Report of Public Comments

Title:	ICANN Future Meetings Strategy
Publication Date:	25 February 2014
Prepared By:	Tanzanica King

Comment Period:			**Important Information Links**
Comment Open Date:	25 February 2014		[Announcement](#)
Comment Close Date:	20 March 2014 extended to 4 April 2014		[Public Comment Box](#)
Reply Close Date:	25 April 2014		[View Comments Submitted](#)
Time (UTC):	23:59 UTC		Report of Public Comments

Staff Contact:	Tanzanica King	**Email:**	tanzanica.king@icann.org

Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

The [Meeting Strategy Working Group Recommendations for Public Comment](#) [PDF, 528KB] was provided for community discussion and public comment. It proposes a new strategy for the structure, purpose and locations of the ICANN public meetings to support broad, informed participation and reflect the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.

The overall recommendations made by the MSWG for public comment are:

Continue the three-meeting schedule annually, but evolve the structure of the three meetings (defined as Meeting A, B, and C) to better address meeting objectives, scheduling conflicts and to use the time in a most effective way.

Continue regional rotation for all meetings and coordinate rotation to balance global coverage on a multi-year cycle, but evolve the rotation strategy to take advantage of the smaller mid-year meeting (Meeting B) to rotate through new geographic locations previously unavailable to the meetings due to the attendance and logistical requirements of the current meeting structure.

Continue to allocate adequate time for SO/AC work, but evolve the format of the meetings to afford greater opportunity for cross-community engagement and outreach.

Continue with the public forum at the first and third meetings in the cycle, but evolve the format by splitting the time into two portions with differing focus.

This Public Comment solicitation provided an opportunity for the community to consider the recommendations detailed in the report, provide feedback and request further clarifications. The responses will help inform any additional aspects to be considered for inclusion in the final recommendations to the Board in June 2014.

For all recommendations in the document, subject to Board approval, the anticipated timing for implementation would be calendar year 2016.

Section II: Contributors

At the time this report was prepared, a total of seven (7) community submissions had been posted to the Forum and one (1) submission was submitted via email to staff after the end of the reply period. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
GNSO Business Constituency (BC)	Steve DelBianco	BC
At-Large Advisory Committee	ICANN At-Large Staff	ALAC
GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)	Paul Diaz	RySG
Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC)	Kristina Rosette	IPC
GNSO Council	Jonathan Robinson	GNSO

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Eberhard Blocher		EB
Michele Neylon		MN
Xu Xiao		XX

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

This document contains a summary of the public comments received in response to the Meeting Strategy Working Group Draft Recommendations. The comments are summarized in order of submission for each recommendation group as applicable. General comments are also summarized below.

Even though this summary was drawn-up to reflect as accurately and objectively as possible the views expressed by participants, it does not substitute in any way the original contributions.

Eight (8) comments were received in response to this public comment forum.

EB:
Fully supports continued regional rotation for all meetings.

MN:
Supports the recognition of the real duration of meetings.
Expresses concerns about extending any meetings beyond the current length.
Supports the idea of two public forums in meeting A and C to provide more opportunity for all groups to engage.
Does not support lack of a public forum in meeting B.

XX:
Suggests a bid for meeting local hosts to save costs and work, and expand globalization.
Wishes all presentation slides would be posted in advance of the meeting.

BC:
Supports continuation of the three-meeting cycle and evolved structure.
Supports continued regional rotation for all meetings.
Supports Meeting A duration of up to six (6) days.
Concerned that Meeting B may be too short for travelers.
Concerned that Meeting B will not draw enough participation.
Requests clarification on regional rotation for all meetings in diverse locations.
Supports continuous improvement and technical support for remote participants.
Supports efforts to support press interest at ICANN Meetings.
Supports visa deliverance as one of the main criteria for selection of a meeting venue.
Supports a two-part public forum format.
Requests that two meetings have a Board Meeting.

ALAC:
Confirmed support of the MSWG recommendations via online vote with 14 votes in favour, 0 against, and 0 abstentions.
Fully supports continued regional rotation for all meetings.
Supports visa deliverance as one of the main criteria for selection of a meeting venue.

RySG:
Believes the report is absent of any details related to the guiding principle to 'promote efficient use of community and ICANN staff time with less session conflicts.'
Believes ICANN should explore the use of streams to reduce scheduling conflicts and encourage cross-community interaction on key issues.
Supports Meeting B format to maintain the rotation and a dedicated SO/AC working meeting to support more cross-community interaction.
Has concerns about reducing the time allocated to the public forum; concerned about lack of Board attendance in Meeting B.

IPC:
Supports the recognition in the Meeting A recommendation that the actual duration of ICANN meetings is longer than 5 days.
Does NOT support a meeting structure that has no public forum or public Board meeting.
Does not support any model that implies the Board and its members would not be available to meeting with the SOs and ACs.
Opposes the recommendation that Meeting C be 8 days long.
Supports MSWG recommendations regarding visas and all other recommendations related to meeting planning.
Proposes ICANN eliminate the exhibit hall at one or two meetings.

GNSO:
Appreciates the recognition of the need to start proposed Meetings A and C with at least two days of internal work.
Does not support a meeting beyond seven days.
Welcomes the recognition that more time is needed for policy development activities, but does not support having focus on policy development activities only once a year during Meeting B.
Believes making SO/AC interactions the focus just once a year may hamper progress on important topics
Supports steps to address visa issues.
Recommends that MSWG recommend that staff is encouraged to consider hub cities in light of travel time and expense involved in attending ICANN meetings.

Other comments related to selection criteria for locations to hold ICANN Meetings:
- Inclusion of less expensive meeting locations in the rotation
- Avoidance of geographic locations that pose undue health and/or safety risks to attendees
- Avoidance of venues without facilities for the disabled communities

There were also a range of suggestions about general improvements to meetings including:
- Earlier identification of meeting locations
- Development of a program to facilitate local outreach projects
- Use of pan and zoom video coverage to make meetings more engaging for remote participants

In addition to comments submitted through the public comment process, there were also consultations and discussions held at a public session in Singapore on 24 March 2014. See full transcript of the public session.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

Clarification of recommendations:

- While recommendations suggest splitting the Public Forum in two parts in Meetings A and C, there is no specific intention to reduce the overall time allocated to the forum per meeting.

- While the second meeting in the cycle (Meeting B) is intended to require fewer resources from a meeting venue, it is not necessarily expected to have fewer participants.

- The second meeting in the cycle (Meeting B) is not intended to be absent Board participation.

- While the second meeting in the cycle (Meeting B) would focus on policy development activities, this is not intended to suggest the absence of policy development activities from Meetings A and C.

- While the third meeting in the cycle would be slightly longer than the existing meetings, there is no eight (8) day long intention for Meeting C.

- Several comments suggested areas for improvement of the public forum and these will be forwarded on to the appropriate departments for review.