Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding

Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy

Publication Date:	26 February 2018
Prepared By:	Tanzanica King

Public Comment Proceeding	
Open Date:	14 December 2017
Close Date:	1 February 2018
Staff Report Due Date:	15 February 2018

Important Information Links

[Announcement](#)
[Public Comment Proceeding](#)
[View Comments Submitted](#)

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

Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

On 17 August 2017, ICANN Organization (ICANN org) hosted a call with community leaders to discuss questions about the criteria for ICANN Meeting venue selection, and potential updates to the current strategy for ICANN Public Meetings, which was approved by the ICANN Board in 2014.

ICANN org prepared a [summary of the discussion](#) which included proposed incremental changes to the [current meeting strategy](#). Fundamental changes to the meeting strategy were also discussed, however participants agreed to wait for a more comprehensive review of the current meeting strategy with the community to examine those issues and make informed recommendations for change.

ICANN org presented the paper to community leaders on 13 October 2017 and solicited feedback from the group at a meeting on 2 November 2017 during ICANN60 Annual General Meeting in Abu Dhabi. As a result, community leaders directed ICANN org to seek further input from the community via this public comment proceeding.

Community leaders and representatives were asked what consideration, if any, should be made for changes to the meeting duration.

- **Policy Forum**
  Community leaders recognize an apparent need for more time at the Policy Forum to facilitate outreach and other activities, which would extend the meeting to five days.

    - Eight (8) submissions to this public comment proceeding included statements on the duration of the Policy Forum. All of the comments support adding one more day to the meeting for a total of five days. There was also consensus that the additional day should not be restricted to outreach, but available for working meetings and other activities.

- **Annual General Meeting (AGM)**
  Community leaders raised concerns about the underutilization of the last day (Day 7) at the AGM. They also ask that the announced meeting dates of the official ICANN Public Meetings guarantee constructive use of the participants' time. Thus, they considered two potential recommendations for the AGM:

  Option 1: Keep the AGM to seven days but reorganize the work so that there is better use of participants' time on the last day.

Option 2: Reduce the official dates published for the AGM to six days, while keeping day seven available for the community to hold internal working meetings and wrap-ups.

- Eight (8) submissions to this public comment proceeding included statements on the duration of the AGM. None of the comments received support option 1 to keep the AGM to seven days but reorganize the work so that there is better use of the participants' time on the last day.
- Seven (7) of those comments agree that the official dates for the AGM should be reduced to six days.
- Five (5) comments support option 2 and agree with a seventh day for the community to hold internal working meetings, however two (2) comments are expressly against a seventh day of any kind.

Note: Community leaders felt that the duration of the Community Forum was appropriate and did not seek recommendations.

Community leaders are looking forward to a more comprehensive review of the 2014 meetings strategy to address fundamental changes to the strategy.

ICANN org will provide community leaders with a summary of feedback received from this public comment proceeding to facilitate a final decision on proposed incremental changes to the current strategy for ICANN Public Meetings.

Section II: Contributors

At the time this report was prepared, a total of eleven (11) community submissions had been posted to the forum. 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-RySG	Stéphane Van Gelder	RySG
ALAC	ICANN At-Large Staff	ALAC
Neustar, Inc.	Donna Austin	NSR
GNSO-BC	Steve DelBianco	BC
GNSO Council	Steve Chan	GNSO
GNSO-RrSG	Zoe Bonython	RrSG
GNSO-NCSG	Rafik Dammak	NCSG
ALAC (Ratified)	ICANN At-Large Staff	ALAC

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Sebastien Bachollet	ALAC	SB
Alan Greenberg	ALAC	AG
Michelle Chaplow	MSWG	MC

Section III: Summary of Comments

- **Policy Forum**
  All of the comments related to the duration of the Policy Forum support adding one more day to the meeting for a total of five days. There was also consensus that the additional day should not be restricted to outreach, but available for working meetings and/or other activities.

    o AG suggests that each community divide their time as appropriate to allow their outreach efforts in parallel with policy discussions.

    o Conversely, the NCSG recommends that no PDPs or GNSO Council meetings be held in conflict with outreach sessions.

    o RySG states that, "ICANN should be cautious about planning new activities on day five and leave sufficient time for SOs/ACs/Groups to better organize their activities over the duration of the meeting."

- **Annual General Meeting (AGM)**
  The RySG and BC support a reduction of the AGM by one day, for six total days. They **do not** support a seventh day.

    o The RySG is concerned that an extension of the Policy Forum in combination with either of the proposed options for the AGM will increase costs.

    o The BC believes reducing the AGM to six days will lower costs for all ICANN travelers, and the funding for a seventh day could instead be used to cover the additional day proposed for the Policy Forum.

  The RrSG supports a six-day AGM and feels that a seven-day meeting is problematic due to labor laws, but if retained, more thought should be given to how that day can be used more effectively.

  The ALAC, GNSO, NSR, and NCSG support a reduction of the official dates for the AGM by one day, maintaining the seventh day for the community to hold internal working meetings and wrap-ups.

    o NSR believes the seventh day will alleviate some of the volunteer fatigue associated with this considerable time commitment.

  AG wants to maintain the seven-day duration for the AGM but make it clear that day seven is for AC/SO meetings, some of which may be closed and that ICANN attendees verify with their AC/SO whether there will be any public meetings.

Other Miscellaneous Comments Received:

SB proposed new sessions be added to the schedule to better organize regional and linguistic activities at the Policy Forum and the Annual General Meeting.

Regarding the Community Forum, NSR suggests, "Consideration could be given to the appropriateness of a more low-key opening ceremony, holding only one public forum, and removing the public Board meeting from the agenda."

The BC recommends that ICANN allow a limited number of new fellows to apply for fellowships for the Policy Forum with a focus on fellows that are from under-represented groups, as identified by an analysis of the Fellowship Program.

The NCSG suggest that ICANN convene a community group similar to that of IETF to come up with a more elaborate set of criteria for venue selection.

MC recommends that strategic remote hubs should be evaluated, then tried and tested at ICANN Meetings.

- Note that ICANN org introduced remote hubs at ICANN Meetings on an experimental basis in 2015, with marginal results. After two years, ICANN org decided to discontinue remote hubs and instead focus our resources and efforts on other tools. More details are posted at https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-discontinues-remote-hubs-at-public-meetings.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

ICANN org will provide community leaders with a summary of feedback received from this public comment proceeding to facilitate their final decision on proposed changes to the duration of the Policy Forum and the Annual General Meeting.