

GNSO Council Input on ICANN58 Planning

	(1) Do we prefer a Single or Split Constituency Day?	(2) What is the right number of High Interest Topics (HIT)? The current Block Schedule drafts contain five HIT sessions.	(3) Any thoughts on the best way to solicit topics for HIT sessions, and how to choose the top 5?	(4) Similarly, any thoughts on how to address the inevitable conflicts between working sessions and HITs?	(5) Any other specific feedback you'd like us to bring to the SO/AC meeting
Rubens Kuhl	(1) Single Constituency Day.	(2) If we can't pick just 1, 2 max... but I think it's easier to pick 1 than 2 to 5. Usually there is something that stands out. For all other HIT slots: PDP WGs and IRTs from the 3 SOs.	(3) SO/AC Leadership.	(4) Having less so-called HITs. Avoid conflicts with PDP WGs and IRTs.	(5) When in doubt, make meeting A more like meeting B than meeting C.
Michele Neylon	(1) Single is easier. Rationale: some of the RrSG members plan their attendance around the SG meeting with some only coming to meetings in Europe to attend it.	(2)(3)(4) I think the entire HIT thing needs to be revisited. What is the rationale behind this? What exactly constitutes "high interest"? For whom? ICANN staff? Community? The GAC? I'm not opposed to the concept of these plenary sessions, but if they are to be truly plenary then the number of them needs to be reduced and that would also mean the number of conflicts would be more manageable. In Hyderabad there were too many of these sessions and the conflicts were a mess. How topics are chosen will always be a difficult point, but other organisations manage to schedule these things without it being such a big deal and headache Why not adopt a "sane" process like others have? I.e. "call for topics / papers" which generates the initial list and then some kind of simple polling / ranking system to choose the two or three that should take place? The way it was handled for India seems to have been completely random			
Donna Austin	I understand ICANN is working to a formula to develop their schedule and it makes sense to do so, but I have a few more questions that I'd like to pose to the Council and their respective groups. What are our priorities, as a Council, for Copenhagen? What are the priorities for the ALAC, ccNSO, the GAC, the SSAC, the Board? Is there overlap in the priorities? Can we manage any overlapping priorities collectively rather than individually? How much time should we be allocating for PDP WG efforts? (Chuck Gomes suggested blocks of 3 hours is optimal. During a CPH joint discussion in Hyderabad we felt more time should be made during ICANN meetings to progress PDP WG efforts.) If the HIT sessions are just discussions, and don't result in any substantive conclusions, could those sessions be conducted during the time allocated for lunch? Or should HITs have some tangible outcome? Avri and Jeff as the Co-Chairs of the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG, gave the same update to a number of groups during Hyderabad. Can the HITs be repurposed for these types of updates? I don't think there is any magic number to HITs, but if the GAC, the ccNSO, the ALAC and others are receiving the same update individually, wouldn't it be a better use of the HIT slots and peoples time, that those individual updates be provided once.				
Rafik Dammak	(1) yes we need a Single Constituency day.	(2) I think even less would be ok i.e. 3 HITs	(3) another point to have in mind is those session proposed by GDD which we don't have any input. no reason to limit the number of community HIT while keeping the same number of GDD sessions. an open call for proposals is ok. however, putting some limit is needed. I noticed that GAC/PSWG submitted several proposals. we should also encourage cross-community submissions or at least those planning to include diverse point of views. the HITs are not supposed to be showcases but designed for debate. we need to raise the point about selections and criteria for HIT. also how they are organized. some HITs organizers seemed excluding other groups or not keen to be inclusive.	(4) spreading the HITs in several days will led inevitably to clashes. restricting them to 1 day may help e.g the official first day of the meeting with 3 HITs. as other comment: - the meeting B is supposed to have a day for outreach, GNSO should avoid organizing sessions clashing with allocated timeslot for outreach. - can we agree on timeslots for GNSO inter-groups sessions? my understanding is that the venue for Copenhagen is not close to the hotels, so wondering if breakfast sessions are convenient or not.	
Edward Morris	(1) No preference. I would like to highlight a problem for NCSG Councillors though. We represent the members of two constituencies - NPOC and NCUC - on Council. Meetings of these constituencies are held at the same time making it impossible for us to attend both meetings of the constituencies whose members we represent on Council.	(2) One. At most. HIT's belong at the IGF and other fora. If there are burning issues directly involving ICANN and ICANN policy that masses of ICANN meeting attendees are interested in learning about and discussing fine. I just don't think this happens very often. The A and C meetings are too long. Events that are not directly tied to policy making and the functioning of our California based public benefits corporation should be reduced with an eye towards elimination. If consideration could be given to somehow scheduling Constituency meetings so these two groups do not completely overlap I would be grateful. It would make it easier at least for this Councillor to feel he is adequately representing all those he is charged to represent on Council.	(3) Open call with attention paid to the number of requests for certain topics. High interest should, well, mean that there is high interest in a topic by a large number of community members.	(4) If HIT's are to continue then I would suggest they should be of sufficient interest that attendees would want to attend the sessions in lieu of other nonessential activities. I would thus schedule HIT's, based upon the Hyderabad meeting, in the 18:30 and beyond time slots. Competition would largely, although not exclusively, be cocktail receptions and other optional activities rather than sessions directly related to the functioning of the corporation.	(5) I am concerned that private trade associations such as the Domain Name Association were able to schedule sessions under the auspices of ICANN SG's. I would suggest this practice be prohibited before it proliferates. I have already had inquiries from NCSG institutional members concerning their desire and ability to hold similar meetings at ICANN using ICANN hosted facilities and resources. We need to stop this practice now before it wreaks havoc on our meeting schedules. I would also like to echo a comment made earlier by Rubens: when in doubt please make meeting A a more like meeting B than like meeting C. I would go so far as to suggest we actually make meeting A exactly like meeting B and have only have one large non policy focused (the AGM) meeting a year.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez					Best recommendation ever based on the Helsinki experience: "I would also like to echo a comment made earlier by Ruebens: when in doubt please make meeting A more like meeting B than like meeting C. I would go so far as to suggest we actually make meeting A exactly like meeting B and have only have one large non policy focused (the AGM) meeting a year. --Ed" (and keep the two yearly "short" policy meetings rotating over standard ICANN hubs) [LA, Istanbul and Singapore]
Phil Corwin	(1) Prefer single Constituency Day	(2) One HIT that the community has broad agreement on, and no more than 3 maximum for entire meeting.	(3) Staff should create a process for requests for HIT's that makes it fair and equitable for all who have requested topics and that looks toward achieving SO/AC consensus; and ICANN staff should moderate any HIT and should select panelists to ensure opportunity for each SOAC to be represented.	(4) Conflicts will be substantially minimized via early review of draft schedule and limiting HIT sessions to no more than 1-3.	
Wolf-Ulrich Knochen	(1) Single day	(2) Max of 4, preference is 3 per meeting. ICANN meetings should be focused on core activities whether an A, B or C meeting, not HITs.	(3) (Best of 4 max) Seek topics via SOAC list, list topics supported, allow all SO/AC/Cs to select preferences in order.	(4) Reducing the number of HITs reduces conflicts. Limiting HITs to 3 greatly reduces this problem. Working sessions should be the priority.	(5) Hard code parts of the program BEFORE defining block schedules e.g. GNSO Council, GNSO meetings with Board, GAC, and CCSO, ASO mtg, CSG open meeting, parts of the CCSO meetings, Open Forum (prefer all on one day), Board Meeting etc,