



The Intellectual Property Constituency (“IPC”) strongly encourages ICANN to restructure its Meetings so they are more manageable and meaningful for community participation, without reducing transparency or accountability. We are pleased to provide the following comments on the Meeting Strategy Working Group recommendations.

- IPC supports the recognition in the Meeting A recommendation that the actual duration of ICANN meetings is longer than 5 days, especially when travel time is taken into account.
- Within a geographic region, the ability of a location to support the meeting space and hotel room requirements should take priority over any interest in “rotating through geographic locations previously unavailable to the ICANN meetings.” It is clear that attendance at ICANN meetings will only increase in the coming years. It should *never* be the case that a potentially interested attendee is turned away because ICANN put priority on “new locations” over meeting space and hotel requirements, and the meeting space is too small with not enough hotel rooms. ICANN should use the increased attendance to its advantage in negotiating meeting space and hotel requirements as well as costs for itself and attendees.
- ICANN should jettison the recently used structure of the public forum, under which a general agenda is made available only 24 hours in advance and the specific topics are determined based on input provided in a 15-minute window at the beginning of the public forum. It is a failure. Attendees and remote participants cannot adequately plan for their attendance at or participation in the public forum without an advance agenda. Limiting topics to those put forward by those who are able to “rush the microphone” is inadequate and does not reflect well on ICANN.
- Reports from SO/AC chairs should not be provided during the public forum; those reports should be provided in advance of the ICANN Meeting.
- With the exception of the public forum comments above, the IPC supports the proposed structure of Meeting A, which is similar to the current meeting structure.
- The Meeting B concept of focusing on SO/AC policy development and cross community interaction and outreach is certainly worth considering. However, IPC does not support a meeting structure in which there is no public forum or public Board meeting, particularly if this implies that the Board and its members would not be available to meet with the SOs and ACs.
- IPC opposes the recommendation that Meeting C be 8 days long. If travel time is taken into account, the total time is likely to be 10-12 days for most attendees. It is simply not realistic to expect persons and entities for whom ICANN is not their primary business or interest to allocate that much time for the meeting. Even remote participants will be adversely impacted. Moreover, the current length of the ICANN Meetings is a significant obstacle to

attracting new participants. If adopted, this recommendation will ultimately decrease the number of persons who can actively participate in and attend ICANN meetings, which will frustrate the stated objective of “showcasing ICANN’s work to a broader global audience.” If outreach is a meaningful goal for ICANN, it can best be accomplished by shortening, not lengthening, the ICANN Meetings.

- IPC supports the BC’s proposals that ICANN (a) seek to hold the meetings in less expensive locations; and (b) identify the meeting locations farther in advance. Both proposals will enable more potential attendees to attend the meetings. It is especially important that ICANN publish future meeting locations at least 18 months in advance, which will allow potential attendees sufficient time to prepare and submit the internal budget requests necessary to obtain travel support resources.
- IPC supports the MSWG recommendations for technical support for remote participants. IPC requests that ICANN post the scribe feed as soon as possible after a meeting session has ended because the formal transcription is often delayed.
- IPC also supports the MSWG recommendations regarding visas and all of the recommendations relating to meeting planning.
- IPC proposes that ICANN eliminate the exhibit hall at one or two of the Meetings. The exhibit hall is more appropriate for a trade association for the domain name industry than for ICANN.
- IPC requests that ICANN undertake to avoid holding meetings in geographic locations that pose undue health and/or safety risks to attendees.