

Comments to Los Angeles Survey Feedback from the ccNSO Meetings Programme Working Group

The input received to the Los Angeles meeting survey showed four main points: 1) Interpretation 2) Interactive sessions; 3) Speakers; 4) Topics.

In order to make our replies as clear as possible, we sorted all input under their respective heading, and addressed the input and requests under each point.

1) Interpretation:

- *To have interpretation in the room.*
- *I would like to see translation services. ccNSO may consider to ask to RO for contribution in translation services in order to attend the requirements of each region.*

REPLY: Providing live interpretation is a costly undertaking, however, the Programme Working Group looked into the expenses to get an understanding of what the figures actually are.

Basing on the *Survey on the Need of Translation of ccNSO Documents*, conducted in March 2013, interpretation seems to be mainly required for Spanish and French (see question number six at:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=e5KkU9s3UUrJ_2fmRQDJcuNgPQHx_2bHG6P2yHP34LkGFs0_3d)

Therefore, the Programme Working Group requested ICANN's translation department to provide a cost estimate for interpretation for these two languages:

Please find herein the cost for the request of having 2 days of interpretation support, in both FR and ES, for the ccNSO meetings, three times a year. The cost per meeting will be \$28,200.00.

Type of Expense	3 Meetings / Year
Interpreters Contract Fee (per diem incl)	\$25,200.00
Travel	\$24,000.00
Accommodations	\$14,400.00
Interpretation Equipment (incl Tra&Acc)	\$21,000.00
Total	\$84,600.00

As the ccNSO does not have a budget for interpretation services, these costs need to be covered by some other body. We are happy to coordinate and organise the service, though. Please, contact ccnsossecretariat@icann.org if you think you could sponsor interpretation during a meeting.

However, please, bear in mind that live-interpretation requires interpretation booths in the meeting room. To ensure a large enough room and the installation of such booths, we need to have information that interpretation is required at least six months before the meeting takes place.

2) Interactive Sessions

- */.../more interactive sessions, presentation of all participants*
- *More panels /.../*
- *More dynamic sessions*
- *More discussion where possible.*
- *More action /.../*

REPLY: There are more and more panel sessions on the agenda. We are trying to appoint engaging Session Chairs. We allocate more time for Q&A after presentations. Therefore we believe that we are constantly moving towards providing meeting agendas with many “dynamic sessions”.

However – a great deal of the dynamics, “action”, and discussions depend on the audience!

Our Chairs are constantly trying to initiate discussions, reactions and input from the participants and we are also encouraging the audience to use our Adobe room to ask questions, in case you do not wish to do so in person.

Beyond that, it is hard to find a suitable way to spur more engagement from the audience. However, we welcome ideas of other means that we can try!

We also need to note that a balance is needed between offering panel sessions and more “classical” sessions (with a presenter and a presentation), as these are also often very popular and asked for (for instance the “ccTLD News session”).

Regarding presenting the participants – yes, this should be standard. If this hasn’t been done, then the Session Chair has failed. We will let the Session Chairs know that this belongs to their task.

3) Speakers

- *More diversity (geo, cultural) on the panel*
- *Make panel participation representative of other regions as well.*
-

REPLY: Again, this is very much dependent on the participants themselves.

The Programme Working Group members are always considering this when setting the agenda. When we do calls for presentations, we are trying to get onboard new faces, especially from the region that we are currently visiting. In many cases we have also done direct outreach and asked specific people from a specific region for their participation. However, if there are no volunteers that are willing to step forward from a given region, we don’t have much choice, but to invite people that you might have seen many times before, but that are offering their engagement.

So – please, volunteer! Only then we can ensure a fully diverse representation on panels and in sessions.

4) Topics

- *More marketing, commercial and no so expected session as repetition of previous meeting*

REPLY: Marketing is on the agenda for Singapore (thanks to the feedback received during the last surveys!).

However, we also have to have “expected sessions” on our agenda (such as the IANA Stewardship Transition, or ICANN Accountability), as these are topical and need to be discussed.

- *More of general debate on current issues, e.g. Byron’s IANA transition*
- *We should see more actual issues*

REPLY: We are always trying to address topical issues, which we think are of importance and interest to the majority of our community. We are also trying to publish our first draft agenda as early as possible, in order to give everyone a chance to deliver input in case we have missed something important.

Please, let us know in case you think we have neglected bringing up any issue that we should have!

- *Panel discussions about interesting subjects /.../*

REPLY: We often have Panel Discussions on issues that we consider being urgent or topical – in the hope that they also will be of interest to the participants. However, we are also open for suggestions on potential issues that could be debated in coming panels. Please, let us know what you would consider being an “interesting subject” and we will try to fit it into one of our coming agendas!

- *More experiences and information sharing between ccTLD.*

REPLY: We have three pure ccTLD information-sharing sessions scheduled for the Singapore meeting: 1) Marketing Session 2) Legal Session 3) ccTLD News Session.

As we need to balance ccTLD information-sharing sessions between our Panel Discussions, meetings with the GAC and Board, ICANN Updates etc. we can’t, unfortunately, really extend the time for even more information sharing.

- *The theme approached works well in giving the programme coherence and this could be developed.*

REPLY: Whenever possible to “theme” a programme, we will try to do so. However, given that we need to cover many different topics, this will not always be possible.

- *.../ better planning of presentations*

REPLY: We would be grateful for some clarification!

As far as we understand the question – and given that we only allow presentations that fit under the given sessions - it seems like we are supposed to look into the presentations prior to the presentation?

If so – no, that is not possible, for several reasons:

- 1) The presentations are rarely ready earlier than a few hours, or even minutes, prior to the meeting;
- 2) How can we decide what is “good” or “bad”?;
- 3) Who is supposed to look into them and take a decision?;
- 4) The presenters know the subject of their presentation better than anyone else.

In order to make the presenters think through their presentations, though, we are asking them to provide us with a short summary, which we are publishing on our website (you can click on the name of the presentation on the agenda page to see them).

However, we might have missed a point here, so we welcome clarification.