EN

DAVID OLIVE:	Thank you, everyone, for joining our second Production call. The agenda is as follows. We'll have a welcome word. I'm starting a little bit with the welcome and Sally Costerton may also add a few words as well. We'll have the plenary topics for ICANN72. Tanzanica, Mary, and Carlos will take people through that, the survey results, topic selection, and the planning for these, the block schedule, and then Any Other Business. That is the proposed agenda for today. If there are no objections to this, we will move forward. And with that, I will see if my colleague Sally Costerton would like to say a few words of welcome as well. Sally?
SALLY COSTERTON:	Thank you, David. I just wanted to welcome everybody. I know that for lots of people in the Northern Hemisphere, this is vacation time. And in some cases, it's kind of back-to-school time. So this is a very busy, busy time for many of you who are already very busy people. So I just wanted to thank you very much for the time you've taken to input into this work. And I think it'll be very useful today to hear everybody's piece. Looking forward to a good meeting. Thank you.
DAVID OLIVE:	Thank you, Sally. And thanks, everyone. Let's move on to the other part of the agenda, the plenary topics. I'll turn it over to Tanzanica with assistance from Mary and Carlos, I think. Tanzanica, please.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, David, and hi, everybody. We're going to jump right into the survey results so that we can have this discussion because, as you see, there's a lot of interest in multiple topics. If we scroll down a little bit, we'll see that the preference is to limit it to two. I just want to say because I know you all are aware of your own entries into the survey. It was a challenge. There were six different GNSO groups who submitted so those were consolidated, and a lot of similar interests, leaving us with these results so that we sort of have a tie between DNS Abuse and the Public Interest session. I apologize the title of that session is not updated. But it is in the next slide that we'll look at. So this is from the original form.

So the session about meetings, clearly there was there were some comments about that on the list, and it definitely rose to the top as being the most preferred. I believe we have both Joanna and Marita on this call, who I will look to possibly for some comments on the two sessions that are sort of tying here.

If we scroll down just a little bit, I also want to just share the comments that were submitted as well with you. Really, there just needs to be a good discussion about which sessions you want to keep, given the common interest in multiple sessions here, whether or not some of those or one of those could actually just be a regular session. There's a lot of different ways this could go. So I want to immediately open it up for comments, suggestions. Manal, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

EN

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Tanzanica. Just a question because I thought we have three sessions that are tying, you now mentioned only two.

TANZANICA KING: I'm sorry. So the top session that's preferred is the one on meetings. And then there are two that are tied, which is the DNS Abuse session and the Public Interest session.

MANAL ISMAIL: So is this a different version than the link I'm looking at right now? Because I tried the link in the presentation and I can see three sessions at 40%—the DNS Abuse, the Public Interest, and the GDPR WHOIS data.

TANZANICA KING: Yes. So when I say that there's two, I'm referring to the fact that the final tally was for there to be a total of two plenaries. So while GDPR came in also at 40%, that would only be if we were to have three sessions. Let me back up a little because I see why this is confusing. The difficulty with the way that we did this review forum was that because there are multiple GNSO groups responding, we then have to take that and tally it up. So anybody who selected, for instance, that they wanted the GDPR and maybe they didn't select DNS Abuse, it makes it still show up in the results. So we're still seeing that these are the top four sessions. But based on the entries, the two that rise to the very top are the DNS Abuse and Public Interest.

I know that it's very confusing. I thought about a lot of different ways of showing you guys the results. I think in the future, we need to do it a

EN

little differently and let the GNSO have a separate entry so we can just see the total results for the one group as a whole instead of consolidating it, just me doing it because it makes it a little hard to show you guys the details in all of it. But I assure you I'm being very careful.

So, the top two are the first two that you see there that are after the meeting session, if that makes sense. Does that help?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Tanzanica. I'm sure you were very careful. I was just trying to understand. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: So I know that we received an update on the Public Interest session. I think we can go back to the slides so that we can show the short descriptions of the review. This is not intended to be a voting forum. So it doesn't mean that we can't talk about all of the proposals, any of the proposals if there are comments. The goal is just to try and get to which ones are going to be selected for the meeting. So, Ashley, I see your hand up. So go ahead, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi, there. Sorry. I was trying really hard not to be the first one to speak. But apparently, I just can't help myself. So for the record, yeah, this is Ashley with the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I guess I'll try and pose this as a question.

EN

I know Sam and I both had raised concerns with the DNS Abuse session. We had a number of different concerns, mine primarily being that the proposed speakers knew nothing about the proposal, and I have it under pretty good authority that they wouldn't agree to being speakers. Also, there was quite a bit in the proposal that really wasn't DNS abuse in the sense of how it leads the Registries and Registrars to find DNS abuse and looked into things like misinformation, all interesting issues just not within the remit of ICANN.

I know that there are also concerns posed about the public interest but I believe there was an attempt to address those concerns. But I'm not aware of any modifications being made to that DNS Abuse session to address the concerns that were raised. So I just want to ask if I perhaps missed something in terms of revised proposal, or if it still stands as it did originally. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Ashley. Marita, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. Yes, perfect timing. Thanks, Ashley. Completely revised in order to address the fact that you raised the last time that we don't want to get into a discussion of what is the public interest. This new proposal makes sure that what we would be talking about is the global public interest framework which has been developed with the community in order to assist the Board in incorporating the public interest in their decision-making.

There was actually a session on this in ICANN Montreal, ICANN66, where it was initially presented. And then I guess the intention here is to go back to that, see where it is, see how it's being used. The intention was for the community to have more input to be helping the Board to see where the public interest is in any particular decisions or recommendations. So really, this is like an update and to try to move the whole thing a little further ahead. That's the whole thing.

You did not see the revised proposal. Part of it is right here in the number three, the title has changed, and there's a little bit more to it than that does not fit in the box. That's basically as I described. It says how at ICANN the global public interest is tied to its mission and central to the primary governance documents, and that it's been difficult to operationalize that. So this is just a look at that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Just to jump in. No, I'm sorry. I noted that I did get your revisions. I appreciate them and they address my concerns. My concern was with a DNS Abuse proposal that I did not see any revisions to that one. But thank you for the revisions you made because they did address my concerns. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Marita. I think Beth was next, and then Susan.

BETH BACON: Thanks, folks. Hi, this is Beth Bacon. I'm a new voice for you folks. I'm the vice chair of Policy for the Registries. I'm just pinch hitting for Sam

EN

Demetriou this week. So thank you for having me and putting up with me. As I say, I pinch hit.

Obviously, I think we echo the concerns that Sam stated and then actually just reiterated with regards to the DNS Abuse session, especially the fact that those folks that were going to speak weren't aware of it.

I think also taking into account that because of the shortened week, the preference is to have two sessions. There was such good support for the Hybrid Meeting, and then there was equal support for the Public Interest. And then looking also at the other plans on the calendar, the Contracted Party House is planning to have another DNS Working Group Open Community session. Perhaps we could consider the fact that that is going to be an open session, and that folks can participate in any way publicly there, and maybe help ourselves along with making this choice between to get to two sessions. I just wanted to offer that. We did nail that down this week.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Beth. Any other comments? Joanna, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Just briefly to address the concerns, the proposal put forward on DNS abuse was, in essence, to address parallel debates that are going on across the community. It's not a new topic so I fully

EN

understand the reservations that come as part of this specific discussion. I'm happy to present the updated proposal.

The overall idea was for us as a community to have a more detailed narrative around DNS abuse before the IETF coming up at the end of the year, which will be based in Europe. And there does seem to be a legislative proposal we talked about last time that might address DNS abuse also from the angle of platforms to so called non-hosting intermediaries. There has been debate on that. And looking at the DNS abuse related proposals that have been submitted for the upcoming IGF, the background for the At-Large proposal for a plenary was for us as a community to consolidate the efforts. Therefore, the proposed speakers yet to be confirmed should the proposal find approval from the Program Committee would consolidate those efforts that we will likely provide as input to the hybrid IGF happening later this year.

So if there is interest from the community to discuss this further for the ICANN community to be on the same page when DNS abuse is discussed in Europe in the context of digital services and digital media, that plenary might be the opportunity for us to move that ball forward. But I fully understand where the concerns are coming from. I did send an updated proposal. If this is still useful, I'm happy to resend it onto the list directly tonight. But I fully respect all the concerns that have been raised and I am happy to adapt to whatever decision this group makes. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Joanna. Mary, go ahead, please.

EN

MARY WONG: Thanks, Tanzanica. I was waiting to see if one of our community leaders or representatives had more comments. I do note in the chat that, Joanna, it looks like your modified proposal never hit the mailing list. So, as you say, I don't know if it'll be helpful for you to just send it to the list now considering that I guess that the form has been closed. But perhaps it will give folks more information about the update that you're proposing.

Actually, I see Maureen has a hand up. So I'll just make my comments real quick. These are comments you've all heard before that, essentially, if there are topics that seem to be of equal or close enough interest across the community to consider potentially moving one or more to the next ICANN meeting based either on urgency or timeliness, and also given that the number of community groups have moved to sessions that discuss topics of common interest that if, for example, it's not something that seem to be a plenary, that perhaps the groups in question can host those sessions try and schedule them at a time where most interested community members can attend. And that way we can cover maybe a breadth of topics, perhaps not at one meeting, but at more than one meeting and in multiple ways beyond just plenaries. Thanks, Tanzanica.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Mary. Maureen, your turn. Go ahead, please.

EN

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Tanzanica and Mary. I just wanted to mention we've been surveying our community, specifically around the plenaries and what we're going to be doing ourselves during ICANN72. We held a very recent survey about the plenary topics. I only just found out this morning that the preferred by one vote the topic as a plenary was the Public Interest one for At-Large. But at the same time, the At-Large community are aware that anything that doesn't make this plenary and to take advantage of the fact that there's been a lot of thought gone into planning for this, that we will include them into our At-Large week which we are going to be covering our own policy topics. But interestingly, in the discussions during the plenary, as has been noted, there was really strong support for the GAC session on the ICANN meetings that was considered, something that the whole community does need to take [inaudible] of, so we certainly support that.

Also, there was strong feeling about the two plenaries. And I think it's a lot to do with just, basically, volunteer burnout, just the whole thing about the ICANN meeting being over three weeks. So there's been lots of things that have actually been discussed during just the ordinary choosing the plenary topic, but it generated quite a lot of interest within the community. But I think it would be fair if there was one from the GAC, one from the ALAC, and we just choose either of those topics. But just putting forward through the At-Large perspective. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Maureen. Alejandra? Go ahead, please.

EN

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to make a comment regarding the process that we established. We said when and how things were going to be presented and voted upon. I think we shouldn't respect those deadlines since that's what we agreed. On the other hand, also reviewing a little bit on what just came through the mail, it still says something regarding content moderation and content regulation that, if I'm not mistaken, that's what was bothering others in the community of being addressed in this plenary. So I just wanted to make that comment. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Alejandra. Manal? Go ahead, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Tanzanica. Just to share the GAC views in full. And of course, I do respect whatever conclusion based on votes of other parts of the community. But just to make it clear, we obviously were the only vote for three sessions, and this was basically to accommodate for the Hybrid Meetings, the DNS Abuse and the GDPR WHOIS. Then we got a tie between the Public Interest and Closed Generics. But again, we see them as potential for future meetings. So I'll stop here. We already voted and they have been considered so I'm just sharing GAC views with everyone. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Manal. David, I'm happy to give you the floor.

DAVID OLIVE:	In listening to the discussions, including Maureen, I think, if I understood you correct, Maureen, you think you might want to move one of those topics to one of your "regular" sessions. And would that be the DNS Abuse one, which would then make the Public Interest become number two? Was that your kind of idea or proposal? I may have misunderstood that, sorry.
MAUREEN HILYARD:	Yeah. Thank you, David. We've always had a sort of common understanding for ALAC. They put forward their proposals and to the plenary. DNS abuse is important to the At-Large, and so we will be incorporating that, whether it's in the plenary or if not, that's okay. We can cover that, too. Thanks.
DAVID OLIVE:	Thank you. Because that may be the solution for sessions one and two, the GAC's suggested one, and then the ALAC suggested the other one on the framework and how does that pertain and apply and move forward. Tanzanica, I think Manal's hand is up.
TANZANICA KING:	Yes. Manal, go ahead, please.
MANAL ISMAIL:	Sorry, old hand. I'm sorry.

EN

TANZANICA KING: Okay. I see in the chat there's questions about who voted for what. So amongst the GNSO submissions, which were six of them, there was one vote for one session, two votes for two sessions, and two votes for three sessions. Sorry, there's five GNSO. So the idea since there's a vote for one session and multiple votes for two sessions, that beats out the votes for three sessions. But I'm just acknowledging, yes, we did see those. Hoping for any other comments or thoughts about which ones should make the cut. Beth, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

BETH BACON: Thank you, Tanzanica. It's always fun when you ask a question and there's dead silence. Just to offer some flavor, the contracted parties—sorry, contracted parties, different call—the Registries, we had our meeting yesterday and there was support for the Hybrid. We thought that was that was very important, and then the Public Interest session, and thought that those were kind of the most broad reaching and would be of interest to the most folks in a cross functional way. So just simply, those were the top two from the Registries.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Beth. So with the four-day-only meeting and all of the meetings with the Board—and thank you, all of you, because I've gotten most of your requests for those and when we move on to the block schedule, you'll see them there—it doesn't leave a whole lot of time for expanding the number of plenaries. So we were expecting that the final request would be for one to two. I'm not quite sure how we would fit

three, given the four-day schedule and all the things that need to go in there. So that's just my two cents on that number.

Are there any thoughts on whether is there more time needed to go back and review? Can we do a vote? What's the best way forward here? We need to figure out. Beth, my savior again. You're winning lots of points here. Go ahead, please.

BETH BACON: Well, I'm here for one call and you'll have Sam back. So when she comes, she'd be like, "Wow, Beth was great." So I think that our preference for Registries was for two. But I do see Susan's comment in the chat, and I know that you had mentioned at the top of the call that because the GNSO had so many constituencies, you combine those. So I'm not sure how that shook out. But maybe if you looked back at your stats, that would be helpful. I thought there was a preference for two sessions. And from the Registry perspective, because we do have other open sessions and then we do have constituency sessions and it's only going to be four days, we felt that two was going to be plenty, especially considering we also have a public forum. So that is essentially another plenary length and breadth session. So if we had three, it would be a plenary every day and I think that people might start to lose their brains a little bit.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. I just put in the chat. I will try to multitask here and see if I can produce a link with just the GNSO results for everybody. While I'm doing that, Alejandra, please go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tanzanica. I just wanted to say again that I do agree that the number of plenaries should be reduced since we only have four days. We are already minimizing our content in our own sessions. So having the plenaries that are blocking potential in use time within our communities, I do believe that three is too much.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Alejandra. Ashley, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi, everybody. It's Ashley again from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Yes, we voted for one plenary and that was largely because we were— surprised I guess is the right word—but going down to four days for the meeting, we already started experiencing problems with scheduling. And also recognizing—I guess it was our last prep call that we had, folks were talking about making sure that sessions were open and available to people. So we're really trying to do our best to not make sessions that we knew of interest to the community not to have them conflicting with other relevant sessions, and it really just became difficult to do that in the four days. That includes trying our best to have our meeting with the Board within the four days.

So the idea of having even two plenaries at that point seems like it was really difficult to get everything on the plate in a way that was consistent with how everybody was talking about wanting to keep it within the week, wanting to keep things open and available for people

EN

to attend. So I feel like there's a lot of conflicting desires. That's why we voted for one session, for what it's worth. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. Maureen, please. You're up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Tanzanica. I just wanted to mention that with regards to the number of plenaries that even though that we've actually decided to take all our sessions, all our focused At-Large sessions, out of the actual main conference, and we're actually having at middle week the intersessional week between the prep week and the conference. We've decided to use that as our At-Large week where we can focus our community on what's important for us as part of the ICANN work that we're all doing. But it also would give our community an opportunity to be involved in more cross-community activities during the actual ICANN week and be part of the plenaries if they were here to attend Board meetings and other community meetings that they would not normally be able to. Because many of them are often in conflict with our own sessions and our community really does need to get out and see what's actually happening within the other ICANN communities.

So we have decided to put the sessions into that little week and we're not constrained by the timing of the conference week, which is often not convenient for many of the participants. But we can be more adaptable with timing and all that sort of stuff. That's how we're addressing that, the fact that conference week can be really too much

for a lot of our volunteers. So that's how we're dealing with it. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Maureen. Bruna, please, you're next.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you, Tanzanica. Hello. Just to touch on that topic, I think that although we're still slightly concerned from time to time emptying out or something like that, like the amount of meetings we had over the main week, we do also acknowledge that everybody has been kind of operating under capacity over here. So the idea of having one to two plenaries tops is what we support over here, although I did not have the chance to reply to the survey because I am not receiving every single e-mail from the list. So, just to also highlight this to you, guys. But yeah, our support is from one to two plenaries. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Bruna. I just put a link to the GNSO-only responses in the list, noting that one of them came in after the deadline, which is my fault because I hadn't turned off the link yet. But it does not change the consolidated entry for GNSO. Beth, go ahead. I'll let you comment.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Tanzanica. I just wanted to just quickly respond to Maureen and I think that the dedication to do that whole extra week is amazing. Within the Registries, we're encountering the same kind of scheduling

EN

challenges as the Registrars. Unfortunately, we're not really able. We have the three ICANN weeks scheduled, and as we operate we block out those weeks for the discussions on ICANN issues, as well as Registry/Registrar issues, and then we talk with community as well. For example, we have our open CPH DNS Abuse Working Group that's open to everyone. So we really reserve that week for that.

So if we're not using the ICANN week for the ICANN work, that becomes a real challenge. So I think we would love to be able to have more flexibility. We are, as Maureen says, reducing capacity is a great way to say that. I think we're all kind of in a different headspace and we're also on a different kind of ability level to spread things out in that way, especially considering folks would be then kind of forced to do two weeks at a different time zone or a single time zone. I think it's a real challenge for folks and I worry about that. But from the Registries, we do support the two because there's just less bandwidth, both in days and human resources. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Beth. So we sort of linger between the two options of, on one hand, it sounds like it's possible that DNS abuse could be absorbed into the At-Large week that's going to happen just prior to the meeting. On the other hand, that does create an instance where many of you may be then having to attend more meetings, more weeks. That's what's on the table. David, any thoughts on this?

EN

DAVID OLIVE:	Listening to kind of the various points and I think people are, one, obviously quite agree that they realize four days, the limited schedule, wanting to make it manageable and considering the time zones for everyone. The two plenaries seem to be the consensus. And in terms of the topics, quite clearly, designing the ICANN meetings is number one. And I think from what Maureen said—we'll call it the Maureen compromise, and maybe Joanna as well—they would go with the number two being the public interest framework but with some of the other session or some focus on DNS abuse or preparatory to ICANN to the IGF meeting in Europe, being a regular session that they may sponsor when they can. I think that's the latest that I have heard.
	I would also add that since this is the AGM, we're going to end this in that sense. We may want to think of having a planning session on plenaries that would go across the three ICANN meetings, looking forward and keeping topics that people have suggested and then refining them or reviewing them and placing them in the various ICANN meetings. That's the future orientation. I'm sorry to add that. But I think at the moment we're looking at two, we're looking at the GAC and the public interest by ALAC.
	Thank you, Joanna. It's good that you can post that with the focus in the European focus that may be helpful for what you want to do moving forward with the IGF and [inaudible]. Wolf-Ulrich, thank you. Okay, great, Maureen. Tanzanica, I think we have it.
TANZANICA KING:	I think so. Well done.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, everyone. And we'll consider this idea of a broader topic moving forward, that can be placed in the various three sequences that we have of ICANN meetings so that the topics you want can be addressed in that fashion. Thank you for your flexibility and collaboration here. Tanzanica, any other comments on the prep work or for these? We can move to the next topic on the agenda. What would you say?

TANZANICA KING: I think that's great. I'm glad we could narrow this down. I wanted to give Carlos a chance just to share the planning that will go into these topics and session development. Carlos, did you have anything you wanted to add on this?

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tanzanica. Hi, everyone. This is Carlos Reyes. I work with a team that supports planning for the plenary sessions. So now that we've identified the plenary sessions, we'll work with you on the mailing list to assemble the planning teams next week and also start confirming the program participants. We'll schedule weekly calls with those planning teams. So we have a schedule here of five planning calls, six if necessary during prep week, but we try to avoid that. And then there's a dry run. Then the last week of October is the AGM so we'll have the plenary sessions.

EN

So this gives you a sense of what the planning cadence will be for the next month or so, a month and a half. As I mentioned, we'll follow up in the mailing list to put together the planning teams and start the planning. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Carlos. We can go ahead and move on to the next slide. Mary, did you want to make a comment?

MARY WONG: I did. But really quickly, just to emphasize the schedule that Carlos has shown and based on our past work with you all and suggestions from you as the community planning leads, that it really will be important starting from week one to secure the participants, speakers, panelists for these sessions. I don't think we need to go into why that's important. I think everybody knows that. So I just urge the groups to get on that, I suppose, as quickly as possible. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: And Org is happy to help out, obviously. Mary, Carlos, and Tanzanica will be there to work with people that make sure we're well prepped and you're comfortable with that.

TANZANICA KING: Absolutely. Thank you both. So, looking now at the draft block schedule. Now that we've finalized that we're having four days, we finalized that we're having two plenaries. This is showing you the meetings with the

EN

Board that, for the most part, have been confirmed or at least tentative. I think we're only missing SSAC here, which I believe we'll be getting soon.

I had an opportunity to speak last night—actually, night for me—during the APAC [inaudible] call. One of the things that they mentioned is they would really like us to schedule the plenaries at different times of the day to make it easier for some to attend at a time that is easiest for them, given the time zone issues.

So I've highlighted—you can see there's two slots, one on Monday, one on Tuesday that we could potentially move the Monday plenary slot to. I'm really just looking for any preferences. If there is no preference, I will pick one. But if there's different things going on, that would make it better for us to choose one slot over the other. Please speak now. And any other questions or comments you have on the block schedule? Please share the ideas to finalize this so that everybody can continue with planning the rest of their schedules based on the things that we have slotted here, and we'll get going on that the session request forms pretty soon here. Are there any comments, questions, concerns, specific requests in terms of which plenary is scheduled on Monday and which one ends up on Wednesday? Beth, please go ahead.

BETH BACON: Just to be annoying, what are the chances that anyone would be interested in moving a plenary to Tuesday? I'm getting some chitchat for my schedule as well. We're just trying to find a nice spot for that DNS Abuse session so that we can make sure that it is open and as

broad as possible. If not, then we'll work it out. But I just thought I'd ask. We're all here.

TANZANICA KING: And just to clarify, would you prefer to see the Monday one moved to Tuesday or the Wednesday one moved to Tuesday?

BETH BACON: I care 0%.

TANZANICA KING: Okay, great.

BETH BACON: Whatever works.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. Manal, what are your thoughts?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Tanzanica. Actually, I was going to just make sure that whatever is on Wednesday, if any, doesn't conflict with the GAC communiqué drafting. So if we're moving it to Tuesday, I think this works.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Manal. Good point, yes. The one that is on Wednesday is definitely intended to avoid any of those afternoon sessions, including GAC communiqué, the GNSO Council, and typically the DNSSEC workshop. Similar to that, we should also be considerate of Tech Day being scheduled on Monday. So Tuesday might be a great option. Sally, did your hand go away?

SALLY COSTERTON: It went up and then went away, but yes. Thank you. I thought I would talk a little bit about the Executive Q&A because that's also a session that we want to add to the schedule. I know we've talked about it in planning for previous public meetings, and in the last iteration of this throwing at us that we please add it. In knowing that it's such a well-attended session, we think it's important to add, but what the difference this time will be that we won't ask for a non-conflicted spot because it's just there's too much in the schedule. So we'll look at where it fits best in relationship to the other events. And well before public meeting itself, we'll circulate some questions for you about what topics you'd like for us to address, and maybe propose some topics so that we make sure that we meet the needs of the community with the topics. So I just wanted to mention that so it wasn't a surprise.

TANZANICA KING: Great. Thank you, Sally. We should get together sooner rather than later and try and identify a potential slot for that so that everyone can be aware and schedule around it if they wish to, even though it won't be a non-conflicted session.

SALLY COSTERTON: Sounds good. Thanks, Tanzanica.

TANZANICA KING: Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Tanzanica. I put this in chat that I was informed but I do care. We would prefer the Monday, if possible, as they dig through the schedule. But I just wanted to clarify that so I did put it in the chat. Thank you, guys, very much for your patience.

TANZANICA KING: Great. So that would suggest that we're good with keeping Monday and Wednesday, but potentially moving the Monday slot to block three so that we can at least provide a little bit—not a huge difference for time zone issues but some difference there in the time of day. Any objections to that? Going once. Okay. I'm sold. So we will finalize this. We'll get a final copy out again so you can schedule around it. Rod, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, sorry. I'm speaking up for ccNSO maybe. But Monday session, how does that line up with Tech Day? That is on Monday.

TANZANICA KING: So therein lies the question, is Tech Day—so for the past few meetings, it has varied a little bit from being half day, being centered in the afternoon, sometimes in the mornings. Alejandra, do you have some more info on that?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, just to add that it's targeted to different audiences. So techies want to be in Tech Day, and so a plenary in parallel will not affect that day. But thank you, Rod.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Alejandra. Rod, are you thinking a particular plenary would be better to schedule Monday versus Wednesday in light of Tech Day?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. Our two options again are the meetings one and the public interest one?

TANZANICA KING: Yes.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I guess techies just show up when they're told to show up, so maybe the meetings.

EN

TANZANICA KING: Okay. It might be good just to kick off the week with the meetings one just because that will allow everybody the rest of the week to continue talking about the ideas on how to best make hybrid meetings work.

Beth, no. I thought you wanted to keep Monday so we're talking about keeping Monday. Any other comments? Beth, I thought you wanted to keep Monday?

BETH BACON: No. I'm very sorry. The request was to move the Monday to Tuesday.

TANZANICA KING: Okay.

BETH BACON: I apologize. I was unclear and you had promised you'll have Sam back next time. You will never have to hear from me again.

TANZANICA KING: We will love to have you any time. Okay. So the request is to move it to Tuesday, which would in fact, Rod, avoid Tech Day altogether.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And the geeks rejoice.

EN

TANZANICA KING: It would also allow us to utilize that a little bit later time at block four, so there's that benefit. Any objections to Tuesday block four and Wednesday block two? Final suggestion. Okay. I think we got it. We will lock that in. And I'm making myself a note so I don't somehow flip Monday and Tuesday. So Tuesday, Wednesday will be the final slots. We are perfect timing because we're getting close to wrapping this up. If we go to the next slide.

This is just a quick overview of our dates. You all should have received the slide deck. So there's also a couple of slides just for your reference of the more detailed timeline, as well as the time zone chart. Is there any other business that you want to take over for, David, or anybody else?

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you Tanzanica. Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, David. I just wanted to address something that's a little bit outside of this but related to it. Just some clarification. Traditionally, of course, the GNSO has always had the representation of its separate constituencies. I've enjoyed the conversations that we've had, and it's fine.

It's just that within At-Large, we have an extended leadership team and it consists of the ALAC, which is their main decision-making group, and our regional leaders, our regional chairs. As has been our tradition, when we've had come to this sort of a meeting, we've consolidated.

Everyone's included in the decision-making and we've consolidated our vote for something together. So we come to some kind of consensus. And as I see it, like we had our votes for the plenaries and that included everyone within the leadership team.

I was just wondering, some of our RALO chairs have actually been attending at the meeting and have contributed to the discussions. But when it actually comes to the voting, they don't have a separate vote. And so I just wanted to know and to raise at this particular point in time that in future, if I could also include a wider leadership team as a separate vote as the GNSO has a separate vote for its constituency. I just thought I'd raise it. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Maureen. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Hi, I'm Susan Payne. I'm here on behalf of the IPC. I just wanted to kind of understand where you were going with that, Maureen. And I may have misunderstood you, but I think you were talking about in this meeting planning process, looking to have additional participation from your group and additional voting. I'm not objecting to that in any way but I think there's a misunderstanding about how the GNSO's perspectives are treated in this meeting planning group. It's quite clear from what we've seen today, we may all get a vote but what the individual constituencies and stakeholder groups are voting on gets sort of somehow consolidated.

Like IPC, the perspectives of the IPC that I had to put forward on behalf of that constituency, are nowhere reflected in the outcome of this. And I think that a number of the other constituencies and stakeholder groups would feel similarly. So effectively, we may all look as though we've had a vote, but we've had that same kind of consensus process being done for us that you at least were doing on behalf of yourselves.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Susan, for that. I think it's reflected and what I was saying earlier was that there was so much discussion that came out of just these plenary topics. And that's because we've got five regions covering five really very different areas, and even coming to the decisions that we've done, it was quite a process. When the regional leaders come along to this meeting, they're excellent, they participate, and you've probably heard some of the views that are presented by some of them may not completely align with the ALAC position. But at the same time, they do accept that because that's been the tradition that we've had. And I just feel that it would be really, really good for us as a community to know that, again, the voices of our end user communities also is incorporated into the planning of our meetings. So like on a wider perspective rather than just on one vote. So that was my point. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you for this discussion. I'm sure we will continue, though. The point is that we don't really have "votes". We really tried to get that consensus either from among the various groups or within those various

groups to come up with this idea. And so this is surely something that we can continue with discussion with the SO/AC chairs and others as we plan for ICANN73. But at this stage, we understand your points and we try to make sure that there is a balancing of interests and approaches to move forward.

So we're at the top of the hour. I would just like to summarize that we are again confirming the four-day AGM for ICANN72 to make sure that there is prioritizations of the session selected and to be sensitive to the time zones, noting that the Pacific/Seattle time is the home time for this so that others can participate actively. We thank you for also looking at the ways to consolidate and, thus, the plenaries will be two, the one presented by the GAC, the other one on the future of the meetings and how to plan for that. And the second one by the ALAC on public interest framework, how does that work, what does that mean, as well as the settling of the Board interactions with the communities during those four days. You'll likely receive a communication from the Board ops on that and how that would work. And also the sessions, not to conflict with Tech Day and other sessions that we know are doing that for the plenary and your major other sessions.

With that, I think this has been a very helpful and productive session. I would just like to say that we will obviously continue our discussions to refine that. We will have staff to help you prepare for the plenaries and, of course, if you have any questions, we do want to hear from you as well. So let me thank all of you and wish everyone a good evening, good morning, or good afternoon, wherever you may be. Thank you very much.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. Have a great day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]