JONATHAN ZUCK:	Alright, everybody, welcome to Plenary Call #40. It's subtitled "The Road to Copenhagen." As you probably saw in the agenda, we're going to have something on the 7th that we're sharing with the community. So, that's exciting and you all have it in your inbox without having had enough time to read it, but the proofread version of the report.
	Before we get started, is there anybody who's on the phone who's not in the Adobe Connect? And are there any updates to Statement of Interests?
	Alright, well then what I'm going to do is hand the talking stick to Jean-Baptiste to talk about our schedule in Copenhagen. Jean-Baptiste, please go ahead.
JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Yes, do you her me? Do you hear me?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yes.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Yes.
JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Okay, perfect. Good morning, everyone. So, you all have received now the CCTRT program for ICANN 58 in your inbox, so we're just going to

review it together, and should you have any comments, input, please let me know.

On this program, I placed for you different useful information. The venue map, the shuttle schedule and the meeting schedule as well in case you would like to participate in other sessions. Looking at our program for Copenhagen, starting on the 10th, we have our first face-to-face meeting day. We'll be starting with discussing and preparing the different slides that we're going to present to the community, so first for engagement session and second for our meeting with the Board. So just we will go through each session afterwards in the agenda, but we will need to make sure that today also we have discussed which input and which recommendations we want to outline during these two sessions.

In the afternoon, we have two presentations scheduled. One for the DNS Abuse Study, and we'll have Maarten Wullink from SIDN and Maciej Korczyński from the Delft University of Technology will be there to present their findings and the results of their study.

And then it will be followed by the INTA survey presentation, and Lori Schulman will be presenting.

So, there will be time for a Q&A. We have allowed enough time so that they can provide good input on that.

And then the following day, on day two, so on the 11th, we'll start with two sessions to try identifying the findings and recommendations following these two presentations, and we'll focus on of course DNS abuse and RPMs.

And it will be followed with discussion with the Subsequent Procedures Leadership. It was hard to find some time to meet with them, so the session is a bit short, but we hope it's going to be a productive one. It will be only 45 minutes, and unfortunately, we could not plan it at a different time.

After lunch, we'll have the [inaudible] joining our face-to-face meeting for one hour. They'll have a look at our draft recommendation and will be providing a high-level input on this. We propose following that to discuss the different input received from these two discussions and work on that.

And also, you may have received it, but Stan has indicated just lately that he had some input on what should be discussed as well [inaudible] with that, so discuss planning for updating of concentration calculations, producing parking [and just] concentration calculations, and finally producing country-specific concentration calculations.

I'll make sure this is included in the agenda and it is updated, and also I will place this latest version of the agenda on the wiki page. After our face to face meeting, we have a busy day on Sunday starting with the engagement session which will last an hour and a half.

What would be ideal for this session is to have a short, 20-minute presentation of our draft recommendations to allow enough time for the community to ask questions. Why is that? If you remember, in Hyderabad, the community only had a few, I think it was about 20 minutes for them to be able to ask questions, and we felt that this is the

right time for them to come with some input and share comments and also ask questions about our work.

After that, there will be a presentation from the GAC CCT Review Team representative at the GAC briefing, so this will last half an hour starting at noon, and two hours later we'll have our CCT RT meeting with ICANN Board where we'll need to do prepare a presentation, and here the agenda is that we would provide a 20-minute presentation and give a summary of our draft recommendations. And they will have about half an hour or 40 minutes to provide some input on the implementation of our recommendations.

On Monday, we'll have our CCT RT wrap-up, so the goal of this meeting will be to debrief all of the various input we will have received on our recommendations and to do a kind of recap of the different action items gathered during our face-to-face meeting, but also I'm sure to discuss the next steps to the completion of our final report.

And then there are a few sessions of interest. On the 12th of March, Jonathan will be giving an update to SSAC. On the 13th of March, there is the session from ICANN GDD on the new gTLD program reviews. Jonathan will be part of the panel and you are all invited to attend.

On the 14th of March, we have Jonathan being invited to provide an update to ccNSO members. And again, this session is open, so we count on you in the audience. That's mainly it. If you have any questions, let me know.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just wanted to respond to Jordyn's remark. It is tough to get to these individual briefings, but most of them are short, and I guess what we'll try to do in our planning meeting is to figure out if there's sort of concentrated [inaudible] different groups. If you've just got 15 minutes to make a presentation, then trying to find what's most relevant to that group probably makes sense. Particularly the GAC and ccNSO, etc., we might want to do some customization.

Jean-Baptiste, it looks like Megan and Waudo both have their hands up.

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Megan, go ahead. Thank you, Jonathan.

WAUDO ZIGANGA: Hello.

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Waudo, [inaudible].

MEGAN TAYLOR: [inaudible] I thought you didn't see me. I was just writing it in the chat.

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Go ahead, Megan.

MEGAN TAYLOR: Okay. Thanks. Sorry, Waudo, you'll be just after me. I just wondered if we were going to have time to look at updates, revisions, new work, etc. Because that's one of the things we said when we [inaudible] particularly on evaluation, we're rather weak compared to the other parts, which I think are pretty good now. But we still have [other] aspects to look at. So, I just wondered if that was being factored into the timing here, or if that's foreseen for a future meeting. Thanks.

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You mean you would like to review today the different papers that were done in the application and evaluation section? Is that what you mean?

MEGAN TAYLOR: No, we're talking about the agenda in Copenhagen, and I'm wondering in the agenda in Copenhagen. Maybe I didn't see it properly, but I didn't see a part factored in for updates, revisions, new information, etc.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] Megan, I think it's probably part and parcel to Stan's recommendations for updating data that's a year old and also trying to do the regional [recent] information. So, maybe that session or that time period in the schedule Jean-Baptiste has best described as updates and additions or something like that to the paper before the final draft.

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. I can add that. Thank you, Megan. Waudo?

WAUDO ZIGANGA: Yes, can you hear me?

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes.

WAUDO ZIGANGA: Hello. Just two quick questions. The first one is about the meeting with the Subsequent Procedures leadership. I wanted to know what will be the format of that meeting so that we can know how to prepare for it. Would that be a presentation by them, or a presentation by us? What will be the format for engagement?

That's the first question, and the second one is, I can see somewhere down we have some engagement meetings with some of the groups within ICANN, ccNSO, [SSAC] and so on. I've not seen one for the GNSO, and I remember when we started our work we talked about using some of our output as input for continuous policy discussions.

So, I've not seen a specific meeting with the GNSO, or is this one for Subsequent Procedures? Is it the one that you will present in the meeting with the GNSO?

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Waudo, to reply to your first question, I think for the meeting with the Subsequent Procedures leadership, they are expecting I think to get an update on which recommendations are addressed to them and the level

of priority. I think considering the meeting is quite short, we should be focusing on that. But that's up to you to discuss today as well.

On your second question, and it's also a clarification as well that Carlton mentioned that ALAC would be interested to receive an update from CCT leadership.

There was a communication sent out from Jonathan to all SO and AC groups to offer to provide an update and to inform them all that we're going to have the engagement session in Copenhagen and that they are of course all invited to attend at that time and ask questions.

So far, we couldn't find any possible times with GNSO at a different session. That's the feedback we received this morning, so I'm afraid in this case they will need to be attending the [inaudible] session, or of course we'll be providing them the draft report, and especially if they can look into the different recommendation on that matter.

I don't know if you want to add anything, Jonathan, on Waudo's second question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: On the second question about the GNSO? I think that the GNSO meeting schedule is very crammed, so as Jean-Baptiste said, we're going to have difficulties doing a briefing for them. I don't think that the Updates and Subsequent Procedures Working Group is a substitute with GNSO, but they're going to I think try to read the executive summary and things like that and come back with questions based on that rather than an in person briefing.

Laureen, [you have the mic] go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure. I had a question actually about the review of the draft which just came to us. What is the procedure for making any comments for minor corrections?

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Laureen, at this stage I'm afraid that considering the schedule and the fact that we are on target for next Tuesday, and considering the designer is working into it, it's really hard to make minor modification at this stage.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I guess I had assumed because it was being circulated that it was circulated for review. But it sounds like I was mistaken.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But I guess we have to set a real bar. If there's something that's outright inaccurate or something, maybe we need to make the change. But otherwise, we have to try and get this out, I think.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That makes sense. I do note that at some point, the word objectify is used, and it's used incorrectly. And maybe for the final, we would want to correct that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That sounds like maybe a mistake I made, but I'll take a look for it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, it's just you could objectify women in a beauty pageant, but you can look at data objectively, and I think your intent was to emphasize that we're going to be objective in our approach.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, I'll take a look at that. The questions about the program for the face to face?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do we have a time when we're going to… I'm a little unclear about the preparation of slides and if there's going to be a draft that we're then going to look at and tweak. Since our presentation schedule is going to be very tight, I just want to make sure we're going to get sufficient time to look at any draft set of slides that can be refined and worked on prior to the presentations.

I know it's on the program. What I'm concerned about is that – thanks, Megan. What I'm concerned about is that unless we have something that gets to us perhaps before this meeting to take a look at, there's not going to be a lot of time to work on them during the meeting.

We're meeting on Friday and Saturday, we're discussing a whole bunch of things, and then boom, Sunday we go into our sessions. So it doesn't

strike me that there's sufficient time to actually work on those, unless we get something beforehand that we can work on before we leave.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does it make sense to ask staff to try and draft some strawman slides for the engagement session?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, I think it's a –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Or do you want – because the alternative is to sort of – it's probably me and Jordyn doing it, and I don't know if we'll get that done in time.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think it would make sense -

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: To at least have a draft version.

MEGAN TAYLOR: Would it not – I'm sorry to jump in, because I raised my hand but it doesn't seem to be seen. Would it not be useful to start from the

EN

executive summary and just take bits and pieces from that, and use that as a presentation, as a framework for the presentation? And then the staff could put that together relatively quickly in a PowerPoint and we could adjust it there.

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Much easier [inaudible] right?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, if I could come in. So once I get back from the designer, some of the stuff might be easier – like prettier, if you will – that that can be clipped and put into slides. So we'll be happy to take initiative and pull together a draft focusing on the issues that are in the executive summary.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, thank you. I hope you're hearing me. That was one thing I wanted to – Megan made the suggestion [and] that's what I was thinking. And following on that note, you might have seen the note that the ALAC is keen to have a face to face, at least with the leadership of the team, and I wondered whether or not that will be possible and what could we convey to them reasonably.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Carlton, I think we can probably [inaudible] the requests for in person meetings. So we just need to get your staff or in touch with Jean-Baptiste to schedule something, I think.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Alright. Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you very much.

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jamie, you have your hand raised.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes, just going back to the previous point, and at the risk of stating the obvious, sometimes these presentations are kind of regurgitation of what's there, and people walk away and they think, "Okay, we have a better understanding of what's in the document," and what might be really helpful for us as a review team is to focus more on the questions that we hope to get input from the community, and then drilling down on some of the more specifics in terms of what exactly would be the most helpful to get back from the community in their comments.

So a summary of the executive – the slides on the executive summary would be great, but either in the slides or just in the session themselves, focusing more on what we need from – what we're hoping to get in terms of input. And for those kinds of questions, it might be better for members of the review team to come up with than staff. Although staff

is obviously able to do it. But it's the review team that holds the pen. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a good point, Jamie, and that might be what we end up focusing that part of the face to face on, is try to identify where we'll be seeking input rather than just odd silence from the community. So I think that should definitely be part of that conversation.

I think there are some instances where we're asking questions on the community long term embedded in our recommendations, like what to do about the Global South for example, that we don't expect to get answered as part of the comment period but as part of a separate policy development process.

So we'll maybe sort of drill in to figure out what it is that answers we're really looking to the community for for the comment process. Anything else on the agenda? Preparing input on the presentations. Jean-Baptiste, what did you have in mind with number three here? Is that what we're doing already?

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Jonathan, it is, and it's actually, what we're discussing it, it's really about reviewing together which input, which recommendations we want to focus on for each group that we will be meeting with. It's just so that – and also Laureen stated that we should be prepared in advance so that you have at least drafts for the moment we are in Copenhagen and we can just refine those.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, so as an agenda item for today, you're looking for conversation about what might distinguish the presentations between these different audiences.

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, do people have a sense on that? The Board is interesting I think in a way to focus potentially on the data recommendations. Even though the Board is technically the audience for all of the recommendations, Board implementation is only true for a few of them. What do people think distinguishes these presentations? Megan, go ahead.

MEGAN TAYLOR: Thanks, Jonathan. No, I agree with you that – I think that for the Board in particular, the best thing is to raise not just the data issue. Of course, that's important, but all the issues that are urgent and of high priority, let's put it that way.

So if I were you, I would organize it in such a way that [inaudible] urgent and necessary things that have to be done before any new round is started are identified in red or highlighted. I don't care how you do it, obviously, but those are the ones that we want the Board to really concentrate on.   And obviously, the whole review is addressed to the Board as well, and of course, to the community too. But if I were

you, I would do something like that so that they can see which things are really important and very high priority, and the way in which they've been written, to show that these are prerequisites to any new TLD round or they're very important, etc.

And then of course, any others that are necessary to be done before a future CCT review. But [inaudible] the most important ones are of course for any new gTLD round. That I said about four times, that cost me about $4 I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well be sure to [dine out] on your dollar jar contributions. I think you raise a good point, Megan, in that I believe as we're trying to figure out what we might – to Jamie's point – want to hear from the community, it may very well be that the most extensive input will be on the prioritization exercise that we've gone through in terms of what people believe ought to be [inaudible] and not.

I think that's where there might be a lot of color commentary from different components of the community. So, emphasizing that prioritization exercise is probably important for the Board, but also for the engagement session. Carlton, go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Jonathan. I wanted to echo what Megan said. I think for the Board, there are some big-ticket items that we must put before them, and those – I would agree with Megan – are the high priority items,

especially the ones that are prerequisite for any new round as we see them.

There are some groups that will be interested in some of the issues more than others. For example, the ALAC is very much interested in the consumer trust issues and the consumer choice issues, and those recommendations would be high priority for the ALAC, and that's just one group.

I think the prioritization is going to be an issue, and we should look for feedback specifically. The radar should be out for feedback on our prioritization, because I think we could get some interesting feedback on our sense of priority as opposed to some other groups, and so I think we should be listening closely for any difference in priority as seen by some of our groups, and then make the adjustment.

The question and answer sessions. In my view, we've always been kind of lucky to have some people who are more vocal than others in sessions, but they usually tend to flag where their community is located.

And one of the things that we should do is probably just see if we could raise flags with those persons early, so we would know what the questions they have, and maybe take some time to research the answers and share them in the next session, so on. That's my view of how we might proceed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Carlton, any other comments on that aspect of things? I think priorities are, as you say, we're likely to get some interesting inputs on them. So, other thoughts? Okay.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sorry, I apologies for not putting my hand up. My only suggestion for the Board, for what it's worth, is to focus more on what kind of input you would want from the Board after the meeting than instant reactions. Because they're not going to have a lot of time to really digest.

Some will and others might not, but I think in order to get a thoughtful response from the Board, focus more on putting front and center what feedback we want on the prioritization, etc., and then make sure that that's what they're looking at as they're formulating their feedback.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that makes sense. Do you think we should make a presentation to the Compliance Department?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Isn't there a meeting with PDD already? Or am I making that up?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's right, it's on Saturday.

JONATHAN ZUCK: There is a – yes, during the face to face.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So I think those two could be combined. Of course, they're completely independent functions, but I think Compliance is already intending to go to that session too.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I was kind of teasing you, but alright.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Oh.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eleeza has her hand up.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I'm very [inaudible]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No he's not. I actually wanted to talk about the session with PDD. It's kind of related to the comment that Jamie just made. Because I've kind of been briefing my GDD colleagues on your recommendations as they've gone along, but they haven't really seen the full report yet just because it's been in flux up until very recently.

EN

So, we won't have a kind of wholesome list of feedback to share at that point, and actually might be more interested in just discussing with you what types of feedback you'd like to hear on the recommendations, whether it's a for example cost/benefit analysis or whatever the case may be. So, I just wanted to flag that to think about before meeting with Akram and some of my colleagues in GDD and Compliance.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense. [inaudible] already some organic feedback you said the GDD has on implementability and things like that, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. We can certainly make some comments, like Jean-Baptiste said earlier, that we can talk about some high-level comments in certain topic areas. But we just don't have like a detailed list of feedback we can share yet.

JAMIE HEDLUND: But again, to avoid the kind of dynamic that happens when the Board or staff get ambiguous directions from – or what they consider ambiguous direction – from the community, these discussions could be really helpful in clarifying and to have a question and answer back and forth, it's an iterative process to get to exactly what is intended by the language, because sometimes for no express reason, there's not a shared understanding. So, it would seem to me that these discussions would be an opportunity to really get aligned in terms of what the

recommendation is, and then allow staff or the Board to come back with what would be required in order to implement it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that makes sense. And we know that's part of what we're going to be doing here in the new year, is trying to make these things as specific and implementable as possible. Any other questions or comments on that, on preparing for these audiences?

Okay, so I guess we're landing on staff doing a strawman of these presentations that we can go over and as a jumping off point with an emphasis on getting feedback from these audiences on prioritization and their perceptions of sort of implementability of these recommendations, and we'll try to drill then into that in our discussions with them, and I' sure it will be ongoing.

Alright, any other thoughts on these presentations? Waudo wants to know when we'll get these presentations. Waudo, I think probably after they've had the chance to get the report out, so it won't be too long prior to our face to face. I think Margie was saying that we're waiting for the beautified version of the report from which to construct the slides, so I think that's probably smart.

I don't know, folks on staff, if it makes sense to just do the ugly version earlier, that's just bullet points that seem most important? Again, just to get the conversation going form something other than a blank page as we are now, with the knowledge that we might be adding charts and so they're a little prettier in a second rev.

All with an eye toward trying to get conversation going prior to the face to face, potentially. Is there a point where this is largely out of your hands and in the hands of the beautifiers where your bandwidth frees up a little bit, Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: We can certainly try to do that. We could take a look at the executive summary and get some ideas of what areas to focus on in the presentation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thank you. Alright, I think we are at Any Other Business. Does anybody else have something that they want to raise on this call? I know that we're looking at May 6 and 7 in Madrid for a face-to-face to in going through the public comments. So, Jean-Baptiste [inaudible] there's a Doodle poll to see who's available to meet on the 6th and 7th of May. I'll hand the microphone back to you.

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Well, yes, thank you, Jonathan. So, you're all invited. I see that some of you did already to fill the Doodle whether you could attend or could not attend, just for us to have an idea if the review team could be present. So far, we are aiming it, organizing it in Madrid, considering that there will be some other events following that week happening in Madrid.

And also please note that the deadline for filling in the Doodle is tomorrow, end of business, [Eastern] time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. Anything else? Any Other Business that folks want to bring up? Jordyn, do you want to just speak?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, I was just responding to Carlton's point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But Eleeza's doing great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Sounds good. I think that may be it for this call. We'll look for some bullets from staff on these presentations and get the feedback loop and the conversation going about prioritizations of the presentations offline so that we can have as efficient a conversation about it in our face to face.

Alright, so keep an eye out on the list there, folks. And thanks for everyone for getting on the call.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Jonathan.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]