

ICANN Virtual Meeting Strategy Survey Report








Preliminary Feedback on Planning for a Virtual ICANN68

Survey Participation



32

Total Submissions



Respondent Primary Affiliation

Choices	Percentage	Count
GNSO	 34.38%	11
GAC	 34.38%	11
ALAC	 12.50%	4
ccNSO	 6.25%	2
SSAC	 6.25%	2
ASO	 3.12%	1
RSSAC	 3.12%	1
Total		32



Support for Plenary Sessions

Choices	Percentage
Yes	 87.50%
No	 12.50%

Support for Public Forum

Choices	Percentage
Yes	 93.75%
No	 6.25%

Preferred Time Zone for a Virtual Meeting

Choices	Percentage
Kuala Lumpur (UTC+8)	 40.62%
London (UTC+1)	 37.50%

Comments Related to Meeting Agenda, Cross-Community Plenaries and Public Forum

"We should continue to prioritize meetings which are both urgent and important, leaving other topics for later or for separate webinars or meetings."

"Cross-community plenary sessions play an important role in ICANN multi-stakeholder model, however, considering today's circumstances it is better not to have this session during the meeting."

"Although cross-community led plenary sessions may present a variety of challenges, such as coordination and technical to name a few, they are a significant part of community discussions."

The Public Forum is an important part of the ICANN Meetings and should not be cancelled for virtual meetings. Its successful execution during ICANN67 allowed the community to interact with the ICANN Board even though there was no inter-personal interaction."

"Closed meetings should be scheduled outside of the ICANN 68 meeting schedule."

"Cross-Community: NO, due to the fact that such approach excludes active participation of the GAC members in those fora"





Public Forum: Yes, provided that also establishing priorities for the subjects to be discussed at those Fora"

"Whether there should be plenary sessions will depend on the topics. It's hard to voice support or non-support without knowing what topics are being proposed."






"I don't have a solid position on cross community sessions, it all depends on the topic and how interactive the session may be."

"There was disappointment expressed in the RySG that the topic for the first public forum was not discussed during the planning sessions and seemed to be arbitrarily decided by either ICANN org or the Board. Similarly, there were some challenges with the Public Forum in terms of maintaining interest because of the static nature of the screen. If the intent is to maintain ICANN68 as a Policy Forum then session priority should be afforded to progressing policy/work efforts. If the Board want to engage with the community, then schedule a Board session with the community rather than identify it as a Public Forum."






"Lots of positive comments about hearing from the CEO and ICANN Org and what is new in each of their areas that many volunteer participants never get to learn about when they only attend regional meetings remotely and hear about voluntary involvements. That session gave those who have never been to an ICANN meeting some idea of the immenseness of the ICANN organisation. The photos were great. Nothing wrong with having that again with the question session."

Choices	Percentage
No Preference	 9.38%
Narrow Timeslots that Cover the Most Time Zones	 6.25%
Los Angeles (UTC-7)	 3.12%
12Hrs CET	 3.12%



Support for Extended Duration of the Meeting

Choices	Percentage
Yes (up to 2 days)	 37.50%
No (keep current duration)	 34.38%
Yes (up to 3 days)	 21.88%
No Preference	 3.12%
Yes (1 day)	 3.12%

Maximum Hours of Virtual Meeting Participation Per Day

Choices	Percentage
6 hours/day	 43.75%
4 hours/day	 31.25%
8 hours/day	 15.62%
2 hours/day	 6.25%
No Preference	 3.12%

Importance of Interpretation

Choices	Percentage
Very Important	 59.38%
Important	 18.75%

Comments Related to Time Zone and Duration

"In ITU we discussed the timing issue and came to the conclusions that the most efficient timing period would be 12,00 Hours Central European Time taking into account the fact that the majority of countries could work on that time efficiently.

Keep current duration. Only if absolutely needed, extend by 1 day. while establishing the priority of items to be discussed and avoid meetings with other constituencies except GNSO."

"The time zone is perhaps the biggest obstacle to overcome. One possible way to address this, may be to have sessions across a 12-hour period, rather than an 8-hour period, to allow for more flexibility for scheduling purposes."

"Initially I was not in favor of choosing a specific time zone .. I was more in favor of trying to calculate the least painful hours for everyone in any time zone (i.e. starting around 8:00 am and ending by 12:00 pm), calculate the max number of hours we can get, then see how many days we need .. Yet, I'm not sure whether this would be fair for the Asia Pacific Region, as they were really disadvantaged during the Cancun meeting and it's now the time for them to benefit from the most decent hours according to their time zone."

Meeting Format, Technical Functions and Other Comments

"Conference tools should be secure, resilient, reliable, safe and consistent with data protection and privacy requirements."

"We don't think the GAC can agree consensus advice with a remote meeting.



At the GAC meeting at ICANN 67 it was very useful to have such a focus on a small number of issues with a very small number of really clear points for discussion. If the next meeting is also remote, I hope we can take a similar approach. "

"Audio and Zoom recordings of each session should be posted immediately after each session (or as soon as practicable) so that those who miss a session (due to time zone issues) can access the recordings at their convenience the following day. We cannot eliminate time-zone issues but we can provide more equitable and timely access to information and records."

"– Video feed of the speakers would keep the participants more engaged.

– May want to plan additional time for meeting slots. A 90-minute slot is eaten up with "Can you hear me?", "Your mic is still on mute", "We can't hear you", etc. There is not that difficulty in a face to face meeting, and we need to adjust for a virtual meeting. An hour and 45 minutes, with a 15-minute break between meetings might be a better solution for a virtual meeting. This would also give 15 minutes for someone to set up for the next meeting in the Zoom room."

"We would suggest more lively and visually aided sessions to assist non-native English speakers. We also would like if speakers would not be 'readers', i.e. PLEASE do discourage people from read from a paper. Share those written

Choices	Percentage
Not very Important	 15.62%
Not at all Important	 6.25%

remarks in advance and summarise the idea briefly during the session.

Another suggestion from our community was to make blocks for virtual meetings shorter – 90 minutes for a virtual meeting is too long."

"Cross community planning committee (SOAC Chairs?) to have some input into the main schedule before it goes public so we can identify and cut down on any conflicts.

SOACs to select people for a cross-community planning committee for multi-sectoral plenary sessions including the selection of HIT topics and most appropriate moderator and speakers as well as presentation format to encourage more audience participation."

Comments Related to Language Services

"Translation services should be provided in response to actual demand and session-by-session basis only. It should not be based on a "wish list" of languages or a "desire or nice-to-have" request from particular community group."

"The public forum is not just a meeting between Board and the rest of the World, but it is also amongst the whole participants. I would like to suggest some innovation: Setup a session in six different rooms with in each one an official language of ICANN (we may choose between English and Portuguese). No need for interpretation (except if ICANN wants and need an English version of all the room exchanges). We may want to have a session for each region in the best time zone for the region. "

"Transcription service needs to be improved by better educating service staff in ICANN specific language."