

From: Katrina Sataki [<mailto:katrina@nic.lv>]

Sent: Friday, June 16, 2017 1:29 PM

To: 'David Olive' <david.olive@icann.org>; 'soac-leaders@icann.org' <soac-leaders@icann.org>

Cc: 'Nick Tomasso' <nick.tomasso@icann.org>; 'Sally Costerton' <sally.costerton@icann.org>; 'Duncan Burns' <duncan.burns@icann.org>

Subject: RE: [SOAC-Leaders] REPLY REQUESTED: Message from Göran Marby on ICANN Meeting Venue Selection

Dear Göran, David, All,

Thank you for bringing this up! These are very important issues and they need to be properly discussed. But first, I would like to note the following:

- The current meeting strategy is effective since March 2016, ICANN 55. The meeting strategy was the result of a long and intense debate and arrived before the public discussion on the IANA Stewardship Transition started. Two years ago the ccNSO decided to review the meeting strategy and the way the ccNSO implemented it at the end of this year, i.e., after 6 consecutive meetings. Would be interesting to know if other SO/ACs are also planning to look back on the way the new strategy work for their respective SO/ACs and, if yes, what their conclusions are. These conclusions may have a major impact on the questions you raised.
- The important questions about meeting venues will be discussed during the ccNSO meeting at ICANN 59 with the ccTLD community present. The reason for this discussion is that since ICANN 57 some in the ccNSO community have explicitly raised similar questions and expressed concerns with respect to the choice of the venue of ICANN 60.
- If I understand it correctly, the issue of meetings and the meetings venue is also part of the deliberation of the CCWG WS 2 discussion on the FOI-HR.

So, in response to your questions and without preempting the outcome of the discussions of the ccTLD community present at ICANN 59 and the CCWG work, I agree that we are now at a time that the criteria for the choice of meeting venues need to be discussed and clarified. However, this only makes sense if the current practice of rotation and meetings structure have been reviewed. Only after confirmation of this strategy the selection criteria for specific venues come into play.

Having said this, I will add in my personal capacity that I cannot agree with the current interpretation of principles for selection of meeting venues, i.e., that the ONLY principle for selecting meeting venues is geographic rotation. The Bylaws state that "ICANN must operate [...] for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, [...] through open and transparent processes [...]". In addition one of ICANN's core values is "Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic,

and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making to ensure that the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process is used to ascertain the global public interest..." and "...respecting internationally recognized human rights ...". The Bylaws also clearly say that "The Commitments and Core Values are intended to apply in the broadest possible range of circumstances." So, if as a result of the choice for a meeting venue people of certain age, colour, sex, religion, nationality, are not allowed to participate on equal footing, I do not see how the value of geographic rotation (which definitely needs to be implemented too) outweighs the basic principles of openness, broad participation and the global nature of the internet.

Kindest regards,

]{atrina

From: soac-leaders-bounces@icann.org [<mailto:soac-leaders-bounces@icann.org>] **On Behalf Of** David Olive
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 4:46 PM
To: soac-leaders@icann.org
Cc: Nick Tomasso <nick.tomasso@icann.org>; Sally Costerton <sally.costerton@icann.org>; Duncan Burns <duncan.burns@icann.org>
Subject: [SOAC-Leaders] REPLY REQUESTED: Message from Göran Marby on ICANN Meeting Venue Selection

Dear SO/AC Leaders:

As I've discussed with you during our calls, I have over the last couple of months received many questions about our criteria for ICANN Meeting venue selection. As established in the ICANN strategy, the goal is to rotate them among ICANN's five geographic regions on a regular basis. The practice has been to avoid, as best as possible, major religious and national holidays, and related Internet industry events that could have an impact on participation. We also take the security of participants seriously. ICANN Meetings are to some extent complicated to arrange, mostly due to the logistics. Since there are so many sessions running concurrently, a meeting venue large enough to accommodate them, and available over our meeting dates, must be found. In addition, at times there are other challenges such as changing visa regulations, and requests for additional sessions before and during the meeting.

For planning purposes, we confirm meeting sites and publish dates several years in advance. For your information, here are the current decided meeting locations and dates:

- ICANN59 26-29 Jun 2017 Johannesburg
- ICANN60 28 Oct - 3 Nov 2017 Abu Dhabi
- ICANN61 10-15 Mar 2018 San Juan
- ICANN62 25-28 Jun 2018 Panama City
- ICANN63 20-26 Oct 2018 Barcelona

Also, as information (as many have asked), on average an ICANN Meeting costs US\$4M.

So now to my question: Do you think it is timely to open up a broader discussion about adding rules on how to choose meeting venues: factors such as gender issues, democratic principles, and strict rules in observance of religious holidays, etc., have been among the questions that have been raised. And, how do you anticipate such a discussion to take place?

I look forward to supporting you.

Best regards,

Göran Marby

David A. Olive
Senior Vice President

Policy Development Support
Managing Director

ICANN Regional Office –Istanbul
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)

Direct Line: [+90.212.999.6212](tel:+902129996212)

Mobile: [+ 1. 202.341.3611](tel:+12023413611)

Mobile: [+90.533.341.6550](tel:+905333416550)