
DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, and welcome, everyone, to our second production call for ICANN70 and preparations for that event. We welcome you and thank you for taking the time to be part of the inputs for this call.

The agenda is as follows. We'll have some welcome introductions. Sally Costerton will be on shortly. We'll have the community feedback related to the Q&A with the Executive Team, a note from Sally Newell Cohen. Tanzania King will then go through the production schedule as it is today, in particular focusing on the plenary sessions but also the current sessions and the networking slots. And then we'll have an update from Ash Rangan on the improved enhanced tools for participation at ICANN70, and then wrap up with AOB and Next Steps. With that, I'd like to see if Sally Costerton would like to make some opening remarks before we move to the agenda. Sally?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, David. Welcome, everybody. Thank you for joining us. It's evening for me this morning/afternoon. It's very important that we get your views particularly on the commenting on the progress we've made so far on planning for the meeting. And I just wanted to refer back to the results of the survey, which I know many/all of you probably participated in and we are working very hard on. We're looking at how we can implement, what we can implement when, and some of that will come up in our discussion today. So, thank you all. I look forward to a very productive call.

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.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sally. We move to the pieces coming together for ICANN70. I now turn it over to Sally Newell Cohen on a piece of this that we were hearing your views on. Sally, please.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Thank you, David. Hello, everyone. I just wanted to follow up on the feedback we received. Thank you to those of you who provided a specific feedback about the executive Q&As. For those of you who may not have seen it, the feedback we received is that with a fewer number of sessions during the public meeting, many people felt that it wasn't the best use of time during the public sessions and suggested maybe we move them into Prep Week.

What we're going to do instead, because Prep Week is really an opportunity to prep the community on the sessions coming up in the public meeting, so the Executive Committee doesn't really fit into that format, so what we're going to do instead is look for other opportunities and other formats for that personalized communication and maybe a way to share more updates in a different way. So I just wanted to give just an update on that. Thank you again for the feedback. It was very helpful.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sally.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay. I don't know if there's any comments or any other thoughts anyone would like to share before we do move to the next topic. All right. Seeing none, David, I think back to you.

DAVID OLIVE: Good. We'll again move forward with experimentation with a new format and a new time zone and timeframe. So good for that. Thank you so much.

Now, item number three on the agenda is obviously the scheduling and planning. Tanzania King, the floor is yours, please.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, David. I like your wintery background there. If we can go to the next slide, please. The first thing that everyone has been waiting for is the plenary topics. So this is the order of preference based on all the votes. We had, as you can see small there in the corner, multiple submissions on behalf of GNSO, which were first calculated so that there is one vote per group. The top session is the governmental regulatory developments and community discussion, and the second one being Registry Volunteer Commitments getting it right.

So the first thing I want to point out is in the block schedule, which we can actually go to next if we go to the next slide, please. In the block schedule, we put two slots for plenary topics. Of course, as we mentioned last time, if there's a preference to add another one or discuss further, we can do that. It's just up to the group. Otherwise, I would suggest we move to figure out where those top two topics should

be on the schedule in terms of the slots we have here for Tuesday and Thursday. So I can do that randomly but if there's any reasons why there's a preference to put specific topics on specific days, please raise your hand and let us know now. Very quiet today. Okay.

DAVID OLIVE: Going once, going twice.

TANZANICA KING: Yeah. I will do the easy thing which is to put the first topic on Tuesday at the 14:30 slot, and the second topic, the Registry Volunteer Commitments, on Thursday. If that works and there's no objections, that's what we will do.

DAVID OLIVE: Manal, your hand is up.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, David and Tanzanica. If we can go to the previous slide, please. On the topics, just to note that despite the GAC voted for the Registry Voluntary Commitments and the Applicant Support, the reason the GAC did not vote for the governmental regulatory developments and community discussion, although the topic is of interest to the GAC, of course, was that the two governments that were listed on the description of the session, actually, one felt this plenary may be redundant to the session that is already being organized with Org on the same topic. And the second government, they have a new

representation and they felt they are not in a position to discuss this as we speak.

So I'm just flagging this that I think it would be good to—specifically if there are governments to be listed that they are approached and maybe coordinated with prior to sending the description including the governments. So just to flag this, if we can coordinate with the governments before listing them. I'll stop here. Thank you. Just by way of information, I have just been told by our amazing support staff that during this past year, we had 65 new representatives. So I hope you understand where we're coming from. Continuous new members is a challenge also. I'll stop here. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Manal. We will definitely be careful and aware of the fact of trying to have some sort of consultation in advance with governments if we mention or name them for our sessions. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING:

Great. If there are no other questions—I see a hand just went up.

DAVID OLIVE:

Ashley, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Hi. Thank you. This is Ashley from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Just to make sure I understood what was just said by Manal, is it fair to say

that it's unlikely that the speakers that were proposed will be able to present? And if that's the case, does that somehow have an impact on the session? Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: If I may, David?

DAVID OLIVE: Please. Good question. Yes, Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Ashley. I think at least one of the governments listed doesn't feel comfortable speaking on the session because they are new representatives. This is their very first meeting and they are trying to catch up with everything that we're discussing within the GAC. The other felt it was a redundancy. So I'm not sure since this became the voted for topic. Maybe they feel comfortable speaking again or being part of the organizing group. Maybe they can find something new to provide. I'm not sure. I'm just providing the reasons from the GAC side but I'm not sure. But at least one of them I don't think would be in a position to speak.

DAVID OLIVE: Ashley, did you want to respond? Then we'll go to Sam.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah. I'll be quick. Thank you very much, Manal. That's exactly what I thought I heard. I just want to make sure that we take this into consideration with respect to the session because I think this has an impact. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. Sam and then Jorge.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, David. Thank you to Ashley and Manal for the clarifications around this session. I want to just note here that the Registries had responded to the survey that we actually did not support this session and a big reason for that was not so much the topic itself but the topic wasn't interesting and worthwhile, but the way the session had been proposed we thought maybe didn't really work. I think what I'm hearing from Manal is that understanding that some of the indicated speakers are also a little bit uncomfortable with it. Maybe there's an opportunity here for us to rethink how this topic can be discussed in a constructive and productive way in the context of a plenary session, if we do decide to go forward with it. I guess I wanted to put my hand up to volunteer to help with that in any way that I can. I understand that the time that happens between when you submit a proposal and when we do the vote, things can obviously change. So just putting that out there.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sam, for the offer to be involved in making it a informative session. Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO: Hello, everyone. I hope you hear me okay. This is Jorge Cancio, GAC vice chair. I'm sorry that I got into the call with a bit of delay. But I wanted to support what Manal had mentioned and maybe what is important in such kind of sessions is to really secure beforehand the support and the collaboration of the corresponding speakers and their administrations at least. From the government side, of course, this is something that has to be subject of consultations and, as Manal said, especially so if we are speaking about new GAC representatives who are getting now used to the way we are working here in ICANN. I hope this helps. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Jorge. Mary, who has been helping organize some of these. Mary?

MARY WONG: Hi, everybody. Thank you, David. This is Mary from Org. Obviously the decision is entirely the community's through this group. I think that most, if not all, of you have seen a couple of the notes that I sent to the group. So I just wanted to pick up, if I may, on say Ashley's and Sam's comments that if there is a high level of interest in this overall topic, how the session is structured and what its focus is, perhaps something that's more interactive, and something that if you choose this topic to go ahead—and looking at the number of votes, I assume that it's going to go ahead—we on the staff side will certainly be working with you all and particularly the BC that proposed it to try to make sure that it is pertinent, that is not duplicative of sessions that may have gone before.

So to that extent, the February 26 webinar that the European Commission will be presenting at that ICANN Org is hosting could, as I've said before, serve some kind of introductory or informational session so that you can then use the ICANN70 time to focus either more on specific topics or to have more of a dialogue. Thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Yes, indeed. Mason Cole, please.

MASON COLE: Thank you, David. Mason Cole here, chair of the Business Constituency. I just wanted to echo what Mary just said because the BC is the group that proposed this topic in the first place. The idea was in fact that it would be more interactive than the session being planned between now and ICANN70. So I just wanted to encourage the community to have openness to a more interactive session rather than just a presentation in the community listening. We're looking for interaction between the community and relevant government representatives, not even necessarily GAC members but those who can represent the points of view of the relevant governments involved in these regulatory changes. Thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Mason. Again, all good points of how best to formulate the session. Should we go forward with it with the votes that you indicate? Do we wish to continue with the top two that are here, noting that there has to be work to formulate the possible interactions with the

appropriate groups and governments in the case of the government regulatory development agencies? Ashley, your hand is up again.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm sorry. I won't—

DAVID OLIVE: No, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm just a smidge concerned here that this is not what people necessarily voted for. So I don't know what the timing is here if this is something that can be revisited or not, but I just wanted to flag that. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Tanzania, any comments on that request?

TANZANICA KING: We can quite easily open back up the vote and let you all do it again. I know that's not too time-consuming since it's just the one question that you have to do it with. That's very easy to do. And we have the time for it considering on the next slides I will show you, you have all amazingly got most of your schedules already in for the remainder of the meeting. I see we could do it while we're on the call—that's a very good point—depending on whether GNSO is able to say what their consolidated vote would be. I see Manal's hand up as well.

DAVID OLIVE: Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. I haven't heard what Ashley said, the audio was breaking. But I'm just wondering how an immediate vote or even a later vote would change things. I mean, maybe for other parts of the community but I think at least from a GAC perspective, if we're voting again right away now, it's going to be the same vote, right? Maybe I have overlooked something. I'm sorry.

DAVID OLIVE: No, no. I think our preference probably would be to propose that we go back and let people think about that and quickly come back with a vote via the e-mail rather than do it instantaneous here and now, though I think part of the concern—if I got Ashley's comments and others' correctly—is that if indeed the proper people and governmental groups could not be on the call, that might change the nature of that session. People might want to look at a different mix of plenaries. So with that, I think we—Susan Payne, sorry. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks. I think it's a really good point. When there's a plenary that's envisaging having external speakers—and that's what we're basically talking about here—clearly, if we couldn't get those external speakers then it might cause a rethink on the proposal. But we were all asked to review a proposal which made it clear that it was talking about external

experts on the relevant pieces of legislation. So unless we come to a point where we find those experts aren't available and can't do it, it seems to me that the original draft and what we're talking about now, it hasn't changed, we've just had Manal's input that the GAC reps in question certainly don't feel that they are the people to be doing the speaking but I don't think that was ever envisaged.

DAVID OLIVE: So, Susan, you're saying it was more of if we could, these possible government people would be good but there could be other ways of hearing the general approach.

SUSAN PAYNE: Not at all. I'm saying that this proposal always envisaged that it would be people from outside of the ICANN community speaking at this plenary. Unless and until we're told that those people can't do it, I don't see what the problem is with this proposal going forward. Nothing has changed.

DAVID OLIVE: Yes. I just was saying it possibly in a different way that it'd be dependent upon government people being involved and willing to do that.

SUSAN PAYNE: Well, I think if the government people aren't involved and aren't willing to do it then we do have a discussion about whether we still want the topic, yes.

DAVID OLIVE: I think that is part of the issue. Yes, Sam?

SAM DEMETRIOU: I'm sorry to ask a really dumb question but it might help break through this part. Have we confirmed with the intended speakers that they are available and willing to do this? I don't know whose job that was. Mason, did you reach out to anyone when you proposed the session? Or is that an ICANN Org responsibility? I'm just not sure how we would go about tackling this and where it stands. But I think knowing that might help us answer the question who's indisposed.

DAVID OLIVE: Tanzania, do you know in the proposal, or Mason? Mason, please.

MASON COLE: I defer to Tanzania. But no, the BC's proposal did not envision specific speakers at least as of yet. We'd certainly be glad to help make those arrangements if that's needed. We do that in cooperation with ICANN Org, of course. I want to echo what Susan just said, nothing about the proposal has changed. It was very clear in the proposal what was envisaged. The BC didn't reorganize what the session may look like. We were very clear that it involved outside speakers from the governments who are authoritative on regulatory changes, and that's what the community was interested in. Thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Any other comments? Because I think at this point, it was exploratory and we'll have to go forward with the planning to see if there are going to be any governmental speakers or GAC speakers involved. And if that is not possible or not available then we'd have to come back to you and say we have to reconfigure or change that topic. Unless you want to go for another vote, I would think we would try to move forward on those two. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: If I may just propose that maybe those who proposed the session may be put in contact with the relevant governmental representatives and sort things out, whether they are willing to speak or will liaise with someone to speak or will be informed by the proposals who are going to speak. I mean, like Sam mentioned, it's just a matter of coordination. I'm not challenging the votes. I don't want to disrupt anything but if we put all relevant parts in coordination, it may take 24 to 48-hour coordination. I think those who proposed the session will be in a good position to proceed in light of whatever they agree with the governments, irrespective.

DAVID OLIVE: I think that's a good proposal and a good way to proceed because the difference, of course, is government representatives talking about the topic as opposed to just interested experts or other experts. I think that needs to be sorted out and best coordinate that as Manal talked about. So I think that would be the way to go forward and I think the proposal—Mason and those group that proposed it will work with that

to make sure that we have the right consultation to mix to be able to move that forward in the way that people wish. How about that?

Okay. Thank you. Moving that one forward. Tanzania, please proceeded.

TANZANICA KING:

Great. We can go to the next slide. Some of you may have already noticed that I went ahead and e-mailed these slides to the list because I knew when we pulled this up, it was going to look very tiny, for one. And also I didn't want to go session by session through this but I do want to make sure you all have it, are able to see what each other is planning to do during the meeting so you can identify early on any conflicts or issues that we need to correct. Again, I'm really impressed how quickly we got all of these session requests in. So, thank you. Thank you, thank you for doing that. Again, I won't go through each and every session that's on here but you will find it in your e-mail box and can send me a message if there are any concerns, overlap, or issues with the sessions on the schedule. We can go ahead and slide through the four days, whoever is controlling this for me, Kim?

DAVID OLIVE:

We will slide forward.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you very much. That's it. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

DAVID OLIVE: Can we go back to the current schedule slide? Just making sure that people can see that. I know we sent them a copy of that. And then the next slide. There we go. And you have this in your—

TANZANICA KING: In your e-mail.

DAVID OLIVE: E-mail. Thank you very much.

TANZANICA KING: There's one final thing I wanted to address quickly and that, of course, is the networking blocks. I know there are a couple of things being planned in terms of social events. But we do have the opportunity to add additional specific sessions in any way you want in terms of networking. So please reach out to me if you have specific things you'd like to do either within your own groups or cross-community. The sky is somewhat the limit. I can't offer you cocktails in your home but I'm sure we can offer a lot of other things. Also we will be sharing details on how to arrange for one-on-one meetings and Zoom meetings within the public schedule online. We'll send out something soon, certainly well before the meeting so that you will be able to see how to request sessions with 1 or 10 or 20 other people and do that during the meeting as well. So that's it for me, David, unless there are any questions.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Tanzanica. Any comments or questions on the block schedule as you see it? Thank you, Tanzanica, for mentioning “enhanced tools,” which is a perfect segue into the next agenda item, the update on improved tools for participation. Ash Rangan will be able to talk to us about some of those options and some exciting new additions. Thank you. Ash, please.

ASHWIN RANGAN:

Thank you, David. I’m going to be talking about five or six items as a part of this update. First and foremost, I want to thank the community for telling us where you felt there was room for improvement so that the fluidity of interaction could be improved with tools and technologies and capabilities that are starting to show up. So what we have done is to experiment with a wide variety of opportunities and options with different tools and different ways in which we can bring them to the forefront.

First and foremost, the exciting advance that we have is in simultaneous interpretation, integrating that into the Zoom platform. I know that some of you have already experienced that, whereas others might not yet have had an opportunity to see how it works. Essentially, it shows up as a button at the bottom of the Zoom screen and it shows them option of languages from which you can choose. And when you do that then the interpretation is automatic and you hear it in the language that you’ve chosen. That’s a very exciting new advance that we have to offer and we will be making that available for ICANN70.

I'm going to pause with each of these because there may be questions related to each of the updates that I'm providing. So let me pause here and see if I can answer any questions you may have.

DAVID OLIVE: I see Jonathan and then Manal. Jonathan, Please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. A quick question. I just wanted to make sure, does this new system work with people using Zoom over their mobile devices?

ASHWIN RANGAN: Yes, it does, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, David and Ash. Actually, it's not a question. It's just to let you all know that we did try it on the GAC agenda setting call and it's a great enhancement. Thank you very much, Ash and everyone involved. It's very convenient and it spares everyone an additional device. So it worked very smoothly and it was great. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Manal. Kevin, please.

[KEVIN MURPHY]: Just a quick question. AI-based or human-based? If it is AI, you might want to let everybody know that, not because it's a bad thing but AI can have some peculiarities when it comes to translation.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you, Kevin. Indeed, AI has limitations. They're not yet at 100%. This is human-based.

[KEVIN MURPHY]: That's wonderful.

DAVID OLIVE: Manal, is that an old hand? Thank you. Any other comments on this topic? Ash, please proceed.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you. The next thing that I want to brief you about is YouTube streaming. As you know, we offered this in ICANN69 to a small number of sessions and we recorded the use of it so that we could study what the usage pattern looked like. Also from our side, we did not broadcast its availability widely so that the experiment was relatively confined so that we could understand the fidelity of the feedback signal. In

reviewing the statistics, it shows that the sessions were indeed leveraged from a YouTube perspective but for very short periods of time. The average covered around five or six minutes. The longest dwell time was between 12 and 15 minutes depending on the session.

Nevertheless, in ICANN70 we will be offering this as an additional channel. We have measured extensively and globally the difference between the response time of Zoom sessions versus YouTube because that was one of the drivers when the request to have YouTube streaming was made. We do see a small difference as in YouTube has more local resources evidently, which makes the latency issues a little bit easier to deal with. So respectful of that, we will be offering YouTube as a streaming mechanism for more sessions. We are currently discussing which sessions to offer it to. And as we did with ICANN69, we will continue to measure and understand what the uptake is so that we know what to do with it if and when we have to offer the same facility downstream. Let me pause here and see if there are any comments or questions.

DAVID OLIVE:

In the chat, Ash, there's a note from Fred.

ASHWIN RANGAN:

I'm seeing it now. Thank you, Fred. We don't have an alternative to YouTube in regions where it may be blocked. As you will appreciate, no doubt, each one of these comes with an overhead—slight or large. Therefore, we don't have the ability to look at it from a regional perspective, let alone a country or an area perspective, and offer many

multiple choices. So at this time, the best way we're able to do is to either offer Zoom directly or YouTube streaming.

DAVID OLIVE:

Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Another quick question or two, I guess. One is I'm curious now, based on your last answer, what the overhead is associated with providing this. But the other is in terms of testing, in addition to latency I think straight-up bandwidth constraint will be the other thing to perhaps try to trust this time. If there's more video, like more people have their cameras on, I think the amalgamation of that signal is where the real benefit of YouTube would lie.

ASHWIN RANGAN:

Thanks, Jonathan. We have indeed measured it for video specifically, and we're not seeing a massive difference. As I said, the difference is there. YouTube seems to consume about 10% less bandwidth than a comparable Zoom session and that is regardless of the load. So if you value the load factor, YouTube tends to parse it with 90% the capacity as would a Zoom session. So we're seeing that as a very consistent kind of a loopback, if you will.

You asked earlier about what the overhead is. It is not in terms of hardware resources but much more in terms of administrative overhead where we have to set up these channels so that the channel becomes available concurrently as a choice for participants. And that places an

overhead in terms of labor and in terms of having to supervise the labor and be sure that what has been set up is indeed responding to the need of the hour, literally, because each one of these sessions has a unique URL that gets attached to it. We don't want to repeat them, as you know, because of cybersecurity concerns. So we have to be careful in the setup and ensure that we are doing due diligence before it becomes available.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Ash. Very helpful explanation of the technical issues. Any other comments? To the next point then, Ash.

ASHWIN RANGAN:

Thank you. So the next thing that we will be offering is real-time transcription. We talked about this briefly during the last call, as you may recall, where this feature is now offered through Zoom as a ticker tape that goes down at the bottom. Kevin, your question, whether this would be an AI-based, indeed it is. As a result, sometimes the vocoder between the spoken word and the written word can make mistakes. We have seen that, particularly when it comes to acronyms. And as you know, we have a lot of those acronyms. So it does make those mistakes in picking up the acronyms because they're not dictionary words, so to speak. Secondly, with people's names and nouns in general, because again they're not dictionary parsed words but they're proper nouns, if you will. So there will be mistakes. As such, we think of this as an assistance for people to understand what is being said, as opposed to it being an official transcript of record. We continue to offer that as a

service in the background with humans and not AI. But simultaneously, we're also tracking advances in AI in companies such as OpenAI as an example in GPT-3 specifically to see what the art of the possible may look like as we fast forward in time. But for the moment, we will be turning on the RTT feature so that people who may have a difficulty in following what's being spoken have an assist in terms of reading what's going on at the bottom of the screen.

Thank you. Let me pause here. Okay. I don't see any raised hands. So let me move to the next one. Thank you.

The next thing that we will be offering is the one-on-one meetings and small group meetings. This was a very loud request that we heard from many different parts of the community. We have been scratching our heads trying to figure out how best to do this. What we have come upon is an opportunity with our registration system providers. So when we have people registering for ICANN70, they will then have access to a Zoom instance, which is not the one that we will use but a Zoom instance that's made available to us by the registration system providers, a separate independent Zoom instance, where they are willing to offer their Zoom instance as a seamless transition between registration and requests for one-on-one and small group meetings.

There are some limitations that they have imposed because it is their instance and they have their own constraints to respect. The sessions that they are willing to make available will be limited to 40 minutes. Their ability to scale the back end is limited in that regard. But it's not limited in terms of geo. So anybody from anywhere has the ability to either request a meeting or respond to a meeting request. The sessions

themselves will be limited to 40 minutes. And the number of concurrent sessions, I believe, will be 50 at any given time.

So we will need to set this up. We want to try this on a small basis, knowing that there is a tremendous demand for this and understand how it works. So following ICANN70, we'll be reaching back out to the community to request feedback, particularly from those who may leverage this as a service so we understand what the experience felt like and whether the constraint of 50 concurrent sessions was an imposition and, therefore, we need to work with our service provider to expand that, and if so, at what cost to them and to us, etc. So very much in the mode of experimenting, we'll be making this available for ICANN70. Once again, let me pause here to see if there are any questions.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thanks, Ash. Comments or questions?

ASHWIN RANGAN:

Fred, I see a question whether this is available one on one or a few calls or is it just for ICANN executive staff? No, this is for the community. We'll be making it available for you as an option when you make the registration happen for yourself or others. This becomes an option that's available and you can leverage this as a service.

DAVID OLIVE:

At ICANN70, we're talking about, yes.

ASHWIN RANGAN: At ICANN70. Susan, I see your question before I go to Maureen for a raised hand. It would be 100 people. That's the maximum size of the small group that it can handle. Maureen, I see your hand.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Ash. I just wanted to, on behalf of the At-Large, thank you very much for these offerings at this particular meeting. I'm sure everyone's very much aware of the fact that At-Large has been—we come from a very diverse community and therefore we very much appreciate the efforts that ICANN has actually [inaudible] it's gone to providing the many opportunities for us in this meeting. I just want to say thank you.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you, Maureen. I appreciate the feedback. Indeed, the team has worked very hard to understand exactly what was being requested and to try to find a suitable solution. I think we were pleasantly surprised by what was offered to us by the registration system service provider, and I'm hopeful that equally the community will find it as pleasant and will provide us that feedback. But time will tell and your experience is important for us to understand.

A couple of other things that we're experimenting with, again in response to requests that we've heard from the community, one is to have breakout rooms, which may be independently proctored by community members themselves and whiteboarding inside of breakout rooms. Now, the whiteboarding inside the breakout rooms is not an issue at all. It's an out-of-the-box feature, so to speak. But the breakout

rooms, we are testing it from three different perspectives. How many breakout rooms can we have before it becomes completely chaotic? How do we make sure that if there are no ICANN Org people, whether members who are in a breakout room or having a pleasant experience, how do we provide guardrails so that the expectations of the ICANN community are indeed being followed inside of the breakout rooms? These are questions that we have not previously had the answer, and therefore we're testing these questions out ourselves, particularly from a legal perspective, so that we're setting foot on the slope by knowing exactly what the slope entails and not inadvertently stepping onto a slippery slope and find ourselves at some ditch.

So we're not quite there yet and we expect to get there in the near future. I just don't know how fast we'll get there. We're having very involved with conversations with what are known as edge and corner cases to those at software engineering so that we're testing out the art of the possible before we make available these two features. If breakout rooms are made available, they will not only be breakout rooms, but they will also have whiteboards for sure. So let me pause here and see if there are any comments or questions.

DAVID OLIVE:

Jonathan Zuck. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Hi. Sorry to be such a frequent questioner, Ash. On the breakout rooms, what you're working out, what the size of a pilot could be in terms of

staff availability? Or are you still at a place where you're trying to figure out whether it's something that can be offered for ICANN70 at all?

ASHWIN RANGAN:

I think it's both, Jonathan. Thank you for the question. Indeed. It's a layered question and we're examining both. I mean, I'll give you a case in point. Let's assume that 100 breakout rooms are possible as a logical limited side of the system. Does that mean we need 100 people from ICANN Org to be one each in the breakout rooms? Or should we train people so that they can administer these breakout rooms themselves? If we do that, then can we be sure that the breakout rooms are being proctored or facilitated as would a breakout room if there were an ICANN Org employee? We don't know the answers to these things. So we're trying to set some limits and trying to understand what limits are feasible from our own selves so that we can figure out what may be good for you. Does that answer your question?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess not quite. Because the answer could be that we're going to allow only one of these to happen at a time with a maximum of six breakouts, and that means there's five slots for them or something like that. That would seem to address all the other questions. But I guess what I'm getting at is are you still trying to determine whether or not this is a functionality that you would make available at all or just the scope of it, if that makes sense?

ASHWIN RANGAN:

Yeah. I think it goes hand in hand, because on the back end of making it available is a manpower issue, if you will. Because depending on concurrent sessions and breakout requests within concurrent sessions, there is a human physical limit to which we are able to man it. So how do we manage that? These are logistical questions, literally like an operations research equation, where we have an objective function and some constraints that we need to solve for it, we need to understand the art of the possible before we say, "Yes, it's available." Or if we say, "Yes, it's available," to a small subset of the community, we want to experiment this. We have a desire to experiment it. We just want to be reasonable about the way in which we move forward with that desire. So give us a little bit of time.

Thank you. I see an "okay" from Jonathan in the chat box. With that said, these are all the changes that we are contemplating and offering for ICANN70. I have just one observation to make and that is back in March of last year, when first we were trying to figure out how to make our meetings virtual, we thought we've made a gigantic leap forward in going fully virtual within a relatively short period of time. When I look back to that meeting and compare it to what's going on now, that seems like the Dark Ages, with the number of things that we're now able to offer and successfully experiment. I think we've come a long way, and I want to thank you for pushing the art of the possible and asking us for things so that we've been able to experiment with a lot more and respond in kind.

As we get closer to ICANN70, depending on the features that are available, my intention is to work with our Comms team to write a blog that's comprehensive as we have done during prior meetings so that

everybody in the community is aware of what is available and what will be possible during ICANN70. Thank you. Back over to you, David.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Ash. A good reminder that we'll be providing those updates and/or summary blogs as we proceed toward the start about six weeks from now of ICANN70. So with that, we move to Tanzania King to tell us about the next steps and the production schedule. Tanzania, please.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, David. So we are looking of course still at a publish date of the 1st of March. We will also go ahead and schedule another call just so we can regroup about the plenary topics and the planning for those sessions. It's not on this current calendar, but we'll get you an invite this week immediately. I think that we are going to try and plan that for the 4th of March, unless there are any objections. But again, we'll get an invite out to you soon for that call. Just a quick reminder, if you have any networking sessions that you'd like to do, please get in touch with me, I'd be happy to help you with those. Otherwise, you may see some meetings, team-led coffee breaks on the schedule for those of you who like to participate in those. Also, please be sure to review the schedule for any conflicts. That's really important because we can fix them if you let us know about them. But if we don't know, then they will stay there. So please don't forget to review, not just your sessions, but the other groups that are on the schedule I sent out so we can help fix any issues there. With that, I'll hand it back to you, David, for any closing comments.

DAVID OLIVE:

Very good. Thank you very much. We are within our timeframe here. And just briefly to summarize, we have looked at the two plenary sessions that were selected in the voting. We need to make sure that we go back and check to be sure on some of the speakers, are they available, their willingness to be part of that and to engage in that. And we thank the people for volunteering to help us out in doing that, especially on the governmental and regulatory side of that. To that, we also thank Tanzania for sharing the current block schedule with you, and Ash for providing some of the new enhancements of our participation tools. We will of course be sending that around in blogs and updates to you.

With that, if there are no other questions, I'll stop here to see if there are any issues for AOB. If not, we will move forward as we plan for ICANN70. Thank you all for your inputs and comments. We'll be obviously working together as we move forward to these dates. With that, I wish you a good evening, good afternoon, or good morning, wherever you may be. Again, thanks for your help and cooperation.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thanks everybody. Thanks, David. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]