NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the At-Large Technology Taskforce call on the 5th of August, 2013. On the call today we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Maureen Hilyard, Gordon Chillcott, Glenn McKnight. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have two apologies, one from Yaovi Atohoun and Bill Thanis.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much, Nathalie. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Chair of the Technology Taskforce. Okay. One of the things that – for those who – we've been using LUCID for the past few meetings. As you're now seeing, LUCID has now implemented their new version of LUCID Meetings and it's obviously a very big visual difference. So the things there are pretty much in the same place as they were before – the agenda and you can [view] documents to the left. On the right-hand side, you have your speaker's queue, attendees, group chat, and audio.

At the bottom, the key difference apart from the visual refresh is that there's a bottom toolbar and we can pop – collapse some of these things on the right-hand side where you put the X. For example, the audio which is not going to be used. You could put an X and it will drop

---

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

down to the bottom. And then you could click on the audio to bring it back up.

So let's just look at the action – review of the action items. I don't want to spend too much time because some of the things that we're going to be focusing on are relatively new topics that came up within the past months. One is the web conferencing, which is later on the agenda, and then the social media strategy which is also on the agenda for this call. So I'm not going to spend too much time on it, but I'm keeping it as a reference.

Lance is not on this call. So part of the new action items that was recorded on the previous call, he [inaudible] updated us on for this call.

In terms of the ongoing AI, the TTF must evaluate and review tools regarding accessibility of the tools. This is also another key thing that's also kind of been lagging and now needs to step up. I've been talking to [inaudible] who is from Armenia, represents an At-Large structure that deals with disabled users or differently able persons. And now that she's coming off of NomCom, she could now help us a lot more. This is not my key subject focus.

Let's see. In progress. Lance to create a template for structuring information. Okay. That's ongoing. The glossary of Terms, I'll bring that up in this social media strategy on that one. Well, staff to find date in Durban. We could cross that out. Okay.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry. I'm really trying to find – this is the first time I'm using LUCID. I don't seem to get into the chat. Maybe I don't have real access. Maybe I'm coming in only as a guest. But I'm not able to open up a chat box or put my hand up in any of the classic features of any kind of web conferencing.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Strange. This is Dev. Go ahead. All right, I'll respond after that. Go ahead, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Second of all, what I see on my screen is I don't see the agenda items. I can't click through it and I don't see the list of your action items either. These are just – I don't want to interrupt you but I want to make sure I'm on the same page.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Glenn. Well, just because it's going – all I did was provided a link to the Wiki page on the. If you look on the left "Review of Action Items" you see that I just put the link to it. I didn't really add a formal PDF or Word document or anything of that sort at this point.

The group shot should be on the right-hand side. It's currently at the bottom of the – I'll say the bottom right of the screen. So if you want to bring it up, you could close off say the audio and possibly the attendees,

and then it will move up in the group and up on the right-hand side, so to speak.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. On the upper right is the speaker's queue. Now, hopefully once you've seen that. I see Gordon Chillcott raised his hand. So, Gordon?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: I just noticed that – oh, Glenn is now one of the attendees. I'll see if I can start off a private chat to him. But, Glenn, can you enter a chat now?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: It's okay. Thanks very much. Back over to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Yes. That's also one of the features there. If you notice now on the group there's a plus new. And from that we can enter a private chat with person. That is one of the features that was implemented from our comments. All right. Let's move on to the next agenda item, which is Agenda Item 3. Let's move it on now.

Looking at the comparison of web conferencing solutions. Before the Durban Meeting, we were obviously looking at LUCID, given its internal rollout in ICANN, and since then we've also looked up – getting to look at other technology web conferencing solutions I should say.

Olivier recommended BlueJeans network for review. We mentioned the WebEx which is from Cisco. And Glenn, who has now joined the Technology Taskforce has also pointed out several other new tools. One of which is ReadyTalk as a web conferencing solution.

So I've already updated the Wiki page on it. Okay. And then one of the things that has me thinking was that – and what Glenn was also suggesting was – well, you need some sort of matrix, some sort of methodology by which we can compare the features and come up with the pluses or minuses of each technology tool so that we could [properly] evaluate the solutions. Especially as we try different solutions, how do we rank them? How do we compare them and so forth?

One of the things we've done, and I'll move on ahead to the next agenda item, which is actually 0.1 which is the actual comparison of web conferencing solutions. What I've done is tried to put together a matrix so that – well, I see some updates and suggestions by Glenn and possibly other members of the Technology Taskforce – as to a key set of features, the desired features for At-Large use. And then we have each of the technology web conferencing solutions: Adobe Connect, LUCID Meetings. And now we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight – eight versions of – eight web conferencing solutions.

Just to go through quickly what some of the features that I put [there], there's technology support. That supports a variety of operating systems. There's the support Windows, Macintosh, Linux. There's the support of variety of mobile or tablet platforms – does it have public and private text chat? Does it have things such as a speakers' queue, meeting scheduling, the ability to present documents, to be able to get poll attendees or get a sense of what people are agreeing or disagreeing with what's being proposed, screen sharing, accessibility, bandwidth. Not everybody has high-speed bandwidth, so if solution has lower bandwidth requirement that may be more appropriate especially for those areas, for those ALS representatives that don't have good bandwidth. Maximum number of participants and things such as – during the Technology Taskforce presentation in Durban, the issue of cost was raised. I've included it, although I don't think that's really a key feature in terms of whether – unless it's something outrageously expensive. But obviously if you ask ICANN implement this, the cost won't really be a factor of such. But it might be useful for At-Large Structures considering solutions for their use.

Now that I've run through briefly some of the features here, is there any particular criterion that is missing from this table? I see Gordon wants to – wishes to speak. Gordon, go ahead.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Some of these factors that have been put in are interrelated to some degree. Bandwidth is affected by a number of things. I see full voice VoIP is one item that's in there and video is under which can impact bandwidth fairly heavily. However, there's something else.

There are two different kinds of tools really. There are conferencing tools and there are collaboration tools. They're a little bit different. Collaboration tools do tend to have a fairly serious bandwidth but they are necessary. Especially for teams – by team here I'm talking about five people or less, preferably four people or less – who are working on a document.

A good collaboration tool would be really, really handy here because the discussions – I'll use that term – about how some things should be worded can be in my experience a lot more quickly resolved with a collaboration tool where everybody can sort of put their finger in the pie. You've got to keep the number of people on that call down, which is also a good thing because it lowers the cost.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you, Glenn. Sorry. Thank, you, Gordon. Sorry when I mix up. Indeed, you're probably right. Some of these factors are interrelated and impact each other. For example, full voice VoIP and full web cam usage would probably be much higher bandwidth requirements and therefore – but I take that point.

In terms of collaboration solutions versus web conferencing solutions, yes, we use both. Well, I was only thinking of looking at collaboration tools as well. I guess it's something we need to put on the Technology Taskforce workspace. But in terms of doing an extensive formal evaluation, I wasn't thinking of that. Did I misunderstand you, Gordon? Just actually a quick follow up.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: No. You're pretty well there. As I say, there is a difference. There is a habit sometimes of [inaudible] conference tool for collaboration and sometimes it works, especially if you've got a small group as we have here. And quite often it doesn't. I should mention too that we're doing some conference tools evaluation within our ALS as well. If it turns out to be successful, I'll add the name of that particular tool for the next for the heck of it. It's an open source tool.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Obviously, Gordon, I mean by all means, definitely put this up on the Technology workspace. I mean the idea is to just catalog all of this stuff so that we can go back to it and say, "We discussed this tool. Here's this tool that could be used." In terms of collaboration, one of the key tools is Google Docs. But I know that many in ICANN and the At-Large community don't want to use Google doc simply because (1) you have to have an account with Google, and (2) it's not accessible by everybody. Not everybody has access to Google. In some countries, that service is blocked.

I think that was also one of the comments coming out of some of the LUCID Meetings. I think it was Cheryl who mentioned it and I probably did not put it in – to ensure…how shall I phrase it? It's to ensure that it is internationally accessible. It is not blocked in any country as such so that anybody anywhere in the world can use this tool. I think that was one of the key things also.

I think Maureen Hilyard is in queue. I know Glenn is also saying he can't see the button, but I'll take Maureen first and then I'll take Glenn. So, Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, hi. Good morning, everyone. You're probably wondering why I've actually popped into meeting because it's not something that I normally come to, but we have an issue in [inaudible]. We were looking at conferencing tools [inaudible] because our board meeting are all in different countries. And [inaudible] for example doesn't accept [Skype], which is our normal form of [inaudible] because of the broadband and [inaudible] doesn't participate except in the chat. So it doesn't seem that – this is actually very interesting for me. And the comparison of the different web conferences is also of interest. I've got a bit of a wish list, but it's very interesting listening to the conversations. [inaudible]. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Maureen. Actually, the meetings actually do [inaudible] observations that help the assessment or at least document issues where this feature which may seem to be beneficial for most of At-Large. It's not very usable in certain areas. For example, Skype, not being – I don't know if it's blocked or not or whatever in your region.

Okay, Glenn, have you seen the button or have not?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No. I think I'm still coming in as a guest status. So, I don't see this. But when I click on my name, I'm just getting who I am. But I do not see a clear – this is the usability issue. It's got to be absolutely clear for people. Here's an example of using a technology. I don't see the button for getting in the queue.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That's strange. I'll respond to that because I mean I'm seeing the button, but maybe – I think other persons are seeing that. I see Olivier. By the way, I see Olivier and Lance have joined the call. Welcome to both of you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Can you [inaudible] – this might be a good demonstration – can you grab my desktop to see my desktop using this tool?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I can make you what they call a facilitator as a presenter, which is a presenter and once you have a plugin called Glance, as a facilitator there's an "install Glance" plugin which allows me to then do desktop sharing.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. The reason I'm saying it, as you can see the fact that my button is not showing up. But I don't want to swell on that yet. Going back to the discussion that Gordon started, my opinion is that when you're working with organizations and some people, for example, when we did the outreach for the ALSs in Toronto, I simply used the Doodle.

The problem wasn't the technology. The problem was getting to actually take the effort and put their times into the Doodle for outreach table. They would say, "Well, yeah. In whatever time that's available. You just slot me in," which means that the responsibility goes back on me.

Tools shouldn't be used by people that empower them. They get information, they're sharing information. But if you're a facilitator and you're being conned into doing stuff that really you're trying to push the work back the other people either filling in these charts or adding these case studies or best practices so that when we make a decision that's appropriate technology, not the best technology but it's compromised a lot of times. Sometimes in our technology group, I can see us as a small group hiding off using a very high bandwidth whiteboard technology if it's a specific project. But generally speaking, it gets back to what I said the first time talked to you about this Taskforce. What is our scope of project, so it's clearly what are we trying to achieve? What's the motive of doing LUCID or something else? That's the key thing that I need to get answered.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Glenn. I would say the scope of – it goes back to what the Technology Taskforce was set up for and it's also to assist the At-Large community in terms of technology tools. And I don't have the exact words in front of me right this second so I can't quote the line in scriptures, so to speak. But the idea was that we could then evaluate the technology and recommend for use by At-Large.

In terms of looking at the web conferencing solutions, Adobe Connect, we use Adobe Connect for example, and repeatedly there had been concerns with that Adobe Connect does not work in certain situations. If you've been involved in various Adobe Connect sessions, there's always sometimes confusion when – well, once you go on speaker, they connect it to the VoIP to the Adobe Connect session and so forth. This is why one of the things we're trying to do is also a one-pager to try to explain all these issues.

I would say the scope is for us to look at solution that help ICANN At-Large community – the RALOs, the ALAC – and to recommend which tools for use so that it can be – the staff can then – if you want to choose a different solution here, for example – if there's a solution here for example that really works all needs, works all benefits, then perhaps staff can also then help, I would say, I want to implement but I mean be able to support. Okay.

The reason why LUCID hasn't been very prominent is because it's probably the more advanced of all of these solutions and that has some use within ICANN. It's been used by other working groups in fact. I discovered that as well. The Meeting Strategy Group is also using LUCID for example, and of course, we have also been using and testing LUCID – guinea pig, pigging it. I don't know if it's the right word. But testing it out, reporting back on the floor. This is the result of the – this new version of LUCID incorporates all of our comments.

Just to answer a question – actually, I see two things. Just to answer a question from Maureen Hilyard. Could we as a At-Large Structure use LUCID in our region or is it just with ICANN?

Good question, Maureen. Currently, only the Adobe Connect rooms are available to At-Large Structures to use for by At-Large Structures. I see Lance is now in the queue. Lance, you have the floor.

LANCE HINDS: Hi. Good morning, Dev. Morning on my end. Good morning and good afternoon to everyone else. I think this leads to a comment I think I made an e-mail discussion about having I guess in the business of requirements, documents to get a feel for what exactly the At-Large is looking for, what sort of tool. I know there are going to be various things that have come up before.

A key thing that came up is the business of using Adobe and the voice over IP separately. So is it that the solution we're looking for will combine those features? Therefore you log into one area and you get voice over IP and you also get the other features that you want which is the chatting and the other collaborative features. So work from there.

Now the issue is that if we are testing to recommend and other groups are already using it – and I'm assuming that based on what you said, I don't know whether they have adopted the solution already – it then leads me to wonder if everyone is still waiting on the Technology Taskforce to recommend that LUCID is the final solution while others have gone ahead and [inaudible] began to use it. So that sort of complicates things in terms of saying that if we're doing the evaluation and others have gone ahead, it then questions the point to some extent as to why we continue to test the product, or it certainly changes the

reason why we [accepted] the product. That's just some early thoughts on that. Thanks, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Lance. I see now Glenn was able to log out and log back in. Thanks to At-Large staff working behind the scene. Now I'm seeing Glenn is in the queue so just – I assume he wants to speak out something. So go ahead, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi, everybody. That's all.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. All right. Well, okay. We're spending a little bit more time now on this 3.1. I take your point, Lance. I will try to articulate the proper scope of work. I hear what you're saying because it doesn't make sense trying to go to all of these solutions if any of our recommendations are going to be feasible to be implemented because regarding LUCID, it's already being implemented in other working groups, for example. I guess this is possibly the challenges we've got to – policy versus implementation. Yeah. But I'll try to articulate clearly the scope of the works on the mailing list and also some – because we now have a much larger list thanks to Glenn who has now put in much more solutions here.

Let me just move ahead to the next agenda item. The idea was to that we would then schedule some trials of other web conferencing solutions. Now there are two solutions that we were looking at. One was the BlueJeans and Glenn had recommended at the Durban Meeting

EN

something called ReadyTalk. I'm just saying I've created trial accounts for these two web conferencing solutions and we can begin a test of these two things this month.

So my suggestion would've been to – for next week, sometime next week and if everybody is okay I would recommend trying the same time, the Monday 1500 UTC unless somebody objects, to try either the BlueJeans network and then the following week up to the formal call on the 19th, we will try the ReadyTalk. And during that time, we can then pull up our criterion, clarify [inaudible] and so forth. Does anybody have an objection to that?

So my recommendation, I've created the trial accounts for the two of the solutions: ReadyTalk, BlueJeans. We can try BlueJeans next week literally only as a testing type, just to check the tires as they say, see whether it works, that type of thing. Then on the fourth week after the 19th, we can then try the ReadyTalk. Okay, Glenn. Go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Where is the polling feature, so we can poll everybody that's on this call? As a facilitator, I guess you have control of those tools?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, there is one. Usually you can add a motion – well, there's two ways of doing this in LUCID. You can add a motion, which I could've done here, and the motion would then be voted on as such. I mean, I'm not typing. I can. After typing that out – I probably should've done this before, but that's how you do it. There's an "add motion" as a

facilitator. I can add a motion and then everybody can then vote to agree or disagree.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: So your question that you were just asking was to do both tests next week.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No. Just to [inaudible]. We do one test for, say, BlueJeans because that was the first one in the queue. We do that next week. I would like to say Monday at the same time unless we want to do a Doodle for a different time. Then on the fourth week, the fourth Monday of the month after the 19th which will be the 26th, we can then do the ReadyTalk one. Does that make sense?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: That's fine with me. All I guess I'm saying is why can't we use a quick poll to have people vote on this idea? Again, it demonstrates the utility of the tool.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Point taken. I can see about looking at adding motions at another time. Anybody else have any thoughts on this for testing the BlueJeans network? I'll work with staff to coordinate how this testing could work or not work. Sorry, I should say coordinate with At-Large staff to do the BlueJeans network web conferencing solution next week Monday.Okay. I'll make that an action item. Then on the 26th we'll do the ReadyTalk,

and again, I'll work with staff to share the administrative passwords and so forth. All right.

I'm seeing nobody else saying anything, so I'm assuming everybody is okay with this. So let's move ahead now to the fourth item on the agenda, the social media strategy. Now, I have two links there which I hope everybody can open up on a separate page.

When the Technology Taskforce came up with the social media strategy, it recommended that the At-Large Wiki be used as the space where content is created and then this information is then re-shared among the various social media channels – put on Facebook and so forth.

One of the recommendations as a quick – well, to put content on was they used the content from the ALAC announced mailing list since this is information that could be shared. Well, this is information that all At-Large structures should be aware of and should be circulating amongst its members – that that information be recirculated and shared across the network.

One of the challenges has been – and this is obviously not a technology issue, per se, was of course what other types of content could be used by the social media that could be posted on social media? We [inaudible] that information by social media. That's one good thing. But of course the next thing is of course to engage. I would say engage with persons on social media. That requires persons to do it, and this is probably the difficulty that we probably need to now look at.

I also note that I realize that what I described didn't quite happen. I've now realized that although I was seeing the post on Facebook what was

happening was that the updates on the ALAC announce were going to the At-Large staff account. [inaudible] At-Large community account which is controlled by At-Large staff, just to clarify.

So the updates were going on that – not only to followers of the At-Large community account were following, but not going to the At-Large community Facebook page. I hope I'm not losing everybody in this process here. And I realized the reason why was because the password was changed, and therefore the updates didn't really go onto the page as such.

So I'll spend some more time on this in terms of strengthening the technology of this. But I just want to discuss something regarding – I put three points here. Who decides what should be posted on the At-Large blog, so to speak, which is then re-shared on social media? I just want to get some feedback here, some ideas here. I do have some ideas. One of the ideas I'm thinking is that, well, the Technology Taskforce, there would be a special group. Sort of put a group that will help – how should I put the word? – curate content.

What I'm thinking of these persons from this Technology Taskforce as well as the secretariat from the five RALOs and possibly one other person from each of the RALOs. The reason why I say the secretariat is because the secretariats are responsible for information flow within their RALOs, and I think what could then happen is that we can ask – in addition to the information being recirculated from ALAC and re-shared from the ALAC announce mailing list, which is controlled by staff and the ALAC Chair, the RALOs can be asked then to make a contribution

and I don't know what the schedule would be like, whether it would be one RALO [inaudible] for something each week and so forth.

So I now see with queue here. Good. Lance, you have the floor.

LANCE HINDS: Thanks, Dev. Probably for this question, because I just sometimes tend to get contentious in terms of what information is supposed to go out there. Who decides what information is supposed to go out there and [inaudible]? What might be useful coming out is some sort of – there's some broad areas I think by now that discussions are normally had [inaudible], and then there is information coming out of the ICANN, out of At-Large, in terms of the messages, the information, the updates that they want to send.

But I think it may be useful to look at about three to four areas of the [inaudible] comment on generally, and then provide guidelines for that. I think that if we get into who gets to do what, any level of [inaudible], that may cause a lengthy discussion that may not be as constructive as we would like it to be. Just my two cents.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Lance. You're touching on the exact problem here. I think what could happen is the Technology Taskforce could put together some guidelines to say, okay, well, obviously it must adhere to community standards, expected standards of behavior. That's straightforward.

Then say we can make commenting into certain area topics regarding the ICANN and so forth, because we can't use the social media strategy to talk about issues outside of [inaudible], for example, of ICANN.

I see Maureen has also mentioned using secretariats makes sense and I think Glenn has also raised his hand. So, Glenn, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. From the NARALO point of view, historically, the secretariat hasn't taken this on at all. So I'm not sure about the other At-Large [inaudible] sharing content. And just looking at that Facebook site on how old the postings are, over the last couple of years, I've been trying to capture as many pictures and short video content as possible to share it. And I think at the end of the day, especially with people that English is not their first language, reading a long drawn-out document really is challenging, and if we can do summaries and short little video clips, summaries of sessions, I think it's contingent on our At-Large structures and there's people who are doing Taskforce, whatever the topic is, to do a short summary because I think as you look at a lot of people, they get burned out. It's too much to read.

I would say that we need to get a lot more people taking video and photos and sharing their content. Lots of people take photos, but they're not sharing them.

I'll give you an example. Music nights. Just recently I posted a number of videos of staff and people having a great time. That's an important element of what we do when we go to these events. Would that be

suitable content? That's because people are having fun. There's the thing. Does it have to be dry, boring stuff? That's my comment.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Glenn. Again, this is coming to the key issue. You talk about doing short summaries and you mentioned we. That's really the challenge here. Who is the "we" in this? Would it be a special group, a curation group so to speak, that will try to take an issue that's currently before the At-Large –[inaudible], for example.

Let's take the Expert Working Group on the directory services. There's been a lot of attention. There's been an initial document published. So could a curation group collaborate together to try to come up with, as they say, a summary of those key topic points and so forth? That's why I say this is the challenge of it. That's why I wanted to get some ideas here on how to come up with this policy then to really do it? It's not really a technology issue and such anymore. The technology is there [inaudible]. We can put content. We can put videos. We can put photos certainly. But it's really who's the editor of this?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Olivier created a table for At-Large for people to do a summary of each of their meetings. If you look at that table a lot of people did not do it. They didn't do a summary where they were. I think we've got a problem of accountability. People aren't doing reports. I haven't seen reports from any of the working groups in my own At-Large. People like to talk, but they are not providing summaries.

In our case in NomCom, we provide a monthly report of exactly what we did. We share it with our At-Large. Everyone should be doing the same thing. It's not long. It's just a one-pager. There's a lack of accountability right down to the core working groups.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Glenn. Well, just to say that I understand what you're saying and I'm also seeing a lot of discussion in the chat. If Maureen or Olivier wants to come in the speaker queue and say something, that would be good.

You make a good point, actually. The meeting reports and of course on the ALAC monthly calls, there are supposed to be working group reports, like RALO monthly reports as well. Those perhaps could be re-tasked to say, "Look, here's a summary of what happened. This is happening in the RALO," any of the RALOs this month and so forth. That's also a good source of information to pull from.

Yes. The thing is maybe not everybody is updating it as perhaps as diligently as they should. I guess we can point out, look, without this information, it becomes harder and harder for persons outside of the Working Group, outside of the At-Large community. If we want to get more people inside the working groups, inside working to develop statements, asking questions and so forth, we need to pull them in. Therefore the summaries are needed from the working groups, from the RALOs and from the ICANN meeting reports and so forth.

I noticed some persons are commenting on the reports on the Durban meeting. It's all part of the group [track] and it would go out on the list. Any other thoughts? Lance, go ahead.

LANCE HINDS: A lot of it [inaudible] again. It's not necessarily the technology at the end of the day. It's the capacity to update the [inaudible] information as Lance said a few minutes ago. I don't know what might help is if we are going down this road, certainly in my neck of the woods to deal with this as a project level, project managers have begun to devise short forms that have three or four broad headings that would allow people in a structured way to put information in.

I think if you provide that kind of guideline – and again, this is [inaudible] technical. But certainly, if you're going to go down the road and [inaudible] the kind of infrastructure [inaudible] that we'd like to see, you may have to put some kind of form structure in there just to help with the process of putting in reports or whatever content that they want to put in [inaudible] from the various meetings. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, Lance. That's an interesting idea. Perhaps some sort of templating of what's expected in a summary. Okay. That's an interesting idea. Just thinking of how the best way to move forward. Okay. I'm sure we could try to incorporate some of these ideas here. There needs to be somebody or a group that needs to be in charge of ultimately posting to the blog, which is then recirculated on Facebook, Twitter, etc.

So the challenge we're now discovering is who decides what goes on and in what format? One of the suggestions will be, well, we can have definitely I think the secretariat should be involved with this since the task [inaudible] information flow within their RALOs as well as the group within the Technology Taskforce working together to actually post the content onto the blog.

Information regarding the meeting group reports, as Glenn has pointed out, either from the Durban meeting – well, not just from the ICANN public meetings could be pulled in as well as the Working Group Monthly Reports, which are typically done before the ALAC monthly call could also be used as material for posts for circulation.

In seeing some of the comments, the Durban meeting reports, even though not everybody filled it out, it was probably much more improved this time around. I would agree with that. I know sometimes some of the ICANN public meetings, a lot of the At-Large community are just simply burned out and don't have time to post anything before the end of that meeting.

A group comprising of members of the Technology Taskforce, the RALO secretariats, and then look at perhaps deciding what could be posted. Before I contact the secretariats, I probably need to set out these guidelines in a document. So I guess the action item here to record is guidelines for this curation group, editing group, for posting to – for disseminating information via social media. That document needs to be created. We'll probably look at incorporating – try to incorporate the summary of the ideas we've taken on this call and then post it out for

comment on the list. So by the 19th we can also look at really improving this a lot better.

In terms of strengthening technology of the social media strategy – sorry, this is [probably] the last point – well, the challenge has always been that the accounts are controlled by At-Large staff. Of course there's a lot of information contained in this, that the staff do not want to necessarily share outside of the At-Large staff.

So, for example, in terms of things like photos and so forth, what I've already done is I've created a Google account, ICANN At-Large Community, so that things like photos and so on can be brought under that banner. And since it does not have any sensitive information regarding At-Large staff information of correspondence and so forth, it's a bit more – we're basically isolating these accounts solely for the social media stuff. Okay. So that's what I'm doing regarding that.

Also I want to do the same thing for the Facebook account, because what also happened was when the At-Large staff changed the password, that also broke the re-sharing tool as well. So I also want to then look at coordinating with At-Large staff to create these separate accounts so that they're just solely used for the sharing of information as part of the social strategy. So there's a good separation of information for the At-Large staff to have their accounts, and then still have control over these community accounts, so to speak.

I don't think there's any – I don't know if anyone has any thoughts or questions. By all means, say something now. Going once, going twice. I do realize we're running out of time here. Going once, going twice.

Okay. So I'll work on that document. Let's move onto the next topic, which is the Any Other Business.

Well, one of the other projects we're looking at is the ideas for improving the organization of At-Large content. I'm just putting that there now. I'm not really going to have an open discussion other than please look at the presentations [inaudible] before and make the comments or suggestions so we can then work on, I would say, delivering a final report on this issue on coming up with the ideas. Identifying the problems, proposing solutions, and so forth. Okay.

The second point was the ICANN Labs. This was introduce by Chris Gift and Fadi Chehade at the Durban meeting. Obviously I think – well, just to take you to the link, the link is at labs.icann.org. They are introducing four innovation tracks. They call it innovation tracks. One is on conversation, education, communication, and discovery.

I just think that we probably shouldn't need to – well, I will encourage all of our members to really join this ICANN Labs, one. Two, I'm thinking in terms of these [inaudible] issues, what ICANN Labs is trying to do, we need to also possibly submit a comment on these issues.

For example, there was a very interesting table infographic and I'm trying to see if I can find that infographic on the page here. Let's see if this works. Okay. So if you look at the link in the chart here, there was a [differentiated] engagement model. The ideas of this engagement strategy is to bring persons in all these three circles and have them collaborating together, which I think is a very interesting infographic and I think we could come up with suggestions on how to achieve this.

There are certain things in terms of meeting logistics I think that should happen in terms of having cameras – better cameras, for example. I know Glenn has been taking a lot of video, but really there should be – I think part of the meeting [logistics] to have better cameras so that better video could be recorded, better content could be extracted and shared more effectively.

One of the comments I've always been making over the years is that the public ICANN meetings, there's so much information there that doesn't really get out even to the At-Large community, much less the wider public. As I say, I'm just putting some ideas out there that I think we need to really monitor ICANN Labs and make our voice heard. Okay. So sorry, Lance, go right ahead. Hello, Lance? Hello? Have I been disconnected? Is anyone hearing me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah, I can hear you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I think unfortunately we may have lost Lance then. Okay. Unfortunately, Lance's line has dropped. Okay. Well, we are now five minutes past the hour, so we are coming up to the top of the – one hour for this call. Anybody else have any – well, I'll hold off for a minute in case Lance is able to come back in. Anybody else have any comments, questions, thoughts?

I'm noticing a lot of the charts here in terms of the social media content and strategy. Like I said – okay, let me answer Maureen Hilyard's comment. The next meeting will be on the 12th, but that's more really

the testing of the BlueJeans network conferencing solution. The next formal meeting of the Technology Taskforce is on the 19th at the same time, 15:00 UTC. Then we'll discuss the social media strategy and all our regular Technology Taskforce agenda items.

Let's see. I take it Lance has still not rejoined the conversation. Going once. Nope. Okay. Well, I think Glenn wants to say a few words. Okay, Glenn, very quickly go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Very quickly on the video and pictures. At the present time, the content is owned by me, which is kind of silly when you think about it. What happens if my account gets erased or whatever reason, it's not prudent because we're going to lose a lot of that history and that content. That's an issue I just want to bring up. Never mind other people – that's a concern for me.

But back to the iLabs. Has anyone did anything on the ICANN Labs yet or is it still in prelaunch mode? I know that it was supposed to be launched in August. Do you have any update on that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. There has been no further updates other than just sign up and join to be notified of any changes and so forth. I've heard mid-August was when they would probably make some sort of more formal announcement from ICANN Labs. Olivier, please. I saw Olivier has his hand raised. Olivier, you want to say something?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was about to say exactly what you said. I've also signed up to the four streams that are there and it doesn't look like anything is moving at the moment. Mid-August. We'll just have to wait a week and a half or something. We'll see what happens then.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I see Lance is back on. Lance, you have a quick few minutes or two.

LANCE HINDS: Thanks, Dev. I suspect when my line dropped what [inaudible]. My views might have been [inaudible]. I'm just saying that if we are doing work certainly at the At-Large side, it should really be within the – bearing in mind the concepts that are being proposed in ICANN Labs. Someone did say that. Olivier [inaudible]. We can certainly press forward in doing our work. Let's keep an eye on them to make sure that we're kind of in concert in terms of the things that we're trying to do.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Great. Absolutely. I agree with you. Now I see Olivier wants to say something. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Dev. I was just going to address Glenn's note who said just now that all of the content is currently under his personal accounts. I think it would be good for this content to be transferred over – definitely be transferred over to an ICANN account as such. I hope that this Working Group can work it out with staff to do that.

I mean, obviously there are two questions in there. There's the first one being what should be in the ICANN accounts, what should not be in the ICANN accounts, whether this Working Group wishes to design a process by which content is vetted before it's put up or whether in the interim you'd like to just put the content up and look at it with assistance from staff. I thought that might be a good thing for this working group to make recommendations on.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier. Again, you're quite correct, and again it comes back to the challenge regarding as a curator kind of thing. How exactly can content be packaged to be posted? Which content should be done and so forth? I agree. I'll probably work with Glenn since he has been doing a lot of the recordings.

I do note that, for example, a lot of pictures and so forth were uploaded to the At-Large Wiki. Typically, under each of the showcases where a lot of the video content was captured, there was typical a sight and sounds link under each of the short pieces where video was uploaded and so forth.

For example, the very first AFRALO showcase in Kenya was recorded. But it was never really repurposed other than being put on the At-Large Wiki for At-Large members.

As another action item, I'll work with Glenn in transferring the content in one location so that it can then be under At-Large in some sort of shared space I guess [inaudible] At-Large staff can have access to the

videos and so forth. Then from there, we'll make the decision as to how it should be edited, what should be shared and so forth.

Let's see. ALAC Facebook page. We are going beyond the time. Let me ask, what does that mean, Olivier? I think I know what it is.

OLIVIER CRÉPN-LEBLOND: This goes further than just creating some Wiki pages and putting [inaudible] for the pictures and stuff. We need to have an actual strategy to develop this – a social media strategy with people who are in charge, with people who have the authority to be able to post on these things, with ways to maintain the account and something that's going to continue after we disappear. We're dealing here with putting together a process and processes and having an organizational home on social media, and maybe not just one social media but many other social medias. Nothing has happened in the past year or two years. We need to do something about it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I agree, and I will. Okay. Just a question, Maureen. You're asking, "Is there one?" Is there one what?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Only one [ALAC] Facebook page.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Ah, okay. I get you. Yes, Maureen. There is an At-Large community page. It hasn't been probably utilized as effectively as it could be, but that's what this group is going to try to really rectify.

Regarding it's difficult to find anything on Wiki pages, that needs organizing as well. This is also another project that we are also working on. Ideas for improving the organization of At-Large content – some work has already been done on that in terms of identifying some of the issues and so forth, the difficulties of course coming up with effective solutions.

Glenn, is that your hand raised or is than an old hand?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, it's a new hand. I have gigabytes of stuff and it's a lot of content. And in the past, when I've sent pictures to Matt, it's to a Dropbox which is a nightmare. It's so much content. There's actually three levels of content. One, as Olivier knows, I cornered people, did a quality video which means I asked them to define a simple concepts. This little video vignettes, I call them ICANN shorts, I have 34 of them and they're people like Olivier and other people who talk about a short topic for one or two minutes.

The other thing is, as you've seen with the AFRALO showcase, only five or six people have viewed those. It's a question of distribution. They're all the speeches from that showcase that we did on the Monday night, as well as all the speeches at the DNS [and women]. A ton of stuff.

The question is to go through all this content to properly metatag it, analyze it, upload it, it is thousands of hours of work. So because it's my

time, I'm a little concerned about dedicating that amount of time to do this sort of thing. So we need to think this through.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. We'll figure out a way how to transfer the content so that it's under At-Large staff control. I mean, I hear it's a lot of content. So let's figure out a solution. Maybe there's a way to do it. I know Dropbox is one solution, but I know you're saying there's some issues with that.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: We need a repository – a central repository – that if it's the [secretariats], which I highly doubt they will take on more responsibility, we need a social media strategist being responsible for the content, properly tagging stuff, getting the content up and fresh, short and sweet up so the rest of our community who can come to these meetings actually can get insight into it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, gotcha. Maureen, please go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. What Glenn's talking about is exactly my point. It's [inaudible] different places to put content and it's all over the place. Just adding social media content is just creating another area to put more content. We just need to be more organized not only [inaudible] who has permission to load and what gets loaded and also where, we need some guidelines as to where you can find what you need. Having

somebody for photos specifically and videos, it should be a particular area.

I think my point is we just need specific areas so that if we're going to put things into a Wiki page, it's related to such-and-such, that you need to be able to find that Wiki page. The organization of all the content areas is quite vital. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Maureen, and agreed. I think [inaudible] also go on part of this document that needs to be put up very quickly. I'll do the first draft of this document and post it up for comment on the Wiki so that persons can make their contributions on that. That's the key action item – incorporating all these issues in terms of the curation of content, [inaudible] content such as videos, photos, etc. Okay.

To answer the question regarding why the page was emptied, I think unfortunately our implementation problem where the ALAC announced e-mails weren't being put onto that page, unfortunately. But going forward, I think all of that information would be put up onto that page.

I did some testing and you've probably seen the beginner's guide, for example, which I posted to the blog on the Wiki and it recirculated it without any issues.

Okay. Now we've really gone beyond time here now, so I think we will probably need to now adjourn this call. I just want to thank everybody for the conversation and the discussions and we have some good ideas going forward regarding social media strategy and also for the web conferencing solutions in terms of more clearly defining a matrix and

also beginning to do the testing of at least two of the other solutions. Of course once we do the evaluation, we can then look at refining our matrix and so forth.

Okay. Thank you all very, very much. Please contribute online on the Wiki and not just doing the calls. With that, thank you very much. Have a good day/evening/afternoon/night. This call is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]