20130919_SOAC_ID817915

Nick Tomasso: As -- the goal of the call is clearly stated, and that is to inform the community leaders of suggested improvements to the Buenos Aires meeting schedule, to maximize community participation and collaboration, and most importantly is to get your feedback on the things that we're considering. On the agenda we'll have Sally, Chris and then myself to take you through some of the concepts we're considering and let you know how that lays out and get your candid feedback on what we're thinking.

So, perhaps I'll turn it over to Chris now, please, to give us some perspective from the Board and his own personal observations.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. Thanks, Nick.

So, look, those of you who have been around for a while will know that this meeting conundrum is driving everybody insane, and has been driving everybody insane for quite some considerable time. And every time someone makes a suggestion about changing things, it's never going to satisfy everybody.

So, there are two kinds of strands going on right now. One is an overarching strategic strand about the whole meeting concept and how can we deal with that. And the other one is a much more sort of detailed logistical strand that's looking at let's just look at what happens at the next meeting. And fundamentally that, I think, is what this call is about, although it bleeds into sort of the greater picture.

Bluntly, part of the issue is that the SO and the AC staff are extraordinarily good at their job. So, Bart gets sent in to battle on behalf of the ccNSO, though when I was chair of the ccNSO I would send him into battle and now Byron sends him into battle to ensure the following things happen at an ICANN meeting for the ccNSO. And then Glen and others do the same for the GNSO and Heidi and others do the same for the ALAC and so on. And you end up with all of these massively competing requirements, which culminate in the sort of joyous example of Durban, where, because we had enough rooms, we had God knows how many conflicting meetings at the same time and it ends up with no one being satisfied.

So, we've sort of come to a conclusion that on a low-level logistical basis we need to make some changes and get some stuff sorted out whilst, at the same time, recognizing that there's a huge amount of work going on at the high level, strategy level. And I should tell you that next week in--.

Yes, thank you, Bart. It's Gabi and Kristina who will do the battle with me, correct. Thank you for pointing that out on the chat room.

I should tell you that next week the Board in a -- at its workshop is going to spend the largest chunk of its three days discussing meetings. And we're not intending to -- yes, the other Kristina. It is intending to -- while we're not intended to make decisions or vastly change it, but we are intending to make -- to talk seriously about the strategy.

But, this is about what happens in Buenos Aires. And Nick and the team have been doing some seriously important sort of background work on trying to figure out how to deal with it so that we can, all of us, not have everything we want, but can at least have a successful meeting without too many clashes and too many issues.

There are some things that flow from that which I'll get back to in context but, Nick, did I cover everything that you thought I should or is there something that I haven't covered that you want me to?

Nick Tomasso: No, Chris, I think that's it. The key message here being the high number of conflicts and how we work with the SOs and ACs and staff to minimize them. Thanks, Chris.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Nick Tomasso: So, Chris, thanks for the intro. I'm sure Sally will join soon. But, what I thought I would do now is take--.

Sally Costerton: No, I'm here. Nick, I've been on for -- sorry. Apologies for being late. I didn't have a signal. But, I just heard most of what Chris said, so I'm on.

Nick Tomasso: So Sally, why don't you give your perspective on the Durban schedule, the -- and your goal to modify the BA schedule--.

Sally Costerton: Okay.

Nick Tomasso: To make -- go ahead.

Sally Costerton: Yeah. Yeah. I mean -- thanks a lot, Chris, because I think that's very good context and a good summary of the time. So, thank you all for joining (inaudible).

                    Can you hear me?

Chris Disspain: Yes.

Sally Costerton: Oh, good.

Nick Tomasso: Go ahead, Sally.

Sally Costerton: So, our short-term objectives (inaudible) the timing for the Buenos Aires meeting is to try to reduce the amount of conflicting sessions on the agenda. And the reason for coming to you to ask for your input is really two things. One is to take your -- better understand your priorities for the Buenos Aires meeting so that we could have a good understanding of how (inaudible).

                    But also, I think Chris made an excellent point in his (inaudible) about the pressure coming in to the meeting planning team from the secretariats. And it seemed to us that one way to achieve that was to have a more open discussion earlier in the process with you, if you will, the kind of clients, if you'll pardon the expression, of those meetings, to

make sure that we didn't create artificial pressure because we haven't actually kind of joined up the discussion, and we ended up solving a problem that possibly we could have avoided by having a more streamlined approach to start with.   So, that's really what I would like to try and get out this call, and for the next couple weeks, is a more streamlined approach going into the agenda so that we have fewer conflicting sessions on the agenda itself.

And the second thing I would say is I think doing that offers us the opportunity to experiment with one or two ideas that we may then feed into the broader sort of evolution of the meetings, as Chris was saying. So, that's my goal.

Nick Tomasso: Okay. Thank you, Sally.

As we look to the ever-increasing number of sessions taking place at ICANN meetings, anecdotally, my first meeting was Cairo in October of 2008. I believe we had 97 sessions. In Durban we had the largest number of meeting sessions ever at 238. And as we considered feedback from the community and the Board in Durban and through the post-meeting survey, the meetings team felt it was necessary to re-examine how the schedule was developed with an eye towards creating a more reasonable schedule that reduces the number of session conflicts, satisfies the community's desires for more interaction with the ACs and SOs, and increase opportunities for discussion on new gTLDs.

So, I'm going to take you through some ideas that we've been discussing and ask for your candid feedback. Please stop my anywhere along through this presentation so that I can really capture your thoughts.

So the question is how we're going to do this. And we're going to maintain those meeting elements that are critical to the success of the meeting, and everyone on the call knows what they are. But then, modify the schedule to meet the objectives of everyone involved; the community, the Board, the ACs, SOs, etc. I'm going to take you through a day-by-day look at the schedule and some of the things that we're considering and I'll highlight the changes that will have an impact.

So, beginning with Sunday, we have a newcomer session; and it's necessary, it's well attended and we'll continue to run them.

On Monday--.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Nick -- Nick, just -- it's Michele. Just interrupting you, because I did put up my hand in the Adobe Connect. Just one thing you've mentioned already, that I just wanted clarification as to what you considered -- it was -- some -- you started to talk about conflicts. And I would appreciate understanding what you guys consider a conflict today, because I can't really -- without understanding what you guys consider a conflict to be, then I can't really have any -- I can't say anything further.

Nick Tomasso: The conflicts that we hear of are more from the community than they are from the meetings team. The community has weighed in that they would like to be in multiple sessions, and yet that they find that there isn't -- that because the schedule is so full of sessions, that they cannot attend all the ones they want to because there are conflicts. So, the concept of conflict is not specific to any one type of session, but it's across the board what we're hearing from the community members.

Does that answer your question?

Chris Disspain: So, Nick, it's Chris. Can I just -- there's a discussion going on in the chat list about conflicts and let's just--.

Nick Tomasso: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Because we can't -- we really can't deal -- we can't go forward unless we do. So, let's be really clear.

So, it was going to be -- another way. There are often going to be sessions, one session that conflicts with another. It's just the nature of the world and that happens. The following issues arise. The first thing that happens that causes is a problem is where a lobbying team for a meeting, let's call them a lobbying team, for a meeting says my meeting must be in the main room and/or they say and nothing must conflict with my meeting. And that's a real issue because, frankly, that's almost impossible.

Let me give you an example. I'll just pluck something out of thin air. Someone comes to you and says we need to have a discussion on variants. And that is an incredibly important topic and it should be in the main room and nothing should conflict with it. Now, the reality is that it may very well be an incredibly important topic for some people, but it's not an important topic for host of other people and there could very sensibly be other things happening at the same time, as long as those things are not involving the same crowd of people who want to talk about variants.

To take another example, we have what appears to have become a standing session at ICANN meetings on Monday afternoons about the Internet Governance Forum or internet governance generally. And personally, for me, that's incredibly important because it's what I'm involved with. But, I recognize and understand that there are a number of organizations or supporting organizations or advisory committees within ICANN for whom that doesn't actually matter all that much. They might go to it if they could but, on the other hand, if something's conflicting that they want to go to, they're fine with that.

What we're missing from the structuring of our Mondays and Wednesday afternoons and Thursday mornings is any sort of nuance or understanding. And what we've got in spades is lobbying. "My meeting is the most important." I've heard people say -- in fact, it's been said to me, I have to have my meeting in the main room because, otherwise, no one will come; or, I can't start my meeting on time in the main room because no one is here yet. So therefore, I'm going to run 15 minutes late and wait for everybody to arrive and everything else is going to have to run 15 minutes because I'm running 15 minutes late. All this stuff is just basically logistics which needs to be dealt with sensibly.

And I have one more thing to say before I move on, which I was about to type into the room but, because I have the microphone, Evan has made a note that everything went to hell in a hand basket when Fridays were abolished and I have to take issue with that. It simply isn't true. The only organized matters that happened on a Friday were the SO and AC 10-minute reporting sessions, which can quite easily be dealt with either in front of the world or another way. And a few other minor bits and pieces which, frankly, having been to every single one of them for the last 10 years, almost no one attended.

So, whilst I'm not averse to having meetings of ICANN on a Friday morning, it's incorrect to say that the collision issue has occurred of Fridays. I think, Nick, you'll accept from me that the collision issue has been occurring for far longer than the removal of Fridays is concerned and is relevant to. I'll stop there. Thanks.

Nick Tomasso: Okay. Thank you, Chris, for that clarification. And yes, I do agree. The only things that took place on Fridays. Evan has actually weighed in that ALAC had a Friday meeting. But for the most part, they were just the SO/AC reports, which were poorly attended, and followed by the public forum and the board meeting.

I'll continue on and we'll continue the discussion. So, let's -- stop me again anywhere along the way.

I talked about the newcomer session on Sunday remaining. On Monday we'll continue with the opening ceremony.

Chris Disspain: Nick, are we supposed to have something up on the screen, because so far all I've got is the agenda.

Nick Tomasso: No, we're just going to stay with the agenda, Chris.

Chris Disspain: Okay, super.

Nick Tomasso: Also on Monday, there's a continuing need for what we're now calling high-interest topics, those topics that take place in the main meeting room and we'll continue with them on Monday as usual. But, we're also reserving some time on Thursday afternoon following the public forum for some of those topics. Staff has already been hard at work identifying them and they are under consideration by the Buenos Aires Steering Committee that we've put together to tackle the Buenos Aires meeting.

Also on Monday, and this is a change, a need for a full -- partial day of new gTLD sessions has been identified and we've created a new gTLD track on Monday running in parallel with the high-interest topics, and it'll provide ample opportunity for discussion on new gTLDs.

Tuesday, always known as Constituency Day, will take place as usual, as well as the AC/SO meetings with the Board that typically take place that day.

On Wednesday we're going to create more opportunities for sessions on outreach and training.

And here's a -- this one is a significant change or a significant addition to the schedule. As it's been said, the community has said that there's more need for interaction between and among the SOs and ACs. And we have taken two approaches to this and I'd really like your feedback on this. The note that David and Sally sent mentioned a two-hour session on Monday with content to be developed by AC and SO leaders. The other proposal is for a full day of sessions on Wednesday in which each of the ACs and SOs will have the opportunity to develop a session and engage the community in interacting and discussion.

David has already cautioned us that we may be too far along in your planning for Buenos Aires to implement the full day Wednesday schedule, but I'd really like to hear your feedback on that now. Is that a feasible thing to do in light of what you've already developed for Buenos Aires, or shall we forego any idea that we could do that on Wednesday with all SOs and ACs involved and consider a Monday afternoon two-hour session, or is neither of those palatable to you?

Byron Holland:	Nick, it's Byron. From the CC perspective, Wednesday is fully booked for us with the general ccNSO meetings so, for us, we would pretty much conflict out of that right away.
Nick Tomasso:	Okay. Thank you, Byron. It's also been mentioned that if we do it on Wednesday that we may not have GAC in attendance as well. So, we now have two of the ACs and SOs who would probably opt out of a full day Wednesday session.
Michele Neylon:	Nick, it's Michele. The GNSO Council also meets on Wednesdays. And I think Marika or somebody else might be able to confirm, but I think usually it's about half a day -- about a half a day of meetings. And just to reiterate what I put on the chat in case you weren't looking at it, I personally think that trying to make substantial changes for Buenos Aires is probably a bad idea at this juncture. It's a bit too late.
Nick Tomasso:	Alright.
Chris Disspain:	I think that's probably true.
Nick Tomasso:	So, let's forego any further discussion on Wednesday and think about a Tuesday session. Is that something that you would find interesting and--.
Chris Disspain:	You mean a Monday--.
Nick Tomasso:	(Inaudible) fit into your schedule?
Chris Disspain:	You mean a Monday session meet.
Nick Tomasso:	Excuse me, a Monday session. My apologies. Thanks.
Unidentified Participant:	Please don't freak me out more, Nick.
Nick Tomasso:	(Laughter.) Sorry about that.
Chris Disspain:	Nick, can I set up a Monday session -- what a Monday session might be like so that we can look at -- we can consider it in context?
Nick Tomasso:	Yes, please.
Chris Disspain:	Okay, thanks.
	So Evan, Michele, Byron, Kristina, I can't remember how many of you were around, but a few years ago we had a -- well, a few meetings. I think about three or four meetings. We had a standing session on a Monday afternoon that was a joint session for all of the SOs and ACs together, for the GAC, GNSO, ccNSO, ALAC, ASO, etc. And what we did was we got -- the leaders of those SOs and ACs got together on a call a few weeks before the ICANN meeting and agreed on a topic or a couple of topics that were of interest across -- generally across the groups. And then we ran a sort of two hour or two-and-a-half hour session on the Monday afternoon where everyone was involved. And it wasn't siloed, it wasn't specific -- it was specific topics, but they were topics that we had all agreed to talk about.
	So, just to take an example in respect to new gTLDs, whilst you might argue that some new gTLD topics are of little interest to the ccNSO, per se, there are some gTLD things that are; maybe variants is one, maybe collisions is another. An update about delegations and compliance is probably not one. But, pretty much working together, we could come

up with at least one, and usually two and sometimes three topics that, as a coalesced community we could discuss together. And there's a sort of idea of possibly reinstating that as a Monday afternoon session for all the groups to get together and to try and break down the silos.

Now, let me say before we go any further that comments that it's too late to do that for Buenos Aires are probably perfectly fine, but I'm more interested in talking about the overarching issue as to whether it's feasible or not to go back to that. It broke down for all sorts of reasons, but very few of them have to do with the SOs and ACs themselves.

Back to you, Nick.

Nick Tomasso: Very good. So, I would like to have your feedback on the possibility of doing that on Monday afternoon, either now or subsequent to this call, to see if it's something that we should consider continuing to keep on the -- or put on the agenda, or if it's something we should not even consider for Buenos Aires.

So I guess there are no comments at this point in time.

Byron Holland: Well, Nick -- Nick, it's Byron.

Nick Tomasso: Yes, Byron.

Byron Holland: Just to go back a moment to what Chris was saying. I mean, I think Monday afternoon (inaudible) time makes some sense and send (inaudible) structure. Certainly from -- just from a cc perspective, generally that's probably more wide open for our -- the scheduled work (inaudible)--.

Nick Tomasso: Byron -- Byron, I'm sorry. Can I stop you a second? There's such a bad echo on my line that I really don't understand--.

Chris Disspain: No, it's not just you, Nick. It's Byron's line, too.

Byron Holland: Okay. Yeah, I am speaking into a headset so it's not--.

Chris Disspain: That's better. You're fine now, Byron.

Byron Holland: Not feedback on myself. Okay.

Chris Disspain: No, you're fine now.

Byron Holland: Okay. So, I was just saying that, certainly from the cc perspective, Monday afternoon is a good time because there's just working group meetings, which are more flexible. And just speaking to the proposed structure that Chris mentioned, that I think certainly has some merit and warrants further investigation. As far as for Buenos Aires, that's probably a little tight, but from a cc perspective again, I think there's flexibility, but I think it would be better looked at for meetings (inaudible) Buenos Aires.

Nick Tomasso: Well, thank you for the input, Byron. I appreciate it.

And one of the final changes we're considering for Buenos Aires, which I don't think will have a major impact, but perhaps I'm wrong and you can advise me, I'm considering moving the public forum to the morning to increase attendance. At this point in time, we

see fewer than 400 people come to the public forum. And our thinking is that, if we move it to earlier in the day, we might increase attendance there substantially.

Do you have any conflicts by us doing a public forum on Thursday morning as opposed to the afternoon as is currently done?

Okay.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. I'm checking the -- I'm just going to check the schedule from the last meeting. I think you might get more turnout if you did move some things to the morning. But if you move the public forum, what else are you moving? We're just moving the forum and nothing else or are you looking at moving something to go with that?

Nick Tomasso: So, there is very few sessions that take place on Thursday morning. And we will certainly have the opportunity for additional sessions Thursday afternoon following the public forum.

Michele Neylon: Well, Nick, the GNSO wrap-up session, for example, that's traditionally held on the Thursday morning.

Nick Tomasso: Okay.

Michele Neylon: So, that's one. Now, I mean, I don't know what the actual attendance at that is. I mean, I'm Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I think I have to show my face for five minutes and say that members didn't murder each other over the course of the Tuesday. And I don't -- that's about all I have to really do there. But obviously--.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. So the key with moving the public forum to the morning is not that nothing happens in the afternoon. It's just that the public form happens in the morning.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, but that's what I'm saying because it has a knock-on effect, Chris. Because if you look at somebody let's say that -- the reason why the public forum might not be that well attended as some meetings is that a lot of people would actually fly out on the Thursday afternoon.

Chris Disspain: But that's the point to move it, Michele. It's not -- if it's not that well attended, then why have it?

Michele Neylon: No, hold on. Hold on, let me finish. If you move the public forum to the morning, then that means that the sessions that would have been on the morning end up in the afternoon, which is fine.

Chris Disspain: Correct.

Michele Neylon: But you're now basically forcing people to stay on an extra night.

Chris Disspain: Well, but that's -- I go back to my point. What's the point? If the public forum itself is not a public forum because there aren't enough people there to make it a public forum, then what's the point in having it? Don't get me wrong. I'm not -- I actually am a massive fan of the public forum. I'm simply saying we're now talking about -- and this is where it starts to get incredibly complicated.

So ALAC -- and I'm just -- and Evan has been typing quite legitimately in chat room about what ALAC's requirements and problems are. ALAC needs to meet on a Friday

because they don't have enough time during the week, on the one hand. On the other hand, we've now got you saying, quite legitimately, I've got to hear the people who normally fly out at lunchtime on a Thursday or leave at lunchtime on a Thursday and go home because they don't want -- they're not worried about the public forum.

Trying to match all those things together is almost impossible because you've got some people who want to leave early. You've got the GAC who basically say come Wednesday afternoon when they draft the communique, although to be fair to them, for the last two meetings it's been the middle of the night but, leaving that aside, leave.

So, how do we manage this so that it's actually workable for everybody? Because you're saying, Michele, quite legitimately and justifiably, what you guys currently do on a Thursday morning enables a number of you to leave on a Thursday afternoon because you don't care about the public forum. And if we move the public forum to a Thursday morning, it means you're going to have to stay all through Thursday, which is perfectly legitimate. But on the other hand, we've got people saying they don't have enough time, whether they want to leave before it's over.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Chris -- sorry, Chris, just to interrupt you there. No, I mean -- the thing I just was trying to point out is that if you move one thing, it has a knock-on effect. I'm not saying-- .

Chris Disspain: I completely agree.

Michele Neylon: That was what I -- that was my point. It wasn't a case of the -- I don't know, whatever. It was just really a case of your saying to me, oh, we're just moving this and it has zero impact isn't really true. Now, I mean--

Chris Disspain: No, (inaudible). You're right.

Michele Neylon: I'm looking at it as -- okay. I was speaking based on what I saw with people; not specifically the registrars. I mean, I'm speaking -- when I'm talking about anything to do with the meetings, I'm looking in terms of what I see in general, not that I've been -- I've had a whole load of registrars whinging and whining to me about things specifically or anything like that.

Now, I mean, Evan's point about the ALAC schedule, I mean, I know trying to arrange a meeting with any of the ALAC leadership, from a registrar perspective, is something that I think is of value because -- well, you know, ALAC registrars, we do interact and not always in the most pleasant fashion. So, having those meetings I find to be useful, but their schedule is absolutely insane.

Now, I found myself at the last meeting on more than one occasion where, in theory, I should have been in two if not three meetings at the same time. Which is kind of a bit difficult, really, because I'm a big guy and everything else, but I'm not that bloody big and I haven't quite worked out how to do that yet.

And so -- I think one of the things that I would suggest that I can really look at is to look at trying to organize the meeting more around the tracks concept. It's not -- conferences of all shapes and sizes organize themselves around tracks. I don't -- I mean, if you take it that Tuesday is sacred, just leave Tuesday alone because it's -- it is what it is, and just organize the rest of the week around tracks, then it should help with the traffic because the conflicts that a lot of people are identifying are that they'd like to be in two places. The ones that are more problematic are where you end up where you're the only person

who needs to be in the two things. So for example, as a Board member, you're being pulled left, right and center.

Chris Disspain: Now, the Board's not relevant. The Board is not relevant to this discussion. This is about the community.

Michele Neylon: Well, it's not entirely -- no, so I'd actually disagree with you, Chris, because the thing is this, is that if the Board is not aware of some of the things that are going on and where people are coming from, then when the Board makes a statement we're all going to be a bit confused because we won't have a clue where the hell -- why -- where it all came from.

Chris Disspain: No, you're making my point. I agree with you 100%. I'm simply saying you can't structure these meetings to suit the Board. That's--.

Michele Neylon: Well, you can't structure the meetings to suit me, either. But what I'm just saying is that I think maybe looking at it in terms of the tracks might be something to consider, rather than (inaudible)--.

Chris Disspain: Well, I think that's a really interesting point. How would you feel if your specific getting together registrar time, or the next level, your specific getting together GNSO time ,or with the ALAC your specific getting together ALAC time was in fact cut because, instead of that, you will be going to meetings on specific issues?

Evan Leibovitch: But who gets to pick those issues?

Chris Disspain: That -- thank you very much. Great question.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, no. The reason I'm saying that is when ALAC and the registrars get together, we get to pick the issues--.

Chris Disspain: (Inaudible.)

Evan Leibovitch: Collaboratively between us and them.

Chris Disspain: That's exactly right, Evan. You are correct. And then -- and when you -- and when the ALAC meets on its own you presumably have a mechanism for picking the issues, right?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. Yeah. I mean, there's -- essentially, the way it's crafted is that there's an agenda that's known well in advance, but that agenda has some -- has a significant space for what's called hot topics, which are things that arise through the rest of the week.

Chris Disspain: Exactly. And that's not going to happen when it comes to issues, is it, because the -- don't get me wrong, I'm actually in favor of issues management workshops. But, my point is -- I'm sorry, of meetings. But my point is that what I can see happening is we end up saying we're going to have three days dealing with issues and then another three or four days for everyone to meet to discuss those. And (inaudible)--.

Evan Leibovitch: I've always seen the way -- I've always seen big issues are sort of immediately tackled after the opening ceremonies at -- when everyone's still in the room. Usually the big hot topic of the week almost always has some big session going on in the main room right after the opening ceremonies. Is that not going to continue?

Chris Disspain: Yes. That's the intention, Nick, isn't it?

Nick Tomasso: Yes, it is.

Evan Leibovitch: I mean, yeah, granted what I've been saying in the chat has been very ALAC-centric but, I mean, everyone must be noticing by now that you have meetings that are coming more and more earlier in the week, that you now have -- ALAC has always been meeting on the Sunday, but (inaudible)--.

Chris Disspain: So does (inaudible) of other people, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Exactly. But, that's what I'm saying. And sort of -- this is why I'm so up in arms about what happened on Friday because, although you say, yes, nobody attends the board meetings or the presentations or public forum--.

Chris Disspain: Correct.

Evan Leibovitch: On Friday, but look how much has been offloaded to earlier in the week, things starting even before the opening ceremonies. You're having more and more.

Chris Disspain: Tell me -- give me an example of something that's (inaudible)--.

Evan Leibovitch: (Inaudible) meetings happening on Thursday.

Chris Disspain: What's been offloaded? Give me one example of something that's been offloaded?

Evan Leibovitch: The NCUC. When they have some of their policy meetings, I've been to -- in the Toronto one I think it was on a Friday. You know, this is real.

Chris Disspain: I don't -- look, can I -- I get there is a push from some people for there to be a Friday, but actually it's a discreet issue. It doesn't go to the concept of how we run these meetings. And what Nick's -- what Nick is saying is -- well, actually, there's a couple of things. It's perfectly clear that Tuesdays and Wednesdays need to exist within the context of the way they currently exist, unless we completely change the structure of the meeting.

                     The question is, can we do anything on Monday to create some silo breakdown between the SOs and the ACs? And if we can't, well then we can't and we'll end up having to restructure everything completely, which is fine.

                     But, we're trying to be creative here and come up with some new ways of dealing with things. And frankly, and with all due respect, saying we should reinstate Fridays doesn't really help because the reality is those on the ALAC who want to meet on Fridays are meeting. Michele quite rightly have said, if you move things out of Thursday afternoon and stop the stuff that's happening on Thursday morning, then people who leave on Thursday won't be able to leave. So, can we not see there is a significant push between those two things? We have serious non-alignment here and someone has to actually pick this up and make it work because, right now, it doesn't work for any of us. It's a failure for all and that's a real problem.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I would agree with you absolutely, Chris, in reworking Mondays. Actually, I -- as far as I'm concerned, Monday would in fact be the best silo-breaking day. Because by Monday you've -- by Monday and Tuesday -- sorry, by Tuesday people are getting entrenched in the silos. So Monday, I think, actually is a really good idea.

But, I actually also want to toss out the idea that the public forum as it is, although the formats are getting rejigged and the speaking orders and the way things are done are being rejigged, I can tell you from the point of view of At Large, the public forum concept itself needs an overhaul because it is generally seen as a way for squeaky wheels to get to come to the meetings, get to get the ear of the CEO and the Board over and above well thought out statements that have taken months to do with very large communities behind them. All of a sudden, somebody gets up to the microphone and seems to have an equal voice.

Chris Disspain: So, what should the public forum be, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: I mean (inaudible)--.

Chris Disspain: What should it be? What should it be?

Evan Leibovitch: I don't know. I know what it shouldn't be. I don't know what it should be. That'll take some thought. The question has never been asked of how to totally re-envision the public forum.

(Cross-talk)

Chris Disspain: Well, I can tell you--.

Evan Leibovitch: Because right now, it's widely seen within ALAC as a way--.

Chris Disspain: Well, I can tell--.

Evan Leibovitch: (Inaudible.)

Chris Disspain: I get it. I understand. I can tell you from the Board's perspective the public forum is precisely that which you just said it shouldn't be. It is for anyone, on any topic but managed to some extent, to come to the microphone and say whatever it is that they want to say. I imagine that if the lobbyists knew that them actually turning up with the microphone and lobbying, there's actually more of a negative impact than a positive impact, they might be less inclined to do it.

But leaving that aside, fundamentally it's a public forum. It doesn't matter whether it's (inaudible) extemporizing on the spot about the most valuable dot-com domain name on the planet, or it's Kristina reading a segment on behalf of her client, or it's you reading out a statement from the ALAC. It is simply a public forum. And I'm at a loss to know how it can be anything else, frankly, if it's going to be called a public forum. It's supposed to be so that kids who turned up in -- wherever we were the meeting before Durban, who Fadi (ph) brought the microphone and they spoke about what they wanted to speak about. That's what it's for. If it's for something else, then you're talking about changing it radically and totally, aren't you?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm saying that I don't think it serves the purpose for which it was designed, as you said right at the beginning of what you said. It's being used for, I think in some cases, almost the exact opposite of what it was intended.

Chris Disspain: Well, I ask you again, what was it intended to be for?

Evan Leibovitch: I think it was a catchall for anything that hadn't been raised, to try and find new perspectives that hadn't been heard, perhaps; to try and find something between -- besides

the usual suspects to get their voice heard. Yes, occasionally you have Paul Foody (ph) and you have some of the kids coming up who essentially -- who have something to say. In that case, it was wildly off topic. But if the -- if you go back to the public forums and you have a look and say for every Paul Foody, right, you have three appearances by Marilyn Cade.

So, I'm sorry, it's a parade of the usual suspects that have already been heard through the rest of the week. So, I would really suggest that if the intention of the public forum is to have something different from just one more kick at the can for the usual suspects, then it really does have to be re-envisioned.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele, Chris, Evan. Evan, I have to disagree with you completely. And I think that the public forum, while it may have its flaws, and I think the -- that over the last couple of years the format and the way it's been handled has changed several times. And it's still not perfect. And it would be good if certain things were to happen like questions that people asked during the public forum were actually answered by ICANN staff, as opposed to ICANN staff hoping that the person has -- and suffers from amnesia.

I don't think we -- I don't think we're going to actually get anything out of this call in the time that's left if we spend our entire time discussing the format of the public forum. I mean, I think we're meant to be looking at sort of general organization, timing and other things like that. So, I mean, maybe we should just move on.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry. I guess I was just briefly going to the earlier point and saying, well, if we -- we're -- that part of the intent of this is to maximize attendance at the public forum. And I would suggest, perhaps, that more effort be put into remote participation for the public forum to get people that wouldn't normally be there.

Michele Neylon: Well, I mean, I agree with you on the remote participation, Evan. I mean, look, ultimately, even though both of you know damn well that we don't agree on a lot of things, but I mean I think in other things we -- you know damn well that we do agree. And I think that the remote participation is something that could be handled better. And if that's what you have a beef with, I can understand it entirely.

But again, I think that's kind of a general thing across the board with respect to how the meetings are handled in that, from my perspective, any ICANN meeting that's being held, there should be some level of remote participation. Now, I do understand that, technically speaking, that it might not always be feasible to have full video, Adobe Connect and everything else, but being told by ICANN staff that there won't even be a phone bridge I find to be --I find laughable.

Evan Leibovitch: Understood. I won't belabor the issue. I've said my point.

Byron Holland: This is Byron. Just pulling it up a bit in terms of the overall sweep of the week and trying to pull a few threads together, we have the opening ceremony. Just look at the overall picture of the week. Tuesday and Wednesday I think we're hearing, or at least that's what I'm interpreting, are pretty much locked and loaded and not really open to significant change and are very individual community based. And certainly, that's the way that it is with the ccs, but I hear that for others.

We have the opening ceremonies. I like Chris's idea of having, if I could just call it a few of the really key themes. Now of course, determining what they are will be an issue. But if in the afternoon, key themes that are relevant to at least most of the community get

focused on in bigger rooms and bigger forums, that helps set up the balance of the week, which then goes into Tuesday and Wednesday.

I have to admit, I think having the public forum Thursday morning is a better idea than Thursday afternoon. Because just the practical reality is people are making decisions to pull out early or fly out on Thursday afternoon/evenings. And I think the public forum is most relevant to the most amount of people and that's why it should be Thursday morning. And then Thursday afternoon can have the more individual, specific sessions. And then, you know what? It's up to individuals. If they want to skip out on their community's session on Thursday afternoon, then so be it.

And that public forum allows you, in theory, to have comment or make comment or follow up on what has transpired over the course of the week. And yeah, sure, not to beat the dead horse here, but some actors are going to get up and say their same thing again and -- but so what? I have confidence that most of the community and the Board can separate the wheat from the chaff here. And people have put significant effort to create meaningful statements. They can get up and say their piece, too, so so be it. But at least the most amount of people, I think, would still be around and therefore participating in the public forum if it was Thursday morning versus Thursday afternoon. And that, I think, would hopefully bookend a week or the Monday to Thursday--.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Byron Holland: In as meaningful a way as possible.

Chris Disspain: Byron, it's Chris. Can I just ask you a couple of questions or push back on a couple of things that you said? Is that alright?

Byron Holland: No. No, I'd rather you didn't. (Laughs.)

Chris Disspain: Okay, cool. So, could you just hang up, then, and we'll move on to someone else?

Byron Holland: Yeah. Okay, sure.

Chris Disspain: So just to go back to the Monday thing, the current kind of tentative plan is to have three streams, if you like; sort of like the high interest topic stream, the workshop stream, and then the new gTLD update session stream.

Now, acknowledging that there are some sessions that -- there are some high interest topics that would be of interest to everyone, and therefore you shouldn't put a new gTLD session against them, does it make sense to -- if you're going to have a -- I'm just trying -- just picking some ideas -- some sessions out of thin air. If there was going to be a session on an update on the latest position on contracts negotiations and delegation for new gTLDs, my gut feeling would be that is a new gTLD session and it's really only of interest to new gTLD people. If there's going to be a session on variant management, that's something that is probably of interest to new gTLDs and maybe some ccTLDs. And then if there's going to be a session on -- I'm trying to think of -- struggling to think of something that's of interest to everybody, but there would be a sessions that's of interest to everybody. Does making that distinction make sense, so that you have your high interest topics, your workshops and your new gTLD sessions? Does that make sense?

Michele Neylon: Chris, Michele. That's sort of moving towards my tracks concept.

Chris Disspain:	Correct.
Michele Neylon:	And I think it's -- I mean, one of the other things -- and I'm sorry if ICANN staff people if it sounds like I'm beating up on you. But then again, I have -- that's what I do at this time of day when I've only had like three coffees. I mean, one of the things that would be helpful is if the actual presentation of the meeting schedule on the meeting site was a little bit clearer. Because, I mean, one of the problems -- if -- one of the problems that I run into is to that registrars will come to me and go, hey, which session should I be going to look at? And it's quite hard to say to somebody exactly which ones because it's hard to know exactly what their interests are. And the way it is laid out at the moment, you have to go into each individual session to get an idea of what the session is about and the potential audience of the session. So, I think--.
Chris Disspain:	Yeah.
Michele Neylon:	These are things which -- it's not the scheduling itself; it's more to do with the presentation of the schedule.
Chris Disspain:	Yeah. Byron, what was your response to what I said?
Byron Holland:	Well, I think whether we call it theme or track I would favor that kind of schedule. I mean, I'm coming at it from a cc who's not involved in--.
Chris Disspain:	Sure.
Byron Holland:	(Inaudible) space, per se. So, hiving that off and making it its own thing is perfectly fine with me and I would say probably most of cc participants who would be much happier to be in a main themes issues track or some kind of workshop track. So to me, that makes sense.
Chris Disspain:	And can I just ask, Michele and Kristina and you and Evan, does it make sense to strive towards having one at least cross-silo hour, two hours in a meeting where, by agreement, the SOs and the ACs, a topic or two topics are actually discussed across everyone. Not run by staff, not run by ICANN, actually run by the SOs and ACs. Does that make sense as something to -- as a goal to aim for?
Michele Neylon:	It's Michele here. Just -- from my perspective, the more cross-silo discussions that could be facilitated the better. I mean, one of the -- I mean, I know from past experience that a lot of the registrars were amazed to discover the ccNSO registries were so nice, charming and professional compared to other parties that they dealt with.
Chris Disspain:	Compared to Jeff.
Michele Neylon:	Sorry?
Chris Disspain:	Compared to Jeff.
Michele Neylon:	Well, I didn't want -- this call is being recorded. He's going to beat me up. But still, it's--.
Chris Disspain:	No, no, it's alright. He'll beat me up. It's fine.
Michele Neylon:	No, but the thing is this, is that some people are a bit odd in that they know when to interact with people across multiple constituencies, across all SOs and ACs, and know

that -- and know these people and this and that. But I mean, it's one of the things that -- say for example -- I raised this in Durban and, I mean, I don't know whether the message got through to people or not. I mean, let's take for example with the GAC members. If I didn't go to some of the ccTLD events I would never actually have interacted with all of the GAC members.

Chris Disspain: Right.

Michele Neylon: And yet, the GAC, like it, love us, whatever, they have a lot -- they have a very important role in the entire ICANN circus these days. And if it's -- if people are able to interact with GAC members or interact with the IPC or whatever in a non-confrontational environment, it makes it easier when there's the potential of conflict. So I mean, for example, Kristina and I, we do not agree on a lot of things. Yes, Kristina is less likely to call me a scumbag, to my face at least, because she has worked with me in the past.

Chris Disspain: Okay. Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Michele, nobody calls you a scumbag to your face.

Michele Neylon: Some people do.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh.

Chris Disspain: What goes on behind your back stays behind your back.

Evan Leibovitch: I would say that having that idea as a cross-constituency track thing is absolutely what we would like. ALAC, or I know I personally and most of the people I know within ALAC, would love to have more cross-constituency work.

                        One example of something I think worked really well for us at the last meeting was a panel session on policy versus implementation, where we started the ball rolling and had speakers from every constituency. It was well attended. It got good feedback. And then we turned around and policy versus implementation turns into a GNSO working group. Well, this is something I think ccNSO and ALAC and SSAC would all probably have an interest in. There's a number of topics that override beyond any particular AC or SO that definitely could use that kind of cross-pollination. So, I'm absolutely in favor of the idea of cross-constituency, subject-based tracks on Monday.

Chris Disspain: So, do we think -- so that -- thank you, Evan. I think that's really helpful. Do we think it's feasible to try and do something for Buenos Aires, or is that just too hard and should we aim for Singapore in March?

                        And what -- because what it takes, and let me -- from experience, because I've done this before, what it takes is a call with the chairs and the vice chairs and, in respect to the GNSO, probably the constituency chairs because they get very upset if they're not involved, and a discussion about what sort of topics there should be and then working out how to actually run it and so on. Is it too much to hope we could do that for Buenos Aires and should we aim to be successful in Singapore?

Evan Leibovitch: Personally, I can think of two topics right off the top of my head that I think would be not only of value to every constituency, hearing each other's point of view, but having an engagement on that in a way that's really necessary and topical. One of those would be the policy versus implementation issue and the other one is the public interest

commitments issue, which I think every constituency seems to have it's own idea of what's going on.

Chris Disspain: So, both of those -- and that's fine, Evan. And both of those are gTLD/ALAC issues which may be of interest to the ccNSO, but--.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, policy versus implementation goes ICANN wide and it goes beyond the (inaudible)--.

Chris Disspain: That one I agree. Kristina's saying we could do it in -- on the list we could do it in BA but we need to get started ASAP.

Nick, if we were to set aside a gap of time on Monday afternoon, when do you need to actually nail the agenda to the wall?

Nick Tomasso: Well, we have -- as everyone knows, we have a commitment to post the schedule 15 days prior to the start of the session. So, we're looking at the end of October. That said, we are plagued by so many session changes that we don't often meet that objective. I can very easily hold the slot on the schedule for that session or sessions and we can work collaboratively to develop the sessions and to update the schedule when the content is known.

Chris Disspain: Okay. So, here's an idea. What about if you -- if staff sent a note out to the people on this call, plus the ones that couldn't make it, Jonathan and so on, the chairs, past chairs, whatever, of the SOs and ACs, saying we're holding a 90-minute session on Monday afternoon for the use of the SOs and ACs in collaboration to run any way they like on any topics that they like. You're the guys in charge. Here's your deadline to tell us, A, you want it and here's your deadline to tell us what it's going to be about and what your logistical requirements are. And then leave it for Byron and Michele and Kristina and Jonathan and Edwin and Olivier to get it sorted out between themselves. And if they can't, which would be perfectly understandable, then it's an open session that we can use for something else. How about we do it that way?

Nick Tomasso: I find that perfectly acceptable. I think that will work.

Chris Disspain: Does anyone have a problem with that?

Jonathan Robinson: This is Jonathan. I've joined the call late, so I'm completely out of it. If you could just repeat that projection, because it sounds pretty important.

Chris Disspain: You're just trying to tax me at 23:06, Jonathan. We're talking about the possibility of a joint cross-constituency session for 90 minutes on Monday afternoon at the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires on a topic or a couple of topics chosen in collaboration with all of the SOs and the ACs, that they can run any way they choose, subject to only -- subject only to the reasonable logistics requirements of the room. Evan, for example, suggested it might be -- one topic you could consider would be -- what was it, Evan? Policy versus implementation, I think.

Evan Leibovitch: That was one of them. Public interest commitments I mentioned only because (Inaudible)--.

Chris Disspain: (Initiative Public interest commitments being gTLD commitments.

And Jonathan, just to give you the history, this used to happen. It happened for about three or four meetings between the SOs and ACs. We were reasonably successful but it ended up, for reason with which I won't bore you, not continuing. But, we're suggesting it's worth bringing back and as a valuable cross-constituency way of getting together and talking. But -- and I'm not sure what I've just said.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chris. And if everyone will forgive me responding (inaudible), at first blush that sounds interesting, positive. Certainly seems like it addresses some of the areas that people have been interested in developing.

Chris Disspain: Cool.

Jonathan Robinson: So, yeah, my first response is potentially positive. I just (inaudible) on the call and a material portion of it and delayed (inaudible) essentially--.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Thanks--.

Jonathan Robinson: (Inaudible.)

Chris Disspain: Thanks, Jonathan.

                      Nick, can I -- can we -- Nick, you and I have to go to another call. Can we agree that you'll send -- or someone will send a note out for the chairs to that effect and we can move on from there?

Nick Tomasso: Yeah, it's agreed.

Chris Disspain: So that leaves Wednesday the same as it was. Tuesday the same as it was. Small changes to Monday and still the possibility of moving the public forum to Thursday morning, with a little bit more consultation.

Jonathan Robinson: Chris and others, if I could add one point, and that's that the council has talked about the need to try and squeeze in something between the constituency or group, say on Tuesday, and the formal council meeting on Wednesday. Because what tends to happen (inaudible) productive (inaudible) conversation between -- we're going to try and find some sort of slot, either interstitially within the agenda or actually as part of the agenda where we offer parts of GNSO the opportunity to come together and discuss some contentious points in an informal way to try and enhance cooperation prior to the formal council meeting on Wednesday afternoon. So, that's something that's just an FYI and doesn't have to be scheduled right now, but that's--.

Chris Disspain: Jonathan, just -- sorry. Just -- I got the end of that, but what was the beginning? Did you see meeting in a corridor?

Jonathan Robinson: Well, historically what happens is that the group meetings take place on Tuesday; the council meeting takes place on Wednesday. If things haven't -- if contentious issues haven't had the opportunity to be (inaudible), they tend to boil over in the council meeting on Wednesday in an unproductive way if there's not an opportunity to air things beforehand. So, we were trying to -- we were talking in our wrap up from Durban to try and create some form of space whereby -- sit at a around a table (inaudible) or something whereby GNSO constituents could come together, those with concerns of a particular (inaudible) and slightly less formally than we might do otherwise, get together and air things out to try and hatch up compromises so that this Wednesday formal meeting is ultimately more productive.

Chris Disspain: Got it. Well, I think Nick can take that onboard and see if there's anything that we could do about that.

Nick Tomasso: I'm very sorry. Jonathan, I am -- your line is extremely noisy and I'm really having trouble following what you are saying--.

Chris Disspain: Maybe we can touch base after the call.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, no problem.

Chris Disspain: So Jonathan's going to send you a note, Nick.

Nick Tomasso: Excellent. Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Okay. I have to go off to another call now.

Nick Tomasso: Chris, thank you very much for all (inaudible)--.

Chris Disspain: No worries.

Nick Tomasso: I really appreciate it.

Are there any other comments from the SO/AC leaders on the call that you want us to consider?

Michele Neylon: This is Michele speaking again. Just some feedback for you. I think the idea of doing this is a good idea and I'm glad to see that you guys are trying to kind of work with us on this kind of thing. Maybe making some changes at Buenos Aires would be good, but if you want to look at making more dramatic changes that would impact people's travel plans, just bear in mind that a lot of people are -- will book flights and everything several months in advance and often can't make changes to those flights. Thanks.

Nick Tomasso: Thank you. That is certainly something that we have considered as we looked at the schedule, so your point is well taken.

Evan Leibovitch: And I'll make my last little bit about Friday. And it's clear that not everybody wants it and some actively don't, but if that means that it's a one-size-does-not-fit-all situation and some constituencies may need it more than others, maybe just take that into consideration.

Nick Tomasso: It's very good and we will do that, Evan.

Sally Costerton: It's Sally here. I just wanted to say thank you to you all. It really has been a very, very useful call. I think we've not only achieved my goal, which is can we find some way to brief you properly about some of the challenges so that you can help us avoid the problems in the first place. Thank you for your response and input because I feel we really made some progress with that. But also, there's been some great input on some of the longer-term things that we might look at that involve more fundamental (inaudible), so thank you for giving up your time because I know that even for this call we had to be in three places at once. I really appreciate that. I know the staff really appreciates it, so thank you very much.

Nick Tomasso: Just -- I've found the call to be particularly informative as we work towards developing not only the schedule for Durban, but I think it sets up -- sets us up for the meetings to be held in 2014. We'll be considering all of your input as we look at those meetings as well.

This call has been recorded. We'll have transcripts and chat that we'll circulate to everyone on the call, as well as everyone else who was invited. And we welcome your feedback as you read those perhaps again and consider other ideas that you might want to present to us.

Thank you. Thank you all for participating. It's been very useful for -- certainly for me and I know it has for Sally. If there are no other comments, we'll wrap this up. Any closing comments from anyone?

Michele Neylon: Thank you.

Nick Tomasso: Thank you very much, all.

Sally Costerton: Bye.

Multiple Speakers: Bye.