

TF-PR Meeting, Tartu, Estonia, 29-30 September 2005

Thursday 29 September

SP opened the meeting and welcomed everyone to the 7th TF-PR meeting. She said it is yet another record with 30 attendees – the most ever so far. She thanked everyone for coming and thanked MR for organising the meeting so beautifully.

SP introduced herself for those who did not know here. She works at SURFnet in the Netherlands and has been the Chair of TF-PR for two years. At SURFnet she works in the community support department, which concentrates on the end users (more about this in the session on this Friday afternoon).

The attendees introduced themselves (30 attendees):

Name	Company	Country	Acronym in Minutes
Tomi Dolenc	ARNES	Slovenia	TD
Veerle Custers	Belnet	Belgium	VCS
Lenka Prazakova	CESNET	Czech Republic	LP
Michel Krsek	CESNET	Czech Republic	MK
Dale Roberston	DANTE	UK	DR
Helga Spitaler	DANTE	UK	HS
Rachael Beale	DANTE	UK	RB
Simon Watts	DANTE	UK	SW
Gerti Foerst	DFN	Germany	GF
Kai Hoelzner	DFN	Germany	KH
Michel Kraav	EENet	Estonia	MKV
Maria Ristkok	EENet	Estonia	MR (Host)
Alessandra De Nicola	GARR	Italy	ADN
Frederica Tanlongo	GARR	Italy	FT
Dimitra Kotsokali	GRNET	Greece	DK
Rose Turner	HEANET	Ireland	RT
Robert Haymon-Collins	JISC	UK	RHC
Sandra Kamara	LATNET	Latvia	SK
David Ferguson	NeSC	UK	DF
Damian Niemir	PSNC	Poland	DN
Zbyszek Krzewinski	PSNC	Poland	ZK
Maria Bolado	RedIRIS	Spain	MB
Virginie Blanquart	RENATER	France	VB
Lennart Forsberg	SUNET	Sweden	LF
Elise Roders	SURFnet	Netherlands	ER
Sandra Passchier	SURFnet	Netherlands	SP
Carol de Groot	TERENA	Netherlands	CdG
Jo Barnett	TERENA	Netherlands	JB (minutes)
Russell Nelson	UKERNA	UK	RN (Chair)
Vanessa Camilleri	University of Malta	Malta	VC

Apologies

Roland Eugster – SWITCH; Gitte Kudsk – UNI-C; Sabine Jaume-Rajaonia – RENATER; Werner Koblitz – Aconet; Zoran Birimisa – CARNet.

SP explained that she was retiring as chair of TF-PR. She made a short speech saying that the reason TF-PR exists is because she wanted to share her PR experiences with like-minded people in the community but didn't generally meet any at the TERENA conferences. She sent an email to CdG at TERENA saying that there must be more PR people out there and CdG suggested she try to start an initiative which could result in a Task Force. The first meeting was held in Ireland, with only 4 attendees, who were mostly technical. That said, it was a constructive meeting and some good ideas were generated. SP then wrote a proposal and held a meeting at the next TNC. To her surprise, quite a few people attended. Since then, the group has grown and SP said we have beautiful deliverables and that she is always inspired by these meetings. She hopes that everyone can benefit from the group. SP added that the group has something to celebrate as the TERENA Executive Committee has accepted the Terms of Reference for another two years. On that note, SP "handed-over" the chairmanship to Russell Nelson from UKERNA.

RN added that we all owe SP a big thank you for putting together TF-PR, as it is not easy in our technical environment. SP was given a round of applause.

CdG added a few words about how the group has got very committed members who are carrying out good work and handed a gift from the group to Sandra.

MINUTES AND ACTION LIST

RN asked if there were any comments on the minutes from the last meeting. There were no comments so RN said they are considered to be a true and accurate record of the last meeting. RN then went through the list of deliverables for the group and asked those responsible to give a quick update on the progress. Then we would talk about future deliverables.

RN stated that just because someone has their name down as leader of a deliverable, it doesn't absolve the rest of the group in helping them.

List of Deliverables (PLEASE CHECK LETTERS)

A) TF-PR Workshops (RN and MR)

These are already planned for this meeting. RN reiterated that the idea of TF-PR is to ensure we learn as well as listen to presentations and write deliverables. So the format of the two days has changed slightly compared to the earlier meetings and we will be having a workshop on press release writing later today. He encouraged people to let him know if they have any ideas for future workshops.

B) PR for Dummies (GK and JB)

Again, this is already planned for this meeting. There will be a talk about Grids and EGEE tomorrow, given by David Ferguson from NeSC. The plan will be to schedule these in for future meetings. Please give suggestions to Russell Nelson. Some past suggestions include: Making Corporate Videos; Setting up a Press List; Writing and Giving Presentations; Writing a Press Release.

VCS said as I am new to the group I don't fully understand what is meant by "PR for Dummies".

RN said that the idea is to take something that is often complex and present it in a way that is easily understandable to assist TF-PR members to communicate it within their own communities. For example, DF will present on EGEE and Grids tomorrow. DF noted that NeSC have a training module called networking for dummies already available at:

<http://www.egee.nesc.ac.uk/trgmat/index.html> .

CdG will look into possible scheduling to have this presentation in a one0day event for TF-PR
(ACTION A - CdG)

C) FAQs (RB)

RB has pulled together a list of FAQs which needs some more work as some of the answers are rather long. There is an editorial board for this that will do some more work on them in the near future.

D) PeaR (FT, ZK, technical contact – Jeroen Houben, TERENA)

The service was outlined for new members. At present there are no planned changes to the service

E) Glossary of Terms (Jeanne-Marie Jobse)

Jeanne-Marie Jobse at SURFnet has done a lot of work on this. You can view the current list of terms here: <http://www.terena.nl/news/pr/members/wiki/doku.php/a> . ER explained that the only issue is that there is currently only one log-in. JMJ will contact the TERENA webmaster in the near future to organise individual log-ins so that it is possible to see who has posted which term. RN encouraged everyone to log-on and start adding to the list and ER reminded people to add URLs where necessary. **(ACTION B – All)**

F) TF-PR Compendium (RN)

RN reiterated that he will be looking to everyone to contribute to the next PR Compendium in order to make it worthwhile. He reiterated that it may in fact prove useful to individuals, for example by proving that more funding needs to go into PR. It was decided to stick with the same as time schedule as for previous years, so we will produce a preliminary version for the March meeting of TF-PR and the final version for the meeting in Catania. **(ACTION C – RN, RB)** – revise questionnaire and distribute it in January with deadline mid-February.

G) Reproduce material (CdG)

CdG said there are a couple of publications from UKERNA that might be good for TERENA to reproduce but she hasn't had time yet to do anything with it. CdG reiterated to the group that if anyone in the community thinks they have a publication that could benefit the community, then they should let her know. ER mentioned it might be nice to reproduce the Eduroam leaflet SURFnet publishes. **(ACTION D – CdG)**

H) Closed website for members (CdG)

CdG said the closed website for TR-PR members has not been used very much as yet. In fact, only MR and CdG have their details on it. CdG asked everyone to send their contact information (which is only accessible by other TF-PR members). ER said there are some developments at SURFnet – they are launching a service Launch groups – and ER will pass the details to CdG when it is ready. CdG said it is a useful forum as she put up the TF-PR compendium before it was published and people were able to correct information. **(ACTION E – ER, CdG, All)**

(I,J,K) END USER COMMUNICATION

The three deliverables for end user communication will be dealt with in more detail in the separate meeting tomorrow specifically for users.

RN asked if there are any additional deliverables the group should be considering.

MK said he has spent last week at an Internet 2 meeting and thinks we should be looking at more international cooperation. CdG asked how we could do that as a group. ER suggested inviting them to our next meeting. MK thinks we should moderate the task force for preparing some short description of the project. DR said she thought we were talking about two different things. The first: How do we cooperate on an international basis and the second, how to raise the profile of technical things going on across Europe.

JB said she thought that raising the profile of technical things happening community wide should be a TERENA - and maybe DANTE - responsibility. CdG said TERENA has a memo of understanding with I2. DR said she thinks that the Americans and Canadians are keen to be seen to cooperate internationally but the problem is to identify similar activities that we are working on. The issue for TF-PR issue is that we have loads of countries and USA and Canada don't.

CdG said that TERENA has a calendar of events which will be easier to find after the TERENA website revamp. She asked if it is worthwhile making this a calendar for the whole of Europe. CdG added that MK has a video portal for video streaming and it would certainly be useful to have one source for all this information and perhaps brand as TF-PR. CdG would like to propose that as a deliverable. JB said it may be too difficult to rely on just a few individuals to be responsible to update a calendar so it would be necessary for a log-on and post like PeaR. RN said it would be necessary to identify precisely what types of meetings are posted. He explained that often in the UK there are funding rules that mean if people want to come from abroad then they are not allowed to. GF said that at DFN most of the meetings are in German so it could be difficult for non-German speakers. JB suggested that if the calendar happens it would be necessary to have options such as open/closed meetings, languages etc. This was received quite well although some wondered how it could be managed in order to make it attractive. This will be discussed further in future meetings. RN concluded the Terms of Reference.

CdG said that TNC 2006 is coming up and the group should consider what sessions TF-PR could contribute to. If there is a dedicated session, we would be looking at 3 x 30 minute presentations. The focus will be on users and it may be that there is not a dedicated TF-PR session, but rather talks could be inserted into different more technical sessions. CdG would like to see proposals coming in from TF-PR on subjects we are working on. The slogan is "Follow the User" - follow what he wants and follow where he is. TF-PR doesn't have to submit a paper as it doesn't fit our field. What is required is an extended abstract saying what you want to talk about. The call for papers is going out next week (as well as an electronic call for papers); deadline for submissions is 30 November. The programme committee meets in January and will decide what talks are accepted. ER said that it may be good to slot these into the technical sessions to reach the technical audience who don't normally attend PR sessions at TNC.

DF was wondering about the "Networks on Networks" session that he will be chairing - it could be that the TF-PR could discuss at this session. CdG added that people can do it in groups, give demos or perhaps hold panel discussions with several people. **(ACTION F - CdG - follow up with an email to the group)**

Workshop: PR and Press Conference during TNC 2005 in Poznan, Zbigniew Krzewinski
[Link to Presentation](#)

ZK presented the results of the media relations PSNC carried out for TNC 2005. The TNC coverage was wide, with coverage on radio, television and in publications. ZK said that organising TNC is a great experience and provides a great possibility to build relationships with media and build PR for long-term. [Link to presentation.](#)

The presentation was divided into 4 main issues:

- Break on through
- PR for TERENA
- Press Conference
- After TNC....

RN thanked ZK for the presentation and added that we are all envious of the amount of coverage they managed to secure around TNC 2005.

Workshop: Writing a Press Release – Tips and Tricks by Robert Haymon-Collins

Link to presentation

RHC gave an overview of JISC media work explaining that they haven't been doing proactive media relations for very long. The belief was that it is not important to tell people what JISC was doing and there was a corporate nervousness in general about the media. The expectations were that journalists would just get it wrong anyway. The fact of the matter was that JISC had to get better at communicating what they did as increasingly they were working in a competitive environment which "forced a change in attitude" towards media relations. JISC began to release news and started to get a bit of exposure. There were unrealistic expectations in the beginning due to fear of journalists, a slowness to respond, poor appreciation of newsworthiness and so on. It took a while to get people to understand what makes news. The notion that coverage should be 100% right all the time was entrenched and it was necessary to lower expectations. RHC presentation gives very useful checklist on the do's and don'ts of preparing and sending out press releases. A workshop followed where groups prepared a crisis communications press release.

JB asked RHC about the fact that every journalist I know would say they want an exclusives but many PR people still get coverage from blanket releases so what should the real approach be? RHC said that of course national journalists tend to be able to pick and choose but you need to assess each journalist and publication as you go. JB asked what is the best way to send a news release via email. Do you send it in the body or as an attachment? SW said they put it in the body of text, ER said they do both. RHC said they write an introduction in the body and then attach the whole thing/

Branding Strategies

THE UKERNA BRANDING STRATEGY - presentation by Russell Nelson UKERNA

RN said there was some confusion between UKERNA and JANET and an imbalance between the two. They are labels not values, not really brands and people don't necessarily associate value with the brand. RN wanted people to have positive associations and awareness when they see those brands. The new audiences – schools, health services etc. didn't know them so that lack of awareness has made delivering projects very difficult.

Constraints

- Resources to build brand and values are considerable. Although people in the company know it is valuable they don't realise how expensive it is. Difficulty to manage those expectations
- Measurement – even large commercial companies have difficulty measuring brand value
- How do we as networking organisations prove that we have got value through raising awareness (and beyond resources of UKERNA)
- Commitment – even if we had all the funding in the world, you still need all those in the organisation pulling in the same direction. Most value is delivered by face-to-face communication. Unless your staff are committed to the brand, you will have difficulties
- So set your own expectations – take a realistic, low-key approach.

Three Choices for UKERNA regarding Branding

- Do nothing - let it continue as is
- Drop UKERNA – only a company name and simply use JANET
- Develop UKERNA further and expand JANET

The choices made will depend on the future plans of an organisation. If UKERNA was ever going to do JANET then the name UKERNA has no value. If UKERNA plan to run other networks then they will still need the name.

The Result for UKERNA was to do nothing!

The constraints were so strong on what realistically could be done that UKERNA opted to do nothing. Having to drop UKERNA or develop UKERNA was too much for the resources available. All felt it was best to do nothing. What was valuable in this experience is that it clarified internally when UKERNA and JANET should be used. Some difficult questions about the future of UKERNA were asked, such as do we have plans to run other networks. So a very valuable exercise in the end.

Comment [RN1]: I have made some changes to the original presentation text because taken out of context this could be misinterpreted.

HOW TO SELL SURFnet - BRANDING AN INVISIBLE NETWORK by Elise Roders

SURFnet

- SURFnet has never consciously branded itself – but over past year the realisation came that we should be thinking about it. Didn't really expect people to know us
- Universities branded our services as their own and SURFnet didn't mind. There was no strategic plan. The results were few people knew SURFnet or what it does
- With increasing pressure of competition from commercial ISPs, SURFnet felt the need to address this.

ER said that we know SURFnet core business is appreciated but what do we sell? Bandwidth, network or services. SURFnet employed a specialist company to help with this. Discovered that they needed two different approaches - Services and Network.

Network: Get other people to give testimonials such as politicians and scientist in media. Services – use media focussing on university publications (will try to use testimonials with less known people such as students).

CdG – what's advantage to SURFnet of people knowing about them? ER said politics, budgets, decision makers etc. CdG asked so why do you want the students to know about your services? ER said if they do they will increase use of network which can help when requesting budgets. ZK asked do you have a budget to target the university papers. ER said yes and that SURFnet will advertise in some of them. RHC asked where do you draw the line between increasing use of services and brand management. ER said we don't have the same problem as UKERNA but it is very difficult because some people see SURFnet as just a network and not services.

TD said that his director is against advertising or advertorials as they are not as good as editorial coverage. ER said theirs will be professionally designed.

KH asked how do you publicise your services to students. ER said we have lists online about what we offer. KH asked are you in competition with ISPs? ER said we work together with the commercial ISPs. KH asked how are you services provided? ER said some of the services are supplied via the universities but some of the services students subscribe online. KH asked if the main communication channel is via the computing centres? ER said SURFnet has spent a long-time raising the profile of a portal with services - Student.nl – adding that they were lucky with the domain name.

MK asked you mentioned branding SURFnet as a network but have you thought of branding as research network? DR asked if SURFnet had done any work about brand values rather than how to promote the brand. Are you planning to do more work on that on what you want to promote SURFnet as? ER said that it was still very new in SURFnet and something that the Management Team still needed to discuss.

The group divided into groups to discuss brand issues further.

JB handed out the TERENA Communications Questionnaire and asked everyone to fill-in and give back to her.

Welcome by Mihkel Kraav Director of EENET

Mihkel Kraav, Director of EEnet, welcomed the group saying he was happy to see us and thanked us to making the long trip to Tartu. He also thanked Maria Ristkok for organising the trip. The group then visited EEnet office and had a guided tour if the local observatory.

Friday 30 September

INTRODUCTION TO EGEE AND GRIDS BY DAVID FERGUSON, NESC (NA3 TRAINING)

Link to presentation

DF explained that where the WWW provides seamless access to information stored in different locations, the grid provides seamless access to computing power and data storage capacity distributed over the globe. It relies on advanced software called middleware. It must share data between 1000s of scientists with multiple interest, must connect major computer centres, must ensure all data is accessible, must grow rapidly for more than a decade, ensure data security.

Characteristics of Grids – multiple resources, owned by mutually trusted organisations and individuals, different security requirements and policies required. Fault tolerance required (as sometimes machines go wrong). Resources are heterogeneous, geographically separated, different resource management policies, connected by multi-level networks. All these require standards (agreed by everyone).

EGEE is not really there to develop the best middleware – not a software development research project. Taking the middleware that already exists and making it more reliable.

EGEE is the first attempt to build a worldwide grid infrastructure for data intensive applications. A large-scale production grid service is already being developed and being used for HEP and Biomed applications.

DR asked I am interested in the new user communities – how do they hear about you and where do they come from? DF said that individual user and user communities are different, as are the applications. There is a whole activity dedicated to finding and encouraging applications join EGEE. He said that if you are an individual user, you probably won't interact with EGEE directly; you would interact with your local grid.

RN asked about politics, for example, what if the North Koreans wanted to join? DF said that if there was an organisation working with the LHC, for example, then they would be allowed to join. ER asked that in essence, to join EGEE you have to bring something in like computing resources. DF said yes as grids are very expensive.

FUTURE DATES

The next meeting on 23 and 24 March 2006 in Cambridge, UK, hosted by DANTE. RENATER have also invited the group to have the meeting after that in Paris. GEANT2 PR meeting will also probably take place the day before the meeting but this will be confirmed.

TNC 2006 will take place on 15-18 May 2006. The TF-PR meeting would be Sat 13/14 May 2006.

Meeting officially closed.

SUB-GROUP MEETING

End-user communication / Marketing communication strategies

The first meeting of the new TF-PR sub-group on communication with the users took place concurrently with the TF-PR meeting in Tartu, Estonia and was held on Friday 30 September beginning at 14:00.

Present were: Russell Nelson - UKERNA, Carol de Groot - TERENA, Alessandra De Nicola - GARR, Federica Tanlongo - GARR, Damien Niemi - PSNC, Robert Haymon-Collins - JISC, Virginie Blanquart - RENATER, Veerle Custers - BELNET, Rose Turner - HEAnet, Helga Spitaler - DANTE, Simon Watt - DANTE, Dale Robertson - DANTE, Gerti Foest - DFN, Maria Ristkok - EENet, Zbyszek Krzewinski - PSNC, Tomi Dolenc - ARNES, Sandra Passchier - SURFnet, and Elise Roders - SURFnet.

The meeting was chaired by Elise Roders, SURFnet and minuted by Carol de Groot, TERENA

SP spoke of the questions sent to the list by email prior to the meeting and asked the attendees to give a short presentation on how they communicate with users of their networks at the present time.

SURFnet, Netherlands

SP gave a slide presentation on SURFnet's direct communication with everyone at the connected institutions: students, scientists and researcher, employees and teaching staff. They focus on communities, for example, their streaming video portal that was set up with the assistance of JISC. They hold meetings and workshops to facilitate the communities. SURFnet's website has special portals for each community including a special portal for the students.

They have successfully run the "Out to Get You" security campaign, targeted at students, distributing about 90,000 CD ROMS each year. The CD ROM can also be ordered online from the student portal.

SP stressed that feedback is very important when you are offering services and they run usability tests on their website as well as an annual user survey. They hold meetings with representatives of the various user groups to hear what they want and are also working on an online forum. They are currently testing a web log.

Future plans will focus on a few users and a few services and all their pr and marketing activities will be concentrated on these.

SURFnet has found it useful and more effective to use experts on advertising, press contacts and event organisation.

SP pointed out that some user groups, such as scientists are a small group and are interested in very specific services, for instance, light paths. These groups require a different approach and SURFnet plans special workshops and meetings at their universities and institutions. There are plans for a contest to involve them more closely with SURFnet.

PSNC - Pionier Network - Poland

ZK explained that PIONIER is a consortium of MANs, and while PSNC is responsible for PR and communication with their local Poznań MAN with which they have direct contact, contact is difficult with the MANs in the rest of Poland.

He thinks that PR activities should be in two steps. PSNC should give the MANS general information but that the MANS should deal with PR activities locally with the institutions they connect. For example, PSNC has good press contacts in their local area and these should be built up the same way by the other MANS.

ARNES, Slovenia

TD reported that ARNES has had no strategy in the past to communicate with users, and that the only contact point has been user support. They communicate only with the network administrators and in the case of smaller institutions, this communication is quite good as these need more support and thus are in closer contact. At present, this support is not formally organised.

They do have reasonably good communication with the schools that are connected, holding an annual schools conference and this works well. They are involved in teacher training and also are in close contact with the top-level libraries, where they have an organised support programme.

Their major problem at present is that if they want to offer a service, the NREN staff and the administrators don't know each other. They don't have a users' conference like CARNet and feel that if they had one, the teachers would come but researchers wouldn't.

EENet, Estonia

MR was able to report that because of her annual user survey, she knows exactly how many users are connected to their network, at present, 228,000.

Because of their statutes, they cannot contact them directly, but can only serve the connected institutions. However, they manage to circumvent some of the restrictions through services they offer, such as, the mail boxes they offer users and the web pages hosted for teachers. They foresee that their imminent eduroam service will be another opportunity to reach out directly to the users.

EENet hosts the database of the Estonian school system which gives them a further opportunity for contact, and they host a web page with listings of the all the freeware available in the country.

The NREN does not have a specific person to deal with end-user affairs. They have a news website that they can use to disseminate information about services, and they have also started an electronic newsletter which is sent to all the administrative contact people.

EENet uses an annual computer drawing contest to (unofficially) raise awareness about the network. They would be interested in sharing this competition with other NRENs and make it an international event.

DFN, Germany

GF outlined the scope of the DFN network, which connects 384 institutions in Germany and has 410 members in the association. All of these have thousands of end users connected to their networks. DFN has no programme to communicate with the end users.

They hold two general assembly meetings per year, which are attended by the decision-makers of the member institutions, who are generally the heads of the computer departments and in these meetings, they hear what their support and technical needs are.

In addition, they hold special workshops on specific services like videoconferencing. With some groups, this works well and in others, not at all.

DFN produces a monthly newsletter and a quarterly brochure targeted not only at the technical people, but also at the administrators and they use these to 'advertise' the services available on the network. They would like to increase the focus on services offered rather than on the network itself, and make users aware that they can get advice from DFN on how to use the services and who to contact for help.

HEAnet, Ireland

RT explained that for HEAnet, their end users are the heads of the IT departments at the connected institutions. These institutions connect approximately 130,000 users.

HEAnet does produce fact sheets on specific services, such as videoconferencing and they also hold an annual conference in November.

HEAnet also produces an electronic newsletter three times per year and they use this to raise awareness of the network and the services offered.

Last year, they produced a video about HEAnet. Included in their strategic planning for the future is an internal questionnaire, which they may also use externally to collect user information.

BELNET, Belgium

VC reported that BELNET connects about 550,000 users. Approximately one third of these are involved with the administration of the institutions and are not of interest to BELNET.

The management of BELNET has made a three-year strategy, which will focus on researchers and the universities, specifically in the science faculties, and not in the others, such as arts and humanities and not in the schools. BELNET has two full-time customer relations people who concentrate their efforts both on the administrators of the networks and the IT people.

They presently have good contacts with the IT people at the institutions and plan to concentrate on strengthening these through user days and other events and materials. They will concentrate on presenting BELNET as a research network, so direct contact with the general student body is not a priority. Testimonials from researchers are most valuable in creating and maintaining this image so that they will continue to get their funding.

RENATER, France

VB explained that RENATER is a backbone with 800 sites in 39 regions so it is difficult to have contact with individual researchers. They hold an end-user day in December but do not have a strategy to reach the students. They produce a newsletter and there is user information on their website. However, RENATER is generally well-known, especially by the institutions and most researchers.

JISC, United Kingdom

RH-C outlined that his audience is 1/ funders 2/ strategic partners 3/ organisations (research councils, professional associations, national organisations) 4/international organisations so they don't and won't ever get to communication with the students.

Consortium GARR, Italy

FT said that GARR has no direct contact with students but consider the connected organisations to be their end users. They do have good communication with these, mainly involving technicians, but also with administrators and managers. They run technical workshops and also training sessions for special groups with special requirements. More attentions is now being given to non-standard applications such as the arts and theatre.

GARR is going to connect schools (primary and secondary) and are going to have to change the way they communicate with users as these will have different needs, a different level of awareness and will require a lot more support. GARR will not be able to manage all of this for all schools and will need to develop a new system with call centres, which could possibly be outsourced. In general, there will be many changes in the next few years in the area of communication with users.

UKERNA, UK

RN outlined the situation in the UK where they have no contact with students or researchers but only with the connected organisations.

Important to their strategy is their requirement that each institution provides three different contacts (although, in smaller organisations, this may be the same person). Each connected institution must provide a management contact, a technical contact, and a CERT contact. UKERNA has about 1000 organisations connected to JANET and about 2500 end users (connected institutions). They produce printed materials such as cookbooks and technical guides, provide information for users on their website, and organise both an annual conference and smaller events to support their users and provide information about the services offered.

Defining our target

The chair listed the possible groups with whom we could communicate and polled the attendees to find out how many are currently contacting each group (shown in brackets). For the purpose of the task force sub-group, the groups above the line will be referred to as 'clients' and the groups below the line will be referred to as 'users' or 'end-users'.

CLIENTS

government (all)
funders/members (all)
connected institutions including libraries and hospitals (all)
technical contacts (all)

END USERS

researchers/scientists (now 8, interested 11)
teachers (now 3, interested 6)
students (now 2/3, interested 7)

Our target for the sub-group is therefore 'below the line' user groups

Review of the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Sub-group

The current ToR is for two years and the sub-group agreed to have at least half of the work started before the TF-PR meeting in Catania. It was noted that the ToR includes the possibility of adding deliverables. Russell will ask the task force for suggestions through the mailing list.
(ACTION 1 - RN)

CdG stressed the urgent need to clearly define the objectives of the task force sub-group and too make a very clear distinction between this group and the LCPM working group. ER will

discuss this with Walter van Dijk of the LCPM initiative and will report back to the sub-group with this definition. **(ACTION 2 - ER)**

The sub-group agreed that we do not yet need a sub-group mailing list but may decide to establish one later on.

Deliverable I (led by Sandra Passchier)

How to get feedback from users

Sandra will work on ways to share the outcome of usability testing, user surveys between the NRENs and will start to identify common needs to be addressed in for the future work. This will include involving Gitte in more activities on testing of accessibility and usability of the network. Sandra Passchier, SURFnet, Gitte Kudsk, UNI-C and Zoran Birimisa, CARNet will work on this deliverable. **(ACTION 3 - SP)**

Deliverable J (led by Dale Robertson)

Segmentation of User Groups

DR pointed out that the survey conducted by DANTE in 2003 covered contacts in 20 countries of users from the groups above and below the line. The group will take a closer look at the data collected. They will also look at the differences between the needs of this group and the GN2 PR group. DR will add some people to the working group and begin to define some activities for the next TF-PR meeting, possibly including the use of user panels as a tool to get feedback. **(ACTION 4 - DR)**

This group will also look at the use of user panels in obtaining feedback from users. **(ACTION 5 - DR)**

Deliverable K (led by Elise Roders)

Best Practice in marketing communication

The group was of the opinion that it is not possible to communicate with end users through the technical contacts of the client institutions. CdG will look into this with a view to preparing a profile of these technical contacts to see if we can find a way to get to the end users through them. **(ACTION 6 - CdG)**

ER reported that SURFnet has services and want to get them used more. One of their main contact points is their website which is set up as portals for difference groups.

The group will investigate the approaches of various NRENs, will find out about campaigns and activities that work and create how sheets with suggestions of basic, practical things. **(ACTION 7 - ER)**

Members of the task force will also be encouraged to request ideas through the mailing list in order to solve specific problems.