

GNSO NCPH Intersessional Meeting Evaluation Survey Results

Background

- On 14-15 February 2017, the GNSO Non-Contracted Parties House held an Intersessional meeting in Reykjavik, ICELAND.
- 43 stakeholders participated in the meeting in person.
- An evaluation survey was distributed to participants on 15 February 2017.

Overview

- A total of 22 responses were recorded.
- 95% of respondents were satisfied (59%) or very satisfied (36%) with the meeting.
- 100% of respondents would support or attend another meeting in the future if resources were available.

Agenda

- **Stakeholder Group or Constituency Breakout Sessions – Tuesday AM**
76% of respondents were satisfied (48%) or very satisfied (28%)
- **Plenary Session 1** | Community Overviews
71% of respondents were satisfied (43%) or very satisfied (28%)
- **Plenary Lunch - Tuesday** | Co-chairs: CSG Jonathan Zuck (IPC), NCSG Anna Loup (NCUC) – ICANN
Compliance Issues
73% of respondents were satisfied (55%) or very satisfied (18%)
- **Plenary Session 2** | Co-chairs: CSG Victoria Sheckler (IPC), NCSG Klaus Stoll (NPOC) – NCPH
Procedural In-House Issues
65% of respondents were satisfied (50%) or very satisfied (15%)
- **Plenary Session 3** | Co-chairs: CSG Tony Harris (ISPCP), NCSG Avri Doria (NCSG) – New gTLDs
“Next Phase”
73% of respondents were satisfied (50%) or very satisfied (23%)
- **Stakeholder Group Breakout Sessions – Tuesday PM**
77% of respondents were satisfied (50%) or very satisfied (27%)
- **Roundtables with Senior Staff - CEO**
36% of respondents were satisfied (27%) or very satisfied (9%)
- **Stakeholder Group or Constituency Breakout Sessions – Wednesday**
82% of respondents were satisfied (64%) or very satisfied (18%)
- **Plenary Session 4** | Co-chairs: CSG Marc Trachtenberg (IPC), NCSG Poncelet Ileleji (NPOC) –
Policy Discussion Topic
68% of respondents were satisfied (45%) or very satisfied (23%)
- **Plenary Lunch - Wednesday** | Co-chairs: CSG Jimson Olufuye (BC), NCSG Ed Morris (NCUC)
ICANN Budgeting Discussion
67% of respondents were satisfied (29%) or very satisfied 38%
- **Plenary Session 5** | Co-chairs: CSG Tony Holmes (ISPCP), NCSG Kathy Kleiman (NCUC) –
Maintaining the GNSO’s traditional policy-making leadership position at ICANN
86% of respondents were satisfied (45%) or very satisfied (41%)
- **Plenary Session 6** | Co-chairs: CSG Steve DelBianco (BC), NCSG Joan Kerr (NCSG) – NCPH
“Presenting”
91% of respondents were satisfied (32%) or very satisfied (59%)

- **Stakeholder Group or Constituency Breakout Sessions – Thursday**
72% of respondents were satisfied (44%) or very satisfied (28%)

Travel Support

- **Itinerary Options**
79% of respondents were satisfied (37%) or very satisfied (42%)
- **Timeliness of Booking**
65% of respondents were satisfied (35%) or very satisfied (30%)
- **Per Diem Process**
50% of respondents were satisfied (33%) or very satisfied (17%)
- **Overall Ease of Communication with Constituency Travel**
61% of respondents were satisfied (17%) or very satisfied (44%)
- **Accommodations**
95% of respondents were satisfied (48%) or very satisfied (47%)

Services and Support

- **Meeting Venue** (Hilton Reykjavik Nordica)
91% of respondents were satisfied (18%) or very satisfied (73%)
- **Remote Participation**
One third of the respondents stayed neutral (Please recall this survey was filled predominantly by in-room participants). Out of the other two thirds 92% of respondents were satisfied (54%) or very satisfied (38%)
- **Resource Materials**
90% of respondents were satisfied (38%) or very satisfied (52%)
- **Resource Materials – Wiki Space**
38% of respondents (8 out of 21) used meeting Wiki Space in preparation for the meeting. 70% of them accessed the meeting Wiki Space 6 or more times. With respect to the value of the meeting Wiki Space approximately half of the respondents stayed neutral. Out of the other half 100% of the respondents were satisfied (57%) or very satisfied (43%)
- **Staff Support**
100% of respondents were satisfied (9%) or very satisfied (91%)
- **Breakfasts**
91% of respondents were satisfied (36%) or very satisfied (55%)
- **Lunches**
81% of respondents were satisfied (19%) or very satisfied (62%)
- **Informal Reception**
86% of respondents were satisfied (24%) or very satisfied (62%)
- **Formal Reception**
91% of respondents were satisfied (32%) or very satisfied (59%)

Respondents

- 22.72% from the BC (5 out of 22)
- 4.54% from the IPC (1 out of 22)
- 13.64% from the ISPCP (3 out of 22)
- 13.64% from the NCSG (3 out of 22)
- 18.18% from the NCUC (4 out of 22)

- 18.18% from the NPOC (4 out of 22)
- 9.09% Guest / Invitee (2 out of 22)
- 100% had participated in a previous ICANN meeting/event whereas 68% had participated in a previous NCPH Intersessional Meeting.

COMMENTS (verbatim)

What aspect of the meeting did you like MOST?

- NCPH Presenting, ICANN Budgeting Discussion, ICANN Compliance Issues, ICANN CEO Discussion
- Plenary discussions & Break out sessions; and staff support Rob & Chantelle in particular
- The possibility to know the institutional memory and the colleagues.
- - Plenary sessions on the second day (NCPH presenting) slot M and slot L (Maintaining the GNSO's traditional policy making leadership position at ICANN) were very useful and productive.
- -The possibility to meet with other participants in a different context than a full ICANN meetings when we have very little time to do so. -The possibility to address long term issues that are not easily addressed during ICANN meetings
- The organization process - Rob Hoggarth is a tremendous facilitator - and the general spirit of cooperation that ran through the meeting from organization to execution.
- open and friendly discussions, opportunities for breakout
- Face to face time with my own stakeholder, constituency and NCPH leadership. It did help to break silos and get other points of view.
- ability to interact with NSG in a collegial environment
- The plenary session discussions.
- The face to face discussions with the NCPH, food availability, accommodations at the same venue as the meeting. The opportunity to present with an experience ICANN member
- Last 2 main sessions
- Strong agenda, very good venue
- Reykjavik
- Most aspects quite good. Individual (NCUC,BC) meetings interesting
- Broad structural discussions
- Face to face opportunity, policy discussion
- Great venue, good discussions
- Face to face talks with people
- Exchange of views between different SO/Acs
- Substantive discussion with the other side of our house
- Far more results oriented than last year in Los Angeles. Day 3 private meetings were essential but could have been part of day 2.
- The interaction and format of the sessions

What aspect of the meeting did you like LEAST?

- Maintaining the GNSO's traditional policy making leadership position at ICANN
- The beginning was very cathartic, looked like it had been a long time.
- The session with the CEO was disappointing. Not prepared enough, poor substance, delay with the conference bridge making it difficult to really exchange.
- Timing. It's hard to be at two ICANN meetings in two months.
- hotel location

- Not enough agenda point to attack with the NCPH, it didn't feel coordinated enough so we could tackle X issues in order to find a common ground towards outside.
- location. it would be better, I think, to have these meetings near an ICANN hub.
- The virtual meeting with CEO Goran Marby and related technical problems.
- The lack of a discussion about a possible goal or outcome beforehand
- Some lack of prep
- Phone interaction of Goran was difficult - not a great engagement
- Lunch food was good but should have breaks for lunch
- Lack any significant breaks during the day
- Early starts!
- Discussing the utility of a meeting that we are actually physically attending.
- Work lunches. Hard to focus (in that room) on both food and discussions.
- Travel
- Working hours
- Too many introductions. This is a leaders meeting. We know each other
- None

Please provide any other comments on the AGENDA.

- Overall positive. Session in Slot J (Place for RPM and / or IP policy subject Matter conversation was a mistake. IPC considering that other constituencies members had to be "educated" on those issues is not fully respectful of others.
- I am impressed with the structuring of agenda and future improvements could include a clear action plan of what needs to be achieved at intersessional and having discussions start early
- More break out meetings
- More discussion on budget
- This year we worked on the essential topic "What is the NCPH" - having the space to work on that was great
- Good agenda. But we should have dedicated more time to Board seat 14 selection.
- Preparation of sessions should be more outcome orientated
- I do think dubious choice of chairs for some sessions, but it is a community issue to fix, not staff. Presence of Board members + NCAs very useful
- More break time for informal discussion
- Very good agenda. No negative comments.
- Good agenda. NCSG sessions not well planned enough
- We covered some important subjects of importance to both CSG and NCSG. I thought that worked well for building a level of shared interest and concern.
- breakout sessions are highly welcome - but preparation of these sessions need improvement
- I thought the agenda was well planned and addressed diverse topics with a great attempt to include everyone

Please provide any other comments on TRAVEL SUPPORT.

- I am very satisfied with ICANN travel team, but FCM is a disaster. I had to wait several weeks before receiving the code to enter into the system and be able to book my flight, and it was only possible because the ICANN travel team intervened. The result in booking at the last minute is increased costs. When my flight was finally booked I received from ICM over 4 hours several hundred of the same confirmation e-mail and my e-mail box was down for several hours.

- My travel requires ground transfer and while I understand options can be hard I still think this could have been done better
- It would serve better where per diem is received before we set out on our journey. It's the end of the intersessional and I am yet to receive mine. This puts pressure on other resources available as the per diem barely covers the cost of incidentals on the trips it's meant to service
- Agency was decent handling my cancelled flight on a weekend
- I self-booked flights. That worked very well for me.
- It's the agency that is the problem, not Constituency Travel.
- I can't comment on per diem process - was I supposed to get per diem before/during the meeting? I got nothing yet.
- My travel experience was positive for this trip. But let's see how getting my luggage through Icelandic goes on the way home.
- Good job.
- Earlier plans
- Everything was beautiful - the hotel, the receptions, the lunches. The receptions were especially nice - and an excellent time to meet people we never have time to talk with at regular ICANN meetings. Tx for these special moments.
- the accommodation itself was ok - but the location left almost no space to "escape"
- I would have liked to be able to book my own flight and be given the permission to do so early on to save money

Please provide any other comments on SERVICES AND SUPPORT.

- As usual the ICANN staff did a fantastic job. Thank you to the all team including those who worked remotely.
- ICANN staff has brought in a professional touch for which they are synonymous with and this has helped to guide discussions. The BC secretariat has done a remarkable job keep us all on track with developments and pointing us areas of interest. Thanks Chantelle D.
- Services and support were excellent. Thank you so much.
- Some issues with remote participation, both technical and administrative. Several complaints about failure to get into AC rooms. Biggest issue with breakfast was getting breakfast before early sessions. Rob in particular was a star for this meeting.
- Great!
- Comments in prior comment section - outstanding, tx you!
- Continue to provide food for the events. Earlier bookings for flights. Continue the cross participation element

Please provide any other comments relevant to this meeting.

- I found this intercessional meeting very useful. those meetings are improving over time, this one was much better than the one in LA.
- General staff support was great.
- This meeting makes it very easy for both houses making up the NCPH to focus on issues of interest between both houses and align different constituency interest with those of their individual houses - with proper coordination it has a potential to help iron out grey areas amongst different Constituencies in each house and help to unify all as best as possible. Focus should be on the strength of all within the house.
- Bring other year ok with me
- Much more useful than previous I have intended. I think topic planning was the big difference.

- This was a very interesting and productive meeting. I fully support the idea of having another one.
- Twice annual, with regular online meetings
- Rob and staff were very well organized. Remote audio quality was poor.
- Ed's idea to put the next meeting before or after the GDD Summit makes sense to me.
- I have shared my comments previously. Given the level of work and commitment -- outstanding for staff and high for all -- it might be a good idea to hold this type of meeting ever other year, rather than annually.
- leave the appointment of attendees up to the various SGs/Cs - but encourage them to send at least 2 newcomers
- This was my third attendance at the Intersession, and my first presentation opportunity. I think this is an important aspect of being able to observe and absorb information over a period of time and then to participate is a really good element of the Intersessional. Face to face meeting can build better relationships and make quicker decisions