


NCPH Intersessional 2018 Evaluation Survey

32 responses


Community Group

32 responses




Please rate your overall satisfaction with the meeting

32 responses




Good value for time spent

32 responses




Please rate the agenda/program for the NCPH Intersessionoanl meeting

32 responses




Would you recommend holding yearly NCPH Intersessional Meetings?

32 responses



Please rate the hotel/venue facilities

32 responses



Which topic(s) did you find most useful?

29 responses

GDPR (4)

I think the dialogue was useful on transparency, for example, because there was some space for overlap and advancing discussions - we had areas of agreement.

Time with the CEO

GDPR conversations

Gdpr/Whois, SSR2,

Session with CEO

GDPR and SSR 2 discussion with CEO and Board members

GDPR, next gen RDS, RPMs

GDPR/WHOIS compliance

conversations with staff

Reconciling WHOIS and GDPR / GDPR Compliance

GDPR, SSR2

WHOIS/GDPR

GDPR, Discussion of WS2 Recommendations

Session with ICANN CEO

Community overview, new gTLDs, GDPR Compliance, informal lunch, ICANN CEO, ICANN Transparency

All GDPR and WHOIS related sessions

Whois/GDPR, and discussion with CEO and our board members

GDPR/WhoIS, Procedural Inhouse issues

NCPH Procedural In-House Issues

The limited discussions about the slow pace of the pdp-wgs - across various topics

Community breakout

((PDP sessions)) and ((Reconciling Whois and GDPR session))

Plenary 1 - The Community Overviews and the meeting with ICANN CEO

Time with ICANN Senior Staff on GDPR

NCHP leadership election procedures, New GTLD SubPro, Privacy Compliance

Which topic(s) did you find least useful?

26 responses

The GDPR sessions, which we had strong disagreements on, were not useful per say... but I guess it's important to include them nonetheless, since these are areas where dialogue can potentially be most important, even if it won't always be fruitful.

Attorney-client privilege section. No new information shared.

Community priorities and introductions

PDP Discussion 1

PDP reviews

Excessive intros and overviews

The community overviews

too much talk about process

Community Overviews

Transparency

none

None

Slot D.

WS2 accountability

recap of Work Stream 2 comments

CEO prep session, Role of Board & SO/ACs in Community driven reviews

PDP Discussion 2: Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs

Bickering to defend positions, rather than exploring mechanisms for working together better - across various topics

Preparation for talking w/ CEO

Role of Board and SO/ACs in Community Driven Reviews

Lunch meeting with Board

GDPR Compliance, as ICANN legal did not attend as planned

None. They were all relevant.

N/A

Capacity Building

Budget

Any topics you would like to have seen that were not offered?

18 responses

None (2)

N/A (2)

A workshop on how we can all work together better.

Introductions

How to collaborate more

none

Account Budget: Input to ways to reduce waste

ICANN reserve fund

IDNs, visit to ICANN Office

More attention to lessons learned, or difficulties encountered in the format of the pdp-wg process as it now operates

I would prefer not to work with CSG anymore, join only when NCPH procedures were important

Insight into how ICANN makes decision. For example, with all the comments on the interim compliance models, who is in the room and involved in the process of making the decision on the final model?

In depth discussion of FY19 Budget

No. It was comprehensive.

I think we should have more time with senior staff as CSG/NCSG separately. I do not think that the intersessional works with both groups. I think the CSG and the NCSG should have separate meetings. We could come together on the limited topics that we need to discuss together like the Board seat or GNSO Council Vice-Chair. But I no longer want to participate in CSG/NCSG group discussion on substantive topics. It is not productive because all the NCSG wants to do is fight.

More discussion about how the two sides of the house can work together on our shared goals more effectively.

Recommendations for future NCPH Intersessional Meetings

23 responses

Every other year. Smaller delegations from each group.

The hotel was very dated and uncomfortable unfortunately. I would suggest selecting a different hotel and venue in the future; though the location of Los Angeles remains very suitable. I think the Intersessional in Iceland worked better as we had a community reception on the evening *before* the Intersessional began.

Deeper dives on current roadblocks on PDPs and long term initiatives

Not sure we need these every year – possibly biennially depending on developments.

Sessions for interacting and discussions between attendees

Not annual, not part of core budget, repeat intersessionals linked explicitly to outcomes and budget-driven

Better to take place in LA with access to key staff.

We don't need the annual intersessional. We might not need intersessional at all. I would like to give my gratitude for the ICANN staff impeccable support, they were great. Pushed us forward although there was a huge wall which was unbreakable. I would like to specifically thank Bendetta Rossi. She has always been great but great support for this event too.

Yes, it helps in closing gap between the CSG and NCSG communities

More innovative and responsive travel desk resulting in savings in travels and stays.

I am of two minds. ICANN staff did a fantastic job and so did some of the community members in preparing the discussions. The venue was good. And this is why it feels like a particular waste of ICANN and community resources: at the end neither the quality of discussion nor the level of engagement were great. The meetings should be restructured, redesigned, re-thought, but there is no real value in holding them in the current form.

do a 1-day session before the Policy Forum

staff to insist in advance that well-prepared (co-) chairs are clearly identified for each session (incl. SG breakout); next meeting closer to Europe

At least one more day, it was too short.

More of a focus on identified problems prior to the session, and less focused in time slots for what frequently looked/felt like PR updates.

I don't see why NCSG and CSG should join to discuss policy when they may have fundamentally opposing views. Meeting could be much more profitable if each SG had their own track to discuss. Also it could be integrated with ICANN meeting (like 1 day previously), this way we could also bring in our newcomers to learn more about current policy themes.

ICANN Board/Exec contact was the most valuable. So, keep it in LA.

Working group discussion with minimum number of Board members (not lunch)

Intersessionals should be held far from ICANN main offices in order for everyone to focus on the purpose of the intersessional and nothing else.

It was my first intersessional meeting and went as I expected it would.

It is not optimal to follow the GNSO Council strategic planning session with the NCPH intersessional, as the Council did not have an opportunity to update the community on its outcomes and thus the discussion was duplicative and conflicting between these two efforts. NCPH Intersessionals are not achieving their intended purpose of identifying commonalities, and rather are simply an environment to deeper entrench longstanding distrust. Annual meetings are not necessary; perhaps less frequent offerings can improve the outcomes and agenda.

hold them in every other year to allow more time for planning

There should be a CSG intersessional and if they want it, and NCSG one. I don't think the meeting structure as is is productive or well spent time. Staff was great. People did their best, but the NCSG sabotages it every time. The really valuable bit is the time with senior staff. That should continue.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google. Report Abuse - Terms of Service - Additional Terms

Google Forms