Notes Programme Working Group Telephone Conference

2 September 2011

Attendees:

Luis Diego Espinoza, .cr
Ondrej Filip, .cz (Chair)
Juhani Juselius, .fi
Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Kathryn Reynolds, .ca
Patricio Poblete, .cl

Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Gabriella Schittek

Apologies:

Hiro Hotta, .jp
Vika Mpisane, .za

- The Meeting Evaluation Survey results were analysed. It was noted that the ccTLD News Session is very popular as well as the joint session with the GAC; however, several respondents indicated that they wish to have a bilateral discussion with the GAC rather than a one-way communication, as it was done in Singapore.

  Many respondents indicated that they valued the session with the ICANN board fully present, but that they would prefer board members to shut their laptops during the discussions.

  The New gTLDs Panel Discussion was also appreciated and it was also suggested to continue with the same topic in Dakar.

  Several respondents noted that there was too little time for thorough discussions and called for less presentations and more time for discussions.

  It was suggested to send out a reminder about the survey a few days after the meeting ends in order to get more respondents.

- The group was informed that the ICANN Board session might change format, however, it is not yet clear in which way. Staff is working on continuing bringing the entire board to the meeting, noting that this format had been appreciated in the Meeting Evaluation Survey.

  It was also noted that “focus topics” should be developed for discussions with the boarding order to keep the session as structured as possible.

- The Geographic Regions session was discussed, as the Geographic Regions Working Group is expected to submit a controversial proposal on how the regions shall be divided. It was discussed whether the session might need to be extended.

  It was decided that Bart will ask David Archbold and Rob Hoggarth, the main parties involved in the Working Group, on whether they only plan to present the proposal, or if they expect a discussion on the topic.

  Action 1: *Bart Boswinkel* to contact David Archbold and Rob Hoggarth to ask about the structure of the Geographic Regions Session.

- It was also noted that the IDN PDP WG 2 might need some extra time. The extra time might be taken from the Affirmation of Commitments slot – however, Gabi is to check how much time the SSR, ATRT and WHOIS Group might need.

  Action 2: *Gabriella Schittek* to check how much the SSR, ATRT and WHOIS teams might need for presentations.

- As the topic of the last panel discussion was popular, it was suggested to fill the last slot with a session on New gTLDs. The Working Group members agreed.

  It was suggested to have a Focus Area, which the presentations would concentrate on. Suggestions from the Working Group members were to look at New gTLDs from a competition point of view, and what kind of names that are currently being looked at.

  It was decided to send out an email to the Programme Working Group email list to encourage further ideas to be submitted on this topic.

- ***Action 3:*** *Gabriella Schittek* to send an email to the Programme Working Group, asking for further input on focus areas for the New gTLD session.

- It was discussed how to make the ccTLD News Session presentations more interesting, as it was noted that some are too long and unfocused. One suggestion was to introduce themes, such as Stability & Security or Government Structures.

  An email is to be sent to the Programme WG email list to ask for further suggestions.

  Action 4: *Gabriella Schittek* to send an email to the Programme Working Group for further theme suggestions for the ccTLD News Session.

  It was furthermore discussed whether presentations can be pre-viewed and formatted, but it was felt that this would not be appropriate or possible to execute.

  However, more focus should be put on emphasizing that interesting and newsworthy presentations are sought.

- It was suggested to have a panel discussion on Data Protection/WHOIS. The group agreed that this would be a good topic. An email will be sent to the group, asking for input on speakers. The ccNSO Council will be asked to provide input as well.

  Action 5: *Gabriella Schittek* to email the Programme Working Group, asking for input to structure the Data Protection/WHOIS session.

- Gabi explained to the group that she had done an informal survey on how many people are using the pre-presentation summaries. She had noted that whilst collecting the summaries is quite time consuming, the impression was that not many people were actually using the summaries. The informal survey seemed to confirm this feeling. The Working Group was therefore asked whether they thought the summaries should continue, or if they should be ended.

  It was suggested to continue with them for the Dakar meeting, but to add a question on the summaries at the Meeting Evaluation Form to find out more on how people are using the summaries.

  Action 6: *Gabriella Schittek* to add a question on the pre-presentation summaries to the Meeting Evaluation Survey.