

---

HELSINKI – ICANN56 Policy Forum Wrap-Up & Looking Ahead to ICANN57

Thursday, June 30, 2016 - 17:00 to 18:30 EEST

ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

ROB HOGGARTH: Good afternoon, everyone. We're getting started now. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

Thank you. That's the first time ever -- thank you.

[ Cheers and Applause ]

See, they're applauding already. This is the first time I've ever started an ICANN meeting with applause. So thank you very much.

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Rob Hoggarth. I'm senior director of policy and community engagement here at ICANN. Tanzanica King, our senior manager of meeting strategy and design, invited me to join her up here this afternoon. Let's give her a hand.

[ Applause ]

The purpose for this final session of the first full work week of the ICANN public forum on policy or the ICANN 56 policy forum is essentially an opportunity for us all to reflect a little bit. I did some of the microphone work earlier in the week and saw a

---

*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.*

---

couple of tired faces. I'm delighted to see today many bright, happy looking faces, satisfied folks, people who are looking forward to the next stage of work. But this is really a milestone for all of us, to sit back and reflect a little bit, and look forward to what we're going to do next with respect to this policy forum.

The next policy forum will be a year from now in Johannesburg. But there are things that you've all learned this week, and we'd like to capture what those learnings are. We'd like to learn from you what works and what didn't work, what you all want to keep, what you all want to get rid of. This is really an opportunity for about the next 90 minutes to just basically hear from all of you and to get a really good perspective on what our next steps will be. And we'd also like you to think a little bit too about certain aspects of this meeting that may be populated into the other meetings of the ICANN yearly cycle. What worked during this meeting that might apply to the meeting in Hyderabad or the next meeting in Copenhagen. So these are other things we'd like to probe and really get some useful participation from you. So Tanzania, I'll turn the microphone over to you and we'll get started. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you, Rob. The first thing we want to do really is say thank you to all of the SO and AC folks that joined us to help produce

---

the schedule. That was something different that we did for this meeting. It was really, really helpful, to help us produce something that we knew was the schedule you wanted to have for this meeting. So thank you for that. We have a list of specific people, if we move forward on the slide, specific people that worked with us so we could get all of the feedback, and hopefully it turned into a schedule that met all of your needs.

If we can go forward to the next slide. What was different about this meeting? So most of us know in general, but we had six days in Marrakech, 2,273 attendees in Marrakech with 350 sessions. We had our typical welcome ceremony, public forums, high interest topics. But in Helsinki, Rob will tell you --

ROB HOGGARTH:

Well, we shifted to the four-day scenario. Although a number of you were here for a week, but with the plan on four days of work. And many fewer sessions, as you can see. Down to 199. That has evoked some thoughts, and I had David Olive on a number of occasions come up and share the perspective that many of you have shared with him on that. But it's not because other meetings didn't focus on community work or policy work, but this was much more of a focus on a number of those working policy development issues that really weren't addressed in as deep a level as the time permits at previous meetings. So not

---

only is it a matter of looking at attendees and number of sessions, but it's really looking at the type of session and the quality of the session. And that's something we also want to tease out of you in terms of your perspectives. Was it really useful from a substance standpoint. Not just a style perspective, not just the layout of the room, which is also important, but some of the deeper value that you got out of the experience.

We had arranged this little hand-off between slides, so I hope it's working effectively. As I mentioned earlier, David would come to me at different times during the week and say, "This is really going well." "That we need to change." "This we need to fix." A number of you came up to me as well and shared your perspectives. We got a number of different quotes, we called it the rumor mill, and we just threw up a few. But they were just examples. Many of you found good, positive aspects of the meeting. Some of you had constructive feedback in terms of others. In your case you had a favorite quote.

TANZANICA KING:

This is my favorite. "Best meeting B ever."

[ Laughter ]

And if we go to the next slide, so what we're going to do is we focused on six areas of interest where we want your feedback.

---

We want to know how you felt about the schedule, the amount of time we had dedicated to focused policy work, cross-community sessions, which we did in the afternoons, board interaction. How did you feel about the fact that the board had a limited schedule in terms of being off on their own and was out there to actually interact with everybody? Outreach and engagement and networking opportunities. So these are the six areas, and the reason we chose these six areas is because they really fit in with the new meeting strategy and what the design was for. So these were the things we were supposed to focus on, and how did we do.

If you go to the next slide, Josh is actually going to tell you how this is going to work so we can do this in the room.

JOSH BAULCH:

All right. So what we're going to do is this is going to require a little bit of action from you guys. If you'll go to either your mobile app and if you have it downloaded you can click on the feedback button and there is a live poll there. Or if you are just on your computer you can go to [meetingapp.icann.org](http://meetingapp.icann.org). So that's [meetingapp.icann.org](http://meetingapp.icann.org). Once you get to the mobile app, you'll be able to click on the feedback button. The feedback button is kind of at the bottom of the page, so if you scroll down,

---

you'll see the icon there. And we're going to click on ICANN 56 wrap-up live poll.

There will be six questions there that we'd like everybody to go through and answer. Once you hit the submit button, we'll be able to show the results up here on screen.

TANZANICA KING:

I'm looking around the room to see if everybody still needs a second to get there. Give you all a second. I see a couple of head nods. Yes, give me a second.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Well, I think it's important to note here that we're looking for your impressions. You'll see these are very general questions. The hope is as we approach each section you'll be able to share with the rest of the community some specifics about each particular area. And we really sincerely want to get that feedback. This feedback is going to go to your colleagues, the next set of planners, it's going to go to Nick and his team. Tanzanica is going to incorporate it into the planning for the next meeting. So it's very important -- you know, enjoy the fun technology. We've discussed how we might use it in the future, potentially to use it as a future metric maybe, just to say, all right, the first meeting was 4.7. The next one was 5.4. We don't

---

know how that will work. We just appreciate everybody willing to play around with a couple of buttons and give us some feedback. I think we're ready.

TANZANICA KING: Think we're ready? If you can go to the next slide. So our first question is, "How satisfied were you with the format of the schedule?" So we want to think about the fact that we did -- all the policy work was sort of stuck in the mornings. People met amongst themselves, were really in their rooms doing policy work. The afternoons we had cross-community sessions. Please submit your answers. Fantastic. It's working well.

ROB HOGGARTH: What I'd like to, if I can observe, is as we've done through the rest of the week, we have microphones throughout the room. I'd like our colleagues who have microphones to please identify themselves. I see one of four. I see three of four. Is there somebody over on this end? This -- this should work. So please, if you have a comment, please raise your hand, and then we'll go through the numbers to do that. Tanzania, this is your session, so this -- this segment, so please go ahead.

TANZANICA KING: I see Chris with his hand up.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hi, thanks, everybody. It's Chris Disspain. I'm sorry, can you just -- I'm just a little confused. Why has each question got the same answer twice?

ROB HOGGARTH: What we're doing, it's a scale, from 1-10.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, but there's two "not at all," two "needs" --

ROB HOGGARTH: Correct.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I get you, so if I think it needs improvement I can mark it a 3 or 4. If I think it's good but needs improvement then it's a 4.

ROB HOGGARTH: Correct.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Now I understand. Thank you so much.



---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

ROB HOGGARTH: No bets on the results. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

TANZANICA KING: It's meetingapp.icann.org.

ROB HOGGARTH: Go ahead, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon Chung here. So I just have a couple of comments on the schedule itself as it was posted online. I guess I'm old school, but I like the old version much more than the sched because it requires me to have a sched account to get the Outlook, you know, session -- like to sync with my Outlook or I have to get the whole thing down. So I -- I think it's -- it's -- what we had before was actually easier to read and figure out where the sessions are. Especially the grid part. The grid part on sched.com doesn't -- doesn't show up very well because it's so dynamic. So just -- just on that particular -- particular point. I don't know what --

---

what other people thought, but just I guess this is -- I have other comments for other parts, so I'll wait for then to -- but the format of the schedule I think generally, to have some -- some of the sessions that are dedicated so everyone can be in the same place, I think that part is -- is a good idea.

TANZANICA KING:                   So we'll go to Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE:                   Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm going to make three short comments, and then I have comments for later on other issues. I agree with what Edmon said, but I also want to comment on what was a major barrier for me in the use of the schedule -- in the use of this agenda because events and -- that are related to work that is taking place in many cases were not on the program. And I will mention, for instance, the DNS women's event. A few other things that may have been closed meetings, but in the past they've always been on the schedule so that people could find them. And I really want to point that out as a major problem because even though the major -- even though the priority of work is policy, many of us use these meetings to organize side meetings, side gathering, work on other things. And since we're at the venue, I urge that you be a little more flexible. That's enough on that point.

---

I think also, while I'm generally satisfied with the new policy format, and there may be a better place for me to say this, but in a deep dive on work on policy this particular room setup is not satisfactory. And that means that venue choices -- I'm not going to look Nick in the eye because I'm going to be giving him more work to do, but the venue choices for the policy session, even though it may be fewer in attendance, room setup is going to be incredibly important. It's very difficult for people to do deep dive policy work in classroom style or in theater style. So this room, for instance, had it been set up this way would have been long but narrower and an open U, even if not everybody can eyeball each other, is much more conducive. Large groups of people, difficult to do. But I think really important to do.

So good on the policy format, but I would only give it a 3 on the venue's ability to really be flexible enough to support it.

And then my final comment that's relevant just to this is, we had so much work to do that myself and many other people that I've spoken to expressed some sense still of too much conflict in terms of not enough time. We proposed four days. I am going to think that we really need to carefully assess whether it's five days or four days. Otherwise, I'm giving good rates -- ratings.

TANZANICA KING:                   Okay. Looks like we're going to number 2.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Alan Greenberg. The format itself was -- is I think moderately good. Some of the rules associated with the format, such as only one afternoon session at a time where in this case most of them were GNSO-related, just excludes a huge number of people who I suppose could tour Helsinki and that was rather nice or just sit by the water. But that's not the intent of the meeting. So I think we need a lot more flexibility to recognize that not everyone has the same interest at the same time.

The original schedule also allowed for -- it classed the last day as inter AC/SO meetings, which is not the same as cross-community. It allowed for bilaterals. And this time we had to squeeze those bilaterals into lunchtimes and other awkward times. So the overall format is not necessarily bad. How we implemented it a problem.

And regarding the physical schedule, what Edmon said. The smiling faces or, in most cases, empty circles take up a lot of real estate and I don't think add anything at all. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING:

We'll go over to Number 3 and then to 4.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Good afternoon. My name is Sebastien Bachollet, and I will speak in English [sic]. Comment from my colleagues are really interesting because, as Marilyn Cade said, the idea of this meeting was to have three days for working sessions and one day for outreach. The meeting with the global community and Internet individual users, with companies, with governments, et cetera, that is outreach.

Now, due to certain reasons related to the Helsinki city and due to the period in which we are holding the meeting because we are on holidays in this city, it seems that the time was not enough to work together.

I heard many comments before taking the floor, and I believe that we need to take a view, a position in which we can make a difference between A, B, and C meetings.

When we're asked whether the format is good, I would say, yes, it is. It's good to have afternoon sessions in which the community participates, but I think we have to move forward. That is, on the table, we should have representatives from the different communities. And I believe it is interesting to have these sessions in the GAC room because there are many governments staying and participating. And this is good because we can exchange ideas with them.

---

And this was not the case before. I don't know if this was made on purpose. But if this is not made on purpose, I believe this is a very good result, a very positive result, and that we should take this into account for the future. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING:                   Number 4.

AVRI DORIA:                           Hi. This is Avri Doria. I wanted to make two quick comments. One, I think it was okay and certainly something that one could acclimate to and make work. And, two, I don't think you should take any meaning by not having anybody say "not at all" because if they really, really hated it, they wouldn't be here right now.

TANZANICA KING:                   I like that point.

We also have somebody else back in Number 4.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:               My name is (saying name) Palmer. I'm working for the Electronic Frontier Finland.

---

I was slightly disappointed. This is my second ICANN meeting. I was slightly disappointed by the fact there was no newbie session in the beginning. And I heard the rumor that it might have been too pressure not having anything on day zero, but then there was, like, an eight-hour CCWG workshop. Like, why couldn't you have a newbie workshop for them? It was pretty hard to try to get people to come here and actually understand what's going on here. And just two hours, one room, isn't that much to ask for.

TANZANICA KING: Over to Number 2.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, hello, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond. I chair European At-Large organization, but I will be making my own comments here.

You mentioned this is a meeting about policy. Please define what "policy" is. Should we start a working group on this or -- No, I'm just kidding.

The reason why I'm saying this is that there has been some really serious decisions made on whether groups or work is policy or not. I happen to be a co-chair of a cross-community working group that deals with policy that takes place outside of ICANN walls but some believe that this is not policy. So I would like to

---

echo the point that other people have made that there should be some flexibility in putting the schedule together and certainly having a single track every afternoon is probably not the way to go because you're just catering for a small segment or a certain segment of the community but not for the others. So thank you.

TANZANICA KING: And Number 3.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Crept up behind me. Hi, it's Chris again. I just wanted to say a couple of things. From my personal perspective, I agree with the comments about the online schedule, I think that's challenging and I couldn't see the whole day, and I find that hard. But I'm not knocking for that. That's an issue -- an online schedule that's easy to be fixed. I'm marking for the schedule -- the format of the meeting as such.

And I marked -- I marked it needs improvement simply because I think it's been great, but it always need improvement. So that's why I put that in there. And it's the first time we've done it.

From a board member perspective, it's been fantastic to be able to go to sessions, to sit at the back of the room, speak occasionally -- some people might think too much -- and to



---

listen to what's going on and learn. That's been amazingly fantastic. Really, really good.

The cross-community stuff in the afternoon, I understand the point about maybe more sessions, although it's challenging. When we were putting this agenda together, I sat in on some of the calls. And one of the challenges is if you actually look at the issues, a lot of the issues are meaningful to the GNSO and to the ALAC and the GAC. And then there might be some issues that are meaningful to the ccNSO and the GAC. But there's not that many issues that are meaningful across the board. So it is a hard job to do, and I think for a first go we did pretty well.

So I'm -- I'd like to be totally positive about this. I think it's been excellent. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING:

And I think we're over at Number 4 next -- or 2? You guys argue. Go ahead. Number 4. And then we'll go to 2.

WERNER STAUB:

Werner Staub from CORE. I'm also very happy about the cross-community way to avoid the separate deliberations in silos. However, I think we might use more of the stuff that has already shown its value. For instance, the microphone at the head of the

---

aisle, it just stands there and people can queue up, should not be suppressed.

I understand it's a good idea to sometimes be able to get a microphone being brought to people who cannot easily move. But don't suppress the microphone where people can queue up because that's how people can, first of all, concentrate and everybody knows who is speaking. All the time we have this problem here not to know who is speaking at all because everything comes from a loudspeaker. You don't know where to turn. If I speak, you probably know it.

But as I say, there's a way to make sure we use those established methods and also have the ability for people to kind of concentrate before they get to the microphone. As they queue up, they can concentrate. And it's probably easier for people to speak than to have this uncertainty whether you can get a microphone, have to get the attention of someone.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH: Can I do a quick intersession there? You've reminded us that as we get up to the microphone, as you stand up to speak, please

---

identify yourself. We want to make sure everybody does that. That's great. Thank you.

We also had a debate before this session started whether to put a microphone right in the middle of the room and to see who would start queuing up without saying anything just for a fun little experiment. But I think it is something that the team is going to look at. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: So we're over at Number 2.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa from ALAC. I speak in French. Having been part of the working group that thought about this new strategy, I would like to say that I'm completely satisfied with this meeting. I like the format. It's very good. And that was the idea behind.

There have been certain problems but easy to solve. For instance, the parallel sessions, we have to find a room where not too many people is gathered. But I'm disappointed in one issue. We have had planned for an outreach session, and it was unfortunate not to held that -- not to have -- that it was not possible to hold this session here because of what Sebastien has mentioned.

---

So I hope the next B meeting will be in a place where we can do some outreach.

ROB HOGGARTH: We may have to make a judgment about how quickly you may move onto the next topic. It's a good blending, I think, of topics. But we may need to say whoever is in the queue on this, let's stop there, microphone helpers, and then we'll see what we do next. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: It may be that your comments will still make perfect sense when we go to the next question.

So if we go to the next slide, please. If we can do a poll again: How satisfied were you with the time for focused policy work? So as I said, this sort of still fits in with the schedule. Please enter your selections from one to ten.

And we'll start with Number 4.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. My name is Thomas Schneider from the GAC. I tried to focus also on this, but there were a few points that I would like to add to what you have discussed before, if you allow me. First of all, I think the interactivity that we had -- sorry -- in this

---

meeting was an absolute plus to the other meetings. Also, in the time that was allocated for policy work, it was extremely hard for the GAC to get to -- to discuss everything and draft the communique in a lot less time that we normally have. But we got there.

Also, because we had lots of different people coming in, we had board members coming in, we had GNSO people coming in, ccNSO people coming in, and so on and that actually -- my take is that we need less time if we have everybody present that care about an issue or are concerned with an issue than to talk to everybody bilaterally.

Because you explain something once to all the stakeholders and you understand each other much quicker, get a holistic picture that allows you to be much more efficient.

I do understand there's flexibilities needed, that maybe we can have some days, some afternoons where nothing is going on in parallel. Just one session where you want to have everybody in the room, but maybe, as Alan says, some of the days, there should be like two parallel sessions in order to cope with more issues. But sometimes it's good to force people to go into somewhere where they think that they are not concerned or that doesn't concern them. And then through sitting in, they actually

---

realize, oh, this matters to me as well. So I would not completely give up that part.

And as I said, the Board presence was extremely useful also in our slots for the policy silo work. And this is something that should probably be kept also for the other meetings to the extent possible, that the Board can sneak into the silos and participate there.

In our case, we did not have a bilateral with the Board in this meeting, but we had, actually, far more in depth exchanges with the Board in our silo work. So this is my take that I take from it.

And just one short word about the room setting. I think Marilyn, with her experience also with different IGFs and EuroDIGs, is right. The more round and face-to-face-looking settings you can get, if the room permits, the easier is the interaction.

And the thing about the queuing behind the mic, the problem with the queuing behind the mic is it's more difficult to react -- to be interactive and reactive to what others say because you queue up with something you want to say, and once you're in the queue you have to speak at that particular moment. You can't go back and come back in. Whereas, floating mics I think allow for a much more red -- thread discussion because you're more free in deciding when you're going to speak than if you have to queue up at a mic.

---

So this is much more rigid, the mic queuing. And I prefer this way of interaction much more.

Thank you very much.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you. I'm observing with the various hands and people getting my attention that even this is challenging; right? And this is, you know, one of those sessions where everybody does have a point of view. So I appreciate everyone's patience as there are people behind you who are also having their hands up before you.

Number 1, please.

DAVID CAKE:

Hi, thank you. David Cake.

So I thought it was -- I mean, I thought it was really great to hear people talking about how they didn't feel overscheduled and they were able to move around and, you know, get involved in the policy sessions they wouldn't normally otherwise, and I think that's, you know, a very common experience. But actually, as one of the people who was heavily involved in that policy work, because I'm on the leadership for one of those -- the big PDPs that we discussed, and so on, I actually did feel really quite

---

overscheduled; right? I felt very, very busy and like I'd got my normal ICANN crammed into slightly more -- slightly less time.

And for me, the sort of -- the -- you know, the idea of a meeting without all of the other stuff and so on, I didn't actually -- I just felt like I'd had the same meeting crammed into a smaller time. And I don't know where we'd fit any outreach.

So for me, the general focus on policy sort of worked, but it really did squeeze some of us quite a lot.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you.

We're going to go 2, 3, 2, 4. So just as people prepare.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Farzaneh Badi from NCUC. And finally I got the microphone!

Okay. So I'm going to make a comment on your meeting strategy and the fact that you keep calling it policy forum. While I'm looking at the website and meeting strategy, and it says format focus, policy work, and outreach.

So why are we keep calling it -- why do we keep call it policy forum and deny the outreach part?



---

And also, I can see that it says day one, outreach. I must have missed something because I didn't see any outreach in day one for our group. So, yeah, that's about it.

Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you.

Number 3.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you. First of all, thank you very much for this last session. It's very important, this evaluation. It give you a little bit more taste how the situation is.

I am not in favor of the queuing microphone. This floating microphone is much better, although we just heard from our distinguished colleagues there. But I don't want to go to the queue, so on and so forth. So this is a good thing.

What I'm suggesting is do you think doing this type of forum every year is not too long to have an experience or shouldn't we consider whether we need every six months?

I found this very, very useful, very instructive, and very productive; in particular, the cross-community session. We had the wide range of information exchange freely and in a

---

transparent matter rather than sitting and discussing board meetings with the CWG -- sorry, with the GAC meeting with the ccNSO, this type of meeting, et patati.

This one was very, very instructive and very, very useful. So I suggest that we continue this sort of thing, but if possible, consider whether we could do it every six months in order to have more ideas. Then we decide whether it would be yearly or whether it would be every six months.

Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you. Back to number 2.

EDMON CHUNG:

Hi, Edmon Chung here.

So I want to talk -- have a comment on, actually, number 2 and number 3. So I think I remember number 3 is about the cross -- cross-community work.

I like the fact that we have focused policy work and cross-community, but I think in order for us to be more productive, the introductions could be shorter. Sitting sometimes -- some of the topics are talked about in the cross-community session which almost feel like an introduction for almost an hour, and then

---

immediately the next day, there is the working group meeting and we repeat some of those introduction and then go into discussion.

I think the two of them could be better merged together so that the entire introduction -- I think it's useful to have the introduction, because some of the other people in the community may not be up to speed on certain issues and it's good to have some introduction, but we expect this to be a policy forum, so whoever is coming in should, for lack of a better word, to do a little bit of homework; right?

So we should be able to hit to the substantive issues much faster and then have one session that almost merges the cross-community one and the policy focused work so that it flows into it. So the new people can actually participate in the working group, and that I think helps bring more people to ICANN policy work as well.

So I guess the comment is 2 and 3 should be better somehow integrated so that the introduction is shorter; substantive, community-wide discussion longer.

---

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you. Before we go to number 4, just another observation. We're now reaching that point in the session where people are interested in making a second comment.

We are always going to err on the side of going to somebody new who has not commented before. But, otherwise -- so some people may jump the queue if they're new and you have been waiting a little bit longer. I just wanted to do that bit of housekeeping.

And I referred to my colleagues as "microphone people" earlier. They're colleagues, not microphone people.

[ Laughter ]

CARLOS GUTIERREZ:

Yes, thank you. Carlos Gutierrez, GNSO Council.

I think it was great for policy work. I'm really very, very satisfied for the format you chose. So satisfied that I strongly support Kavouss' proposal. We should have it two times a year and include other separate face-to-face meetings.

And I was happy that the accountability group got an extra day. We, at the competition review, tried to get a day or two here, and we didn't get it. It would be most efficient if other separate

---

face-to-face meetings can be consolidated with this type of activity because they are very policy related.

I think the best logistic was to be back to back with the GAC. That was wonderful. We could move very efficiently between GAC and GNSO and as we try to have better understanding between the different processes, between GAC and GNSO policy-making. It was very, very good. I don't know if somebody planned it but it worked very well. It should be like this all the time.

For people who work in policy, also we got a lot of flexibility by the planning people. Yesterday we got opportunity to do a policy forum between the ccNSO and the GNSO, and it was great. It was, for us as co-chairs, great to have some senior people managing the discussion and offering us some solutions to move forward with these difficult issues we have to deal with.

We were very honored. I've never seen such a big presence of the Board in our meetings, so thank you very much for the board members.

Nevertheless, a negative point. It was a very high price to pay not to get a T-shirt. I really --

[ Laughter ]

-- miss that.

---

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

ROB HOGGARTH:

Number 3, please.

Oh, we had -- I'm sorry, Sebastien. We have to observe our standing rule.

Number 1, please.

ELSA:

Oh, okay. Hi. I'm Elsa. For the record, I work for the Gulf Center for Human Rights and I'm Lebanese.

I just wanted to say that policy B, actually, for me, I saw ICANN from a wider perspective. And, in fact, through this policy meeting I was able to go into more policy development working groups than I could in my first Meeting A that I had in Dublin.

So I think this kind of meeting would encourage people to see things with a wider perspective and would encourage them to go and dive into working groups and start drafting more and be more interested in ICANN.

And the second point would be I think for a Meeting B kind of setting, newcomers are not very much encouraged to come

---

here. I think old people with old experience in ICANN should be in a policy B meeting. In a Meeting B policy -- in any case. Yeah. Because I could see that newcomers here were a bit confused and they didn't get the whole experience I got, for example, in meeting "A."

So I just want to put this point down, and thank you for giving us the chance to speak about all these things.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you.

Number 4. Sorry, Sebastien.

NIELS TEN OEVER:

Thank you. This is Niels ten Oever, for the record. I definitely can say I really enjoyed Meeting B because it was possible to also get some sleep, which definitely also improved the experience, but what was a bit sad is that the Cross-Community Working Party on ICANN's Corporate and Social Responsibility to Respect Human Rights, we were not able to get a session, even though that work was being discussed in the CCWG Accountability and in the GAC. And I think it would have really worked to coordinate that work and feed in and get that cross-community work going.

---

I understand it happens with CCWGs, but not all cross-community work is happening in cross-community working groups.

So it might be a good point to also take that into account into next Meeting B.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you.

We're going to go number 3, and then, Josh, heads up, we're going to move the poll.

Number 3.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sebastien Bachollet speaking.

I would like to mention two things. Something that has been forgotten is how we can prepare better it meeting so as to avoid an introduction on the podium to the whole of the room, not to give any lecture. What can we do, then, for the conferences that give some background to the participants so these participants may come here and -- to a face-to-face meeting ready for discussion. Because when you're here, you're not here to be lectured but to participate in an interactive discussion.



---

It has been said before, and I've heard this in a meeting during this week, that we should stop calling it A, B, and C meeting. And I think that's okay. We should open a contest, a contest to baptize to give names to each of these meetings. The first, the second and the third during the calendar year. And we should then vote for a name. I think that would be interesting.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Go ahead and put up the next poll, which as we've observed is already shift to go the cross-community sessions and how these are organized.

We've already gotten a number of comments about this area. We certainly would love to capture the votes and the opinions that the rest of you have to express about that.

So let's continue the dialogue consistent with the discussions of the policy work, melded in with the actual running of these afternoon sessions.

Some of the feedback has already focused on the layout of the room, the agenda and the preparation of the individual presenters and moderators.

Let's hear a little bit more about that if we can.

I see number 2.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay. Vanda Scartezini from ALAC.

My point is I do believe we need to go a little bit deeper inside the discussion. Most of our model, even in a cross-constituency, is someone presents, most of the people listen, and in the end there are just few of us has time to express their ideas and discuss, really.

So my suggestion is that to have you know the presentation, the idea, like Sebastien said, maybe well prepared for the people that are running that and the people that will be attending. And you have some, you know, like round tables with let's call multistakeholder participations in each table. And the points to be discussed will be there.

We need a large -- more time for those sessions, because the participation is poor because we have no time.

So even people mostly, well, maybe next to you are thinking and you don't have the time to really discuss the opinion that you want to, and then you go out.

And this time, we are running from one session to another because there was a lot of single, small time. And I personally had a few of I'm missing something because I could not attending that meeting. Attending the other meeting.

---

It was a little running time most of the time. And maybe we need to rethink a little bit about also the -- how we do this kind of distribution.

Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you. Do any of my colleagues have anyone immediately because I have a gentleman -- two gentlemen down front here. Ozan, you can come on down here. Right here first. As Ozan is coming back, one of the things I'd like to tease out, if some of you could think about it because we are focused and we're doing the poll right now in this session. No one's talked about the -- as much as I'd like to, some of the morning sessions. And to really get a perspective of some of you who have been involved in the actual working group efforts within each community and this aspect of having dedicated community time every morning to really focus on some of the work. So if anyone has thoughts on that, please think about it or pull those together. And we'll turn back to the microphone. Microphone number 1.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Hi there. Jordyn Buchanan with Google. And I'm the worst person to talk about the morning sessions because I'm not

---

actively involved with any of the sort of current policy work. So that meant the afternoon sessions were my ICANN. So as the previous speaker mentioned that's great. I got a lot more sleep at this ICANN than I usually do.

I really want to echo Vanda's comments and bring in something Edmon said earlier which is I just felt like the cross-community sessions were way too time constrained to actually feel very useful to me. But there was so -- and combining that with what Edmon said earlier, there was so much presentation brought into each session, it was very hard to have a lot of substantive conversation. It was doubly hard to have the substantive conversation because on the one hand it's great we have everyone from the community in one room. On the other hand, it's not that great because you have hundreds of people in the room, and it's very, very difficult to have a meaningful, substantive discussion with that many people at once. So I think somehow we need to give ourselves a little bit more time to make those conversations substantive, and that probably just means we have to do something that the ICANN community is terrible at, and make some hard decisions and drop things off the agenda, even though everyone is going to want to talk about their particular thing or maybe it does involve some of the overlapping where we talk. We can't quite have everyone in one

---

room, but we'll have parallel tracks so we have a little bit more time for some of the things.

And secondly, you have to -- somehow the moderators have to figure out how to break down the discussion into smaller bits and pieces, with the whole community involved in the room but not necessarily all in the same conversation, with some report out afterwards.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you very much. I believe Alan went before. So number -- we're going back to number 1 here in front.

ASHWIN SASONGKO:

Thank you. It's the first time, of course, we followed the new type of meetings. It is just my direct comment for this new system. Number one, yes, I like this one because like the GAC meeting here, we have the cross-community and so on and so we know more and more.

Secondly, I personally think that three times meeting like this is still necessary because -- well, Chris mentioned perhaps once a year, for example. But I think the three times per thing like this is still important. Perhaps we can next year -- perhaps we can evaluate this because the ICT development is so fast. We have IANA transfer. We have VeriSign testing with the root server

---

management testing. We have many other things. Now with this fast changing the -- we have to know exactly what is happening and, of course, we can -- we can read the report, of course. But it's different with -- if I talk to you directly like this because I can see if it is important you will say oh, this is important, you know. It's something like that.

It might be different with, say, what is the closest to Internet, to ITU meeting. ITU council is an annual meeting, but between this annual meeting we have hundreds -- many, many, many ITU subgroup meeting. WRC meeting, you have the Asia-Pacific meeting, Asia tele community, and so on and so on. The ITR, the Internet Telecommunication Regulations, is once so many years, once every so many years, but that is for a regulation that every country has to sign. And we need the full power from minister of -- minister of foreign affairs and so on and so on. So yes, it is regulations and it has to be there for a few years. Not one year. Not -- we do not renew ITU every year. It will make everybody difficult. But for WRC, yes, we change very, very, very often.

So I think it depends on the nature of the -- of the organization as how often we have to meet. From my point of view, I personally feel comfortable with three times meeting and you say something, I don't know how it will look like, this B meeting policy. Do not know what is the next one. I should have another feeling.

---

Another one is that we don't have the so-called big exhibition here, like the one we had in Marrakech or the one we had in Dublin. We don't have big -- big exhibitions. Now, I miss that because with the exhibition we know exactly what is happening in many fields, at least in that particular country. So you go oh, this country is becoming this and this and so on and so on. It's just my feeling. For example, ICANNWiki is not there so I cannot print my nice face, you know, for fun, of course. So thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you. We're going to go to -- let me take a quick look. Do we have anyone else in the queue -- we'll go -- we'll go -- we have two people with two. And then we'll move to the next item on the agenda. Thank you. Yeah, I know you have two people.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

(Off microphone).

ROB HOGGARTH:

And Alan. We'll do those three. Thanks, Benedetta.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Tijani again, and in French again. This is Tijani Ben Jemaa. We're not talking about cross-community working

---

sessions. So when I comes to this point I would say I like the format. I think we should have a panel with members speaking and that the distribution of those panelists should include diversity because CCTs, a cross-community session, the whole community should be represented by the panelist. In that way we would be able to learn the point of view of every community. So each community should be represented on the panel and a panelist should have short interventions before giving the floor to the audience.

Also, I believe it is a good setup of the session there are sometimes facilitators who are not experts on the topic but they do know how to manage a meeting, how to run a meeting. They ensure the diversity of topics and that it's interesting. Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH: ... and then Kim will have one last up here. I realized I forgot a gentleman up here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg answering the question on how are the morning sessions. Unlike Jordyn I got much less sleep than normal. We had sessions scheduled from 7:00 -- from 8:00 a.m. on and they were pretty fully packed. And some of us do work in multiple



---

areas and, you know, we, of course, had the -- the conflicts of, in my case ALAC versus GNSO meetings held in parallel. That's a reality of all ICANN meetings, but it certainly -- since the meetings were more compressed here, there were no gaps in the ALAC schedule and, therefore, everything was a conflict. That's the way it goes.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you. Back to number 2, and then we'll wrap up with number 1.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: This is Sebastien Bachollet, and I will speak in French. I heard two (indiscernible) talking about this issue of meetings. I want to make a point of clarification. I don't believe we should have more than three meetings, ICANN meetings a year. But each should be focused on an organization or focused on a certain topic. So we are talking about this meeting within a year. This does not mean that we will have only one meeting. It means that we will have only one B meeting per year. So the fact of having different meetings does not mean that what is happening here will not be implemented in another meeting. We can do -- apply exactly the same in another meeting.

---

TANZANICA KING: First, I think we're going to number one.

ROB HOGGARTH: Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Thank you. You asked about the morning session. It was very, very effective. The only thing that sometimes missed because there are so many parallel. But it was effective and very useful, instructive, and we really benefit from that.

I have just one point. Please kindly do not consider it as criticism. The moderator and the panelists should not take any position with respect to the subject under discussions. Should just explain the issue and leave it to the others to comment. If they push for particular things, that has negative impact. We have at least two of them, and I don't want to say that, that the panelists pushing for particular positions. It is better if they agree kindly to avoid that. Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. And if we can move forward to the next slide. Our next question is about how satisfied were you with your

---

opportunities to interact with the board. We've heard some good comments already. We'd like to get some more comments. And I see Marilyn up here, so we can start with number 2.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I was probably -- I would say I was very satisfied with it because the board of directors clearly made an effort to spend their time -- not just the board of directors but also the staff's made an effort to spend their time to be in the rooms and to be available and to interact. And I think that's a real plus, and I'm also going to applaud the fact -- this is only half humorous. I am also going to applaud the fact that most of them were actively engaging and not checking -- having to check their email to see which meeting they had to run off to. So it really was a plus. And I think they also, by not having their working committees, which are a lot of responsibility for them and really important, but not conducting a lot of those working committees, they had the time to be with the community. Now, I'm going to offer a thought that perhaps even somebody sitting next to me might want to comment on. I know all the board of directors by -- I know them personally. I recognize them. They know me. I know them because I've worked with them for years. If I were -- and I think the social events that went back-to-back each night, that were here, were

---

also excellent because the board, the senior staff, and the community were able to see each other night after night after night, easy to get to. I will say if I were a brand new person, finding a board member by myself without a spirit guide might have been very challenging.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. And we'll go back to number 3.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Vanda again. Just to say that we have a very good experience this time. The board coming to ALAC and to stay with us, the CEO and many members, and it was a very good and large productive meeting. So it was a really, really good one. So the experience was good, and I will (indiscernible) that the night meetings, you know, the cocktail meetings that we had, was a very good opportunity because the days were so running and we had a very good opportunity to share with all members of the board during this time. So I believe that we have a very, very good -- you know, I'm here for 17 years, so it's something that for the first time you feel the newcomers could really touch the board. Thank you.

---

TANZANICA KING:                    Okay. And we're going to go to number 2 twice, and then we'll go back to number 1 and then to 3.

MICHELE NEYLON:                    Thanks. I'm Michele Neylon, for the record. Just on this topic of the interaction of the board of directors, I thought it was interesting at this meeting that Goran, the new CEO, was kind of floating around and going into working group sessions. And unlike his predecessors, he didn't make a big scene. He came in, he sat down. I normally spotted him as I could see Cassia. It was kind of if I generally see -- if I see Cassia I know he can't be far behind. And he just observed without disrupting things. Whereas previous CEOs it was always this kind of big song and dance. Oh, look here comes the CEO, all bow down. Whereas Goran seems to be much more interested in just kind of seeing what's going on and getting an idea of what we're all up to, which I think it makes a pleasant change.

As for interactions with other board of director -- members of the board of directors, hard to say. I've heard from some people kind of mixed -- mixed views, that some people say I saw more interaction. Others saw them sitting in meeting rooms but didn't feel that they were interacting that much. And I think there's -- it's like with all these things. You're going to get mixed views. It's hard -- what somebody said to me is, you know,

---

meeting B as a concept, you know, need to give it a couple of goes before you can make a definitive decision on whether it's a good idea or bad idea.

Because what's happening at this meeting is going to be tainted by what's going on out there at the moment, be that IANA transition, U.S. presidential elections, new CEO, et cetera, et cetera, moving location. They all have an impact which make this particular meeting very specific, and a future meeting in this format could be completely different. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: We have a second Number 2.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay. Thank you. George Sadowsky. I'm a member of the board. We -- I think the great majority of the board has been around and present and interacting more or less with people here. We're not -- I think we're pretty approachable, but it takes -- it's going to take effort on the part of attendees here to say, There's a board member. Let's go talk to him. We may agree or disagree with something he said or felt or expressed or just want to talk and introduce yourself. Don't be hesitant. Do it.

---

TANZANICA KING:                    Then we're going to going back to Number 1 and then we'll go to Number 3.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:                    Hi, it's Chris Disspain again. I would be very, very interested, if they're prepared to say something, from anyone who put "not at all" as part of the survey. We haven't had a lot of "not at a " down the line so far in the other questions. And I would really like to hear from anybody who is prepared to say why they're not satisfied at all. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING:                    Okay. Number 1 -- sorry, are we up at 3? Chris was 1.

EDMON CHUNG:                    Edmon Chung here, not responding to Chris' call, though, because I put my hand up earlier.

Very quick comment. I know we talked about this before, but I still think a public forum is useful and it gives the community an interactive session with the board. Maybe we can bring it back to meeting B. Maybe this particular session. This is the first time we do it, so this session is useful. But this particular time slot can used for a public forum. So that's just my comment.

---

TANZANICA KING:                   Number 4.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:               Hi, it's Jordyn Buchanan with Google again. I kind of -- I wish there was a "not applicable" option here. I guess I was disappointed that this question needed to be asked in that this is a policy forum and the board is not a policy-making body. And so I don't know why anyone would particularly care if they came to a policy forum and could talk to the board or not.

I think just in general, we ought to focus on the community making policy as opposed to sort of like leaning on the board to do it.

Now, I did -- in one of the sessions, Erika Mann -- that I was in, Erika Mann got up and made a very nice intervention talking about the difference between European safe harbor -- E.U. safe harbor versus privacy shield. That was a very useful contribution, not in her capacity as a board member but as a knowledgeable and learned person. It's a great that we have board members that are knowledgeable. I want them to be knowledgeable about these topics and so it's great to see them in the room.

But I think whether or not we are interacting with them as board members, as opposed to whether there are board members



---

active and being active in the process, I think that's a somewhat different question.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. We're going to go back to Number 3 and then 2.

DONNA AUSTIN: Hey, Tanzi. It's Donna Austin.

Jordyn, just to respond to what you just said, one of the things with the meeting strategy working group that came up was that the board doesn't interact enough -- excuse me -- with the community. So that's what this is getting at. And it's not so much that the board -- you're right, board doesn't make policy. But I think enabling the board to be in the sessions where the policy is being discussed actually educates them. So I think that's -- you know, from my perspective, that's one of the benefits of having -- giving the board the ability to roam around and not being stuck in a room somewhere not knowing what's going on. Thanks.

TANZANICA KING: Back at Number 2 and then we're going to go forward to the next question, I think.

---

ELSA SAADE:

Hi again. Elsa Saade, from the Netherlands.

I just wanted to say -- and I'm going to be a bit subjective here -- that in this meeting, I saw more women from the ICANN board, and this made me feel so empowered as a woman in this sphere. And their statements especially in cross-community working groups were excellent, and they -- I mean, listening to them and listening to their expertise would definitely inspire me to be more included in this process in ICANN and come back at some point and do my best to look up to them and do my best to be as good as they are.

So thank you to the women in the ICANN board, Rinalia, Lousewies, everyone, for whatever you're doing right now. You are empowering us as women. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

TANZANICA KING:

And if we can move forward the slides.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Oh, you're looking at me because this is my assignment.

TANZANICA KING:

I'm looking at you because this is yours.

ROB HOGGARTH:

I think we would be well-served to look at the next two items generally together. We'll take a break at some point in the discussion to have folks answer the last piece. And I know there were a couple of you that wanted to touch on the board of directors piece.

This area of focus is really on the outreach and engagement side. And I would be very interested to hear feedback on that because as one of the participants already noted, they didn't see a good bit of outreach or engagement in the part of the schedule they had identified. And I know a number of different communities viewed the concept of outreach and engagement in slightly different ways, recognizing the multistakeholder nature of our work.

So as you're thinking about potentially commenting, if you can give some thoughts to that, contribute some thoughts in that area, that would be very helpful.

Continuing in order, we have 4 right up front here, Emily, and then we'll go to 1. You can comment on the last comment as well as on this one. So please take advantage of it, if you would like.

---

**KAVOUSS ARASTEH:** Just a simple comment. We should not compare the former CEO with the present one. They are coming from different cultures, different background, different missions, and so on and so forth. Let us not compare the people. Both are respectful and so on. The objective of this meeting is not to judge the people. Thank you.

**ROB HOGGARTH:** And Number 1.

**OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:** Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, EURALO, European At-Large organization. I actually put one for this question because although the ALAC did do a bit of work to try and get as much outreach and engagement as possible with the local communities, we didn't -- I don't think we got any of the local community. And, of course, that's due to various reasons and so on because originally we were supposed to be in Panama. But I hope that the next meeting B will be able to actually have full outreach and engagement with the local community and make full use of that.

And, again, just to echo on the concerns about this being just called a policy meeting, we might wish to say "policy and outreach meeting." Thank you.

---

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you. Just a quick observation that some of you may have been having throughout the course of the session about the scientific nature of our polling. I appreciate the comments and your patience with this. This is not intended to be a purely scientific exercise. But we hope that we're going to be getting some good trends or senses of the room, if you will. But we will look at these and I will talk later about how we're going to use it.

I think Number 3 is next. Kim, thank you.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, sir. I'm Mark Datysgeld. I come to this meeting under the condition of NextGen ambassador. And I would like to identify the community about the new shape of the program that took part in this meeting. We are actually five ambassadors who have been NextGen before working each with three NextGen. And this has been a very positive experience, I think, because for us, as far as ambassadors are concerned, we have been able to engage -- or forced, rather, to engage much more with the constituencies so that we would have as much knowledge as possible to pass on to them. And at the same time, the NextGen were very engaged and able to access the community because of the efforts of the communities to talk to

---

them and due to having direct access to an ambassador in a very structured way.

So in this sense, the meeting was welcoming for newcomers, at least under this format, because we have seen how much they have been able to take out of this experience.

So as far as the NextGen program is concerned, I think I can speak for most of us, that it has been a very positive learning experience and it has been worked. And the format does support the program as long as there is proper training and the correct approach to this which I think was something that happened at the season. Thank you very much for your attention. That is my comment.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you. (indiscernible) is right in front of me, so I can't see behind if we have got any folks back there. All right. number 1 right here up front.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. Marilyn Cade speaking. I'm going to distinguish for purposes of this -- my comments between outreach and engagement. And the reason I'm going to do that is normally at ICANN meetings, the business constituency has been most successful in our outreach to the community when we have

---

been able to take advantage of publicizing the welcoming ceremony where there is typically a high-level government speaker and then there's a reception in the evening and then on the Tuesday morning, we collaborate with others from the cross-constituency group to do a breakfast that is very often with the governments. And that's a good marketing way to reach businesses in that local area who have never been to an ICANN meeting and to interest them in sticking at least their -- getting in up to their knees in an ICANN meeting and spending at least two days.

For this meeting, because policy was the topic, although I have a very strong relationship with the ICT association here in Helsinki, they were not interested in coming and going into a deep policy dive because they felt it was over their head.

So this is not a criticism. Now I'm going to talk about engagement. Engagement, on the other hand, we did do in the business constituency by identifying a particular couple of potential strong targets for membership who want to get -- knew they wanted to get more involved in ICANN. So we took a different approach here having understood that we weren't going to get the entire ICT sector but instead trying to engage just one or two people and then working very closely together. So I want to make that distinction because I think as we evaluate our outreach strategy in the B.C., we're going to need to

---

differentiate what we have to market, so to speak, at each of the meetings.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you. Number 4.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri speaking again, another one of the same old people that always speak.

I'm actually really happy with the way outreach and engagement worked out here on this one because we backed off spending any of the precious time we needed for policy by having those outreachy events and, yet, managed to pull a bunch of people in and actually get them engaged in doing the policy meetings with the rest of us. I think we actually managed to reach a different crowd of people, those who weren't interested in come hang with us and have some drinks but those who were actually interested in jumping into the stuff we do.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you.

Do we have anyone else on this topic? Okay.

Let's move to the next one, Tanzania.



---

TANZANICA KING: Great. We've got 13 minutes to go before cocktails, which takes us into this next question. How satisfied were you with the opportunities for networking and social interaction?

ROB HOGGARTH: I like that delayed response.

TANZANICA KING: I had to look at the clock.

So do we have some comments? And they can be -- as we're wrapping up the session in ten minutes, you can make comments on any of these subjects, I think. And we'll start with Number 2.

MICHELE NEYLON: Michele Neylon again for the record. I thought it was nice this time around that there was an organized social event of some kind every evening. I didn't get to attend many of them because there were external ones as well. But I thought in terms of the ability for people to do that, I thought, that was positive. I think that was good.

Moving beyond the evening cocktail-type thing, this facility, although it seemed to not have much space, that was a bit

---

misleading because there were tons of little nooks and crannies. And I kept on kind of finding people -- I won't say hiding but kind of tucked away in a corner that managed to find a table, a couple of chairs, having meetings and everything else. And then you had that nice kind of cafe thing downstairs and the bar, which was nice. So I thought it worked pretty well.

It's much better than some of the other venues we have been in where we have been spread out across multiple separate buildings and trying to find somebody when they say, Oh, I'll meet you at the registration desk. And then, of course, they can't find the registration desk and you spend 25 minutes just missing that person. So I thought it was good.

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you. And number 2. I believe you turn around. There you go.

EDMON CHUNG:

Edmon Chung again. Sorry to keep speaking but trying to make it short in every intervention.

I think the scheduled receptions every day is good. It's -- But probably want to rotate the actual venue, because I see the number of people joining kind of decline over the days. It may

---

help if you rotate, but I guess logistically it's harder. That's just a suggestion.

I'm curious why this session, the Adobe Connect room is not open, or is it just me? Because I think a lot of feedback can be done with the chat and text, because rather than just the mic, a lot of the things could be just, you know -- healthy discussion usually happens in the text.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you. I think we're -- Josh, you can explain what may be happening technically that Tanzania and I are not seeing.

JOSH BAULCH: I'm really happy to tell you right now that we're using Adobe Connect hosted through Adobe Connect, the corporate. We have a lot of little problems like this.

Over the next 60 days, we'll be migrating to our own servers, so we will run into much less issues like this.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. We'll take a question back in number 3.

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good evening, everybody. I am Satia (phonetic). I have come from India, and I belong to Hyderabad.

This is the first time I have ever boarded an international flight, and I have come on this beautiful purpose here. And I don't want to speak anything technical or nontechnical. As a mother and as a teacher for so many years, I just want to share a few words with all of you.

I see a beautiful unity of diversity in this hall in ICANN. I feel ICANN is like a garden, and computers are its flowers and the Internet is its fragrance.

And we all, as gardeners in the ICANN garden, we should try to make a beautiful garden in which our future generations will enjoy the fruits of Internetization. And let's all together make the planet a paradise of knowledge, information, and bring more humanity in the world.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. It was very nice to meet you earlier this week.

We'll go to number 2. Or do we go to 1?

---

Sebastien, can I have you wait one second while we go to somebody new at number 1 I did not see.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, of course.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. Number 1.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN: Yeah, I'm Sivasubramanian. Just a very fine observation. We have -- In ICANN meetings on Tuesdays, we have party by Afilias, one party by Dyn, one party by VeriSign, and several other parties which are quite dispersed, and sometimes we have to attend more than one party.

Instead, if there is some agreement --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

[ Laughter ]

SIVASUBRAMANIAN: If there is some agreement, if everything could happen on a Thursday in one place where Afilias brings music and VeriSign

---

brings wine and Dyn brings whiskey and somebody sponsors dinner, it will be great.

[ Applause ]

So you can serve wine with VeriSign written on the wine bottle.

Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Thank you very much.

We will go over to Sebastien now.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet speaking.

In order to continue with these comments, I think since we have parties in the evening around a glass of something, it's really a major step forward.

I regret that in Marrakech we did not have that much number of parties because you may meet people in a nice environment. So this time we had parties every evening, and I think that was good.

Perhaps we may find a way to do different things every single night. And in the previous session, speed dating was mentioned. So perhaps we may have some kind of speed dating in the next

---

meetings during the evenings so as to get to know each other better.

TANZANICA KING:

I have to pause for that, too. Sorry.

So do we have any other questions or comments or....

Nobody okay.

Go forward? Yes. I did not see you. We'll go to number 2.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

This is not about networking. Just to say a simple thank you for ICANN. I'm from Sri Lanka, and this is the first time I'm attending this ICANN meeting. And I would say a first time a Sri Lankan has been attending, which we have 21 million population. But I would like to give one suggestion, that a little more of more orientation would have done a lot, because that way I'm more prepared for these meetings when I come because I'm coming with one intention, to contribute and to give my best. So a little bit of networking. If not for Marilyn and Jimson, I think I would have been lost.

So for the newcomers, a little bit of orientation would definitely help.

Thank you.

---

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. And I believe we have somebody at number 3.

SONIGITU EKPE: Thank you. My name is Sonigitu Ekpe. This is my first ICANN. In fact, I'm really very pleased for making it to this meeting because this meeting has synchronized with the OECD ministerial meeting in Cancun. So I am really very fulfilled.

Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. Thank you. Oh, it depends who gets here first. Number 2.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much. This is my third meeting, and I virtually noticed especially it's been said for a long time in GAC that there is a consistency of the participation by a few countries.

I am just hoping for future meetings this would improve. Especially for my brothers on the African continent. You get one or two only people participating.

Again, there was mention that ICANN would have a meeting with the African group. This is an area we need to look at so that we improve our participation.



---

The Internet belongs to all of us.

Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. And we will stick with number 2, a new speaker, and then we will go to number 4.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Hi, my name is Danko Jevtovic, .RS.

Two short, maybe technical, but still, notes. I like the scheduling application, but it would be beneficiary if we had some idea of the schedule before. I'm mainly involved in the ccNSO, but I don't plan my days here very well because basically I could have gone home today, not tomorrow, because there was not too much work.

And the other small, also, technical thing, the schedule app on mobile is very good, but I selected what I wanted to attend on the -- with the desktop version, from the browser, I logged in, and when I logged in in the mobile app, it didn't pick it up. So it's some small, maybe, issue for next time.

Thanks.

---

TANZANICA KING: Thank you. And we'll go to number 4. That's you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Let me just tell the good things. First of all, thank you very much. Really, we appreciate the way that you run the meeting. The gentleman was quite kind with everybody. And, really, you deserve a big round of applause. This is number one.

[ Applause ]

Number two, if someone wishes to speak, it is not required to refer to the age of the others or their own. I am not interested in the singer. I'm interested in the song.

I don't think it is appropriate saying that from the old or not old people. Let us not refer to the age.

I am proud to be old.

[ Laughter ]

[ Cheers and applause ]

Very proud to be old. But at the same time, I am active.

Today was 25,000 emails that I have received for the ICANN and CCWG. CCWG, 21,000. So active.

But I don't mind to be old or not old. But I request kindly the people please and please refrain to refer to the age of others.

---

Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: And I have to respond just slightly to that. I have been at ICANN 14 years. Some people call me old and some people call me young.

Number 3 in the back.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: My name is Arinola Akinyemi from Nigeria.

This is my first ICANN meeting, but it has afforded me the opportunity to learn more about ICANN and helped me to resolve better to be part of the policy decisions in the -- on the Internet issues.

The organization is, for me, interesting. I find the environment very impressive. And, actually, moving around, networking with people and meeting people from different parts of the world on Internet issues has really been enlightening for me.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

TANZANICA KING: Thank you.

---

And if we go to the next slide, we're going to wrap up.

We're looking ahead at Hyderabad. So this is a -- just a general schedule overview for you to see.

We're looking forward to taking all of this feedback. This was really good feedback that we got, by the way. I'm sorry you had to stay an extra day, but I'm glad we were able to get your feedback.

We're go to take all of this into account, obviously, for the next policy forum, or whatever we may call it. And we're also going to take this forward, too, for the next meeting because I think all of it applies in terms of how we meet, what it is that you're trying to get out of the meeting and what you liked and what you didn't like.

And if we go forward one more slide.

ROB HOGGARTH:

We very much appreciate all of the input that you have provided on the polls, at this session, and potentially what you're going to supply us later.

Tanzanica is going to take all this input. The transcripts, whatever did make it into the chat in the Adobe Connect room

---

earlier in the session. Collate it, curate it, provide some analysis, and it's going to go on the community Wiki.

She'll probably have a blog post announcing when it does go on there.

And in the spirit of constant and never-ending improvement, we hope that you will individually or encourage others to go check it out and help because it's going to become a part of the planning efforts for the next policy forum in Johannesburg.

So thank you all very much for taking the time, making the effort. We've enjoyed the good will and good nature here, the constructive feedback because it is very serious. This is a substantial commitment that you all make from a time perspective. There's a substantial investment from the organization, and we want to make it work for all of you and continue to work with you to do that.

Thank you all very much.

[ Applause ]

TANZANICA KING:

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**