Comments to London Survey Feedback from the ccNSO Meetings Programme Working Group

Question/Request: *Give update on Internet Governance*
Reply: In Los Angeles on day one (Tuesday) we have a session dedicated to these issues.

Question/Request: *Provide headphones*
Reply: We checked the possibility of arranging headphones for at least a part of the audience. We received the information that the ccNSO needs to pay for that itself – and the costs are $1,960 for 30 headsets for a two-day rental. Unfortunately, the ccNSO does not have the budget to cover this.

Question/Request: *If possible, to have two screens. One showing the presenter's contact information, and the other the actual presentation.*
Reply: It is out of our hands on what setup of screens we will have. It very much depends on the size of the room we are allocated.

Question/Request: *Want to have more chance to use the cards (red, green, orange). It was interesting to see the temperature of the room.*
Reply: We are constantly trying to encourage the presenters/session leaders to make use of the cards. You are welcome to interject and suggest using the cards throughout the meeting! (in fact, we would be very grateful!)

Question/Request: *The GNSO councilors have name cards in front of them when sitting at the council table. i think it's a good idea for ccNSO too.*
Reply: We will arrange this for the Los Angeles meeting.

Question/Request:
- *More well structured discussion in a form of panel*
- *More "interviewers" from the floor to trigger discussions. The legal session was very interesting but there was practically no time for questions from the participants. I think we need to revise the idea that all presentations come first and then questions, since that hinders spontaneity and intervention.*

Reply: We are constantly trying to introduce more sessions in the format of panels or interactive discussions to the agenda – we hope this is visible compared to previous meetings. We will continue working towards this.   However, we need many more volunteers to do the job – whether we can have panels/interviewers very much depends on how many people are prepared to take on this role. Volunteers are welcome to contact the ccNSO Secretariat!
At the same time, we cannot force people to ask questions. We encourage more people to come up to the microphone or use Adobe room to post their questions. Everyone is welcome to take part in the discussions!

Question/Request:
· *Less crowding of topics in a session to enable presenters cover major parts of their presentation*
· *Longer discussion time*
· *More time for discussion like TLD registries' liability; many people were not*

able to talk even though raised their hands
·   *More time for interesting sessions*

Reply: Of course, we agree. However, it is very hard to foresee how the discussions will develop.

Sometimes, there are unexpectedly plenty of questions from the audience, which means that unfortunately, not all questions can be covered. Sometimes, there are literally no, or very little discussions around topics, which we expected would stir some interest.

In other words – it is literally impossible to foresee the dynamics of a discussion and therefore very hard to schedule an agenda, balancing the risk of having no discussion at all, versus vivid discussions.   We are trying to monitor which kind of topics or speakers are generating most discussions and will try our best to come up with a schedule with a meaningful time division.

We also would like to remind you – use the survey to submit topics you would like to discuss! You can also propose your topic by sending an email to ccnsosecretariat@icann.org.

Question/Request: *No ad-hoc additions of unprepared ALAC speaker addressing issues over which (cc)TLDs have no control.*
Reply: The presentation was not an ad-hoc addition, but was deferred from the Singapore meeting. Other respondents indicated that it was of interest, which means that at least some part of the audience did not perceive the speaker as unprepared, or the topic as irrelevant.