Meetings Programme Working Group Telephone Conference
27 August 2014

Attendees:

Carolina Aguerre, LACTLD
Ondrej Filip, .cz
Eberhard Lisse, .na (observer)
Allan MacGillivray, .ca
Patricio Poblete, .cl
Alejandra Reynoso, .gt
Katrina Sataki, .lv (Chair)
Peter Van Roste, CENTR

Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Gabriella Schittek

Apologies:

Don Hollander, APTLD
Hiro Hotta, .jp

- The group was informed that Juhani Juselius decided to cease his membership in the group. The group was asked whether a new call for volunteers should be made, however, the general feeling was that there was no urgent need for such at the moment.

  It was suggested to add a question in the meeting questionnaire whether the survey respondent would be interested in joining the Working Group.

  ACTION1: *Gabriella Schittek* to add a question in the meetings survey whether the respondent would be interested in joining the Programme Working Group.

- It was discussed whether the Secretariat should share all incoming requests for presentations immediately with the Programme Working Group, or if it should continue to be summarised the way it is done today.

  It was agreed that the requests for input should continue being presented in the same fashion as today, however, the Secretariat should try to present the draft agenda and a summary of submitted presentations in a more timely manner – at least a couple of days before the teleconference call.

- The Chair ran through the main points of feedback to the London meeting survey:

  Request for more time for discussions. The group felt that it is hard to judge

which sessions will require more time than provided. It was noted that several sessions hardly received any feedback from the floor, whilst other discussions had to be cut short. This seems to be closely aligned with how good the quality of the presentation is, however, that is not always possible to foresee.

It was decided to try to measure which sessions and subjects trigger most interest during the Los Angeles meeting.

ACTION 2: *All* to note which sessions will trigger most/least interest from the public in Los Angeles.

Headphones, two screens: As the sound can improve when using headphones, it was felt it would be worth looking into the possibility to ask just for headphones during a meeting.

Alternatively, people could be encouraged using their own headphones and connect to the adobe room.

It was understood that there was no way to influence whether one or two screens are provided in the room.

ACTION 3: *Kristina Nordström* to check with ICANN's meeting team on the possibility of using headphones during ICANN meetings.

Name cards for Councillors: This will be done.

ACTION 4: *Gabriella Schittek* to ensure that name cards for Councillors will be produced in time for the Los Angeles meeting.

ACTION 5: *Gabriella Schittek* to produce a first draft on the "Feedback on Feedback" paper.

- The Chair ran through the draft Los Angeles meeting agenda. It was noted that the Framework of Interpretation (FoI) Working Group will need more time to present their final report, preferably also using the slot before the meeting with the Board and the GAC. The meeting might have to start at 8.30.

  It was decided to ask the FoI Working Group Chair, Keith Davidson for clarification on how much time will be needed.

  ACTION 6: *Bart Boswinkel* to ask Keith Davidson for clarification on how much time is needed for the presentation of the FoI final report.

  The Chair informed the group that Samantha Dickinson had agreed to give an overview of all relevant Internet Governance initiatives and would therefore be given a timeslot at Internet Governance Session 1.

  It was furthermore suggested to turn the same session into a pure briefing session on what processes there are and how to get involved and also ask the ICG Working Group members to inform the meeting on its work.

ACTION 7: *The Working Group Chair* to ask Samantha Dickinson for confirmation to update the ccNSO Meeting on the various Internet Governance initiatives.

ACTION 8: *Gabriella Schittek* to ask the ICG Working Group members to brief the meeting on their work.

It was also suggested to use the Wednesday afternoon session for discussions on the community involvement in the IANA Oversight Transition and ICANN Accountability. Eberhard Lisse, .na volunteered to participate in this session.

The Working Groups members were encouraged to come up with further name suggestions of possible speakers.

- It was noted that besides the .il contribution, two more presentations were needed for the Security Session on Tuesday.

  One suggestion was to ask a representative for the recently published Oxford Study on Best Security Practices to present their document.

  ACTION 9: *The Chair* to approach the relevant person from the Oxford Study during the Istanbul IGF meeting to ask for a presentation during the security session.

  ACTION 10: (Depending on the outcome of action 9:) *Gabriella Schittek* to make a call for presenters for the security session.

- The ICANN Updates were reviewed and it was noted that the GNSO Review is not of direct relevance for the ccNSO. The Secretariat is currently waiting for a summary of the request, which will be forwarded as soon as received, for further consideration.

  ACTION 11: *Gabriella Schittek* to forward the GNSO Review Request for presentation summary to the Programme Working Group members for consideration, as soon as received.

  It was also noted that there was some interest in receiving an update on IDN Variants. It was suggested that if the GNSO Review is of less interest for the ccNSO, a request should be made to ICANN to receive an update on IDN Variants.

  ACTION 12: (Depending on the outcome of action 11): *Gabriella Schittek* to ask for an update on IDN Variants.

- The Group was asked for input on possible topics for the suggested Registry/Registrar session. One suggestion was to focus on Identification, Verification and EPP Standards.

  Other ideas are still welcome to be submitted.

- It was noted that the regular meeting with the ccNSO Board members had been left out of the draft agenda.

  ACTION 13: *Gabriella Schittek* to find a possible time slot for the Board Update.

- It was suggested to add Becky Burr and Stephan Welzel as speakers to the session on "Is a ccTLD a property?".

  As there seemed to be a lot of interest in the topic, but the session was fairly short, it was suggested to skip the Registry/Registrar session, expand the "Is a ccTLD a property?"-session and leave some time for the Board member update instead.

  The Working Group is to consider this possibility.

- It was noted that there were too many European registries represented on the ccTLD News session.

  The group was informed that some of the European requests for a slot derived from pre-London and that the speakers may no longer be interested in giving their presentation. This will be researched and if a slot becomes free, a call for presentations will be launched.

  It was suggested to approach a minor Caribbean island for an update from the region.

  ACTION 14: *Gabriella Schittek* to check if all European requests for a time slot still are valid. If time becomes free – make a call for presentations and specifically ask a minor Caribbean island for an update.

- The Regional Organisations informed that they are not intending to make their usual presentation. Instead, they will present the results of a global survey on "ccTLDs and National Legislation". Patrick Myles, CENTR will most likely be the presenter. The assigned 20 minutes was felt would be enough.

- ACTION 15: *Gabriella Schittek* to update the draft Agenda according to all changes as discussed and send a new version to the Working Group.

- The date and time of the next Programme Working Group call will be established by a doodle poll.

  ACTION 16: *Gabriella Schittek* to set up a doodle poll for the next Programme Working Group call.