EN

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, and welcome, everyone, to our ICANN69 virtual call to plan for the sessions ahead. Here is the agenda that we would propose: a welcome from Sally Costerton and myself, the plenary sessions, a briefing by Tanzanica and Mary Wong and the community, an ICANN69 draft schedule review by Tanzanica, an update on the preparatory week by Carlos and Ozan, and Any Other Business that you may want to raise or issues to bring to our attention. If there is agreement on our agenda going forward, let us start and waste no time in getting to hear any comments by Sally Costerton. Sally, please?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Good evening, good morning, good afternoon. Thank you, David. Thank you all for joining us tonight. I think this is a good agenda, where we now feel it's coming a bit quickly. Suddenly we feel like there's not really that long until ICANN69. I know today—I think Tanzanica is going to cover this, and we've had some chat on the list as well—we want to try and resolve some overlaps that inevitably occur because of the way we put the agenda together. It's a very bottom-up process. I know from the feedback that you've shared with us in the feedback from ICANN68 was that it was clear that you wanted to minimize or completely avoid overlap of topics so that we could in other words streamline things a little more. So that's something that we'll flag with you now that we've got a reasonably good view of what everybody has asked for and have some discussion around that.

The other thing to be aware of is simply to make sure that we've got the right, as well as we possibly can, balance of when each meeting is being

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.

EN

held. So we have these three different types of meetings. We have our prep week, we have our SO/AC week, and we have the ICANN plenary-dominated week, if you like: our traditional ICANN meeting week. I know we've had lots of discussion over the previous months about how to make that balance work better or everybody, so have a look and see what the draft agenda looks like. If you think there are things that are sitting in one group of meeting timeframes that might be better suited to another, this is a good opportunity to have that discussion. Thank you very much. Back to you, David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Sally. With that, we'll proceed to Item number two on the agenda: the plenary topics; the three, of course, that were selected by the group. Tanzanica and Mary, why don't you start us off, please?

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, David. Hi, everybody. We have the three topics that, after gathering all of your votes, we came to. Hopefully, you all saw the e-mail from Jonathan that came in requesting that we put the DNS marketplace session on Monday. Hopefully, I didn't see anybody coming back with an issue with that timing, but please speak up if there are any concerns. Right now, we have the DNS marketplace in on Monday, the domain name system abuse, and then the consumer protection on the Wednesday of Plenary Week.

Mary, if you want to jump about what the next steps are for planning those sessions out, go ahead, please.

MARY WONG: Thanks, Tanzanica. Hi, everybody. I don't have much to say at this point. I hope that you've seen an e-mail that went out a day or so ago from Carlos setting up a Doodle poll which closes tomorrow, asking for those groups who'd like to be involved in any of these plenary sessions to please at least have one person put down their availability. We'll then get together with the volunteers and work out the usual cadence and what needs to be done. Obviously, the main thing is to have a clear session description, certainly a clear understanding of all those participating, about the shared objectives for those sessions and what the preferred outcomes are and everything that goes into preparing for that.

I think the two other things I'll say is that, for the first one, which is the domain name service marketplace, our assumption is that the contracted parties will take the lead on that one because our understanding is that that is based on a presentation and a briefing that they did for the ICANN Board that was very well received and that the community believes it would benefit from hearing from these parties about the business models and commercial drivers. So that's one thing that I'll follow up directly with the composers of that on.

As to the other point, it really is to reiterate a couple of things that we mentioned before. One is that, to the extent any of these topics match or complement discussions that your community or your sessions are going to be conducting, especially during, say, Week 1, then it'll be helpful to avoid duplication, obviously, and to minimize overlap but to enhance the thematic complementarity. I don't know if I just made up a

word. So that's a way to do that, whether through this group or through the ones who'll be involved in organizing these topics. Then I just wanted to highlight that being a key piece of feedback from previous meetings; if there is a theme and we can build on that, that will be quite a good outcome. Thank you very much for your comment, Donna.

Of course, the other thing is something that I always say: while we know there's a lot of views in the community on certain topics, and while it's always good to hear from a diversity and an array of voices and stakeholders, the emphasis for these plenary sessions should really be on discussion and interactivity. So, if possible, it will be nice to avoid a very cramped panel of people speaking to the slides. If we're going to do that, then hopefully it'll be minimal and we can see much more interaction, especially for a virtual meeting.

So just fill out the Doodle poll if possible. We will back to those volunteers and those proposing groups with a first-meeting proposal. Thanks, Tanzanica.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Mary. I'll also just point out on here that we have the Board community focused on ICANN meetings on Monday afternoon. We're still doing a little bit of work to see what we might add on Tuesday, where it says "Social Activity." So we're looking at that. I know that some of you have sessions at those times.

If we can go to the next slide, we'll go ahead and look at the draft schedule. In all, we have 103 sessions on the schedule, which is quite a

bit more than we've had the last couple meetings, as somewhat expected.

Sebastien, I see you have a question. I don't want to jump too far ahead if you have one about something else, so go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Tanzanica. I don't have a question. It's the fact that Mary told about how we can organize those plenary sessions. I would like to come back with the same proposal I made, I guess, a few years ago. If we want to have a presentation, we must do that in the prep week, and the plenary session must be a place with no presentations but just discussion—a discussion among the panelists, if some wish, and discussion with the room, with the participants. But, if we need some presentation, it must be done outside of that. If not, as usual, there will be presentation and no discussion. And that's not good for what we are doing. It's not good when we're face-to-face, but it's even worse in the current situation because few people will take the floor—the same usual suspects—and the others won't be allowed, because of time and because of pressure. I would like really that the people think about, if they need something, doing it in the prep week for presentation preparation. The name is here: Prep Week. And do the discussion during the two other weeks. Thank you very much.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Sebastien. Moving on to the schedule, 103 sessions. As I was saying, that's quite a bit more than we're used to doing in this virtual format, anyways. Through the various dates here, I've tried to highlight

where we have some questions. There are three or four of what we consider to be third-party meeting requests. So that's something we want to consider. There are also a couple sessions from the Org that I'll point out to that may be conflicts. We'd like to get your feedback on whether those are needed or could happen at a different time and what your preferences are. So I'll go quickly through the days, and then I would like to hear from you.

First, Donna, please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Tanzy, if you want to finish your run through, I'll come back if you like.

TANZANICA KING: Okay, sure. We could do this day by day. There's a little bit of challenge in that only because, if we want to look at things that are redundant, hopefully you all had a chance to look at what we sent out the other day so you could see some of the issues already. But we'll just go ahead and flip through the day, and then we can go back and jump around as needed.

On Tuesday, we've outlined one request that is a Brand Registry Group community session as a third-party request. We can go back to that topic, which I'm guessing Donna might want to talk about.

If we can go ahead to skip to Wednesday, here we've highlighted a couple more third-party meetings and also this first Internet governance-related session on the schedule. We're going to see a few spread out across the two weeks.

Go to Thursday, please. Here is again some Internet governance sessions. These are requested by EURALO.

If we go to the next day, it should skip us up to Monday. The only thing I've highlighted here is to know that we have the first plenary on Monday, as I said, with the DNS marketplace.

Go ahead to Tuesday, please. There have been requests for Middle East Space, which I'm not sure we need to have during the actual meeting or if it's something that could happen outside of the official dates. Then also there's a request for universal acceptance. I mainly highlighted this because it was not on the draft of the schedule that you saw the other day. So I didn't want it to be a surprise.

If we go ahead to Wednesday, we see another Engagement Group on Internet Governance session here. This one also requested through ALAC. Then we have our third plenary for consumer protection. I just highlighted that as a point to note.

If we jump to Thursday, we see there is a community update on a universal acceptance that I thought couldn't be too much of a community update if so many of you were going to be in sessions doing your wrap-ups. So I'd like to hear from you on if that's something that you want to be able to participate in and if we should put it on another day or if it should be considered something that goes into a different timeslot or a webinar at another time.

Donna, I will jump back to you and let you start off with your question or comments. Go ahead, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Tanzy. I'd like to understand the classification of a third-party meeting request and what the concern is.

TANZANICA KING: Sure. I can start off, and then some others may be able to join in. At one point in time, we had a policy (not a formal one) that different groups that were outside of ICANN official SO/ACs, like the Brand Registry Group, just as an example, would be able to request things by being sponsored by a SO/AC. That's how it has happened historically, but it's been, as you probably know, on the table in terms of conversation about whether it makes sense for ICANN to actually support those sessions from a financial point of view, primarily. So third party is anything that's not an ICANN SO/AC—not official ICANN work.

DONNA AUSTIN: Tanzy, both the Geo-TLD Group and the BRG are members of the Registry Stakeholder Group. I'd also mention that all the members of those respective groups are contracted parties with ICANN. So I don't really accept that it's a third-party meeting request. I do believe that the meetings that they hold are like-minded but are also sharing information that might be specific to the geo as a TLD or the brand as a TLD. So, in some respects, it's not really that different from … We have different categories of TLDs now. And, within the Registry Stakeholder Group, we respect that we're not a homogenous group anymore, so it doesn't always make sense to have conversations that are geo-TLD-specific or brand-specific within Registry Stakeholder Group meetings.

So I don't agree with the classification that they are third-party meeting requests because they are both members of the Registry Stakeholder Group. If there's a conflict with these sessions, then by all means, I'm willing to have a conversation to see if there's another time available for those groups that would suit them. Happy to do that, but I really do take issue with the classification that they are a third-party meeting request. Thanks, Tanzy.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Donna. Let me go first to Sebastien and then Susan.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe you wish to continue this discussion and come back to me after you are done with this path because I think it's an important one, and I don't want to talk about that for the moment, please.

TANZANICA KING: I'm going to turn to Sally or David and ask for some help on this because I don't have a specific opinion on whether we can accept them as not being third-party meetings. I think that it's a technical thing. That's what we refer to them as because they're not officially, even if they're members of the groups. But, again, it's definitely not my expertise to say whether they should be or not. So is there anything else I can get—

MARY WONG: Tanzanica?

MARY WONG: Yes?

MARY WONG: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt.

DAVID OLIVE: Mary, go ahead, and I'll add some suggestions.

MARY WONG: Okay. Thank you, David. And thank you, Tanzanica. Maybe it's the use of the word "third-party." Just so you know, Donna and everybody, we certainly don't mean anything more than what Tanzanica said and what I said in chat, as in it's not an official ICANN community structure. That's not to pass any judgments on groups for their meetings or agendas and so forth.

I think, to the point about what is the session about, that could be something that is the focus here, whether it's related to ICANN business. It certainly isn't for Org or any of the staff to make a judgement even based on a request that we see: "This particular group or this particular topic seems more suited for an ICANN meeting and this one is not." So that's one of the reasons why Tanzanica is highlighting it for this group. Again, maybe we should just a different word than "third-party."

I think the other piece that may be helpful here is that, in the past, as Tanzanica said, when we had physical meetings, these requests did cause some concerns because—again, not pointing to any group or any specific requests—we would get request from a group or an entity that is a member of a stakeholder group, for example. Again, it's very hard for us and Org to say, "Well, is that or is that not an official meeting of the group, since it's requested by a member of a community structure or is sponsored by a community structure?"

So we think it's timely to have that discussion, but we certainly didn't mean to imply anything about any group or any request by that. We just want to have the discussion because that has been a growing concern and issue in the past. We just don't want it to be the case for a virtual meeting, either.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Mary. One other thing to consider is that, when we are at the physical meetings, it's a little bit different because we can look at where we have space available that's not being used, and it's easy for us to say, "Okay, there are other members in the community that would like to utilize that space." So then we can easily allocate it. We can let them request their own services or catering from the venue, and it's no problem. It's a little bit strange being in the virtual format because it's costing ICANN money to provide those services. But the physical room doesn't exist, so we don't have that alternate approach. So I just thought that'd be important to point out.

EN

DAVID OLIVE: Susan Payne wanted to have a comment on this, and then I'll say something. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, David. I really just want to support what Donna has been saying. I've heard what Mary said, and I'm somewhat comforted by it. But it seems to be, even in terms of what Mary was saying, some sort of assessment that some meetings are more official and more worthwhile having or being allowed to go ahead than others. I really do feel that's quite a nuanced judgement being made here and would question what the difference is between a Brand Registry Group meeting, for example, which is a group of brand registries and is all about things like outreach and engagement and surely is exactly what an ICANN meeting is meant to be about, and something like a meeting of the ccNSO's Internet Governance Liaison Committee, which is clearly not the whole ccNSO but is a group of them. And I'm not picking on them. It's just an example that [I first came] to as I was scrolling through. Or, as another example, the Registry Stakeholder Group DAAR Discussion Group. Again, not all the Registry Stakeholder Group but a group of registries talking about a specific topic or a specific issue. Really, frankly, if the Registry Stakeholder Group had submitted this request as Registry Stakeholder Group brand registry issues or geographical registry issues, we wouldn't even be having this discussion but it would be the exact same meeting. So I take issue with the distinction being drawn.

DAVID OLIVE: Donna, please?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, David. I think Susan has captured pretty much what I wanted to say, but I just want to come back to, as Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group, that I am aware that this has caused problems in the past. We've done the best that we can to work around that. As I said at the start, if this is an issue about a conflict with another session or you don't have a room, then I'm more than happy to go off and have a conversation with the BRG or the Geo-TLD Group. But it's not fair to represent either the BRG or the Geo-TLD Group as not within the ICANN structure because they are contracted parties with ICANN—all of them—and they sit underneath the umbrella of the Registry Stakeholder Group. As Keith says, we have interest groups, but they are also members of the Registry Stakeholder Group. They pay membership fees to the Registry Stakeholder Group. So they are part of the ICANN construct. So sorry but that argument just doesn't hold with me.

So, if we want to have a conversation about a policy as to how do we handle requests from entities that don't normally sit within the ICANN structure, then I'm happy to have that conversation, but I think it's a little unfair the way this is being categorized as it currently is. Thanks.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Donna. If I may, I don't think we were trying to cast it one way or the other. We were trying to raise the attention for the entire group that, in looking at the 103 sessions we're now facing, there may be too many, and should we look at those that can be placed either

elsewhere outside of the ICANN two weeks or at another time as a webinar, be it sponsored by the registries or the registrars or the like.

So it really is a question of trying to prioritize the resources, whether it is in the real face-to-face meeting or virtual, and to also spread out the time and the efforts for the community so that it's manageable for all. Yes, I think it would be helpful to have a policy on handling these requests of subgroups, if you will, or sub-factions that are part of your larger groups and need to have discussion space or getting together to confer with each other. I think that would be helpful going forward. But, if it's possible to say, should these be on the main ICANN program at the moment and not in a different time and an easier time zone and timeframe, I guess that is the question we're raising to the group without judgement one way or the other.

DONNA AUSTIN: Tanzy/David, if the issue is that there is no room available at the time of the BRG and Geo-TLD groups have requested, then I'm more than happy to go back and work with them to see what else would fit with them.

I will note that it's a little bit ironic that most of the BRG and Geo-TLD group members probably come from a time zone that's close to Europe. So the Hamburg time zone actually works for them. But, as I said, if the issue is a conflict, I'm more than happy to go back and work with the groups to see if we can swap it out for something else.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. Thank you, Donna. I believe at least one of them—the BRG one—we're not exactly on right now. It goes beyond the number of virtual rooms we planned to have the tech team accommodate. So I will have to come back on that, and I think we can probably work on these then online/offline after this call so that we can move on, unless there's any other comments.

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks for the comments. And thanks, Tanzy. Let move on to the next item, please.

TANZANICA KING: I think the next part of the discussion should be about the Internet governance session. I'd like to look to, I think, Sebastien—yeah—as his hand goes up. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, it was exactly the topic. I see that you highlight three meetings in blue. Frankly, they are really three different [upticks] and groups who are meeting, and there are some connections. You have one fitting the other. One is the ccNSO. The other one is organized as we are in the European meeting by EURALO but with a lot of stakeholders from Europe to discuss both ICANN and Internet governance issues. That's why we have two slots of one hour. The last one is a longer meeting, but it's with the engagement group with the wide community group who will discuss different topics, with the Board also participating. Therefore, I really feel it's not, because it's written "Internet governance," the

same meeting. It's really three groups/three types of discussion, and all will be useful for most of the community and for ICANN. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Sebastien. Maureen, you're next.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Tanzy. Again, just talking about the Internet governance issue and just following up on what Sebastien said about the European perspective, for example, as he said, replacing their session times that they were allotted for for their general assembly, which is changed, there is some important aspects that they want to talk about, seeing that it's in the EU region.

But with regards to Olivier's session on the engagement group, remembering that used to be originally the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, over a period of time, people dropped away, and the At-Large community is actually now hosting that particular session. But it is a cross-community session, and I understand that Olivier has a program that covers everyone, including the Board member on Internet governance.

So I'm taking onboard the comments that were made about the doubling up. I don't think that we're actually—in this instance, we're looking at completely different things. The ccNSO—I'm not quite sure what they're doing, but there are reasons they are not part of our group. But I'm just defending the At-Large one. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you, Maureen and Sebastien. That's very helpful to hear the differences between those sessions.

Are there any other comments or concerns about this particular topic?

There are a couple of other things that we have highlighted on the schedule. If we can go to a week from this—the Thursday; thank you' perfect—this community update on universal acceptance: are we right to consider this a conflict? Is there a desire to have this go on to the schedule, possibly on a different date and time? I'm looking for any feedback about this just because community updates against all of your wrap-ups seem like a challenge.

Maureen, is that a new hand?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, it is. I just wanted to basically back up a note a put in the chat is that I think it's important, but I'd really like it to be changed to somewhere else that may not conflict, especially with how we're putting a lot of effort into the whole universal acceptance issue, and it seems a bit anomalous that it's conflicting with another big session of ours as well. So if that could be moved somewhere else, that would be really great. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. Thank you. Well, I will look for another place in the schedule and see if I can recommend some times and send that back out on a new draft later today.

Are there any other comments on this or any other issues, conflicts, or concerns about the current draft schedule?

Okay. I think that's a good sign. Our next dates are really just to get the website ready so that we can get prep week posted because we are going to post that on our typical schedule website and then to get all of these posted for you.

First, we are going to have an update on Prep Week because there are about 16, I believe, or so sessions on Prep Week. So we have Ozan or Carlos. Do you want to speak to this?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Thank you, Tanzanica. Hello. I have a very brief update on the ICANN69 Prep Week. In effect, some of those sessions are targeted only for a specific group, Tanzanica—I think five of them. Either they're for newcomers or the fellows. We have currently 13 confirmed public Prep Week webinars. As we may recall, the prep week goes on from the 5th of October until the 8th of October. As Tanzanica said, we will announce the Prep Week schedule and the sign-up links next week. So this is the brief update with respect to the prep week. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Ozan. Jonathan Robinson, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Just a quick question. I want to make sure I understand on time zone issues. Was this intended to be Hamburg time zone, or are we

taking it that the prep week is as it would have been otherwise just on a range of different times, which is what it perhaps looks like? I'd just like to understand what you've down with time zones for Prep Week. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Initially, our thinking was that it should be as it has been, where people were requesting times and it wasn't officially part of the Hamburg meeting. So we were going to leave that as things progressed, and the number of sessions increased. I think it started to become evident that it needs to really fit into a regular working schedule. So I believe—Ozan, feel free to jump in and correct me if I'm wrong—we're reaching out to a couple of people just to see if we can't adjust those times to get them into the regular workday, which would be in the Hamburg time zone.

Ozan, is that an accurate answer?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Tanzanica. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Sorry, just a quick follow-up again. I'm trying to understand what the rationale is with any particular time zone. I'm personally not convinced by the meeting being necessarily on local time zone, but

that's water under the bridge now. That's fine. We're working with what we are. But it's just to try to clarify because historically we haven't applied the local meeting time zone to the prep week, have we?

TANZANICA KING: We have not. I think the—I see Mary, who will probably say better things than me. But first, I will say that one of the issues is that, if we don't confine things to some sort of eight-hour workday, it makes it very difficult for us to schedule all of the tech teams and people who need to support the sessions if the time zone spans over an entire 24 hours. So I know that's one of the biggest concerns. That of course doesn't mean that it has to be Hamburg, but I'll let Mary speak more to that. Go ahead, Mary.

MARY WONG: Thanks, Tanzanica, and thanks for the question, Jonathan. In addition to what you just said, Tanzanica, which is absolutely one of the factors, there were, I think, other considerations. You're right that, in the past, we would run Prep Week at certain times. Ozan will correct me if I get it wrong, but I believe it was over a four-day period or a six-day period with two potential timeslots. Then, depending on how many Org functions were offering a webinar, we would then slot them into those timeslots as much as possible. That seemed to work quite well and was fairly predictable.

What has happened since is two things. One is that we are getting more webinar requests. That may be a good thing because then that certainly takes the pressure off the actual meeting schedule, which was one of

the reasons for having Prep Week in the first place. But, with more sessions, it became harder to just say, [For the] six days, 09:00 and 16:00 UTC."

The other consideration is that, as you remember, for ICANN69, there was some suggestion that we could perhaps look at folding Prep Week into the meeting and vice versa. The original schedule that you all saw actually looked like a three-week event, with Prep Week as Week 1. Then what we now have as communities as Week 2 and internal week as the third week.

As Tanzanica said, we're not tied to any specific time zone or Hamburg's time zone, so as long as we're able to account for the resources and the staff time and support that'll be needed, and as long as we can accommodate all the appropriate webinars for Prep Week, we can certainly run it in different time zones or different rotations, perhaps maybe not for this particular ICANN meeting but in the future.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, Mary. Are there any other questions about Prep Week?

If we can go to the next slide, I think we are at the end of our planned agenda here, unless there's any other business. Again, Prep Week, is going to be the 5th through the 9th. That schedule will be posted by Monday at the latest. Then we are all about preparing for the meeting and headed towards those dates in October.

David, did you want to take over for Any Other Business?

EN

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Tanzanica. We thank everyone for their discussion again. We wanted to raise issues so that everyone was aware of the various sessions that are being requested and by whom and for what reason and to make sure that we stuck within the original requests of you to make sure that the sessions were valuable, had outcomes and results attached to them, and that it could be a manageable proportion for the communities in their various time zones as well as the supporting and technical and language staff that are needed to make sure it runs smoothly and for the benefit of all

With that, we thank you for your inputs. We will come back to you on some of those other changes and trying to adjust them as need be so that we can make sure that the sessions are addressing your needs and are supported in the way that are important.

With that, here are some of the other final deadlines for you. We look forward to finalizing this and moving forward to the preparatory week, the SO/AC/SG/C work week, as well as the plenary and annual general meeting.

With that, I wish everyone a good afternoon, good evening, or good morning, wherever you may be. We'll talk again soon and will be sending you additional documentation to finalize this program.

TANZANICA KING: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]