SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC INPUT RE: Revised Process for Selection of Sites for ICANN International Public Meetings

 (21 June – 20 July 2010)

A public comment process, related to ICANN International Public meetings site selection was recently closed. Two comments were received, reviewed and acted upon if required by the Meetings team. These comments can be viewed below.

Source references:

http://forum.icann.org/lists/ssp-feedback/

Comments:

1. Alan Greenberg

I strongly support this revised process. The description is silent on what meetings will covered in the 21 July 2010 announcement. I would hope that the announcement and the internal ICANN site identification process will be looking several years out as is the norm for meetings of this type.

2.   George Kirikos, Leap of Faith Financial Services Inc.

As per our prior statement at: http://forum.icann.org/lists/economic-framework/msg00000.html

We have carefully considered whether it is beneficial for us to disclose our analysis and comments to ICANN. It has become abundantly clear that ICANN does not value public input, and we will passively resist by not participating in a process that only leads to predetermined outcomes. "Participation" is not sufficient if it does not impact results.

We may or may not support aspects of the current topic or proposal (although from past comments in the archives of all ICANN comment periods, it should be clear we oppose bad ideas, and ICANN has mostly produced bad ideas throughout its history).

For those organizations that do value our input, we will be happy to provide you with the benefit of our insights and experience. Perhaps ICANN will one day become such an organization. Until then, this is the template for our comments, and we respectfully request that ICANN notify the community when it is ready and willing to demonstrate that it properly values public comments.

We encourage other organizations, who normally don't comment as they feel it will make no difference, to submit a brief note to that effect, as a sign of dissent. For those reading this who have power to compel ICANN to change (NTIA, DOC, DOJ, GAC, etc.), we encourage you to actually use that power, as the "threat" alone has been insufficient to get to the proper outcomes that we all seek.