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Survey Participation by Region

- North America: 30%
- Latin America/Caribbean islands: 18%
- Africa: 11%
- Europe: 30%
- Asia/Australia/Pacific: 11%
Q3: How effective is the ICANN Public Meeting yearly structure, with one Community Forum in March, one Policy Forum in June, and one AGM in October?

79%

Effective or Very Effective
Q4. How can the yearly format be improved?

“We should look at the objectives and what we really need to achieve during these meetings. Should not just be a ‘state of play’ recalling the various issues, each meeting should have added value.”

“The format is very ineffective for virtual meetings - the meeting itself should be a light event, with a few key meetings. All other sessions should be spread over the year.”

“In the current situation of the pandemic, the virtual meetings should be improved. There should be more emphasis on the inter-sessional work that is spread out to pare down the length of time of a complete gathering of the ICANN community.”
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Q5. How many public meetings should be held each year?

“Although the structure is by and large effective, it does not mean that it could not be made more effective - for instance by reducing the global meetings to two and increasing the number of specialized events - either by topic or by geographic location.”

“One face-to-face, one virtual.”

“The total number of meetings per year is less important than ensuring that the individual meetings are structured in a way to accomplish the work the community needs to do. Allowing sufficient time for policy work is critical.”

Q5. How many public meetings should be held each year?

- Three (same as current), 68%
- Two, 27%
- One, 5%

“One face-to-face, one virtual.”
Q6. What aspects of the meeting should we focus on improving?

- Capacity-building: 45%
- Networking: 56%
- Outreach to newcomers: 41%
- Policy development work: 65%
- None: 5%
Q7: How effective is the virtual format to accomplishing your meeting goals?

- Very Effective: 1%
- Effective: 45%
- Ineffective: 41%
- Very Ineffective: 8%
- No opinion: 5%
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Q8. How can the virtual format be improved?

“Distribute material in advance, have pre-sessions in small groups, have a strategy to include new participants....”

“Many sessions on the last meeting could have been previously recorded and taken out of the meeting schedule. That alone could leave room for both reducing the duration of the meeting and for focusing on topics which require discussion.”

“Reduce length of meeting since time zone is a challenge as well as commitments to the meetings while attending to both professional and personal everyday commitments.”
Q9: Which Virtual Public Meeting feature(s) or platform(s) need improvement?

- Time zone of meeting schedule: 54%
- Networking activities: 50%
- Schedule platform usability: 38%
- Registration platform usability: 30%
- Zoom platform: 21%
- Interpretation availability: 20%
- Interpretation platform: 19%
- Newsletters: 11%
- None: 9%
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Q10: For the individual sessions at ICANN Virtual Public Meetings, rank the features that are most important to you. (1 = most important, 9 = least important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to interact with other participants (Zoom meeting room vs. Zoom webinar room)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation slides and other materials made available to participants</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of other participants’ names and number of participants attending</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of video to see presenter(s)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between presenter(s) and participants</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A feature</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized participant queue</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmoderated chat feature</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of video to see participants</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11: How would you characterize the number of sessions scheduled for each of the following ICANN Virtual Public Meetings?

- **ICANN67 Community Forum**: 23% Too Many Sessions, 14% Correct Number of Sessions, 16% Too Few Sessions, 47% N/A
- **ICANN68 Policy Forum**: 17% Too Many Sessions, 13% Correct Number of Sessions, 14% Too Few Sessions, 56% N/A
- **ICANN69 Annual General Meeting**: 35% Too Many Sessions, 7% Correct Number of Sessions, 6% Too Few Sessions, 53% N/A

“The problem is not the number of sessions. The problem is the number of simultaneous sessions.”

“Meeting 69 should have been compressed to less days, not necessarily less sessions.”
Q12: What is the ideal length of an individual session?

- 60 minutes: 40%
- 75 minutes: 22%
- 90 minutes: 36%
- 120 minutes: 2%

“There is no common ideal length of an individual session. Session lengths should naturally vary based upon the format and nature of the individual session.”

“60 min of presentation and 15 min Q&A. FIKA sessions work really good to relax and refresh your mind.”
Q13: What should drive the time zone of the virtual public meeting?

“Have 3 zones - Americas, EMEA, Asia/Pacific.”

“Find a time zone that is the least painful to the largest number of meeting attendees.”

“Rotating seems fairer, despite inconveniences.”

Consistent time zone for all Virtual Public Meetings, 22%

Rotating time zone between the five ICANN regions, 52%

Original Public Meeting location time zone pre-COVID-19 pandemic, 27%
Q14: Rank (by importance) which activities should take place during ICANN Virtual Public Meetings?

- Information sharing: 4.86
- Decision-making: 4.77
- Policy-making: 4.57
- Capacity-building: 4.1
- Issue reporting: 3.9
- Networking: 3.22
- Outreach: 2.58
Q15: Which of the following session types, if any, do you think should take place outside the official dates for an ICANN Virtual Public Meeting?

- Nominating Committee meetings: 53%
- Regional meetings: 63%
- Review team meetings: 44%
- Working group meetings: 53%
- None: 13%
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Q16: Rank the inputs (by importance) that should govern the ICANN Board's decision-making process on whether to hold a Public Meeting, in-person or virtually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health and safety</th>
<th>Ability of majority of people worldwide to travel freely</th>
<th>Community input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17: Under what circumstances would you choose to participate, in-person, at an ICANN Public Meeting?

- Adequate ventilation of meeting facilities: 46%
- Availability of Travel Insurance: 42%
- Majority of worldwide COVID-19 travel restrictions lifted: 75%
- Return to normal (pre-COVID-19) living and working conditions: 47%
- Vaccine widely available: 60%
- Unsure: 5%

Q18: Select the requirement(s) below that you would agree to follow to attend an ICANN Public Meeting, in-person.

- Maintain physical distance throughout the meeting: 73%
- Share personal health information (reporting of symptoms, COVID-19 test status, etc.): 59%
- Submit to daily health screenings before entry to meeting facility: 73%
- Wear a mask throughout the meeting: 77%
- None of the above: 9%
- Unsure: 7%
“Virtual meetings are all of the work and almost none of the enjoyment. They are a necessary evil, and we should return to in-person meetings when the science and public health consensus says we can.”

“I'm pretty much zoom'ed out.”

“The virtual format is just about working in the short term, but we need to move back to three physical meetings per year as soon as it is possible.”

“Looking forward to in-person meetings again. Understand that these are tough decisions and ICANN has done a great job of handling things to date.”