
DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, everyone, for joining our production call number two as we proceed to work on the planning for the Annual General Meeting or ICANN 69. The agenda is as follows. We'll have some welcome—so, my remarks as well as Sally Costerton's. We'll have a discussion on the plenary topics proposals. Tanzania will present there, some of the discussion and proposals that have come in. We will review the block schedule as planned. That will be, again, by Tanzania, including areas for the joint meeting with the ICANN Board, the public forum, the executive Q&A, and such matters. And finally, with any other business.

With that, I want to thank people for joining. I'm sorry I've been away for the last meeting and missed it but glad to be back to help in the planning of this important Annual General Meeting. Sally, I turn it over to you for any comments.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, David. You were on vacation. You made it sound like you forgot to turn up.

DAVID OLIVE: I was on vacation. That's correct.

SALLY COSTERTON: Seeing your brand new grandchild. So, I think you can be allowed to do that.

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 COSTERTON:

Welcome back. It's good to have you back. Welcome, everybody, and good to have you with us. I think today, where we are in the cycle, we want to try and ... I should say, firstly, thank you for all the input on the list. It's been really helpful. I think we've moved forward quite a long way since our last call.

Want to make sure today that we focus on—when we're talking about plenary sessions that we address the topic of duplication and not because I think there necessarily is any but this is something that comes up quite regularly on these calls. And about now is the time to head off any potential duplication that we can see looming while we've still got plenty of time to consolidate and streamline, to identify whether there are any gaps that we think need to be filled on the plenary. So, I know we didn't get much time on plenaries in the last session and I want to make sure, with Tanzi, that we have plenty of time for that today.

On the block schedule ... It's a little bit more detail but just making sure that we have ... And I know Tanzi always does this but there should be [inaudible] schedule the way it's been structured like this, stretched across these two weeks. But we just want to make sure that if there is anything that is troubling people, again, that we see it—we hear from you, ideally today, if it's obvious to you, so that we've got time to adjust.

The third thing is just to make you aware, as we would do in a normal ICANN meeting planning session around this sort of time. If there are

other meetings that community members, in whatever configuration, want to have in the block schedule week, for which they need your recommendation—your nomination, as the SO/AC chairs ... If there's anything anybody know that's out there, that they think might be on the way, if we don't already have it on the schedule, do let us know because the schedule, I know, is starting to get ... The block schedule is getting pretty full and we don't want to get into conflict and overflow. And that's part of this approach that we're taking.

And any other questions and comments, feedback, obviously, as always, very welcome. We look forward to hear it. Thank you very much.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Sally, for the recap of where we are on the programming. I now would like to turn it over to Tanzania to talk about the plenary topic proposals. Tanzania, please.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, David. And good morning, or whatever time of day it may be for you, to everybody. Thank you for your proposals. We have three official ones that I sent. Of course, there was still more time for additional proposals to come in. And so, we actually have a fourth one we'll go over to. And I'll ask Jonathan to help explain what that proposal is.

If we can go ahead to the first slide. I put just some of the basic descriptions that you submitted with these on the slides. Hopefully, you all actually had time to read the proposals in full. I know that wasn't a

lot of time so I don't blame you if you haven't. I want to allow as much time as possible for you all to have a discussion on these. So, I'm not going to read through the details.

This first one, the Domain Name Services Marketplace: Market Dynamics, Business Models, and Commercial Drivers, I also want to remind you that this was a submission for ICANN 67. I hope I'm correct in that because I'm hesitating. I believe it was 67. And at that time, the group had approved it and it was going on the schedule but then there was some discussion of whether it might make more sense to hold off on it. So, I think this one was expected.

And I'm going to go ahead and just go through these and then we can have the group discuss what opinions they may have on these different topics and the way forward.

So, let's go ahead and go to the second topic. So, this second one, from the BC, is Enhancing the Effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model: A Way Forward. And the third—we'll go ahead to the next slide—is also from the BC, the Domain Name System Abuse: [Practical] Solutions.

The fourth one that I mentioned is Consumer Protection Post-EPDP. Jonathan, do you want to go ahead right now and give everybody a bit of an overview of what this fourth proposal will be?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure. I'm happy to. This is not completely formed in our heads. But the idea is, now that we've gotten through the EPDP process, and made

some decisions, and started implementing, etc., is to have a discussion from the point of view of the data providers and the data requestors about how it's going. Are law enforcement and researchers able to get the data they need? Or are they finding alternative sources for the data and becoming less reliant on registrant data in its legacy form? And then, from the perspective of the Contracted Parties, what has request volume been like and how has it been trying to process the requests under the new regime and things like that.

So, our interest, as the At-Large, obviously, is a consumer protection umbrella over this discussion, which is just what is the state of consumer protection and the various folks that are engaged in it under this new data regime? That's the idea behind it. Hopefully that is enough to get a conversation going.

The other proposal that we made, just here at the last minute, is talking about the prioritization question. With the ATRT3 report out and discussions of prioritization, beginning to have a conversation about those particular recommendations, and a holistic look at the several hundred reform recommendations that are now sitting on the inbox of the Board, and how we might go about addressing that as a community was the other recommendation for a plenary session. So, that's it, Tanzania. Thanks for the opportunity to present them.

TANZANICA KING:

No problem. Thank you, Jonathan. So, before we go into completely just open discussion, does anybody from the BC want to speak to these

other proposals? I think we could probably start off with that. If not, we can just open the discussion completely to these submissions.

I'll also point out that, as you know, we mocked up three slots in the block schedule. Of course, the whole point of all of this is to really decide on which topics are most important to cover. It doesn't have to conform to those slots. Thank you, Chantelle. I hear you. Nobody from the BC's on the call.

And, Donna, to answer your question about the date that we need to decide. Again, that's a good question. It does not have to be decided now. I think it would be most useful for everybody if we did have an idea on whether you think there should be three or four topics. And that's purely to make sure that people can schedule around them. If that's a non-issue, then the topics don't have to be confirmed until we finalize the schedule. So, I think we can decide that based on this discussion—how much more time is needed, what makes most sense to you.

Mary, I see your hand up. Did you want to jump in here?

MARY WONG:

I did. And I just wanted to take us back a little bit, before we delve into the topics, if that's okay, to make a couple of points. I think one is to consider the number of slots that Tanzania has preliminarily assigned for plenary sessions for the AGM. Obviously, if there's more, we'll have to accommodate. If there's fewer, then we shouldn't feel the need to fill all the available slots. The reminder obviously being, what is the group

thinking as topics that will be most timely and most suitable for a cross-community plenary session?

And in that vein, we also want to encourage the groups, in considering these topics, that even if a particular topic is not something that the group feels you want to do as a plenary session at the AGM, it could be done as part of cross-community dialog, hosted by one of the groups during your sessions. And some of these, if appropriate, could also be refashioned as informational webinars, either during prep week or at some other time that we can help schedule. Thanks, Tanzania.

TANZANICA KING:

Thanks, Mary. That is helpful to remind everybody of that. Jonathan Robinson, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thank, Tanzania. I think mine's a follow-on from Mary. I just want to make sure I'm crystal clear on this. So, as I understand it, we have three slots currently, plus Mary just mentioned that there were potentially some other slots or mechanisms that we could put things into. We have three proposals that were submitted. And then, we have two additional possible proposals that weren't submitted by the deadline but that Jonathan Zuck mentioned may be requested.

Am I correct? Because it's getting a little confusing. We had a deadline for submission. There were three in by the deadline. And I just want to be very clear what there is here. As I understand it, it's three slots, three submissions, some additional possible slots for related cross-

community-type sessions, and the possibility of two supplementary submissions. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING:

That is correct. And part of it ... I wanted to make sure you guys had as much time as possible to actually submit proposals. And so, the deadline ... It's 7:00 A.M. here in Los Angeles now and the deadline would have been midnight. So, in an effort to get you guys the information so you had time to read it, that didn't really allow as much time for me to take the proposals and include them all on slides. So, yes. A little bit late they are. But sort of just before the bell, if you will.

So, yes. We have the three official ones, the two that Jonathan just mentioned. And as Mary said, we have the three slots that are just part of that draft block schedule. We can, based on how few or how many topics are important to cover, we can adjust those slots. So, we don't need to conform to those, necessarily. I think Mary, you had your hand up. No. It's down now. So, Barbara.

DAVID OLIVE:

Barbara, yes.

TANZANICA KING:

Go ahead, please.

BARBARA WANNER:

Can you hear me okay?

TANZANICA KING: Yes. We can hear you.

BARBARA WANNER: Great! First, my apologies for being a bit late to the call. But I see on the screen here is one of the BC's proposals on domain name abuse. And I know we are ... We usually offer this as a proposal, just because we think it's an acute problem that needs to be addressed thoughtfully by the community and has spiked as result of the COVID crisis. So, I just wanted to give that an extra boost and express our support for taking that forward as a plenary session. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Barbara. Donna Austin, go ahead, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Tanzi. Just more of a clarification to how this all fits together. One of the things that we came across in ICANN 68 was that the ALAC had a few sessions that could have been considered plenary, even though they were hosted by the ALAC. And that was where some of the duplication came in, not because of the plenary sessions per se but there were other sessions being done within the community that were duplicative of what the plenary session topics were.

So, I wonder if ... It would be helpful if the ALAC has done some thinking or other groups are doing thinking, about maybe other topics that they're going to discuss, which are open to everyone, whether we can

get a look into that as well because I think that's where most of the duplication came from last time. We had one DNS abuse session that was a plenary session and I think three or four others that also ended up at prime time because of the virtual nature. And I think that's duplication that we wanted to make sure we understood what else is going to be on the schedule. Thanks, Tanzi.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Donna. Jonathan, you're next. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Hi. Thanks for the question. I guess we don't know exactly what we're going to be trying to do as our own sessions yet. And I think the duplication you were talking about is at a very high level. The sessions we were trying to run were very, very specific proposal-driven discussions. But they did share themes with the plenary. So, I don't know whether the same theme is something we should be trying to avoid this time or not. That's a good question for the group.

Part of what we're going to be trying to discuss is that we made a commitment back at that meeting, in ICANN 67, to do some outreach to end users via the RALOs and ALSs about DNS abuse and how people—what people should do to better protect themselves, etc. And I think we'll be doing a session on how best to execute on that commitment.

So, that may, again, end up bringing up DNS abuse but less about ICANN policy around it and more about At-Large itself and how we'll use our structures to try and do some community outreach around the world.

But beyond that, I guess we don't know yet about what our individual sessions will be. I hope that's helpful.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Jonathan. The issue, just comment on this as well from our side ... The issue of duplication was also a pretty big theme in the survey results that we received. So, it's definitely something that we should work on. Whether that means providing better descriptions of what the sessions are intended for or who the audience is, to make sense of something that is intended duplication, that can be addressed. But this is certainly something that we will keep on the agenda in particular for the next call, when we have a schedule to look at.

I'm going to go ahead and go to Jonathan Robinson because I think we confused our order of Jonathans last time. And then, I'll go to you, Sebastien. Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks. It's just a follow-on from my last point. And I guess the challenge I'm facing is we've got these three submissions. It's now clear that there is [skirt] for additional submissions today. We haven't had a chance to socialize these with our groups so it's very difficult to come back and give feedback. And we're sort of trying to decide on them while the submissions haven't yet closed.

So, my thought is in future, if we're to do this again, really, the planning group should meet after the deadline for the submissions, unless I'm missing something because we've got three out of potentially five

submissions—three slots. And I'm just trying ... I'm struggling to understand what the purpose of this discussion is. Are we just giving initial, informal feedback on the submissions or are we really trying to plan something or evaluate them, when we've neither run them back past our groups nor got the full slate of submissions?

So, I guess I'm making a comment on the management process here and thinking we should think carefully about how we order these things in future. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Jonathan. Sebastien Bachollet, go ahead, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Tanzania. Yeah. I wanted to underline what Mary Wong already wrote in the chat. But I think it's important—that way to think about a different session with the same type of topic. Either we say it's duplication or it builds on or builds upon.

But I think here, we are talking about one who could be the one, the first or week one, and be helpful for discussion within one community, even if it's open to other. The goal is to have a discussion among the end users, for example, for At-Large. And then, the second week, we have one general meeting about this topic and it will be good to have the input of each and every SO/ACs and groups. And that builds on. And we can do the reverse, of course.

But I think it's important not to just say that it's duplication. No, it's not or it must not be. It's a way to have discussion within each of our groups

and a common discussion. And that's where a meeting could be organized. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Sebastien. And just to address the process question from Jonathan, this was ... I knew as we were doing this that it was going to be right up against the call. There's always a bit of a struggle between giving as much time as possible for all of you to submit these and having the discussion. Because we aren't in—there's no major issue with not finalize these today—I think that this call is to socialize these with this group, give you time, certainly, as you need it, to go back to your groups and socialize some more.

As I said, we don't have to decide the topics. But what would be most useful is if we got some kind of general idea how many we think ... Are any of these topics that are being proposed just not reasonable? We should go ahead and have that discussion now, if there are comments, so that we can make some early decisions, if you will, on things that aren't—there isn't a need to socialize them.

So, are there other comments? We can certainly move the slides around to the other topics. I know we've been just staring at this one. Any other comments or do you all just need that? Do you need time to take these all back and socialize them? Jonathan Robinson, go ahead, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks, Tanzi. Let me give a positive comment on the submission on the DNS Marketplace point. You rightly remembered that it was submitted

to ICANN 67. And it was decided, when we made it a virtual meeting, that we would—the submitters would—prefer it to be an in-person ... We felt we'd get maximum value if it was an in-person discussion. We've now, obviously, passed 67. Didn't get the opportunity to do it at 68, as we had then envisaged.

And it's now come to 69. An in some senses, we may be in virtual meetings, or partially virtual meetings, for the foreseeable future. So, it was therefore thought that we would bring it up in any case and try and create some fresh and interesting content for cross-community discussion, information, and education.

So, that's really what's driving this. It would be optimal for it to be at an in-person meeting but we recognize the constraints we're working under and so hope to produce something interesting and informative for the whole community to both hear and contribute to. And that's really where that comes from. So, that just gives you a little bit more context from the submitters. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Jonathan. And Jonathan Zuck, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Thanks. I guess, in reading the Domain Name Marketplace proposal, I wonder if there's an evolution of this that makes it more of discussion and less of a webinar, that wouldn't need necessarily to take place during an ICANN meeting. Is it looking at whether or not we're using the right economic model to support ICANN or something like

that? Because it feels like a lecture in its current form and one that I think would be very useful for everyone to receive and hear. But from a meeting standpoint, does it make sense to find some way to make it more of a discussion and more of an interactive thing? I don't know, Jonathan, if you gave that any thought. But that's just what occurs to me, reading it, is it feels one-directional somehow.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Shall I respond briefly?

TANZANICA KING: Yes. Please go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Frankly, it's an interesting suggestion, Jonathan. Thank you. I can't say it was specifically considered. And in some ways, it may be a natural consequence of this and an implicit point that discussion along those lines might happen. And I think, really, the idea was to stimulate some sort of further understanding and recognition of some of the diversity of economic drivers.

And you're right. It may well be that the opportunity is either created by this ... And there certainly was an intention that there would be an opportunity for contribution, discussion, and dialog, as opposed to simply webinar/lecture. But let me take that on board. And very happy to feed that back. So, thanks for that input.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Jonathan. Ashley, please go ahead.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi. Thank you. Ashley from the Registrars Stakeholder Group. Just to build off of what Jonathan just said, I think, just to be fair, the intention here is to be educational—so, not so much to be a lecture, per se, in the negative sense of the word. But we wanted to take an opportunity just to refresh the community and ourselves with respect to what the market is because I think we get so accustomed to working on these specific issues, we often lose sight of what are the commercial, and operational, and technical constraints that the Contracted Parties are living in.

But to that point, I think if we could be more explicit with respect to where we can have Q&A and discussion around specific issues, that's certainly something to do. But I think the short and the dirty of it is that this was intended largely to be somewhat of a briefing to articulate this part of the industry from the folks that are it. So, thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. Is that a new ...? Oh. It's an old hand. Are there any additional comments on these topics that we've discussed so far? Donna, go ahead, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Tanzi. So, one comment I would like to make ... And this comes back to the conversations we've had about whether it's a high-interest topic, or a cross-community session, or whatever the purpose of the session is. That's a conversation that we've had many times. But

this is a build-on from a conversation that Graeme and I had with the Board about the industry and the business models that we work in. And the Board encouraged us to do more of this kind of outreach.

And as Jonathan Robinson said, we appreciated that this would lend itself better to an in-person meeting. But we do have the situation that we're in now. I think during the DNS abuse discussions—and Graeme mentioned this on one of the panels that he was on—it's really important for the community to understand the business models of registries and registrars, and impacts of the market, and things like that. And this is prime time opportunity for us to do that.

So, that's why we think ... I appreciate Jonathan Zuck's point about maybe it's not as interactive as it could be. And I think Ashley and Jonathan had said we can work to make it like that. So, we want to use this as an opportunity for a little bit of prime time viewing, given it is ICANN 69. So, that's one of the reasons we've brought it back to the front.

We appreciate that it may not be traditional interaction, in the sense that we want everybody on a panel to talk about a topic. But we still think it's important education and information for the community, particularly as we have other discussions around DNS abuse and even GDPR and things like that. So, I just wanted to provide a little bit more context on why we'd like to see this maintain a position as one of the topics. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Donna. And David, you can definitely speak next. I see your hand up.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you very much. And thanks for the comments that people have made. I think a number of observations I'd like to make is that we're looking at a limited number of plenary sessions in the plenary week, again, because of the time zone and community participation. And so, that number should be looked at rather closely. And if other things need to be given as a webinar or a cross-community discussion by an SO or an AC, that is also available elsewhere at another timing.

The other important issue is—and thank you, Donna, for raising that—about interaction versus a briefing. And we really want to see it to be an enrichment as an interactive session. And it's not to say that one can't do it. But keep that in mind as a criteria for the plenary sessions. And other, more information sharing and/or topics that you want to present could be, in part, part of webinar week or, in part, part of the SO/AC week and still have a draw of community participation and support.

And so, maybe, since we have three discussion—three, excuse me, proposals—and other supposedly on the way, maybe we need to have the more details of the others so that we can decide on the number of, hopefully, three because of the efforts to organize it and also a choice of among three, or four, or five your groups can comment on and add to. That would be my observations.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, David. So, one thing I would like to just see what everybody thinks is do we feel that we could keep within the three slots so that we don't have the pressure of necessarily finding a date that may be too soon to finalize which three topics would go there? Or is there a sense that we need to keep that flexible? Ashley, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks. I still really think it's dependent on seeing the full set of proposals. I really just don't ... I don't feel comfortable making that decision on whether or not we should be flexible or not. I think the goal should be to keep them modest, so as to not have way too many sessions. But I also don't want to take something off the table because I honestly just haven't seen the full set of proposals. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. And we can do that. We can give you all some time to take the final proposals. If there are proposals that have been discussed on this call that did not get submitted into the form, please do that right away so that we can get this full list out to the group.

I saw a question in the chat about participation during the prep week. Is there somebody ... Mary, would you be able to give an idea of what type of participation we usually see in prep week? I know it's usually pretty good.

MARY WONG: Yeah. And we can get those numbers to you all, as David said in the chat. So, I don't have them on me. But my recollection, particularly for ICANN 68, was that registrations were high. And also, the actual attendance were very high for most if not all of the webinars, which was encouraging to us.

TANZANICA KING: Great. Thank you. Are there any other comments now on the topics? So, what we will do is get any missing information into the form. We'll get out a comprehensive list of the topics and set and date, possibly a week from now, maybe by next Wednesday. And we'll ask for feedback on the mailing list and take it from there. It may mean we need to schedule a call a little sooner than our currently next-scheduled call, which will appear in one of our next slides so we can see what that is. Sally Costerton, go ahead, please.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thanks, Tanzi. Just a quick one. I just wanted to see if there was any interest in the group for us, in our next call, to have a session specifically on format, particularly for plenaries. I think as somebody said earlier, there's been a lot of discussion about if something a webinar or is it a plenary? But I think within the plenary, it isn't just panels. There are lots of different ways we can do plenaries, even on a virtual format.

And I'd certainly be happy to bring some thinking to this group. Or I'm sure lots of other people would have ideas so that we, at least, have explored some varied options, so that to the best of our ability, each topic has a bespoke solution. Just wanted to see if everybody ... If

people hate that idea, then we won't put it on the agenda. If people think it would be helpful, then we will.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Sally. There's a question in the chat about when you would have all the proposed topics. So, I'm thinking that we want to get more feedback by next Wednesday. So, I would actually hope that we could get the final proposals in to you by end of the day today. Of course, those of you who are still trying to get those last ones in, you can let me know if that won't work for you. But that would be the goal, to get them all out today and ask for additional feedback by next week.

So, we have a couple other things to cover, regarding the block schedule and meetings with the Board. Are there any other comments on the topics before we move to that next part? Okay. I don't see any hands.

So, this is the block schedule. It's the same as the last version we sent out. I mainly wanted to update you on the joint meetings with the Board, which are starting to fill in. And I believe that Registrars and Registries are wanting to utilize some of those blocks on Wednesday but I haven't finished formally getting that in there yet. So, if you are going to be requesting a joint meeting with the Board and you're not on here yet, please get that to us, preferably before the middle of next week—just as soon as you can—the sooner the better, so that you can get onto the schedule.

I'm just reading in the chat here. You can see here the slots that we currently have mapped out as tentative for the plenary. There was also a bit of discussion on the list about whether or not there need to be two

public forums, some questions about the executive Q&A. So, I want to bring this up in case there are any comments now.

I know that the format, because it's quite different from what we normally do, where we have the public forum at the beginning of the week and the public forum at the end, with all of the—a lot of the other work that's going on during the week one here, scattered in between. Are there any comments on whether this affects the public forums, in terms of needing one versus two? This is something Donna and Jonathan both have brought up, I believe. Any comments, thoughts here? Susan, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah. Thanks. I'm not sure it's a comment or question, really. But is just is striking me that plenary week two is very cross-community, in terms of the ... At the moment, three plenaries are allocated. There's two public forums, there's an executive Q&A, there's a public Board meeting, all of which I'm assuming—oh, and a welcome ceremony—all of which I'm assuming are, or most of which I'm assuming, are sessions whereby there have got to be minimal conflicting sessions organized. And it just doesn't seem to leave very much for what many of us would normally feel to be—what we'd normally expect to be happening during an ICANN meeting. And perhaps that's because that's all envisaged to be in week one.

But I wonder because if we're having to make choices about what we cover and what we don't cover because of the nature of a remote meeting and so on, then perhaps we need to start thinking about do we

actually need some of these sessions? Do we actually need two public forums? I know that's what we would normally have at an AGM but do we need it when we're doing a remote meeting and we're, it would appear, struggling to fit our meeting into a single week, as we would normally expect to.

Similarly, do we need the executive Q&A? Maybe we do. But I'm just questioning whether we've got the balance right here, between big production numbers and actually getting into our groups and getting our work done. For me, for example, I'm very focused on PDP work and I don't even see in the schedule where that's going to happen.

So, I'd love to know when that is going to happen because it's really frustrating to me when the PDP work is always clashing with my own internal meetings. Frankly, from my perspective, I'd rather see the PDP work unconflicted than some of these plenaries, which I'm potentially less interested in. So, I'm just ... It's a comment/question. Do we need all of this stuff?

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Susan. Sebastien, go ahead, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Tanzania. It seems that we are not coming all for the same type of meeting. And that's the beauty of an ICANN meeting. Therefore, the question is not too much to decide that we need to cancel something but how we can accommodate all of the needs

because, yes, there are things that we can do in a virtual meeting that are ... I guess it can be done elsewhere in another form.

But usually, the people, outside of the room, have a lot of business meetings and we are not organizing that. But for the rest, the work done by each SO/AC or groups, RALOs, and constituencies and so on need to be scheduled as much as possible because, of course, we do the work week-by-week or all the days—all the year round and not just during an ICANN meeting.

When it's interesting to have an ICANN meeting is where we can meet all together. And that's why I think plenary and the public forum are important to allow some exchange. And it maybe that we, as a group here, are not the one who will bring some other issue. But we need to open and facilitate the other participants to be able do so.

I have a question about the week one because there is one slot for each. But each, when the Board met with the ccNSO, just to take an example, another group is organizing a meeting without the Board, is it possible? And how we can inform you about that? Thank you very much.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Sebastien. Jonathan Robinson, you're next.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks, Tanzanica. And I think my comment follows on from what Susan said and what I then put in the chat. So, I won't repeat what I put in the chat. But I think the essence of what I'm thinking is that this group—the meeting group that we're in right now—appears to be a very

operationally-focused group. It's designed to manage—or assist staff in managing and organizing the schedule of an ICANN meeting.

And the challenge we're facing is that the ... In the pandemic-related circumstances, our expectations of what an ICANN meeting is seem to have shifted. And they've shifted variously. And we don't seem to have allowed ourselves the opportunity to have the more strategic discussions. What are our expectations of the meeting? We seem to be committed to, rather, repeating the planning exercise that we did previously. And so, to me, that's where there's a little bit of a disconnect.

And I think you've raised this before. It would be really useful to know where in the organization is the thinking about how things change, at least for the short-term, in terms of what our expectations are. And that doesn't seem to be facilitated or existing, a discussion around expectations of—the objectives and strategy behind an ICANN meeting. We seem to be just going along the same rails, as we did before. So, that concerns me a little. I think we're all, in good faith, trying to do that. But we haven't given ourselves the opportunity to step out of that and think about things from a bigger perspective. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Jonathan. I don't see other hands. Are there any more comments? There was also some comments in the chat, not only about the public forum but also about the public Board meeting. Are there any additional thoughts on whether we should consider going from two public forums to just one?

Again, with the plenary week two, I think the benefit that we can take from the way this block schedule is set up is that if there are not a lot of things that are going to be going against things during the plenary week, it is okay to make a little bit later decisions on whether we need all of these blocks. Stephanie, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much. I think that Jonathan very well stated our thoughts on this. And in particular, I think ... Strike me dead but I think the public Board meeting just doesn't have the impact virtually that it does in a real, face-to-face meeting. And I don't see the benefit. By all means, make it open. Do it some other time. Don't try to squeeze it into this week unless there is a solid reason for having a Board meeting. In other words, do they have any particular motions they have to pass in order to enable the switchover that happens at this annual meeting? But it's not a high draw, I wouldn't think.

More important would be to discuss issues that are confronting us. So, we'd like to hear Board members discuss the challenges. And among those challenges are when are we out of virtual meetings? We really need to rethink how we imagine these meetings. We're still "paving the cow path," is the expression I've used in the last couple of discussions on this. We need to rethink everything.

And I don't see us addressing all the challenges facing us. The submission on the actual economic realities of domain name sales, I think, is a good start. That's why I really, really support that proposal because we have economic realities. We have complexity realities. And

then, we have, from the perspective of civil society, we have real outreach challenges, if this continues for the next, let's say a year but potentially more. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Stephanie. Donna Austin, you're next.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Tanzi. So, I struggled with the utility of the public forums in a virtual setting, particularly having two of them in this week, given that we've potentially got three plenary session topics.

So, it kind of builds on what Stephanie said. I think what might be particularly helpful with a public forum—particularly just one of them—is if we could have the interaction with the Board about what's their long-term thinking on the meetings and the planning because we haven't had that discussion as a community. And as Jonathan said, what we're doing here is very operational, based on a decision made by the Board that they would cancel Hamburg in favor of a virtual meeting. So, that's what we're trying to prepare for.

So, I wonder if ... Public forum topics are usually developed on the fly, to some extent, at the time. But I wonder ... I really think there would be value in the community having a discussion around what's the longer-term thinking of face-to-face meeting versus virtual. And I know Nick's paper, or the paper that was put together about the different phases of when we get back to face-to-face.

But the conversation we should be having with the Board is what's their thinking about ... How long is phase zero going to be in place? And I think that's a really good discussion that we could have during the public forum. But I really think it needs to be led, to some extent, by the Board.

So, if we can't find a substantive topic for engagement with the Board for the public forums, I would say let's get rid of them because we're going to have a number of plenary sessions. But if we can agree on a substantive topic for engagement with the Board from a community perspective, then I'd say keep the first public forum. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Donna. And David, go ahead please.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. On the point of Board meetings, this is an Annual General Meeting and there is a transition of leadership and whatnot. So, there is a need for that type of formal meeting. But in terms of the public forum, generally, they've tried to have topics, in a sense. And so, maybe that's what, hearing Donna at others' suggestions, Stephanie's, that that should be a topic for the public forum, either one of them or part of one of them. And that could be a good way to have that interaction and discussion that you're talking about.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, David and Donna. So, if we were to go that direction, which makes sense to take one of these public forums and actually focus it on

a more specific topic with the Board, next we would just want to get a feel for would that be in the first slot that we have here for the public forum—make the most sense for that discussion—or the last slot? So, I'm just putting that out there as something to think about. That doesn't necessarily have to be decided right this moment.

Are there any other thoughts about the executive Q&A? I'll go ahead and point out, with the social slots that we have here at the very end of the day, the welcome ceremony is something that we're working on internally, how to make that more of an interesting virtual program. And some of these other slots are also just to allow you to think about if you want to do some sort of social activities that we can help support.

Jonathan Robinson, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks, Tanzi. You probably think you've caught me in a bit of bad mood today because I seem to be raising various challenging issues. But we did have pretty universal criticism, as far as I could tell, the feedback on the executive Q&A. I think the format didn't go down very well. It felt like there was a set of slides with a bunch of people introducing themselves and their responsibilities. But the feedback I got was that those could have been covered by previously-circulated documents and that a more interactive format was desirable. So, that's certainly what was ... The executive Q&A, as was at 68, didn't seem to go down very well and needs works. Thanks very much.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Jonathan. Yeah. I believe this was just a carryover of something that we've done in the past. If there is desire to not do that session or do it more as a webinar, even, I believe more recently we did the executive Q&A during prep week, if I'm not mistaken. So, that's certainly an option, to not have it on the schedule here. I see Susan Payne. Go ahead, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yes. Thanks, Tanzi. I'll be really quick. I think I'd support that—the moving the exec Q&A. I think it's one of those sessions that perhaps doesn't translate very well to virtual. It seems very formal. And I would completely support what Jonathan says about the format. But I think perhaps it has a place when we're meeting in person and we can see the individuals face-to-face, if you know what I mean. And perhaps for some of us who don't know some of the exec staff members, it's a nice opportunity to put a name to a face and so on. But none of that translates very well to the virtual meeting, or certainly hasn't to date.

And so, I would second Jonathan that unless we could come up with a much more interactive format, and almost take it as read—that we've read that CVs or we've attended previous sessions where we've had the introductions. Perhaps [inaudible] staff to feel comfortable with that kind of interactive format. Or perhaps we need to have some deadline by which different groups or different people should submit questions, for example, to make it more comfortable for them, if there's a nervousness about that. But yeah. Otherwise, I would totally support moving it to being more of a webinar presentation.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Susan. I see some additional agreement to that point in the chat. So, I think we will go ahead and say that that executive Q&A, unless there is any arguments, we will go ahead and move that to prep week. So, we'll get that off of the week two.

We have just a couple minutes left. So, I also want to address ... I saw earlier in the chat a question about the virtual break versus these other breaks. I'm sorry. That is a little confusing, now that I look at it. That one is basically specifying that we will provide the four or so different topics from virtual coffee breaks during that break right there. There will also potentially be some hosted coffee breaks at other times of the day. We just don't have those confirmed yet. So, that's what that green break is after the plenaries, is the Meetings Team-hosted coffee breaks, which seemed to go very well last time.

Before we wrap up, I'll just say we will try to get to you, by the end of the day today, a list and details for all the proposed topics, with a date on when we want to discuss those next. We will get you an updated block schedule, just to show the executive Q&A moved off of here. I'll add ... SSAC was missing here from Tuesday in block four. And I think we'll see Registrar and Registry stuff going in on Wednesday. Again, please let us know if there are other requests for joint meetings with the Board that you want to get into these slots.

Just looking in the chat here. Are there any other questions, comments? David does the most wonderful wrap-ups. So, I will probably kick it over to him to see if he wants to do that.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, everyone. In the last, quick one minute, in terms of the plenary sessions, we will ask you to, again, finalize and put into more detail some of the general proposals we heard, in addition to the three that we had on the screen, and make sure you get those in on the deadlines so that there can be a review of the various topics, hopefully to narrow it down to the few that are more manageable and all. And we will, indeed, move forward on that and share that with you.

In terms of the block schedule, again, the three parts—the prep week, the SO/AC week, and plenary—again, trying to keep that spread out so that it's manageable for people to participate in various time zones and to encourage the most active participation.

In terms of prep week, I did share, and I'm happy to share again with everyone, the prep week numbers. They're rather impressive, both in terms of geography distribution as well as people. And that is a possibility.

In terms of the sessions—the Board meetings, executive Q&A—maybe it's better to have executive update on prep week, as well as to have a session of the public forum to be a discussion of the Board's view of virtual meetings going forward or something similar to that—a topic-related one so that there can be discussions at that level.

And finally, I should have made mention. I think we're probably going to be hearing from the Board on the Board interaction with the various stakeholder and constituency groups as to the topics to be done there. And I think the final steps there would be also, in our next session,

maybe to have a discussion on the format for the plenary sessions. That may be helpful in focusing our preparation and organization of those sessions.

I think that's the summary I have. Tanzania, I hope that touches everyone's main points.

TANZANICA KING:

Yep. Well-covered, as always. Our next call will be, at the moment, on the 10th. Again, we'll circulate some updates and information and then see what we get back. We may find that it would be useful to have a call before the 10th of September. If that's the case, we will propose that to you as soon as possible so you can have it on your calendars. And that is it.

DAVID OLIVE:

With that, we thank you for this call, your inputs and comments as we move forward for the planning of the Annual General Meeting, ICANN 69. With that, I wish everyone a good evening, good morning, and good afternoon, wherever you may be. Thank you very much for your participation and inputs.

TANZANICA KING:

Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]