

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FROM F2F PDP WORKING GROUP PARTICIPANTS

General:

- Almost all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the effort was good value for the time spent
- Almost all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the effort will help the group to get work done efficiently and effectively
- Almost all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they would recommend this to other Working Groups.

Key observations about usefulness of the session:

- Ability to see facial expressions (one participant noted it was particularly useful for non-English speaking people, as it is easier to understand when you see the person speaking)
- Ability to have in-depth conversations (not limited by typical time limit of WG call)
- Ability to have side-conversations
- Discussion seemed less adversarial than phone meetings sometimes can be
- Breaking complex issues into smaller chunks while remaining focused on key concepts instead of edge cases
- Discussion format allowed for clarifying of both consensus and points of difference rather than focus on very specific points
- Structured, moderated debate helped by a facilitator who managed to capture and summarize groups views in an effective manner
- Neutral but knowledgeable third party facilitator

Key observations about least useful aspects:

- Time keeping was a little off in places
- Remarks by outside facilitator about expected behavior (considered condescending by some)
- Revisiting some issues that had already been closed (need to include reminder on issues on which rough consensus had already been achieved - helpful to avoid re-opening discussions on some of the issues already dealt with)
- If the leaders can re-cap where we left off as a group at the beginning of each topic – we might have been able to avoid ‘re-discussing’ certain topics
- Difficult to integrate remote participants
- Capturing language changes without changing language live on Adobe was a bit challenging

Suggestions for improvements:

- Explore different processes such as open space (OST – see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_Space_Technology)
- Critical to have advance preparation to avoid old ground being covered
- Consider using a web-cam to allow remote participants to also ‘experience’ the F2F meeting by seeing expressions (very useful to build community among those there but important to remember that not everyone can be there).
- Plan early to allow for better scheduling (don’t make a late announcement of meeting).
- Expand travel / hotel support for WG/Constituency members. For those not part of Council, reimbursement for 2 days rather than 1 will help the non-commercial side & others.
- Put it in direct proximity to the meeting, not before the weekend sessions.
- Anything that can be done remotely, do remotely. Keep F2F time for brainstorming solutions.
- A less contentious working group could get a ton done in a full day.
- Important for facilitator to be neutral and intimately knowledgeable of the topics involved.
- Idea of losing our screens (at least briefly) worth considering, but would need all relevant docs available in written form.
- Have fewer topics and spend a bit more time on each, perhaps with breaks to caucus