

---

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you and welcome, everyone. Per our usual procedure, we'll record this meeting for our notes and information. As you know, the preparation for the next ICANN meeting usually happens at the end of the previous one, and the ICANN68 Planning Group that is now here today is the first step in that direction. But as you know, with the current pandemic situation that we're all in, we're facing unprecedented and unknown conditions and we realized that many people are focused on health, family, and economic issues, and so we all thank you for joining today as we look forward to how we plan our work in the next several months.

As you know, Goran has been talking to many groups and to all of us about our commitment to successfully fulfilling the mission but we must know the human impact involved as we are looking at and concerned about personal and family and health matters, families and friends. We see the travel shut downs, meeting cancellations, altering schedules and all that, and we know that that's another issue we have to address and we have to look to our realistic expectations of what we as a group can do in the resources we have in these stressful times.

In the current situation, unlike the quick and helpful change to ICANN67 from face-to-face to virtual, thanks to everyone's contributions here on this call, we are even in more extraordinary situations. We're not sure how best to approach this, but of course we're trying to adjust our new normal at the moment so that we can deliver on the mission and on an ICANN68 policy forum. So our intention in having this call today is to start that thought process as well as planning and to talk about the

---

*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.*

---

other options for the meeting, other outlines, if you will, and given some of this thought we want to share these ideas with you and hear your views. As you know the Board on the 8<sup>th</sup> of April will make a formal decision on Kuala Lumpur, and our comments here are to be part of the inputs so that we can talk about an outline for what might be virtual ICANN68 and how best to do that.

With that as a preface, I'd like to turn it over to my colleague, Sally Costerton, to see if she has some other words and we will proceed to the agenda as we have it. Sally?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thanks, David. You have very well framed comments. Thank you all so much for joining us today. Our goal is to have – you've been tremendous partners to us through the ICANN67 process and that I think has been a big part of the reason why we were able to pivot so very fast. We have more time to think about the next meeting and we want to make the most of that time both your and for everybody's benefit. So what we're going to do today is to both show with you, as David said, what you've told us [inaudible] but also to take you through some of the considerations that we have to face now, that we are in a complete and total work-from-home situation. All org staff around the world are now working from home, and that we're working with assumption that that situation will continue. That creates a different pressures to the ones that we had for ICANN67 when that had not yet been fully implemented and because the governments involved in the different countries that are seemed to [inaudible] had not all implemented the level of lockdown that they now have. So we'll spend

---

a bit of time on that today and when we're going through the call, please take the time to ask questions today that you may have, if it's not immediately clear to you why, something that we normally expect to be normal is not easily available. And we have Josh with us on the call; we have Ash today with us on the call as well to take the time that you need to answer these questions. Our key goal of today's call is to make sure that to the best of our ability we're on the same page about what is possible and how do we then match what's possible from the supply side with what your priorities are or if you like the sort of demand side, if you want to look at it that way.

I've been going through that early as we are now, starting early. It will give us the time to come up with plans that we work on together that are co-created and maximize our collective ability to prioritize and achieve our objectives. So thank you for your patience and I look forward to really constructive discussion on the call. Thanks, David. Back to you.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Sally. The agenda is as follows. Next slide, please. We turn it over to Tanzania to give us results of the survey. Thank you for participating. That's a quick link. Tanzania, please.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, David. Hello, everybody. I want to take you through the results first. Thank you very much. I know it was last minute and there was some comments about that. We apologize for being the last minute but also really grateful that you took the time to go and submit your

---

answers. It really helps for us to have an idea of where you stand and what direction we should take with these things before we walk in the call. So, thank you, thank you.

The first thing that we have here is the time zone, which is by far the most difficult thing for us to figure out what to do with the virtual meetings. As you can see, we have an even split between Kuala Lumpur and London. Again, I just want to point out, I know this is in the e-mail, but these aren't meant to be definitive. We're not taking these as votes but we really just want to have them and share them with you so that we can continue the conversation and try to get at least have a goal of getting some of these answers before we leave the call because it helps us to actually begin our planning. The other thing we asked was how many hours a day you thought it was reasonable, and the majority of people said six hours. We can go ahead and go to the next slide.

Please feel free to interrupt me with questions about these. We're going to have time at the end to really hear from you but you're always welcome to interrupt me. Next we have the preferred duration for the meeting. The question here was really, if we were to do the meeting in a certain time zone, would you want to shorten the days and extend the actual duration of the meeting in order to accommodate that? The majority of you said that you would want to extend it and Friday was an overwhelming choice for the up to two days that we had in there as an option. So, 65% wanted to do that. I think Friday is probably a done deal if we were to do a virtual meeting, but again we want to hear from you. These are not definitive.

---

There are also in terms of the time zone I just want to mention. There was a couple of comments about why we should choose one over the other. Some of those were in relation to being fair to the Asia-Pacific region. They were disadvantaged during Cancún, not that we were in Cancún but during the Cancún meeting. So there's a thought that it's only fair that they should have more decent hours this time.

There was also a couple of suggestions to have sessions held across a 12-hour period rather than an 8-hour period that we normally think of as a working day. We can discuss the pros and cons of that more. I just wanted to make you aware of those comments.

We also asked – sorry, go ahead and go forward for me to the next slide, please. Can you guys still hear me?

DAVID OLIVE:

Yes, we can.

TANZANICA KING:

Okay, good. I think it's probably a good time right now to point out one of the comments. One of the comments about challenge with the session was people having to stop and say, "Can you hear me?" throughout calls. There were some comments about we should have shorter sessions because they're too long. There were also comments saying that we need to make the sessions longer. All of these are different perspectives and there's quite a variety of them. So there's just things that we need to think about when we walk into another

---

potential virtual meeting situation in terms of what we want to do and really what's still a unique situation.

18 out of 20 of you supported doing a public forum and/or plenary sessions. There were comments that you would like to know what those topics might be. We have the past topics, the ones that were delayed from the Cancún meeting, to share with you, too, a little bit later so we can discuss those.

There was a response to importance of interpretations that we're sharing here with you. This goes right into the next part here. We really want you to understand what is going to be possible for a virtual ICANN68. Josh is going to explain exactly what would be available to you in terms of technical services. So I'll hand it over to you, Josh, to do that.

JOSH BAULCH:

Thank you, Tanzania. My name is Josh Baulch, I'm with Meeting Operations. Really, what I am going to be doing is just setting the expectations for what our current technical situation is with COVID-19 for virtual meeting. Honestly, we'd really like to be optimistic that we can expand beyond our current limits that I'm going to go through here but for now, I just want to set the minimal expectation as a baseline for us, moving forward.

David and Sally had both said at the top of the call, we have a lot of issues within the US, like we our shelter in place mandates and we also have international travel restrictions, which really impact the Meeting Support Team and we're unable to gather in one location for us to be able to support the meeting like we did for ICANN67. That is due to

---

some technical limitations that we'll see by not being able to be in one location to be able to provide all of the services, for example, like interpretation and the mp3 streaming.

For a virtual ICANN68, if that was to move forward, we would be able to offer mp3 audio steaming. So for those of you guys that know what that is, that's the language interpretation that stream. So if you don't have bandwidth to be able to [purchase] so they can, the Zoom session that we offer a secondary lower bandwidth mp3 audio streaming. Unfortunately, that requires onsite servers and hardware to be connected to that in-person interpretation booth. And the Zoom audio – we're not able to do it in our home setups with the technicians and everything right now.

The other factors for us on human limitation that we're going to be facing, we'll have a technical support staff limitation. Right now we're looking at this as – our technical staff can reasonably support sessions all within consecutive 8-10 hour window of time. But the technical teams are limited from the technical experts to be able to cover a full 24-hour period. We'd love to be able to do that but this is a people problem. We're not able to expand beyond that. There are some discussions about other options of being able to split the days, that type of thing. We'll work the best that we can to be able to support those.

Then also just kind of the hotter topic with all of these discussions is the interpretation. There will be a limitation because right now I can only have the limited team of interpreters that are familiar with the work of ICANN including the terminology and acronyms. What that means for us is that when these folks are interpreting the calls, they're doing it via

---

phone and that is physically and mentally taxing on the interpreters, especially when they're doing it on the phone. So in order for us to be able to provide the service, it will need to be reduced a bit. Right now the minimum that we would be able to provide would be two 60-minute sessions per day with the six UN languages for the GAC and two 60-minute sessions with two languages for ALAC. Like I said at the very beginning, this is just a baseline. This would be a worst case situation. I know that Ashwin and Christina, and all of the teams are working diligently behind the scenes to see how we can expand that and increase that, but as a baseline expectation, this is the minimum. If we would have to do this tomorrow, this is the minimum we would be able to provide with that.

But the other things that would be provided, the use of the Zoom conferencing platforms for all the sessions. There's no issues there. Then we would still be able to post the session recordings of the Zooms within 12-24 hours. The delay on time is actually just waiting on the Zoom recording to be processed by Zoom. One of the things we saw through 67 was there is a delay because of the sheer volume of people using Zoom on those recording times being posted. So as soon as that information is available, we'll post it up.

Real-time transcription. Christina's team had already transitioned that to them working from home over the last year or so, so we'll be able to do that with no impact and that scenario is good.

Then also we'll have support staff working during the working hours whichever time zone you decide to move forward with. We'll be able to support that. We'll still be able to post the meeting transcripts in English

---



---

and then also for those sessions that have the UN languages, we're able to post those. We'll still be able to utilize the meeting schedule website and ask for the participants. With that, I'll open either questions or we can move on.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Josh.

JOSH BAULCH: Bruna, yeah. RTT is stream text, so yes, that would be available.

DAVID OLIVE: I will then take the queue. I see that Sébastien Bachollet's hand is up. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, David. Regarding that, I have the impression that since ICANN virtual Cancún meeting, the fact that a lot of people are working from home change the landscape. That's my understanding of the presentation of Josh. It was already a very important challenge to organize virtual 67, but here it will be even more.

I was wondering before we get into more details, it's the first question – can we delay the meeting? Not to say we need to wait to have a face-to-face but delaying the meeting adds to the time the technical people are able to go back to their feet, for example. Everything that we need to take this as, I would say, first question before going into details. I am

---

happy with what's proposed here, but I think that it will relieve a lot of difficulty of a meeting if we can decide such thing. Yes, I don't know when it will happen and I guess nobody knows, but that could be one thing. That's it for the moment. Thank you very much.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Sébastien. A very good point. I think at this stage, Goran and others are talking about the timeframe through September and so no travel or meetings until September because it's just unclear what the situations will be. So the idea of a postponement as you point out is okay but until when, and that's again the unknown. But at least we're in place until September in the caution and concern for the safety and security of all people involved.

JOSH BAULCH:

David, this is Josh again. I just wanted to make a quick clarification on what I had said. For describing the real-time transcription, we do have a limited team that is able to do that. So we'd still only be provided for the sessions that have always received it which are the GAC and the plenary sessions. So just a clarification. Sorry for misspeaking on that.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Josh. The normal policy forum approach, right.

Manal, your hand is up, please.

---

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, David and Josh and everyone. I'm glad we're having this discussion because the survey itself was a little bit challenging. In fact, some of the questions I don't even recall how I answered them because I was between two answers. So I think the discussion is needed and the rationale behind what's been submitted is also important.

So I was designing this from scratch, I would have looked at the least painful hours for all time zones and take it from there. But now given that we have already gave this privilege to the Latin American region and worked with Cancún time during the last meeting, that's why I did vote for the UTC + 8 time zone. Although this wouldn't be my first preference if I'm designing the whole thing from scratch, but given that the Asia-Pacific region were really disadvantaged during the Cancún meeting, that's why I'm now voting for the UTC + 8.

I'm just wondering whether we have any calculation what is the block that would be least painful for anyone in any time zone? Maybe we can work around then see whether we can split the day into two like what Mary suggested in the chat as well or we need to decrease the hours a little bit to accommodate the painful hours or increase them a little bit. I think a few given would help us work thing better.

I also hope we have the chance to consult with our constituencies as you rightly mentioned. Tanzania also said in the e-mail this does not represent the views of our constituencies. We didn't have the chance to consult with them, so I hope we will have this chance and maybe share with them even the very same survey and see how they get back to us.

---

One last thing on the Friday, I'm happy to work on the Friday. We sometimes do this but just to flag that this is also a weekend for some parts of the world. But again, we have to go by the majority and it only makes sense for the majority to add the Friday. But just flagging that it's a weekend. I'll stop here. I can see more hands. I may come in later. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Manal. We'll get back to you on the time zone and what might be the least painful hours for such sessions. Bruna, you're next. After that, Eduardo. Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you very much, David. I just wanted to concur what some of Manal's points right now because I think that a lot of the decisions and a lot of the discussions should be referred back to our constituencies. And again we do appreciate the survey but then the timelines for us to get some responses from our constituencies was rather short. Like in my constituency, I have two answers for this all pointing out to the London time zone, but I do agree that it's not really fair to the APAC members or to the APAC part of this community.

But moving on from this initial comment, we did point out at the NCSG meeting with the Board that if we're working one with such virtual meetings, it would be necessary for ICANN to develop a kind of a governance mechanism with what we spoke about as extensive consultation for [inaudible]. I just think that given how limited the resources can be for this next meeting, we do need to consult with

---

more people and we do need to tell them how limited the resources are, how we can only have transitions in two sessions for the GAC and two sessions for the ALAC, who used to be the ones requested, but then if we're moving to an entirely virtual scenario, these resources are certainly needed for other meetings. It's not the transition. It's just the stream text part of it. Just so we can cover up some of this lack of spaces, because if we're not to have the audio stream, then we can maybe try to see if we can have the Zoom text for anything such as an in time kind of report of the session just so we can cover up for everybody who cannot show up to the session. Because we saw that a lot of our members were not able to attend due to connectivity and some others issues related to that. Just maybe we emphasize the need for more thorough consultations with community. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Bruna, on a newer governance system if we go more long term on virtual meetings such as this. Thank you for that comment. Eduardo, you're next.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you. I just wanted to comment on the time zone that we as a group, we have to decide if we just want to maintain the time zone of the Kuala Lumpur time zone, we have to say that, because if we decide to go that way then that's the time zone. Or if we're looking at the maximum participation, we have to say which one is first, which one we select because the outcomes would be different. Thank you.

---

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you very much. I appreciate that, Eduardo. Other comments? Indeed, because this is a policy forum, the format is different from the other community and annual general meeting formats. One block is for intensive working group sessions to continue their work, and the second block usually in the afternoon is for the plenary. So there is a possibility of finding that – to Manal and Bruna’s point – the ideal spot for these plenary sessions and then working groups to also see what a good timeframe for them as well. Again, that’s something we’re going to have to explore as we move forward.

Sébastien, your hand is up, and then Susan Payne. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, David. Just to take your words, this meeting is supposed to be, yeah. But we are doing it virtually then supposed to be I am not sure that we need to maintain it. For example, working groups, we spend hours in working group in virtual working group. Why we will need to do that virtually in one specific day? I consider that working group if it’s to go virtually can stay with their current method of working and we may decide to not add them during a virtual meeting. I guess what is more important is the time we can spend all together on topics which can be shared among the different stakeholders. For example, what will be the advantage to have whatever working group on this time? They can meet the week before, the week after like they do all the time. Therefore, I would like very much to consider that.

Once again, I want to come back to my first question: do we really need to keep this date of the meeting? If it’s until September, okay, let’s

---

move it to September. What is so urgent that we need to keep the meeting? I understand we keep the 70, the 67, and it was good. But here we have so much more limitation then I consider that we may postpone the meeting for a few weeks. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sébastien. Those are options for consideration. We appreciate that. Susan Payne, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks. Hi, I'm Susan Payne and I'm a member of the IPC. Actually, I was going to start by saying something very similar to Sébastien regarding the working groups. I do recognize that when we have a face-to-face meeting, we prioritize the PDP working groups and other working groups to take advantage of the fact that we're all together and try and have really intensive sessions. But we all know that doing this virtually makes really intensive sessions quite challenging for all sorts of reasons. The personal ones leaving us [idle], these technical ones that I don't think I'd truly appreciate it until I just came on this call.

For example, in ICANN67 we had four sessions allocated for the Rights Protection Mechanisms group during a week. That's a big ask of people and it's something that you do because you're meeting face to face, but once you're not meeting face to face then maybe we think about just having slightly more meetings during virtual normal working group meetings during the next summer period or something because we're not going to be able to do that face-to-face activity. Rather than trying

---

to engineer a remote one-week meeting which seems to be ... the kind of structure is almost defeating the intent and the purpose.

In our working group, for example, we quite often have time rotations that we will work out as a collective working group team to share the pain or whatever, and then we threw all that out of the window for the virtual Cancún meeting. Again, I'm not criticizing the Cancún meeting but it really was an issue, the time difference to people depending on where they live in the world. And I would think if you look at the way the survey that you did from people about their experiences of virtual Cancún, how positive they felt about it would vary significantly depending on how badly the time zone was for them so that in Europe it wasn't great but it was manageable, but if you were in Asia it was hideous. That was the first thing I was going to say.

Then when we're talking about what is it that we need to be doing, we'd like to keep plenary sessions or particular cross-community discussions, well, great. But then again, actually, do we need to shoehorn this into a week that's now quite an arbitrary week or could we be looking at some other way to do this, where we have two different time zones for a plenary session on the same topic to accommodate different locations, and it's more like a series of virtual interactions, virtual webinars over maybe two- to three-week period rather than, as I say, working on a meeting schedule that really is kind of irrelevant now.



---

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Susan, for the comments. Again, in summary, what outcomes or deliverables would the community need to achieve during this time period and you talk about the flexibility of how the working groups do this or more of a larger webinar, different time zones to accommodate more people to deliver larger messages. Thank you for that.

Jonathan Robinson then we'll go to some of the other options that we are proposing. Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks, David. Thanks also having this feedback. I think my thoughts pick up from the previous, too, and I'll try and take that on rather than repeat. But I think the idea – I haven't discussed this so I haven't canvassed it with the group, but I think the idea of breaking up the session, so in a sense we almost put workload on ICANN org and on the community perhaps by forcing artificially when it's now no longer necessary the concentration into a single very tight period. I understand there will be arguments for why we continue to do that but I certainly think we should consider spreading it out a little more. And what that then does is it also not only it reduces the pressure and workload on participants and perhaps even create an opportunity then for greater participation and potentially flexibility on time zone. So again, rather than shoehorning us into a single type of period and a fixed time zone, we could then perhaps rotate the time zones a little more.

Then I think there's one other point in all of that and that's – I did make this comment on the survey. The survey presumed that the public

---

forum, for example, the cross-community sessions which we seem to be saying have value was a success. I think technically and practically it was a success in the sense that it worked, but I think we shouldn't necessarily assume because it functioned well on a technical and operational level that it necessarily achieved what we might have achieved as best as it could do. So I think even when we ended up narrowing it down to cross-community sessions, we're going to do them virtually, we shouldn't necessarily assume anything. We should be prepared to think creatively about how to get the maximum out of those sessions' participation, interaction, sense of involvement, or whatever it is. So I think there's still some more work to be done as to how to optimize the virtual meeting format. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Jonathan and others for their comments, of thinking creatively and flexibly. That's very helpful to hear and encouraging. Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thanks again. Just a short question. In one report that Keith shared with some of the SO/AC leaders, he mentioned that with [in their] interaction with Goran it was acknowledged that the communities working at around 70% of its capacity. So just maybe a question on how are you guys looking into it and if you're seeing that this capacity is decreasing or how do you see this sort of engagement involving from now on. I mean, as far as virtual meeting, it was an interesting opportunity for us that we're more into this community. It was certainly easier to maybe

---

navigate between sessions and so on but it was kind of seen as one-time effort, but how do you see this engagement, sort of like decreasing community engagement and moving on with the work if we're stuck with maybe one or two more for virtual meetings this year.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Bruna. I think that is correct. Goran was saying this in particular to point out that it's not business as usual. It can't be considering the pressures and the stress of this pandemic on all of us, and that it was an estimate of maybe the expectation should be around that 70% productivity level, noting that people have to take care of other things that's more difficult to shopping and interacting. Trying to look at that what it's realistically possible by the community and org and others to go forward. It's something that we're concerned about and you're pointing it out as well. We're also making sure that we frame whatever next steps we do so that it's a manageable portion for people to be involved with and continue the important work of ICANN as we go forward.

Kevin from the Numbers community. Thank you.

KEVIN:

Good morning. Just an observation that I've seen within other groups that I'm involved with right now and you brought it up and I wanted to just expand it a little bit. Fatigue of individuals within our communities is reaching a significant point right now and when you look at 12 weeks in advance, that fatigue is going to exacerbate. Family, work, community – those are sort of the order of operations.

---

While we may be focused on what is important to us as an individual ASO or whatever the case may be, we need to be very cognizant of both people's productivity levels that they're able to do as well as what they're able to commit to, and asking them to commit to things that they feel indebted to is probably the wrong way of looking at it. It's more important to look at what we feel that the community can do and what is reasonable for the community to do, not what they should be doing. The human aspect that should probably be front and center in many of the decisions. I know we've talked about this. But just even the commitment of time to this especially when we look at again many weeks out, what we have now a day in place for the next 12 weeks in Toronto, I expect that to be extended. So just a thought.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Kevin, and definitely a point well taken. That's all based on this notion of what level can we expect and knowing it has to be not business as usual and less than normal high interest in participation you give us. We'll now move if we could to some options. Let's put it that way. Since you've provided some excellent suggestions and ideas, and so to that extent, we'll go to this next phase on what can be done.

TANZANICA KING:

Thanks, David. I think those were a lot of really good ideas just now in terms of how you want to look at this meeting. This is a new situation, it's a unique situation, so we want to make sure that we're looking at it that way in terms of being flexible about what's possible and in consideration of the technical limitations and the effect that that has on

---

the work that you do and how useful your meetings still are or aren't based on some of the services that we are providing. So that flexibility is really important. I think the idea that came forward about spreading things out in plenaries during times that are best – and we can look at the time zone chart a little bit – are really good ways to think about this.

So I want to suggest that we have a poll because, as Sebastien mentioned, I think it's a good point. We should figure out what type of approach you want to take to the meeting. Do you want to keep looking at this as another virtual meeting that is sort of based on what we usually do for the policy forum over specific days, or do you want to look at an alternative approach, something that we can take your comments and then we can go back to the table and try and build something that makes sense and present it to you? Which direction do you want to go in? So, Kim, if you have that already, I think we could do that and then maybe we can go to some more feedback.

So this asks, "Do you support a virtual policy forum or an alternative to that?" This is just simply what it says, do we go forward with the same approach to trying to conduct the policy forum in a virtual way or do we want to look at something new? Kim, I can't see if the answers are coming in. You have to tell me.

KIM: We've got 25 votes so far.

TANZANICA KING: I see – Manal, you have your hand up.

MANAL ISMAIL: Just meanwhile, as we're waiting for the votes, can I just ask – because I'm very much interested to hear from our constituencies again on the results from this – so can we share the same survey or should we take the questions offline and share them?

TANZANICA KING: Absolutely.

MANAL ISMAIL: I mean, how can we feed their views into our discussions here?

TANZANICA KING: What we could do is, if you would like, we can update the current survey, adjust the questions for what you want to leave there or add to it if you would prefer to just add this question, and we can keep receiving notes. Again, I apologize that we weren't able to get that out much sooner to give you a chance to get more answers from your groups, but we can certainly keep that open so that you can continue to get feedback and I can set it up so that the results are shared immediately with you when they're submitted as well.

Okay, looks like we have the poll results. Can everybody see the results?

DAVID OLIVE: I hope so, yes. I think you want to read it out.

TANZANICA KING: So we've got 28% for a virtual policy forum and 72% in favor of an alternative. Kim, can you tell us, is that the majority? We have 69 people on the call, how many people answered it?

KIM: There's about 36%.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. And we've got a lot of staff on the call too, so I'm assuming that staff are not answering the question. So that's pretty good. This gives us a lot of information to go back with while we are expecting the Board to meet on the 8<sup>th</sup>, I believe it is. What I would suggest we do is we go back with this information, try to then take it and develop some more ideas for you and maybe come back together after that Board meeting that happens on the 8<sup>th</sup>, the following Thursday, so I think it would be the 16<sup>th</sup>, to give you a chance to get more information from your groups to consult as Manal asked about and let us take the fact that you want to do something different and see what we can come up with based on what your needs are, what work you have to complete and the feedback you give us.

SALLY COSTERTON: Tanzanica, it's Sally. Can I just say something?

---

TANZANICA KING:

Yes, please.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you for this. I agree with what you just said. I think what I'm not hearing necessarily is that we shouldn't have an ICANN meeting at all. What I'm hearing is we shouldn't necessarily run a virtual meeting in the same way that we did in Cancún. I just want to check from people if they're in agreement with that. Because I think there is a point of coming together around what we're calling the summer of policy forum and what this poll is suggesting is that we need to look at how we run that policy forum essentially very differently to how we have done it before and also how we ran a community forum, which is obviously the meeting we did in the Cancún meeting. I just wanted to kind of clarify that point to make sure we were on the same page about that. It might just be a labeling thing but I think it's important that we might have, for example, have a longer meeting that is more deconstructed and that is broken up over a longer period of time. But if you were to put a wrap around it, we would consider it to being a meeting, if that makes sense.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Sally. Remind me a high point in a series of background and information sharing, yes.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Exactly. But it has some sort of [inaudible].



---

DAVID OLIVE: Right. And a policy forum label of 68. Dean, I see your hand is up, please.

DEAN MARKS: Thank you so much, David. I just wanted to respond to Sally to say, I think that's fair, your comment, and that was what was going through my head as well. But I think you have to be also equally careful with that assumption, because I think there are views that, "Yes, we want to have a policy forum but we should delay it until a time when we could all meet in person." Alternatively, a view that could be, "Yes, let's have a policy forum virtually but with lots of changes as compared to the ICANN67 forum," where, for example, we wouldn't have any working group [sessions], we would need those to be scheduled by the working group. But I think it's hard – you have a poll question that's so limited like the one that was – and I don't mean that as a criticism, I just mean it as a reality of the virtual meeting or an alternative to try and necessarily pigeonhole all of the votes for alternative [inaudible]. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Dean. The limitation of polls, we're trying to get some trend or assessment or leaning to what might be again this flexible approach, yet uncertain. And that's why these discussions and further planning, luckily, we have time to do that can help arrive at the solution that I think we all would find comfortable and doable and effective. We're not there yet, but some of the options are helpful as we move forward. Other comments or questions?

---

As people are looking and thinking of that, just to remind you of some of the next steps, the Board will be formally meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup>. An announcement of their meeting is already out on the Cancún meeting. Then I think we would want to schedule something soon thereafter with this group, tentatively the 15<sup>th</sup> of April. To that extent, to continue the discussions that we have, and to that extent, that's something to consider. That way, we will follow a steady planning course and be able to also share some of these preliminary views with the Board as it's going into its review phase next week.

Also, this does give you some time and a time to consult with your groups. To that extent, that's a very important element. Again, part of the concept of the community's ability and focus in these stressful times, to Kevin and to others who've made the point about that, we are concerned primarily and top priority is the health and safety and security of everyone on this call and in our communities and families. To that extent, we're trying to look for the workable options that conformed to the extraordinary situations we're under, the limitations and constraints that we see. Yet, the resiliency of this community, time and again, has shown that we can produce some wonderful things. I suspect we'll be doing that going forward with the proper consultation and planning that we are now engaged in.

With that, I will stop and see if there's Any Other Business. And to that extent, we will keep you informed about the decisions and other information that we have as we are exploring and looking at various elements and aspects to the technical and staffing and logistics for the meeting. But we thank you for your flexibility again and creativity of

---

how to continue the important policy advice work of our community in a way that makes it open to all and transparent to all.

So with that, seeing no other comments, I will turn to my colleague, Sally Costerton, to see if she has any final remarks, and then we will close the session and give you a few minutes back. Sally?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, David, thank you all and thank you for comments in the chat. We have a recording of this so we'll be able to go through this in a lot of detail to make sure we don't miss any of your input. I think you are all aware of the fact that the governance model is that the Board makes the decision about if we decide we're going to change the location, for example, the ICANN meeting, the Board makes a decision that that changes happen. Then they'll ask the org to make recommendations about how that change should be implemented. We've had that, as you all know, a couple of times in the past few years where we've had to move from one city to another. So we actually know what that decision-making cadence looks like.

This is no different. The difference is that we aren't going to move from one city to another. Like the Cancún situation, we're using exactly the same decision-making process in terms of governance. But now the decision is, "If not, then what?" if you'd like to put it that way. I think the idea is that you're sharing about how we can maximize the concept of an ICANN gathering where the community comes together and exchanges views on key topics, but also gives itself the right amount of

---

flexibility to continue the productivity of the work in the working groups. Feels like that's what we're striving for here.

How we then – what's the right word? How we then package that – for wanting for a better word – and the kind of communications it needs around that as well as the technical support is what we will now look at within the staff and the org as to combine that input with your input and into the Board to say if they think about how to guide us moving forward. So thank you for that. I think this discussion and input has been quite invaluable. Appreciate very much your openness.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Sally. Just one final note, I'm reminding them – sorry, I didn't mention this earlier. As you know in the policy forum, we have the Excellence Award. The Community Excellence Award is given at that time for a community member. Please give us some thoughts on this on how we want to move forward because the committee has been obviously working on this and all in how we want to handle that as we proceed some of these creative other ideas to still maintain our community recognition but in a way that's flexible and creative as well.

So with that, we have a lot of good notes and good comments in the chat. We will be packaging all that to you in the recording. With that, if there's no other comments, I will proceed to wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, good morning, wherever you may be. Thank you for a very productive and helpful set of comments and inputs. Thank you very much. Goodbye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**