

---

SALLY COSTERTON:

Okay. Let's get started, everybody. Good to have you all with us. So, I am doing my world-famous impression of David Olive, who is taking a well-deserved vacation this week. I will chair the call today.

We have an hour and I want to try and make the very best use of it. I have some of my colleagues with me and I hope that we can focus most of the call today on sharing with you where we have got to, thanking you very much for your feedback and all the other feedback we've collected from different meetings and discussions during the ICANN68 meeting and other discussions on the list.

We will run through, very quickly, how we have got to where we are now, which is essentially the beginning of a draft block schedule, with some tweaks to try and overcome some of the barriers that we still foresee.

So, I'm going to allow at least half the call for the block schedule and discussions around it, because I think the major opportunity today is to get a sense of what people feel about the format, get a sense of what we feel about plenaries and what kind of plenaries, how many we think we might want, are there any obvious topics that jump out, and then to be able to allow time for some discussion around the pre-meeting week and how to make sure that we maximize the time available for intra-SO/AC meetings—that is your working meetings—as well as maximizing the lack of conflict for the plenaries.

In summary, just to kick it off, the feedback that we received, which was fantastic, on the discussions, left us with three key areas. The first area was the question of translations and interpretations.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

The general feedback we've had so far on this is that, after ICANN68, we're on the right track. We may even be, potentially, at the destination, or close to the destination. We now have in place a solution that allows us both to maximize the amount of languages we can offer simultaneously, but also to do that fully remotely, which is what we did in the Kuala Lumpur meeting, if necessary, and that gives us a lot of versatility moving forward. I'm going to ask Sally to update you on that in a minute.

On the second area, we talked about the limitations of Zoom. We got a lot of good feedback about this, and there was a lot of detail. But in essence, what we appear to be dealing with is, if you like, a kind of tradeoff between the convenience of a Zoom meeting format, where everybody can see each other and they know who is in the room, but as we found out in the Kuala Lumpur meeting, it can be prone to Zoom-bombing. As you all know, we switched to the webinar format during the 68 meeting, and that has other advantages, but it does have the disadvantage of not being able to see who is in the room.

So, I've asked Ash to join us today, very quickly, to update you on what kind of options he thinks we have as with account to the Hamburg meeting and to hear a little bit of feedback from you on what the tradeoffs are that you feel comfortable with—and there will be some tradeoffs.

And then, finally, the other key topic that came up was the question about time zones. There was quite a long discussion about this on the last call. This is, of course, always a problem at ICANN meetings, whether we have them face-to-face or not. It was particularly pronounced this time

---

as we had the meeting in the Asia time zone. And here we face, actually, another different tradeoff. Here, I would say the tradeoff between having the productivity versus representation.

So, there is a lot of discussion saying we think it's very important to have the meeting in the local time zone, as planned. Part of the meeting strategy is that we rotate the meetings to encourage local participation, and the team will be able to tell you that we saw very good participation from the Asia-Pac region at this meeting, so that seems to be borne out.

But then, we also have this question about the difficulty of participating if you are working for a week, effectively through the night. And this meeting time zone was particularly brutal for the U.S. East Coast, and the Hamburg meeting time zone will be particularly brutal for the U.S. West Coast, as well as not ideal for the East Coast, or even parts of Asia.

So, on the one hand, Europe offers some benefits in the time zone, but it also offers some dis-benefits. So, what we've tried to do is to come up with, potentially, a creative way of thinking about how we organize the time we have available to us to try and minimize that impact, to try and maximize the productivity that we get as we interact and participate in the different issues we want to work on and discuss, but also maximize the participation, not just from the local region that we're in but from everybody around the world.

So, we're going to take you through a suggested block schedule, which Tanzania is going to present to you, and that's what will form the body of the call to discuss.

---

---

Any comments, any questions? You can see the agenda in the room. Would anybody like to add anything before we start? I'm watching the room. I can't see any hands. So, on that basis, I'm going to hand over, initially, to Sally, and then Ash, just to catch us up on those first two points on where are we at and what do we think is likely to be feasible for Hamburg on translation/interpretations, what do we think we need, and also for Zoom. So, I'm going to go to, first, Sally.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN:

Great. Thank you so much, Sally. Hello, everyone. I don't speak often on these calls, so for those of you who I've not met or talked with before, I head up the Global Communications and Language Services Teams at ICANN Org.

So, what I thought I would do today is share with you a little bit of the background of interpretation, what the results were from ICANN68, and some things that we're going to be doing to continue to improve the quality of interpretations going forward.

So, from a pure service perspective, we were really pleased with the performance of the remote simultaneous platform that we selected, using Congress Rental as our provider for ICANN68.

As you may know, interpretation happens to be one of the most complex aspects of running the virtual meetings, and that's for several reasons. One is that Zoom doesn't provide the level of support that we need to provide interpretation in six unique languages in real-time.

---

For each session where interpretation is offered, we require a minimum of three interpreters, and that's because of the taxing nature of real-time interpretation and having to navigate accents, terminology, changing speakers.

So, during in-person meetings, interpretation and the interpreters perform a type of relay where they almost tap each other on the back when it's time to switch out, because of the need to just take a break. In the virtual setting, that time is compressed and it's reduced to ten minutes, because of the sheer focus and concentration.

So, that's something we had to take into account and making it more complex in a truly remote environment. And then, finally, our participants need a stable, reliable, and easy-to-use tool. So, all of those were aspects to think about and, for ICANN68, the team rigorously tested several different tools, and you know that we ultimately selected Congress Rental.

It integrated smoothly with Zoom, it was simple to use, and it was stable, and it was well-used. So, we were really pleased to see the level of use. In the past, we haven't really been able to track who uses the interpretation tools and in what language, but we were able to track usage for ICANN68 because of the use of this platform.

So, I thought you would be interested to know that approximately 17% of all attendees used the interpretation platform, 41% of them used the mobile app, and 59% accessed their language through the web.

Now, on a daily basis, an average of 295 attendees took advantage of the interpretation platform. The way this breaks down is that 15%, on

---

average, of all GAC session attendees used interpretation, 23% of ALAC attendees used interpretation, and then 10% of all plenary attendees or participants used the tool, which are good numbers.

We can provide more detail on language if necessary, but we do know that all languages were used. And although it's not a complicated system, it was a new system for the community.

So one of the things that we did was, to help participants adapt quickly, the Org team offered two sessions during prep week on how to use the tool, and they were well-attended by staff, and the community, and the board, which made the transition on day one of ICANN68 fairly issue-free. There were a few people that needed assistance but, generally, it was an easy-to-use-and-adopt tool.

From a delivery perspective, we had no degradation in service over the days of the event and the meeting, and we never had to switch to the back-up system we had in place, which was a great thing. We'll always have that back-up system but we didn't need it in this case.

Where we did run into issues was in the variation of the audio quality of the presenters, and there are two particular issues that are attached to that. One is just the human nature and natural tendency to speak too quickly. So, that makes it a challenge for presenters. So, we're always trying to slow presenters down. One of the things we're working on is a deck—presentation on guidance for all session presenters that will help them with easy-to-use tips and tools on how to present in a way that can be managed by the interpreters and will just be helpful for attendees.

---

The second aspect is the type of equipment used by the presenters. It varied widely. If you had quality equipment, it was easier for the interpreters to interpret the spoken word. But when there were technology issues, maybe poor mics, or headsets that weren't working particularly well, or people were using their computer mics, then there were challenges with that.

So, one of the things that we are looking into is how to provide equipment: a good headset mic for staff, executives, board, and some session presenters, particularly with GAC and ALAC. So, that's one of the things that we're looking into doing.

Regarding our transcriptions, one of the things that we focused on was providing a quick turn for clean transcriptions of the sessions. We'll continue to do that in the future.

That's really the update. So, the primary things that we're going to be working on are the technology, and the equipment, and continuing to look for ways to potentially have sessions to work with the community on what are the most important sessions for interpretation to be available. And with that, Sally, if I didn't miss anything, is there anything else you wanted me to address?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Sally. That's very helpful. I can see that Sébastien is saying in the chat that these webinars to introduce the tools were a great idea, that the figures are impressive, and he's making the excellent point that a slow way of speaking is important when we don't have interpretation.

---

This is a great point. We don't need to discuss it now, but as I am one of the people who speaks very quickly, which I know can cause problems for people if I'm presenting—she said very slowly—this might be something we want to have a look at when we're preparing people, particularly presenters, for the Hamburg meeting, along with the technology.

I think it's a great point, Sébastien, and I know it can really cause problems, even for native English language speakers, at least in my case. I don't see any hands up but we can take some questions after. I suggest we go to Ash, next.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sally, I'm sorry. Sébastien's hand is up.

SALLY COSTERTON: Oh, I do apologize. Sébastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Sally. Thank you very much, Sallies. Great introduction. I know that it's just a question of words, but it's important. When you talk about the attendees from ALAC, you were thinking about the attendees from At-Large. ALAC is just 15 people at the At-Large Advisory Committee, but people are elected by At-Large. And it's important where you talk to the people you talk at the good level. I know that it's quite tricky because the other organization, ccNSO, GNSO, GAC, is a full group, but ALAC is just the 15 people.



---

And my second point is that, yes, it's definitely a great improvement, the interpretation. A really good job, both by your team and by the interpreters who are doing an amazing job.

What is important is also that the accent of the people, even when you are not translating or when you don't use the translation tool. It's very difficult to go from an Indian accent, to a Texan accent, to a London accent. And for some people, like me, it's some are more difficult to understand than the other. Therefore, the slow-down is quite important. Thank you very much.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Thank you, Sébastien. Yes, great points on the At-Large and the ALAC.

SALLY COSTERTON: Okay. Let's go to you next, Ash. If anybody would like to ask Ash a question after this, please put your hand up and I will come to you.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you, Sally. So, talking of technology, the backbone of our virtual meeting continues to be Zoom. We're committing to using Zoom as the platform of choice after having looked at many other potential possibilities just under two years ago, as you'll recall, following the Puerto Rico meeting.

Zoom has had their fair share of press. We have been working very closely with the Zoom product development team and legal team on understanding what they're doing, understanding their roadmap, and,

frankly, deeply influencing their product roadmap over the last year or so, so that the features that we now have access to were provided faster for ICANN's benefit than for anyone else in the world.

We were included in the pods of people that they cast a net over to ask for early help and validation, and much of that was made available during the last meeting.

As Sally Costerton pointed out, we do have a choice, and that choice is between the Zoom session rooms, which provides the facility through which everybody can see everyone else and can chat, and the other is through Zoom webinars, where only the panelists are visible to the attendees, and the attendees cannot see one another.

We switched from one to the other and we did a blanket switch, if you will, in the course of the last meeting, because of the behaviors of people, which was to come in uninvited and Zoom bomb.

We recovered from those fast enough. Frankly, when I look at the time to recovery on each of the incidents that occurred ... And there were more than ... I think there were several. Let's leave it at that. The recovery time was under two minutes in the worst case. So, that was good recovery, in so far as that goes, but it was embarrassing to see the platform being abused.

Now, the reason I wanted to present is to, basically, make you aware that we have a choice [of what] we do. If we choose to have the session rooms be made available for all sessions other than the plenary session, then we do run the risk of continued Zoom bombing, with the prospect of quick recovery, as we have shown we're capable of.

---

The plenary sessions, of course, we would like to continue to use the broader platform, the webinar platform. It makes sense for us to do that during the plenary sessions. The number can be quite unpredictable, and certainly over a thousand. Zoom, themselves, recommend that we use the webinar format, as opposed to the room format.

Now, we had some early thinking about how we can potentially protect ourselves from Zoom bombing. That would entail verifying the participants ahead of time. There are many mechanisms that can be used to do that. We have been talking about those possibilities.

We have also been in contact with Zoom to see whether some of the session room features can be incorporated into their webinar product. It's early days in those discussions, and that's a fairly deep-rooted kind of product development problem that we're posing for them.

So, they are not willing to rush. Neither are we willing to rush into a solution that may be half-cooked, because I'd much rather have predictable solutions that are safe than a half-cooked solution that blows up in our face in the course of one of our virtual meetings.

So, that's everything that I have to report to this team. What we are seeking, to be clear about the ask, is some feedback today on any strong preferences there may be, short of telling us to either find another platform, which we're not going to be doing, because there aren't as-good platforms. We have already tested that field out.

And frankly, the best we are in a position to do right now is to work closely with Zoom, and their product development organization, to see how far

---

---

and how fast we can push their product development to meet our requirements. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Ash. I have Bruna, and then Manal in the queue. Bruna, we'll go to you first.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thank you very much, Sally, and thank you, Ash, for this presentation. For starters, I would like just to acknowledge that this time of recovery was, indeed, really good and fast. Obviously, those situations are rather unpredictable in terms of the extent and the amount that they would happen, [and what rule] actually happened with the rooms, and the abusers, and so on. But indeed, it was a really good recovery.

But at the same time, I think that's kind of something that could happen when we opted for an open online meeting with links that were publicly available in the indexes. It's kind of one hard situation, but also in agreement with the open meeting format that ICANN decided to keep alongside the virtual meetings.

I just wanted to mention one little experience with RightsCon that's happening right now. RightsCon has achieved a model in which they can ... And they have been embedding the video of the bigger meetings, kind of what will be our webinars or open forums at ICANN.

But they are actually embedding the videos with a chat on the meeting app or the meeting website environment. So, it's [a slightly closed] environment that could be done with our app or anything like that, but

---

that also kind of gives us slightly more transparency in terms of who else is in the room, who else has RSVPed for that meeting, and also allows us for having the chat.

Because while I do appreciate the webinar mode, I do think it's a little [opaque] for the sort of meetings we were used to having, and so on. So, I would be really willing to learn more about if we are willing to change that format, or even to give more transparency to that one, because I do think we have changed a lot of the format, and it was good.

But this webinar one is the one which I still find myself struggling, especially in terms of lack of interaction and about not knowing who else is in the room. So, apologies for the long intervention, but that was it.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Bruna. So, I'm just going to summarize and get back to Ash when we've taken all the questions, if that's okay. So, that's about embedding the video channel inside a private space, such as our website or our app, and Bruna is saying she wants the opportunity to be able to chat. Manal, next to you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you very much, Sally. Before talking about this one, just very quickly to put on record our thanks for providing real-time interpretation in principle, but also for going the extra mile and providing to the GAC and ALAC, I understand, all 6 UN languages, and, for the GAC, Portuguese, as well, but also for the quality of service that has been provided. So, deep appreciation.

On the Zoom, again, I don't have an exact ... So, I'm going to speak about the pros and cons because, like everyone else, we got frustrated by working sort of in a black box, not knowing who is within the attendees, and make it difficult to chat, and so on.

But again, using this for the GAC, it gave us, also, an opportunity to have the GAC within the panelists so that we can identify them easily when giving the floor. So, it also tends to be useful in another way.

My question, also, is whether, this segregation between panelists and attendees, there is something similar for the chat, as well? I'm saying this because the separation tends to be useful for the GAC because we have committed to have open meetings and be very transparent.

But at the same time, it got very distracting at certain points in time to identify the comments from the GAC regarding communiqué drafting and the work we're doing, versus other chats that may be not really directly relevant to the communiqué drafting, just as an example.

So at this point in time, we're just interested in investigating all the features and all the options. But in all cases, I think there is an opportunity for everyone to see who is participating in Zoom. I'm sure it would be good to have this included. So, I'll stop here.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thanks, Manal. So, you're making a specific point there which I wanted to note. Well, you're making several points, but the specific point that I wanted to just throw to Ash is this idea of segregated chat channels, which allows you to focus if you've got multiple chats going on in the

---

---

same meeting. It provides a bit more definition and focus, which I think is an interesting observation.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. And just to be clear, we're happy to have this, also, transparent and seen by others.

SALLY COSTERTON: Yes, of course [inaudible].

MANAL ISMAIL: So, thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Not the private chat. That's a different thing.

MANAL ISMAIL: Exactly.

SALLY COSTERTON: Okay. Go to you next, Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sally. I already put this in the chat, but I just wanted to bring it up verbally for people that aren't following the chat. I think the stakes associated with Zoom bombing are much lower in meetings that involve

---

just adults. I feel like the downside of the Zoom bombing is a minimal, in this context, compared to the downside of switching over to the webinar format and the lack of interactivity that it entails.

I think the At-Large will definitely favor for its sessions the meeting room format, and would encourage others to prefer that, as well, because it would enable better participation by us in those sessions.

And so, I think it's worth the risk. As Ash mentioned, there are mitigation measures that can be taken and have been taken by others to minimize the chances of Zoom bombing, but I just don't feel like it was that big of a deal, given that we're all grown-ups.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Good feedback. Thank you, Jonathan. We'll take the trade-off on the Zoom bombing and we'll do everything we can to mitigate it; that would be your verdict from the At-Large's perspective. That's very helpful. Jonathan Robinson.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks, Sally. I'll try and be as brief as possible. I think the possible variation on the per-group, per-meeting basis is an attractive option, but I think I also, personally, at this stage, see it similarly to Jonathan Zuck and others.

You'll see my suggestion in the chat that, whilst it won't lock out the problem everywhere, balancing the level of frustration that I heard expressed with the solution that we had at ICANN68, I think opening up



---

the meetings a little with some, accepting that full security is only possible if you do that, and partial security ...

I mean, I have criticism of the fact that we just publish the schedule and allow anyone to see that, and there maybe a way of doing a partial security ... And while that won't stop a determined Zoom bomber from getting in, it might substantially reduce the frequency of the event happening. Thanks.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thanks, Jonathan. And just as there are two Jonathans on this call—there may be more—there are two Sallies, and it has been made clear to me that I haven't explained for the record what my department is. I head up engagement for ICANN.

So, the two Sallies work very closely with each other, which is even more confusing. But Sally Newell Cohen leads communications, and me, Sally Costerton, I lead engagement, just for any of you who don't know me. Ash, over to you for last words before we turn to Tanzania and the block schedule.

ASHWIN RANGAN:

Thank you. Thank you, Sally. Thank you, everybody, for providing your feedback and commentary. I appreciate it. I think, if I'm reading the sentiment correctly, there isn't a lot of love for the webinar format, there is a broad understanding of the potential for Zoom bombing, and there is a suggestion that we are to explore possible ways through which we can limit the potential for such Zoom bombing, and one such could be, for

instance, to make available information about sessions only to registered users, rather than through a public broadcast.

That may entail making a request of the SO/AC leaders to spread the word amongst the constituencies that registration is a prerequisite in order to participate. That way, we can limit the participation where it's necessary to only registered users, who thereby would have signaled to us who they are.

We won't be in a position to authenticate them because that would require some third party to say they are who they say they are, but the fact that they are registering with us would also allow us to track back to who they claim to be if, indeed, we can trace a Zoom bombing incident to them.

Of course, the plenary sessions, we can continue to use the webinar format, and they are the open ones anyway and don't have a facility for Zoom bombing. That may be the nature of how we resolve where we currently are. We'll see what we can do for the immediately forthcoming meeting [that's feedback]. If I misread any of the signals that we received today in my summary, please say so on the chat channel. I'll continue to monitor that. Thank you, Sally. Back to you.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Ash. That's a very helpful summary. Right. I'm going to switch gear slightly, now, to ask Tanzania to introduce for you where we have got to with our thinking on suggested ways of tackling a schedule that we hope will maximize productivity and participation.

---

So, the goal here is to think about the time and the time zone, specifically. This is what we have playing around with a little bit to share with you now. So, going over to you, Tanzania.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Sally. I think, everybody on this call, I recognize your name, so you probably know me. I'm Tanzania, often referred to as "the scheduling queen." So, we are on this third virtual meeting, now. The schedule has been pretty light so far. I think we've done good with it. But as Sally just mentioned, there is this ongoing issue/challenge with time zone that continues to be hurtful toward participation for some people, and we see it repeatedly in the comments and feedback.

So, our goal with this block schedule was really to try and address that issue a little bit more by providing some more flexibilities with the schedule, spreading out the days a little bit. So, this high-level slide right here is just showing you that we've got the prep week scheduled at the beginning of October.

And then, what we are proposing is that we take three days in the following week to do just your internal SO/AC work. So, that would include the sessions that you typically have on constituency day and other days. And then, have the third week, which is really within the official days in the meeting, focused on plenary sessions.

Again, it's all about flexibility. So, when we talk about prep week, we are thinking that it can include things like prep for sessions with the board and other things really based on what your preference is to include, there. So, go ahead and see if you can go to the next slide.

So, the SO/AC internal workdays. I'm sure we might have different ways we'd like to refer to this. But this will be the same blocks of time that we will have for the next week that I'll show you. So, it's just to say that you can schedule as you wish, just like what we did for Kuala Lumpur.

During the official block, you would be able to get all services that you might want specifically to ALAC and GAC—all of the interpretation, the scribing needs, and those things. But just like we did before, we also want to make sure you know you can schedule outside of those times.

So, if you have other internal meetings that you want to schedule at different times of the day, those can be scheduled, and we will post all of those on the schedule. The official schedule, this time, to make sure it's easy for you to see everything you have scheduled.

The way we'll do that is by sort of doing some sort of tagging to the sessions to make sure it's clear what is happening within the official schedule and what's happening outside of the regular hours. But it will all be accessible in the same place.

Can we go ahead and go to the next slide? I'm going to try to go through this not too slowly, because our primary goal today is to get your feedback on this. Keep in mind it's all draft. This is just our idea of how we can provide you the flexibility that we think you're asking for. So, it's really important to get your feedback on this.

During this plenary week we have, as you can see, three plenary slots. Those can be expanded or reduced, depending on how many topics you think you want to cover. That's another thing we'd like to ask you about today.

---

---

And then, we've got our usual public forum. "XCI" is referring to cross-community interactions. So, these meetings could include the joint meetings with the board, or you can schedule those in the prior week.

Again, it's all about the flexibility to do that. We're looking forward to you telling us what makes sense to you. I know, for example, some groups have a strong need to meet with the board really early, versus some of you may be happy to do that on Wednesday, at the end of the meeting.

So, this is what we're looking at. Again, we only have 20 minutes, so I think I want to, Sally, stop there, if we can get some feedback on this current block schedule. And I do want to point out there are some minor changes from the one you already received via e-mail. I'm sorry about that. But we realized the day was slightly too long in terms of our tech teams, and probably for you as well. So, I already see some hands up.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Tanzi. Let's kick off the questions and the discussion. So, first I have Ashley, and then Jonathan Robinson. Ashley, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, yeah. Could you go back one slide to the breakdown of all the SOs and ACs? Thanks. First, could you give us a brief explanation as to what "open Zoom seven" is? But before that, I just wanted to note that the GNSO in particular has a lot of different moving parts to it, and having to organize all the different groups that are within the GNSO might be a challenge.

---

I think one of our concerns, at least from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, is that we were a little bit nervous that we might find ourselves in a situation of scheduling 12-plus hours a day, just to make sure we get everything crammed in here, depending on how it's staggered. But otherwise, I'll just stop short there and get some additional details on "Zoom seven." Thanks.

TANZANICA KING:

Yeah. So, this is really high-level, so I want to make sure it's understood. This is not a limitation. It's not that there is a limit of seven rooms or that each group can only have one room. "Open Zoom seven" is just to indicate that there is also room for other groups or other meetings to happen, as well.

And I know in particular, of course, that the GNSO often, on constituency days and stuff, has multiple stakeholder groups and constituencies meetings concurrently. So, that will not be an issue. The important thing will be for us to get a handle on exactly what the needs are as early as possible so that we can get all of our tech teams in place.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Tan, did you want to manage the queue?

TANZANICA KING:

Sure.

---

SALLY COSTERTON: I can if you want me to, but otherwise I'll keep interrupting you.

TANZANICA KING: I think Jonathan Robinson is next. Somebody yell at me if I'm wrong.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Tanzi, Sally, and others on the call. A couple of things. I mean, first of all, thank you for giving this some thought and trying something different. It's great. I think there are elements that seem attractive, and I think it's difficult because there are challenges with this.

The one thing that doesn't seem to be answered at a high level is that this seems to be ... We are dealing with ICANN69, and I'm not sure where the question of 70, 71, and 69 is being dealt with. So, it would be very useful to understand how ... Stretching it out a little, but that's separate to the question you're asking right now, which is, how do we deal with this tactical response to 69?

Some immediate feedback we had was, "Oh, my goodness. You're expecting us to have a three-week ICANN meeting," and I can see how that immediate reaction happens, and I can also see how, as you explain it, it may not be quite as it seems in that way.

I heard Sally Costerton at the beginning talking about time zones. You made a coherent point, Sally, and a good point, about how and why one might do it on the local time zone. I do wonder, though, in that context, whether the prep week needs to be done in that way.

---

So, assuming for a moment one accepts that we believe that the actual meeting needs to be on the local time zone for whatever rationale, the prep week could be staggered and could be needed, necessarily, beyond that local time zone, and perhaps not even the SO/AC internal workdays either.

That being said, you've just explained that the SO/AC internal workdays are up to the SO/AC to work within that, so there is quite a bit of flexibility there. But I would question why prep week needs to be on a single time zone. I think that I'll stop there. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING:

I'm going to defer that one, possibly, to Mary. I'm not sure that we do need to adhere to the specific time zone for prep week, but I'm going to defer because I don't want to say the wrong thing and I haven't been part of those conversations.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Mary, do you want to ...? Oh, I tell you what. Jonathan, if you wouldn't mind, could we take the rest of the questions ... Well, we'll take a couple more questions, and then I'll pause and we'll go back to Mary and/or Tan, unless it's very straight-forward. So, that's a big question about ... You asked two big questions.

One is about, are we going to have a more strategic discussion about is the stretching concept beyond just one meeting, or is this just a sort of pilot? We've presented it as a pilot, but it's an interesting point.



And the second question, could we stagger the prep week to have a bit more of a flexibility around different time zones to manage that time crunch? Mary, I'm going to come to you in a minute, but if I may, before I do, I'm going to go to Jonathan Zuck, and maybe ... Is that an old hand, Jonathan Robinson? Thank you. Okay. So, why don't we do Jonathan, and then Susan, and then I'm going to come back to you, Mary? Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Sally. The point I wanted to raise was about interpretation and the impact of this structure on interpretation, because I know that, again, for the At-Large, interpretation is really essential for nearly everything that we do.

And so the fact that, for example, the two weeks prior to ICANN68 without interpretation was very difficult for us. It affected participation, etc. And so, having built into this a process of having to decide when we may or may not have interpretation, I think, is one of the challenges that we'll continue to see.

And so, I raise that as something to address directly, but also ask that you take a look at some of the things that are out there for machine language translation, such as Streamer that ISOC is using quite a bit, as a kind of backup alternative to the vastly superior live interpretation, but still make that available—it has good Zoom integration, etc.—for the times at which live interpretation is not available.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Susan.

---

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah. Thanks. Hi. Obviously, we haven't had extensive feedback from IPC members on this yet, but there was some initial reaction, and it was somewhat similar to the concerns that Jonathan Robinson mentioned about the preliminary reaction was, goodness, it was hard enough doing a one-week meeting where people were having to do their day job and then log-in in a different time zone, as we did for ICANN68, let alone have this now become a kind of three-week meeting where we face that prospect for some people, and a real feeling that this has the risk of excluding anyone who isn't a domain industry person.

So, anyone who, as many of the IPC members do, has another job, they can't spend three weeks working on Hamburg time, particularly on a schedule which, certainly, when we first saw it, looked like it was from 9:00 AM to 8:00 PM for three weeks.

Now, I do understand that that might be an initial reaction, and some of what has been explained now, here, suggests that that risk isn't entirely going to be realized, but I think the SO/AC internal workdays, because of the way they're being described as with a degree of flexibility, with the SOs and ACs making their own decisions about how they will use those ...

To the extent that those workdays will, maybe, include public sessions organized by particular SOs or ACs where they will be discussing topics of wide community interest, there is still a risk that, at a minimum, this becomes a two-week meeting, plus the prep week.

Because if the GAC are going to be talking about Subsequent Procedures extensively during that SO/AC internal workday week, then I need to be

---

---

listening to what's happening even if I'm not a member of the GAC. Do you understand what I mean?

And so, there is some concern that we are just making a two- or three-week meeting out of something that would, ordinarily, have been a one-week meeting. And really, concerns that that shouldn't end up being the case, as it will be excluding for many people who aren't employed in the domain industry.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Susan. Okay. Let's go, now, to Mary. I'd also like to go to Sally because we've got a couple of fairly big questions, there. One is the question about flexibility of time zones in prep week, and the second question is about, what does that mean, and what does this approach as a whole mean to interpretation availability?

And you raised a third point, Susan, which is quite fundamental, about what is ... You are expressing very well the trade-off question. What is the sacrifice, the "lose," if you like, from stretching it out versus the issue to people operating?

Are we going to lose participation from different parts of the world if we end up biasing to an East Coast, which tends to be an East Coast time zone, if the SO/AC groups move to work within their own ... Pick their own working time zones?

That's the thing we have to think about/be mindful of. Do we then bias too far away the other way from a time zone that allows us to get

---

participation? I'm not saying we will, it's just something we have to think about. Going to you first, Mary.

MARY WONG:

Thanks, Sally. So, I'll address the prep week from Jonathan really quickly and make a comment about what Susan has just observed, because they both have to do with the flexibility that we have been talking about.

I did suggest an answer to Jonathan in the chat, but it may have gone by too quickly, and some people may be on the phone. Essentially, while this three-week framework is meant to help all the groups plan accordingly, we do anticipate that there will need to be some crossover and that, when we say things like "prep week," we don't necessarily mean just the usual pre-meeting informational webinars that we have now started to hold.

In other words, prep week will include those informational webinars. What they are and how many, we don't know as of yet. But to the extent that groups are willing and slots are available, prep week can also be used for each of your group's prep sessions, say for joint meetings and so forth. So, that is one example that we thought of as the flexibility that this schedule could provide.

To Susan's point, that seems very similar to a point that Brad made in the chat, as well. It is one of the concerns that we are very aware of. It applies both to folks who work within the domain community and industry and those who don't because of day jobs, other commitments, time zones, etc.

---

So, all I can say for now is that it will require coordination, certainly across the staff teams that support all of you, including and especially in the policy team. So, I just want to assure you that we're aware of it. We will certainly do our best to make sure that the coordination that we do takes into account all of this and that this is always top and foremost of our minds as we prepare block schedules for each of our groups. Thanks, Sally.

SALLY COSTERTON: Sally, I'll just go to you on the bigger question on the availability of interpretation on this kind of "stretched" model.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: There are a couple of things I think I would say. One is thank you for the suggestions. I think that there are always opportunities to look at other approaches, like machine translation, although we do lose context and quality, there. But what the interpretation team will do, headed by Christina, is we're going to continue to look for creative solutions over an extended period.

Of course, we have to take into consideration costs and volume of resources and making sure they're available, but we're committed to trying to find ways to make that available where necessary. I'm going to actually ask Christina to share her thoughts as well, if you don't mind.

CHRISTINA RODRIGUEZ: Yes. Hi. Thank you so much, Sally. I just wanted to bring a quick point to it. So, ICANN68 was the very first meeting where we had deployed and

launched the RSI platform. So, there was a lot of prepping done by the entire group of interpreters and the ICANN Language Services Team.

With that, we were not really available, and we had to cut the days that we provide, for example, teleconference interpretation, to the community a little earlier, so that you have an idea.

So, we started training on a daily basis, almost, for three weeks prior to the two first prep weeks. So, that's why we were not available. This is not the case for ICANN69 and moving forward. So, prep week, as Mary Wong said, should not only, or could not only, be used for the webinars that are the set webinars, but also having, of course, looking into how we schedule things, and the timeframes, and so on, between sessions—be, also, very workable for other sessions, for other community members and groups.

With that said, before we enter those two weeks of prep weeks, we will be available, of course, to provide all the support the community needs regarding language services. That's it.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Christina. I have two more questions in the queue and we have seven more minutes. I want to be respectful of people's time, so, after we have taken the two questions, I'm going to hand back to you, Tanzania, for prompts for next steps. Is that okay?

TANZANICA KING:

Sounds good.

---

SALLY COSTERTON: Okay. I have Manal and Sébastien. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Sally. Thank you. I was going to take down my hand because I think all my points were made. I was going to echo what Jonathan Zuck said on real-time interpretation and translation and whether this will be available throughout the three weeks or not.

I was also going to flag that the prep week ... We're avoiding Fridays on the internal workdays on the plenary week, but not on the prep week. And I was wondering whether, because Friday is already a [weekend at some parts,] but now, given that the other days are working days, I'm not really sure what would work best for the GAC, and maybe I need to consult before proposing something now. So, I'll stop here and we will consult and get back to you. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Manal. Yes, good point. [I'll allow a] question for you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Sally. Just to say that I think it's a very good proposal. Now, we can try to enhance it, but the fact that there are different things going on and that separated ... Of course, I hope that it will not be five days of work during the three weeks, but that's one point.

---

The second is that it's important for At-Large that we are spread all around the world. Therefore, when a meeting comes to one region, it's a pain for the other, but it will be the same next time for the six regions. Therefore, we don't have, really ... We like the fact that it goes from one place to another place, and we take that into account.

Maybe you can a little bit think about how to [call prep week, because prep week is with an image.] It's what staff has done with that. But if you take what we have worked, when we were in the Meeting Strategy Working Group, we were talking about adding webinar ... Preparing a meeting and not having a presentation during the meeting face-to-face.

Now, with this, it could be organized that, during the first week, we organize such a webinar or discussion. But the discussion will be during the plenary week or the meeting where we will meet, and that will decrease the time of presentation and increase the time of discussion at that part of the meeting.

And last point: definitely, interpretation, if you find another solution to have that open the three weeks, it will be great if we end up with three weeks. Thank you very much.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Sébastien. Can I turn back to you, Tanzania?

TANZANICA KING: Yes.



---

SALLY COSTERTON: I know you want to mention the “P” word, and we need to—

TANZANICA KING: I do.

SALLY COSTERTON: Understand ... I thought you’d do that.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Can we deal with it in four minutes?

SALLY COSTERTON: Well, we may need to work out some next steps, as well. So, I give you back the floor.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: First, I’ll say that we will send this updated block schedule out so that you can look at it some more. We should utilize the mailing list. We always do good when we start having conversations back and forth on the mailing list.

And so, we want to get this into a shape that the majority of you feel works—all of you, preferably, feel works. There is no intention for every slot that we show in these days to be filled. So, it’s not to suggest that you have to schedule over something during prep week, or something during these internal workdays.

---

So, hopefully, you can continue to give us feedback. Take the draft to your groups and let us know what you think. We will also go back to the drawing table and see if we can take some of your comments and make any additional changes.

When it comes to the plenaries, I wish we had time to have our usual discussion. We really want to know, are there topics you already have in mind, things that we had on the list before that should have carried over, and figure out, do we need to do a formal process for having you submit proposals, or are there already some topics you have in mind?

So, we can also do that on the mailing list. We'll prompt you to do that. Manal, I see your hand up. I want to give you the opportunity to ask a question if you have one.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Just very quickly, if the deadline for plenaries is what's conveyed over e-mail, which was 7<sup>th</sup> of August, I'm just flagging that this might be too tight for the GAC. Thank you.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN:

Yes. Kim, can you go to the next slide for me? One more. There we go. So, this is our production dates, high-level. This is not as detailed as the one that you have gotten via e-mail but the dates are the same.

So, we did have a deadline of 7<sup>th</sup> August. If you recall, in the past we have always tried to stay away from doing too much in August, which is always a challenge. I'm guessing that you all aren't jumping on airplanes to go on vacation, so you may feel differently about that this time around.

So, we can extend this to a degree. Also, if we have the block schedule the way that we do, where there is some separation between plenaries during the third week and other meetings during that second week, it will make it easier to fill in the blanks a little bit later and give you more time.

We just need to know what your thoughts are on plenary topics, and if it's more time that you need then we will find a way to do that. We do need to get forms in for the schedule, obviously, and get it produced to post by the deadline. So, the dates that you see for [EMS submissions] that are here from the 19<sup>th</sup> of August through the 4<sup>th</sup> of September will remain, and we will push for finalizing these details through the mailing list and, if we need to, schedule another call prior to the 13<sup>th</sup>.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN:

Thank you, Tanzania. I think if people are in agreement ... Two requests, really, in addition to what Tanzania said. I would suggest, given how important this is and that we are looking at some changes here, that we encourage a lot of participation on the list but that we pencil-in we put a holding call in before the 13<sup>th</sup>. We can always cancel it if we don't need it. If the list has resolved all the issues we need, happy days.

But I wouldn't want to deny this group and us the opportunity to just finesse that discussion more, but on the back of an evolving discussion on the list. How does that sound? Does anybody strongly object to that idea? I'm assuming that the lack of shouting is a ... Anyway. Okay, let's, in principle, suggest that.

The final thing I would suggest is that, on the list, if you could also consider the big, meta-question in the way that we have posed to you

---

---

today, which, as well as the plenary question, is, overall, do you really feel that your communities are better served by a two or two-and-a-half-week, more compressed schedule, or a more open and flexible, longer schedule?

I know there are lots of “it depends” aspects to that, and picking those up on the list would be extremely helpful. But it’s very useful to just get a sense of the feeling and sentiment in your different groups about that, taking, of course, on board the very important considerations that have been raised by several people on this call.

Okay. I look forward to the discussion on the list. We will pencil in a call for that period before the 13<sup>th</sup> of August, and then, if we don’t need it, we’ll cancel it. But thank you all very much indeed for coming on this call and being so contributive.

It’s a big group. It makes a huge difference. We really value your input. With that, as David would say, I wish you a good afternoon, a good evening, and good night, which always makes him sound like a TV presenter, I think, but he’s great at this. We’ll speak to you all soon and we’ll see you on the list. Thank you all very much.

MARY WONG:

Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Sally, everybody. Take care.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**