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Introduction

This document aims to evaluate the community feedback received regarding the ccNSO Members meeting in Copenhagen, and provides the feedback from the ccNSO Meetings Programme Working Group in response. Read more about the ccNSO Meeting Programme WG here: https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/mpwg.htm

Feedback from the community on the ICANN58 ccNSO Members Meeting in Copenhagen was collected via two channels:

1. **Online meeting satisfaction survey**

The ICANN58 online meeting satisfaction survey was refined and simplified, after consultation with the Programme Working Group. The survey was shared via e-mail, social media and via an announcement on the ccNSO website with the ccNSO Members and ccTLD community on day 2 of the ccNSO Members Meeting, on 15 March 2017. The survey closed on 29 March 2017, 23:59 UTC. 26 answers have been received, which is more than double compared to the previous survey. Consult the survey results here: https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-8B252ZPG/

2. **Interviews**

16 face-to-face interviews with ccTLD community members were conducted. The interviewers were members of the ccNSO Meeting Programme WG and the Secretariat, and the interviews were taken during the ccNSO cocktail, and following conclusion of the ccNSO Members Meeting in Copenhagen. At least one person per region has been interviewed. Consult the feedback received via the interviews here: https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/icann58-meeting-satisfaction-assessment-05apr17-en.pdf

On behalf of the Secretariat and Programme Working Group members: many thanks to all those that provided feedback: your input is valuable to us, and helps us in shaping future ccNSO Member Meetings.

Feedback by the ccNSO Meeting Programme Working Group on the community feedback

**Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the ICANN58 ccNSO Member Meeting?**
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**Response**

The Meeting Programme WG values your appreciation. We will continue to strive to meet the needs of the ccTLD community.
How would you rate the following items?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>very good</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>fair</th>
<th>poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relevance of the presentations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance of the sessions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunity for exchange of information with other participants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of the presentations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information available online</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational arrangements during the ccNSO Members Meeting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remote participation arrangements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response

Overall the individual items in the table above were rated positively. Many thanks for this. The ccNSO Meeting Programme Working Group believes the direction of travel of the ccNSO Members Meeting is the right one, even though we fully recognise there is still room for improvement.

What aspects of the ccNSO Member Meeting went particularly well?

- Interactivity is appreciated. It is important to allow the community to express their views, for instance via the temperature-of-the-room cards.
- The legal session was very good, according to many the respondents. Both because of the interaction with the public, and because law enforcement and a registrar were invited to share their point of view.
- Moreover, the following was explicitly mentioned by the online survey respondents and in the interviews, as being valuable: Working Group updates, Legal session, ccTLD news, the discussion during the PTI update, session with the ccNSO appointed members to the ICANN Board, the PDP session.

Response

Thank you! Within the Programme WG we believe sharing best practices and concerns and/or recommendations from various players is fundamental. We take this opportunity to thank all the presenters for sharing their experiences with the community.

The ccNSO secretariat organized for the first time in Copenhagen a briefing session with the session chairs, prior to the ccNSO Members Meeting. This briefing will be further refined for Johannesburg, and session chairs are invited to engage even more with the audience, to ensure sufficient interaction and involvement. The opportunity for interaction should be considered during the agenda setting. The session chair or moderator play a fundamental role here as well.
What aspects of the ccNSO Member Meeting need improvement?

- Certain updates, especially during the accountability session, were too detailed for most of the respondents, which made it hard to keep focused.
- More interaction. Suggested is to start with a more engaging session, after the welcome by the chair, and to keep the WG updates for later.
- Advance preparation is key. If the opinion from the audience on a very important matter is asked, an email should be circulated to the mailing list prior to the meeting, to allow the community to formulate an informed opinion.
- Presentations should be available prior to the meeting
- Coffee and water in the room
- Allow people to contribute in their own language
- More updates between the ccNSO Members Meetings (for instance via email)
- More opportunity to get to know other community members is appreciated
- Avoid overlap

Response

- Unfortunately, there is indeed an overlap between some topics addressed during the ccNSO Members Meeting, and the joint sessions. Publication of the agenda items to be discussed assists participants in making an informed choice on the sessions to attend. The ccNSO Members Meeting typically allows for discussion and interaction with the audience, whereas the joint sessions with other SO/ACs or the ICANN Board takes the form of briefings, rather than discussions.
- Additional services, such as refreshments and language service, come with an additional cost, which have not been budgeted, and would need to be carried by the ccTLD community.
- The ccNSO secretariat realizes that communication is important: we will strive to improve the information shared with the community even more efficiently. The ccNSO is a platform for and by ccTLD managers, and the exchange of information, best practices, and knowledge is a cornerstone of what makes the ccNSO so valuable. The numerous efforts by volunteers are a fundamental aspect to the success of the ccNSO, being driven by and for the community.
- We will seek a way give support to newcomers and/or people who are coming back after some time, facilitating a way to catch up with current topics.
- The ccNSO secretariat publishes the presentation slides as soon as possible on the overall ICANN schedule, while the ccNSO Members Meetings is still ongoing. Typically, the slides are uploaded shortly after – or even during – each session. The slides are then made available on the ccNSO website as well, latest few days after the meeting. Unfortunately, the presentation material often arrives to the ccNSO Secretariat at the last-minute. Behind the scenes, the ccNSO secretariat converts the slides provided into a format which is accepted by the AdobeConnect-room, ensuring a good user experience for remote participants and those attending in person. It is therefore not possible to upload the slides even sooner.
- Networking opportunities are part of a good meeting, and special thanks goes out to the sponsors of the ccNSO cocktail, who made this possible.
- The ccNSO Meetings Programme WG and Secretariat will aim to ensure the ccNSO Member Meetings remain interesting and relevant, and are conducted in an efficient manner.
Which agenda topics do you like to see included for the next ccNSO Members meeting?

Among others, the following suggestions were raised:

- Data science development
- Qualitative analysis regarding the DNS landscape
- DNSSEC
- Privacy, data protection
- Best practices from local and regional DNS events
- Impact new gTLDs on ccTLDs
- CTN: 1st-level, 2nd-level, geo names short/long/listed/unlisted. CCWG-UCTN was mentioned several times
- Different services, projects and forms of income for ccTLDs other than Domain sales. How are ccTLDs sustainable in view of the lower sales and domain growth worldwide?
- update Accountability - chance for ccTLDs to offer substantive feedback on whatever key consultations are under way (change from approach in CPH where we presented the issues but didn’t allow time for discussion)
- step outside the TLD and domain name cocoon
- ICANN bylaw changes
- Content control, takedown of domain names
- Internet governance
- ICANN budget
- Policies, legal governance

Response

General information sharing on what is happening in the ccTLD environment is a core focus for the Programme WG when drafting the agenda of the ccNSO Member Meeting. The Programme WG recognizes the fact that attendants appreciate the exchange of information and best practices, but at the same time appreciate even more the opportunity for discussion. The ccNSO Meetings Programme WG welcomes the idea to allow for sufficient discussion time and interaction opportunities in the agenda of the next ccNSO Members Meeting.

Up-front consultation with the community on the cross-community topics will continue to take place. Community members are welcome any time to suggest topics they like to see included in the next agenda of the ccNSO Members Meeting.

ICANN59 is a Policy Forum, the 2nd public ICANN meeting in the three-meeting annual cycle. The duration is four (4) total days, and the format is focused on SO/AC/SG/C policy work and outreach. The ccNSO Meetings Programme WG and the secretariat will strive to put together a relevant programme for the ccNSO members and the broader ccTLD community.