
DAVID OLIVE:

Greetings, everyone. And welcome to the first call of our community planning session for ICANN 70. We all welcome you to this call and we thank you for joining in such short notice. The agenda is as follows. We'll have a revised look at the ICANN 70 block schedule, production timeline, and a summary of the survey paper that you have in your possession.

We'll talk about plenary topics, look at the bilateral meetings with the Board and your views on that for ICANN 70. We'll explore the question-and-answer session from the ICANN executives—when best to program that. Looking at some updated tools for the meeting support for ICANN 70. Any other businesses and then a wrap-up here. With that, if my colleague, Sally, is online, I'd like to turn it over to her to see if she has any remarks.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thanks, David. Welcome, everybody. Thanks very much for joining us. So I think we're going to cook off with either Tanzi or Nick taking us through just the very high-level summary of the survey results.

And I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank you and to thank all your constituency and membership groups for the really remarkable participation. I think what we have here is an extremely comprehensive piece of feedback. It's both comprehensive and actionable and it looks short, medium, and long-term at the challenges that we all have discussed and that we share about how we maximize our ability to use

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.

ICANN meetings to achieve ICANN's mission and bylaws to deliver against our priorities and our strategic plan.

So thank you very much for that because I think as ever, with any survey, you need a good level of participation in order for it to be credible, and useful. And you've absolutely done that this time. So thank you very, very much. Thanks, David.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Sally. I'll now turn it over to Nick and Tanzanica to talk about the revised block schedule timing and a summary of the paper we've just shared with you. Nick?

NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you, David. Good morning, all, or good day, all. It's good to be here with you. I'll be very brief. First, I'd like to thank you for all your efforts in responding to our surveys and providing clear direction for the schedule for ICANN 70. I realize that we're getting off to a late start in planning for ICANN 70 and I'd like to assure you that planning for ICANN 71 will begin much earlier. With that, I'll turn things over to Tanzanica to take us through some brief survey comments and direction. And then we'll do a deep dive into the schedule for ICANN 70. Thank you very much. Tanzanica?

TANZANICA KING:

Thanks, Nick. Hello, everyone and happy new year or welcome to the new year, as a lot of people are saying. Going through the key takeaways that we got out of your feedback. The first one is that

improvements to participation ... I don't think this is the first slide but we'll take it from here. Improvements to participation features and services of virtual meetings should be prioritized separately from changes to the overall meeting strategy. It was very clear that there was more of an expectation that we would be focusing separately on the virtual meetings. So that should be done.

Also, more time and community consultation is needed to establish strategic changes that would be applicable to future face-to-face meetings—so taking a slower approach to looking at the overall meeting strategy and doing more consultation on that.

The third point here is, of course, the immediate need to set a block schedule for ICANN 70 and get started on schedule development and planning, which is the big reason we are here today. And Kim, if you could go to the next slide, please.

So then, it was clear that the majority of you are not in favor of moving sessions currently scheduled during the public meetings to be spread throughout the year, out of concern that it would actually increase burnout and create too much extra lifting throughout the year, versus reduce some of that burnout, and also the potential to create more conflicts with other internet community events.

In line with that is the unified online calendar, which we had recommended as a way to then make sure that those sessions that might be moved out of the schedule would be visible. So it's clear that there's a lot of support for the online calendar that's going to be launched, I believe, in June because it's going to help make policy work

and everything that you do more visible and hopefully increase participation but that that should not supplement the ICANN meetings or moving sessions out of the regular schedule. Next slide, please.

And these last two, the first one is ... There's obviously a need for us to look at some of our terminology and make sure that we're all on the same page, in particular with the cross-community and plenaries. I think that maybe we have some confusion because as I think most of you know on this call, we've changed some of that terminology when it comes to plenaries. So we need to discuss that.

Also, with networking, clearly there's a lot of different ideas about what networking means—a lot of comments about the need for cross-community networking—I'll use one of the terms that's also unclear—cross-community networking versus intra- and internetworking between groups. So we'll talk more later about how we can use all of your suggestions and actually make networking slots appeal to your specific needs.

And then, this last one is a request to increase existing language services, such as interpretation and real-time transcription, should be evaluated before we start looking at brand-new services and support. So we'll talk more about that. I believe Ashwin is here with us and going to be talking about some of those things too, later.

So that's a quick summary. I'll send it back to you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you very much, Tanzania. That is a review of the paper that you have. Do you have any comments or questions at this stage? Manal, I see your hand is up. Please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, David and Tanzania, for the compiled paper and also for the presentation. Just out of curiosity, have you received anything that is contradicting from different parts of the community? I'm glad we were almost all on the same page. I can see all the comments pushing in the same direction. Just wondering whether you have received anything that is contradicting, that we may need to pay special attention to or discuss here. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Hi, Manal. Thank you for the question. Surprisingly, because I know, typically, we have a lot more differing opinions, a lot of the feedback we got was really in-sync, when it comes to these high-level points. At-Large feedback was more adaptable to the block schedule that we proposed. And we'll be looking at that next. So that's the only place where we really saw something that one group would be more open to or enjoy more than the rest. But I think that we can still find ways to accommodate the preferences there. And I see Jonathan's hand has gone up so I'll go ahead and let us hear from him.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tanzania. Sorry. I got in here late and missed the beginning of the presentation. But one of the things that we're interested in and

wanted to know how the community reported back on was the idea of the simulcasting onto a YouTube that took place during the last meeting. Was that experiment considered a success by the community? It's something that's important to us but I don't know—and perhaps the GAC as well. But I don't know about the rest of the community, in terms of making these sessions available to a wider audience with lower bandwidth.

TANZANICA KING: So I'm going to leave that for Ash because I believe that's something that he'll be discussing later in the agenda unless, ash, you want to make any comment on that now.

ASHWIN RANGAN: I'm happy to take it out of sequence, if you'd like. Or I can wait until it's my turn and speak to that along with all the other things that I will be addressing.

TANZANICA KING: Yeah.

DAVID OLIVE: Yes. Ash, why don't you wait for your section and then you can provide a comprehensive approach.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you. I'll do that.

DAVID OLIVE: Susan Payne, your hand's up.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah. Thanks very much. It's just a really quick question. And apologies if you've explained this previously and I missed it. The feedback here and in the paper, it seemed to be based entirely on feedback from SOs and ACs that was appended to the paper. What happened to the feedback from individuals or smaller groups? I know a number of people submitted surveys and so on. Where did that go or how was that taken into consideration?

TANZANICA KING: That's a very good point. Right now, I'm wishing I had, over the break, remembered to include those individual responses in this overall feedback. So it did not disappear. I assure you that. But rather than try to fix this now, I'd like to say I'd rather add that so we can update this to actually include that and fold it all together. So I'm grateful that you're bringing it up and I do know the individual feedback that you're referring to.

DAVID OLIVE: But also, the various groups did share that with constituency stakeholders and there was a consolidated commentary, which was very, very helpful and thus directed in that sense as well.

TANZANICA KING: Correct.

DAVID OLIVE: All right. We'll deal with Jonathan Zuck's comment on streaming with Ash's presentation. Thank you, Susan. We'll proceed to the next part, Tanzania.

TANZANICA KING: So we'll take a look at this adjusted proposed block schedule. It was clear that the majority of you do not want to see us do another two-week meeting. So we're looking at this still as a Monday through Thursday. We'd like to put on the table that if there's a desire to make this a five-day versus four-day meeting, we just need to hear that from you. But we're looking at this, at the moment, as a four-day meeting.

At your suggestions, we reduced the networking slots. But again, we'll want to talk with you and work with you to make those more defined. There were a lot of good suggestions and comments about what those might be used for. So we would want to work with you to make those the most useful.

We reduced the plenaries to just two. As always, this is more a suggestion to get us going. The number of topics really should be dependent on what topics and how many you think are important to get covered for this particular meeting.

And then, of course, we retained one public forum at the end of the week. What else here? Also, it was clear that there's not really any preference to keep that community updates with the ICANN Board

session. So one of the things we've noted here is that we can schedule, like we usually do, the meetings all within the week. But we'd like to know if you have any interest in scheduling with the Board outside of those dates because we'd be happy to work and see what might be available—what options there are, if it makes your schedules work better over the official dates.

So that is a high-level look at this. I'll be interested to know if you all like this approach, if there's any major changes you want to make because I know that each of you really needs this to be—set the scene so that you can get going on your schedules. Are there any questions or comments on this block schedule?

DAVID OLIVE:

Manal, I think your hand is up, and then Julie, and then Rod. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Yes. Just to thank you for considering the input received. And I think this resonates well with the GAC views. We would like to see the work concentrated during the ICANN meeting week. And we always intend to meet the Board during the meeting week. And again, I can see that we're not replacing the bilateral with the Board by the 10-minute report that was suggested before. So again, confirming that this aligns with GAC views. So thank you very much.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Manal. Julie Hammer.

JULIE HAMMER: Just a quick comment. It isn't really going to work to have Tech Day and DNSSEC Workshop on the same day. They're currently both listed for day one. And they really have a big overlap in the attendance that goes to each of them. So just a point for, perhaps, amending that schedule as we go forward. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. We'll note that about the Tech Day and DNS Sessions. Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks. Julie and I were on the same wavelength there and we discussed that. I don't know if Katrina wants to weigh in on that as well, on the same reason. I just want to say thank you for making all these adjustments. I know there's a lot of input and this seems to have captured a lot of it.

I also want to just comment on the Board sessions. That's an interesting concept, to change that for out of this week. I assume that you've talked to the Board about doing that. I know there's some concern about the work they're doing, too. And I don't want to be unfair to our very hard-working Board members who have to go through a lot of sessions, especially dragging out. They've got their own things they need to do as well. I just want to be careful that we don't abuse our privileges there to some extent as well. Love to hear some thought process on potentially moving sessions out of this week to have those in-depth interactions with the Board, with each of the SO/ACs. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks, Rod. We'll address that more directly on the next item that we have on that particular point, if you don't mind.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Great.

DAVID OLIVE: But we will have some thoughts on that. Thank you. Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, David. Your last answer may be the answer to my question as well. But one of the key benefits of the formal meetings over our day-to-day Zoom calls to do our work for the At-Large is the enhanced interpretation. So to the extent that we decided we wanted to do some preparatory or what I might call internal meetings or regional meetings, etc., for the At-Large outside of this schedule, is it likely that we'd be able to get access to the broader language support, etc., that is generally on offer during the formal meetings? That may be part of what you were going to discuss next, anyway.

DAVID OLIVE: We'll answer that question, yes, when we talk about the technical side of things. How about that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect.

DAVID OLIVE: I make note of that—interpretation on outside sessions. Any other comments here on the block schedule?

TANZANICA KING: David, if I could just respond to a couple of things quickly.

DAVID OLIVE: Yes, please.

TANZANICA KING: So with the Tech Day and DNSSEC workshop, I believe my thinking was in the past couple of meetings, I believe we've done one in the morning and one in the afternoon. But you'll also notice that the plenaries that are proposed here, I tried to avoid Monday and Wednesday, knowing that we usually have the technical stuff going on, on Monday, and that Wednesday, of course, we see the GAC being busy with the communique and the GNSO in the Council meeting.

So certainly, Tech Day could be Monday and the DNSSEC Workshop could still take place Wednesday, which I know is how we've done it in the face-to-face meetings. So just wanted to make that clear. And we can save the rest for other agenda points.

DAVID OLIVE: Any other questions? Susan Payne. Sorry. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah. Thank you very much. Just a quick question about the time for community groups to request their either internal meetings, or meetings between one constituency and another, or one stakeholder group and another, or whatever. I think that the slots that you now have on this ICANN block schedule are intended to allow for that. But I just wanted to be sure I was understanding it correctly.

And secondly as I'm reading it, it looks as though you're envisaging, at the moment, the Board meetings with the various groups going over day two and day three. And that does look, from the Board's perspective, to be quite intense.

Would it make sense to spread those meetings out across the week so that the Board has a bit of downtime? Or even, you asked whether we thought, perhaps, we needed day five. And I wonder whether that would help to lighten the load a bit, to actually have day five. I'm afraid I wasn't on the last meeting so I'm not quite sure where the decision to take it down to four days came from. So apologies if I'm covering ground that was well-covered last time.

TANZANICA KING: Not at all. The four days is really because—and particularly, when we're doing the virtual meetings—Fridays tend to be Saturdays for a lot of people. So we found that there seems to be an ongoing desire to end the week on Thursday. But again, that's flexible from our standpoint. It's

really just about what the majority of you want to do. And that goes for the scheduling of the meetings with the Board.

What days things happen are really up to you guys. This is just trying to give some sort of structure so that we can look at it. Typically, I find that all the requests fall onto Tuesday and Wednesday. But that certainly doesn't mean that we can't spread those out to make it a little bit better for the Board.

DAVID OLIVE: Okay. Any other comments, questions? Tanzania, any last word?

TANZANICA KING: Nope. I think I'll hang on so we can get into the next agenda items.

DAVID OLIVE: So thank you for the commentary on the Tech Day and DNSSEC Day. And thank you, Tanzania, for the scheduling note. We now move to the production timeline. Tanzania, please. You want to take us through that?

TANZANICA KING: Yes. I'll just do this very quickly. As Nick pointed out, we are sorry that we do have a reduced amount of time. But if we're looking at getting started today, having a good discussion on plenary topics to kick us off, hopefully, we'll have until January 22nd to get that done. And it doesn't have to be completely done. We can continue to talk about plenary

topics for as long as you need. Probably, what we need to do is decide on the slots for them so that we can schedule around them as needed. And as you see, then we'll have our session request period. We'll have 10 days for that and for resolving conflicts. And we will post a final schedule by the 1st of March.

If there are any questions on the timeline, please let me know. Jonathan Robinson, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Tanzania. The prep week, Monday, 8th of March followed by ICANN 70 the 22nd of March, does that mean we have a gap week in between, just to make sure that ... The Monday, 15th of March week, what will happen then? Thanks?

TANZANICA KING: Yes. That is the idea, to make sure that ... And that is what we've done in the past. We made the, maybe, mistake, if you look back on it, of having that feeling that we had of multiple weeks in the meeting last time by having so much back-to-back. So we wanted to make sure we got back to having that bit of spacer between prep week and the official meeting dates. Mary, did you want to comment on that?

MARY WONG: I was going to say that too, Tanzania, because we are conscious of the feedback about, really, the mental and other exhaustion that folks felt going through ICANN 69. That said, Jonathan and everybody, at this point, obviously we don't know how many prep week sessions there

are. There have been times where we've been able to have them within three or four days—therefore within a week. I think one of the last couple of meetings, we did go over into a second week because of the number of prep week sessions. So we may need a bit of flexibility there as well.

And of course, to the extent that groups want to have other meetings around ICANN 70, if not within ICANN 70 week, that breathing space can allow for flexibility for that kind of scheduling as well, again, obviously taking into account that we really don't want folks to feel like they're going through a three-week meeting. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE:

Any other comments or questions? I hope that was clear. And thank you for those comments.

The next item on the agenda is plenary sessions, I think. And Tanzania and Mary will talk about that. And then, we'll get to the bilateral meeting with the Board. That's coming. Thank you for the comments there.

TANZANICA KING:

Mary, did you want to kick this topic off?

MARY WONG:

I can. And there's really not much to kick off. I think a lot of it was in the email. You will have seen from the production schedule that we are talking about something like the next seven to 10 days to get plenary

topic suggestions in. But as we noted, given the overall tight timeline for everything, we thought it would be helpful to try to surface potential topics ahead of time, including for this call.

You'll recall, some of you, that in the past, there have been kickoff meetings where the group was actually able to agree on what the plenary topics should be. And if that is the case, then that will certainly ease your and our planning burdens for this particular meeting. So right now, as you see on this slide, we did receive the following topics. But we invite comments on that. Tanzania, did I leave anything out that you want to add?

TANZANICA KING:

No. Just to say that in the past, we've had experiences where there's a lot of good back and forth on the email list, where you all are able to narrow down on the topics that you think are the most important to cover for the meeting. And we've had other times where we really needed to give you a process to submit proposals and be able to review those.

So we have these suggestions that are already here. I think it would be great, if you all do have things that you're already thinking that you would like to do, to share those, either here or on the email list, so that we can start to talk about those and see if there's already some narrowing down that we can do. Otherwise, we're more than happy to send out the usual proposal form so that we can do a more formal process to identify which topics you'd like to cover.

DAVID OLIVE: Okay. In the chat, there was a question about the difference between plenary and cross-community sessions. Would you want to add some more light on that for Susan?

MARY WONG: David, as I said in the chat, what we did was reproduce what the At-Large suggestions were. Perhaps Jonathan or somebody could speak to that from the At-Large perspective. I think, given the current block schedule now from the staff perspective, we're looking at two plenary sessions now on the block schedule, which imply that those will have to be unconflicted slots.

For the other block slots, those could either be intragroup work or cross-community work. So potentially, there could be cross-community sessions that can take place in conflicted slots that are not considered plenaries. I know that's not helpful to the question that Susan's asking. But to the extent that there are topics that the groups would like to work on across different groups, what I'm saying is that those don't necessarily have to be a plenary session which has to be unconflicted.

TANZANICA KING: And the reason that there's the extra cross-community stuff included on this slide really was just to make sure that we captured that from the At-Large feedback we got with the suggestions for some of these session topics. So apologies if it's a little confusing because we're focused on plenaries. And that information's included here. I just wanted to make sure we captured it.

But as Mary said, the main difference is the plenary sessions are catering to all attendees, making sure that we don't have conflicts, whereas the cross-community sessions could be between multiple groups—two or more groups—and not necessarily require everyone to attend or have no conflicts.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Tanzania and Mary. Any other comments or questions? We will, of course, hear more from your ... Manal, please, and then Ashley. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Sorry. Was trying to unmute. Can we receive a compilation of all the slides we have on the screen now over email to consult with the relevant constituencies? That would be helpful if possible.

DAVID OLIVE: Yes. No problem. We'll be doing that.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Ashley, please. You're next.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi. Thanks. Yeah. This is in line with what Manal just said. And there was a bit of back-and-forth on that chat. But just to make sure that we get something in email that officially teases out and asks us for our input and the deadline. But do you want us to also ... Any feedback we provide back on potential topics, do we want to prioritize if we want it to be plenary or cross-community and rationalize why we want what? Just to make sure that I understand the process, and if we do propose anything as a group, that we do so correctly. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks, Ashley. Jonathan and then Bruna, who cannot raise her hand but we're happy to have her. Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, David. As Tanzania mentioned at the top of the presentation, I guess there's some value in defining terms of something. I know I've been guilty of just defining them myself and trying to socialize those definitions. But happy for a more democratic process.

But it seems to me—and this is just my personal opinion, not a consensus opinion of the ALAC—that all the sessions, at some measure, for the primary meeting should be about the community interacting with each other—that it's meant to be a broader audience for sessions and a broader range of participants than are normally the case on the day-to-day Zoom calls. That feels like a good intention, to take advantage of the fact that we've gotten everybody to clear their schedules.

So I guess, in my mind, I would propose the difference between a plenary and a cross-community session is that a plenary session is diversity of voices at a table, at a session that is about something that everybody cares about and that a cross-community session is more about an interactive session, which is a discussion more so—as opposed to series of presentations, etc., more of a discussion that involves multiple parties. That might be a way to create some sort of a taxonomy between those two. Just a thought.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Jonathan. A good distinction made there. Thank you. Bruna, please, now that you have your hand up as well.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thank you very much, David and Jonathan, for the help as well. So about the topics, it's pretty much the same request as Manal and Ashley, so we can have a compiled email for that. And I recall, in a previous planning of an ICANN meeting, we did some sort of voting or exchange of perceptions between the SO and ACs' leadership. And I think this would be an interesting point as well.

NCSG has an idea on one of the topics that was proposed—this one on regulatory updates. We necessarily don't think this would be, maybe, optimal to have during the ICANN 70, mostly because some of these regulations that are mentioned here, they are mostly drafts. So this maybe, for us, can be something that is taken inside any of the communities or either in other opportunities.

But we had an extra topic that would be a discussion or some sort of session that would try to differentiate between technical internet governance and internet governance on itself. We're seeing a lot of confusion around this. And I think some of these initiatives we have been facing in the past years also convey a lot of confusion. So that would be our proposal for this as well. But I'll be happy to reply to that on the email, once we have an opportunity to compile the suggestions.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Bruna. Mary? Yes. We'll include it in your email exchange. Mary?

MARY WONG: Yeah. Thanks, David. And thank you, Bruna. I think we certainly have a process for determining cross-community sessions, as you noted. It's just that in the past that there have also been occasions where the group was able to actually come quite quickly to an agreement on what the topics might be. It doesn't sound like that's the case here. But I just wanted to note that. Thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Very good. Let's move on to the next topic, if we could, on the bilateral meetings and the Board, to move the agenda along. Tanzania, do you want to start or do you want me to do that?

TANZANICA KING: I can. I do see that Sebastien has his hand up, though.

DAVID OLIVE: Ah. Excuse me. I missed that. Sebastien, excuse me. Please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Which topic. I'm sorry. Did you want—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Tanzania. Thank you, David. I'm not sure that it's in any topics. But I was wondering. It just occurred to me that I don't know if there is the leadership of the NomCom participating to this meeting. I didn't find the name of any of them. Therefore, I will do my task as a new NomCom member, saying that it may be useful to have one slot for NomCom to be able to raise the issue of the new leadership we are looking for this year. I don't know if it's already somewhere in the schedule but I wanted to be sure that we don't miss this opportunity for NomCom to explain what they are doing. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Ah. Very good. Thank you, Sebastien.

TANZANICA KING: I'll make a note of that, that that's something we can expect for the schedule. So that's no problem. Mary, is that a new hand.

MARY WONG:

It is. And I think you and I are in tandem with that. So maybe just two more specific things. What we encourage every group to do, obviously, is to make sure that the staff supporting your group submit the session requests in the system that they are familiar with on time so that Tanzania can indeed, as she said, make sure that those requests appear on the schedule.

There have been times in the past where we've had these discussions at these meetings. But because the request didn't come in or didn't come in on time, there were some misunderstandings when the original block schedule went out without the session that we had actually talked about. So just want to encourage everybody to use this opportunity to make sure that your support staff does, in fact, put a request in on time.

Secondly, with regard not just to NomCom but to a couple of other groups, in the past or the recent past, too—and this is review teams and the like—to the extent that it is an update to the community, we're also encouraging folks to remember that there is prep week and the use of webinars. And the intent there, obviously, is so that informational update and preparatory sessions can be held during prep week to better inform and to encourage more interactive discussions during the meeting itself. Thanks, David.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Mary, for that important point. Let's move on to the interesting topic that people wanted to know about—the interaction

with the Board during this timeframe. Tanzania, do you want to start that off.

TANZANICA KING:

Yes. Happy to. And thank you for all the comments that you've already made about making sure that we don't overwhelm the Board. At the moment, as I think somebody pointed out minutes ago, the Board is busy, of course. But they're also looking to figure out when they're doing their workshop dates and things like that. So we don't have definitive availability, if you will, about the Board surrounding the dates of the meeting.

I think the biggest thing, from my standpoint, is to understand what would help all of you, in terms of building your schedules for the meetings so that we at least have an idea. Is there a preference? Would it be helpful to be able to meet with the Board in the week before or even the week after the official meeting dates? Who would be interested in doing that, so that we can see what the requests are? Because it's quite possible that there's only two groups who would prefer to meet in the dates outside of the meeting. So that's something that would be easier, of course, than if six groups wanted to do that.

So right now, it's really to get an understanding of what your preferences are, not to say that we can guarantee everything but to understand what's desirable and take it from there. So I know there were a lot of additional questions and comments. So I will open it back to you, David, or to any questions.

DAVID OLIVE:

Yes. Thanks. It was designed for flexibility, both on your parts, the scheduling, and the Board's part. And this is why we'd like to hear your views on preferences for this. So thank you. I know the GAC and the NCSG said they would prefer it during the meeting time. Other comments or expressions of preference?

TANZANICA KING:

One other thing, David, if you will, I want to throw out there, too, is part of the reason that this question came up. If you look at our past virtual meetings this past year, first we didn't do any meetings with the Board at all at, of course, the policy forum. Then, we had ICANN 69, where you all were able to do most of your meetings with the Board in week one of the two weeks that we did.

So I'm conscious of the fact that if we aren't doing a two-week meeting and it's virtual—so we've got a little bit shorter days—that it may be all of you to fit meetings with the Board in with the four-day schedule. So that's another reason that this question is coming up, just to make sure that you can get everything you want to get done.

Jonathan, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks. I don't think we've discussed this with the Registries Stakeholder group in any detail—at least to recently, in the current context. But my question is, is this necessarily a binary question? Could some groups meet with the Board during the meeting and some meet outside?

I suspect that may be of interest to some groups and to the Board. Because one of the concerns ... And this is very much my personal perspective, I suppose. One of the concerns I've seen is that the Board appears fatigued at times. They get a series of meetings in a very compressed timeframe, together with a whole lot of other meetings.

And perhaps the Board, let alone the constituent groups, don't necessarily want to have everything crammed within one week. So it may be that there's a hybrid possible here. And that is that those groups that do want to take advantage of their being together and the time being together aim to meet with the Board during that weekend. And other meetings are scheduled relatively nearby but not within the week itself. So there may be a hybrid possible and that's something for, perhaps, others, and staff, and the Board to consider.

TANZANICA KING:

Yes. If I can respond to that quickly and then we can go to Philippe. I'm sorry if it's unclear here. But the intention is to say that both of those can happen. So there's no intention of ... Do we have to make a collective decision that all the meetings with the Board fall either within the meeting week or outside of it? This is to suggest that we want to hear from each of you individually, for your groups, what your preference would be.

So it's my thinking that yes, exactly what you're suggesting. There could be three meetings that happen outside of the official dates and others that happen within the official week, spreading them out, just like you're suggesting.

DAVID OLIVE: Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, David. I hope you can hear me. I was about to say pretty much what Jonathan said. As far as Council is concerned, I think we're flexible. We wouldn't like to see the Board having [inaudible] discussions and more of the same, to put it bluntly. So if that would help to have the Council-Board meeting before or after, as long as it's in the same timeframe and as long as we can have substantive discussions, which I'm sure we will have, I think we'd be happy. This is a personal comment. I haven't consulted my councilors on this. But I think we can be flexible thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Philippe. And gain, please express your preferences in some emails and we'll move there. I need to go on with Sally and Ash. So, Sally, would you please move to the next topic, the Executive Q&A session?

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Happily. Thank you, David. And hello, everyone. I'm going to talk about the Executive Q&A session and then also language services. So we'll start with the Executive Q&A. Typically, the session had been held during the public meeting week. In the last two meetings, ICANN 68 and 69, they were held during prep week. And as you're thinking about

where to place this for this next ICANN 70, I thought there would be some value in sharing some information with you.

One of the recommendations that you provided before ICANN 69 was that you wanted to see more interaction and for it to be more of a true Q&A and less about presentations. So one of the things we did with the format this last time was to allot much more time for Q&A and it proved to be successful. And in fact, I think we ended up going to the very limits of the session timing to respond to all of the questions and it carried on after that. So that, I think, is a good change to the format and we can continue to evolve it.

But the other piece of information that I thought would be valuable is to know about participation. So even though we moved it into prep week, the participation in this session is high. And there were 282 attendees in ICANN 69, which ranks it among the top 10 of all of the sessions held during that week. So I just want to make sure you have that information as you're thinking about where to place it because the indications are that it's clearly a valuable session for folks and they find use in the content.

So if there are any thoughts about the format, while we have a minute, I'd be glad to take those as well or answer any questions about the session.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Sally, for that. Any comments here?

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay. Shall I move on to language services and interpretation?

DAVID OLIVE: Please.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay. So the request of, “Can we add interpretation?” The Language Services Team is fairly booked, if you would, during those two weeks. And there isn’t a lot of room to add interpretation. One thing that we are adding to the Zoom interface this time is real-time transcription. So you’ll be able to actually see transcriptions in English as the meeting happens. It won’t be the official transcript. We will still provide a clean transcript that’s error-free after the sessions. But at least that may facilitate. It doesn’t solve the interpretation issue but it may ease it.

But of course, if there are other requests for support, either prior to prep week and the meeting week, we’d be glad to look at those and see how we can support them. And I think the same would be true with the Meetings Team as well. But we did want to make you aware that at least we’ll have that option. So the real-time transcription will be available in English, on the Zoom screen.

Okay, David. I think that covers it.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sally. Does that cover the questions? Okay. Jonathan, quickly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. I have a question for Ash, which is—

DAVID OLIVE: He's coming.

JONATHAN ZUCK: There are tools that are available to do real-time transcription in multiple languages, depending on the language of choice of the attendee. And maybe Ash will cover this. But that might be something that would help to ease the interpretation burden, even more so than just an English-language transcription. And I didn't know if you had looked at those tools and considered machine language, non-official interpretation. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: A good segue to Ash, on updated tools for the meeting. Ash, please.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you, David. Thank you for inviting me and thank you for the interest in continued evolution of technologies. There's a handful of things that I want to go through. So I'll go through it in no particular sequence but just the way in which we've organized it.

So first and foremost, some of the communities have already participated in meetings where they have seen remote simultaneous interpretation being integrated into Zoom itself. As you may recall,

during ICANN 69, we offered this as a feature. However, as a user, you needed two different devices and you were interacting with two different platforms.

What we've been successful in doing now is to integrate the feature with Zoom itself so that there is no need for a second device. Participants just select the language of their choice by clicking on an interpretation icon that appears in the choices menu at the bottom of Zoom. And it's off the session, from that point on forward. We've tested this feature out and received very positive feedback during the LAC Domain Names Week session in November. And we're looking forward to offering this during ICANN 70.

On YouTube, Jonathan, you asked for feedback. During 69, the adoption rate of this service was very low. The average view time was less than 15 minutes and the average peak was about 25 users for the five sessions that we streamed. So our thought was to not abandon this but instead to continue to embrace it and try it out a little bit more this time. We were thinking of offering this for plenary or high-interest topic sessions.

From a technical perspective, we have tested this out extensively, side-by-side with Zoom, from remote locations, to see latency impacts, etc. And what we are seeing is that there is a slight improvement in buffering with YouTube as compared with Zoom. So Zoom buffers a little bit more and therefore there is a latency lag, whereas YouTube seems to do a better job of being closer to real time, if you will. So that's something that we will continue to offer and perhaps limit to maybe eight sessions and test it out again.

I think that's an overarching comment that I'd like to make. As we are continuing to expand the offerings on the virtual platform, we want to get into this habit of testing, and getting feedback, and measuring, and understanding what's going on before we make it available as a blanket offering, if you will.

The third thing is something that my colleague, Sally, just referred to and that's automated real-time transcription. We've turned this on and tested it extensively in a single language, and that's English. And we find that it is approximately correct.

So it cannot be used as the official transcription of record because of our frequent use of acronyms and terminology that's very ICANN-centric, which leads to some garbling of the interpretation, because as you said, it is machine-based. It's a machine that's doing the listening, and the interpretation, and the rendering, all without any human interfaces. So we will offer this. There is that concern about the accuracy, in terms of nouns and acronyms. So we're testing it out. Let's put it that way.

Breakout rooms is a request that we heard loud and clear. Technically, we are continuing to test this out. It's indeed possible to do this. But there are a few concerns. One is do we have sufficient proctoring capability if increased staffing is required to assist inside of breakout rooms. We have a limited number of people who support these sessions when we have rooms established. So when you think of the session, if it were to break into four breakout rooms for example, we would need three times more the number of people to support each of the breakout rooms.

So that is a concern that we're working our way through. Technically, it's feasible. We're considering how best to offer it so that it makes sense to the community, while at the same time it doesn't break back of the support team.

There was a request for whiteboarding inside of the breakout rooms. Once again, technically, it's entirely possible. We have tested this out, too. And depending on how far we want to fan the breakout room capability, we will also make available whiteboarding if needed.

The last thing that I wanted to talk about is one-to-one meetings. We've been wrestling with this. And we have a path to a solution. And the path to the solution is to use what we currently do for scheduling our website. On the website, we have a tool called Pathable. Using that, we have been able to figure out a way of offering Zoom Rooms. So Pathable themselves have Zoom as a capability behind the scenes and have offered to let us use that to create Zoom Rooms one-to-one.

So when you schedule a meeting with somebody—let's say I want to meet with you, Jonathan—you and I could decide, on Pathable, to meet. And Pathable would make available a Zoom instance, which is private and limited to just the two of us. It would occur not on our Zoom platform. But instead, it would occur on Pathable's Zoom platform. Because that is the case, we're still trying to negotiate the terms with them and get some legal guidance internally on what the hand over from one platform to another means, etc. So it's very much a work in process but I do expect to make progress and to have something available, hopefully by ICANN 70.

The very last thing, mindful of time, is from a virtual meetings overall perspective, we are pressing pretty hard on new technologies that are emerging during lockdown. Globally, there is a whole new set of tools that are emerging. We're taking a look at that.

So that's a lot of information in a short time. I apologize for that. But it's important that you know that we're pressing pretty hard on evolving how we make available these virtual meetings. Thank you. Back over to you for questions.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you. A quick question from Jonathan and then we want to move to AOB and wrap-up, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Sorry. I know that we're running short on time. I'd be very interested—and I can follow up with you separately, Ash—regarding the YouTube test. Because I think the real benefit that we've observed to the YouTube is when there's multiple video feeds in a meeting.

So a meeting like this one that we're having right now doesn't get a lot of advantage from YouTube. But one in which there was a gallery view and a bunch of people all on camera at once, etc., which I think we want more of, if we can, is when turning it into a video feed instead of multiple video feeds is when that makes a difference. So I'll follow up with separately. Thanks.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you very much, Ash and Jonathan. We'll move to AOB. And I want to recognize Sally Costerton and we'll try to address some of the issues that are appearing in the chat. Sally?

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, David. Very quickly, I just wanted to ask the group to consider, as we will be in the LAC time zone for this meeting, what types of regional outreach sessions would the group like to look at and where might you like to schedule them? So this is just something to think about. There's two different questions there. So they could be done in prep week. They could be done outside the ICANN meeting. They could be done at the ICANN meeting.

But I just want to put it on your collective agendas that bear in mind, we will be in the LAC time zone and we will want to do our best to replicate the outreach to our LAC community that we would have if we were face-to-face. So please let us know. And Rodrigo will coordinate those inputs. So either email Rodrigo, or Tanzania, or myself, or David and we will take your inputs. So we don't need to take it now but I just wanted to be put that question so it's on everybody's minds. Thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you very much. And the other AOB in the chat—and I think Philippe as well as, I think, a note from Fred Baker—on the question of ICANN 71 and 72, moving forward. We take the sentiment here.

Obviously, we don't have a quick answer for that. And to that extent, we are listening and hearing what you're saying on that point.

In terms of Ashley's question, I think we're going to get to that on the wrap-up and next steps. So hopefully, that will be for you to be answered. But that's a Board meeting after this session. Sally, would you want to go to wrap-up and then I'll go into next steps?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Yes. Let's do that. I just wanted to thank everybody. I think we are making good progress. Thank you for very constructive call. It feels like we're consolidating quite fast around the block schedule. So as ever, at this stage in this process, it tends to be about picking the plenaries and making sure that you all feel comfortable about that in the earliest part of the timeframe. That gives everybody that solid framework that you can then crack on with planning your own SO/AC meeting structures. But we are here to help.

The final thing I would say is there has been a lot of movement in the last three or four months on the enhancement of the tools. And I wanted to thank you for the detailed input you gave us on the survey about what you wanted to see and what you wanted to prioritize because we have reflected that in where Ash's team has put the effort and Sally's team—the effort and the energy, in terms of development.

So I hope you feel that there's a fairly instant or fairly immediate reaction to the feedback you've given, in terms of we will deliver as many of those things as we can at ICANN 70. Not everything will be able to be delivered by then but that doesn't mean we're not working on it

and we don't keep building that as we go into 71 and 72. So I really wanted to thank you and your communities for that because that's a hotline, if you like—a very immediate process of reaction. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:

And then, finally, yes. The Board meets today to make its decision on Cancun. We are all expecting that, because of the pandemic, that will again be virtual. They will also be reviewing the inputs that you've given in the paper. And they're, of course, most interested in that. And we take the point of Philippe and others of the SO/AC chairs on how to map that forward in planning purposes for 71 and 72.

And finally, to summarize ... But I think Tanzania may want to make a comment. So I'll turn to her. Tanzania?

TANZANICA KING:

Yes. Really quickly. We will send out the proposal form so that we can kick forward a formal process to figure out the plenary topics. But as a reminder, it's usually really a good idea to actually socialize them on the email list first and maybe even save you from submitting something because oftentimes, there are duplicates. So I would suggest that. And they'll be due by the end of next week and then we'll carry it forward, as best we can, via email until our next call.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you. And quite clearly, to summarize, we will share the slides with you and recording. Obviously, Tanzania reminded people of the plenary sessions and the block schedule as it begins to be populated.

We will also hear more about your preferences for the interaction with the Board—a bit of the hybrid, if you want it during the session or outside of that. Obviously, the Executive Q&A, when best to schedule that for your needs. There will be new tools available, as Ash pointed out, for breakout rooms or private sessions, as well as real-time transcriptions in English and interpretation during that meeting.

I think that is many of the good points you covered. And we thank you for those inputs and all. With that, I think I'm a few minutes over and I am sorry for that delay.

With that, the materials will be coming your way. And a reminder that 17th of February is our next production call. We'll definitely get a calendar invite out to people as we move forward to ICANN 70, the community forum. Thank you very much. I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, or good morning, wherever you may be. On behalf of my colleagues, thank you so much.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you all very much. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]