Programme Working Group Telephone Conference
21 August 2012

Attendees:

Carolina Aguerre, LACTLD
Luis Diego Espinoza, .cr
Ondrej Filip, .cz
Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Katrina Sataki, .lv
Barrack Otieno, AfTLD
Patricio Poblete, .cl
Peter Van Roste, CENTR

Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Gabriella Schittek

Apologies:

Hiro Hotta, .jp

1) Overview of Action Points

Following Actions were discussed:

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.

No Working Group Member had time to interview people in the breaks; the Working Group is to revisit the proposal and consider whether it's feasible to pursue it.

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

This Action was completed – see results under 2.1

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.

It was noted that not many people had used Facebook during the meeting, however, it was felt that it would be worth to keep trying it for the next 2-3 meetings. It was also agreed that the participants should be reminded about the Facebook page at the beginning of the meeting.

Furthermore, the Programme Working Group members thought it would be useful to start a Twitter account, which should be linked to the Facebook page.

The participants should also be reminded to follow the Twitter account at the beginning of the meetings.

[New] **ACTION 27:** *Katrina Sataki and Gabriella Schittek* to look into starting a Twitter account in time for the Toronto meeting.

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

This Action had not been completed, as the ccNSO Chair did not think it was appropriate to post such a question.

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

This Action had not been completed, as the ccNSO Chair did not think it was an appropriate motivating factor.

Action 18: ACTION 18: *Peter Van Roste* and *Carolina Aguerre* to develop a template for Regional Organisation presentations.

The templates were drafted and the impression was that the room had reacted positively. However, the Regional Organisation managers were somewhat disappointed that they had not scored better in the meetings survey.

2) Prague Meeting Survey Results

2.1) Survey Results, lesson learned

- It was noted that the Prague meeting scored about as good as the San José meeting.

- The most popular session was the ccTLD News Session. The Programme Working Group was pleased that a good format had been found for this session and agreed to continue in the same fashion.

- It was noted that much of the feedback was contradicting: Many had, for instance, indicated that the IDN Session was useful, whilst many others indicated it was the least useful session.

- It was also noted that between 60-70% of the respondents had indicated that they had left the meeting for other sessions.

- A notably large amount of respondents indicated that the meeting room was not suitable for a ccNSO meeting.

   The Working Group members agreed that it would be worth to work tightly with the meeting hosts, to explain the needs of a decent room.

Furthermore, the Chair and vice Chairs should get involved in putting some pressure on ICANN's Meetings Team prior to the meetings in order to ensure that the quality of rooms increases.

ACTION 28: *The Programme Working Group Chair and the ccNSO Secretariat* to liaise with the hosts and the ccNSO Chairs prior to each meeting on contacting the Meetings Team regarding the quality of the ccNSO meeting rooms.

- The .cz registry had counted the participants in the room at each session.

  The morning and post-lunch sessions had least participants, whilst the sessions before lunch had most participants. It was noted that the distribution of lunch tickets probably had an influence on the popularity of the pre-lunch sessions.

  It was suggested to schedule popular sessions, such as the ccTLD News session to the post-lunch sessions to encourage participation.

  The group agreed to continue with counting the number of participants at each session. However, as no one volunteered to do the counting, it was suggested to ask the host for help.

  ACTION 29: *Gabriella Schittek* to ask Byron Holland, on behalf of the Programme Working Group, for assistance from CIRA staff to count people in the room at each session.

2.2) Survey improvement

- It was suggested to add a question on the job profile of the respondents to the survey.

  ACTION 30: *Gabriella Schittek* to add a question on the job profile of the respondents to the ccNSO meetings survey.

  ACTION 31: *Gabriella Schittek* to post the question on the job profile to the Programme Working Group email list, in order to receive feedback on whether it is providing relevant options.

2.3) Motivation of Survey Participants

- The number of respondents of the Prague Meeting Survey was much larger than the average response rate (Meeting Day 1: 38; Meeting Day 2: 28). It was noted that the distribution of gadgets had contributed to the result and that it was good to pursue this mechanism.

  ACTION 32: *The Chair* to ask Byron Holland to contribute with gadgets for Meeting Survey Respondents.

3) Toronto Meeting Draft Agenda

- The group was informed that the GAC is looking into moving the joint ccNSO/GAC session to Tuesday morning. This would not be suitable for the ccNSO, due to the meeting with the ICANN Board. The GAC had been informed and the ccNSO Chair is to send an email to Heather Dryden, asking to push the meeting to Tuesday afternoon instead.

  In the meantime, the actual agenda of the ccNSO meeting can't be confirmed.

4) Topics for Toronto meeting

- It was agreed to devote the Panel Discussion to Registry Principles. Keith Davidson had drafted a suggestion as to what the panel discussion could look like – the email will be forwarded to the Programme Working Group email list.

  ACTION 33: *Gabriella Schittek* to forward Keith Davidson's suggestion for a Panel Discussion to the Programme Working Group email list.

- It was also agreed to arrange a session on the marketing of getting DNSSEC zones signed. The session should be a follow-up on the session held on the same topic at the San Francisco meeting. The same presenters were to be invited to hear what had happened to their initiatives since then. A registrar could possibly also be invited.

- Other topics that were suggested to be discussed at any extra slots were IGF and WCIT; WHOIS, DSSA Issues session.

  ACTON 34: *Gabriella Schittek* to redraft the agenda, based on the feedback received from the Programme Working Group call.

5) AOB

- The Group was informed that a proposal will be sent to the ccNSO Council to replace the current ccNSO Members Dinners with ccTLD Community Cocktails instead. If the Council agrees, the last ccNSO Members Dinner would be held at the Toronto meeting.

  The main reason behind this proposal is that with the increasing number of members, the dinners have become harder to manage, whilst frustration in the community grows when someone is left without a dinner ticket. The costs of the dinners have also become much higher and it is hard to find sponsors. A ccTLD Cocktail would invite all ccTLDs and a dinner list would not have to be maintained.

6) Date of Next Call

> **ACTION 35:** *Gabriella Schittek* to send out a doodle poll to schedule a Programme Working Group meeting in two weeks.