Survey feedback	1. Organise a ccNSO Members Meeting at every ICANN meeting
	
	2. The Meeting Programme Working Group should explore the possibility to organise a 1-day ccNSO Members Meeting during the second ICANN meeting of the year. (the Policy Forum)
	
	3. Keep the ccNSO Members Meeting as a single stream, and do not organise parallel sessions.
	
	4. When putting together the agenda for the ccNSO Members meeting, the Meeting Programme Working Group should keep in mind those priorities highlighted via the survey, namely:
	    a. developing relations between ccTLDs
	    b. providing updates by and to the ccTLD community

Additional recommendations	5. The Meeting Programme Working Group should attempt avoiding <u>unnecessary</u> overlap or duplications with regional organisations' meetings. 6. The ccNSO council should ensure that the joint sessions with other supporting organisations and advisory committees at public ICANN meetings are a valuable experience for all parties, in terms of their objectives and timing.

Group 1 (Annebeth)	Group 2 (Margarita)	Group 3 (Liz)	Group 4 (Raymond)
Does not agree - Better content when 2 meetings - More quality More time to communicate with others (2 m / not 3)	Agrees	Agrees	Agrees - focus the 2nd one on WGs and networking with other constituencies. No members meeting as such - Not to have ccNSO meetings at every icann. Too little content - 2 times a year
Agrees If 3 meetings: - 1 day. Policy forum condensed	Agrees - 1 day equals 8 hours (can be spread over 2 days) - Sharing info among ccTLDs is important - At least 1,5 h info-sharing - Meeting other SO/ACs is important Revise agenda: what is essential?	Agrees	Does not agree - If there is only 1 meeting, then better not to organize a members meeting at all 1-day meeting enables to visit cross-community and other meetings that we tend to have overlaps
Agrees	Agrees	Agrees	Agrees
Agrees (but with some reservations) - Condensed updates - Written updates - Focus on special issues. Feedback - Good preparations Papers in advance	Agrees - Updates should be relevant and add value	Agrees	Agrees
Agrees - Unnecessary - Take the best from the Regional Organisations Log previous presentations: has it been done before? Where/When?	Agrees - make sure to involve the ROs in the programme - duplication is not necessarily bad: it depends on the topic - providing choice is important	Agrees Avoid duplication by modifying the presentations	Does not agree
Agrees	Agrees - Exchange ideas and information, do not provide dry reports - Have a dialogue on pressing issues - The value needs to be defined - Preparation is important	Agrees	Agrees

https://de.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-3W825CRKL