DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, everyone. And welcome to our ICANN71 Planning Call on today the 29th of April 2021. We appreciate people taking the time, and also to those groups who are collaborating and looking at how best to form the plenary sessions at ICANN71.

With that, the agenda you see here. After some opening remarks, we'll have the update on those topics and planning, the community feedback for potential sessions with ICANN Org and the executives, questions and requests on scheduling or other matters relating to conflicts and topics, and then a wrap up and an AOB.

Without further delay, if there are no objections to this agenda, we'll proceed as forward. And I'd like to turn it over now to my colleague, Sally Costerton, for a few words. Sally.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, David. And welcome to everybody. Very good to have you with us. This is such an important time we're going to spend together. I'm very much looking forward to hearing your thoughts on these key topics and to, I hope, a good brainstorm and feedback on the question particularly on the Executive Team session, the Org session.

I want to make absolutely sure that we get as much input as we can from you; that we have a really good clarity on what's going to work for everybody. Looking forward to a good meeting. Thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE:	Thanks, Sally. With that, we'll go to Item #2 on the agenda: update on the plenary session topics and planning. Tanzanica, Mary Wong, and others. Tanzanica, please.
TANZANICA KING:	Thank you, David. And Kim, you can go ahead and put up our document. Hopefully, most of you had a chance, at least for a couple minutes, to review this new list. This includes all of the proposals that we saw last time, but we managed to have a really productive call yesterday with all the proposers to come up with these consolidated sessions.
	So, we now have three proposals for consolidated topics. And then we also have a proposal to have, separately, a meeting on the future or meetings which was also a proposal that came through from the GAC.
	So, what I'd like to do, actually, is open it up to see—Ashley or James or Nigel or Jonathan—if any of you want to make any comments about the consolidated topics. Also, if there are any questions rather than me reading through the previous proposals. And I can keep attempting to make comments until I see hands come up.
DAVID OLIVE:	There is Mason and then Mary.
MASON COLE:	Thank you, David. Can I be heard?

DAVID OLIVE:	Yes, you can.
MASON COLE:	Thank you. Tanzanica, just a question on proposal #1. From my reading, it looks like there's a fair amount of overlap with the plenary session that was carried over from ICANN70. Am I reading that correctly?
TANZANICA KING:	Yes.
MASON COLE:	Okay. All right. The CSG proposed the last version. Is the thinking that the CSG would cooperate with the GAC to form out that plenary, or has that discussion been had?
TANZANICA KING:	Yep. That discussion should be had now.
MASON COLE:	Okay.
TANZANICA KING:	Yes, that is the proposal and so definitely we'd like to hear whether that is doable from your perspective. And I'm sure other in line, I bet, have comments as well.

MASON COLE:	Sure. I have not talked to anyone else on the CSG since I saw the proposed topics, but I'll go out on a limb and say that I think the CSG would probably be glad to cooperate with the GAC on arranging that meeting. So, if anyone on the GAC is on the call, I'd be happy to reach out to them and start that conversation.
TANZANICA KING:	Great, thank you.
DAVID OLIVE:	Okay. Thank you, Mason. We now go to Jonathan Zuck and then Nigel. Jonathan, please.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, David. Yeah, Mason, this was just to get us past the proposal phase. I think at this point, the rest of the process will be similar to what it is for all plenaries which is that there will be a call for those who are interested in being on an organizing committee for the plenary. And so, you'll probably get more than just the GAC and the CSG engaged in trying to develop that session one. It is carried over from the previous ICANN meeting.
	We focused in on the GAC's proposal for the future of the multistakeholder model and kind of made some modifications to that. And then there was a proposal that came out of the Registrars, I think, that was sort of about looking at the life of a registrant and the challenges faced by a registrant. And I think the early focus was to kind of flip the script on the WHOIS discussion that has taken place ever since

the EPDP began and deal with those issues related to privacy and harassment and things like that.

And then the ALAC added to that things related to block lists and the impact that they have on the life of registrants. But that could expand further again, I think, once an organizing committee gets together, these things will get their ultimate refinement. That doesn't need to really happen on this call. That's my understanding. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. And we see Nigel's comment in the chat as well. But Nigel, please, you're next. I'm sorry, Manal's note in the chat. Nigel, please.

NIGEL HICKSON: Only to say that this proposal from the GAC, when we had the call yesterday—and Berry, no doubt, is the expert of all these things, and Tanzanica, of course—it was noted, of course, that there was the proposal that was carried forward, if you like, from ICANN70 in terms of looking at the legislative developments elsewhere. And, of course, we'd want to reflect on that proposal, reflect on what was going to happen in that session.

And what we put forward here in terms of giving examples like GDPR and NIS 2 are only examples. I mean, there might well be other legislative developments that we'd need to take into account. So obviously, very willing and happy to work with others in this regard. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks, Nigel. Anyone else? Tanzanica? Mary?

TANZANICA KING: So, if we have general agreement on these topics, the next thing we would do is go to the calendar. And I'd want to know if there are any specific requests for the order of these? And, Kim, go ahead and go back to the slides so we can put up the block schedule.

So, I know sometimes there's a preference to put specific topics on certain days if we're trying to avoid, for instance, Monday, Tech Day. Again, I don't know if these are actually the slots for Tech Day and the DNSSEC Workshop. That's just carried over from the last Policy Forum, so that could change. Are there any requests specifically for certain topics to fall on certain days or a specific order of the topics?

If not, I will plot them in as 1, 2, 3, just as you see them across the week. I see no hands.

DAVID OLIVE: Susan Payne. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks. Apologies. It's not a hand to answer your question, I'm afraid, Tanzanica, but just so I understand. Is the proposal that we're taking forward for plenaries? Is that what you're saying? Or are we still going to do the exercise of trying to prioritize a couple of them or something? Or is everyone agreed that we think four could be fitted into this four-day meeting?

TANZANICA KING:	So, just to be clear about the fourth one on the document. So that one, the one about the future of meetings, we are thinking can be a session that the Org will lead. And it does not have to be a non-conflicted plenary. So, we would just end up with these three that you see on the block schedule.
	And, of course, that's still up to the group. If, for any reason, you want to go through them and possibly consider doing few, then that's something that we can talk about. But it is up to you all.
	I see Mary has her hand up, and she's probably got something good to contribute. Go ahead, Mary.
MARY WONG:	Oh, my. I don't know about that. So, I guess to a couple of questions, including, potentially, part of Susan's. This is probably one of the first times or the few times where we've gotten to a point fairly quickly where it looks like there could be preliminary agreement on not just the number of plenary sessions, but what they might roughly cover.
	And what I'll say is that when we met with the different proposers and representatives yesterday, I think it was, I think everybody was very careful to note that all the discussions there would have to come back to this main meeting planning group which is what we're doing right now.
	So, Carlos has mentioned in chat that he can talk to the planning timeline and what happens next, but I think we're hopeful that—we were hopeful, and it sounds like we got there—that the three tracks or

themes, if I can call them that, met with general support, or at least tentatively or clearly. And we're now hopeful, then, that those that have been the submitters or the leads for the different sessions can now meet—and we're happy to facilitate that—to try and work out either an overarching theme or a focus for that particular track. Like I said, we're hopeful that can happen. And, in particularly, we were quite conscious, obviously, that the CSG—Mason, Susan, and your colleagues—were not part of the call yesterday.

So, we just wanted to make sure this group understood and knew what the proposals were, the general themes, and that each of the suggested combinations for the representatives could go off and work on something that can be more concrete in the form of an overall session description per plenary, if that's helpful.

DAVID OLIVE: Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, thanks. So, it's sounding a little like it's a foregone conclusion. And if that's the case, then fine, I guess. I suppose my only reaction, and I've only seen these proposals, obviously, in the last couple of hours and so I haven't spent a huge amount of time. And I certainly haven't gotten any input from the IPC no it.

But the one that's about looking at things from the registrant perspective and understanding block lists, I haven't even appreciated until I just came on this call that that was actually being proposed as a

EN

sort of single topic. It seems to me that that's quite a stretch. To my mind, there doesn't seem to be a massive synergy between those two topics, and it seems more like they've been squished together in order to make a plenary because that way they would both get through.

Again, I'm not a proposer of either of those, so I obviously don't know the nuance of what the proposers are planning. And Ashley's saying in the chat that Jonathan Zuck can explain how they fit together because they don't fit together to me at the moment. And whilst I think both of them are potentially very interesting topics, I don't see how they work as a plenary. And maybe they both are something that are very interesting, single-topic sessions. But I'd love to hear how they fit together. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Would you like me to go, David or Tanzanica?

DAVID OLIVE: Please, Jonathan. [Yes, try it].

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, Susan, there definitely was an effort to try and find synergies on the call that took place yesterday to combine these. And so, Steinar from the At-Large who had originally proposed the session on block lists was talking about trying to have a whole panel of them, and his original idea was to try to understand why there was so much inconsistency from them. They reach different conclusions about different sites, etc.

And the original proposal on the registrant experience had more to do with data being out there, and it was just a way to bring part of that—what is it—block list provider problem for the end user component of it over to that discussion of data so that if you've had your website taken down and you don't understand why, getting some people to explain the rationales they use to put sites on block lists, etc., what you might do to get your site off of a block list.

It kind of operates on an assumption that you were put on a block list illegitimately as opposed to trying to come up with tricks and techniques for those that are actually engaged in DNS abuse. So, that was the synergy that we found by taking part of the block list provider topic and adding it into a topic that's, overall, talking about what the registrant experience is. Right?

Again, the organizing committee will flesh that out, and they may add the Transfer discussion since that's about to start. But that was sort of the thinking on the synergy. So, I don't know what you're thinking they are and why you think they don't match, but that was sort of the rationale behind blending them.

DAVID OLIVE: Ashley and then Susan. Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi there. Ashley here from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And Jonathan, I think, did a really good job. And I have to admit that I didn't see the synergy either until he talked about it yesterday. But I think this

is a really good opportunity to talk about how what we do here does have impact on the registrants.

And we don't always talk about that, and I think it's really helpful to think this through when we're developing policies because we often hear whether it's from the contracted parties' side or from the users of the data's side. But we often don't hear about the registrants' experience. So, I think it's really helpful to have these conversations. I see this as potentially something to talk about on an iterative basis depending on what policies we're talking about.

But, yeah, I think from the block list perspective, what happens if somebody's put on a block list and they don't know about it or they don't know how to get off of it. But I think from the WHOIS side, what people don't often understand when they actually register for a domain name and that information is made public, there are all kinds of interesting things that happen.

So, anyway, I'll stop there because I think Jonathan did a really good job explaining it. And thank you for doing that, Jonathan. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. Susan, please. Does it help?

SUSAN PAYNE: Well, it does. But I guess I now feel like I was pretty interested, and I think IPC members were pretty interested in the Reputation Block List proposal as it was originally proposed. And it feels to me like most of that has been lost now in the effort to make a synergy with the

registrant experience topic. And so, to my mind, what was attractive in the block list proposal is, to some extent, now gone.

I liked that proposal better as a stand-alone session. I felt that was genuinely informative and educational for the whole community. There's a lot of misunderstanding about what the block lists do and don't do. People have expectations of them that perhaps are unrealistic or unreasonable, and disappointments when what they're anticipating don't get met.

I felt it was genuinely a very educational and useful session, and it feels like that's been lost. And so, I don't feel that that merged plenary is one that's a positive. I think merging the two sessions has created something that's less positive. If anything, as I said, I think both of those topics had some merits and had some interest for some members of the community. And I think they could stand on their own. I don't think they stand together in a positive way.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. Mary, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

MARY WONG: Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Susan. I think that is very helpful feedback not just for staff, obviously, but for all the members and representatives in this planning group. We obviously understand that—if you recall that first meeting, the first production call—several people had not had the chance to really look at the proposals in any great detail. So, the feedback that you've just provided, again, is very helpful.

And as Jonathan Zuck is saying, there are a few options here. One is that there could be a stand-alone session that one of the groups could organize as part of their schedule. Obviously, it would then no longer be unconflicted, but there are things that we can try to do to give some flexibility. That's one option.

Another option is to see what the various proposers might come back with. And I apologize, Carlos. I don't recall what the timeline was that you had in mind, but that's a potential second option to see what it is that the groups can work out. And if there are topics or focus points that drop out, that could be something that this group says, "It's something that we want to keep on the list for the next meeting."

A third option could be something that we've mentioned previously, and that the smaller group of proposers also talked a little bit about yesterday, which is to look at the three tracks as a kind of miniseries and to have the focus at ICANN71 on one or more specific topics to be followed up by a different topic in ICANN72, or some combination like that.

So, I think what we were trying to do was to see if, for this meeting—given the topics that were proposed and given the willingness of all the proposers from the last call to try and work something out—was to have that flexibility to see if there are good options ahead here instead of just dropping some topics as we sometimes used to do and then leaving it to the groups to remember to repropose it next time. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Mary. Those are three possibilities, indeed. And, Susan, to your point that merging seeming to be less of interest, but there is still some interest that also could be built upon as a separate follow on by your group in your meetings or some of the other two options that Mary has talked about is a way forward on this.

Other comments, please?

TANZANICA KING:

David, while others are thinking and seeing if they have comments, I think, let's take a look to the next slide which has the planning calendar just so that you all can see. And, Carlos, do you want to speak to this at all?

CARLOS REYES:

Thanks, Tanzanica. Hi, everyone. Working with Mary and others on the Policy Team, we've organized the planning for plenary sessions for the last several ICANN public meetings. Here, working with Tanzanica, we've put together a timeline of what the planning would look like over the course of the next month, the month of May. So, basically, this week and next week we're expecting some of this consolidation to happen based on the discussion yesterday. And we'll identify the different teams that are interested in planning each plenary session, and we'll identify a standing time for the next five weeks or so.

And then the rest of the slide here, we outline roughly the agenda or the cadence of agendas for each week. So, the first planning call we typically focus on discussing the rationale and the desired outcomes of the

plenary session, and then we'll work with the teams to assign outreach for specific speakers. And we assign a due date.

The next three calls are really just refining the program and discussing details related to the flow and other program elements for each plenary session. We request draft slides so that we can have a dry run. And then, obviously, the meeting week itself.

So, this gives you a sense of how we organize planning for these plenary sessions. This process has worked pretty well over the last few meetings, and I think it has made it a little bit more predictable and manageable for everyone involved. So, hopefully, this gives you a better view of the next few weeks. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Carlos. Are there any other … I see the conversation is still going a bit in the chat. Are there any other comments about these consolidations? Do we need to actually have a voting process, or is this something that we can decide on today?

DAVID OLIVE: Well, thank you, Tanzanica. In light of the fact that we're going to hold onto topics that may or may not make it in one session of ICANN to another, there is that possibility that it's not the end of the discussion, especially if topics are themed and have a longer interest. If they don't fit in one, they could surely fit into another. And to that extent, this is a possible way forward.

Mary, please.

MARY WONG:

Thank you, David, and everyone. Just in the interest of trying to move things forward, and I note Ashley's comment in the chat, potentially merging topics is not necessarily the same thing as having a preference and voting on it.

I did ask a question in the chat before that, and people might want some time to reflect and to consult with the rest of their group, perhaps. Looking at the timeline that Carlos has, obviously we always run short of time, but perhaps we could ask that you provide additional comments on the list. And I'm going to say perhaps by Monday or Tuesday since, actually, the topic proposals haven't changed from the last call. There's nothing really new, although there are details now.

But in the meantime, we can try to facilitate those proposers with the three mergers and give them a chance to see what they come back with. And we can take this to the list, hopefully to try to close it out there in the absence of voting, if possible.

DAVID OLIVE:

I think that might be a way forward, and as Ashley points out, we're just not there yet. And, okay, fine. So, that might be the best way to handle it as we move on.

Looking at the topics, do we want to address the potentially fourth one that, of course, would be conflicted? And the fourth topic being the future of ICANN meetings after the COVID-19 pandemic.

TANZANICA KING:	Thanks, David. And with that one, we really just want to know if that is okay with everyone if we run that as a regular session so you would not have to attend it. Although, I bet most of you would like to. Susan says in the chat, "It's definitely a timely session and a good discussion to have."
	I see Sam in the chat asking if we could get a written version of some of the combined topic there. And that is something I think—Carlos, correct me if I'm wrong—one of the first things that needs to happen in your timeline.
CARLOS REYES:	Yes, correct. Thanks. Once we have the planning teams [ready for] plenary session, we ask them to revise the descriptions as needed to really focus on what the session will cover during the meeting if it may differ from the proposal.
TANZANICA KING:	So, at the moment we had an initial block schedule just showing the three plenary slots. And that's just based on what we've been doing most recently. If the future meetings topic is going to be a regular session versus a non-conflicted plenary, there is potential, if there's a desire to turn this instead of three, into four plenaries. I'm just responding to some of the thoughts in the chat.
	So, that is also another option. I know that's a challenge on that Wednesday just because of all the things that groups already have going on, but it's not something that's absolutely impossible. I feel like we

could do a quick count right now of who wants there to be four plenaries versus three, probably, and make that decision.

DAVID OLIVE: Noting the block schedule and people planning, maybe we should stay with the three. But it's up to what the group would like to do.

TANZANICA KING: Does anybody second the motion to go to four? How about that?

MARY WONG: Tanzanica, would the fourth one be on meetings, or would it be one of the other topics that might potentially get dropped? Sorry, I may have missed what you said.

TANZANICA KING: So, I think the suggestion in the chat was what would be the fourth. So, instead of consolidating, maybe they should be two, I think. [I'm just going] back in the chat.

MARY WONG: Okay, so basically—and forgive me for jumping in, but I'm conscious of time. So, basically, we're talking about one plenary on governmental regulatory developments, WHOIS and cybersecurity, if the GAC and the CSG can come back with something. Another one on registrant protections with the same caveat. A third on the multistakeholder

model Internet governance—forgive the shorthand. And a fourth one on RBL, Reputation Block List?

TANZANICA KING: That was my understanding in the chat, but others can jump in if that's the suggestion because I am scrolling and scrolling and I cannot find it back in the chat.

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

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks. That seems like too many. This is a four-day meeting, and then we've also got the meeting planning session as well which, okay, isn't going to be a plenary. But as we've all acknowledged, lots of people are going to want to attend. So, they probably are going to be trying to make the time to go to that and trying not to run too many sessions that conflict with it.

In a four-day meeting, that sounds like four plenaries and one extra that isn't a plenary but that most people are going to want to attend. That seems like too much. I think we should do our normal voting process—if we were going to go down that path—and stick with three and we vote for them.

TANZANICA KING: So, David, I think, to get us past this—I know we have some other topics to cover—we can set up a voting form like we usually do. The question is, what's going to be included to vote on? Are we voting on the three consolidated versus separating one of the consolidated topics and the total number? We can certainly set it up that way.

DAVID OLIVE: I think that's a good approach.

TANZANICA KING: Okay.

DAVID OLIVE: Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, David. I just wanted to raise that there is a plenary planning session next week where it is actually looking very much at that whole what's to me merged, and this is a perfect discussion on basically what Lyman and I thought that's where that final decision about what the actual merging or merged topics were going to be. And then we could make a decision.

But I know that that's the forerunner to this meeting, and there is obviously a lot more that needs to be discussed in order to look at which ones are going to be the merged ones.

But I was thinking that, for example, Steinar's suggestion as a topic, I can't see that as being a plenary topic. The decision at the next planning meeting would be which are the ones that are going to be merged, and what can the planning group bring to this meeting that we can actually make a decision about what goes forward? I'm probably getting myself all confused now, but thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks, Maureen. Mary.

MARY WONG: Thanks, David and Maureen and everyone. And looking at the comments in the chat and the feedback today, in the interest of time, I'm just going to suggest and I'm going to talk the liberty of speaking on behalf of Tanzanica and Carlos as well. But why don't the three of us take the comments and the feedback—we heard everyone—and come back to you all as soon as we can, hopefully by tomorrow, with a suggestion of what the poll might look like to try and give you some clear options so that we can close this out hopefully fairly quickly?

And hopefully, the vote will be quite conclusive because we also know that everyone does want to finalize the schedule, and it is important to know what's conflicted and what's non-conflicted, how many sessions, and when.

DAVID OLIVE: Very good. Maureen, is that another hand or an old hand?

MAUREEN HILYARD:	Sorry. It's an old hand.

DAVID OLIVE:	Thank you. We will proceed to quickly come back with a proposal to the group as well, and noting in the chat the session that would be on the future of the ICANN meeting face-to-face would be at a time that hopefully is not going to be too conflicting to others. And with that, we'll get back to you and make sure that we have the other groups talking about what final decision to propose for us to look at in the next session. So with that, thank you very much.
	Could we now move to the next part of the agenda? If I could ask Sally Newell Cohen to talk to us about the community feedback on the potential session with the ICANN Org Executive Team. And that's Sally and others, with your contributions, please. Sally.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN:	Thank you, David. Hi, everyone. So, on the last call, the topic surfaced about the Executive Q&A and potential different formats for how we could do this, and specifically an e-mail from Susan about looking at ways to make it more Q&A based than presentation based. And that makes complete sense.
	What we wanted to do is ask for some feedback from you because I think there's a way we can do this, certainly either by pre-submitted questions or looking at another model. But I think the most important thing that we'd like to talk with you about today and get your feedback

on is what are the types of information that would be important to you? What would make this a meaningful session? I know it's not presentations, but are there specific types of updates you'd like to hear more about? So, it's really questions as opposed to presenting ideas, but does anyone have anything they'd to share or would like to hear about in a session from the Executive Team?

DAVID OLIVE: In many ways it could be similar to the suggesting of a topic or topics for the Board, I guess, when you mean with them. So, it could be a similar way. So, if the discussion is framed and we can have some idea of how best to address and talk about that as a conversation.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay. Let me ask a different question. Oh, Susan, go ahead.

DAVID OLIVE: Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Well, maybe I'll let you ask the different question first and then I'll come back.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: No. You know what? I'd rather you just answer the first ones because I might hold the second one. So, go ahead, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:
Well, this is really off the top of my head. At any point in time, there will be things that are priorities or things that have been taken forward. Obviously, they're the sort of things that we talk to the Board about, but frequently it's actually the staff who are really doing it.

So, thinking about DNS abuse, for example, there was a whole host of tasks that were handed to staff by the Board to progress various cost benefit analyses, gap analyses, studies, and so on. And there's rarely an opportunity for a kind of deep dive on something like that.

Something like Operational Design Phases are very new, so it may be that this particular time around it's too soon for that, but I could imagine that people would have questions about that kind of process and what's going on and how is it working?

What else? Coming back to DNS abuse again, there was a question—a colleague of mine, in fact, raised it at ICANN70 with the Board—which was around the fund that Verisign had committed to be used for address DNS abuse and what's the plan for that? What's happening with that? Those are just off the top of my head.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN:
Yeah. That's helpful. I think those are good topics to start to get us thinking about what would be important. So, the question that I was going to ask next in tandem is, to what David alluded to, treating it kind of like the constituency days and actually submitting those questions

ahead of time so that we know what you're looking to know most about and then can be prepared for that.

Is there an appetite for that with this group to be able to supply questions to us in advance? And I see that Nigel said yes, that he felt like the GAC could come up with other ideas. Is this reasonable for the other groups as well?

Thanks, Susan. Okay. Well, I think what we'll do is propose a structure for this and how it can happen and how we can go through the process to solicit your questions with adequate time for us to prepare the session itself and prepare feedback.

Okay. All right. Well, thank you for this. If you think of anything else, I know that you know the channels to communicate it out to us. But I think that's how we'll proceed.

David, anything you would add to that?

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. I think here we're trying to address the issues of trying to keep it more interactive. The point about the aspects of things that might be more operational that Org does that we can explain more fully. I think that's also good. And it could be, indeed, I think an informative and good session.

Again, it doesn't have to be non-conflicted in that sense, but I think it would be a helpful and useful session for everyone. And to have your input would be, of course, the best way to inform it and make sure it addresses your requests and topics. Good.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay. Thanks, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Other comments? Thanks, Susan and Nigel for those comments. Thank you, Sally.

With that, we will move to any other questions related to scheduling conflicts or the topics as a bit of an AOB. Tanzanica, do you … ?

TANZANICA KING: No. I just would remind everyone that we are taking session requests right now. As soon as we have a first draft of the schedule, I will send it out to make sure that you can take a look for any unforeseen conflicts and make sure we get those corrected. Otherwise, everything seems to be going pretty smoothly with the initial requests that we've received.

DAVID OLIVE: All right, thank you. Seeing no other hands or questions, we could move to the last item of the agenda, which is closing and wrap up which I hope I can get some of this right, but I'll try.

So, I thank you very much for the preliminary work within the various proposers of topics for the plenary sessions. And that effort will continue. We'll come back with some other ideas and suggestions of how that might progress forward in terms of the numbers, looking at three but it might be more.

We also see the interest in the topic on the future of the ICANN meetings post-COVID. That would be a regular session, and we hope that would be able to be worked in at a convenient time spot with the least amount of conflict.

You are proceeding on with your block schedule. Please go ahead and do that.

Thank you for your comments about how best to format an ICANN Executive Team session with you in terms of either topics of interest to discuss in advance or questions in areas that could be a more of an interactive but managed approach so that we know that people could be prepared to answer the questions or comment on the topics that you have suggested. And that could be, then, hopefully fitted in at a regular time as well.

In terms of the technical aspects, we are discussing that the services provided for ICANN70, we'll be looking at, we'll be continuing, obviously, in ICANN71. And we'll have a better and more detailed information for you at the next session to remind you of those services such as RTT and interpretation; and also to hear if you have any comments or questions on how that went for you in ICANN70 as we proceed to roll out those services that we had for breakout sessions and the like.

With that, any other comments? Sally, would you care for any final remarks?

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you all, everybody. I think we've moved on very well. Appreciate the input.

DAVID OLIVE: If there are no other comments or questions at this stage, I will be happy to give back a few precious moments to all of you. With that, we'll be following up on the topics, including the organization and selections of the plenaries and get back to you shortly.

With that, I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, or good morning, where you may be. Talk to you soon. Thank you very much for your time and attention.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]