Notes Programme Working Group Telephone Conference
4 April 2012

Attendees

Luis Diego Espinoza, .cr
Ondrej Filip, .cz (Chair)
Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Vika Mpisane, .za
Patricio Poblete, .cl
Katrina Sataki, .lv
Peter Van Roste, CENTR

Support Staff

Bart Boswinkel
Gabriella Schittek

1) Welcome of New Members

- The Chair welcomed Katrina Sataki, .lv as a new member of the Working Group. Peter Van Roste was welcomed back to the working group, after a longer break.

2) Survey

2.1 Survey Results, Lessons Learned

- It was noted that some of the responses were clearly "nonsense-responses", as they had rated a meeting, which did not take place. However, it was also felt that there was not much to do about these kinds of responses.

- It was agreed that a question on the facilities should be added to the survey to see whether that had an impact on how people rated the meetings overall.

  ACTION 1: *Gabriella Schittek* to add a question on the meeting room facilities to the Meetings Survey.

- Some discussions were held on how much the ccNSO could influence the meeting rooms. It was pointed out that the ccNSO unfortunately only has little influence, as the group is one of the largest ICANN communities that meets at one time. However, some feedback could be conveyed to the meetings team.

- It was discussed how to improve the quality of the speakers. Various options were considered and in the end it was agreed that it would be useful to write some "Guidelines" on what the potential presenters should think of when giving a presentation.

  ACTION 2: *Gabriella Schittek* to draft speaker guidelines, with the assistance of *Katrina Sataki*.

2.2 Survey Improvements

- Some Working Group members felt that it would be useful to get a feeling of how many people were sitting in the room, as it was felt this would indicate how interested people are in the various topics.

    It was pointed out that although people were interested in the session, they would sometimes have to attend parallel meetings. Furthermore, it was raised that meeting day 2 always has many less people than meeting day 1, but generally scores better in the survey.

    To get some clarity on this, following actions were suggested:

    ACTION 3: *The Working Group Members* to informally "interview" people from their respective region, which had left the meeting room, on the reasons for why they left.

    ACTION 4: *Gabriella Schittek* to add another question to the meetings survey on whether the respondent attended other meetings in parallel to the ccNSO meeting.

    The Chair volunteered .cz staff to count the number of participants at each ccNSO session. This would be done on a trial basis, to see how useful the information gained would be.

    ACTION 5: .cz staff to count the number of participants at each ccNSO during the ccNSO meeting in Prague.

- A suggestion in the meetings survey was to survey what people thought of each speaker, as a way to improve the quality of the speakers. However, the general feeling was that this could not only scare away potential speakers, but would also cause a lot of more questions in the survey – which would attract fewer respondents.

- It was suggested to try to introduce an "instant feedback" mechanism after each session.

    ACTION 6: *Gabriella Schittek*, with the help of *Katrina Sataki,* to look into what instant feedback tools or possibilities there are and which of them could be used for the ccNSO meeting.

2.3 Motivation of Survey Participants

- The possibility to give a kind of "gift" to those who participated in the meetings survey was discussed.

    It was clarified that the ccNSO does not have a budget for such gifts, but if sponsors could be found, there could be ways to arrange this. However, those who would want to receive the gift would have to state their names in the meetings survey.

ACTION 7: *Gabriella Schittek* to add a "Name" field in the meeting survey. The field shall not be obligatory to be filled in.

Some logistical issues were envisaged, as the surveys were typically filled in after the end of the meeting, but these issues could be overcome.

Ondrej agreed, on behalf of .cz, to look into sponsoring such gifts at the Prague meeting.

ACTION 8: *Ondrej Filip* to explore the possibilities of .cz sponsoring gifts for those who filled in the meeting survey at the Prague meeting.

It was also suggested that those who fill in the survey would have a ccNSO dinner ticket granted for the *upcoming* meeting.

It was agreed to try this option at the Prague meeting.

ACTION 9: *Gabriella Schittek* to reserve Toronto ccNSO dinner tickets for those who filled in the meeting survey in Prague.

3) Topics for the Prague Meeting

- An IDN session is to be held, as community members had shown interest in this already prior to the Costa Rica meeting, but due to time constraint the session had to be deferred to the Prague meeting.

- The topic of the Panel Discussion was discussed.

  As the names of the new gTLDs would be published at the end of April, it was felt that the issues would still be of major interest for the community, however, it would be important not to repeat what had already been discussed at previous meetings.

  ACTION 10: *Vika Mpisane* to draft a paper on what topics a possible New gTLD Panel Discussion could cover.

- However, it was pointed out that the community also had signalised that there is an interest to have a panel discussion on Internet Legislative issues and it was considered whether it would be an option to instead use the panel discussion for this item instead. The new gTLD issues could possibly be discussed during a standard session instead.

  It was agreed to see how much time there would be left on the agenda for such a session.

  ACTION 11: *Bart Boswinkel* to send out a list of topics that need to be dealt with at the Prague meeting, *Gabriella Schittek* to draft a first agenda based on this.

4) AOB

- The issue of whether to keep the Presentation Summaries was raised, but it was decided to discuss it more extensively at the next Programme Working Group call.

- It was also decided to look into some of Katrina Sataki's suggestions during the following call (as they were only posted prior to start of the telephone conference)

5) Date of Next Call

ACTION 12: *Gabriella Schittek* to send out a Doodle poll for a meeting in the week 18 – 25 April 2012.