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INTRODUCTION

What Is an ICANN Public Meeting?

ICANN Public Meetings provide the opportunity for an internationally diverse group of individuals and organizations to come together to discuss and develop policies for the Internet’s naming systems. ICANN’s international meetings have been a staple of ICANN’s multistakeholder, bottom-up, consensus-building model since its formation in 1998.

What Is a Virtual Policy Forum?

Remote participation is an integral part of any ICANN Public Meeting, but it was expanded for ICANN67 and ICANN68. The Policy Forum was transitioned to an entirely virtual format in response to the global outbreak of COVID-19. A cross-functional team from ICANN collaborated with community groups to develop a streamlined schedule that included the sessions necessary to continue the important policy work of the community.

Why Do We Publish Technical Data From ICANN Public Meetings?

Just like any other event, ICANN meetings need to innovate, adapt, and evolve to meet their purpose: to support ICANN’s multistakeholder model. Data from the Public Meetings helps provide reliable information on what attendees want, what ICANN is doing well, and where ICANN has opportunities to improve. By leveraging this data, we can be an organization that is responsive to our community’s needs.

Given that ICANN68 was an entirely virtual meeting, the data in this report is different than in past By the Numbers reports. We will continue to look for opportunities to standardize the information that we collect to ensure that data is consistent. Ultimately, our goal is to continue to improve on our metrics and to provide our community with more valuable data.

If you would like to learn more about ICANN Meetings Technical Services or have questions about this data report, please contact: meetings@icann.org.

Where can I find more information about ICANN Public Meetings?

Each ICANN Public Meeting has a dedicated website that acts as a broad guide to the conference with details on the meeting schedule and answers to frequently asked questions.

To find out how to participate, go to https://meetings.icann.org/en/about.

To learn more about the Fellowship Program, go to http://www.icann.org/en/fellowships.

For a schedule of past and upcoming meetings, go to http://meetings.icann.org/calendar.
ICANN68 had 1,585 unique Zoom participants.

ICANN Public Meetings are a central part of ICANN’s multistakeholder model because the meetings provide a venue for advancing policy work, conducting outreach, exchanging best practices, conducting business deals, and interacting with members of the ICANN community, Board, and staff.

For this meeting, we do not have the same amount of data about attendees that we have had for past meetings. For ICANN68, the attendee profile metrics were derived from Zoom and event registration data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Zoom Participants</th>
<th>Countries or Territories Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Session Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Zoom and registration data includes ICANN Board and ICANN staff members as well as community participants.
# TOP 20 SESSIONS BY ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Title</th>
<th>Unique Attendee Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plenary Session: DNS Abuse and Malicious Registrations During COVID-19</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Plenary Session: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GAC Communique Drafting (1/5)</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GAC Subsequent Rounds Discussions (3/3)</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GAC Discussions on RPM and WS2 Recommendations</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GAC Communique Drafting (2/5)</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GAC Meeting with the ICANN Board</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. GAC ICANN68 Communique Review Point</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. GAC WHOIS and Data Protection Policies Discussions</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. GAC Subsequent Rounds Discussions (2/3)</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. GAC DNS Abuse Mitigation (with PSWG) (2/2)</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. GAC DNS Abuse Mitigation (with PSWG) (1/2)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. At-Large Policy Session: DNS Abuse: Setting an Acceptable Threshold</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. At-Large Policy Session: DNS Abuse: COVID-19 and End-user Issues</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. GNSO - New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and GNSO Council</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. GNSO Council Meeting</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. GAC Subsequent Rounds Discussions (1/3)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. At-Large Policy Session: Aligning UA and IDNs with the Multilingual Internet: End-user perspectives</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Zoom data includes ICANN Board and ICANN staff members as well as community participants.
In 2016, the new ICANN Meetings Strategy was implemented to address the growing number of attendees at meetings, and the growing demand for more sessions. The ICANN56 Policy Forum in Helsinki, Finland was the first “policy only” focused meeting to be conducted under this new strategy. Below are the Policy Forum participation numbers since 2016, and how the Virtual Policy attendance compared to in-person attendance.

### Regional Breakdown:

- **Africa**: 11%
- **Asia Pacific**: 32%
- **Europe**: 21%
- **North America**: 26%

### Policy Forum Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Participants (In-Person)</th>
<th>Participants (Virtual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Policy Forum</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>1,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>ICANN59 Johannesburg Policy Forum</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>ICANN62 Panama City Policy Forum</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>ICANN65 Marrakech Policy Forum</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule Website/Mobile App

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logged in Participants</td>
<td>1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87% of total registrations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pageviews</td>
<td>207,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Visit Duration</td>
<td>5m, 43s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>10,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data includes ICANN Board and ICANN staff members as well as community participants.
Interpretation Facts:

- 34 Interpreters
- Working remotely from 6 countries

Interpretation Tool Stats:

**Overall Use of Interpretation**
- Users: 17%
- Non-Users: 83%

Based on 318 average daily users.

**Interpretation Platform Device Usage**
- App Usage: 41%
- Web Usage: 59%

Based on daily average users by device.

**PLENARY Use of Interpretation**
- Users: 10%
- Non-Users: 90%

Based on average session usage.

**GAC Use of Interpretation**
- Users: 15%
- Non-Users: 85%

Based on 149 average daily users.

**ALAC Use of Interpretation**
- Users: 23%
- Non-Users: 77%

Based on 76 average daily users.

This data includes ICANN Board and ICANN staff members as well as community participants.
ICANN68 was ICANN’s first all-virtual Policy Forum. 1,585 Zoom participants attended some portion of at least one virtual session, 52 sessions were held in total. Because this was our second virtual meeting, it is important to gather feedback from participants to learn what worked and what can be improved for future virtual meetings.

**Survey Format**

From 22-25 June 2020, we conducted one post-ICANN68 survey. The survey focused on 14 qualitative and quantitative questions about the virtual meeting experience, participants’ ability to engage during the sessions, and the communications around the meeting.

**Survey Participation**

The results of this survey provide directional data and useful feedback on how participants felt about the overall virtual meeting experience. A total of 160 ICANN68 Zoom participants completed the survey, which is a 10% response rate. There is a 98% confidence level with the quantitative data, with a 5.5% margin of error.

**Survey Results At A Glance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>160 survey respondents out of 1,585 unique Zoom participants completed the survey, 10% response rate.</th>
<th>57% rated their virtual meeting experience as very good or good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74% rated the meeting communications as very good or good</td>
<td>64% rated the interpretation resources as very good or good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW WOULD YOU RATE:

Your virtual meeting experience?

- Good: 35%
- Very Good: 22%
- Average: 28%
- Poor: 7%
- Very Poor: 6%
- No Response: 3%

Your ability to interact during the virtual sessions?

- Poor: 22%
- Average: 29%
- Good: 29%
- Very Good: 15%
- No Response: 2%

The communications around the virtual format, meeting schedule, and participation guidelines?

- Very Poor: 6%
- Poor: 3%
- Average: 18%
- Good: 38%
- Very Good: 36%
- No Response: 3%
**How Many Sessions Were You Able to Participate in Per Day?**

- No Response: 10%
- One Session: 19%
- Two Sessions: 16%
- Three Sessions: 24%
- Four Sessions: 11%
- More Than Four Sessions: 20%
- No Response: 10%

**What Region Did You Participate From?**

- North America: 25%
- Latin America/Caribbean: 14%
- Asia Pacific: 24%
- Europe: 19%
- Africa: 9%
- No Response: 9%

**How Did the Time Zone Impact Your Ability to Participate?**

- Very Negative: 23%
- Negative: 33%
- No Impact: 11%
- Positive: 13%
- Very Positive: 17%
- No Response: 3%
- Very Poor: 2%
- Poor: 4%
- No Response: 3%

**How Would You Rate the Interpretation Resources Available During ICANN68?**

- Poor: 2%
- Average: 27%
- Good: 38%
- Very Good: 26%
- Very Poor: 2%
QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK FROM THE SURVEY

Top Ten Themes.

1. Zoom worked consistently.
2. Agenda was redundant.
3. Webinar format made interaction difficult.
4. Less presenting, more time for questions.
5. Offer virtual networking sessions with Board members.
6. The meeting was well setup.
7. Schedule and time zone made it difficult to attend meetings.
8. Allowing anonymous questions undermines transparency.
9. Want to be able to view participant list, it creates more of a community environment.
10. Interpretation resources were helpful.

* Survey responses have not been edited for spelling or other grammatical errors.