| All Responses (176) | https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-K288XKT67/ |
|---------------------|--|
| ALAC Responses (48) | https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-N56C5ZR67/ |

A COMPARISON OF AT-LARGE VS ALL OF ICANN RESPONSES.

PLEASE SEND ME ANY COMMENTS YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD TO THOSE MADE BELOW.

| # | QUESTION | At-Large Responses | ICANN Responses |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | What ICANN group do you belong to | 48 | 27% of 176 total respondents |
| 2 | Respondents per Region | AF:15% AP:13% EU:19% LA: 16% NA:21% | AF:11% AP:11% EU:30% LA: 18% NA:30% |
| 3 | How effective is the ICANN Public | Effective: 65% | Effective: 61% |
| | Meeting yearly structure, with one | Very effective: 23% | Very effective: 18% |
| | Community Forum in March, one | Ineffective: 8% | Ineffective: 2% |
| | Policy Forum in June, and one | | |
| | Annual General Meeting in October? | | |
| | | KEY: <5% VARIANCE >5% VARIANCE | |

If you selected ineffective or very ineffective, please explain how the yearly format could be improved?

(48 ICANN-wide responses including 7 from At-Large)

Common key words: (Meeting/s,ICANN),policy,community





POLICY COMMENTS;

#order is appropriate for tackling global policy issues

*allowing sufficient time for policy work is critical

*perhaps two policy sessions per year *little difference between 1&3, and policy has reduced attendance & engagement yet important in virtual context

**Policy forum has become bloated, just another meeting – needs to focus exclusively on policy work

*policy forum not sufficient for focus on policy – schedule clogged with non-related meetings

*policy work could be divvied up during the vear

*policy forum in June is less value cos of less prep time – needs more discussion than passive listening

*eliminate policy forum – not necessary
*most policy work is done outside of the
public meetings, so what is the point of
gathering everyone together online at a fixed
date and time?

COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

*Public meetings should not be a "state of play" recalling issues, but should add value

#focus of public sessions blurred - more of an opportunity to "get together" regardless of the focus

*virtual public meetings becoming more of a "roadshow" with less discussions unless in working groups

*Org needs to consider other tech option to deliver virtual mtgs rather than just zoom, and a web-based calendar

*virtual mtgs need improvement - more intersessional work would reduce the need for gathering of the community.

*Many sessions are empty in substance and others could be done on regular monthly.

*there is no meaningful distinction between the meetings- get rid of the titles or stick to the topics to make the designation meaningful

*artificial division of policy-general-community does not make much sense and prevents attendance of certain branches of ICANN from attending eg compliance during a community meeting

*the AGM is too long

*the purpose of each mtg is lost especially virtually, no clear distinction between the 3

*the format of virtual mtgs is ineffective

*short middle of the year mtg is nearly useless as it takes about as long to get there as we spend at the meeting

#the meeting formats often ineffective as not relevant to what should be achieved, fitting with an Org need rather than a community need.

NUMBER COMMENTS: FROM ICANN LIST

*only 2 instead of 3 meetings

*number is less important than getting work done

*taking current situation into account, are 3 annual mtgs necessary – need to look at what we need to achieve

*perhaps two policy sessions per year

*number of meetings can be reduced

*more frequent and shorter might be more effective in keeping the community engaged and the work done

reduce the global mtgs to 2 and increase the number of specialised events – by topic or geographical location

*1x F2F. 2x Virtual

*should reduce to 2 meetings per year, longer if necessary

*mtgs are indistingishable in structure and content, if continue as virtual, no need to be concentrated in 3 events

*3 F2F mtg structure functional and allows for work to be done, less effective when held remotely

*the number needs to be discussed, because of the virtual environment we are now in, it now seems like a never ending meeting.

#2/3 short policy forums/year and 1 general assembly

*Attending a virtual meeting should not be a burden that disrupts participants lives and agendas

* the three meetings are still very similar formats

*virtual meetings should be lighter with a few key sessions – other sessions should be spread over the year.

*there should not be meetings for the sake of meetings

| | *better to put emphasis on community and AGM meetings with normal policy work being done during the year *Policy forum becoming less significant esp when GDD is held beforehand and it gets confusing about what is more important to go to – both somewhat suffer | #some community meetings di nor to the community #instant messages apps for net | dn't add value either to the participants | *not sure | if the different types a different in practice |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | How many ICANN Public meetings should be held each year? | Three: 67% Two: 29% One: 4% | | Three: 68% Two: 27% One: 5% | |
| 6 | What aspects of ICANN Public meetings should we focus on improving? | Policy Development: 67% Networking: 65% Capacity-Building: 56% Outreach: 54% | | Policy Development: 65% Networking: 56% Capacity-Building: 45% Outreach: 41% | |
| 7 | How effective is the virtual format to accomplish your meeting goals? | Very effective: 0% Effective: 48% Ineffective: 42% Very ineffective: 6% | | Effective Ineffecti | |
| 8 | Explain how the virtual format could be improved to accomplish your meeting goals. (ALAC 22 responses, ICANN – 94) Common words – virtual, time, face Only At-Large comments below | PERSPECTIVES E BREAK DAILY 2 PEOPLE SESSION 2 VARIOUS PARTICLE VARIOUS PARTICLE | TOPICS THINGS & OTHERS CONMUNITY THINGS & OTHERS CONMUNITY THINGS & OTHERS THI | NETWORK INT INT WEFF Wall A Waller | MITTER OPPORTUNITY BOTTON OF STATE OF |
| | VIRTUAL COMMENTS *100% virtual meetings are not going to make the work. It has several problems, among them: - People find it very difficult to attend, at least for volunteers. different time zone, work (we usually ask for vacation to attend a meeting, but not to attend a virtual meeting). | | **TIME COMMENTS *participants have to fit the meeting into to-day schedule wherever they live – the expect to turn their lives and professiona upside down to participate in an ICANN representation of the school | y do not Il activities neeting. | *Interaction in a face-to-face setting is very important to help "lubricate" positions and better understand others' views *Networking is where most policy processes find common ground. Short of meeting face to face we stay entrenched |

experience into something terrifying"

and at cross purposes.

- this is not encouraging young people to attend, the only one with this luxury of time are the retired or the unemployed.
- And for underserved regions, it doesn't matter how much ICANN helps to pay the internet fee, there is no such internet as to properly connect to a meeting.
- *It is exhausting because of two main reasons: 1. When following a meeting online people are also working for their daily job and it is very hard to manage both and be productive. This leads to many simply entering the online meeting but not being really present. While when in a face-to-face meeting, you know ICANN is your only commitment during those 5 days and you focus all your energy in the meeting, taking a complete break from the job. 2. And as an additional disadvantage, the networking.
- * Very difficult to do networking and work closely with people when you are remote.
- *While it removes the stress with traveling, it introduces the stress in doing many other things at the same time hence there is more likelihood of getting distracted from time to time in a remote based meeting. The break time side talks that usually contribute towards improving outcome of a face to face discussion thereby arriving at consensus faster, is also lacking.
- *Because of lack of personal communications and informal discussions
- * Breakout rooms could help to improve the experience. Brainstorming spaces are needed to have the opportunity to talk in a more intimate environment. The setting of meetings using the timezone of the region where the virtual meeting is held hampers the possibility of having all interested parties involved. In a face-to-face scenario, everyone is in the same colocation.
- * There are lots of distractions and inability to see the facial expression.

- *Because of the session zone time and also i cannot attend all sessions for issues of my job and other activities
- * you need to adopt to a different time zone, which obviously is very difficult since we are in the mean time working 8 hr in our daily jobs.
- * Less sessions. Need to be concentrate in main issues needed multistakeholder inputs More multistakeholder meetings and exchanges (like the European round-table of ICANN69)
- * Very difficult to do networking and work closely with people when you are remote.
- * Time zone difference and shorter attention span online than face to face
- * Because the session zone time and also i don't can attend all sessions for issues of my job and other activities
- * The schedules in the virtual meetings should be modified, you have to find intermediate hours that do not make you get up at 3 AM. A pleasant experience turns into something terrifying
- * Ineffective because we are being plugged into sessions that are not often inconvenient for our constituency needs as far as timing and timezones. Also the meeting formats are too restrictive because of Org policies.

- *Need virtual corridor conversations and other virtual places for smaller and more ad hoc conversations. Need to break up the monotony of a wall of Zoom meetings every day. Need to create a sense of place and community.
- * Meetings are generally where people gather formally and informally and develop a deeper understanding of different perspectives on issues. Very difficult task in a virtual setting. Well moderated sessions that present different perspectives on issues and cross-community sessions that highlight hot topics for various stakeholders have both been successful bridge strategies. A keynote speaker with various virtual breakout rooms to discuss the topic might be interesting if it is not too resource intensive to organize. Emphasize some networking events at the front end of the meeting, before everyone is exhausted with the time zone issues and zoom. fatigue.
- * It is not the same as in-person meetings. We lose most of the interactions and networking that could happen in a face to face meeting
- *Co-ordinate with other constituencies to minimize overlap on session topics.
- * Interaction in a face to face setting is very important to help "lubricate" positions and better understand others' views

9 Select which virtual public meeting feature(s) or platform(s) need improvement? Networking activities: 73%
Time zone of meeting: 50%
Interpretation platform: 44%
Interpretation Availability: 40%

Schedule platform: 40% Zoom platform: 33%

Time zone of meeting: 54%
Networking activities: 50%
Schedule platform: 38%
Registration platform: 30%
Zook Platform: 21%

Interpretation Availability: 20%

| 10 | For the individual sessions at ICANN | Top 3 (combined 1,2&3 ratings) | Top 3 (combined 1,2 or 3 ratings) |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 10 | Virtual Public Meetings, rank the | Interaction with other participants - 73% | Interaction with other participants - 64% |
| | features most important | Interaction presenters & participants - 73% | Interaction presenters & participants - 70% |
| | reacures most important | Presentation materials available - 40% | Presentation materials available - 42% |
| | | Fresentation materials available - 40% | Fresentation materials available - 42% |
| | | Least favoured (combined ratings 7,8,9) | Least favoured (combined ratings 7,8,9) |
| | | Use videos to see presenters - 45% | Participant queues - 48% |
| | | Unmoderated chat - 51% | Unmoderated chat – 57% |
| | | Use videos to see participants - 63% | Use videos to see participants – 64% |
| 11 | How would you characterise the | Too many – (67)19%, (68)19%, (69)44% | Too many – (67)23%, (68)17%, (69)35% |
| | number of sessions scheduled for | Correct number – 60%, 62%, 46% | Correct number of sessions – 47%, 56%, 53% |
| | each of the following virtual ICANN | Too few sessions – 8%, 9%, 6% | Too few sessions – 14%, 13%, 7% |
| | meetings | 100 1ew sessions - 670, 570, 670 | 100 few sessions – 1470, 1370, 770 |
| 12 | What is the ideal length of an | 60 minutes – 44% | 60 minutes – 40% |
| | individual session | 90 minutes – 38% | 90 minutes – 36% |
| | | 75 minutes – 17% | 75 minutes – 22% |
| | | 120 minutes – 2% | 120 minutes – 2% |
| | | | |
| 13 | What would drive the time zone of | Rotating around the regions – 52% | Rotating around the regions – 52% |
| | each virtual public meeting | Original Meeting location time – 29% | Original Meeting location time – 27% |
| | | A consistent time zone – 19% | A consistent time zone – 22% |
| | | | |
| 14 | Rank by importance which activities | Decision-making – | Information sharing – |
| | should take place during ICANN | Information sharing – | Decision-making – |
| | Virtual Public Meetings | Capacity Building – | Policy-making – |
| | | Policy-making – | Capacity building – |
| | | Issue reporting – | Issue reporting – |
| | | Networking - | Networking – |
| | | Outreach - | Outreach – |
| 15 | Which of the following session types | Regional meetings – 67% | Regional meetings – 63% |
| | should take place outside of ICANN | Working group meetings – 58% | NomCom meetings – 53% |
| | Public Meetings | NomCom meetings – 50% | Working Group meetings – 53% |
| | | Review team meeting – 46% | Review team meetings – 44% |

| 17 | Rank the inputs by importance that should govern the Boards decision on whether to hold a public meeting, in person or virtually? Under what circumstances would you choose to participate in person in an ICANN Public meeting | Health and Safety – 63% first priority Majority can travel freely – 42% second priority Community input – 54% third priority Majority can travel freely – 67% Availability of Travel Insurance – 60% Vaccine widely available – 52% Adequate ventilation – 44% Return to pre-covid conditions – 42% Unsure – 4% | Health and Safety – 63% first priority Majority can travel freely – 51% second priority Community input – 66% third priority Majority can travel freely – 75% Vaccine widely available – 60% Return to pre-covid conditions – 47% Adequate ventilation – 46% Availability of travel insurance – 42% Unsure – 5% |
|----|--|--|---|
| 18 | What requirements would you agree to follow to attend an ICANN Public meeting in person | Wear a mask throughout the meeting – 83% Maintain physical distancing – 77% Submit to daily health screenings – 75% Share personal health info – 63% None of the above – 17% Unsure – 4% | Wear a mask throughout the meeting – 77% Maintain physical distancing – 73% Submit to daily health screenings – 73% Share personal health info – 59% None of the above – 9% Unsure – 7% |
| 19 | Please share any feedback you have about ICANN Public Meetings, the virtual meeting format, or returning to in-person meetings. Apologies – I didn't get time to detail the individual responses but these were the key words within the comments made in the 84 ICANN responses (including 25 made by At-Large). | format get week work function sessions travel near materials returning least place of the possible safe two weeks etc return soon focus of | |