

GNSO NCPH Intersessional Meeting Evaluation Survey Results

Background

- On 4-5 February 2016, the GNSO Non-Contracted Parties House held an Intersessional meeting in Los Angeles, CA.
- 43 stakeholders participated in the meeting in person.
- An evaluation survey was distributed to participants on 24 February 2016.

Overview

- A total of 18 responses were recorded (2 from remote participants).
- 66% of respondents were satisfied (33%) or very satisfied (33%) with the meeting. Both respondents who participated in the meeting remotely rated their satisfaction level as neutral.
- 94% of respondents would support or attend another meeting in the future if resources were available.

Agenda

- **Community Session - Wednesday**
94% of respondents were satisfied (75%) or very satisfied (19%)
- **Plenary Session 1** | Co-chairs: CSG Phil Crowin (BC), NSCG Ed Morris (NCUC) - Exploration of Common NCPH Issues
80% of respondents were satisfied (60%) or very satisfied (20%)
- **Plenary Session 2** | Co-chairs: CSG Lori Schulman (IPC), NSCG Tapani Tarvainen (NCSG) - Process for Community Decision Making, Board Seat and Council Vice Chairs
62% of respondents were satisfied (56%) or very satisfied (6%)
- **Plenary Lunch - Thursday** | Co-chairs: CSG Cheryl Miller (BC), NSCG Avri Doria (NCUC) - GNSO Review Matters
60% of respondents were satisfied (53%) or very satisfied (7%)
- **Plenary Session 3** | Co-chairs: CSG Tony Holmes (ISPCP), NSCG Rudi Vansnick (NPOC) - Possible GNSO Future
69% of respondents were satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (25%)
- **Stakeholder Group or Constituency Breakout Sessions**
100% of respondents were satisfied (73%) or very satisfied (27%)
- **Roundtables with Senior Staff - CEO**
64% of respondents were satisfied (50%) or very satisfied (14%)
- **Roundtables with Senior Staff - Sr. V.P Policy Development Support**
56% of respondents were satisfied (37%) or very satisfied (19%)
- **Roundtables with Senior Staff - CFO**
71% of respondents were satisfied (57%) or very satisfied (14%)
- **Plenary Lunch - Friday** | Public Meeting Matters
63% of respondents were satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (19%)
- **Plenary Session 4** | Co-chairs: CSG Greg Shatan (IPC), NSCG Tapani Tarvainen (NCSG) - Shared Topics `Third Rail Issues`
74% of respondents were satisfied (47%) or very satisfied (27%)
- **Plenary Session 5** | Co-chairs: CSG Tony Holmes (ISPCP), NSCG Marilia Maciel (NCUC) - Any Other Business
88% of respondents were satisfied (69%) or very satisfied (19%)

Travel Support

- **Itinerary Options**
76% of respondents were satisfied (29%) or very satisfied (47%)
- **Timeliness of Booking**
62% of respondents were satisfied (31%) or very satisfied (31%)
- **Per Diem Process**
65% of respondents were satisfied (47%) or very satisfied (18%)
- **Overall Ease of Communication with Constituency Travel**
53% of respondents were satisfied (41%) or very satisfied (12%)
- **Accommodation**
75% of respondents were satisfied (38%) or very satisfied (37%)

Services and Support

- **Meeting Venue** (DoubleTree Hilton)
72% of respondents were satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (28%)
- **Remote Participation**
Half of the respondents stayed neutral (Please recall this survey was filled predominantly by in-room participants). Out of the other half 89% of respondents were satisfied (67%) or very satisfied (22%)
- **Resource Materials**
78% of respondents were satisfied (50%) or very satisfied (28%)
- **Staff Support**
100% of respondents were satisfied (25%) or very satisfied (75%)
- **Breakfasts**
83% of respondents were satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (39%)
- **Lunches**
82% of respondents were satisfied (47%) or very satisfied (35%)
- **Reception**
83% of respondents were satisfied (55%) or very satisfied (28%)

Respondents

- 12.50% from the BC
- 6.25% from the IPC
- 18.75% from the ISPCP
- 12.50% from the NCSG
- 12.50% from the NCUC
- 37.50% from the NPOC
- 100% had participated in a previous ICANN meeting/event

COMMENTS (verbatim)

What aspect of the meeting did you like MOST?

- The opportunity to discuss with other members of the House common interest issues.
- Interaction with the other non contracted parties.
- Openness of discussions, creative and positive debate, constructive proposals for future collaboration

- Meeting people
- During the face-to-face time we stayed focused on hot button work issues
- Plenary sessions that focused on key issues for both Houses
- Well pulled together by ICANN staff
- Opportunity to exchange and discuss topics cross community.
- The meeting of the proposal, and the topics covered perfectly suited to the coming year
- Opportunity to meet with ICANN Board member, and ICANN CEO, and staff, as well as to discuss informally governance issues
- Open Discussion. Food
- The opportunity to meet and better get to know attendees from both SGs
- Finally I did not attend due to lack of US Visa
- All
- Meetings within stakeholder groups.
- Intensive engagement of work agendas

What aspect of the meeting did you like LEAST?

- None I can think of
- The agenda was a mess. Done chairs were unprepared
- Not being able to go outside and enjoy fresh air
- Still some concern on the willingness of some ICANN staff to really partner in with some of the NCPH in designing strategy plans for shared objectives.
- A couple of sessions that lacked real focus or had unclear goals.
- Wasn't results-oriented enough
- Time and effort it took to prepare meeting. Some sessions were not prepared at all by CO-Chairs resulting in a waste of time. CEO did not answer the questions he was asked.
- The pace of the meeting was very intense, short intervals, becoming tiring and consequently reducing productivity
- I am not sure that the sessions were well formulated ahead of the meeting, which made preparation and planning more challenging
- Lack of outcomes. Unwillingness to discuss the "elephants in the room"
- Session with CEI.
- Weak follow up on work agendas (not the fault of the intersessional)

Please provide any other comments on the AGENDA.

- I thought it was an ambitious agenda, but it was well planned.
- Agenda of each plenary and the detail of discussion has to be prepared with consultation with the broader community well in advance. Chairs have to discuss the topics beforehand
- Overall I felt that there was more open discussion between SG's and C's than normally is the case. I have seen some increased respect and sharing since the intersessional.
- Chairs just NEED to work on making more of the stuff that happens outcome-driven. There was too much talking just to talk.
- Focus!!!
- There is still a large gulf in some areas between Staff efforts and the efforts of NCSG volunteers.

Please provide any other comments on TRAVEL SUPPORT.

- They did a very good job for the resources they have

- Joseph was nice and helpful but unresponsive sometimes. I don't know about my per diem and the timeline
- original travel offered was rather abysmal (25 hour travel time, 10 hour layover in Moscow)
- Constituency Travel could use a service ticket app when it gets email from us. As it is now, we send email for clarification, questions, issues, etc. and may wait and wait for a signal that they read it, or got a response. Most "help desk" and "query" email give an automatic response with a ticket number. That confirms that the message was received (even if not read) and follow up is attached to the query ticket so tracking at both ends works better.
- Initially proved difficult to obtain a response if your request didn't fit with the standardised pro forma supplied.
- ASK ED!!!
- Lead time for scheduled meeting so one can prepare more
- There tended to be delays getting responses back from Constituency Travel, although I recognise they were probably very busy also organising the CCT-RT and Marrakech meetings. All flight options all came up as over budget so until I got a response back from the Travel team I did not know what to do about this. Since we did not have any visibility on the budget it was difficult to know whether a selected itinerary was reasonable or not
- IMHO there is no sufficient support from ICANN Travel Constituency for US visa inquiries.
- I'd like to suggest that consideration be made for earlier arrivals due to jet-lag challenges and also for next day check-out.
- Living 250km from the departure airport I find that frequently I have to supplement the per diem with personal funds to cover all costs. Also, details as early as possible would help, and Travel might use a "ticket process" like tech help uses, to track client questions.

Please provide any other comments on SERVICES AND SUPPORT.

- They were quite good
- Lunch was horrible. We had an indeed technical problem for rp. In one of the rooms we needed a satellite mic extension but they didn't have...
- Main issue on services and support is the ticketing app for travel - it would simplify things for both constituency travel and the travelers. As for the quality of accommodations I am very easy to please.
- Excellent staff support and help
- After the culinary delights of cold left over pizza paid and tainted by IPC money at Tuesdays reception, I skipped Wednesdays reception to go to 5 star restaurant in Beverly Hills and ended up with galloping diarrhea! Bad choice !!! Maybe the IPC is not such a bad option.
- Staff support was excellent as always
- Excellent support from Rob and team!
- I view services as food and accommodations as basic and do not expect anything fancy. I get annoyed when people complain about services (like complaining about the gala meal in Marrakesh). Entitlement does not belong in ICANN.

Please provide any other comments relevant to this meeting.

- i think these meetings are very good for the development of our house and the integration between the different constituencies.
- Perhaps next time somewhere other than the US

- My key concern is that we identify good hot button issues in advance, to have a focused agenda. More advanced information as to Staff plans for outreach, collaborations, etc. would help. More proactive transparency there.
- ...if we make some major changes to preparation process that was to work intensive and over engineered. It would also be good to have breaks during the meeting, (see previous health related comment). More chances for real dialogue.
- I think it is important to get together and discuss issues, whether it's the Intersessional or otherwise. We don't get to discuss issues and delve into them via emails or at the conferences.
- Although there were positives, overall I do not think that this meeting represented good value for the cost of holding it. This is based on assumptions as to the likely cost of the meeting, including the travel support, hotels, food, per diem, meeting space, etc. It is also based on the minimal concrete outcomes. Such meetings may have the capacity to be worthwhile but there would need to be a much clearer agenda and agreement as to desired outcomes that all parties were committed to trying to achieve. It would also be preferable for such a meeting to be the culmination of a workstream or project rather than the first time that it was discussed.
- I need more assistance for US visa request. It's the third time that the
- Still waiting for the minutes of the meeting...
- I would support NPOC attendance but it might be someone other than me, depending on issues and the context. NPOC has the entitlement to participate. I don't