DAVID OLIVE: Welcome everyone on the 30th of April for the SOAC planning call for the virtual 68 policy forum. We thank you for joining us today. The agenda is as you see it. A welcome by Sally Costerton and myself, a logistics update by Nick and Josh, survey results by Tanzanica King, thank you for your inputs. A draft block schedule and production dates, again, by Tanzanica, and any other business by everyone else.

Just to say, I hope that everyone is keeping safe and remaining healthy during these troubling times. Indeed, we're all concerned about family, friends, and our wellbeing as we try as best we can to continue our daily lives and our activities, including our participation and engagement with ICANN.

This group—and we thank you for joining the call today—is a useful and productive planning group that continues to help everyone organize our ICANN meetings now and into the near future even during these difficult times. And we've heard you on these calls but also in recent budget briefings and plannings on the FY 21-25 plans, we're also hearing your comments highlighting a way to address virtual meetings going forward in the near term. And to that extent, we are aware of that. Although today our focus will be on the virtual policy forum on ICANN 68, I wanted to let you know that we are also looking at and hearing these comments.

May I turn it over to Sally for some remarks? I mean, she was part of the original meeting strategy planning group and may have some interesting comments or observations as well. Sally.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, David. Yes, I was younger and had less gray hair and all those good things. It was a long time ago now, actually, five or six years ago. I think we absolutely need to look at a potentially different framework for the foreseeable future. I mean, I think what we haven't seen yet, the comments that came up on the budget call yesterday David was referring to, there are obviously, and quite understandably, many of you in the community are grappling with, well, what does the future look like? Not just the immediate future where we have an effectively global lockdown, which is where we are now and what we're going to talk about today on the call for ICANN 68. But this sense of, well, there are many different things that may kick in that are new and restrictive in a post-lockdown world. Availability of flights is one, something that people would be mentioning, different kinds of costs structures, what is the feasibility of social distancing, how are countries and populations and governments going to feel about what you might call mass-gatherings, whether or not one of our events might count as that.

There are many new things that we're going to have to consider as a community as we move forward and I think, if you all agree, it makes lots of sense to use this group as a way to explore what kind of options might be available to us. So, I'm very [inaudible]. I think we learned a lot last time when we went through—almost a year, I think—community process to design the current meeting strategy. And there are many people in this group who were part of that process, too, so I think there should be a good collective memory about that we can lean on.

So, I for one, very much welcome that and look forward to being part of those discussions and everything we can do to make things work so that everybody gets what they need. Thank you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sally. And I'll turn it over to Nick and possibly Josh as well on the logistics update. Nick, please.

NICK TOMASSO: Good day, everyone. Good to be here with you today. I just want to take you through specifically the interpretation platform. Last time I talked to you about an infosec review. I am pleased to tell you that that review has been completed and gone through thoroughly with no major exposures identified, so we'll be able to use the new interpretation platform.

As for moving forward, there'll be extensive testing that takes place beginning again next week and in the run up to ICANN 68 virtual meeting. What we plan to do, by the way, is to use the interpretation platform during prep week for those meetings to really give it a vigorous test. I'll also be using [it in a dry run in the runup to test it.]

Training materials. As you'll remember, this platform requires a laptop and a mobile device or a second laptop to act as the headset, if you will, for the non-English languages. So, we're going to be producing training materials and training people on how to use that [in early June.]

Everything else is going as planned and on track for a successful virtual ICANN 68. So, I'll stop there and see if there are any questions. David, over to you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, I think Maureen has her hand up. Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, David, and thank you, Nick. I know the last time we talked about English, the Spanish and French, because we're in the Asia Pacific region, and I know that—Jia-Rong might be able to make some more comments, but I know that in the APAC meetings that we've had very high levels of Asian participants. And I know that although we use English in our APAC sessions, I was wondering if there had been a request at all for Chinese or one of the other Asian languages be available? Jia-Rong might be able to add more on that on whether that would be appropriate. Thank you.

JIA-RONG LOW: David, if I may.

DAVID OLIVE: Yes, please, Jia-Rong.

JIA-RONG LOW: Thank you. So, Maureen, in the case of APAC region this round, there hasn't been any requests particularly for Chinese. Even the case, let's

say if we were to have gone face-to-face to Malaysia for this meeting, I wouldn't have expected for there to be additional requests for APAC languages because Malaysia specifically uses English also as a working language. So, in this case, I think we're all right. In terms of the demand, we are not seeing any additional requests. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Jia-Rong.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Maureen and Jia-Rong. Maureen, does that answer the question?

MAUREEN HILYARD: It certainly does. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. Graeme, you're next please.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks. Hey, all. So, the Registrar Stakeholder Group has played a little bit with live translation and found it really … and that was really part of APAC outreach. And so, subsequently we've really tried to dig into what would be helpful for our members who are not primarily English speakers and it turned out that the live translation is less interesting to them than live transcription. So, for the most part they can follow along, but where they miss a word or whatever, they want to be able to look at

the transcription. And so, I'm pretty curious about what the availability of that is going to be for a number of sessions, as well as for something like our stakeholder group meeting.

NICK TOMASSO: We'll certainly have transcription for all of the plenary sessions. And as we accumulate requests for other sessions, we'll make a determination as to where we can actually provide that service. So, Tanzanica will be gathering all of those requests and we will evaluate them with an eye toward what can we do and how many concurrent sessions there are. So, back to you on that on that particular question.

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay. So, thank you, we'll make sure to put that request in and maybe that's a tip for other people on the call is when you're asking your members about what translation services would be helpful, that was a surprise to me that was going to be so useful, but it was pretty unanimous across all the non-native English speakers that that was helpful. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Graeme, and a good way to kind of determine if interpretation or the transcription is most useful for your groups and also there is a function within the Zoom that allows a similar, but not as direct, service, and that also could be tested as well to see how that works.

With that, I'd like to go to Nick to see if he has any other comments.

NICK TOMASSO: Thank you, David. No other comments from me. Thank you very much. I can certainly be reached via e-mail if any of you have any particular questions. [Thanks.]

DAVID OLIVE: Very good. And we'll continue to update you as developments happen and obviously on the next call at the latest. I now turn it over to the next part of our agenda, which is the survey results. Tanzanica King, would you like to take us through that?

TANZANICA KING: Yes, thanks David. Hi, everybody. Thank you again for completing yet another survey, I know it was probably more than you were expecting this time, so I appreciate you all being able to go ahead and submit these.

                         So, we asked how many plenary sessions we should conduct during the ICANN meeting. We had 19 total responses. So, here you can see the breakdown of how many per group. To get this number, we averaged all of the responses per group so that there was really one vote and when you do it that way, you get just over two. And when you do it just by all 19 responses, you get three. So, that's why we have two to three here for you to think about conducting. Go ahead to the next slide for me please.

                         So, this is the order of the topics that you ranked and this number, because I've been asked a couple of times already, is reflected by a

ranking system that puts a weight on your choices. So, if you choose one, you get a higher weight, and it takes that into consideration along with the number of people who selected a specific topic. So, these are scores. I don't think anybody will be surprised that DNS abuse is at the top of the list here.

Then we have the DNS and the Internet of Things came next. The reason that I have outlined DNS abuse and the other end where we have DNS misuse is because there is also some comments and suggestions that we could combine those maybe. So, that's something to think about. And then, of course, if you're looking at doing two to three, we have those two sessions and the ICANN public forum in third place. Go ahead to the next slide for me please.

The last question we asked was about the community excellence board during ICANN 68 and the majority of you said yes, that we should go ahead and announce that at the virtual meeting but have the actual ceremony take place in our next face-to-face meeting.

So, there's a couple of things from here that I'm hoping we can get some comments on and that is doing the two versus three session, and I know there's some strong feelings about whether a public forum is needed in order to have an opportunity for the community to express concerns and things during this time, especially with the COVID-19, to ICANN, and there's some other suggestions too that maybe it's not the right time to do a public forum. So, I think a little bit more conversation on that would probably be good so we can make a decision.

And then, also, a conversation on whether or not we can combine the DNS abuse sessions. Those were in a couple of different comments that were submitted on the form. So, I want to, before we go on, open it up for conversation on those two topics.

DAVID OLIVE: I will watch the queue for you, Tanzanica.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you very much.

DAVID OLIVE: Jonathan Robinson.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, David. Hello everyone, I'm happy … Sorry, my mic got accidently muted there, apologies.

DAVID OLIVE: You're back, thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah. So, I think a couple of thoughts here. I think I don't feel strongly on the two to three plenary and I think I pretty much recall that we voted for two, the Registry Stakeholder Group. But, in part that depends on the topics. So, I understand it's easy to criticize and I really don't want to become critical of the method, but in some ways asking two to

three without knowing the topics is a little hypothetical and sort of if there were three good topics, let's have three plenary sessions. If there are only two good topics, let's have two. I think, for me, the easy answer is combine DNS abuse with DNS misuse with COVID, I mean I think one is a subset of the other, so for me that's a no brainer. Integrate the two.

What seems to be missing, Tanzanica, is we had proposed, and I don't see that it's there, unless you saw that as DNS misuse with COVID, was … I mean now seems the opportune time to have a session that teases out some immediate lessons learned and thoughts for the future for how we work as a community and how we deal with, perhaps meetings, but other things. I know David made reference to that at the outset. It really just seems to be a perfect opportunity to at least take some [findings] on life in a post-COVID-19 world and how we're all adapting to that and how we might adapt in the future, even if it's a non-conclusive session, but an opportunity to discuss them. And you may feel that's what the public forum is, but those two should be carved apart because I know there were certainly some feelings from our group and perhaps others that the public forum doesn't necessarily belong in a policy meeting.

So, those are my thoughts. Two or three if there's good reason. Certainly combine the two DNS misuse/abuse and consider still, which seems to have got dropped, a forum, an opportunity, a plenary session to discuss life in a post-COVID world from an ICANN perspective. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Jonathan. Manal and then Alejandra. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, David. Sorry, I was trying to unmute. Actually, I was hesitant maybe to take my hand down because Jonathan covered what I wanted to say. I fully agree that we should be topic-oriented, so let's discuss the topics and then agree on the number of slots. Also, regarding the public forum, again, it's not normally scheduled within a policy forum and we shouldn't be putting it because the previous one was successful only. But if there is a good reason to have a similar forum for the discussion, I mean, whether we call it a public forum or not, but let's again be triggered by the topics. So, if there is a specific topic and not just public forum as we call it, again, unless there is a need.

Finally, on the question of the award and having the ceremony when we go face-to-face, if we can have a little bit of brainstorming on what the pros and cons because, again, the question seems to be out of context. We haven't brainstormed on it, I'm not sure what are the pros and cons for having the announcement at one meeting and the ceremony at another meeting versus having both at the same meeting. So, I think it would be good to brainstorm on this as well. Thank you, I'll stop here.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Manal. Again, we use the term public forum I guess in a more broad case. It could also be just a short 60-minute session that the board could conduct, giving them an opportunity to meet with the community as well. And that also could be a topic-driven session either

by the board or a community. So, that's kind of a permutation on that, again, to conserve the time slots as well.

Alexandra and then Rod. Alejandra. Alejandra, you're on mute, if you could unmute. Let me go to Rod, and then we'll come to …

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, I hope you can hear me.

DAVID OLIVE: That's it. Good. Yes, we can. Thank you very much. Please go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you. Can you hear me now?

DAVID OLIVE: Yes, we can. We can hear you, Alejandra, but not now. Let me go to Rod Rasmussen and then we'll come back to you. Rod, if you could.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks, David. So, I think that the thought of combining a general DNS abuse topic with the specifics around COVID-19 and what's going on makes some sense, but only if we have a little bit longer time. That's one of the things I know we had put in our survey is that seeing that the plenaries at 60 minutes were awfully short, that 90 minutes might be more appropriate because I believe that's more of what we normally do if not longer. So, I don't know if other folks have had thoughts on that as

EN

well, but if you want to do a combined topic, I think you need a little bit more time on that to talk because as soon as you start getting into some of the specifics of what's going on, it's going to take up most of your time and not give you a lot of time for, say, a general discussion around the status of things. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Rod. Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Sorry.

DAVID OLIVE: That's okay.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Disconnected exactly at the time I was going to talk. So, sorry for that. I wanted to warn you that we need to reach out back to the group that was organizing the DNS and Internet of Things plenary for Cancún to see if it's feasible for them to be able to do it for ICANN 68. So, just to let you know that and to please not consider it yet fixed until we can confirm with them if that's something that can happen. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Alejandra. Julie Hammer, please.

EN

JULIE HAMMER:	Thanks, David. Just to also follow up on Rod's comment. We also [both have] had a comment that normally when we talk about topics for plenaries, we're just talking about the topics that we as a community constitute a panel of some sort to present various views and interact with the community on. We don't normally mix ICANN public forums in such a category or updates on various topics such as the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. So, as part of the survey to answer that, we think we need two to three plenaries and then have some of those other topics, which to my knowledge, we've never regarded as plenary-type sessions on the list and have them counted as plenaries was a bit confusing. So, in my view, the answer of two to three plenaries is more in relation to that first type of topic and then it could be there are other topics like EPDP, evolution that constitute more briefings that may be appropriate to have. Thanks.
DAVID OLIVE:	Thank you, Julie. A good point about update briefings possibly as a different approach and a different formatting for scheduling. So, thank you for that. Sébastien Bachollet.
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thank you, David. I really think that even if it's not in a usual policy forum that a time for the community to come together and to exchange on various topics that a participant would like to bring to the table. At this period of time, it's very important. But if we don't want to do the same thing, may I suggest that we don't organize—and I know it will be virtual, but we don't organize a table with a board member and the rest

of the community in the other side, but we ask the chair of SOs and ACs, the chair of the Board, and the chair of the NomCom and the CEO to be at the table and to discuss with the rest of the community. It could be one way to have something a little bit different and, in the same time, I think it's very important that we offer some place where we have the possibility to open discussion to breathe and not just a topic to bring to the attention for one session.

And I think it's very important for the people who are new or quite new within ICANN. My fear is that online will be a way to have less new voices and more of the usual suspects speaking and I hope that one way to decrease this fear is to have this, we'll call that, community public forum. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sébastien. Other comments or questions? Jonathan Zuck, your hand's up please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, David. This may be late because we just did the survey and everything like that, but I think as we went through and did the prioritization on the last call and Keith Drazek mentioned that, for example, subsequent procedures was still going to be a priority, et cetera, and we know that DNS abuse is a priority and we know that people will still be discussing the PIR situation by then. I wonder if a plenary on reform of public interest commitments and PIC DRP would be something that would have cross-community support. I guess it probably wasn't on your survey, but it occurs to me that it's something

that ties together a lot of things that have been identified as priority topics and it's certainly something that requires a kind of community-wide discussion. So, I just wanted to put it out there, even though this might be an inconvenient time to raise it. But, PICs and PIC DRP and what needs to be done to fix them feels like a really important topic.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Jonathan. Other comments? If I could quickly go back to Manal, if I could, in terms of the question of the community excellence award and also your question about announcing but what to do, that's very important to make sure the recognition is appropriate and while one could try to do a virtual ceremony, if you will, we of course are looking for approaches to that. And so, thank you for raising that, we'll give that some other thoughts and we could also probably ask the group that's looking to select the person to receive the award.

In terms of what we're hearing now that there, yes, should be a combination of the DNS abuse and the COVID, or somehow linked but maybe needing more than 60 minutes. The Internet of Things still relies on and is contingent upon the group that would help do that, so Alejandra questioned us about needing to check that, if we would [look forward] to that.

Again, Keith Drazek earlier talked to us about this a policy forum, and so we should focus on those topics of policy advice that may be of interest to the entire group as a priority for the sessions. Sébastien Bachollet talked about maybe having a session with the ICANN Board chair, vice chair, SOAC leaders, and whatnot to talk about things and issues.

Jonathan Robinson talked about possibly a session on what does it mean in a post-pandemic era to deal with our ICANN work. And Jonathan Zook talked about reforms for PICs and reforms of those community requirements as possible additions.

I think I've captured most of that. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, David. Just a quick remark, it's more of food for thought. At one point in time we were discussing an approach that we are working with the review session policy and trying to prioritize only topics that are important and pressing. And this is as we wait for our face-to-face meeting. Or are we now discussing a new normal meeting, or sort of? I mean, because the agenda would differ, the schedule would differ. Either we're working with our regular agenda and then putting all the topics that we need to discuss, or are we working under some emergency circumstances so we're prioritizing specific topics to have concise and focused meetings to progress on pressing matters until we meet face-to-face.

So, just flagging it for discussion so that we take it into consideration because sometimes I feel we're changing the approach. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Manal. Jonathan Robinson.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, David. I think I can offer a partial response to Manal's thought and it feels to me like we are neither in a new normal nor in the sort of rapid response mode that we were for ICANN 67. It feels to me like we're in some kind of transition between the two at this stage. We're trying to be more considered and not just reacting to the rapid change of circumstances, but frankly we don't know quite what will and won't yet work effectively.

I'm conscious of not wanting to bang my sort of own drum too hard in this and be very much listening to others as well, but I can't help feeling that we haven't simply have a brief period of change and things revert back to normal. I think Sally remarked on that, I think David remarked on that. It's forming for all of us that for so many reasons, a country may be wide open, may accept the meeting, but may not accept citizens from other countries or it could be so many different … And we talked about this a little on the finance call as well.

So, it feels to me like the sooner we embrace that as a possibility, even if it's not a certainty, and start to discuss what that means, and including … Even if we narrow that in on to how we do policy development work, which makes it directly relevant to this meeting, but it feels to me like it would serve two purposes: One, this sort of pressure cooker thing that Sébastien made reference to, which is like creating an opportunity for people to simply share experiences, but also what we don't want to do is simply share experiences, we want to say, "Well, what do we think that means?" And just start to fill the funnel with ideas, even if it's not conclusive, as I said earlier, and hear from the community as to what this might mean, if for example, we can't meet at ICANN 69 or even further, can't meet at ICANN 70. And start to just look

EN

really ahead and think how we might work differently on policy primarily, but also in other ways that we might work. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks, Jonathan. Sébastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, and I agree with Jonathan. I just wanted to add one or two points. The first one is that the meeting strategy working group Sally talked about in the introduction. We may have forgotten, but the name of this meeting is policy forum, but in fact it was not just for policy, but it was also for outreach as it was supposed to be in places where ICANN have trouble to go before and we wanted to have some outreach. And I think it's a place where we have trouble to go, it's a large world with virtual meeting and it's one of the reason I really think that a global moment for everybody to participate and say what they want and their experiences could be useful.

And to add about Manal's question, I don't think we are in, as Jonathan said, either in this one way or the other, but we may act as if we will never have any more face-to-face meeting. I hope that it's not the case, but in the same time ready to have the next face-to-face meeting. Therefore, we need to try to take both on board to find the best way to have this meeting. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you very much. Other comments? Again, we should try to focus again on these plenary sessions. Again, those are times that are going to

be maybe difficult for some, but we want to have the coherence of the meeting focusing on that. And so, I guess the first question, do we want to have a 60-minute session that is led by the Board and talking about a topic that they might want to raise with the community? Because of the policy forum, normally there is not such a meeting and we encourage board members to attend and participate in various sessions, but maybe this would be a possibility for a 60-minute session. And then, for the topics for the plenary, there seems to be the COVID DNS abuse as being one, and possibly the Internet of Things being two. But others as we mentioned before. Do we have any comments? Do we want to rule out a 60-minute session with the Board and a topic that you could suggest or they might suggest or combine? Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, David. I was just thinking about that special block session where we've got eight 60-minute sessions in that four-day period. And we're looking at the moment perhaps two plenaries and perhaps your suggestion of a session with the board. But, what other purposes is it conceived that we will be using the other sessions within that block, which is supposed to be a special block where the more important sort of combined discussions will take place? But is it only sort of like ICANN-related, or if there was a spare one and At-Large, perhaps, or some other group, was planning a cross-community plenary of our own. For example, if we decided to do one on the PICs that we might want to hold it in that particular session. I mean, has it already been decided about what would be the priority from Org's point of view about what goes into those slots?

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Maureen. I'll have Tanzanica talk a little bit about the block schedule beforehand. But again, what this group prefers to do—and we're just pointing out some of the logistics, the time zone issues—but we really need to have your views on the topics that need to be in for the virtual policy forum. Tanzanica, do you want to talk about this slide here?

TANZANICA KING:

Thanks, David. So, the question about the time—I just want to start with that because it was on my list as well in terms of 90 minutes or 60 minutes. We can easily turn the plenary slots into 90, obviously that sounds like it would be a necessity, especially if we're combining multiple topics. So, that's not a problem whatsoever.

The way that the block schedule came about, if you recall on the last call, we had the four-hour blocks that we were showing. We increased it to include the full day because that's what we're able to provide is the services to accommodate that. And so, that four-hour block was looking at what time across all time zones would be the best if your focusing on Kuala Lumpur as the primary location, or the time that we're following, what time of day would be the best.

So, when we did that, we found that this time that's about 13:00 in KL or 5:00 UTC is probably the best time that doesn't fall in quite such horrible hours. I hesitate as I say that because I know it's not great for everybody, there's no single answer that's perfect. But that's why we selected those slots. You'll see in this block schedule we're showing now

I took out that second row of plenary session slots since the results of the survey were to hold two to three. So, and I have seen some of the planning that you all have been doing in terms of your schedules, so I think if I understand your question correctly, Maureen, yes, you're able to use those slots as you wish. If we're not scheduling plenaries in them, then you can schedule anything you want in there. And there's no block on doing things in 60 minutes or 90 minutes, so as long as we have 30 minutes between sessions, we're doing that to make sure that everybody has a chance to disconnect, reconnect, do what they need to do, in particular with our techs and interpreters so that they don't have any issues if sessions go over a couple of minutes, there's enough time to make the transition to another session.

I'm also showing on here the DNSSEC workshop and GAC communique. You're used to seeing those in the block schedule, and Tech Day as well. But there are some other sessions that I've either heard about or seen drafted as well. So, we should be able to share some more soon. Are there any other questions about how we have this block schedule laid out? And are we okay with thinking of these three potential slots on Monday, Tuesday, or Thursday, depending on what the final decision is? Or I could send out another survey. I have somebody laughing behind their mute button.

DAVID OLIVE: I think we really would like to see if we can provide more specificity at this stage. We seem to have the COVID-related session at 90 minutes as a possible plenary. There could be a session that Jonathan Robinson talked about, which might be something to the effect of combining how

we do policy and advice development in the virtual world in the pandemic time, and that could be a linked a little bit to the multi-stakeholder model discussion how indeed the continuity and ability of the community to do that work is an important part of that. That would be another way of combining some.

And then I see Keith talking about a session that might include the Board and SOAC leaders, not a typical public forum, but an opportunity to come together and discuss maybe the current situation of the COVID. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, David. I'll give you a strawman to sort of build on what you were saying there, or I'm not sure if we say strawperson these days or if there is an alternative.

The two sessions. There's the DNS abuse and I would argue COVID domain name-related misuse combined. You've got your IoT, you've got Keith and perhaps others coming in in support of this Board and SOAC leaders combined and I would think a fourth one is looking at an ICANN work in a post-COVID-19 world. And the reason I mention the policy linkage was I didn't want to be deviating too far from ICANN 68 being a policy forum, but really they are one and the same thing. It's ICANN work in a post COVID world, if necessary, if others feel strongly about it, specifically focusing on the policy development aspects of our ICANN work, but frankly I've got an open mind as to whether it was [broad] or policy specific. Thanks, David. [Inaudible] [in 10 minutes].

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Jonathan. A good summary of what would be roughly four sessions. The DNS abuse and COVID-19, Internet of Things, if indeed that group can do that, although that could also maybe be a webinar at another time. The Board, SOAC, ICANN Exec, CEO, leadership call to discuss generally and then a topic on ICANN's work in the post-COVID-19 world, what does it mean, and what are the implications. Does that work for what might be three or four at this stage? Noting that the DNS abuse one has to be 90 minutes, the SOAC Board, that could be 60, and others we can determine the timeframes involved. Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, David, thank you very much. I know that you read part of the comments but I feel that all the public session must be 90 minutes. The time we warm up, the time we are ready to go, the time we participate, and I am not talking about technical issues but personal involvement and there's a time the discussion will go. Even in a virtual world, or even more in a virtual world we need to have time and I think it's really very important. And I know that my proposal to have SOAC leaders, it's now SOAC leaders, the full Board, and the full exec team, and so on, and we can't have everyone in the room and nobody on the stage. But I feel we need to be a little bit innovative, it's why I suggest that we concentrate on the SOAC leaders and I am not among them. I will say SOAC chairs here to be more precise and that means that it's less people will be the good one to be in front, if there is a front, in this virtual meeting. Thank you very much.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Sébastien, and thank you Keith. Indeed, the Board, SOAC leaders, ICANN execs, can, I think, three or four can be combined successfully as that is a topic, the ICANN work in the post-COVID-19. And as you know, some of these plenary sessions are not necessarily run by panel or panelists but a kind of ability to engage everyone and we could have it with a very light moderator and have obviously Board, SOAC chairs, the ICANN CEO, and all others talking about it and combine that into the one session that could be the 90 minutes and could help us address those issues that also touch upon the policy and advice development.

And so, a clever and creative way of combining the two so that we then have roughly three: The DNS abuse/COVID, Internet of Things if possible by the organizers, and then a combined large group session on the ICANN work in a post-COVID-19 world, challenges, and opportunities type of thing, which we can try to make sure that the board chair, vice chair, SOAC chairs, and others are involved to input. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, David. I'm just taking up what is sort of currently being discussed. We really are still working on this, on a face-to-face model and fitting it into a virtual program. And of course, when the meeting formats were originally done and Sébastien was on that working group, but when it was done it was all focusing on how people will need to interact to get the best value out of being together in a face-to-face situation. I mean, we're talking around it in our discussion today, but I think we really need to look at a fourth model, a fourth meeting format that specifically looks at what we need to include into a virtual meeting.

And it has to be something that we actually try to look at it a little bit more creatively so that when we see a block schedule that's just got normal items that are normally in a normal, face-to-face meeting, sort of like slotted in already, it doesn't make it look as if we're trying to do something that is actually working toward a virtual model. So, it's just something I think we should be paying a little more attention to. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Maureen. And I think the virtual model going forward, whatever it might be, is I think a discussion for this group in a separate session, which we surely can help facilitate that conversation. I think it is important and needed to focus specifically on how that virtual meeting or new model might look. Bruna, please, and then Jonathan Robinson.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you very much, David. Just to add some support to Maureen on this. This is a point, and she mentioned she has brought to this group before, especially in the first meeting of this planning for ICANN 68, we did hope that that first meeting was kind of an assessment of what worked and what didn't work in ICANN 67. But, we do agree with the need for us to develop some sort of governance model/virtual meeting plan for the future since we are looking into a future that it's not really coming back to face-to-face meetings, at least not this year, in our opinion. So, just to back up this statement from Maureen and for us to further discuss what will be our virtual meeting strategies. Thank you very much.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. If I could ask my colleague, Sally Costerton, to comment. She may wish to do that. Sally?

SALLY COSTERTON: Thanks, David. Thanks, everybody. Yeah, it feels like, as I said in my introductory comment, this is a discussion we were all kind of itching to have. So, what I was going to suggest is that we don't do that as a plenary session because that will be just unmanageable, but we use this group as we are very established as to a working group together, we convene a call for this group to do exactly what you're describing maybe during prep week. How does that sound? So, we've got it on the schedule. I mean, we could use another one of these calls to set up a separate call for this group before that if you wanted to start sooner. And then, if we need to, depending on normally we would reconvene after ICANN 68, and it may be we want to use some of those calls to do this work, if that makes sense.

But it depends on what the appetite is to when do you want to start that discussion, but I suggest we do it outside the plenary session, but that we put it in the diary.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks, Sally, and thank you, Bruna. Again, in this transition period that we're in to try to keep to a policy forum but yet be attentive to the community top issues that are important as well. Jonathan Robinson.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, David. I'll try to keep this brief and focused as possible. I was going to raise this under AOB, but it links very neatly to the previous three comments, including that from Sally. One of the key points of opposition I got was on this time zone. A, the specific time zone, and B, forcing us into—mostly the specific time zone. It's incredibly inconvenient for some and I know the answer will be all time zones are inconvenient for some, but this goes to the heart of the point because in a physical meeting, we all come together in the same time zone. It makes sense to coalesce and work around that local time zone, obviously. In a virtual meeting, expecting any one group, for example, to work between X antisocial hour and Y antisocial hour for four days in a row is problematic.

And I realize there's other logistics about the technical support and so on, but exactly as Sally says, it's a timely conversation. I fully support having it. I don't have a strong view about when we have it, but I'm in line with sort of Maureen and Bruna and others that we really have to tackle this and think innovatively and thoroughly about key aspects of what we've come to assume as sort of normal today. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Jonathan. Jia-Rong, please.

JIA-RONG LOW: Thank you, David. If you don't mind a bit, [inaudible] a little bit because I need some guidance from the leadership in this group. Typically, for each ICANN meeting there was usually a local/regional element to it and I know we're looking at this as a virtual policy forum, but what I'm

seeing now is that association with Kuala Lumpur [still.] And I'm still getting a little bit confused in terms of whether we should do the bare minimum, what is essential, or we can do some good to haves. And now, it's about a month and a half until the actual meeting itself. We need to do a bit of planning in terms of if we want to bring in some regional elements to the virtual policy forum, and I'm hoping for some guidance on do we do that? Should we keep to the bare minimum, or we shouldn't look at it at all? So, I'm just hoping some guidance in this area so we can start planning. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Any thoughts, now for Jia-Rong, or we can surely share those at another time? He makes a good point about the planning for that is needed. Jia-Rong, we'll try to get some further guidance from the group as soon as we can to help on this point, as they focus on that. If I may just, Tanzanica, do you have any other comments on the block schedule here before we come to the top of the hour?

TANZANICA KING: Nope. I think we can take what we've gotten on this call and do another update and send that out. The only thing left is just our last slide, which we'll send these slides out to everybody, but, Kim, if you could go forward to that really quickly? Oh, we're not seeing it there. We have calendar dates, which seem to be missing in action. Here they are. So, this is primarily for staff who will be helping to get your sessions in, so we won't keep you on it. We'll just send these out. Plenty of time to get everything in and think about how you actually complete your

schedules and work on planning development for the sessions. So, thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you very much. And, quickly, as we're running short on time, we will let you know and schedule another one of these calls in the next week or so, so that we can continue the discussion.

We seem to have come to the conclusion that we're looking at a possibility of three forums, at least at 90 minutes each. The combination of the DNS abuse and the COVID challenges, the second one is an Internet of Things, pending some of the experts there, and a combined leadership led discussion on the topic of ICANN's work in a post-COVID-19 world challenges and opportunities. And those would be the three there.

Indeed, we are hearing you about the need for a possible future governance model or a fourth model for virtual meetings if indeed that is going to be more in our future than less. And that we will be convene this group as a separate discussion track to do that and we'll see if we wanted to have something more formal in prep week to do that. But [inaudible], that's an important topic that I think needs its own separate track.

We also talked about the need to focus attention on what the regional linkings, as Jia-Rong questioned, and ask for some guidance on preparation for that. And we also looked to announcing the community excellence award, but also asking that group how best to present it in a virtual form or a face-to-face form.

EN

With that, I think I've covered everything. Any other final AOB comments? With that, I thank you for the time and attention. Please stay safe and healthy. With that, I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, or good morning wherever you may be. Thank you very much for this good and constructive chat. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]