EN

DAVID OLIVE: Welcome, everyone, to the ICANN71 Planning Call today on the 22nd of April 2021. We thank you for joining. This, of course, is the start of the process as we move forward to the Virtual Policy Forum at ICANN71. This, as you know, is the second meeting. The first is a Community Forum. The Policy Forum is this one we're planning for. And, of course, the Annual General Meeting is the third forum, as part of the three meetings we have every year.

With that, I just wanted to welcome everyone. Sally Costerton will be joining us a little later. And to that extent, we have the agenda here. We'll be looking at the Meeting Planning Guidelines and next steps to help us plan the meeting. The ICANN71 plenary topics. Tanzanica and Mary Wong will go through that with us. The block schedule. And then we'll just have any closing remarks and wrap up. With that, I want to thank everyone again for coming into the meeting.

Now I'd like to turn to the ICANN meeting planning guidelines that have been circulated and worked through. This has really been an ongoing process since, I think, maybe ICANN69 where we wanted to make sure that we captured the best practices, the procedures, how best to plan and organize the meetings, and to make sure that people had that as a reference, especially the SO/AC chairs and other leaders helping us.

So, these guidelines are part of that effort to provide that written guideline—talking about the time zones, the scheduling, the managing of sessions, how we develop these programs through successive rounds of consultations and feedback.

And to that extent, this also documents the roles and responsibilities for the community-based meeting and our planning group, ensuring that the accountability is there through the guidance and oversight of the SO/AC chairs, and includes other helpful ways to submit and schedule sessions including the plenary sessions.

The guidelines are, again, to be our framework. They're not to cover decisions on resourcing or meeting locations or other matters within the Board or the Org's remit. Those have already been set, as you well know. And there are no changes to the meeting structure as we have been following for the several years. That is to say, three meetings a year, rotations across the ICANN geographic regions, and of course key features like the Board Community sessions, public forum, community recognition. All that remains as we know it.

The issue going forward would be, now, as we want to use these guidelines for the planning of our ICANN71, the Virtual Policy Forum. And the group, of course, would review the membership of this particular planning group to make sure that updated lists of their new chairs are coming in, and the like. We want to make sure that the SO/AC chairs note that and include the appropriate people.

The guidelines, of course, are not a static thing. We'll update them and review them based on the experience, feedback, lessons learned at every time so that we have a body of guidance and knowledge to help us move the meetings forward. And I think it also anchors any future discussions about the evolution of the ICANN public meetings, including the improvements as we return to face-to-face meetings.

So, we wanted to let you know about that. We'll make sure that that document is the one we'll refer to as we move forward. And, again, it's going to be ever adapting to the situations that we need to address.

With that, I'll stop and see if we now want to move to … Are there are any comments or questions here? We thank you for all of your inputs, and I think we've captured them all.

So, now to the real heart of the matter—ICANN71 plenary topics, proposals received, and next steps. I'll turn it over to Tanzanica.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, David. Hi, everybody. I know that this was a very quick turnaround, and a difficult one. So, thank you for working with me so we could get this list together.

I did see a proposal that just came in about 30 seconds ago, and we do have some full proposals for the two you see at the top here from ALAC. The rest, I've been in contact with all of you, and we determined together that there was some more time needed to get the full proposals together.

So, the idea today is to go ahead and just discuss these topics that are on the list here. The goal being, at the least, to figure out if we're okay with the block schedule with the number of slots we have there for plenaries. And that, of course, is to help facilitate all of your planning for the rest of your schedules so we can start submitting those and produce the schedule next week.

So, with that being said, we can start at the top here. It would be great if we could just go through the topics and have a discussion. So, if we're starting with ALAC, who do we have on the call that wants to speak to this?

I saw Jonathan. Do we also have …

JONATHAN ZUCK: I could do it if necessary. I guess I'm the owner for the ALAC.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. You have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, everybody. Jonathan Zuck, co-vice-chair of the ALAC. We did sort of a call for topics inside of the At-Large community, and there were six proposals put forward. And just yesterday, we did a discussion of them and ranked them. And these were two that floated to the top as possible to propose as plenaries.

The criteria we were trying to use is conversations that should involve a broad range of stakeholders and constituencies within the ICANN community, and also the degree to which they were topical, the conversations that were going on.

The first one is about ICANN's multistakeholder model and how to improve it. It's sort of building on some of the things that Brian Cute started and having a community discussion on the effectiveness of the

multistakeholder model because it stands as one of the few prominent examples of multistakeholderism around the Internet community generally; and what could we do to improve it to make sure that it develops and grows and continues to be an example for others to follow rather than just becoming kind of a footnote in Internet history?

So, there is more text to this that I welcome people to read, that Marita Moll composed for us. But that's sort of the idea—a discussion around the multistakeholder model and what we could do to continue to evolve it.

The author of the second proposal … It's about the block list providers and their role because this has been an ongoing conversation in the context of DNS abuse. They're a major source of information for everybody, but there's a level of inconsistency between them, and understanding what they do and how they make their decisions better is something that seems to have come up frequently. And so, getting them involved in the conversation feels like a good idea.

But what I'd love to do is ask Steinar from the At-Large community to say a few words about this proposal that he drafted. Steinar, are you available to turn on your mic and talk about this proposal a little bit?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thanks, Jonathan.

DAVID OLIVE: Please, yes.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: You can hear me, everybody?

DAVID OLIVE: We can. Go ahead. Thanks, Jonathan.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: The basic idea here is that we have, for quite a long time, had policy discussions about what should be included in a definition of DNS abuse. And from these discussions, there is quite a variant of what should be included and what should not be included.

Professionally, I'm working with the block list providers for clients. And we gather data from them and we categorize them for our clients and give our reports in order for them to reserve the name space and be up to date, compliance wise, with ICANN.

What occurs to me is that the block list provider is actually the best tool the contracted parties have today. They have a huge amount of data. We use them; DAAR uses them, etc. But it's kind of a black box. We get something from them, but we don't know exactly what they are doing to identify the different kinds of suspicious behavior. I think that's a pity because we need to trust these sources. We need to make sure that they operate on the same level. So, that's kind of the first angle or the first take on this one.

The second is that the community, the end users, should also be aware of how should I act when I'm being notified that my domain name, my

website is being attacked or being seen as a suspicious site? Is it me? Have I don't anything wrong? Who's in blame? How can I sort these things out? And that's just something that I was hoping that the block list providers could take their expertise and their guidance into the audience and tell them what to do.

So, that's initially what I'm … I hope that is understandable. It's a very complex thing because if I, with my professional hat, go to a block list [where I] say, "How did [you] identify that as a phishing site?" Well, they say, "That's a business secret."

And then I go to another block list provider. "Why didn't you identify this domain name as a phishing site? It's in your data, but the other one identified it." That's a business secret. And that has kind of, in my opinion, ruined the toolbox. The value of the toolbox is getting less.

So, yeah. Questions?

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Steinar. Any questions?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I can't believe I was that crystal clear.

DAVID OLIVE: Steinar, I think people might have taken a look at some of the others. It's not a reflection of lack of interest or interest. It's just that they were

taking it in and listening to your explanation which was very helpful, I think.

Any other comments on the two suggestions from ALAC? Tanzanica?

TANZANICA KING: Yes. So, going back. No comments on the ALAC ones?

DAVID OLIVE: We can maybe circle back.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. Sounds like a plan. So, next we have four topics that are being planed for proposals to come in. Again, as I said, we're going to give some more time for full proposals to come in for these to allow everyone to actually flesh those out.

But if Manal is here and would be willing to make some comments about these four topics.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Tanzanica. And thank you, David. Noting Susan's comment in the chat, I do apologize for submitting everything in a rush and not being able to give the time for everyone to review before the call.

In fact, I don't think we have yet, as you mentioned, Tanzanica, we haven't yet submitted the form itself. So, those were brainstorming topics among the GAC that we shared.

So, just before getting to the proposals, I note that I'm accompanied today by Nigel Hickson, a UK GAC representative who also is being part of our planning team replacing Luisa Paez who is term limited and is not serving as a GAC vice-chair anymore.

So, Nigel is with me on the call. And with your permission, if I may hand over to him to give a quick brief on the topics. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Manal. Please, Nigel, go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much. Good afternoon. Thank you, Manal. Thank you, David. It's a pleasure to do so, as others. And of course, these are suggestions and, no doubt, we can discuss them in more detail as we go along.

The first one, the role of ICANN in the wider Internet governance arena, is a sort of, I suppose, a proposal for a holistic discussion of where ICANN is fitting in, in this dynamics Internet governance ecosystem that we live in. So, looking at the role of ICANN in, as I was saying, the wider ecosystem whether it's in how ICANN is portrayed or how ICANN is represented in wider international arenas such as the UN, the ITU, the OECD, etc.; or to look at how ICANN exerts its influence in this sphere to

ensure that the interests and the objectives of ICANN are understood and are appreciated.

So, I think that's the first one, and it's not a new topic. It's a topic, I suppose, that the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance has addressed from time to time.

The second proposal, I think, is really picking up … Well, it is picking up on the proposal for a plenary session from the last meeting, from ICANN70. I know it didn't go ahead, but I think, from what I had seen, it was delineated in a fairly—well, in a very interesting way as well, this topic that we're told is being carried over on governmental regulatory developments.

And this is really picking up what could be affecting the Domain Name System elsewhere, if you see what I mean. So, not just proposals at the UN or the ITU, but specifically legislative proposals, be they national or regional. I mean, obviously, who is GDPR in relation to the DNS? And that's well understood. But there are also proposals being put forward in NIS 2, the revision of the network and information security directive which impacts the root zone operators and the registries and registrars—or potentially does, depending on how the proposals end up.

And also, proposals, for instance, in the OECD where there's a paper on the rotting system and the naming system and issues pertaining to that and possible suggestions of future recommendations in that field. So, that's the second one.

How the DNS could evolve to meet the needs and aspirations of the global community of 2025. Again, looking ahead, no doubt it would link

to proposals, I suspect, in the interest of other parts of the community. And some of this has perhaps been discussed before, but certainly the DNS is evolving with the proposals and the IETF and elsewhere for evolutions for the DNS whether its DNS over HTTPS or other types of protocols.

So, I suppose this is a fairly broad topic, but it's not just technical in nature. It's also, if you like, policy in nature and societal in nature how the Domain Name System itself might be able to be adapted to meet the global community.

And the fourth one, I think we thought in the GAC that this is certainly worth a continuing discussion. Of course, it won't be discussed elsewhere. I'm sort of a complete novice at planning and things like that for ICANN meetings, and this may well have been taken into account. In which case, apologies. But it's just that I think this is of great interest.

And the final thing I'd say about this one if I may, Mr. Chair, is that I think here we can take into account in any discussion we have on this—and I know Sally Costerton and other colleagues have given this a great deal of thought. But we could take account of what's happening elsewhere, as well, in this new hybrid environment, I suppose you could call it, how governments are approaching it; how other international institutions are approaching it; how major global companies are approaching the post-COVID world in terms of working and meeting, etc. Thank you very much.

DAVID OLIVE:	Any other comments or discussions? Thank you, Nigel. I appreciate that. Welcome. Tanzanica.
TANZANICA KING:	Yes, thank you. Nice to see you, Nigel. I have to throw that in there. So, then next two topics we see here are coming from the Registrars. And if we have Ashley, I believe she will speak to these two.
ASHLEY HEINEMAN:	Hey, there. Can you hear me?
TANZANICA KING:	Yep, we can hear you.
DAVID OLIVE:	Thank you, please.
ASHLEY HEINEMAN:	Yeah, sorry. My headset died just before I was coming on, so I wasn't sure I was functioning otherwise. So, yes, hello. My name is Ashley Heineman. I am the chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and like others have expressed, it was quite hard to come up with something that we had fully baked and bought in by our membership in the time given. I appreciate trying to keep things moving, but it was quite difficult to get something in good form in the time we were given.

And just to take the moment I have here, I think we need to look at stuff like this because I think this kind of lends to issues that we've experienced in the past with respect to how we move forward with items and whether or not they're able to proceed as originally proposed.

But with that, I'll go ahead and give you a quick overview of what we're proposing from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. The first one is WHOIS registrant experiences, and this is the one that I was able to upload in terms of an actual proposal, filling out the web form. But in short, we thought it would be helpful to do a session that highlights what the registrant experiences when their information goes into WHOIS, particularly when it's made public.

And we have a lot of information regarding the amounts of spam that results and other impacts because we often focus quite a bit on the utility of access to registration information for third parties who use that information for things like law enforcement and other enforcement measures. But we rarely hear about the impact on registrants when the information is provided.

And we thought this would be a really good opportunity to round out the conversation so, as folks developing policy, we have a full picture of the environment and the impact of parties and what they're experiencing. So, we have that as our first.

And the second one which seems to kind of fall in line with the theme of the day which is basically how to preserve a functional and productive ICANN. And our particular focus was on how to deal with log jams. And I think we've seen this probably since the dawn of ICANN, but it seems to

be particularly prominent these days where we [initiate] work items that either take a really long time or seem virtually impossible to conclude.

And we think it's important to continue to have a thriving ICANN, one that is useful and constructive, that we find ways to deal with these because it's not useful to anyone, it's not useful to us in terms of lauding ICANN as a great multistakeholder venue and process and way to deal with Internet governance if we can't address problems. And so, we want to try and figure out how best to deal with these situations.

And I hope to get more details on this uploaded very soon, but we're still actually going through the process of finalizing how we want to present this. So, my apologies for not having that ready for you all today. So, thank you very much.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Ashley. Does anybody have questions/comments on any of the topics? The next thing we'll do is ask that all of those formal proposals actually come in by Friday if we can so that we can send them out to the group.

I see Sam with your hand up. Go ahead.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Tanzanica. And this sort of a bit of a comment about timing since you just mentioned it. Ashley said this, so I'm just going to repeat what she said. It seems like there is a good amount of overlap in a number of these topics, which I actually think is a good thing for plenary sessions. I think that shows that there's a concept out there that many

members of the community are interested in discussing and airing and talking about and things like that.

So, I almost wonder if it's worth the folks who propose the ALAC/GAC and the Registrar's sessions—the ones that talk about the future of the multistakeholder model and things that need to be improved and all that stuff—if it's maybe worth giving them a few extra days and see if there's an overarching session that could combine a lot of these topics.

TANZANICA KING: I personally think that's a fantastic idea. For us, it's all about being able to allow everyone to move forward with the schedule. So, if everybody is comfortable at the end of this call with a decision on how many slots we're going to have and where they're going to fit, I don't see any reason why we can't take a little longer to finish up proposals. But that's really up to the group. So, if there are any comments, now would be the time. If you don't argue it, we'll just do it.

DAVID OLIVE: I think it's a good idea. Thank you. Jonathan has his hand up, I see.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just was speaking up rather than putting something in the chat or whatever, being passive. But I'd be happy to participate in such a discussion because I'm definitely a firm believer that the underlying concept of a plenary should be a session that's good really broad support and broad participation. So, we'd be happy to participate and

get our pen holders engaged with those from the other constituencies to craft something that is pleasing to all.

DAVID OLIVE: And to Samantha's point about the commonalities in some of them, it would be, I think, a helpful way to see if we can combine or merge that which might be helpful.

Tanzanica, would you want to wrap up?

TANZANICA KING: Sure. If we can actually go to the next slide here so we're looking at the box schedule. One more, sorry.

So, this is what we started off with. Just as a reminder, the DNSSEC Workshop and Tech Day. This is just a duplicate of what we did for the Policy Forum last year, so it certainly doesn't mean that you have to schedule those that way again. It's just something to start us off.

There are three slots on here for plenary sessions. Of course, we already know that one of them needs to be the session that's carried over from ICANN70.

Are there any comments or concerns about the potential timing for these plenaries that are currently on the block schedule? Or any concerns about delaying the proposal, the timing to get those in so that … You know, can you still get your schedule done? Any issues? Or do we love these three slots?

DAVID OLIVE: It seems for the moment those three slots look like you've done a good job, Tanzanica, as always.

TANZANICA KING: Silence sounds like love. Okay.

DAVID OLIVE: Okay.

TANZANICA KING: Good. In that case, we will not do a hard everything-has-to-be-in-by-Friday. I would think we can go into next week and not have a firm idea of when it has to be, considering that everybody's agreeable to these three slots. So, maybe we can do that update on the list instead of trying to figure out a deadline now. We're still going to start accepting session requests next week, and I know a lot of you have already been planning your schedules. So, I think we're good there.

And that is all I have. Oh, I have one more thing that I wanted to update you all on, and that is that the production calendar we originally sent out showed Prep Week as being the 31st of May into that first week of June. Of course, we realized that the 31st is a holiday, so that is going to shirt to be just from June 1-3. So, I just wanted to make sure make sure everyone knew that. And that is all I have, David.

DAVID OLIVE:

Okay, Tanzanica, and everyone. Again, we understand the timing of these proposals. And others have mentioned the need to have a little more time to reflect. And so, hopefully, I think the solution we proposed will allow that on the plenary topics. And in the meantime, of course, with this Virtual Policy Forum block schedule the same, generally, as we're familiar with.

Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah, thanks. Hi. It's Susan Payne with the IPC. So, I posted a message to the list just about an hour or so ago, and obviously people haven't really had a time to think about that.

But since it sounds as though there's a bit of time on this call, if I'm reading the comments from Tanzanica correctly, is this an opportunity now to talk about what we think about the Q&A with the Exec where Mary and asked us all a question about whether we wanted to have that and do we find that session useful and should it be scheduled for this meeting and should it be conflicted or non-conflicted?

Is this a suitable time to see if people have thoughts on that?

DAVID OLIVE:

I did read, early this morning, your e-mail, Susan. And I think now would be a good time to start that conversation because others may not have seen it.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, thank you. So, the IPC have been giving this a lot of thought, and I think we were one of the groups for the last meeting who perhaps had been less enthusiastic about having the Q&A session with the Exec at the last meeting. Or, indeed, I think we had suggested it be moved into Prep Week.

But we've been thinking about this more, and we do value that session, or at least we value the opportunity for engagement with ICANN staff, with the team leads for various departments. But there was a certain dissatisfaction amongst IPC members, and I think others as well, with the actual session as it has currently been structured.

There tends to be quite a lot of material to be covered, and it gets covered in very formal presentations. And as a consequence, there really isn't that much opportunity for genuine Q&A. And so, what we were feeling was that, yes, there's a place for that sort of formal presentation, and perhaps the place for that, we think, is in Prep Week. Probably not for every [thick] meeting, but from time to time, as update on what the current priorities for the different ICANN teams are.

But we'd really welcome a genuine kind of Q&A, and what we were having in mind what something similar to the public forum that we have with the Board at two out of the three meetings. Something where a few of the ICANN Exec, the senior staff, have a very unstructured, genuine kind of Q&A with the community. And we just wanted to float that and see what other people thought—whether they thought it was a good idea, whether it's workable, whether staff would be willing.

So, just wanting to start the discussion on that rather than this very formal kind of presentation session which we find doesn't allow for that much interactivity.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Susan. We appreciate those comments and the need to have a good dialogue. We always prefer that, obviously. People will also be able to read it in the e-mail, but if there are any other initial comments, we can surely hear them as well, in the chat or with that.

Over the various ICANN meetings, we have experimented, if you will, with various formats to see what might be the most effective for an interaction. And I know Sally Costerton, Sally Newell Cohen, and others have looked at this, including myself. So, this is a helpful input as we start looking at what would work.

Sally, would you want to jump in? You've been moderating some recently and helping to change that format to be more interactive.

SALLY COSTERTON: Yes.

DAVID OLIVE: That would be very helpful. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Yeah. I would be happy to, David. We have been trying to change the format a bit, and I think you're exactly right, Susan, that there hasn't

been enough time for Q&A. And so, we can look at better ways to improve that structure so that it feels like more of a genuine conversation. I think you said it really well. It should be a little bit more open and less formal and presentation-focused.

So, let us take that back. I'm not convinced that it should be during Prep Week, though, because it's not really prepping you for the sessions to come. That's the only thing I think about. And I know it's well-attended. It has been in the last several sessions that we've had.

So, if we could take that back and look at the format a little bit. And perhaps this could be a bit of an iterative process. David, if you think that would work to do that.

DAVID OLIVE: Yes, right. Why don't we do that? The sentiment seems to be a good opportunity to have this exchange in a format that's more informal. And you're right. It is not really Prep Week in the way we try to distinguish that particular week for items of info and things like this. Whereas, this is really more I think what people want as an opportunity for interaction.

SALLY COSTERTON: Yes, and we value the dialogue as well. So, I think it's very much worthwhile for us to look for a way that will work.

EN

DAVID OLIVE:
Thanks. I see, in the chat as well. So, if people, please, input and comment on Susan Payne's initial e-mail she sent around. I see Sam and Nigel and others are commenting, but it would be good to do that. And then we'll collect that and continue to have a discussion on that.

Will that work for everyone? Susan, is that okay?

SUSAN PAYNE:
Yes, that sounds great. And I was just trying to clarify in the chat. Yeah, we were kind of seeing this as two different things, almost. And I still feel, depending on if it ends up being a single session, then I agree that kind of interactive engagement isn't a Prep Week session. But we've been thinking if we were still to have those kind of [inaudible] things, they feel very much like a prep week type thing. Whereas, this more of a dialogue session feels definitely like meeting proper.

DAVID OLIVE:
I think at this stage, people are really—my reaction is that people prefer the dialogue and informal interaction style rather than death by PowerPoint. So, let's work on that one. How about that? Making it interactive as you suggest. Fine, very good

Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:
Yeah. This is just a proposal from left field to see if there's some interest. Some of you that saw some of my presentations, and one from Hadia as well, during the ICANN70 saw that we made use of presentation

technology that blended the presentation with the video feeds so that you were more prominent on camera when making presentations. You made me think of this with the "death by PowerPoint" statement, David.

If that's something that people are interested in, I'd be happy to try to facilitate some kind of a broader introduction to that. The company's technology it is, I don't have any kind of relationship with then. But it's Prezi, and they are aggressive enough about wanting to see this used that they're willing to do things like design presentations for key notes and things like that if people are interested in trying to take up the presentations at the ICANN meeting or not, perhaps.

So let me know if that would be interesting to people because that's something that I could certainly facilitate.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Jonathan. Again, we have also tried to help with people in their presentations using the Zoom, as we are now accustomed to, to making it more attractive and interactive, and any steps that would be, I think, very helpful for us.

Tanzanica, do you want to go over the production schedule?

TANZANICA KING: Yes. So, as you see, we have on here right now, it says, "if needed." We had a 29 April slot on here. We'll go ahead and keep that so that we can have the follow up discussion that's needed on the plenary topics. Other than that, again, we are accepting all of your schedule requests starting

next week, preparing for the posting of the final schedule by the 24th of May. Quick, quick turnaround this time.

DAVID OLIVE: Okay. Let's move to Any Other Business and, indeed, we might be able to give back some time to meeting. That has become an important element of an efficient running of a meeting, but also to provide the necessary breaks to your busy days.

All right, then. To, if I could, just recap. Thank you very much for …

Sam, please. Sorry.

SAM DEMETRIOU: David, I'm so sorry that I was slow getting my and up and that I'm trampling on your ability to wrap this meeting up earlier. I will try to be very brief, but I did promise the Registries Stakeholder Group I would a couple of these concerns.

And it's just as we are getting into the plenary topic planning. I think we're going to be in a better place this meeting than maybe we were for the last go around because there's so much overlap in commonality in some of the subjects that have been proposed. So, again, I think that's a really good thing.

I did want to note a couple of concerns with the way we voted on the plenary topics the last time around, especially where we had the ability to voice that we did not support a session. But I don't really know how that was taken on board. So, I think that, obviously, we should see how

things play out, how many topics we do end up with once groups collaborate and settle on their final submissions.

But I just want to plant a flag, and maybe we can revisit this at the next call. But I think we maybe want to give a little bit more thought to the way we vote and the way we ultimately, as a group, decide which topics will go forward when we have more proposals than plenary sessions. Because I think it got a little bit challenging last time around.

So, I'll stop there. I don't want to take up too much time. But it's something that I wanted to flag for us to continue to think about. So, thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. Sam. A good point in the effort to make sure that we select the right topics, that we have people prepared for that, and that we present, in our best way, a plenary session. I think that was some of the lessons learned from the last one or two sessions.

And so, to that extent, I think people can see that and want to make sure that there's a topic of overall interest, well prepared, and people saying at the end, "That was something we wanted to be part of." So, I accept that and I thank you. We'll move forward on that one as well.

Any other business? Give that one more chance.

With that, if I could wrap up, I want to thank you all for participating. We are moving forward with the meeting guidelines that have been presented as a document that will continue to be updated and improved. We thank the SO/AC chair and other leaders for their work on

this stemming from past practices and the need to put it together, as well as the meeting surveys and others as we move forward in our continuing virtual meetings at ICANN and hopefully eventually going back to our face-to-face meetings.

With that, we saw the topics for the plenary sessions from the various groups—ALAC, GNSO, and GAC, among others. There may be more. We are extending that timeline so that people can look at that more closely, as well as the commonalities that some could be combined or moved together.

And to that extent, the block schedule was presented here and, buy and large, the way it is organized would be the way we'll move forward as you also begin to organize your own sessions as part of that.

There was also an issue raised about making sure that the plenary sessions, or the selectin of that, is solid so that we have a good consensus to move forward and provide the best program for our communities.

We also raised the issue of a more interactive session with the ICANN Executives allowing Qs and As and the like. And to that extent, we'll be exploring that as well as ways to enhance our presentations so that they are of interest and attractive, including use of video and the like.

With that, I hope I have summed what we have discussed today, and I thank everyone for their cooperation as we move forward. With that, I'd like to see if Sally Costerton would like to have some final remarks. And we also have our managing director for Europe, Chris Mondini, on board

as well because this will technically be our virtual Hague meeting. So, we thank him for being part of that.

Sally, would you like say some final words?

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, David. Appreciate it. And thank you, everybody, for being so flexible and doing so much work beforehand. In all the years we've been planning these events, the timing is always tight.

I'm very interested in the feedback on the plenaries. I think one thing I would like to offer help with to try and make sure that we find time to discuss, which we've touched on as well, is the question or so of good formats. How do we make sure that, having picked topics, that you get the absolutely maximum experience from them and that we roll in all the best practice we've had so far while we've been doing virtual meetings?

And other ideas that you have to provide the support for you to make sure that these are as interactive as possible and they reach as many of our community as they can and we really make the most of them because I know it takes time and effort.

So, thank you for that. I'm looking forward to working with you all again as we go forward to our next ICANN meeting. Thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sally. And thank you, Chris, for your note in the chat. With that, let's give back a few minutes of our valuable time. And with that, I

wish everyone good evening, good afternoon, or good morning, wherever you may be. We will be discussing, both by e-mail and again possibly on the 29th in person, as we continue to plan for the Virtual Public Forum, the Policy Forum, for ICANN71.

With that, thank you very much. Good-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]