

Feedback on feedback

Questions/Comments: Accountability and IANA stewardship transition sessions

- BLOCK 3: very well facilitated by Peter Vergote
- All 3 sessions were very much appreciated by several survey respondents.
- The approval of the CCWG Accountability proposal was a momentous event

Response

Thank you for the positive feedback! The Meetings Programme WG appreciated the fact that the sessions were considered being valuable. We understand the urgent need to properly cover these very important topics, and set aside 3 different blocks, tackling all elements that required our attention. For ICANN56, 2 major blocks are foreseen regarding the transition: Implementation CWG-Stewardship proposals, including ccNSO Specific items. Implementation CCWG WS 1 and progress to date WS 2 (including ccNSO Accountability)

Questions/Comments: Marketing sessions

- Marketing session in general was appreciated
- Sessions mentioned as being interesting, by survey respondents: Conveying Brand Image of .jp, A 'hybrid' business model for (African) ccTLDs

Response

Thank you. There seems to be general consensus that the marketing session is an added-value to the ccNSO Members Day agenda.

Questions/Comments: Legal sessions

- Listed as very interesting: tz local dispute resolution services, intermediary liability ccTLDs
- More attention to the legal session, and more panel discussions

Response

Thank you. We will certainly keep discussing issues that are of common interest for ccTLDs around the world.

Questions/Comments: ccTLD News sessions

- They are very refreshing and it is always nice to know what is happening in other ccTLDs to take ideas and know what to do in a similar situation.

- ccTLD News session was too long as a whole and the presentations were too long individually and not that interesting.
- Sessions pointed out as being interesting, by survey respondents: News from .ru, Growing a sustainable ccTLD: the rebirth of .ng, what is the .np registry?

Response

The Meetings Programme WG is aware that some of the sessions are interesting to some and less to others. We will continue to ask presenters to provide an extract of their presentations well before the meeting to allow participants to select those sessions they consider to be worthwhile.

Questions/Comments about the other sessions, WG updates

- The chat with the incoming CEO was interesting
- Updates highlighted by survey respondents as being interesting: the ccNSO GRC update, update by the SOP WG chair, Introduction Policy Development Processes Retirement of ccTLD and Review Mechanism decisions delegation, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs, Regional Organisations update, the session on Universal Acceptance.
- The ICANN/IANA updates were not very clear as to what their point was.

Response

Thank you! The policy work is the most important component of the ccNSO. The working groups report back to the community during our face-to-face meetings. Your feedback is very important for the volunteers who contribute to the work of these groups.

Questions/Comments: Timing of sessions, preparations and follow-up

- Make sure that the ccNSO meetings days' coffee break slots are aligned with the general ICANN breaks
- "good job: perfect smooth day!"
- the agenda was well packed with good material.
- Thanks for changing the orange temperature cards into yellow ones!
- Try to limit panels to 3 people max.
- Allow more time for interaction and case studies
- Regarding the meeting satisfaction survey: It is hard to remember everything that happened during the ccNSO Members Days, and people are less and less inclined to answer the survey once they are back home. Why don't we do a per-day survey, with more detailed questions?

Response

We fully understand that the coffee breaks are valuable, and will do everything we can to align the ccNSO breaks with the ones foreseen by ICANN. The Programme Committee is aware of the fact that the current satisfaction survey is subject to improvement, and options to increase the response rate and the engagement from the community are currently being explored.

We will convey the wish to have a discussion after each presentation to the session chairs.

Suggested changes, topics and presenters for future meetings

- An update on how the IANA transition implementation plan is going to work would be appreciated
- Suggested topics for the next meeting: Security for registries, Update on TTIP, Registries engagement with local stakeholders
- An overview of the effect of the arrival of new gTLDs on ccTLDs
- The meeting is all about policy development, so let's talk policy
- More on Intermediary liability and ccTLDs
- IANA transition implementation update; Work Stream TWO update. New PDP update, legal sessions
- Suggested presenters: the ICANN Board chair, and the new CEO. All presenters did a good job.
- I would suggest that some updates (eg ICANN/IANA Updates and Regional organisation updates) could be provided in writing in advance of the meeting allowing more time for discussion of substantial topics and a shorter overall ccNSO session. It was not clear whether we really need a full two days of the ccNSO. A shorter ccNSO would help members participate in other parts of ICANN policy making/discussions. The sharing of information between ccTLDs is clearly helpful but may be better delivered as optional workshops rather than built into a two day programme
- Session on PDP: very important but we need to work on how to present this to members

Response

For ICANN56, 2 major blocks are foreseen during the ccNSO Member Days regarding the transition: Implementation CWG-Stewardship proposals, including ccNSO Specific items; Implementation CCWG WS 1 and progress to date WS 2 (including ccNSO Accountability).

As you know the upcoming ICANN meeting in Helsinki will be the first meeting B. One of the recommendations formulated by the working group that made proposals for changes to ICANN Public Meetings, was to continue to allocate adequate time for SO/AC work, but evolve the format of the meetings to afford greater opportunity for cross-community engagement and outreach. The Programme Committee is looking forward to drafting the schedule that meets the expectations of the community.

Given the amount of requests we receive from the community on topics the ccNSO should cover, we strongly believe cutting the meeting short to 1 day only is an isolated opinion. Should we, however, sense that there is a broader support for this suggestion, we will look more carefully into the options.