1. Welcome from Chair and Gitte Kudsk (UNI-C). Round of Introductions

Welcome and introduction

The meeting was chaired by Maria Ristkok (EENet) in the absence of the chair Russell Nelson (UKERNA) during the first part of the meeting. MR opened the meeting and welcomed everybody. She noted that the meeting would mainly focus on the terms of reference (ToR): review of the present and working out the new one; during the second part of the meeting a portal developed by REDIRIS would be demonstrated by TF-ECS (Enhanced Communication Services) and could end up as a deliverable for TF-PR.

Gitte Kudsk from UNI-C welcomed the attendees to Denmark and gave some tips about local sights and useful Danish words.

Introduction round

The meeting was attended by 23 people from Europe and beyond (e.g Brazil) from 15 countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claudio</td>
<td>Allocchio</td>
<td>GARR</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajos</td>
<td>Balint</td>
<td>NIIF/Hungarnet</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Greve Bendixen</td>
<td>UNI-C/Forskningsnettet</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>LGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Camilleri</td>
<td>University of Malta</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>DANTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>KC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veerle</td>
<td>Custers</td>
<td>BELNET</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>VCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomi</td>
<td>Dolenc</td>
<td>ARNES</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawel</td>
<td>Dunczewski</td>
<td>ICM, Warsaw University</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Durnford</td>
<td>TERENA</td>
<td></td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td>Grojsgold</td>
<td>RNP</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avgust</td>
<td>Jauk</td>
<td>ARNES</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>AJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner</td>
<td>Koblitz</td>
<td>ACONet</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>WK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>Krcmarova</td>
<td>CESNET</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>GK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitte Julin</td>
<td>Kudsk</td>
<td>UNI-C/Forskningsnettet</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>GJK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>UKERNA</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>RN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Panigl</td>
<td>ACONet</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MR ran through the present ToR, which were reviewed as a group. KV asked for deletion of the sentence “Participation will be on a voluntary basis.”. CP made a suggestion to explain the difference between various TF-PR mailing lists in ToR: 1) general mailing list tf-pr@terena.org 2) pr-work@terena.org


Run through of deliverables

PR for Dummies – to be renamed.

KC commented that she was creating similar things for TEIN2 and EUMEDCONNECT and these were termed PR Tool kits. MR had also found that at earlier meetings someone had suggested naming it “Communication Concepts”. CP suggested uploading fact sheets onto a wiki for easier updating. SW suggested doing PR for fact sheets and letting more people know that these resources exist. It was agreed that PR about the existence of the fact sheets should be done.

ER asked whether members of TF-PR should attend other meetings to raise awareness amongst other TFs and the links that can be established between the TFs.

It was also questioned how to update the wiki page with the fact sheets and who should be the overseer.

Inter-Task Force cooperation

MR: what can TF-PR do for other task forces? It was agreed that TF-PR needs an overview of what other groups and task forces are doing.

ER marked that the general aim of TF-PR should be increasing inter-task force cooperation.

It was agreed that everyone should look out for possibilities to present at other task forces.
**PeaR news agency** – the best brand of TF-PR, but not enough items are published. The question is how to make it more active. Should the news agency be led by people who post a lot – GRNET, CESNET, DANTE? It was agreed that regular reminders to the mailing list would be helpful and handy. MR also suggested monitoring our own TF-PR activity more actively. WK shared his idea about what the purpose of this task force is; that TF-PRs exchange ideas on how to do PR within our own NRENs and that we have the possibility to learn from each other. Thus it is not just to do work that is of little external value.

**Action:** discuss changing leaders of PeaR via mailing list, send reminders to the pr-work mailing list, Laura to ask Christian to add features so PeaR members can edit after putting it up, in addition to be able to set the date at which the news item will become live.

**A monthly newsletter based on PeaR for senior managers within NRENs** was discussed. ER suggested role of TERENA in this (layout plain text, photos), the question is also whether the newsletter would be printable or just electronically available. GK said we need to raise use of PeaR. It was also agreed that newsletters should have visual material. LD asked who it is for. Originally it was suggested to be for the senior NREN managers. GK suggested to extend people to receive it. LD: have headlines email and links to click through. It was also discussed whether a separate newsletter would be necessary at all – instead the group could concentrate more on the PeaR news agency and make it better. WK backed this idea.

**Action:** LD to look into who receives PeaR, stats on hits etc.

**TF-PR Compendium** – an overview of what NRENs are doing in the field of PR and information dissemination. The turnout has been quite good in getting information in reply to list of questions. ER suggested discussing the list of questions at the next meeting in Lisbon.

**Private members website**

MR asked for input into contacts at the beginning. KV asked why the private members website is important for the group. MR answered that private contact data, drafts of documents are kept in this environment and thus shared just with the group. It was agreed that the website could be more active and the reason why it is not used enough is that people have forgotten access to it or how to use it. ER found that she could make a small workshop on dealing with the wikis and PR websites.

**Action:** make a workshop on using the wikis and PR websites at the next meeting. Add more info to the website.
End-user communication subgroup – not to include in ToR now (like 'how to get feedback from Users), but go via 'How To' sheets.

Some elements were already incorporated into 'how to' sheets and new deliverables. The same was with segmentation on target groups, best practices on marketing communications.

Suggested new deliverables

Calendar of streaming events – incorporate into TERENA events calendar? KV asked for people to email secretariat with events details, because often not even TERENA’s events calendar includes all the important events. This is why a separate calendar would be a good idea. On the other hand it was estimated to be enough with the existing TERENA calendar – a central place as a good option, but members should more actively inform TERENA about what is happening.

Decision: not to be taken as a deliverable.

Databases – need to find experts on databases for advice: what can be done, what cannot etc. ER to ask a colleague who has some experience. VC: what is expected in this area – what kind of information do we want to put in. MR replied that the first ideas were to make a database for contacts, another idea from the very start of TF-PR was to make a database of projects etc. TD found that contacts database could be useful, he also asked if the database would be more than a list. VC brought out the accessibility questions: how it will be accessible and would it be accessible to all, whether it should be done via the web or some other way. Another question is who will be responsible for updating the database and how the updating process is done: e.g. one person responsible, more people responsible. GK found that there could be more practical advice given on how to build databases for your own use. TD suggested that if the group wants something simple it could start to collect information for given period of time. VC found: “we have to decide first what we want.”

Action: Start with a deliverable of simple contact database. ER to ask a colleague who has some experience, the group to find an expert to talk about the possibilities of databases at the next meetings.

Round table

One of the suggestions made during the earlier meetings was to make a deliverable for round table sessions. Thus MR asked the group whether it should be a different deliverable. She had an idea of briefing on events the members have attended and asked the group whether it would be worthwhile to share experiences of what has been discussed: topics, trends, questions set up and problems found etc. It was agreed to be a useful idea. ER replied that the group could set topic on the agenda
of each meeting.

**Decision:** not to take it as a deliverable

**Action:** start a session at every meeting in which members of the group report back to each other about meetings etc they have attended in the meanwhile.

**Webmasters subgroup** – whether to end up as a deliverable
KV had heard from Christian that he was in favour of presentations about web issues in TF-PR meetings but did not see any deliverables that could be produced by a separate subgroup of webmasters, also because not all NRENs have dedicated webmasters and where dedicated webmasters are employed their responsibilities are very different.

The group found that they could do presentations now and then within TF-PR. VC pointed out that web is opening up and there are new trends and role of web in mobile technologies. Thus it was agreed that the group should keep up to date about the opportunities in new technologies etc.

**Decision:** not to make it as a separate deliverable, but have one web-related presentation or topic discussion per meeting.

RN came up as part of web subgroup discussion.

**Further Communication concepts:** Last meeting Roland Eugster gave a good presentation on the topic. Thus it would be good to handle the topic further.

**Possible action:** make a presentation at one of the TERENA General Assembly meetings.

**A library of technical talks**
Aim to gather presentations about technical talks that can be used by a broader audience. SW suggested broadening out to any presentations the group comes across that would be of use. This was decided as a good idea.

**Gallery of images for sharing**
It was agreed to be a good idea.

**Decision:** added as a deliverable

**Action:** LD to check status of images database at TERENA.

**Topics that were proposed – workshops and seminars**

**New ideas:** making corporate videos, federations (ER to look into options), VoIP seminar –
overview on VoIP.

**More international cooperation** – Look into Internet2 giving videoconference at Lisbon meeting on their approach to PR.

**Community centred websites** – with collaborative web spaces (Web 2.0) – At the next meeting JISC will have a presentation on how to make interactive websites.

**Cross promotion of NRENs and their services** – what our family of NRENs is doing. Encourage more NREN profiles in newsletters (like UKERNA quarterly newsletter).

**Community centred pan-European NREN services** – promoting eduroam, VISIT, etc. Promoting point-to-point services. Eduroam – RN finding some universities resistant to it. ER told that in the Netherlands not all universities use roaming device. TD found that it is the same for Slovenia, but he feels that it needs to reach a critical mass before it will change. Need to know national picture of NRENs – (possible workshop/survey/lessons learned – implementing eduroam). TD said that small ambition is to have better contacts with other contacts.

ER suggested incorporating into wider federation presentation.

**How to:**

- Video and DVD
- Annual Report
- Plan and carry out user surveys
- Create a communication plan

**Workshops:**

**Databases**

**Promoting TF-PR** – something we develop as a group

**How to use WIKI and private members area**

**Online events management** – GS said that CARNET has an environment where people can book things on-line – virtual events management.

**In-house handling of payments** – GK said there was an idea to have things brought in house.

MR suggested some more topics:

**Crisis communication** – cyber attacks etc.
**Briefing of events**: de-brief others on events attended, trends noticed etc (which turned to be a good idea and will be included in every round table session)

**Market research and marketing communication** – anything on **branding**? Like how to carry out a brand analysis.

**Research methods of communication**. KC thought it could probably be part of the segmentation project.

**Handling PR** as one of NREN priorities – **tackling problems of understanding what PR is**.

**Collaboration with other academic network associations** (e.g communicating with special user groups). ER said they have different communication with user groups at SURFnet, but it's a process of trial and error. RN offered to share his experiences on engaging more with librarians and estate managers: “for our SMS service different positioning is required”.

**MR then ran through list of deliverables**

**PeaR** – need to generate more content before we can start promoting it outside ourselves

**How To's** – circulate list of new ones. GK happy to continue. Roland proposed as deputy (should be checked with him as well)

**TF-PR Compendium** – annual compendium to be presented at annual TNC. Technical co-ordinator is Rachael Beale from DANTE. RN asked it to be noted that thanks should be given to RB.

**Closed website for TF-PR** – ongoing

**Running streaming and videoconference events** – VC spoke to Carol, but it still needs to be defined what can be done. Action: discuss it further.

**Inter-task force co-operation** – not to be included as a separate deliverable, but an agenda item only.

**Databases** – wait and see. TD suggested starting with something simple and see what happens. VC pointed out that the purpose needs to be defined from the start.

**Round table** – not separate deliverable, but an agenda item only.

**Library of technical talks** – continue. Find people and right topics at general level – colleagues who can teach.

4. **Presentation on ARCA – federated access to multimedia content - by Diego Lopez**

http://arca.uc3m.es

Collaboration team: Diego Lopez (RedIRIS), Francisco Cruz (UCM3), Catalin Meirosu (TERENA)
Diego Lopez ran a demo of ARCA. the software was developed by RedIRIS and will be installed on the TERENA server. The original plan was to use the portal only for Arts & Humanities – the PEACHES project. TF-PR could work out how to provide content for many other areas: content for schools, conferences & workshops that are streamed. ARCA is like an “NREN version of YouTube, flickr”.

Main goals:

- Harmonise and centralise all the information about available multimedia content.
- Up to date information – especially with respect to changes in each institution schedules.
- Flexibility for participating institutions, so they can change announcements on their own.
- In use by RedIRIS community, and currently being evaluated by TERENA.

Built out of channels – a source of multimedia content (podcasts, video on demand, live events). Every institution is associated with one or more channels.

- Playing of items either embedded videos or external viewers.
- Supports direct playing of podcasts – a “universal podcast player”
- I-Tunes friendly – can point I-Tunes direct to ARCA portal
- Based on Apache, PHP5 and MySQL
- 7 institutions currently participating (in addition UNED – a Spanish Open University)
- 700 items available – with UNED up to 70,000.

Topology question: your URL needs to be in source database. Sources from Commercial Internet (not dependent on running over RedIRIS).

5. Round Table

Maria Ristkok gave an overview of the Porta Optica Study project. The program started to address digital divide inside European research and education community. It lasted for 15 months and is finishing now.

The beneficiary countries are from Southern Caucasus (Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan), Eastern Europe (Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine) and the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania).

Potential impact of the project: 9 countries, 136 cities, 1400 research institutions, over 700 higher education institutions and over 2 million end users. Construction of fibre network is needed in all regions: 190 km in Southern Caucasus, 5800 km in the Baltic States, 6000 km in Eastern Europe.
6. 15:45 -16:00 AOB

- Kevin Meynell's finding about Wikipedia - information about NRENs. ER said it would be good to have structure, because it's quite a strict community to write for. RN pointed out that people are more likely to find NRENs through Google and not via wikipedia with its strict rules.
- Suggest people who would be good to invite to give presentations at workshops
- TD asked the group about point-to-point connections. ARNES does not have many users for this kind of service. The question is what can be done to promote that service. We may have few users but they would not be aware of this possibility. SW said that the process was being set up and service promotion could follow. ER gave details of lightpath competition “Enlighten your research” (June 21st for awarding).
  It was found that specific lightpath material would be useful. VC has used GÉANT2 interactive demo to introduce networking (UoM) to potential new customers.
- KV spoke about GLIF website and brochure with applications profiled.
- The next TF-PR meeting will take place in Lisbon on 27 and 28 September, with GÉANT2 PR meeting on Wednesday before.

7. Close