

Minutes TF-PR Meeting - TNC 2004, Rhodes - 6 June 2004

1. Welcome and introduction TF-PR

The chair opened the meeting, welcoming those who have not attended a TF-PR before. The chair gave a brief introduction to TF-PR, explaining that the taskforce is the first non-technical one at TERENA and was set-up to represent the NRENS on information dissemination. The Chair explained that the taskforce also provides TERENA members with an opportunity to exchange both ideas and experiences.

TF-PR has several formal deliverables but the Chair would present more about these at the TF-PR session at the TERENA Networking Conference (TNC) later this week. It was also mentioned that Gitte Kudsk would present in detail about one of the deliverables to the TERENA General Assembly on Thursday at the TNC.

2. Introduction round

Short round of introductions (20 attendees)

Lajos Balint	-	Hungarnet	-	Hungary	-	LK
Jo Barnett secretary)	-	TERENA	-	Netherlands	-	JB (meeting
Zoran Birimisa	-	CARNet	-	Croatia	-	ZB
Roland Eugster	-	SWITCH	-	Switzerland	-	RE
Gerti Foest	-	DFN	-	Germany	-	GF
Robert Haymon-Collins	-	JISC	-	United Kingdom	-	RHC
Werner Koblitz	-	ACOnet	-	Austria	-	WK
Dimitra Kotsokali	-	GRNET	-	Greece	-	DK
Michal Krsek	-	CESNET	-	Czech Republic	-	MK
Gitte Kudsk	-	UNI-C	-	Denmark	-	GK
Russell Nelson	-	UKERNA	-	United Kingdom	-	RN
Sandra Passchier	-	SURFnet	-	Netherlands	-	Chair
Maria Riskok	-	EENET	-	Estonia	-	MR
Dale Robertson	-	DANTE	-	United Kingdom	-	DR
Elise Roders	-	SURFnet	-	Netherlands	-	ER
Karel Vietsch	-	TERENA	-	Netherlands	-	KV
Shirley Wood	-	UKERNA	-	United Kingdom	-	SW
Simon Watts	-	DANTE	-	United Kingdom	-	SW
Patricia Soria	-	HEAnet	-	Republic of Ireland	-	PS
Carol de Groot	-	TERENA	-	Netherlands	-	CdG

The chair explained that at the bi-annual TF-PR meetings, the progress of the deliverables is discussed. The chair explained that the meeting at Rhodes was an extra and therefore would not focus on the deliverables – instead the time would be used as a forum to exchange ideas.

3. Security Awareness Campaign

Elise Roders (ER) presented SURFnet's new security awareness campaign: "They're out to get you" (<http://www.terena.nl/news/pr/presentations/detective.ppt>). SURFnet created the campaign following a request from institutions who were suffering increasingly from worms and viruses. Aimed at end-users, the campaign has three key messages:

- Install security software and updates
- Keep passwords to yourself
- Back-up your files

ER explained that SURFnet consciously didn't use the campaign as a virus alert because they didn't want to be responsible for alerting institutions to undetected viruses, explaining: "We built the roads, we don't check the traffic."

The tools of the campaign included:

- 2500 posters
- 200,000 freecards (postcards in racks around the Netherlands)
- a special website www.outtogetyou.nl
- newsletter
- press release
- screensaver

ER added that the campaign is ongoing and SURFnet plans more publicity, give-aways, interactivity and new functionality of the website. The next stage of the campaign will co-incide with the new university term in the Netherlands.

ER asked TF-PR for feedback, and wanted to know if the taskforce thought the campaign could become a "European-wide campaign".

RE asked about the budget for the campaign. ER said that with the poster design, freecards and website the total budget for the campaign was around 60,000 Euros.

RE asked if SURFnet if the universities had to pay for the posters. ER said that the universities asked for them so SURFnet gave them for free.

KV asked who paid for the campaign. ER explained that SURFnet decided to pay for the campaign because they saw it as a good investment. ER said that in the future if SURFnet decides to create more giveaways then they would look into alternatives for funding. ER added that if universities wanted to include their logos on the posters they were required to pay 250 euros per poster.

RN asked as the campaign was aimed at end-user, if SURFnet planned to run a similar campaign for those who administrators. ER explained the campaign was aimed at the end-users as research has shown they are the weakest link. ER added that network administrators tend to know what they are talking about so are not so susceptible to viruses and worms.

WK asked who in SURFnet decided to do such a campaign. ER explained that the campaign was born because SURFnet was asked by the institutions to do something. The communications team at SURFnet came up with the campaign idea and made a proposal to their managers. The budget was already in existence.

RE asked if SURFnet worked with the universities or alone. ER said the concept was discussed within SURFnet (and the external agency) and then the messages were presented to the universities who were happy with it.

ER then asked TF-PR if anyone thought a similar campaign could be successful in their countries.

RE said that he didn't know the extent of the problem in Switzerland as yet so wasn't sure. He asked if SURFnet had evaluated the campaign.

ER said not officially but they had looked at the number of hits on the website and the press coverage in the Netherlands which was positive.

RN said that the end-user market was not really relevant to UKERNA but that he would be interested if SURFnet widen the campaign to target systems administrators.

RHC said that UKERNA are planning to roll-out a network to adult learning and the campaign may be relevant to that audience rather than their normal system administrators.

The chair then suggested feedback from everyone and went round the table.

SW said that UKERNA can't get to the end-users because they feel security is their responsibility, not UKERNA's but would be interested if the campaign was extended to systems administrators.

DK said that GRNET are one step behind and do not think that they are ready to pass messages about security to their end-users at this stage.

CdG said the campaign was a good example of the methodology of a campaign and NRENs could benefit from that rather than using the actual message.

LK said Hungary admires the Netherlands and how they organise campaigns like these. He felt it would be difficult to do such a campaign in Hungary but that he would take the idea back and maybe use the campaign even in a slightly different way.

WK added that TF-PR is a very good taskforce as we can learn from each other. He said he would take the concept home and see if he could do something with it, depending on the budget.

ER said that if funding is the only problem in carrying out a campaign like this then TF-PR could perhaps try and get funding from the EU.

GF said that Germany has the same issue as UKERNA – they don't communicate with their end-users. She felt that perhaps the campaign could be adapted and directed to another level at the universities.

ZB said that although CARNet does communicate directly with the end-user he doesn't have the budget to replicate the campaign this year. He will think about budgeting for it in 2005.

RE says he likes the idea and will put it on the agenda at Switch. However he doesn't yet know if security is a priority in Switzerland but feels that if EU funding was to be available then it would give security a higher level of importance.

KV said that if TF-PR wanted to go for EU funding then a proposal would have to be made by the end of the year (November 2004).

PS from HEAnet is interested in the campaign but added that security is handled by system administrators so may adapt the campaign to target other audiences, for example schools.

MR said that it is a very interesting campaign but isn't sure it is suitable for EENET.

MK said he thought the idea was very good but wasn't sure of the suitability of the campaign for all NRENs as many don't have contact with their end-users.

CdG asked if it would be possible for SURFnet to make a package for the universities to use themselves.

ER said SURFnet will think of concepts like that.

The chair said the TF-PR mailing list would be utilised to discuss more options for the campaign.

4. Information Dissemination

Maria Ristkok from EENET presented first, explaining that the majority of EENET's information dissemination activities stem from the information that EENET must make available under the Public Information Act in Estonia.

At the end of the presentation, KV said that he had rarely seen such a clear demonstration of the enormous cultural differences that there are working across Europe. He added that some of the things EENET have to make public are illegal to make public in other countries. KV then asked MR if anyone does read the minutes EENET puts on their website.

MR replied that journalists are very interested in the weekly progress reports and although EENET doesn't have to make those public, they prefer to in order to be transparent.

RHC asked whether it was difficult dealing with commercial relationships when everything has to be so transparent.

MR responded that for commercially sensitive things EENET only put the bare contractual details on the site.

RHC said that he was amazed that journalists in Estonia take the time to look through the sheer amount of information on the site, adding that journalists in the United Kingdom would not.

LK asked when EENET started publicising all this information and whether they feel any benefit in doing so.

MK said the amount of information just continued to grow and although at the beginning it was very time consuming, it is useful to have it as a reference now.

In the presentation, MK mentioned that the offices were open for people to visit if they wished. The chair asked who tended to visit the office. MK answered that it was usually system administrators but occasionally the public would come in.

<http://www.terena.nl/news/pr/presentations/eenet.ppt>

The next to present was Russell Nelson from UKERNA. RN started by explaining what UKERNA had to release under the Freedom of Information Act in the UK to make the public sector transparent and then move to explain what UKERNA chose release.

RN explained that verbal communication within a company is largely unregulated and that staff will often put their own subjective views across which can dilute the key messages of a company. RN said UKERNA decided to explore what staff felt the key messages were and the results were quite shocking. In one workshop there was general agreement about the company's key messages, but in another nobody could agree.

JB asked RN that if there was confusion over the key messages of an organisation didn't highlight a gap in the internal communications? RN agreed but explained that UKERNA do have internal communications in the form of an intranet (which is currently undergoing a revamp) and monthly meetings with all divisions together.

<http://www.terena.nl/news/pr/presentations/ukerna.ppt>

The next to present was DK from GRNET.

DK's presentation highlighted GRNET's national and international initiatives, objectives and expected results.

LK asked whether DK was personally responsible for doing all of GRNET's dissemination. DK explained that GRNET have a team of people who work together which is integral to GRNET's philosophy about dissemination.

RHC said that GRNET's audience list was interesting but seemed very ambitious with UNESCO and NATO as target audiences. He said that GRNET users were not part of the target audience and asked where they fit in.

DK said that in her presentation she tried to concentrate more on dissemination plans rather than the end-users as GRNET yet haven't found a way to communicate directly with them.

WK said that it is interesting to see the differences between NRENs. He said that AConet's main audience is the Universities, not end-users. AConet provide the network to the Universities and how they handle the end-users is seen as their challenge, not AConet's.

DK asked if that is the case then how can AConet increase their network and strengthen their status.

WK said that as AConet's main funding comes from the Government but that there are several institutions that have to pay for connection. He explained that schools have a different solution – a separate company provides the path between AConet and the schools. He added that from next year there will be no central budget so Universities will have to make contracts direct with AConet.

DK said that it is very important for GRNET to maintain a budget from the Ministry so they need to constantly prove how good their network is.

The chair said that information dissemination needs a follow-up and will go onto the agenda for the next TF-PR meeting.

<http://www.terena.nl/news/pr/presentations/grnet.ppt>

5. PeaR News

The chair said that the question is whether PeaR should now be made public.

RN explained that there have been some negative comments because people can't access PeaR. Postings have risen and as a result the demand has risen to view it.

The chair said it was her opinion that PeaR should go public but that people should continue to post news items.

RN asked KV about it as he thought it wasn't ready to go live at the last meeting. KV said that originally PeaR was supposed to be for NREN PRs to use in their own newsletters and at the last meeting he had reservations because the postings were so low. They have now risen to 3 items per week, which is acceptable. KV's other reservation was that if people were uploading rubbish that HEAnet and UKERNA should continue to check the items and act as an editorial board.

CdG said that it still doesn't have an international feel so it is important to include items from a wide-range of European countries. This may mean publicising the fact that only a summary in English is necessary and that the main news items can be published in own languages.

MK said that perhaps some way of filtering is necessary so people can sort on certain languages.

The chair concluded that PeaR would go public but would be re-evaluated at the next TF-PR meeting in September.

6. AOB

The chair added that for the next meeting the TF-PR group is invited to Vienna. The dates were decided upon – 16 and 17 September.

The chair thanked everyone for attending and officially closed the meeting.