UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Future Meeting Strategy Implementation, October 15, 2014.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. We will get started. Welcome. Thank you, guys, for taking the time to join us today.

This discussion is going to be a reminder to the community about the recommendations made by the Meeting Strategy Working Group, which was a community-led initiative to propose a new vision for ICANN meetings 2016 and forward. You're going to hear from a few of those community members today from the Meeting Strategy Working Group, but we'll start with Sebastian Bachollet who is a member of the ICANN Board and was instrumental to the creation of the Meeting Strategy Working Group.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Tanzanica.

I am very happy to go over with you the proposed implementation of the Meeting Strategy Working Group report. If you recall, in London the Board resolve take a resolution and ask in order to inform the Board discussion on the Meeting Strategy Working Group recommendations. The Board directed the President and CEO through its designee, and I guess that we have around the table those people in charge of, to

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.

propose a plan for implementation of the recommendation contained in the report to be provided to the Board for consideration in sufficient time for possible implementation for meetings to be held in calendar year 2016.

First, thanks to the staff for the very good work they have done to bring us this proposal today, and thank you to allow us to have this discussion with the community before it goes to the Board hopefully in the next weeks I hope.

Some members of the Meeting Strategy Working Group will present to you the current implementation proposal. Donna will go through the guiding principles that working group take in to consideration to develop the proposal. Anna, will talk about Meeting A and you will see in more detail what is A. Tijani will go through Meeting B, Eduardo through Meeting C, and I guess that Nick will present geographic rotation, and then Tanzanica will give us the next step and some conclusion.

And, I hope that if you have questions and remarks, it will be a good time to do that. Thank you once again for attending this meeting, and I give the floor to Donna, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sebastian. I'm Donna Austin. I represented the registry stakeholder group for the GNSO in this Working Group.

This was a bit of a challenge for us because there's so many different ways that you could have sliced and diced this. So in order to work out

what was the more important and how to get the most out of the work we were doing, we developed some guiding principles about how we do the work and what was important.

Ensure sufficient face-to-face time for the SO/AC policy development processes. It's a critical task that's undertaken during each meeting, so we wanted to ensure that there was enough time for that to continue.

Develop the next level of equal footed cross-constituency interaction and facilitate sufficient delegate networking possibilities. So one of the things that we acknowledged is that generally most of the constituencies work within a closed room with no windows and don't do much interaction across the board, so we tried to find a way to expand that a little bit.

Promote efficient use of community and ICANN time with reduced session conflicts. I think I heard there's about 230 sessions at this meeting. They've been growing over time, and one of the big concerns is that there's not enough time. There's too many sessions for people to be able to keep up with, so we need to find a way to cut those back and reduce the conflicts.

Maximize qualitative participation. So ensure capabilities for remote participation.

Provide sufficient language services – so interpretation, translation.

Balance geographic rotation versus hub location. So we've actually had some discussion about the benefits of continuing the geographic

rotation as opposed to hub locations, and I think what we've agreed to is to continue the geographic rotation.

Outreach with local communities. So this was about finding opportunities that, while we are in those local communities, what outreach opportunities are there for the different organizations within ICANN?

Educate new and existing participants on issues being addressed by ICANN. That's a huge challenge for anybody.

Minimize conflicts with other internet community events. So oftentimes, ICANN has had a consistent three meetings a year, but there are other meetings that we try not to clash with.

Visa availability. Tijani advocated very formidably for visa availability.

Develop a design that allows for growth. We've got an increasing number of topics, constituency groups are getting bigger, the attendees are getting a lot more as well. How do we develop a meeting that's going to make sure that we can get the most out of the time we have available?

Serve to increase the credibility of ICANN with the broader global community. I guess that's just a measure objective and something to keep in the back of mind when we're looking at developing the meetings.

So that's all I have. Thank you.

ANA NEVES: Hello. My name is Ana Neves. I'm from GAC.

So to present this meeting A. So we are continuing to have three meetings a year. This meeting A, you will not see so many changes except two.

For the time being, we called day one Monday, but lots of working groups and other meetings are taking place since Saturday. So, now we'll start day one on Saturday and day six will be on Thursday. So it means that what was more or less informal, Saturday and Sunday, now it's formal.

Another thing that we found that will be very useful for the community is to have two public forums. We will have one in the beginning of the week and the other one at the end of the week. So, we think that it will be very useful for the community to come, to ask, to raise the questions that they are worried about or concerned or they want more development. And at the end of the week, we'll see if the questions are the same, if they are different, what happened, and what was the evolution.

We think that it is an improvement of what we have noticed. Thank you.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Ana. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sebastian.

First of all, I would like to tell you that the new proposed strategy is composed of three different types of meetings.

The first one is what Ana just presented. It is the first one of the calendar year. The second one is this one, the B, that I will present. It will be the middle one. And the last one, Eduardo will speak about it. It will be the last one of the year.

So meeting B will be the second meeting in the year. Duration is only four full days. Three of those full days are focused on Board and SO and AC work, and one day is fully focused on the community outreach. So as you see on the bottom of the – who is playing?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's because there is a problem of there is one line missing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know why, and I solved it here.

TANZANICA KING: Yes, they can't see it remotely, so we're just going to have to say apologies.

NICK TOMASSO: Let's have Tijani keep going and bring the screen back up [inaudible]. That's good that way. Perfect.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So the duration is only four full days. Three of them are focused on the Board and the SO and the ACs work. And one of the four days will be focused on the community outreach.

So if you look at the bottom of the screen, this is the layout of the four days. The first day will be – and it is flexible here – we say the first day, but there is not a defined order. It will be fully dedicated to the local community outreach. The second day will be for intra work, the third day the same, and the fourth day will be for the inter-community work.

You can [inaudible] or remark that we have one full day for the community outreach. That means it gives it a quarter of the meeting. The quarter of the meeting is for outreach. This is very important. I will tell you why.

You remember we were always saying that we want to go to the community. We want to go to people where they are. This configuration will help us to do so. Why?

Because this meeting doesn't have sponsor exhibition. There is no opening ceremony, no public forum, only working sessions. The consequence will be less attendees, less noisy sessions, only working sessions. What does that mean?

That means that we will be using smaller venue. When we use a smaller venue, that means that we will be able to go to the regions that wasn't possible to go there because they didn't have the infrastructure for such a huge meeting that we have now. So this configuration will help us now to go everywhere in the world. This is an element of inclusion, and this will make us go to people where they are as we always wanted to do.

So, smaller size of the venue, that means less rooms, smaller rooms. We can go to all the regions. More time will be focused on the community outreach, so one over four of the time of this meeting will be dedicated to the outreach. The outreach to the local community is one of the most important point because it is not interesting to have always the same figures, the same faces, always the same people, so there is not an added value. We need to make people enter into the system, and this is one way to do so.

Another important thing, we'll have no more session overlap because we have [less] segmented work. We have two days for intra-community work. So we will not be divided between working with each own community and go to the inter-community working groups.

Second thing, the meeting is not too huge to have so many sessions so we will not have overlap of the sessions. We will concentrate more and more on the intra- and inter-community work, which is the most important.

NICK TOMASSO: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

NICK TOMASSO: May you explain the difference between INTRA and INTER? Perhaps it's not quite so obvious.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. You are right. I am sorry.

NICK TOMASSO: No. Not at all.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Inter-community is very clear. That means that GNSO with ALAC with ccNSO together. They work together. This is the inter-community work. Intra-community work, that means that you work in your community. Each community work in its own work. This is what is the difference between those two categories of work.

So we concentrate more on those works, on the effective work, if you want. I think that this kind of meeting will solve a lot of problems that we had before.

More or less, this review was based on the fact that we cannot find a huge venue for the ICANN meetings. With this configuration, now we will be able to go to all the regions, even those that don't have a huge venue.

Before giving you the floor back, Sebastian, I would like to say that I was really pleased to work with this dream team. Really. They are a special team, and they was always helping without trying to impose anything. Now they have Maya, and Maya also is a wonderful person, so you are really lucky. Thank you.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Tijani. I share your sentiment here about the great team we have to organize the meeting. Eduardo, please can you go to the next slide please?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Sebastian.

This is the D meeting. You know, with D big meeting? It's really focused to showcase ICANN. As you can see, it's very similar to the first meeting except that it has one more day. This is the meeting where most people that come are replacing other people. It happens in this meeting and it happens almost at the end and, as such, the wrap-up sessions and other intra-community work ends up in day seven.

But basically, you have the same structure as the first one where you have two public meetings and there is a slot for high-interest topics [inaudible]. So it looks the same, but basically it's where everything happens. This is where we know ICANN to have the AGM Meeting. It's basically at the end so this is meeting C.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I guess now its Nick, the big boss of the meeting team.

NICK TOMASSO: Well, thank you very much, Sebastian.

We've noted through a couple of the presentations that there is a need to continue geographic rotation of ICANN meetings, especially to those locations that have been unable to host in the past because they do not have the facilities that are of the size that are necessary. We find a lot of that in Africa and Latin America.

So what you see in front of you now is a proposed geographic rotation that takes in to account all of the different meeting types, all three of them, and how we might place them in the different regions. You can see that Africa and Latin America are home to quite a few of the – I don't want to say smaller – but reduced-scope ICANN meetings so that we can go to places that we've been unable to go to before. And, what we've shown you is a five-year rotation and how each geography would get the same number of meetings over that five years.

The Meeting Strategy Working Group has given staff the latitude to adjust this schedule based on availability of facilities, time of year, etc., but to maintain the principle of continuing to do geographic rotation and not to utilize hub cities as has sometimes been suggested in the past. So that's how we propose to roll this out.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Nick. Tanzanica, almost the last word. No. Maybe you will have plenty of questions, but go ahead for the last slide. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: So, I'm just going to go over the next steps for implementation.

The first task we have is to seek approval for future dates and the regional rotation, which we've shown you to a degree. A lot of work has already actually been done on this to find dates. We take the time to look at all holidays, every holiday you can think of, also celebrations/observances. And then very importantly, we go to look at all of the different community events that are going on, so we can avoid all of those and find the right dates to set the meetings.

We also need to develop requirements for the three different formats and figure out how we're going to move forward with getting hosts engaged in the meetings locally.

We are going to work with our SOs and ACs on scheduling needs. I think this is probably one of the biggest areas that we have to work in because we need to really get into some smaller meetings with each of our groups and figure out what their needs are, how much time they can dedicate to different topics, meeting with each other, and meeting by themselves.

Then we need to engage our own staff in designing outreach programs based on the recommendations to create some days where we are really doing a lot of outreach.

And then of course, we need to develop a final implementation plan to submit to the Board for approval. We are looking at doing that very soon since we've got to get this in play by 2016.

Next, we are going to take questions, and I know you have tons. Do I have one here?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Maybe you can reverse and ask the questions to the people who are in the room who are concerned because they will have to help you to organize all that what they think about. If it's something they think its good work, they have ideas that something is maybe challenging or whatever. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What's the feedback that you've had about meeting B, because that's where the biggest changes seem to lie? What feedback have you had, from the SOs and ACs in particular, but from the wider community?

NICK TOMASSO: The representatives of the Meeting Strategy Working Group – you see four here today – there were a lot more, and they represented the SOs and ACs. So we had the input directly from the SOs and ACs to develop this.

This also went through a public comment period where we received feedback. Tanzanica is the one who worked on that, and she may be able to add a little bit more detail than I, but there was no fundamental disagreement.

The need to continue to provide the opportunity for the SOs and ACs to do their work caused us to look at a three-meeting rotation. There had been some ideas floated awhile back – since I've been around and certainly before my tenure of six years – to go to two meetings a year. We found that that was not a viable solution because it didn't allow

enough time for the SOs and ACs to do their work. So what you see is a hybrid of that idea, two meetings a year to develop that middle meeting.

Now, we need to educate the community, and we have our VP of coms in the room, Duncan Burns, who will be working very closely with us to make sure that the community understands what that meeting is and why they may or may not decide to attend that meeting, so it's a fundamental change.

ICANN has always had this – I've been to 30 meetings, I've been to 40 meetings – well, you may not want to be at meeting B unless you're really focused on the work of the SOs and ACs. There has been no significant pushback because the program was developed by the SOs and ACs fundamentally.

TANZANICA KING: We actually have a question on Adobe Connect from Michelle Chaplow. She's asking, "Who are the staff members that are going to be responsible for seeing the Meeting Strategy Working Group recommendations through?"

I certainly know that's going to be myself. Nick is going to be part of that. Sally Costerton is going to stick with us. Duncan Burns is going to definitely be there. I have to say the rest of the meetings team is definitely going to be a big part of helping see this through, who are all sitting here right now. We have Nancy Lupiano, Laura, Melanie, [inaudible], we will all be working on this and Maya, too, who is helping us just to run this meeting right now.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: We count on you. Thank you, Michelle, for joining us from Spain and for your work within the Meeting Strategy Working Group, and we hope to see you in a future ICANN meeting soon.

NICK TOMASSO: So to do this in an opposite direction, does anyone have a concern about what they see? Are there any issues? Please tell us what they are.

MICHELLE SCOTT TUCKER: My name's Michelle Scott Tucker. I'm from the ACIG GAC secretariat. We're the independent consulting firm that provides secretariat support to the GAC. So I [inaudible] I'm not speaking on behalf of the GAC at all; I'm speaking as a support person who provides support to the GAC.

I don't know how we're going to fit a GAC meeting in to four days. That's my challenge, I know, is to bring that to the GAC, which we're doing tomorrow morning. Aren't we, Ana, and talking that through with them? I'll be very curious to see what they say when pressed when I ask them the question directly.

I know Ana's asked them directly, and I know Suzanne's been working with them directly as well. The issue will be concentrating their minds, I think, on exactly this issue. I don't have a solution to it, but I might be coming to you for help and support to see how you've done it with other SOs and ACs if that's okay.

SALLY COSTERTON: So I think it's probably helpful to clarify. I'm sure Sebastian will correct me if I'm wrong about this, but this process is done.

We just had Board approval. It's been through public comment, and it's had Board approval. One of the reasons I think that process was reasonably smooth was because of the way it was built. And including, as you rightly identify, one of the bigger challenges that we face – and I'm looking at Ana here because we were together when we did it – was this question as to how we were going to accommodate the needs of the GAC within this evolved framework.

One of the challenges of the current setup is that the needs of the GAC drive a lot of other challenges elsewhere in the agenda, in particular in the choice of location actually. So this is probably one of the hardest things that we had to debate. This working group met – just so that you might find this useful to know – for pretty much every week for a year. There was an enormous amount of hours spent by a group which was quite large. I'm looking at Sebastian; I think the Working Group was about 15 people?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: [Maybe about] 20.

SALLY COSTERTON: 20?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: 20 people.

SALLY COSTERTON: Yes. So a multiplied number of man hours and women hours. I actually tried to crack this problem. I think what we came up with, we were very happy that we'd managed to find a compromise position that mitigated most of the problems and maximized the opportunities.

What has not happened – and I don't think there is any plan for it to happen – is for this plan to be taken back into the SO/SA structures for detailed discussion. I know you're not saying that, but I just wanted to so that you knew that you shouldn't feel that that has to happen because nobody else will be expected to try to make that happen. And if we did, we would basically go back to the beginning again. Trust me.

There's a point which we've reached, and we talked about this a lot as a Working Group, where we had to take it to the Board. When we did take it to the Board, we had to make sure that the Board really understood what they were approving and that this was a truly bottom up process. But what that meant was that the bottom up was one way. The door shuts behind it. It doesn't then become a bit of top down, a bit of bottom up, a bit of moving around.

Now, one of the reasons we thought having this session here today was useful was for exactly this reason. You just validated why we had this meeting. Because actually in reality, despite the fact that we had all those man hours, been out for public comment, all the SOs and ACs contributed to it, I have no doubt whatsoever, no doubt at all, that when the implementation plan is signed off by the Board, which was the next step as Tanzi was saying, at this point, you know what I'm going to

say, don't you? A whole bunch of people are going to go, "What do you mean you're doing this!"

And we're going, "Yes, we told you 20 times." There was a public comment, we promoted it, we did this, we did dancing girls, the whole nine yards.

Anyway, I say that because we know this is going to happen, and this I think is also partly why this group is staying at least loosely together. Because I think that's a reasonable possibility, and Sebastian will have to judge this, that we may need to at least informally reconvene if at some point after the implementation plan is signed off by the Board we have to remind the community – to put it that way nicely – that they've agreed to this, that they built it and now we're implementing it.

I hope that's helpful background. In summary, it's a very innovative proposal. It was completely bottom up. But of course, it does involve change. I know that sounds very, "Well, obviously, it involves change," but you'd be surprised how many people will think that you can mitigate all the problems without actually changing anything.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: [Wanda].

[WANDA]:   Just giving my personal opinion here. I really appreciate all those effort. I have been here – I believe only Sebastian is so longer in this area as myself – 15 years, so it's a very interesting perspective that I'm seeing here.

First of all, very hard work. I saw during some times and the check out some webinars and blah, blah, blah, but didn't pay so much attention to that as I'm seeing now. Well, you came out with a very interesting solution. Congratulations.

Of course, there will be a lot of complaints, always have. But I don't care about complaints all the time, because people need to be heard and if they have nothing to say, they complain. But congratulations, a really interesting approach to the meetings.

I do believe that we need to come up with some solution to continue to reach people around because that continues to be a difficult problem in the South American region. We are working hard for doing this and getting better and better with our strategy on that, but even that we are far away to you.

People recognize – and I believe Africa's the same – recognize, what the hell ICANN is about? So, we had this in Brazil in particular. We had this time the NETmundial that helps a lot because it's all in the media. So people now has a lot of confused issues about what the hell is NETmundial? What the hell is ICANN?

But anyway, it's a beginning, and I do believe that that solution that you come out was very, very good work. Thank you very much because you're going to make it work finally very well. Thank you.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you, [Wanda]. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: I wonder if you could go back to the slide with the rotation. So on the topic, I guess I myself, I am probably one of them. I care very much about this, but I haven't really followed it. This is the first time I really take a look at this, and I came in late. So, I understand the concern there.

I think the community will definitely appreciate the work coming out from here. But that being said, most of the things that we've experienced at ICANN before tells us that we should expect potential changes as it goes along. This is a living organization, so that's important.

I missed this. I apologize immediately. What are the number of people? I guess there are different size of meetings anticipated. I think that's very innovative. What's the difference anticipated at this point?

NICK TOMASSO: I'll take that one on, Edmon. We don't intend to limit participation at any of these meetings.

What changes the facility size is predominantly the number of sessions and the size of those sessions. When I say that, it's the physical structure of the room. For instance, we can scale from 1,500 delegates to 3,100 delegates with the same size facility. It gets a little bit more crowded, but you don't necessarily have to change your meeting room infrastructure to do that.

So I believe that the meeting A and Meeting C will be typically sized as they are now. Meeting B is the one where I think there just won't be a

lot of demand from the community to attend that meeting. It's our job to communicate very effectively what the content of the meeting is, the types of sessions that will take place, but I think in and of itself the agenda will drive a reduction in the number of delegates who attend.

As Tijani pointed out earlier, there won't be a sponsor area. So all of the sponsors that we have here in purple jump suits and other flora and fauna, you're just not going to see them.

And when you look at meetings, and we do meeting counts for every session that we run, we never see 2,000 people sitting in meetings at any given point and time. So there's a lot of other business that takes place at ICANN meetings, and I think that will be the limiting factor for Meeting B. That people will understand that they don't need to be there or don't want to be there. I can't guess at this point, Edmon, how many people will come, but the number in my mind is 1,000.

However, the meeting facilities are going to be fundamentally different than they are today, which then allows us to reach out to places in Latin America like Santiago and Lima who have wanted to host an ICANN meeting for years and years and haven't been able to because of the size of the facilities.

Well, now we can go there. Now, we can go into Africa and to almost every country in Africa and hold an ICANN meeting. So this is added or the side benefit, if you will, of the meeting B format.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I just want to add one thing. It's that and to do that there are some consequences. The committee has to agree that we need to do this geographic rotation, and then we need to adapt the way the meeting is organized and then the way of each SO/AC, etc., organize themselves for the work during this, in particular, the B Meeting. But also the same thing will have other challenges.

You can't have, as we say in France, "le beurre et l'argent du beurre" (the butter and the money of the butter). It's where we will have some work to do, some communication to take in to account, but I am sure that it will be a good improvement.

And one point in addition, it's not just we were a multi-stakeholder working group. I can tell you that one part of the discussion during the beginning was to decide if we will produce one, two, or three scenarios to the community. It happened that the whole group decided to produce just one because we agree on the solution.

That was not imposed. That was not something I was expecting at all, but I think it's a very good image that we have that we agree and I hope that the rest of the community will follow their representative on this working group.

Edmon, you wanted to add something, sorry.

EDMON CHUNG: No. That's a very valid point. We're not going to stop the purple jumpsuit people.

But I'm curious how much flexibility there are in terms of the rotation at this point? Is this cast in stone?

The reason why – and this is a little more self-interested – we'd love to bring one of the meetings to Hong Kong and Macau soon. Looking at the first C, that's probably tough. We know that March and June works for us.

Anyway, so the point is, how much flexibility?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. I will not answer your question. I will make a proposal for Nick.

I saw the rotation here. It's very good, but I saw that Africa and Latin America has always the smaller over five years. They have only smaller meetings. And, Asia, for example, where they have the small isles of the Pacific that want to organize meetings of ICANN. They cannot. They don't have an opportunity because they have only A and C meetings.

I wonder if, Nick, you can change it a little bit, the distribution, and make it one big meeting for Africa over five years and one big meeting for Latin America over five years while you have two big meetings for the other regions. This will be more balanced and this gives the opportunity to the small islands of Asia Pacific to hold the meetings of ICANN.

NICK TOMASSO: Perhaps it's not quite so obvious, but I have already taken in to consideration that Latin America clearly does have the facilities to host a

large ICANN meeting and it's accounted for on that chart. After our conversation yesterday, Tijani, the answer is yes. I will adjust my thinking, if you will, about Africa because we do know that Africa also has facilities for large meetings.

What this is, is an attempt to show you how we might accomplish this ABC rotation. And again to your point, Southeast Asia clearly is another opportunity to place a B meeting. So, this is a work in progress. This is just a representative chart. The Meeting Strategy Working Group has given staff the latitude – and I said this once already but it's worth repeating – has given staff the latitude to place these meetings as appropriate just so long as we stick to the basic fundamental principle of geographic rotation and we will do that.

It gives me the good opportunity, Edmon, to talk with you about where and when you would like to host a meeting and perhaps build a schedule that accommodates those needs. I've already had a conversation with .JP who would also like to host an ICANN meeting. So it will open up the opportunity to begin today to talk about 2016 through 2021 without the constraints that we have of the strict regional rotation that we've traditionally maintained.

TANZANICA KING: We have one more question – I think one versus two; we'll find out – online, and it's from Michelle Chaplow again. She asks, "If the Meeting Strategy Working Group work is now complete or will it continue through to implementation?"

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: The answer is it's complete. It's now in the hands of the staff. We are here to support, to help. And if one day you need to have the Meeting Strategy Working Group coming back to be reorganized, it will be done. But I really think that it's in the safe and capable hands of the staff and, for once, we are the reverse. We are here to support, and I don't see any reason why we will have to reconvene the Meeting Strategy Working Group. But if we need, we will do it. There's no doubt about that. Thank you, Michelle.

TANZANICA KING: Okay. We had another question from Eberhard Blocher – I know I'm saying that wrong so I apologize – asking, "While I understand the logic behind this scheme, I have a feeling that Africans might not like being relegated to hosting category B."

I was hoping we've answered this already and if not, please go ahead and extend your question online.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I will try to answer this question. The situation was we don't organize anymore meeting in Africa or we organize. We try to find a way to have an ICANN meeting organize not just in Africa but in countries in this world where we were not able to go before.

We need to take that as a positive step. Because at the beginning of the discussion, we might have decided we just do three meetings a year but we go in Singapore, Istanbul, and Los Angeles and that's it. As usual, you have plus and minus, and you have to try to accommodate that. I

understand that it could raise some question, but I hope that the way we have set it up, it's not a punishment. It's a reverse. It's that we take in to account the reality of the country.

I will add one point, it's that the B meeting may be the more useful for a country to be organized because we will have a set up to do outreach in the B Meeting and that's also progress. You can't say that it's a smaller meeting. It's just a different type of meeting, differently organized.

Take the good part of that and not just say, "Oh yes, but we will not have 3,000 people coming to my continent." You will get much better, I think, than just people coming. We will outreach and we will do things.

For example, when we were in Durban – I don't remember if it was Wednesday morning or Thursday morning – when the part of the community went to paint a school. That will be something we can imagine to do in the frame of the B Meeting. And to be close to the community, to be open to the community, I guess it's a good win and not a lose at all. Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: Okay, we have no more questions online. Do we have any more questions in the room, or do we have any more questions for them?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think we're wrapping up.

TANZANICA KING: Okay, we will wrap it up. Thank you to everybody in the room and everybody who participated online. We appreciate your participation.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]