DAVID OLIVE: Now I feel better. Greetings, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN68 Virtual Meeting call as we plan for this event. We thank everyone for taking the time to be with us.

The agenda is as follows. I just would like to quickly go through it. I'll finish some remarks along with Sally Costerton. We'll have technical and logistical updates from Nick Tomasso and Josh. We'll then move to Tanzanica to talk about the survey results of the second round. Thank you very much for participation that helps us hone in and look at some of the details that you're interested in. They will cover the cross-community plenary topics, the preferred dates and sessions, as well as the time zone preferences. The fourth one will be a discussion of these results and next steps to develop that block schedule and timeline. And five, AOB, I would just like to point out that the Community Excellence Award process continues. Normally, we do announce the winner of that award at ICANN68 and we have to think how best to do that at either one of the sessions or prior the sessions so that we can fully recognize the community work there.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to Sally Costerton for some words of welcome, and then we'll go on with the agenda. Sally, please.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, David. Welcome, everybody. I'm so excited to see – it's going up every minute – we now have 64 people on this call, which I think is quite spectacular. And it's very good to have you all together with us this evening, this morning, wherever you are today. I wanted to

thank you for your ongoing partnership in this process with us in the org. It's been quite incredible and it's helping us enormously to work with you to hopefully provide all of us with the best possible experience we can for ICANN68.

Some of you have been on call with Goran and with myself and David, looking at pre-imposed ICANN68 webinar topics and engagement topics, and I just wanted to mention that as we go through the agenda today, if there are things, when we talk about the hot topics in particular, that you think we should tackle but don't need to be tackled in one of those key essential plenary topics, don't forget to just let us know as they come up. We're in those early stages of just collecting up what are the most important topics that our community wants to address as whole, either as a global group or in regional engagement sessions before and run up to the meeting and this is a good opportunity. So I just wanted to mention that, but the most important part on the agenda today. I look forward to a good call. Thank you very much.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sally. If we could move to #2 on the agenda. Nick and Josh want to take us through an update here, please.

NICK TOMASSO: Thank you, David. Good day, everyone. It's great to be here with you. I've been looking forward to this call. I'd like to give a short briefing on the technical services and the support that we'll be providing ICANN68 Virtual.

As you might expect, we're going to be using Zoom conferencing platform for all the sessions. We'll be able to post the Zoom session recordings within 12-24 hours. That's really dependent on Zoom's turnaround time but we're confident that we could do it in that timeframe.

I'm very pleased to report that the technical and language services teams have been working on interpretation with [inaudible]. They have come up with a way to provide interpretation via a separate interpretation platform that's been developed. They will be able to provide six UN languages and Portuguese for the GAC, six UN languages for plenary sessions and French and Spanish as always for ALAC. There is a bit of a caveat and that is that this new platform requires a laptop to access Zoom and a mobile device to serve as the headset for the session. So thinking about walking into the ballroom, you pick up a headset, you put that on and you listen through the headset, everything that happens in the room [inaudible]. The second caveat is ICANN InfoSec is still reviewing the platform. Things are looking very good and we hope to get clearance for that soon.

We'll be doing real-time transcription or live scribing for the GAC and plenary sessions. Each session will have technical and remote participation managers. We'll be posting the meeting transcripts after the session and we'll be able to use the website and the app for all participants as soon as the dates of the meeting are established. With that, I'll stop talking and see if anyone has any questions.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you. Any questions for Nick? We saw some comments in the chat expressing positive matters. I see Sebastien Bachollet. Please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, David, and thank you, Nick. Just to say what people are saying in the chat, but I think it's very, very important improvement that I want to thank all [inaudible] it was one that we request from the last meeting and I see that you have to conduct [inaudible]. That's really great. Thank you very much.

NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you, Sebastien, for those comments and for the comments from everyone in the room. As I said, the technical team and the language services team have been working very hard on this solution and I'm really pleased that we're going to be able to offer.

DAVID OLIVE:

Other comments or questions for Nick? Very good. Nick, any other last remarks before we move on to the next part of the agenda?

NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you to everyone. I look forward to the rest of the meeting. Thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Nick. We now move to Tanzanica to talk about the results of the second survey. Tanzanica, the floor is yours.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, David. Hello, everyone. Thank you for submitting the survey. As many of you might think that you were the only person to submit yours within the last hour, but you weren't. There was quite a few. So I think we've pulled it all together. But the one thing that I will give you guys a link for is a webpage to go look at the comments. Once we look at who submitted survey responses – this is a breakdown – we actually had a total of 28 submissions, so a very good turnout I'd say considering all the surveys that I've done for scheduling and stuff.

If we go to the next slide, the first question that we asked was just simply, "Do you support a virtual ICANN68?" and 79% of these said yes. A couple of people said, "No preference." There was also a couple of nos. We'll go ahead and go to the next slide.

The first thing that I thought would be good to talk about is the topics. Which topics do you want to hold? Which ones do you want to postpone until ICANN69? Of course, there's some that have no preference. This list you're looking at is in order of the ones that people said we should hold it at virtual ICANN68 the most. The top topics are DNS abuse, followed by the Q&A with the Executive Team, and a public forum. There's still a lot of people interested in doing the Domain Name System and the Internet of Things, and then a little less desire to hold those last two there. What I think the conversation needs to be around is for those of you who said to postpone certain topics or that have no preference, what we don't capture here is if there's a reason for that, if there's currently no progress, there's something on a particular topic and that's the reason that you want to postpone, or if in fact it still

would be okay to hold the session. Here we're looking at six. But before we get into that conversation, I want to show you on the next slide the additional topics that you submitted having interest in holding these at the virtual meeting.

As we look at these, certainly the second one on DNS misuse and how all of these come about in terms of our current COVID-19 situation. If we're looking at that and we also have on the previous slide DNS abuse, one of the considerations ought to be could that be a combined session or does it need to be two separate things? Of course, our goal here is not to cut down because obviously we don't have a huge number of sessions, but we'll look later at exactly how you want to schedule these and space them out over the days of the meeting and depending on how many topics you want to do that'll sort of work itself out based on your selections to the survey. So, go ahead and go to the next slide for me.

The next part of this is to talk about the results of the survey in terms of when to schedule these and the time of day. But I think it would be useful first to get into discussion of those topics, those last two slides and see what you think about the results and see if we can get a general idea of how many of those topics you actually want to conduct as sessions. So I'd like to open it up for comments. Again, I think it'd be useful for those who marked certain topics as "hold off until the next meeting" just to give some more background on why is there a specific reason to hold off on certain topics.

I see Jonathan. You have your hand up. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. I'm just looking for a microphone. I think I'd just like to go back one step before we answer the specific question. I'm slightly concerned about the surveys, both the previous one and this one, that it's quite sort of narrowing having this multiple choice. I understand it's a difficult position because you need to try and narrow down the options that it does limit the choices that channel us. I think we were told that the previous survey, for example, that that was just indicative we were giving some feedback, some input. But I'm worried this is going start to gel in terms of some of the points. I'd like to talk at a high level about that, first of all.

I think with ICANN67 we did a very good job of repurposing a physical meeting and that was the opportunity that was available to us, that we trimmed it right back, organized around that, and essentially ran a physical meeting in a much pared back form but more or less merit the physical meeting, I mean in very broad terms. I'm concerned that we are going to potentially do the same without really rethinking the meeting format. For example, some of the constructive suggestions I receive now that I've had the chance and that could be prior to the previous survey we didn't get the questions beforehand which was very helpful in this most recent case, it's extremely helpful. And one of the reasons for my last-minute answering was because we had a stakeholder group meeting an hour or so before the deadline on the survey so I was able to consult and therefore use that consultation to inform the answers.

For example, time zone. I don't think we necessarily need to force ourselves into a single time zone. So I don't want to hijack when you've asked a specific question, a bunch of things that I do think it's really important that we are imaginative about the way we conduct the virtual meeting and don't fall into the trap of simply doing what we did for 67 when there are some real opportunities here to tweak the way we do it both perhaps, as we talked about previously over more than one week, over more than one time zone, a lot of people talking about breaks, making shorter sessions, extremely demanding. So hopefully, we are responding to those points and not getting railroaded into mimicking a virtual meeting.

That's my point then. I know you had a specific point about the survey results and the proposed topics. Certainly they are said in the chat. I think 2 and 7 are key. I don't mind owning up to the fact that 7 was a point that I raised. That's my comment there that things have impacted all of us in myriad ways with the COVID-19. I think it would be very, very useful to have a session and perhaps even 2. One that looked at COVID-19 and its impact on ICANN org, on the community, and give people an opportunity to talk and discuss and air key themes, businesses that would be an impact positively, negatively, or otherwise, and then move on to the impact of that on things like registrations and mitigating harm because actually it's a really interesting opportunity to get ourselves aligned around a positive topic which may then lead into some rather helpful conversations on other elements of so-called DNS abuse or concerns around registrations in the past. So I wouldn't hijack the whole meeting. Those are my two thoughts there immediately. Let me pause

and let others take an opportunity to contribute and ask questions. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Jonathan. I apologize. I was busy talking to myself. I'm not very good with the mute button today. So I think that's very helpful. The issues with time zone and all of that we do have suggestions here, and there certainly were a number of different comments about time zone and when we can conduct that. My thinking for this conversation was that if we can determine what the topics are, what the content of the meeting is going to be, then we can sort of take that and have something to work with to try and put it into whatever format or times that we want to. Oftentimes we go to say, "Okay, when do we want to hold sessions?" but we have no idea what sessions are going to be held. So I was hoping that we can go – at least take a look at this list and it's not to say that this is all we can do because it came into the survey. It's just a starting place. I see Wolf has his hand up. Go ahead Wolf.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Hello. Thanks, Tanzanica. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. I'm from the ISPCP Constituency. Can we go the last slide, please? In between I can explain already. I had also consulted my constituency as well with this survey, and I got [inaudible] majority of our answers with regards to the timing and structuring of the meeting was tentatively, but to spread it over more than one week, so in order to have it a maximum, let me say, two meetings per day. When I looked at this chart here, this could give one the impression that if you look just to the numbers here that, okay, the

majority is for holding that meeting during the original dates plus to a maximum of one session per day. And this, for my logic, is not consistent if you look at this. So if you have one session per day, it consequently would spread the meeting over more days in just one day. That's my perception here. So we should be careful in reading those numbers and drawing our results from it. I just gave you my impression and what we have regarding our constituency. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. Again, these numbers are just from the survey. They're not meant to be final or finite in any way. I do see what you mean in terms of the number of sessions that you want to hold is going to drive the outcome of the days and when things are scheduled. Really, this was just to get an idea of the expectation and what people are willing to handle at this time in terms of daily work. I see Sebastien I think is next, and then Tijani.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Tanzanica. I really think that we need to keep a meeting with one unity. One of the reasons is that if we spread that more than one week or two weeks, we will have some more work that will be done at the same time. If we all got in one week, we stop what is done day to day and we concentrate on one type of meeting … [double] meeting during this week. I think it's important that we change our mindset during this time. If we spread that one once a week, it's just one conference call, an additional conference call, and nothing different, nothing useful.

I understand that you would like us to discuss the content but I really think we need to also decide about the timing and what is the hour we use because I think Asia-Pacific deserve that we take care of them as we take care of Mexico and Latin America and North America time zone. It's important that we do that. If not, we are completely changing what we are doing and we forget that one of the reasons we have meeting in different places is also to help the people from specific regions to join the meeting. I think we need to keep that in mind. That's why I would like very much that we stay with the time zone of the country where we are supposed to go. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Sebastien. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Tanzanica. First of all, the 43% for one session per day is for the cross-community plenary sessions. It's not for one meeting per day. So I don't think it is a harm, it a big deal. I think it is possible to make it like while I prefer two sessions per day but if the one session per day wins, I don't have any problem. As for the duration of the meeting, I don't see any harm in making it longer because I had the experience of having three teleconferences of two hours during the CCWG-Accountability. I can tell you that the productivity of these meetings is very poor and also that it was really, really exhausting. It is not the same if you are in the room in the meeting and speaking in the meeting, and if you are on the phone or on the Zoom speaking. It is absolutely different. I think that there is no ham to make the meeting

longer. I know that some people try to have vacation to attend the meeting. But for virtual meeting, I think it is better to have flexible time, flexible duration, because we don't have any constant [inaudible] in my point of view. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Tijani. I see Alejandro next.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tanzanica. Hi, everyone. Tijani won me over to what I was going to say that we are referring only to the cross-community plenary sessions, not to the whole sessions that we might have in a day. So at least I understood that question that way. So one session per day talking about cross-community sessions, not the whole sessions of a day.

Also, I would like to support what Sebastien said regarding time zone. I do believe it is important to respect the time zone of the meeting where it's supposed to be because that was the main idea, to bring the ICANN community to the regions. So I think we should keep that in mind. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. With that, I'm actually going to ask that we go to the next slide so I can show you our proposal for the timing here. If you think back to the first survey and the results we got were really split 50/50 between KL and London. So we looked at that in addition to your comments about having one or two per day and we're circling this

section of Monday noon, so afternoon in KL because that also translates to semi reasonable depending on whether or not you're a morning person in London. So this is our suggestion based on your input so far. Any reactions? Does this fit in with what you guys are thinking might work? Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. I think it's more of a clarification. So what I see you're proposing here is four sessions I think, four one-hour slots in a sort of sweet spot of time. Is that the correct way to express it? So there's a four-hour slot that we work with on any given day which could give us up to two cross-community sessions or plenary sessions on any given day. Is that correct?

TANZANICA KING: That is the thinking. So it would really be up to you whether if you were doing one-hour sessions, you could do them back to back or you could choose to do one session at noon and have a break between. But yeah, it's basically focusing on the set of times. Are there any objections to holding plenary sessions during this block of time? Is that a new hand, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is. Thanks, Tanzanica. I guess the question – this is in reaction to Steve DelBianco's comment about the East Coast. Do we have any sense of the normal demographics or a meeting like between London and East

Coast of US? I'm just curious if there's a way to bias this towards greater participation while still putting it in the working hours of Kuala Lumpur.

TANZANICA KING: Josh may be able to talk more to this. We do have demographics from the last meeting. It depends on whether you're looking at one event or looking at a broader amount of details from multiple meetings. To be honest, I believe our highest participation is always going to show really high numbers for the US, but obviously the reason that we rotate meetings around the world is to get that participation and make sure that there's opportunity to participate in those other time zones. So that's the best answer I can give to that. Josh may be able to speak more to metrics.

JOSH BAULCH: Thanks, Tanzanica. Yeah, we do keep track of that information. We don't segregate based on regions within the United States but we do track within the United States itself. If we look at by the numbers report for the last meeting, we do list the top countries. And for the last online meeting that we have, obviously it was higher for the United States. But it is kind of like what Tanzanica was saying, it's that we find that the participation is always higher in whatever region the meeting was geared towards, so there's that impact that kind of skews the numbers. So it's a little bit difficult for us to come back and say, "Yeah, this is the best time zone because it will capture 30% of our attendees while the other attendees in a different time zone may not be because it makes it a little bit more difficult for us to come back and say, "These 3% or 4%

people in this other region won't be able to ideally participate." So I think there's a lot of political discussion around that. But yeah, I can post a link here in the chat in just a sec with some of those information.

TANZANICA KING: Manal, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Tanzanica. Just to confirm, so those are the hours of the whole event, the official schedule as written? Or we're just talking about the cross-community sessions in specific? I'm just asking to see if, for example, we need a session earlier or later than the [same] hours would this benefit from the real time interpretation? I mean, what's the limitation we have in terms of the language services? Because for ICANN67, we had a certain official hours and anything scheduled other than the official hours did not benefit from the language services. So I'm just asking whether it's only those four hours within the day.

TANZANICA KING: These four hours are just our suggested time period for plenary sessions only. So you can still schedule other working sessions outside of these hours. These would just be the ones that end up on the official schedule published with all those services.

In terms of still having language services and live scribing and all of those things, that stuff will still be available to you for other sessions, it's just these ones would be published as plenary on that public schedule. I hope that answers the questions.

MANAL ISMAIL: It does. Thank you, Tanzanica.

TANZANICA KING: You're welcome. Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, that's an old hand. I was putting my –

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Jonathan Robinson's hand, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, sorry.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. No worries. Having looked at this, I'd like to recognize that you've tried a very pragmatic compromise here, and it does seem like it has – I can see, as I think about it and reflect on it, it looks like it makes all sense to run a core meeting through that area, and to the extent that you want widespread participation – [Rod] made a good point about staff support, which I'm sure it was something on your mind – you create a core meeting here and then you let the individual groups and it also answers people like Sebastien I think who would quite like to, if I understood him correctly and others, focus on the coherence of the meeting around the four days. You end up with a call that's coherent

across the four days. Then I still think we have to answer the question as to whether individual groups because then they can take a poll if it's my group or any of the other groups or the working groups themselves can understand the makeup of their particular group and whether that's best suited to working within the ICANN week outside of this call that you defined or in perhaps adjacent week, the week before or the week after.

So I'm warming to this as a thought, if I understand what's effectively being proposed here is a four or five-hour call running through the four days of the meeting that is as tolerable or as a sort of midpoint for everyone. It sort of has a downside of being not perfect for anyone except it's close to perfect for the local time zone of the meeting as it was. I'm sorry if it's a little [runny], but I'm kind of processing it as I see and it does look like I'd like to give you a little bit of support for that. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. Yes, that's exactly what we're trying to offer here. It's just a way to look at where these core plenary sessions will go and still allowing of course the flexibility to schedule your other sessions at different times throughout the day depending on what your needs are.

SALLY COSTERTON: Jonathan, it's Sally. I think that's absolutely right. The term we've been using officially when we [inaudible], this is the idea of a meeting that's a little bit deconstructed. In a way that you make a recipe and you take the ingredients out and then you kind of put them back in a slightly

different order, if you think about it like that. And the way you summarized I think is perfect. We want to see whether this is going to work for everybody because it has a big impact on how we organize resourcing. But this idea of having the central band of time, the sort of magic hours that works for everybody, and then being able to allow as I say quite a deconstructed approach over a longer period of time or the different parts of the community that needs to meet two different things is the hypothesis. Let's put it that way. We're testing.

DAVID OLIVE: We have Manal, Jonathan, and Sebastien I think in the line. Manal, do you want to go next?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. Thank you, David. Just a quick follow-up on the same discussion. I agree that the four hours are a good thing to identify for the plenary sessions and the cross-community sessions or whatever core sessions we need here. I heard some flexibility regarding the individual SOs and ACs or constituencies. I just want to make sure that this flexibility would still benefit from getting into the records of the official meeting hours and still benefit from interpretation and language services. That's why I was asking whether we still have some flexibility despite not being good in the sweet spot, but again with staff support and services and getting through the official record of the meeting. Because for example, if we're flexible to schedule outside those hours as GAC and we have our communiqué drafting, for example, scheduled outside this block, but then it doesn't get into the official record of the meeting then we have a

problem here, if you see what I mean. So I'm just trying to see if we have a little bit more flexibility as individual SOs and ACs but still within the official schedule and still benefitting from language services and support. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Manal. Let me intervene here at the moment. I think we would want to do that in terms of making sure that in the umbrella of the virtual ICANN68 Policy Forum and the policy forum was designed to have those intense working groups to advance policy and advise work and in your case the GAC communiqué is part of that, but yes, that would be, if you will, included or patterned within those four days and listed because to some sense, you want people who are interested to be able to observe or be part of that as some of the work we've had and the like. But I think that would be our intention, yes. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, David. You may have answered my question before but just a brief question. Are you suggesting in terms of this deconstructed model and the flexibility that there would be flexibility to meet really outside of the call within the four days – that I've heard – but is that flexibility stretched to say the week before and the week after? Or are you at this point hoping to constrain things to the four days of the original meeting? The flexibility is therefore only outside of this call over those four days.

DAVID OLIVE: On that point, as you know, we do have the ICANN meeting prep week. And to that extent, that also includes the GNSO briefing, it's more detailed policy development processes, and so that could be part of it as well. And whether to be some sort of additional special topic to one or two of the groups, a larger webinar could be post of the ICANN meeting but is part of the general programming in keeping with the context of issues that are important in the audiences that you're trying to address. So yes, that could be a flexibility that we would want to have. And of course, normally working groups and other sessions, council meetings are scheduled in that period of the meeting but there could be a special theme or special webinar or brief information sharing that you'd want to do as we do in the GNSO case of policy briefing, compliance and others do other information sharing pre-meeting, and we could think of post-meeting as well as part of this lecture series, if you will, to maintain the virtual approach. I hope that answers that question.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes. Thanks, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Sebastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, David. I understand your discussion here but I have a fear that we start to have three weeks of meeting and we will increase the number of session during the three weeks and people will have to work more and still do the current work of ICANN as you say. In this particular

situation, we need really to think about that because we need to decrease the need for us to be involved. We are in a very particular situation and yet we are online but we have no [indefinite] time to participate to ICANN work. We need really to take care of us all in that situation. ICANN is just one amongst other things. I know that there are people who are doing less work because they are at home but at home there are other things to do. Others take care of other people or they do other things, but they need to do in that period. I really think and I would implore you to decrease the demand on our participants on the time, the number of sessions. We need to concentrate on important topics and to schedule them well and not to open that to everything in this meeting. It's for me really very important.

I will just add one thing. I really think that it must be a decision of ICANN to give more time to any work going on now. Yes, we have deadlines, we are supposed to deliver this thing or this thing, and it's even in the bylaw, and in this really specific case we need to be able to change that and to take care of us and not just take care of what we have to do for ICANN. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sebastien. I think it's not a three-week meeting of which we have from 9 until 5 meetings running for three weeks. We're talking about the core function of the core meetings in those time zones, and then similar to the pre and post, there would be a few, possibly maybe one a day of that on topics of preparation and/or information sharing. It doesn't change too much of how we do it now at this moment but we focus on the core sessions on those core times for the most number of

people to be involved, but other sessions may not be of interest to everyone and that would be optional, if you will, or as they would prefer. That's just to clarify that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, David. Just to be clear myself also, what was really useful in 67 is that the sessions organized by one on other group were very well attended globally and if we miss this, we miss a lot what's been in [real] ICANN meeting. No, we didn't mimic an ICANN meeting in doing virtually. We have changed things and we need to succeed this part and to keep that running in the future, but if you spread that into two or three weeks, it's very demanding in that period. Just to let you know, I am doing things for the community here. I can't stop for one week. I can't stop for three weeks. That means that if you spread that, you will not allow me to participate to some part of the meeting because it's spread too much. And I am not sure if I am the only one. That's okay. Forget about me. Let's not dig the question, but I think that we all have something different to do in that period and we have to take that into account as ICANN. If not, we miss one of our work duties, I guess. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sebastien. You're trying to highlight the important sessions for everyone to be part of in the policy forum and others being business as usual as we can schedule them, and that's a good point and I think people are also noting that. I hear you now. Thank you. Tanzanica, did you want to go on to –

TANZANICA KING: Yeah. I wanted to make a couple of points that may help a little bit with the conversation about interpretation. The issue we face is we have a set of interpreters and because they're human beings, they can only provide support for what we would consider a regular work day. So the flexibility that we know we can give is to say yes, we can do things outside of these four hours but it's going to have to depend on – are we doing plenary sessions from noon to 2:00 KL time? And what time do you want to hold those sessions? So it's going to be a little bit of a puzzle but the ICANN meeting schedule always is. And in this case, I think we have a lot fewer sessions that we are trying to work with, so I think it would be fairly reasonable to think that we can work things out fairly easily, but again it's just going to depend on how many hours we have and making sure that we have those next to each other so that they're within a reasonable work day for those interpreters. I hope that makes some sense.

The last slide that we have in here, if we can go to that slide. It's just a really simple look at production dates. This is just to help give us some idea of where we're at. Obviously, the next steps need to include some decisions about the plenary topics, which ones you're most interested in putting together, but this is just to say what we would normally do is open up our scheduling to the 1st of May and give you lots of time to submit those probably more than you would ever need for reduced schedule. So we're doing okay on time. I see Jonathan. You have your hand up. Is that a new hand?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. Yes. I said quite a lot already so I'll keep it brief. It strikes me that you've got four days, four call sessions. One of the things we may need to trim back on, if we did two plenary sessions per day over four days, we use all that time for plenary sessions, maybe we need to pull back on our expectations of plenary and permit others to work within those four hours to some extent. So that's just an additional thought. I just want to say that in case it was misunderstood, I'm not advocating for a two-week meeting. It was just trying to understand the parameters within which we're working. It sounds like we're pretty close to alignment with the prep week and the focus around these core hours over a four-day meeting. So I feel like we're fairly close to seeing eye to eye on this. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. In looking at next steps, how would you all feel about having either another discussion or another way to give us your feedback on which of these topics we go forward with? I dare call it a survey. Hearing no objections, we can easily put that together.

I also will send you guys following this call a link so that you can look at the survey data that we already received and see the comments and things that are there because I think there's a lot of good input and input that's worth reading from each other so that you can get a feel for what the group wants to do. We will definitely provide the slides. I think considering the production timeline, we're looking at plenty of time for you to go back to your groups too and respond.

Are there any other comments or questions? So then, David, I think in Any Other Business you did want to talk about the award.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you very much. Just again to remind people that the selection process for the Community Excellence Award continues, and normally we have a 30-minute slot during the ICANN Policy Forum for the presentation of that award and the question would be as we're looking at sessions and plenaries, if we would want to do that of course virtually for that 30 minutes within that timeframe or how best to handle that. Please give that some thought because we could surely work out an appropriate and commemorative 30 minutes with the awardee being allowed to say some words and the Nominating Committee similar to the – normally what they do is to talk about the selection process in honor of the person virtually, and then at such times when we're together again, have another physical salute to the person. But please give that some thought as we look to the scheduling and see if that can work or we have to move it to some other time. We can ask those thoughts at another time.

Any other business? I think if I could summarize our conversation here, we are looking to keep the important policy advice and sessions of interest of community in the four-day program time in a ideal time zone that we had presented that would allow a bit of a focus for the Asia-Pacific region in the Kuala Lumpur time zone, and to then in these core sessions move forward and have other groups work around or provide those important working group meetings to take place within that timeframe of the four days. Also to use the prep week for any

information sharing preliminary work for the advancement of the regular meetings and if need be a webinar afterwards to do that but to make sure that the important work is done in the core sessions and business as usual framed around the four-day core program. With that, we will proceed to continue to share information with you and we'll look to scheduling another time in the call. Do you think within a week or so? What would be preference? So we'll send that around to see how it is for your schedules. We want to look to something in a week or two timeframe. And we'll definitely share the slides and the summary notes and the recordings with people so they can focus on that. With that, I'll see if Nick, Tanzanica, or Sally have any final words.

TANZANICA KING: Just to say thank you very much. We'll get those things out to you right away so you can start talking to your groups. Take care of yourselves.

NICK TOMASSO: Thank you all. I appreciate all the support.

DAVID OLIVE: With that, I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, good morning, wherever you may be. Thank you and stay safe. We'll talk to you very soon. Thanks very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]