS REYES

So, there are many, many working groups. There are four advisory committees and three supporting organizations. This sort of gets to the questions about effectiveness and I think what I've observed over the years is that, the input or the feedback from, for example, the contracted parties about a policy, it's ongoing. And ICANN, the organization, when we receive direction from the ICANN board to implement a specific policy, it takes time to develop how that's implemented and then how it's enforced through contracts.

So, it's something that is done deliberately through collaboration. The community and the organization will work on ensuring that policy seeks to actually address the issue that was originally identified.

ILHAM SUTOYO

So, there is like still a platform for like different working groups to come up together to collaborate in terms of like building the policy consensus then?

CARLOS REYES Yeah. So, the different communities participate within that working group, correct.

ILHAM SUTOYO I see.

CARLOS REYES Mm-hmm.

ILHAM SUTOYO And then just a little bit more, how like young generations to be able to like put up input there as like someone who might be not really know about what's going on there?

CARLOS REYES So, every ICANN community group has some sort of membership process for bringing on new members. In the case of the ccNSO, for example, you have to be a ccTLD. So, you'd have to be employed by a ccTLD or work with a ccTLD. The Root Server System Advisory Committee consists of root server operators, so you would have to be working with a root server operator.

But if you look at some of the more individual-based communities, such as the At-Large through the At-Large structures, or the regional At-Large organizations, or some of them have individual membership categories, then there's a way for younger emerging leaders to participate there.

The constituencies of the GNSO also have different membership requirements, but basically, outside of the membership process, this is outside of anything that the ICANN organization would manage, it's up to those community groups to set those guidelines. And they manage their own membership application and process, et cetera.

So, we can chat afterward or the ICANN website's a good resource to find the group that most aligns with your interest and your experience and your goals. And then you would get involved there and then contribute through that working group.

ILHAM SUTOYO

I see. Cheers. Thank you.

CARLOS REYES

Mm-hmm.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

And actually, your question leads to the point that we will be coming soon, starting from the next session, learning about each supporting organization and advisory committee. So, it will be a good opportunity for all of you now to hear from each community individually, as we can say, how they do their membership, how you can get engaged. So, that's why we started with general, technical, and policy, and we'll move to learning about the communities themselves. Yes, Ozan, please.

OZAN SAHIN

Yeah, just one thing to add to this question on the topic of young generations contributing to policy and advice development processes and coming up to speed.

So, since I also support the work of the Consolidated Policy Working Group of At-Large EPWG, an observation here to share with you is that when they form small groups to look at the ongoing issues, like the post-development processes or any documents on which the advice is being sought, the young people or newcomers do not hesitate to take part in the small teams.

Even though this is the first time they are taking part or they already know that they cannot contribute much to the process, they still volunteer to take part. And then small teams are a blend of, you know, usually the newcomers and seasoned members and that is done deliberately within the At-Large.

So, within the small team, you would find the subject matter expert on this topic and then potentially a representative to the other group. For instance, in the case of the DNS abuse, the representative to this post-development process working group within the small group that's reviewing the document. And then there's a discussion in the small group, which is a mixture of seasoned members and the newcomers.

So, there may also be a split of work. You know, one can look at the public comment proceeding, the document, and start developing

some bullet points. And then when they have a call to discuss and consolidate what to discuss, you know, the seasoned members would definitely help the newcomers in creating the document.

And then there may be different tasks, you know, presenting this work to the At-Large consolidated policy working group, that's one thing the new members can also do. And then by taking part in the small groups, the newcomers also feel more and more comfortable contributing more next time. So that's what I observed about what's happening within At-Large consolidated post-working group and their small teams. So, I'm glad that not many people are hesitating to take part.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you, Ozan, and let me thank -- we are already out of time, so if you have any questions, these are the guys who will be here for the entire week so feel free to reach them. And I would like, on behalf of all fellows, NextGen-ners and newcomers, thank you, Carlos and Ozan, for being here with us. And with that, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you and looking forward seeing you back at 3:00 in the same room to hear from the communities.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]