DAVID OLIVE:

Welcome, everyone, to this call for the planning for ICANN72, the Annual General Meeting that we will be having in October. And so, here is the agenda for today as we start this planning process, as we do for each of our ICANN meetings. Provide some opening remarks soon. We'll then see what are the supporting organizations or advisory committee priorities for ICANN72. If you'd like to share those at this stage, that would be great.

But surely onward, as we plan our work. We'll have a review of the block schedule and the deadlines that Tanzanica King will provide us with. And then, we'll look at the ICANN72 plenary topic suggestions thanks to the work of Tanzanica, Carlos, and Mary to help facilitate your work in selecting as well as implementing and organizing those. And then, any other business. If we are in agreement with this agenda, let's proceed.

Seeing no objections, we will move forward as stated. As you know, on the 15th of July, the board announced its decision to hold ICANN72 as a virtual annual meeting and affirmed its intent to hold ICANN73 as a hybrid meeting with an in-person component if feasible to do so. The board also has encouraged ICANN Org in coordination with you to see if there could be pilot projects to start hosting smaller in-person or hybrid community meetings before the end of 2021. And much of this was found in the board resolution which we shared with you and we move forward.

But in terms of the overview for the Org and possibly the board priorities for ICANN72, which are closely linked to your work, I think there are a number of points I want to really make. One, as we all know,

we have to be mindful of having just priority sessions for the largest number of parliament, cross-community, so that they could be involved in that. We have gone through this virtual meeting iteration many times and I think that this is an area that we also have to be careful in planning ICANN72.

Again, it goes without saying but I want to make it known, there is the burden of the time zone difference. We'll be in the Pacific Coast Seattle time zone for ICANN72 and, to that extent, we have to be aware of the impacts of our community members located elsewhere, on how that can help or hinder their participation, as well as the Org servicing of such sessions.

Thirdly, I guess we have to note that this is an Annual General Meeting and there are certain requirements for that: change of leaderships, elections, new positions being filled, and the like. And those processes have to be completed, as well, as part of the Annual General Meeting. We also need to be aware of how best you want to interact with the board and the constituency day is traditionally the way that is done, though we have modified that. We're being flexible on that so it does not have to fall, necessarily, within the ICANN meeting timeframe.

But again, that's something we might want to think about for your choices on that. And to that extent, these are some of the main kinds of ideas and concerns for the Org and the board as they move forward to make sure that they can best accommodate and make sure that ICANN72 meets the objectives that you want and that we all want for our various policy development, advice development, and general work

for the community that normally would take place at an Annual General Meeting.

So, with that, I will stop there, and thank you for this time and your attention, and move to the second item on the agenda: any comments on your preferences or priorities as we move into the planning for ICANN72? I open the floor for any comments there. Okay. We can always come back to that as AOB or when you raise your hand. That's not a problem. Let's then move to the ... I'm sorry. Alejandra, please.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi, everyone. Hi, David. Sorry for the late raising the hand. I was looking only at the ...

DAVID OLIVE: That's all right. Time delay in the [bottom].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Well, just to share a little bit, we have had a meeting with the Meetings Program Committee right before this one and we agreed on the meetings that we would like to see in ICANN72. It's still very fresh, so it's still in the discussion. But just to give you a preview, we are setting up our ccTLD news that are always a top priority for us and we might have a focus on Internet governance in one of those. And we are also seeking to build a session on the potential role of the ccNSO in DNS abuse. As always, we will have tech day, a joint meeting with the board. And that's it for now. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Alejandra. Very good. Any other comments at this stage? So, surely you are going to be consulting, I'm sure. Manal, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, David. As you rightly mentioned, we are yet to be consulting on the agenda but, again, our priorities normally revolve around the communities' priorities, subsequent rounds, and relevant operational design phase, the SSAD and the relevant operational design phase. Also, the protection of IGOs and the Work Stream 2 accountability implementation. And any relevant discussions on DNS abuse, I'm sure the GAC would be interested, as well. But also, we have the elections of our vice-chairs during the Annual General Meeting, as well.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. An excellent overview, as always, of the priorities and work of the GAC, including, as we know, AGM's ... The elections of officers. So, thank you for that sharing, as well. Anyone else? Fine. Good. Not your last chance, obviously, but we'll move to the next item on the agenda. Tanzanica, would you take us through a review of the ICANN72 block schedule?

TANZANICA KING: Yes. Thank you, David, and hi, everyone. We can go ahead and advance to the next slide. So, I know that this conversation is sort of ongoing already, but, looking back at last year's AGM, remembering that it turned into what some people called a "three-week meeting." And the

reason for that was that all of the virtual meetings really have been limited to four days. That seems to be the maximum that people can handle being at home and having ... Whether it's e-mail, or colleagues, or family, the audience is in their own environment with different priorities and distractions.

So, as a general rule, we know that we need to keep the virtual meetings much shorter and typically not up to the six days that we would normally do for an AGM. So, that said, you're looking right now at two examples, one showing a four-day block schedule and one showing five days. I know that there also seems to be a pretty strong preference to avoid the weekends, which would include Friday because you'll end up ... It will be Saturday for somebody or a lot of people.

So, this is just something really important for us to finalize so that we know, what are the official dates going to be? I know there are a lot of different ideas about what might be able to be held outside of the official dates, so there is also the question of, do you have internal working sessions that might be held either in prep week or at some other time? We can accommodate additional things that are outside of the official week, going into the calendar. I know that that came up during the round table. So, that is not an issue.

But looking at the need for fewer days while accommodating all of your goals for the meeting, can we confirm a four versus five days? And then, after that, we can discuss ... And I think I saw Mary put in the chat that we are going to continue working with our board ops colleagues to see what's possible, if there is a desire to schedule meetings with the board

outside of the official dates. The way that these block schedules are shown, I've actually included nine slots for those in the actual week.

So, it's doable. But if your priorities are such that you'd prefer to have your group meet with the board outside then we can have that discussion in working with the board to see if that's a possibility. So, I'm looking for hands from anyone to say yay or nay on a four versus five-day schedule, or any other comments you may have.

DAVID OLIVE: We see in the chat Manal's comment about Friday being already that weekend, and that is true for other parts of our global community. So, that's important, to see that. Thank you, Manal, for that comment.

NICK TOMASSO: Eduardo is voting for a four-day schedule in the chat.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Nick. I see Susan Payne. Please, you have your hand up. Susan, and then Manal. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, hi. It's Susan from the IPC, although these are largely personal comments at the moment because, obviously, I haven't had that much opportunity to consult with the constituency yet. But based on feedback from previous meetings, I think, one thing I think that we would all find very helpful is, if there is a move to have some of the board meetings

happen outside of the meeting week, at the last ICANN71 meeting, they tended then not to be visible in the schedule.

And I think at previous meetings, perhaps the one prior to that, the meeting schedule was sort of extended to show those sorts of meetings that took place outside of the official week so that those who wanted to attend one of those meetings, perhaps for a constituency or stakeholder group that they weren't in but they were interested in listening in, were able to find that information very easily and do so. For ICANN71, it was not so easy. So it's a request, really, to move back to that much more visible process of including it with the schedule, recognizing that it's not during the official week but it might be a week, or two weeks later, or a week before.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Susan. I understand that. And it's also, then, if you're not having it within that ICANN block ... The scheduling is also a challenge, as well, but I take your point about making sure that it's well-publicized and well-known to those groups, not only that's part of, let's say, the IPC, but again because they're open and available to anyone who wants to listen in, that that be done. So, thank you very much. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, David. First, agreeing also with the point Susan made on the publicity of meetings taking place outside of the ICANN week. Again, like Susan, I still need to consult with the GAC. We haven't had this discussion before. But judging by previous experience, I know the GAC would like to concentrate all meetings during the meeting week,

including our bilateral with the board. But again, question would be whether ... If this means a fifth day, including Friday, would this be okay? Or would the GAC rather have something outside the meeting week? So, this is the question I intend to pose to the GAC. But at least, as a general principle, we tend to concentrate everything during the four days of the meeting week.

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

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thanks very much. [inaudible].

DAVID OLIVE: Nigel, you're breaking up. We can't understand what you're saying.

NIGEL HICKSON: [inaudible].

DAVID OLIVE: Nigel, we lost you. If it's easier, you can put it into the chat. I'm happy to read your comment. In the meantime, let's go to Nick, maybe as another commentary or a response to some things. Nick, please.

NICK TOMASSO: Yeah. Thank you, David, and thank you, all. I just want to say that I noted the concerns you raised during the SOAC roundtable about not having

visibidy to sessions that took place outside of the meeting week. I've discussed that with Tanzanica and my technical team and was assured that we have a workaround for that and that, moving forward, all of those sessions will be on the public schedule.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, nick. Very helpful clarification, I appreciate that. And the need to kind of make sure that people are aware of and can participate in it, both from the various stakeholder constituency groups or anyone, generally. Jonathan, you're next, and then Sébastien. Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, David. Jonathan Zuck here from the ALAC. I guess we've come to view these virtual meetings as valuable on two fronts. One is for internal discussions, the broader availability of interpretation. And so, certainly, the objective of the ALAC is to get as broad a participation as possible to take advantage of those additional resources that are available to us, specifically during ICANN meetings. So, as far as our own internal discussions, and consensus-building, and efforts, we hope to bring as many people as possible to that and continue to try and leverage the tools that allow for greater participation.

So, I'm thankful that we have been able to do, in the last sessions ... Make use of breakout rooms and things like that so that, when 300 people show up to a session, there is a way to have a greater participation. I think we'll try to continue to experiment with whatever tools are available to us in that regard and do more polling, etc., to get a broader perspective in some of our internal discussions.

And then, the other benefit to these meetings is just that everybody is focused on them. And so, we're primarily focused on cross-community discussions that need to take place because the natural effect of all of this lockdown has been more siloing, I think, in the community, and the meetings represent an opportunity for discussions that the community as a whole really needed to have and compromises that need to be reached.

And so, that's sort of where our focus is for these meetings. I think we're inclined to have the board with the bilateral meetings in particular outside of the ICANN schedule, at the board meeting, and be more focused on things in which multiple constituencies are involved. Just some thoughts. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Jonathan. I appreciate that. Part of what we were talking about earlier on the priorities of the focus. That's very helpful. Sébastien, if I could, I see Nigel's face. Maybe he wants to make his comment since he was in line, then we'll go to you, Sébastien. Nigel, let's see if your microphone connection is working any better.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thanks very much. Can you hear me?

DAVID OLIVE: Unfortunately poorly, but please proceed. Let's see if that improves.

NIGEL HICKSON:	Yeah, probably, I'll give up and just use the chat. I'm very sorry.
DAVID OLIVE:	Good. You were going to support the transparency point by Susan and also ask that ... What we lose by a four-day option if we can do odd meetings outside the schedule. And I think we have talked about that, as well, that there can be ways to reschedule and be flexible for those additional sessions. Sébastien, please.
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thanks very much, David. I just wanted to underline a few points that Jonathan just explained, but I want to be sure that when we talk about tools for interpretation it's not the fact that we have interpretation because we used to have those tools. But outside of an ICANN meeting, unfortunately, we have not embedded the interpretation tool into the Zoom room, and that's a pity now that we have used that during the ICANN meeting. We would like to be able to use it every time.

But particularly, if we are doing some session outside of the ICANN meeting and they are marketed as an ICANN meeting, I hope that the tool will be available. That's one point. And the second is that I really support, also, the fact that we need to have as much as possible cross-community sessions, more than in-house sessions. Because I guess we can always organize the meeting for our own members but it's more difficult to have one point of coordination and the ICANN meeting could be a good one.

Therefore, I would like very much that we push that, and maybe having an additional plenary session could be one way, also, to have that done. Now, regarding the four or five days, as anyhow it will be middle of my night, frankly, I think we need to see what we want to achieve and then how many times we need. If we need five days, just take five days. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:
Thank you, Sébastien. That's absolutely correct, to focus on what we need to accomplish at the time and see if that is doable within the four or the five days, though we've heard some of the disadvantages of the fifth day as that's a weekend for others. But I thank you for your comment.

In terms of the interpretation of all of the UN languages that we provide and using that to the Zoom, of course, that makes a distinction for the ICANN public meetings, and that is the hallmark of that because of the additional services and technology involved with that. And to the extent that we use interpretation for other meetings, that's really a matter of resources, and planning, and also the demand. So, I thank you for your comments. Tanzanica, any other comments you want to add to this?

TANZANICA KING:
So, I would just add that part of ... Something that should be considered when it comes to scheduling things outside of the meeting is just how that works out for all participants and attendees. So, I have heard comments in the past where people are ... I'm sensing some frustration of, how long is this meeting? And for everybody, it's not necessarily

feasible. So, I would suggest that the official meeting week should have the sessions that are most conducive to have broad participation.

So, whatever those sessions may be … And I know typically those are often the ones with the most services, including the interpretation and all of that. So, I would just say that it would be good to focus on anything that's going to be moved out of the meeting week, be something that is typically attended just by the committee or something that's not necessarily expected to have broad participation.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks very much. I think Mary and then Alejandra. Mary.

[MARY WONG:]   Thank you, David. Actually, this will be quick because Tanzanica pretty much said what I was going to say. I was going to try and link it back to the publication of the sessions on the schedule. Because when we started—and David, you noted this in your opening remarks—one of the reasons why we encourage you all as leaders to share information about your group's priorities is so that we can ensure that we have the appropriate meeting duration.

And because we've heard the feedback about preventing the three-week meeting, as Tanzanica has on this slide. And so, obviously, while it is certainly open to all groups to have meetings off-schedule, as it were, from the Org perspective it probably will be very important to be very clear from each group's perspective not just which meetings are officially part of ICANN72 and which are not but why.

And Tanzanica has just offered one potential distinguishing feature. Because then, when we publish the schedule, including all these other meetings, we don't get the feedback that, "Oh, here's another three-week meeting," and that's a very serious consideration. And like I said, this translates also to how we publish details for the off-schedule meetings. As Nick says, there is a solution. But just to be consistent and to have that clarity, especially for community members that are not involved in the planning as you are. Thanks, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Mary. Alejandra, please.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you. Well we, the ccNSO, have a couple of sessions that are outside the ICANN meeting week. Not because we think they are not part of the ICANN meeting. We do. It is because since we went full remote we didn't want to have really long days in our week in ICANN. And those are, for example, the ccTLD news that I mentioned previously. Those are one of our most beloved sessions and our community looks forward to them. But what we have been also seeing is that they are losing visibility now because if they are not in schedule then other people don't get to know that this is happening.

So, I was wondering if having these sessions in the schedule ... What would that entail? For example, we were just looking to have them there so people actually are aware, but would that mean that people will need to register well in advance to get access to the links and all these things that come with the ICANN current schedule, or will they just be posted

there and we can continue just to show that we have this session and that's it? That's my question. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Alejandra. If one of my colleagues wishes to comment? Because that's an important part about the registration element.

TANZANICA KING: Yes, I can comment on it.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: There is some consideration right now, or discussions, I should say, about whether we can remove the lock, so to speak, on the schedule. But right now, that's still just a discussion. And Josh, I know you're on the call. Feel free to jump in and correct me on any of this. But at the moment, yes, it would mean that anybody who wants to access the schedule would need to register to be able to see it, particularly because we wouldn't ... Normally, what happens now is that, at the end of the meeting, we unlock it.

So, anybody who goes to look at transcripts or do anything at that point when the meeting is over, we no longer need to require that registration aspect. But if we kept everything on the schedule, it would still have to remain locked so that we could post the URLs within 24 hours, as we

have been doing. So, that doesn't mean that we're not going to figure out a way to avoid that, because that would be much better, if we can just unlock it. So, Josh and I will work on that. If it's just a few sessions, it may just mean that we do that part manually. And so, it could be very easy to do. But that is on our minds.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Alejandra. Good point. Thank you, Tanzanica, that we are obviously looking at that, concerned about that, and how best to manage it in an easy, accessible way for people and move that forward. Very good, thank you. Other comments? Tanzanica, would you want to have a summary at this stage? Eduardo, excuse me. Ah, a plus. Thank you. Please.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you hear me?

DAVID OLIVE: Yes I can, thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes. In terms of this thing about locking and unlocking at the end, there was a point that ICANN was simul-casting some of these events through YouTube and those things are there instantly for people to look at. You

don't have to wait until the end of the week to do or check X and Y plenary or meeting to do whatever you need to do. But I noticed that that stopped and that's another way of doing it, that people can reach the meeting without registering, or if they want to check something out and don't want to wait until the end. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Eduardo. Any other comments? I see from our discussion we seem to be tending toward the four-day meeting, though you were going to go back and, obviously, consult with your various stakeholder constituency and community groups. But again, trying to avoid that Friday and the weekend overlap, as well as to focus the attention on key or priority sessions within the four days, and that may mean, yes, an interaction with the board, or no, an interaction with the board outside of that four-day period, and other combinations.

But at this stage, I think that's what I'm hearing. And of course, we want to hear more from you as you go back and look at the priorities you want to accomplish and what your community is saying on the sessions that need to be had. Noting that we were trying to—and we will at the best of our ability—make sure that they're well-publicized and easily accessed so that, again, they can be part of the records and involved in the totality of the work of ICANN, both at an ICANN public meeting and all the work that you do outside of that. Tanzanica, any last words?

TANZANICA KING: Just that if we need time to go back to your groups, great. We will push to get this finalized as soon as possible so that we can start contracting

and doing all the things we need to do to make sure that we're technically set up to run the meeting. So, we'll bug you in an e-mail, probably within 24 hours, and a deadline to say for sure whether we want to keep this at four days or five. And I'll leave it at that.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. You're making an important point that we do need your decision on this sooner rather than later because it helps with the arrangement of the [services] but also for you and your groups to understand how best to position their work now, in advance of, and during the ICANN72. So, thank you very much. With that, we'll move to the next item on the agenda, which relates to the plenary topic selection. Here, again, Tanzanica added with Mary and Carlos to talk about the various groups and discussions and how to move that forward. Do I turn it over to you, Tanzanica, or Mary?

TANZANICA KING: Sure, I can.

DAVID OLIVE: Please.

TANZANICA KING: I can kick this topic off. So, we can go ahead and go to the next slide. We received six total topic proposals. Hopefully some of you, at least, had a chance to look at those that we sent out yesterday. Also, so all of you know, I sent these slides that we're looking at to the list just minutes

ago, in case you need to view this much bigger, as I do. So, what I think we want to do is just quickly allow the submitters to introduce their proposals so that we can hopefully get some feedback from the group or answer questions and see where this takes us. So, the first one I'm going to hand it over to Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tanzanica. Because we were doing our own brainstorming internally about sessions that we thought might be useful for the community to take on, a little bit of a series kind of took hold, which is taking a little bit of the unfinished business from subsequent [procedures work], and divide that up into some bitesize chunks, and getting some conversations going. We did a session that I think wasn't a plenary but was an At-Large session two meetings ago on applicant support that I think went pretty well and was a good beginning to that conversation in terms of both priorities.

So, the next thing that sort of came to us was this idea of closed generics, which is particularly interesting because the Subsequent Procedures Working Group charter basically stated that whatever there wasn't consensus to change would default back to the previous Applicant Guidebook and to the established policy prior to the Subsequent Procedures. And this is a strange case in that there really isn't a pre-established policy.

While the previous Applicant Guidebook allowed for closed generics, the GAC advice at the time kind of put a halt to it and demanded a kind of public interest filter for those closed generics, and everybody just kind

of switched. And so, we have an interesting situation where we have unfortunately handed this to the board to make a compromise, and I think ideally they would push it back on the community.

And we have a new board coming, and so it seemed like a good conversation to get out in the open and out of the small teams that we're discussing [in Subsequent Procedures] and kind of through the topic of closed generics, and pros and cons, and what we ought to do; what the default should be, if you will, for a new round. So, I'm happy to answer questions about that. I just wanted to zip through that quickly and give you a sense. Any questions about that? Okay. Oh, Susan Payne. Go, sorry.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah. Thanks, Jonathan, for this. I suppose I'm interested to understand how you feel this session will move the discussion forward. Given that the Subsequent Procedures Working Group worked for five years and this topic was on their radar for five years ... I accept, obviously, clearly, not discussed in every meeting multiple times a week for five years but was discussed extensively, was subject to at least two public comments, possibly three. I don't have the figures to the top of my head at the moment.

And toward the end, after we'd had the draft final report, the feedback was specifically targeted to this and a small number of other issues as a priority. And working group, by this point, spent multiple sessions, and meetings, and weeks talking about this topic with various proposals coming from different parts of the community and being unable to

reach a consensus. So, I'm just wondering what you think the value of a plenary would be on this, bearing in mind that the range of community perspectives have all been aired. It's just that they continue to be a range of perspectives with no meeting of the minds.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Susan. I understand your frustration on this. I guess I'm taking a step back from the processes of the Subsequent Procedures. Absent the community continuing to discuss this, we're basically asking a new board to somehow do the work that we have failed to do as a community, and that feels like the wrong outcome.

And so, I guess what I see as a possibility is more people engaged in a live conversation about this, as opposed to work group meetings and public comments that have kind of a limited input, generally. I don't know whether it will move the ball or not but I guess I feel fairly strongly that it's the community's responsibility to move that ball and that abdication of that responsibility to the board is not the right answer.

So, I don't know. I don't know the answer, as far as what could be accomplished, except more people out in the open talking about it at once. Because I don't see any reason why a new board would be in any better position to find a compromise position than we are. I feel like it's still our work to do.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Susan and Jonathan. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, David. Frankly, it's more of a general comment and not specifically to this proposal. I was going to suggest that, if feasible, it would be good to provide an expected timeframe for any input to help us if all proposals are equally good, and timely, and hot topics, and qualifies for face-to-face—I mean for cross-community discussions—then maybe the timeframe would be a factor that helps our decision. If something is more pressing, or more urgent, or needs some input by a certain deadline, it would be helpful to clarify this to allow us, as a final resort, in making decisions or prioritizing.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Manal. Just a time check. We have 15 minutes still remaining for our program and we want to make sure we get through the plenary topics. Any other comments on the At-Large proposal on closed generics? Okay. Tanzanica, shall we move to the next topic suggested?

TANZANICA KING: We should, definitely.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: So, the next one. Joanna, I haven't seen. I assume she's on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Tanzanica, I don't think she's on the call, so I will do my best. Joanna is sort of the intellectual powerhouse of the At-Large so I'm sure I won't do it justice. But as is often the case with Joanna's topics, she's attempting to bridge a conversation inside and outside the ICANN community on various topics. This one being DNS abuse, looking at various regimes for platform liability and other DNS abuse discussions that are happening inside governments at the same time that they're happening inside the ICANN community and allocation of effort, and responsibility, and coordination to prevent too much fragmentation in expectations.

And I'm sure she will do a better job of representing that but that was sort of the idea, getting a broad group of folks, including the domains and jurisdiction folks that have been dealing with this. Some folks in the government sector, Graeme from the fairly newly minted DNS Abuse Institute, etc., to Brian, because there's a new PIR framework on this, and trying to blend these things together and find where the commonalities are and where the differences might be.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks, Jonathan, for channeling your colleague. Sam, please.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, David and Jonathan. Thank you or walking us through that topic. I just have to straight-out object to this topic as a plenary session, and a big reason for that is ... And I'm trying to speak not only on behalf of the registries but on behalf of the contracted parties as a whole. And I hope Ashley's here. I didn't scroll through but if Ashley is here I'd invite her to chime in, as well.

The contracted parties have really put a lot of effort of the last year, maybe year-and-a-half at this point, to keep the conversation and the community-wide discussions on DNS abuse, including the question of how to tackle, and mitigate, and work on DNS abuse. Really tightly focused on DNS security threats and the things that are, A, within ICANN's remit to enforce, and B, within the power of registries and registrars to really effectively address.

And so, this, to see this discussion, this proposed discussion, that would really blur the lines between technical security threat mitigation and content moderation. I think it's exactly the opposite direction of where the contracted parties have been trying to take these discussions. I think every time we conflate these two things that's where there is just tons of disagreement and we don't really end up getting anywhere or moving forward.

So, I will also note that the contracted parties are planning, for now—I think it's the third or fourth meeting in a row—to have an engagement session around the topic of DNS abuse and the work that's being done within the Contracted Parties House to address the topic, to mitigate instances of abuse. So, it certainly will be part of the agenda for the meeting but I just ... On behalf of the registries, I can't support this session as it has been proposed. Sorry to be very dramatic but I wanted to make that crystal clear.

DAVID OLIVE: Good to have your clear point of view and that of the registries, as well. But now, I see Ashley is also on. So, please, Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hey, there. First, can you hear me? I'm on a really bad headset today.

DAVID OLIVE: Yes, we can.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can hear you fine.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay, good. Well, I won't be as dramatic as Sam, which I don't think she was all that dramatic, actually. I'd have to echo her concerns. And just to add to that, it's not clear that the speakers that are being proposed are appropriate, either, considering the subject matter that's really, here, not so much DNS abuse in a sense of how it is commonly defined. But they're not aware of this proposal, either, so I think they're running into the risk ... Well, not the risk, but I don't want to call it a trap. Something that has happened in the past where proposals are put forward with speakers who are not only not aware of their being proposed to be speakers but also, at the end of the day, aren't always even supportive of the proposal.

So, I just want to urge people to be a bit careful when they're putting together these proposals. If you're including speakers, to make sure that it has been socialized with those who are proposed, because I think it gives a misimpression, potentially, that these folks are supportive of being included but also of the proposal itself. So, that's it. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Ashley. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Sébastien Bachollet from EURALO. It's always a question of who is [chicken of the eggs]. And then, you can ask people to come to a session if, three days later, we say, "Oh, there is no session. It's always difficult with some of the people." But I need to say that it's a follow-up of what has happened in mostly round-table by EURALO in July and it will be followed by something during IGF.

Therefore, I think the idea of Joanna is to have something more specific to discuss within ICANN to allow this, and broader than just one monthly round table, and to be ready for the IGF. Therefore, I understand what both speakers previously say, but take into account that, on the part of the community, I have a different point of view, and, therefore, discussion could be useful. And I am sure that Joanna is doing that in good faith. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sébastien. Other comments? Good to hear, thank you, Ashley, about a good IGF session but not an ICANN one, and also that the ICANN Org is probably considering some information webinars, as well, so that we don't want to duplicate the efforts. Any other comments, here? Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Sorry, but your comments, yes, of course. But when we have a discussion within ICANN, it's not the same as doing it in IGF. Therefore, it's not one or the other from our point of view, and I guess from Joanna's point of view. Proposal, it's to be both and to try to bring the idea of what's within ICANN/we think are the boundaries to take that to the IGF. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sébastien. Noting the time, shall we move to the next session? Tanzanica?

TANZANICA KING: Yes, let's do that. So, the third one we are going to hear from Marita. We'll quickly hand it over to you. Go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Hey, yes. Thank you, I hope I can be heard okay. This particular session is kind of something that is out there. It is actually in the FY 22 Operating Plan. It's an activity that's proposed, there, which says, "Community to decide whether the proposed public interest framework can be used to demonstrate how specific recommendations, advice, and public comments are in the global public interest."

Now, I know that some while ago we did a survey about the global public interest and that that whole agenda, if I can call it that, is now there. It's being used. Not totally sure how well the community understands this and how well they understand how it's being implemented. So, the proposal is to bring this discussion out in the open

and actually implement this activity, which is proposed already, in the FY 22 Operating Plans, and just have a discussion about community comfort with the way it's going, and produce more understanding about it, and also explore, maybe, possible other uses for such a tool.

Now, full disclosure, I have not asked Avri whether or not she would do this. She is the board shepherd on this. But you know, before it's even accepted, I guess I just didn't ... I think it's an opportunity for us to discuss this. I think there could be a high level of interest because this affects everyone. In the end, when decisions are made, if it's put under this particular magnifying glass, we should understand exactly what that is. So, that's the proposal. I'm open to questions.

DAVID OLIVE: Any comments or questions on Marita's proposed plenary? Noting that the board member, Avri Doria, who is the lead, might ... Her availability and interest is important, obviously. And the notion of having the public interest guidelines and/or concept/framework be better understood and better explained, so that's fine. Ashley, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hey, sorry. Yeah. Not an expression of objection or support, but just curious: is this just to socialize the existing effort or is this seeking to do something different? Only because I think, if we're looking at the public interest writ large and what different people mean by it, there are many different perspectives that could be articulated here.

And just calling upon registrars, we believe we look out for the public interest, as well, to a certain extent, because largely the public interest here is our customers. At the end of the day, our job is to keep our customers happy, so that's just one example of just trying to better understand the intent of the session.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Thanks for that, Ashley. That is a great question. And the very first thing that comes to mind, when this proposal gets out there, are we going to try and define the public interest here? No. No, that would probably ... That would not go very far. It's a discussion that has gone on for an awful long time. The public interest in this particular context is specific and Avri will be able to put the borders around that topic. Now, once I maybe talk to her about this, if this is accepted, I could maybe redefine the brief description so that it's not an open ... This is not an open discussion about what is the public interest, but it's totally in the context of the operation that the board uses in order to look at the things that come its way and make decisions on it. So, thank you for that question.

DAVID OLIVE: Good points. Thank you, Ashley and Marita. Any other comments on the public interest session? Which may be more on the framework we are using at ICANN and moving that forward within our decisions and the SO/AC group activities. Okay. Tanzanica, is there another session? There is, number four. Please. And we're coming closer to our hour, so please.

TANZANICA KING:	Yes. We have a total of six so I will hand it right over to Sébastien to talk about this next one.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thanks very much, David and Tanzanica. Just I wanted first to start to apologize for the word I used. I am sorry. I am not a native English, and sometimes the words are coming to my mouth just to give an idea and not the word as it is. But coming back to the proposal here, it's to talk about ICANN accountability and transparency, the link with the ICANN reviews, and to have a review of all what is happening in this arena, and particularly to have a possibility to [attend] between the member of the communities, the board and Org, about the holistic review.
	The idea is to have a first session, a webinar outside of the ICANN meeting, in the prep week, somewhere like that, where we can explain what is at stake, like that we don't spend time to explain that during the discussion, and a plenary session with two parts, one with an introduction from some of the leaders of ATRT3 and board, and then three minutes' flash pitch tour where we will ask each and every part of the ICANN to give their feedback on that, what they think about, in a very short time.
	And then, the second hour will be a discussion with a participant and how we organize that. Do we have just one room we split the room have to still to be discussed. I didn't approach anyone yet. I am sure that that will be available to talk, but first I wanted to be sure that there is some buy-in on this proposal. Thank you very much. Yes, I just want to add one thing. It's written "EURALO" because I am not an ALAC member. But

in fact, the full proposal, this one and the three previous, are all At-Large. Just a hat I have is different from my colleagues before. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks very much, Sébastien. Mark, you have your hand up. Please.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. This is Mark Datysgeld, one of the BC representatives for the GNSO Council. We recently discussed the plenary topics within our constituency and we'd like to strongly support this proposal number four. To us, this shows a very timely discussion to have and we would very much like to support it and offer some our membership to speak on it. Thank you very much.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Mark. I don't want to cut the discussion short. People, please think about this going forward. I know Sébastien would have to talk about some more preparation work, but this is something that we want to keep in our view. I know we have two more GAC proposals next, so we want to get through those and then we can go through any other business.

TANZANICA KING: Great. I'm not sure who ... If Manal wants to address this next one about hybrid meetings or if there is somebody else.

NIGEL HICKSON: Hello, yes.

TANZANICA KING: Nigel, there you are.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you so much. Can you hear me this time?

DAVID OLIVE: Luckily, yes. Thank you, Nigel. Go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, David. I'm so sorry. Yeah, I'll be very brief. So, the first one on how to design inclusive, equitable, hybrid ICANN meetings really follows up from discussions we've had before and the very helpful blog that was put out by the ICANN Board on planning for ICANN72 and 73. And really, it's to focus down on what is meant by a hybrid meeting, people's preferences for how it would work in terms of the practicalities of people engaging physically but, at the same time, having virtual experiences, so to speak.

And really, also taking into consideration in there some of the experiences that are being discussed on how the IGF should be run as a hybrid meeting in Poland, how the next IETF meeting should be run as a hybrid meeting. Discussions are taking place in both those [fora], and there are some interesting ideas, and I'm sure that members of the

community will have other examples to bring to bear on this that could be helpful as we look toward San Juan in March next year, with all hopes pinned on there.

DAVID OLIVE: Nigel, why don't you go ...? Okay. I'll see if there are any quick comments. Will you also take us through the next topic so we can take care of those two? Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much. This is ... Well, you can see it. GDPR/WHOIS data: what is next? This is to really look at slightly holistically, not to question the current Policy Development Processes in any way or the operational design phases of what is taking place. Not to second guess anything on that score but to look what is happening on data protection, if you like, in the real world, to take into account people's experiences. In particular, some of the ccNSO examples on what they're doing in various countries. And really, to have a discussion on this that might be quite illuminating in light of all the work that is taking place. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Nigel. These are two proposals by the GAC, one relating to virtual meetings and the other one GDPR/WHOIS: what is next? Do we have any comments at this stage? Very good. Thank you very much. I would like to quickly move to the AOB, which is really to ask that each of the groups go back and take the plenary topic selections that have been introduced here and give that some more thought. Obviously, if we can

narrow it down or sort it out through e-mail, that would be preferable and saving people's time.

But if, indeed, in the e-mail exchanges, we need to have another call on this, we're happy to do that. And to Manal's point about making sure that we are clear about the timing, the people, the preparation needed in any decision on final topics, that we also have well-prepared sessions for our community. In general, of course, we want to make sure that there are priority sessions for the largest number of people in cross-community discussions, that we, indeed, look at that as we prepare the sessions.

We're looking and tending toward a four-day session, so that will cause a careful consideration of what is needed at that time. But there will also be flexibility for outside discussions, including how best to deal with an interaction with the board. We thank you, both the ccNSO, and GAC, and At-Large, for providing some insights on their priorities for ICANN72 and, to that extent, that's a very helpful way forward.

And indeed, we want to see if we can quickly, at least conclude on the four-day as preparations and services need to be done on that. With that, we'll schedule our next call for the 26th of August. If we need to finalize any topics, you'll see that in the chat, and then we'll move from there. But in the meantime, we'll make sure that e-mail exchanges are there and are informing you of our steps and of the discussions we've had as we move forward.

With that, I am sorry to keep you over nine minutes but I think it was a very helpful and useful discussion as we plan the ICANN72 virtual

Annual General Meeting. With that, I would like to wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, or good morning, wherever you may be. We'll be e-mailing or talking soon, I'm sure. Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]