ICANN Meeting Survey Consolidated Response - GNSO

GNSO community responses available here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-TQKG85R67/>

## Summary

***In total, 69 responses were received from GNSO Council members and all of the GNSO’s Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, across many regions.***

In terms of overall themes, there is a clear recognition of the **benefits to the in-person** format for **meaningful engagement** in sessions and **networking/outreach** opportunities. However, it is equally clear that the respondents in the GNSO community are only willing to return to in-person meetings once it is safe to do so, both from a global perspective and precautions that may still need to be taken within the venue. As such, there seems to be a general sentiment that the virtual meetings, despite some notable challenges, work well enough. However, the community should not feel like it must **force the face-to-face structure into the virtual format** and it should actively seek to **address some of those challenges**, which include the **time zone issues**, enhancing the **focus on policy development**, **improving the interaction** in sessions, and **enhancing networking opportunities**. Lastly, there is an overall sentiment that in any format, **sessions should be objective and outcome driven**, and not merely the panel speaking to an audience.

## Summarized findings from the survey results:

#### ICANN Public Meeting Questions (In-Person or Virtual): Questions 3-6

* 74%of respondents believe “the ICANN Public Meeting yearly structure, with one Community Forum in March, one Policy Forum in June, and one Annual General Meeting in October” is **Effective** or **Very Effective.** *Some themes in the comments for this question suggested:*
	+ To eliminate the differentiation between the types of the ICANN public meetings (Community Forum, Policy Forum and Annual General Meeting). Some noted that in particular, the policy forum should be eliminated.
	+ Some emphasized that it is more important to ensure that individual meetings are designed to accomplish an outcome, rather than the format of meeting.
* 72% of respondents believethere should continue to be **3 ICANN Public Meetings per year**.
* In regards to aspects of ICANN Public Meetings that should be the focus for improvement, respondents identified **policy development (74%),** Networking (55%), Capacity-building (35%), and Outreach to newcomers (30%).

#### ICANN Virtual Public Meeting Questions: 7-15

* 52%of respondents believe the virtual format is **Ineffective** to accomplishing their meeting goals, with 45% believing the format to be **Effective** or **Very Effective**. *Some common themes in the comments for this question were consistent with the outcomes below, and included:*
* Challenges in networking, where meeting in the hallways or over dinner is impossible.
* A virtual meeting makes it less distinguishable from intersessional virtual meetings. The virtual format makes it even harder to meaningfully engage during sessions, turning many into the mere presentations/webinars.
* Not necessarily limited to the virtual format, but criteria or filtering is needed to determine what meetings should be held, in an effort to streamline the number and types of sessions. Sessions should have objective and be outcome driven.
* There concerns about the length of the meetings, especially ICANN69, and the conflicts it causes with personal commitments.
* For elements of the virtual format that need improvement, respondents identified **time zone of meeting as the most important** (67%). Other areas identified include networking activities (41%), schedule platform (41%), registration platform (32%), zoom platform (17%) and other areas with 10% or less.
* For individual sessions in the virtual format, on scale from 1-9, respondents identified **interaction between presenters and participants** (7) and the **ability to interact with other participants** (7) as the most important. Respondents also noted the importance of visibility of information about other participants (5), availability of presentation / preparatory materials (5). Unmoderated chat (4), use of video for presenters (4), the Q&A feature (4), and use of video for participants (3) rounded out the input.
* For each of ICANN67, ICANN68, and ICANN69, between **41-51% of respondents felt the number of sessions was correct**, with ICANN68 receiving the highest approval number for that metric. Others found the meetings to have too many or too few sessions to varying degrees, though **ICANN69** in particular saw 36% of respondents stating there were **too many sessions**.
* For ideal length of session, a **plurality of respondents said 90 minutes** (41%), with others choosing 60 minutes (33%), 75 minutes (23%).
* Regarding time zone of the virtual meeting, respondents indicated their preference to **rotate the time zone between the 5 ICANN regions** (57%). In equal amount, others prefer to have a consistent time zone for all virtual meetings or to be consistent with the original physical location (22%).
* On a 1-7 scale and consistent with the in-person meeting format, **policy-making** rated as very important for the virtual format, though equally so with **information sharing** and **decision-making** (all scoring 5). Issue reporting (4), capacity-building (3.5), and networking (3) were also identified.
* For sessions that should take place outside of the official ICANN Virtual Public Meeting, respondents identified the Nominating Committee (67%), regional meetings (59%), working group meetings (52%), and review team meetings (43%).

#### Returning to In-Person Meeting Questions: 16-18

* **Health and safety** ranked by far as the most important factor in governing when the ICANN Public Meeting should be held in-person.
* Respondents identified the most important circumstances for returning to in-person meetings to be when the majority of worldwide COVID-19 **travel restrictions are lifted** (83%), when a **vaccine** is widely available (72%), and return to **normal (pre-COVID-19) living and working conditions** (57%).
* Respondents identified the most important requirements needed to return to in-person meetings as **wearing a mask** throughout the meeting (83%), **daily health screenings** before entry to meeting facility (74%), maintaining **physical distance** throughout the meeting (70%), and **sharing personal health information** (reporting of symptoms, COVID-19 test status, etc.) (61%).