

Title:	ICANN Consolidated Meetings Strategy Proposal		
Publication Date:	13 December 12		
Prepared By:	Nick Tomasso		
Comment Period:		Important Information Links	
Open Date:	2 October 2012	Announcement	
Close Date:	16 November 2012	Public Comment Box	
Time (UTC):	23:59	View Comments Submitted	
Staff Contact:	Nick Tomasso	Email:	nick.tomasso@icann.org
Section I: General Overview and Next Steps			
Comments received on the ICANN Consolidated Meetings Strategy Proposal Final Report will be factored into subsequent Board consideration and action.			
Section II: Contributors			
<p><i>At the time this report was prepared, a total of [number] (16) community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.</i></p>			
Organizations and Groups:			
Name	Submitted by	Initials	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ICANN At-Large Staff	ALAC	
Latin American and Caribbean ccTLDs (LACTLD)	Carolina Aguerre	LACTLD	
Business Constituency	Steve DelBianco	BC	
Latin America/Caribbean At-Large Organization (LACRALO)	Fatima Cambroner	LACRALO	
Latin American and Caribbean Internet Addresses Registry (LACNIC)	Andres Piazza	LACNIC	
ARI Registry Services	Donna Austin	ARI	
Top Level Domain Holdings / Minds + Machines	Antony Van Covering	TLD / MM	
GoDaddy.com	Jill Titzer	GD	
Individuals:			
Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials	
Yoav Keren	GNSO council member & CEO of Domain The Net Technologies Ltd.	YK	
S. Subbiah		SS	
Olga Cavalli	Argentina GAC representative	OC	
Joan Manuel Rojas	AGEIC DENSI Colombia	JMR	
Fahd A. Batayneh		FAB	
Michelle Chaplow	Travel & Luxury Hotel Photographer	MC	
Kieren McCarthy		KM	
Rubens Kuhl		RK	

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

1. **The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)** is not in support of the proposed meeting strategy. The ALAC states that ICANN's main objective should be to provide global access to its meetings for the Internet community, and continue to hold meetings in all five regions as equally as possible. The ALAC suggests a new strategy should focus on three main areas:
 - a. Easy visa procurement for citizens of all countries.
 - b. Quality of the venue, including accessibility, proximity to hotels, and security.
 - c. Reasonable costs for all attendees.
2. **LACTLD** does not support the proposed meeting strategy. LACTLD believes ICANN should continue to use the current model and rotation to include developing regions. LACTLD supports repeating cities in regions where there are limited venues suitable to hold an ICANN meeting.
3. **The Business Constituency (BC)** favors a continuous meetings evaluation process. The BC suggests ICANN staff produce an evaluation matrix for proposed future locations, identifying key selection factors, and post for public comment. The BC believes a new strategy should focus on:
 - a. Easy visa procurement for citizens of all countries.
 - b. Securing significant discounts on hotel rates for all attendees.
 - c. Superior Internet infrastructure and a standard practice of rewarding hosts who demonstrate a high level of commitment to the network.
4. **Latin American and Caribbean Internet Addresses Registry (LACNIC)** does not support the proposed meeting strategy. LACNIC believes in the current model and regional rotation, which engages the community and fosters closer relations with governmental figures. LACNIC also strongly suggests that ICANN develop new mechanisms for increasing global engagement from the community before it considers a new strategy. Alternatively, LACNIC suggests ICANN reexamine the meeting structure and agendas to attract more interest from potential hosts, and ease the overall process of organizing these events.
5. **LACRALO** does not support the proposed strategy and points out the following concerns:
 - a. Timing – The Geographic Regions Framework is currently in an open review process, which could result in significant modifications to ICANN's regions.
 - b. Inequitable Rotation – The new strategy would reduce the number of meetings held in LAC to once every three years.
 - i. This is a long cycle considering the mandate of leadership in the region is limited to one or two years.
 - ii. This would hinder participation from LAC community members unable to finance travel outside of the region.
 - iii. Negative impact on the fellowship program.
 - c. LAC Travel Benefits – Most countries in the LAC region do not require a visa for travellers, which would benefit ICANN attendees.

6. **ARI Registry Services** agrees with the proposal, and believes the new strategy will allow for more accurate planning (including budgets) for participants and ICANN.
Additional considerations:
- Increased participation at future meetings from Europe and Asia due to new gTLDs.
 - Possibility of holding smaller, regionally-focused meetings in other regions during 2014-16, and in the longer term, the rotation could be changed from 2017 to 2020 based on the participation during that period.
 - Would like to see an increase in informative conversations and informal interaction with all groups, which take place outside of the typical breaks and meeting rooms.
7. **Antony Van Couvering, Top Level Domain Holdings / Mind + Machines**, does not agree with the proposal and suggests maintaining the current model, as it exposes attendees to new places and cultures, while furthering ICANN's mission to internationalize.
The following webpage provides a list of some venues capable of handling ICANN meetings:
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_convention_and_exhibition_centers.
8. **GoDaddy.com** states that all regions should be represented equally and suggests the following meeting model:
North America, Europe, APAC would rotate each year, while AF and LAC will rotate as a pair, every other year. An example would be:
- 2014: EU, AP, and LAC or AF
 - 2015: NA, AP, and LAC or AF
 - 2016: EU, NA, and LAC or AF
 - 2017 and beyond: (Repeat the cycle)
- GoDaddy.com also makes the following recommendations:
- ICANN should make it a requirement that potential meeting locations be serviced by at least two airline alliances to ensure accessibility.
 - Reliable Internet access and mobile coverage for all attendees at meetings.
 - Reliable ground transportation, including airport shuttles at meetings.
9. **Yoav Keren, GNSO council member & CEO, Domain The Net Technologies Ltd.**, does not support the proposal.
- While he is sensitive to the logistical challenges, he believes there are many cities in the world with sufficient facilities to host an ICANN meeting, and supports the current model and regional rotation.
10. **S. Subbiah** does not support the proposal.
- This proposal would further the still disproportionate influence in ICANN governance between developed and developing countries.
 - There are many other ways to improve meetings.
11. **Olga Cavalli, Argentina GAC representative**, is concerned that this proposal will mean that an ICANN meeting will not be in the LAC region until 2016, which is even longer than the current ICANN meeting rotation. Olga emphasizes that having even fewer meetings in LAC contradicts the effort to internationalize and will further increase the existing gap in engagement and participation between regions. Olga suggests that meetings should be held at the same venues and cities in regions where viable meeting facilities are limited.

12. **Juan Manuel Rojas, AGEIA DENSI, Colombia** agrees in an equitable permanent rotation for all regions. However, instead of the proposed strategy, the following is suggested:

- First meeting of the year in two Asia-Pacific cities.
- Second in a North American city and another one in a European city.
- Third rotated between African cities (2014) and Latin American cities (2015).

13. **Fahd A. Batayneh** believes equal regional rotation is not necessary right now because some regions of the world currently do not have strong competition or relevant resources to host ICANN meetings. In addition, weather-related issues could also be a factor. Europe and Asia-Pacific are good meeting locations because of the accessible air transportation and easy visa processing. Perhaps all meeting proposals should be evaluated and the strong ones could be further considered in case obstacles arise.

14. **Michelle Chaplow** states that the various ICANN meeting locations allow people to learn about other countries.

Concerns:

- a. Repeating venues could put ICANN participants at risk for inflation by hotels and local businesses. The case study given was the World Mobile Conference (www.mobileworldcongress.com).

15. **Kieren McCarthy** is in support of the proposal.

Additional Comments:

- a. North America should be chosen as one of the main hubs since over 50% of attendees, and the majority of ICANN staff, are based in the US. Not choosing the U.S. as one of the main hubs will make it less convenient, and more costly for these participants.
- b. Surveying the community for suggestions on how to improve meetings could result in cost savings.

16. **Rubens Kuhl** believes that travel logistics and effort by all participants is just as important as equal regional rotation. Rubens believes holding more meetings in North America and Europe will promote more participation by those from LAC and Africa because NA and Europe are actually cheaper for them to visit.

The following meeting strategy is suggested:

- Hold the first meeting of the year in two cities in North America, one near the Atlantic Ocean and the other near the Pacific Ocean.
- Hold the second meeting of the year in two cities in Europe.
- Rotate the third meeting of the year though Asia-Pacific (2014), Latin America/Caribbean (2015) and Africa (2016).
(These years chosen to avoid FIFA World Cup and Summer Olympics in LAC.)

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

Out of sixteen (16) submitted comments from organizations and individuals, about sixty (60) percent do not agree with the ICANN Consolidated Meetings Proposal. While the logistical challenges facing the Meetings Team are understood and appreciated, many view the proposed changes to be an inequitable rotation of meetings, which is perceived to be directly counter-productive to ICANN's recent declaration to further internationalize the organization.

While all suggestions and issues are heard and considered, the following recurring themes have emerged. In the cases where there are not many venues in a particular region that can meet ICANN's meeting requirements, some groups have expressed that repeating the same venue in a particular region would be acceptable. Also, it has been suggested that assessing how much effort is required by individuals from other regions is highly important and basing the decision to hold a meeting in a country that has minimal VISA requirements should be on the top of the list of priorities in the selection process.

Perhaps the most immediate alternative to the proposal is an evaluation of the current schedule/format. Adjustments to or the removal of similar meetings in an effort to pare down to a more manageable size could increase the likelihood of attracting potential hosts and the chance of securing viable venues while providing an effective meeting platform for the ICANN community.