
TORONTO – PPC Community Consultation
Thursday, October 18, 2012 – 09:15 to 10:15
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We would like to start the session, this public session of the Public Participation Committee of the board. Please take a seat, and please take a headset if you need for any interpretation in any language because I need to tell you that I will start in non-English language.

(Speaker is off microphone.)

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Not yet. Bertrand is asking me which one I will choose. I don't know yet.

[Laughter]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I talk just for one second? It would be really great if we could maybe just bunch -- Avri, come on.

(Speaker is off microphone.)

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.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just because it's much easier to see everybody and engage with everybody when there's -- with a small number of people if everyone is in the middle here. So thanks, guys. That's much appreciated.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Welcome to the PPC meeting of the ICANN board. My name is Sebastien Bachollet. I'm chair of this working group of the board, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee here who -- here attending this meeting. I saw Gonzalo Navarro who is here, Kuo-Wei also here, and Thomas Narten who is also here in attendance.

I hope (saying name) will join us.

This meeting is a bit special because it is organized on a specific theme, and our objective is to listen to you, to discuss. Knowing that there's already a comment period that was open on the Web site, I will not talk further and I would like to give the microphone to the last member of this committee that I haven't presented, but that will come here and mediate this session, Chris Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So this is going to run pretty simply. Nick Tomasso is going to run us through some very brief slides which explain the proposal that's currently out for public comment, and then we're going to ask you to comment and take questions from you. So Nick, over to you.



NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you, Chris.

What I'd like to do this morning is to just take you through the proposal that we're proposing here for the consolidated meeting strategy.

We have two goals for this strategy. The first is to adopt locations for 2014, '15, and '16, selecting facilities that best meet community requirements such as ease and cost of air travel, cost of hotel rooms for delegates, proximity of hotels to the meeting venue, and enough conference space for everyone who wants to attend.

This is becoming more and more important as the -- as our meetings increase in size.

And of course when we pick facilities that meet ICANN requirements, scalable so that we can, in fact, expand in the number of participants and the number of meeting sessions. This is the biggest one we've ever seen with 220 sessions.

And of course the locations need to be cost-effective.

The second goal is to establish a community working group to determine what meetings, conferences, symposia, whatever shape and form they need to take for 2017 and beyond.

Does the three-meeting-a-year strategy still serve us well or do we need to adopt something entirely different as we move forward? That's another piece of this proposal.

So to understand the issues we face, it's important to understand how we select meeting locations right now.



We use a geographic rotation. We announce -- post an announcement requesting hosting proposals from organizations in the geography. In that same announcement, we also offer the opportunity to anyone around the world who would like to host that meeting in that geography, and if none of that works, then we identify our own locations and select one of those to hold the meeting.

So this process has served ICANN extremely well for a very, very long time. But what we're finding now is that the -- as ICANN meetings have increased in size and scope, there are fewer and fewer facilities available worldwide that are capable of hosting an ICANN meeting.

The other issue that we face is that we've already held meetings in more than 40 different cities around the world, and it's getting harder and harder to identify potential hosts and appropriate facilities.

As we thought about what the perfect facility looked like, we listened to the community, to the board, to ICANN staff, ICANN executive team, and many, many others, and we came up with this list.

The venue must meet meeting requirements and allow for the ability to grow. It has to be a safe and secure environment, good international airline routes and access, reasonable airfare, reasonable visa requirements. It will probably be a convention center with adjacent anchor hotels or a very large meeting facility such as this.

It should have access to convenient and affordable public transportation. There should be a good selection of additional hotels in the area at varying price points for all delegates, fully accessible for



people with disabilities, adequate Internet infrastructure, and reasonable expense for the ICANN community and for ICANN.

So the proposal.

2013 is business as usual: Hold the April meeting in Beijing, China; hold the July meeting in Durban, South Africa; and hold the November meeting in a Latin America/Caribbean location that is yet to be determined.

For 2014, '15, and '16, the proposal is to pick a city or two cities, depending on the availability, in the Asia-Pacific region, and hold the first meeting of the year there; hold the second meeting of the year for all three years in a European city; and then rotate the third meeting of the year through North America, Africa, and Latin America.

And this is basically what that looks like from now until 2016.

I'll leave that up for a little bit.

So what are the advantages?

It gives us the opportunity to pick the best facility for an ICANN meeting that satisfies everyone's requirements for that meeting, and it gives us the ability to negotiate multiple-year contracts so that we can be cost-effective as we do this. And with that, I'll turn it back over to Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Nick.



Just to add one or two more things, just to give you some idea about our thinking, a couple of people have said to me, "Well, why have you chosen the Asia-Pacific region and the European region to be the basis for the hubs?"

Nick has done a huge amount of research about available venues and they've got to be available for the -- you know, the rough time of the year for the time -- you know, two or three years running.

We also looked at -- we're also looking at how much choice there is. There is more choice in those two regions, unless you add in North America, which we didn't think was the right thing to do.

You could have a hub meeting in -- in the States pretty easily, I should imagine, Nick in various locations, or is it hard -- is it just as hard to do it there?

NICK TOMASSO:

No. It's much easier to do it in the States. There are many more facilities.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

So we thought that's perhaps not showing the right face of ICANN to the world to say we're going to have one meeting a year for three years in the U.S.

So there was some method in choosing Europe and Asia-Pacific. It wasn't just, "Oh, let's do it in Europe and let's do it in the AP region." So



I think really we should -- just if you've got questions, come up to the microphone and -- and we'll take them. There's another one over here.

Tijani, you're going to use it. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Yeah, Avri Doria speaking. I guess I had two questions. One of them had to do with the whole visa issue –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

AVRI DORIA: -- and I noticed that while it wasn't in the list of priorities, it was in the list of other considerations.

In all of these negotiations, especially when you're talking to the countries that are going to have the multiple, do you just rely on their current visa regulations or do you, as we see with some meetings, actually negotiate with them to make it easier?

Because in many cases, there -- you know, it's very difficult for many of the international participants –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.



AVRI DORIA: -- to get a visa. So I'm wondering about that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's a really good question, and we are dealing with this right now with Azerbaijan -- right? -- for the IGF?

AVRI DORIA: Exactly.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I mean Nick can speak to -- I'm pretty sure we don't, but having a location fixed for a period of time would mean that it would make it much easier to do that, if indeed it was a problem. Is that right, Nick?

NICK TOMASSO: So to answer the first part of your question, we always ask for a contact with immigration to help us with visa issues.

We're more successful in developing countries, frankly, than we are in larger established countries like the United States and Canada, but we always ask the question of our host and we always ask for a single point of contact in immigration.

I believe when we pick a facility that we'll use repeatedly, it will be easy to negotiate that with the -- with the government immigration office.

AVRI DORIA: Can I ask a follow-up?



CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, of course you can.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. I guess that's a first step. That's sort of having somebody in the office that will take the complaints that will -- that will happen, but it --

Excuse my voice. I think I've been talking too much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I seriously doubt that, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's my pleasure.

[Laughter]

AVRI DORIA: But I'm wondering whether, as we've seen with Azerbaijan and other things, when -- and it's not just IGF with Azerbaijan. Eurovision did it too.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.



AVRI DORIA: -- that they managed to get special visa consideration in terms of visas at the border, as opposed to needing to send your passport away for a month for many people.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.

AVRI DORIA: So I'm wondering if we can go beyond the, "Give us a contact" to "Give us better conditions for visa getting."

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And I think -- as I said, I think that would certainly be easier if we say -- if we're saying to the country "We're making a commitment of multiple years." But I agree.

AVRI DORIA: But be brazen enough, even when it's just one –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. Absolutely. It's something we should do.

AVRI DORIA: And that's a good reason for not doing it in North America.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Avri.



>> Thank you very much. My name is (saying name). I just have a comment. The presentation is very clear, but in a document I just download from the Internet, you have a paragraph which is not looking very clear and people are supposed to make comments. So the document is saying -- the paragraph talking about consolidated meeting proposal for two thousand- -- for the three years, "Hold the first meeting of the year in two cities in Asia-Pacific, hold the second meeting of the year in two cities in Europe," but the presentation, this one, is very clear, so it would be helpful if you can change that document –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I understand.

>> Yeah. So my second comment is, when I read the document, the very -- the document is very clear and ICANN needs to do assessment. ICANN has criteria to select the country. So for me, putting out these documents and having a fixed plan for three years, for me personally it's not necessarily -- necessary, because in all the three regions, if you just select two regions, like -- it's like there is a firm "these two regions that can meet," but I don't think that it's correct to put a document to ask for comment when you set a condition and these people to apply. It is not working. You just -- I know ICANN has also a plan B because it's not the first time. You used to switch a meeting to the second area if maybe some few months before a meeting you have some information.



So I don't -- for me personally, I don't think it's very important to set this document saying that "okay, this is a region."

And now I want to -- now I want to conclude by coming to the last paragraph in the document. When we're talking about a conclusion, is equality of regional rotation is not, I think it is very important because ICANN has always a plan B. If a country is selected and some months before you see a problem, you still have a plan B.

So putting out this document for me is not very, very important. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. I'll speak in French, so please put your headphones.

I'm very, very happy that ICANN thought about reviewing the way we decide about the city where the meetings will take place, but I'm a little disappointed because the criteria of this review are not what I think the best.

My opinion is that the biggest problem for these meetings are two things.

First, the visas, and second, the cost. And third is quality, of course. Quality of services.



What I see is that when it comes to visas, for example, it was not a criteria of first level, of importance.

For me, it's the most important criteria. This will bring -- this will change the participation and will make it better or worse than what we have now.

I see now that there are -- at this meeting, there are a lot of people that already done so much to come here and that puts a (indiscernible) on those different Canadian embassies and have not been able to come here.

Second criteria is cost. I am -- I agree that we do -- we make meeting in North America or in Europe because those are the places that are more expensive. And now we have to talk about choice.

If, for example, you decided to have a meeting every year in Europe, in Asia, I agree for Asia because for the visa we have no problem. Quality of services will be there because for the cost it will be moderate, but for Europe, the cost is high, the visa is really hard -- the Chinese visa is really hard to obtain. We have a lot of Africans who will not be able to get the Schengen visa.

On the other hand, we could have thought about to have meetings every year in Africa, although like you say, we're going to choose one or two cities in which we will have the meetings.

We could do the same thing in Africa. We can find two cities who have good -- which have good services, who have moderate costs, and where the visa is easily obtainable.



I don't see why we chose Europe more than we could choose Africa or Latin America. There are a lot of countries in Latin America that have a good quality of services that have good service, again, and where the visa is easily obtainable. Here you go.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

The message that visas are important is clear.

For every group of people for whom Europe might be more difficult to get a visa, there is a group of people for whom countries in Africa is hard to get a visa.

I have two passports, and it is extremely hard for me to get visas from many countries in Africa in either of my passports.

So I -- the point I'm trying to make is, it's a balance, and I accept completely what you say.

There -- the other point to make is whilst it's correct that there are a small number of venues available in Africa right now, a small number of venues available in Africa right now that we could possibly use, there are far more venues available in Europe, and there are other constraints that we have around dates and so on and so forth.

But your input is heard and taken, and we'll look at -- and I certainly accept, from a visa point of view, that we need to sort that out.

I'm going to go to Kieren next.

KIEREN McCARTHY: Hi. So –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hold on. Sorry. Did you want to say anything? No. Okay. Thanks.

KIEREN McCARTHY: So I just wanted to speak in support of this –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Are you going to speak in French?

KIEREN McCARTHY: No. Swahili today.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Excellent.

KIEREN McCARTHY: I won't.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Gibberish.

KIEREN McCARTHY: Gibberish, yeah. So I want to support it. There are huge pragmatic organizational advantages to doing this, and we should have done it



years ago. In fact, we tried twice to do this. This is the third time to do this.

I predict if it's anything like the last two times, you'll have a lot of people from the community explaining all the reasons why you shouldn't do this. I think you need -- I applaud you. I think you're looking at this from an organizational, "How does ICANN work better" way, especially what we're about to go into, which is a much more professional, much more businesslike ICANN because of the gTLDs, and I think this is the right thing to do. Absolutely.

So don't get too swayed. Or if you do argue a lot about it, persuade them why this is a good idea, because it is a good idea.

Now, with that, I do think you should make North America one of the regions. I know why it doesn't look good, but the reality is, if you break down the numbers of attendees, it's always 50% or more from North America. Well, actually from the United States. If you add the Canadians, it's probably 60%. I did these figures years ago, when we tried to rationalize the meetings away.

So the reality is, for the sake of not wanting to look too U.S. centric, you're making half the attendees have to fly around the world, and I just think that's not -- that's not what you should do. You should say, "What is best for the organization and for the people that come to meetings?"

The reality is, for the next five years, it's always going to be 50% or more from the United States.

So I get it. I really think you should make a pragmatic decision on that.



CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Kieren. I mean, I disagree with you. I think the reality is that the fact that 50% of the audience comes from America is irrelevant. ICANN is an international organization and needs to be seen to -- needs to be as much seen to be that. And it's a pragmatic approach in a different way to say, "We're going to be seen" -- it's a safe approach to say, "Stay in the States," just -- but it's much more complicated than that. But you know that. We've talked about this.

KIEREN McCARTHY: We know this. I think where it should come down should be on the U.S., because if you look at who are the registries, registrars, people are going to be realistically in the next five years, it's going to be U.S.-centric.

But I have an idea with that, is that you're going to save a ton of money if you do this approach and a ton of organizational hassle if you do this approach. And actually, attendees will get used to it very quickly and they'll say, "I love the fact that I know where all the rooms are." That would be a huge boon to people that come. So what I -- oh, here's a suggestion. The money that you save doing this -- and it will probably be in the millions of dollars -- why not put that into top-notch remote participation.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.



KIEREN McCARTHY: That's an idea.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Thank you. Just before I go to Ayesha and then to Werner, I just want to make it clear, just in case the point's slipped by, this is a plan for what we do for the next three years while we are running a community working group on the much bigger broad-brush look at meetings, so not just venues but also, you know, the whole structure of it, how many, and so on and so forth.

And irrespective of what happens with this particular hub proposal, we're still going to have the community working group on meetings generally. Ayesha.

AYESHA HASSAN: Thank you, Chris.

Ayesha Hassan on behalf of the International Chamber of Commerce.

ICC has contributed over the past years to the discussions about the meetings and how the locations should be allocated, et cetera, and so I'm -- we're very pleased to see a plan being put forward for consideration, and would just underscore a couple of points.

One is, we have to continue to remain cognizant of the limited time and resources of many different stakeholders, so we have many stakeholders in this house, and keeping that in mind as we thread through what the meetings locations will be will be important. Also this week, we've engaged in a number of discussions about outreach and

participation and engagement and strategies for regions, et cetera, and I think looking at the meetings in that context is very important as well, so that everything's moving in a coherent, effective plan.

That said, most of my members have been supportive of trying some repeat locations, hub cities, et cetera, if it all fits into the overall plan and goals.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks. Just an additional point. Again, as we're talking, I'm remembering things.

We've had some input from a couple of -- of government people in the GAC, we had some input, and about, "Well, you know, the -- this means that our location won't see so many meetings." And that is true, but we've got some ideas that we're thinking about if we actually go forward with this. So for example, you could have a situation where the gala is sponsored by a -- another -- by a different country. So there's still an opportunity for people to have their presence in the -- in the -- in the meeting, so to speak. So that's -- so there's lots of flexibility about this. Did you want to come back on something and then -- and I'll go to Werner?

AYESHA HASSAN:

And to pick up on that, Chris -- Ayesha Hassan again on behalf of ICC -- there are other events and opportunities that ICANN's plans, you know, will include, and so the meetings are not the only opportunity --



CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's right.

AYESHA HASSAN: -- to engage and I think it's important to keep that in mind.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Thanks. Werner.

WERNER STAUB: Werner Staub from CORE. If I try to remember the most efficient ICANN meeting in terms of, you know, use of resources and so on, that's Los Angeles. LAX, you know.

[Laughter]

Okay. It's efficient.

(Speaker is off microphone.)

WERNER STAUB: It's efficient.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's going down well.

WERNER STAUB: Then again, in terms of output, in terms of output, it wasn't good, but the output doesn't come directly out of the meeting, it comes over time.

What we need is something that enables us to see better, and if that costs 1 million more per meeting, that's money well spent.

So now I really -- you know, I really congratulate the meeting team for the enormous effort they're making, but I would like -- this is worth so much, I would not want to try and say "Let's make it easier" and so on, but is this really what makes ICANN better able to interact with the world.

So I wouldn't go to the repeat locations for the ease of interaction because we -- what we gain there, we lose elsewhere. We really need the contribution of those efforts of the meeting team, and this -- it's a big effort by everybody, but it helps us get better output of those meetings.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Werner. Steve?

STEVE DeIBIANCO: Thank you, Steve DelBianco with Netchoice. The title of the document is "Consolidated Meetings," so as you just indicated in replying to Ayesha, it's really the long-term vision of where this would lead that gives me the most concern, because "consolidated" to me means an



effort to go from three to two meetings in the long run, and my question -- let me just say that I don't know how we could possibly get the work done that we have in two meetings a year. It's a lot of work to do in three, but I think it's what it takes to get it done.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.

STEVE DeBIANCO: So the question would be: Is there anything about this proposal of the three-year that is a transition, an interim, or a step towards sort of dropping that third meeting and going to two? And it's a fair question, given the way it's structured, and let's just be transparent about it if that's where we're going.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Steve, it's a perfectly fair question, so let me give you some --

First of all, the answer is no. But the reason why we have a working group in there is because that's exactly what we're going to do is have a working group to talk about that, so you'll get your opportunity.

I have no idea if the working group will even head towards the possibility of fewer meetings a year, but the reason why it's called a consolidated meeting strategy document, we have a -- we -- Nick actually came back to us with a list of seven different possible titles --



STEVE DeIBIANCO: It's a consolidated topic, so I –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And consolidated locations. He came back to us with a list of seven possible different things we could call this.

STEVE DeIBIANCO: Okay.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Because I think at one point we'd said we didn't want to call it "Hub City Proposal" or something like that, and that was the -- and because the name of the slides was chosen by committee, it is, of course, the wrong name.

STEVE DeIBIANCO: Yeah. Structured rotation.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So thank you. Ma'am.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Oksana Prykhodko, Ukraine, EURALO secretariat. I would like to go back to visa issues and add some aspects.

For example, all those who were rejected with Canadian visa, as for my own experience, they are now on stop list for all other visa procedures,



and that is why I think that ICANN has to do its best to protect, to ensure that they will not suffer –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I understand.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: -- further.

And the second aspect, for example, to receive a visa in some countries, you meet a lot of legislation problems with conflict with national legislation, and the only one way to solve this problem is to use informational technologies, and ICANN again has to force countries to use those technologies.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I understand.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Actually, I would like to propose to create an ad hoc working group on visa issues.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. So thank you. We've, I think, got the message that visas are a real problem. It's part of what we're talking about in the sense of going to the same places, but it's much bigger than that. We could have



rotating meetings, one in every region, and still have the visa issues, so it's a metapoint and thank you.

Tony?

TONY HARRIS: Yes. Just two things. Well, quickly to get that out of the way, we would not be supportive -- I'm speaking for the Latin American region -- of having two meetings instead of three. Let me get that out the way.

The other thing is, I don't have any problem either with consolidating, let's say, venues because of logistics, as long as you get to the region.

I don't think you should stop going to the developing regions.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely not, absolutely not.

TONY HARRIS: And I don't think you should put them in a slower rotation, because from what I saw, if you go through this -- this (indiscernible) which you have put before us, for instance, you would have a meeting in Latin America every three years instead of every 18 or 20 months. That's my only comment. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Hello.



PETER MAJOR: I'm Peter Major from Hungary.

Just to share some information with you coming out of the GAC, South Africa made it clear that they have no knowledge about the Durban meeting. They haven't been contacted.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's actually not correct.

PETER MAJOR: Well, I just wanted to share it with you. In case there's something to be done, please do it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much for that. Margarita.

MARGARITA VALDES: Good morning.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Do you need a box to stand on, darling, or are you okay?

MARGARITA VALDES: No. I'm okay. My name is Margarita Valdes. I from dot cl, the registry country code in Chile, and trying to represent some of my feelings of my colleagues in the region, Latin American/Caribbean region. We have --



well, I agree with Tony Harris before me. Visas is an issue, in terms of U.S. for example. It's hard hard work in Latin America in general.

Maybe some countries in Canada, some countries not, but U.S. is -- is really hard work.

Secondly, there is an issue in terms of I have more than 30 ICANN meetings in my body, and the diversity and the way that ICANN have this kind of support from the community is as-built in terms of the ICANN meeting is rotating around the world. And the awareness that we need in terms of facing problems with international organizations is a -- is -- there is strong help from the communities.

So if you do not change or fix it, probably this work could be missed or lost.

And the third thing is that it's true that we are trying to achieve a role in terms of having in our region an ICANN, but it's true that the requirements that ICANN is asking to the national -- the entity that could be the host in the countries is -- the requirements are very hard for us. And especially in terms of the number of rooms at the same time and the capability of the rooms.

So our proposal is -- in the case of our region is two things.

One thing is I remember is the ICANN regional meetings. If you see the schedule, years ago I saw regional ICANN meetings, so it was sometimes in Africa, sometimes in Europe or sometimes in -- in the case of Latin America, there is no -- no that kind of meetings, but maybe that is a kind of solution.



And the second thing is that I'm not sure, but maybe it's possible but you have the kind of flexibility in terms of the requirements, because the main capitals in Latin America and Caribbean sometimes are in small countries and small cities, of course, but we are in the middle in the case of Chile. We are very interested to have an ICANN meeting next year, for example, but we know that we are extremely rushing to have a place so -- big enough, but big enough is so enough for us.

So my proposal is that there is a possibility to flex -- flex the requirements. That's it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you.

Let me respond. You might want to say something back to me. The reason why we are having -- we're going to form a broad community working group to go through this is precisely to say, well, if we're not going to be able to go to these locations as big ICANN so often, maybe we need to go with regional meetings.

We also want, with everyone, to look at the requirements for meetings that we currently have and revisit those and see how much of that is -- we could change.

To give you an example, you could -- there may well be more locations in Africa or in Latin America where there is a Convention Center that is big enough, but the hotels are --



MARGARITA VALDES: In the case of Santiago, yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: -- is a 20-minute bus ride. At the moment we would say that's probably not good enough. Not good enough, yeah. It's not within our requirements.

MARGARITA VALDES: Yeah, yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So maybe, when we look at this as a working group, we're will actually to say, hey, we would be prepared to accept that or maybe not.

The other thing I wanted to say, so that we're really clear, this is not an attempt to make this idea set in stone. We're asking the community if you will allow us to stabilize the meeting structure for three years so that we can work with you all to figure out how we go forward after that.

So I want to be really clear with everybody that we're not trying here to say this is how it's always going to be. What we want to do is to put our efforts into figuring out how we're going to run meetings in the future rather than putting our efforts into figuring out where we're going to have meetings for the next few years while we're trying to figure out how we're going to run them. Does that make sense?

MARGARITA VALDES: Yeah, absolutely. It's a kind of culture. Latin American culture is very different to others. But just to have a sensibility in terms of governments.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I understand.

MARGARITA VALDES: That this is filling. For example, we know in our region who are the main countries, so the main organizations. In the case of the ccTLDs, which is the most community. So we have Argentina. We have Brazil. And probably the third one is Mexico or Chile or -- for to say something.

But the thing is that, if you put fixes three years or, well, the round, things like that, if you fix it, sometimes they feel jealous.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I understand.

MARGARITA VALDES: And it's not something that we -- it's something that we need to keep in mind. Because sometimes the country why three times and not –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I understand. Thank you, Margarita. Thank you.

Good Lord. Good morning. How are you?



MIKE SILBER:

If I could just respond to that, because I think it's an excellent point. But what that does mean is that sometimes -- and I'm going to pick on our community because I know they won't take offense. If I pick on anybody else, maybe they will.

If there are pillars all through the room because that's the best room that Nick could find that could accommodate that number of people, it's not ideal. But, because we're going to go there, people are going to stop complaining. Because right now what we have is a situation, and it's really tough. And this is why this interaction is taking place -- of a large part of the community complaining about certain venues and not just in developing countries but in developed countries as well. People complain about the venue. And now we're trying to say, well, let's go and pick ideal venues where they shouldn't be other problems where, if the GAC expands by another 20 countries and because of their requirement to sit in the U shape and how that stretches the size of the room, we can accommodate them. If the CCs add another 50 CCs, whatever the case may be, we can grow into that. That's what we're trying to do. But there are consequences. And I think that's the critical thing here is we know there are consequences. And we must then work with the community to see which of those consequences the community can accept. And I think this is what Chris is saying about hotels or convention centers or other things. What are the essentials? What are the good to have and a first set of requirements, but we can relax, if necessary.



And what are those things that are nice to have but, if we get rid of them, doesn't really matter?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Mike. I think we might be done, unless there's anyone else who wants to say anything. The public comment period is still open, closes on November the 16th. So please put in your public comments. And we will take them all into account, I guess. Anyone else? Last call for comment? Okay. Thank you all very much indeed.

[Applause]

Pierre dand jou

>> END OF SESSION