
KATHY SCHNITT: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the website revamp project call on Friday, the 12th of September, 2014 at 16:00 UTC. On the call today, we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Steve Allison, Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

We have apologies from Anthony Nigganni. And from staff, we have Heidi Ulrich, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew, myself, Kathy Schnitt.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And back over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. It's Olivier speaking. Over to you, I gather, is over to me, but I gather, is it Ariel who is going to lead the call today?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. This is Ariel for transcript. So let me just start the call and let you guys know what we are going to talk about today. Today, we're going to do a [inaudible] on the correspondence page on the At Large website. We mainly want to hear from Olivier and staff about the frustrations you have with that page and what you would like to include. So it's not going to be a formal presentation or any sort, it's just going to be a brainstorm session.

And then on the conversation, Steve and I will jump in and we may ask you questions to further investigate certain issues. So, we can just take

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.

a look at the page and start a conversation. And feel free to jump in any time.

STEVE ALLISON:

Sure. This is Steve. So maybe I can help give a little structure to some of the things that I thought would be valuable, and then we can obviously kind of make this little free form, as Ariel said. The goal is really to pull out as much from you guys and brainstorm as we go. It may be valuable, and some stuff may not end up being valuable. But we'll see what we get.

So the first kind of thing that I thought I would be valuable is just talk about the intent behind the correspond page. There may be multiple different intents, but it would be valuable for us to kind of talk about that and figure out what our original intent was, maybe what a future intent was. And then maybe even talk about just the meaning of it. What does the word correspondence represent? You know, how do we come to that name? And what does it mean to the rest of the community or newcomers in the community?

So that would be a good starting point I think. Ariel, do you want to do a screen share in this pull up correspondence page two? As we talk through, there may be things that we want to look at together.

ARIEL LIANG:

Yeah, sure. Yeah, I was just about to suggest that. But let me setup my AP room properly, now I can share my screen. But just give me one moment and I will share my screen. Okay.

STEVE ALLISON: While she's doing that, if maybe somebody wants to take a crack at the intent behind the correspondence page, at least originally.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well I don't know if anybody was here when that page was started, but when I came on board, that site was seen as the key site for all ALAC correspondence, including statements, letters, for example, to the CEO, to the Chair of the Board, and major announcements. And again, that site had the full statements, it had the translations in the five UN languages. And then later on, well the actual format of the statements changed under Olivier, for the better.

So that's my recollection of the purpose of the site. Now that classification apparently never really worked. Everything reads as correspondence I think, so that's a problem that I would hope it would be fixed. So yeah, it's supposed to be advisories, announcements, correspondence, statements, I don't think that really works. I'm not sure, maybe if everything was a statement. I don't know.

[CROSSTALK]

HEIDI ULLRICH: And then, sorry, and then one last thing is that the region, most of the statements are from the ALAC. And I think when LACRALO prepared one statement, I think that [inaudible], I don't know if this works. Let's

see, I'm quite sure there is a LACRALO one in there. But there are no other ones, I don't think. Because RALOs have ended up not doing very many statements, and there we go, oh there are a couple.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, there are some AFRALO ones. In fact the LACRALO ones are not on there for some reason.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, the LACRALO ones, yeah...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then the...

STEVE ALLISON: Correct.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Can you just take a look at, let's take a look if any of the other ones... Does NARALO have any...? Let's take a look. No, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not any other regions, I think AFRALO only has two.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I think was intended under the assumption that RALOs would produce statements and that hasn't been the case so far, too much.

STEVE ALLISON: Wait, why not? Sorry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: In terms of, I think, they just haven't had that capability yet. And maybe they all feel, maybe the ALAC and the RALOs feel that statements are stronger when they come from the ALAC versus a region. Or, you know, ideally, there would be consensus within the At Large community. So. I mean, Olivier, maybe you can answer to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. So, my take on this, I've worked on this correspondence page for the past four years with four different people. I think originally it was, did I use to work with [inaudible] on this? I think...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just for, literally for four months, because you came on in 2010 and he left in that March, 2011. So.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So [inaudible] and Seth Green, and then Matt Ashtiani, and then Ariel. And so this page is particularly frustrating, because it's not one that is directly updated by At Large staff. It is actually one that is updated by web services, and there seems to be all of these classifications. Either

an announcement, correspondence, or statement, and the entities, sorry, advisory, announcement, correspondence, or statement. And then the entity lists the At Large advisory committee, executive committee, and you can see the different ones and so on in there.

And then we've got the region that could be coming from. One is any and then you've got all of the regions as well. Unfortunately, there was no standard way of us to notify web admin as to how we wanted this classification to be done. So a lot of it was just classed as the standard stuff, which is just At Large and there was no specific classification on this.

Furthermore, if you check on correspondence, there were a few things which were actual correspondence. The problem is that we've tagged, everything is actually tagged as correspondence and something else, when really a statement should not be correspondence. A statement should be a statement. A correspondence is a letter which is not actually voted on by the ALAC. And so we've got a classification system of our statements and of our correspondences, a set of numbers where ST is a statement and correspondence is CO.

And this unfortunately wasn't followed in that. So, you know, the use of classification of correspondence and statement is correct, but the way that it was used there is incorrect. The region, having the region, I think, is very helpful as well. Again, it wasn't used correctly because I know that they were, as Heidi said, there were a few LACRALO statements. As you've seen in there, there were a couple of statements from Africa, so there are AFRALO for AF ICANN statements. They date

from 2010, and we know that, at each ICANN meeting, AFRALO and AF ICANN release a statement.

So for some reason we haven't added them on to this either. And in their election said, announcement correspondence and statements, so you know, click all the boxes, why not? So it's a bit of a problem with that. I think having the region there is helpful, having the entity there is a little bit more difficult because we might have an unlimited number of entities in there. I mean, yeah, okay, ALAC, executive committee, the different RALOs.

Of course now it's not called the executive committee anymore, it's the...

HEIDI ULRICH: At Large leadership team.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: At Large leadership team, yeah, ALC. I guess that's helpful as well. And classification we might need to look at more carefully because it's between advisory, announcement, correspondence, and statement. Well, I think that we don't put any announcements in there. We've never done so, correct me if I'm wrong. I'm just passing it as we go along now. But [inaudible] was an announcement, okay, that's right.

Certain things are just for their announcements. [Inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]...

STEVE ALLISON:

Sorry. So, I think this will be, so a lot of these comments are going to be valuable, as a first step of this so that we're all thinking about this in the same perspective. Let's talk about just the page as a whole, before we start thinking about any of the functionality of it. Let's think of the word correspondence. What is this page supposed to do and for whom?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

So this page as a whole, [inaudible] page as a whole is supposed to be our outward facing, display of what work we have done, what written work we have done. Whether it is a correspondence or an actual letter, or even an email that we sent to the Board, or an official email that we've sent to any of ICANN's supporting organization and advisory committees. Whether it is a statement, and a statement being a text that gets voted on by the ALAC, that includes advisory, what is it?

That includes the advice from them. So that includes advice in there, and of course, that statement is sent over to a public comment period, or gets sent to the Board. But it's a permanent record of those statements that we have done. And then any others in there that doesn't qualify under correspondence or statements. I think that announcement and advisory can be taken up. So this is outward facing, and someone in there, you know there is a reader coming to this stage, should be able to find the information and go further than how it is currently displayed.

Currently they can look at it by region, they can look at it by the entity drafting the statement, or the correspondence, and they can look at it by the classification of what type of correspondence it is.

STEVE ALLISON: So what do they want to do with all of this? It's good to have a record, but to what end do they want this record? Do they want to do research? Do they want to get involved with some of these things? Are they ongoing? What are the things that they want to do now that they know that this record is here?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All of the above, all of the above. This is a permanent record of our positions over time, so if someone basically says, "Well, what does the ALAC think about X, Y, Z?" Then they should be able to find all of the official positions of the ALAC in that topology. The problem we have at the moment is we don't actually have any classification giving any kind of nomenclature or taxonomy, and therefore no key words or anything like that.

And so the only way to find out, let's say, a search and say, "Well, I like to find out all of the statements that the ALAC has released since the beginning of time, regarding WHOIS issues." The only way to do it these days is to go into Google, general Google to do a search using Google. And that doesn't work very well, and it's not [inaudible], and I think we need to develop a taxonomy and a way where either in pull down menus, yeah probably pull down menus.

We need to have all of our keywords and therefore be able to find, or a search just on that database, and find all of the statements on WHOIS, all the statements on web design, all the statements on new gTLDs, etc. etc.

STEVE ALLISON: So you... This is really valuable. Is there a difference between work that is ongoing and work that is historical? Or does it all get lumped into here in one location? Is there a need to distinguish between the two?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I think it's all historical. I don't think there needs to be a difference between the two, because the ongoing work is actually seen on our own working pages. Remember this is just the showcase in the front. We've got our set of wiki pages in the back that actually is where all the work is going on. And if we have things that are ongoing then we've got a lot more detail that shown in our policy development page.

I don't know whether you've been shown any of the policy development pages yet. We see the table of policy, At Large policy development is a much more expensive and as an expansive AN rather than expensive, it will be cheaper. Not more expensive table which has got call for comments open, call for comments closed, etc. etc. And staff contact and all of this. Have you been shown any of that?

STEVE ALLISON: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible]...

STEVE ALLISON: Ariel spent a lot of hours showing it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Super. So that really is our backend, and that will then, that can show whether this is ongoing or not ongoing, it can somehow, that are front end, the stuff which is going to be on the website. I think it's just going to be [inaudible] repository of what we've done. And an archive what we have done, hopefully not losing any of it over the years.

STEVE ALLISON: Okay. Ariel, do you have any thoughts on this as well to add?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. This is Ariel speaking. One comment, actually following what Steve said, before we jump into the content of this page [inaudible], we need to understand who we created page four. Is of course really good to have a storage space for all of those statements, but if we don't know whether it's a beginning or reading those documents, or to see them [inaudible] those documents of a way of classification, you know, [inaudible] will be impact by the audience.

Like for me, when I just joined, I had no idea the difference between ALAC and ExCom, and executive committee, they just sound kind of similar. And then also, there is repetition between the RALOs and the regions too. And so if from the beginner's point of view, I think to have the taxonomy will be really valuable because they will understand the issue topics much more than the structure of the At Large or ALAC.

So we just need to have that clear understanding in the beginning. We can talk more about, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think, you know, simply said, it needs to be complex enough for even users to be able to find the information they want, and easy enough for a baby to use.

STEVE ALLISON: Yeah, I agree. So one thing that I was thinking that would be valuable, is you know, you can have a page dedicated, that is very powerful with this search mechanism that allows a seasoned person to uncover something that they're seeking. And then separately, it can use the same data on the backend. You could have a page focused more from an issue perspective, that helps people understand issues and lets them research issues, and see issues that are ongoing.

And then have that page really jump them to the wiki where all of the work is actually being performed. So it could still be used as a frontend to insight, you know, people and encourage people to become a little more involved than they are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yup, if you could do that, you'll have at least one happy customer here, that will be me. Because I don't know about the others. Heidi, you put your hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, just thank you Steve, I think that's a really good idea. I like the interactive part. Ariel, I'm just wondering, or Olivier, on how we would ensure that the multi, the translated version are also posted. Will we just have a table where, you know, similar...? I really love that board page, where you have all, you know, the statements, the resolution page with the category, the status, resolution number, topics, summary. You know, if we can have a table similar to that on the PV page, add another one for translations or something to where we can get all of the translated versions clearly stated there as well, that would be useful.

STEVE ALLISON:

So the way we usually implement this, just for comment is, what we do, and the mechanism is less important, but the way we go about doing this is, I would propose we attempt to translate as much as the content on the site as possible, always, especially for the stuff that we are publishing. You know, stuff that's more ad hoc, is less likely to be translatable. But stuff that we're going to publish through our web admin groups, we should get it translated.

And so what I would propose is having not just buttons like above this table that say, you know, show me the Spanish documents, but across the website. If you click Spanish, all of the content is in Spanish. So if you were to click on the WHOIS dot ICANN dot org website, you would see that if you click Spanish right now, all the content on the page is Spanish.

Now if you click on the, scroll up real quick, if you click on the [Spanish], that's basically the knowledge center in Spanish, and all of the content

is in, you know... If there was a Spanish document, it would be tied to the English document, or whatever the source document is. And then it would just automatically update itself. If there happen to not be a Spanish document, it would just show the English document. But the title maybe translated at least.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Steve, are we... My understanding is that we're not going to have that kind of multilingual website to start off with.

STEVE ALLISON: I don't know. So what we can and can't do is really a question of implementation and, as we kind of come to that, if we put the requirement out there that we want to do a certain amount of translation, then, you know, we can kind of negotiate with them and we can prioritize as we need. But the requirement remains.

HEIDI ULLRICH: But I just want to stress, and this really does need to remain that all of our statements translated into the five UN languages, and that really does need to remain, at a minimum, you know, that all of our statements... So I'm not sure how that would work.

STEVE ALLISON: Yeah, okay. So we'll have to figure something out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That doesn't apply... I'm just taking some time, having fun looking at the same statement in the different languages. There is an error in there by the way, in that the statement's filing number does not change. It ends with -en for the English version. And all of the versions, for some reason, end in -en as well. It should be ending with their respective language.

STEVE ALLISON: Well that one...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's just a little, nothing to do with our site, it's to do with the statements translation part.

STEVE ALLISON: I see the actual document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, the document itself. So Heidi you'll have to [CROSSTALK] follow up on this.

STEVE ALLISON: Interesting. It's actually linking to the English document. Oh no it's not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, no, no. They go in their respective... They are all translated fine, we can see all of the translated documents, but the actual reference code,

we usually end the reference code for the English documents with dash –en, and the Russian language should end with –ru, and it still ends with dash –en.

STEVE ALLISON: Got you. So Heidi, I've documented that at a minimum...

[CROSSTALK]

ARIEL LIANG: I can respond, oh my gosh. So I guess we'll have to go back all the way to, at least when I started to revise all of these. Okay. I think the problem is, when I sent to the translation request, the title... I can show you the system in the internal table that I use for tracking translations, when I get the translations, and the title they have on this –ar, -es, -fr, based on the language, but because sometimes we just get a crunch, and I directly convert them into PDF and then over to web admin.

So I didn't notice, like within the document, it didn't change.

STEVE ALLISON: No, they won't change that.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. I don't, it's a lot, like things that come on board we have this many. So I can, well... [CROSSTALK]

HEIDI ULRICH: ...and you might want to check before you came onboard as well, to make sure Matt was doing that.

ARIEL LIANG: But I don't have the original documents. The problem is I have to convert them into PDF, and then send them over to web admin.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So on the wiki page, for the read page, are you doing the PDFs on that, or are you doing the original documents for those? I mean, I'm not sure what Matt, I'm not sure if he posted the Word doc or the PDF on those.

ARIEL LIANG: You mean this page?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, the read, the wiki, you know, the read only.

ARIEL LIANG: That's only in the English document. There is no other languages. And also another thing you should keep in mind is the web admin doesn't have that many people as before, so if you look at this internal table, the red one is the ones that they send over, but they have them posted. They usually will table the translation and then post it later on. So, it just so having that established to do it that quickly.

That's one thing that we need to keep in mind too. So if I change all of these, it will probably take a long time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. So, I'm looking at the table at the moment and look at the classification and entity, and there is some oddities, for example, if you're going to French you've only got three statements for 2013. There is obviously some bad connection somewhere. Let's leave this aside and not waste time on that. We'll follow up afterwards, and go back to this call.

So Steve, I think that ultimately... Oh, I see, sorry, Dev you put your hand up a long time ago. You have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks Olivier, this is Dev. I think, what was said, what you've said already I think covers most of the points I was trying to make you see. This is also some of the, an example, and I'm just pumping it out of an example a kind of interactive type of thing we can drill down into a table. So as you type, for example, the entities that filter out as you type a word or phrase, so that will be, it's that type of interactive drill down that will really help.

If I want to find out all of the things about new gTLDs, or WHOIS, or that type of thing. Let's see, trying to think of what other things that haven't already been said by Olivier, Ariel, and...

STEVE ALLISON: So I had a couple of things I can add what you guys, if we want to bring some like.... If you want to continue, that's fine too.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think, I do think that, one thing that also comes to mind then, is the... I find that the system isn't quite [inaudible] of multiple statements, multiple pages in order to get to the statement. And then the [inaudible] URL for each of the [inaudible] entities, it's all very different URLs. So it makes this harder, I think, in my mind, to link to, consistently, because the URL is so different for every single one.

I mean, if we wanted to keep this, if we wanted [inaudible] and the ability for ALSs or for At Large members to keep this immediately, or to post it to Facebook, it's a very [inaudible] drill down to the second page from the correspondence page, and then tweak and then copy that URL. You know, so that's, I'll stop now.

STEVE ALLISON: Can you click on, just any of the statements, preferably in English so that we can read it? Or I can read it. [CROSSTALK]

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: And it's not a consistent... So I think one of them is correspondence dash 19 July 14 dash en. But then...

STEVE ALLISON: So the first question I have for this page is, what is this statement trying...? What's it in response to? I understand that it says, "Operating Plan and Budget," but that's, I mean, it's the title.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Steve, they're all, most of them, the vast majority are in response to public comments. On rare occasions, the ALAC will make a statement to the Board correspondence, or will respond on another issue, but again, most of them are in response to public comments.

STEVE ALLISON: So what were the other scenarios?

HEIDI ULLRICH: They might write a note to the Board on a particular issue, once they wrote, well twice, they wrote to other outside organizations, one time to the G8, just a note, a letter to the G8. And one time a letter to an US congressman. What is the issue?

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...the NCIA as well, in response to [CROSSTALK]...

STEVE ALLISON: So let me ask, this is a really good experiment for us. Show me the one that was written to an US congressman.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have to do a Google search.

[LAUGHTER]

[CROSSTALK]

STEVE ALLISON: All right, fair enough. What about this? What was the issue that we were even writing to them about?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The NTIA, I think, yeah. So we have, I mean, that's just a very good question. So people in the know, we can... It's between 2010 and 2014, since I would guess [Laughter]... Yeah, good question. I mean, I can research that, and that's...

STEVE ALLISON: So even if we found that item, and we were to click on the little hyperlink, would we even know what that issue was related to? I'm talking about just the content on the next page. Does it educate us

enough to refresh our memory on what the issue was that we're even reading about? The statement is only so good as what it is referring to.

And so one of the things that I kind of noted, okay, now that we've hoped onto the statements like first intro page, what do we want to see about that? I would think that the very first thing we would want to see is in relation to what, you know, what sparked this statement as being on this page? It had to come from somewhere, whether it's a public comment, whether the Board posted something, or there is a hot topic that we're tacking on, whether there is an outside organization that had a blog post.

There should always be an artifact that sparked our community to respond in some way. I think that people want to know this.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. Okay [inaudible]... each of the statement, there is a summary, which kind of gives the background or why this statement was generated, and typically it would say, "This is in response to the public comment." "This is in response to the NTIA call for whatever."

STEVE ALLISON: Where does it say that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It says that, yes, there is an introduction and a summary. And then, but then the statement, I find, the actual statement itself. So there in the background, so it's kind of... It's not very clear.

[CROSSTALK]

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: You have to [inaudible]. You have to really have to know where you're going in, in order to open it and see it. You cannot find this easy.

STEVE ALLISON: Okay. So maybe I propose, it's not necessarily a solution, but as we're going through the design effort, one of the challenges we've proposed with the designers is, help us come up with a way to have a repeatable, you know, visual that can say, you know, in response to, or some way were people can very quickly start getting used to looking for, oh yeah, that's the issue I was looking for. Or, that's a public comment issue. That's something relevant to me.

And then they can start looking at some of those repeatable things, and I think you'll find that their adoption of using it is higher because it's more effective to them. The summary is a little verbose, so they have to spend more time reading it, and you saw, they only spent maximum two minutes. So, but not reading that thing in two minutes.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah. Well this goes back to the taxonomy, that's what happened. If we want to define... To me, the taxonomy would help to be in the table, rather than the entity part is not useful, for example. I suppose to really [inaudible], you know...

STEVE ALLISON: So maybe if we're documenting...

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: ...gTLD, WHOIS... A statement may in fact cover more than one. It will be new gTLDs and IDNs. So, you know, [inaudible] might be two or more fields can be assigned to a policy, to a statement or a correspondence.

STEVE ALLISON: Sure. So, so far two things I think we've identified for taxonomy, maybe we should capture this, is we definitely want a taxonomy issues, like issue topics, which maybe is a little bit more freeform. And definitely something related to, in response to, so that way we have an artifact or at least a summary of why the issue is relevant to us. So those are maybe two things so far. Obviously, the dates and classifications, and stuff are also relevant.

ARIEL LIANG: Another thing I want to add is when you click through the specific statement, the first thing you see is the staff intro section. And it's just explains the process, how the statement is made. But if people spend time on that and they lost interest, they didn't have a chance to read the summary.

And I'm just wondering whether for, you know, publication purpose, we post the summary before the introduction, so that we give the meat to

the reader at the front, and then we don't lose their interest when they read through the statement.

STEVE ALLISON:

Yeah. I think that seems valuable. You could even pull out the introduction to be something a little more standard. You could put, you know, potentially the individuals involved on the far right side, so if they want to look at who was involved on the right, and then if you want key dates, you know, maybe key dates go right below the summary.

Now you've broken up the page so their eyes can very quickly look to the piece of information that's relevant to them.

ARIEL LIANG:

Agree.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Well this is, yeah, actually this is Dev. Actually I'm beginning to think, maybe we don't need to have this type of introduction and summary, because the statement itself, all the letters and so forth, all our statements have this introduction and summary in the PDF. So maybe the thing is to actually link to the PDF, and then also link to the different language versions of the PDF on that same row.

STEVE ALLISON:

Sure. So one thing that I think we, it's probably a little discouraging if you've got 2,000 statements and they have to open up 2,000 PDFs to

get the one that was relevant to them. But you're right, we don't want to unnecessarily add another page that their just going to click on the statement anyways.

[CROSSTALK]

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: But I mean, because I mean, well I would think that if somebody was to do a search on the site, I think that all of the text and introduction and summary from each of these PDFs, will be searchable so it could be found. Say I wanted to find a statement written by an ALAC member, or former ALAC member, I could just type, I could do that search. And then it will pick up the PDFs, in which that person's name was mentioned.

STEVE ALLISON: Sure. Okay so maybe another follow on question, so I agree. At some point, we should probably pose the question of whether or not we search straight into the PDF, or if there is some need for a landing page. Maybe a question that can help us get to that is, the question about, you know, ongoing statements. I know some of the statements go through initial draft. Do they ever have initial drafts on these before we get to the final draft?

And then the follow on question to that is, if we do have that type of content, so you know, we have these living issues that are going through the process, are people commenting on those? And would

they ever have a need to comment on them, you know, via the website even? Or are we going to drop them straight to the wiki page?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. Well that's the policy development page, on the wiki, which I will show right now. I mean, that is where our work happens, and this correspondence page is the final output from all of this interactive work. So yeah. So correspondence is the final statement [inaudible] ALAC and since, and of course, correspondence, I would think... Thinking about correspondence, maybe Olivier will chime in on this, is that, the correspondence page also be correspondence received by the ALAC from other entities. You know.

In terms, or are they back and forth? So if the Board responded to the ALAC, that should also be searchable. I don't know Olivier, what do you think about that? So like, or when, I think the GNSO simply responded to our statement, so that could also be, you know, it actually ought to be an [active row?]. So a response to a statement to a correspondence, there is a reply, then that should be on that same row as, you know...

STEVE ALLISON: So you can almost have a landing page that would discuss the issue that was at hand, and whether there was one ALAC statement, or 15 ALAC statements, or potentially responsive to each of those statements, you could have a landing page that captured the issue that was important.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, I suppose what could happen is that for taxonomy of it... Well, I would think that, you could probably from the taxonomy, I don't know. Potentially, I think that would be a hard thing to do for every single ALAC response. But as [inaudible]... so I'll keep quiet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dev, you've raised a very good point. It's Olivier speaking. You've raised a very interesting point there, the responses that we get. And of course, a few years ago, we haven't received any real responses, it's a new thing we have to grapple with. And I would absolutely agree with you, it's important to be able to make the responses to the correspondence that we sent out.

So far, the way we've done it, I think, on an ad hoc basis, is to link the response to our, to the page that we were building the statements on. And therefore to our policy development pages. Having a linked up database of the responses would be absolutely great as well. And with minimum amount of intervention from staff. I mean, I hear all the great ideas we're all having here. I don't know how much work that involves, and I don't know how much work it requires for maintaining it, And of course, I'm also considerate to staff with regards the maintenance of this space.

If it becomes a full-time job, then we've got a problem. So make it, if you can design this to make it as simple as possible for staff to maintain, and not to have to go through the complex process that we have to go through today, which is for our staff to fill in a number of forms and emails, and send it to web admin, and web admin has to put it when

they can, and so on, that I think will really help everyone. And I don't whether you can propose to this.

ARIEL LIANG:

Just for [inaudible] Olivier's point. If staff could directly update the website, it will be so much easier. That's like [steering?] from ATLAS 2 one where I have the admin rights to post to the ATLAS 2 website to update things. And I understand the platform pretty well, so it's really fast. And instead of writing emails to the web admin, if I can just do it myself, it doesn't really take too much time.

And also, following staff's point about publishing correspondence to our correspondence. I mean, that is the position we probably have to make at the beginning, is to decide what type of things to publish, and it's a kind of manual process. We have to select what you publish. So that probably will take a little bit of time to figure out too. Right now, we publish all the statements because it has already been decided that we do that all the time.

So I can automatically to do that. But if we would decide to publish more than a statement, then we have to have a consensus on what to publish and what not to. And maybe this will vary case by case too.

STEVE ALLISON:

So, maybe I can propose something, food for thought for something for us to think about over the next week is, when I read this page, ALAC statements, okay. So the first thing I think of is, this page is going to show me the artifact of that statement. If you want to, sorry, click back

real quick. Okay. So I read the title, ALAC statement, on and then universal acceptance of TLD draft roadmap. That is the topic of consideration.

Universal of TLDs draft roadmap, maybe a single finite event that we never readdress. However, it may be an ongoing issue or topic of concern for many years, right? When we think of WHOIS privacy. WHOIS privacy could have 30 ALAC statements as the conversation evolves. So we could easily, I think, separate out the difference between having a topic, and then this specific artifact. So if someone wants to jump straight to ALAC statement.

One, ALAC statement on universal acceptance of TLDs draft roadmap is, in my opinion, it's a little too generic to know what topic within that we're addressing, but we could always say ALAC statement and then we have a date. We may have five ALAC statements on that. But then, when you get is a separation between the issue, and the statement. And you can have a page on the issue, to give a summary of the issue, and then the many statements that may exist, and the many responses to statements.

You almost have a landing page now that has value because it's aggregating a lot of content. The aggregation of that content, is something that can be more dynamic. The uploading of the initial, you know, overview of that issue, is something that is more manual and does require some commitment to getting that content correct.

But it's something for us to think about this week. It's not just having a giant database of statement that people now have to figure out which

one is relevant, but linking a statement to an issue and building out that classification so that it can support it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This is Olivier speaking. I was going to say quickly that Ariel and I and also with Matt prior, we had thought about having more information in that introduction, along the lines of what you just mentioned. The problem is really staff time, because it's not going to be the person drafting the statement that will do this. And the staff intro is a single thing that shows what the process was, it's a standard way of what the process...

We recently added the summary, which gives staff a little bit more work because they have to summarize the contents of the statement, but that can be done at minimum expense. Having more than that, we're going to have think seriously on our staff allocations, and certainly on the resources required to be able to do this. And I guess, I can probably imagine Heidi is rubbing her head at the moment.

And I love this, I love that to happen by the way. I think it actually would do a lot more justice to At Large statements to have that additional information, intros, and point us to the actual context in which this is drafted. So that it's more accessible to newcomers. If we can do that, you've got my full support.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think that's actually...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...that's an allocation.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I think that was actually an item from the ALAC review, that we were supposed to do that. In addition, the summaries that's relatively new on that page, and that was something that came out from discussions with the Board. Long discussions with the Board about what is easier for them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So the summary came out of that. And now we've got the At Large summit recommendations, which ask for suitable resources. And I think that might fall in line with that. This whole garnishing of the context and so on, is something that is very time consuming, and I don't think that volunteers would have the amount of time required, or even the level of knowledge and, you know...

Some people are very down to earth. They'll just say, "That's the statement bank." They will not be able to explain it to a layperson, or to put the garnish around it for it to be understandable by a layperson. While if we had staff allocation on this, there would be a continuity for all statements. We have to remember that statements are drafted by individuals, and some of them are drier than others. Dev, I cut you a dozen times by now.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. No problem. I agree, I mean, it's a nice idea but I just think that the time... I think we would want a dedicated person to almost be able

to weave that tapestry of the topic, how it evolved, and so on. How about this as a sort of compromise? What the taxonomy, we can have an introduction, like [inaudible]... taxonomy would include IDNs. Okay, because that's what this is... Actually, this is probably just, you know, this is what this is about, IDNs.

Even though you may not notice that some of these from the heading. So it's [inaudible] IDN, so you have slash cards slash one IDN, IDN and you can have back on there what IDNs are, [inaudible] behind IDNs, and then some day you have a listing of all the IDN statements that the ALAC has produced, and then or correspondence in relation to this topic.

So that would be, I think, more helpful, you know, then to try to create a landing page for every single topic and how it faces an official history, and the whole history of this issue.

STEVE ALLISON: Can you give me an example? Can we look at an example as we go through this so I can make sure I understand?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. So the one on your screen right now, this is related to internationalized domain names, okay? So, that's what this statement was on. And right now, reading that first line, you may not even realize it's about IDNs. So if the taxonomy has IDNs on it, a person could, what could happen is each taxonomy field has its own landing page.

New gTLDs, WHOIS, IDNs, you know, and so forth. So each taxonomy has an explanation and a history behind it as to why or what this topic is

about. And then, underneath that, you'll then see a listing of all the correspondence related to that taxonomy, or the statement issues. So I think that would make it a much more effective research tool and so forth. Do you understand how I'm saying it?

You have a landing page for each taxonomy field. You know, one for IDN, one for new gTLDs, for WHOIS, and whatever other taxonomy fields you have. You know.

STEVE ALLISON:

So if I were new to the not only At Large community, just ICANN in general, and I were looking at this topic, I wouldn't know if this is something that I should become involved in at all. Even if I was potentially in the At Large community, I wouldn't know, looking at the word universal acceptance, what we were talking about. The summary is a start at it.

So universal acceptance is very important for upholding, but why? The why is the reason why At Large wants to respond and have a statement on. And, you know, it can very easily be that the person who is the penholder should define why we're even responding to a statement. Because if we went through the effort of saying we are going to respond, we knew why. So it could be communicated somewhere, whether we do it as a landing page for each issue, or whether there is some way of linking them, the reader is not going to know, and they may not remember, eight months later, why.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev again. I mean, this is part of the discussions we've had in the kind of policy and development stage on the wiki, and it comes down to like, why should I care about this topic? You know, so, I mean, if you look at some of the statements [inaudible] At Large... I think the famous one is public comment on GNSO IRTP part D, and they're saying, "Why the heck should I care about that?"

And so, I don't how to put [inaudible] it, so why should I care? And then that paragraph, as part of the [inaudible], and this is some of the discussions that have been happening in At Large, would be that we identify subject matter as experts. That could [inaudible] to say, "Okay, ROTP is that if you have a domain name, and you want to switch between the registrars, the company that you buy your domain from."

And this is the policy that helps guide that aspect. So if you're a registrant this is important to you. And yeah. Something regarding geographic names, well this, if you're involved in the management of a ccTLD, or if you're in a ccTLD country code, you know, this is of interest to you. And so forth. So you get that, why do I care statement as to why it's harder to get involved.

STEVE ALLISON: But that's why a registrar would care, right? But why does At Large care? How is it a tie to what At Large is intending to do as an organization? So that's the confusing point to me. How do they pick the topic? How do we know which topics are ones that we will have a statement on?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The way it works, this is Olivier speaking. The way it works is the most common multiples, which effectively, if it is important to at least one of our members, and they are ready to hold the pen, then they can move forward and draft something, and then discussion will take place. The community, the At Large community is very varied. You know, we have not for profit, we have for profit, we have organizations that teach Internet, organizations that bring Internet to far reaching places.

And they are worldwide. So it's very difficult to define the typical At Large user out there. The only common denominator between all of our At Large users, is that they are Internet end users. And they have an interest in ICANN in one way or the other. There might be someone who has registered a domain name, they might be someone who is just interested the bottom up, multistakeholder policies.

Or they might be people who are domain owners. And in fact, there are these three categories, and many more are included in the At Large community. It's very hard to define all of them. On the other hand, I go completely with being able to frame those statements better, and being able to say why is this important, and having this on our correspondence page, or having links to further information on the topic, or background information on the topic, or cross linking with everything else.

Because at the moment, I agree with you, it's very dry. And you know, ALAC statement and universal acceptance of TLD draft roadmap, we don't have a clue who that could be interesting to. We don't have any background to it, we just have that statement, and frankly, if somebody

is not specifically looking for this statement, than you know, that's not going to entice anyone to read it or to even have a look at it.

And in fact, the majority of cases, if we haven't actually pointed people to our statements in the correspondence page, they may not be able to find a statement on this. And if I just said, "Oh, we've done a statement on that." No one would be able to find it. And didn't know what the name of it was. So I'm all with you, Steve, on this. I agree totally this is an excellent idea. How to do it though? I have no idea.

STEVE ALLISON:

Sure. So let's, I want to be clear. There is two points we're talking about at once. The first point that I didn't intend to bring up, it seems like it's an issue is, I think it's very relevant for us, not only just for newcomers, but people within the community to understand some form of boundary of what our mission is, and to what end. They should know the types of issues that are relevant. And whether they're allowed to bring issues to the table, or to define those issues, is not the point.

We need to know what they are. We need to know the issues that we're thinking about. And then separately, is tying the work we're doing to the issues that are important to us, so that people can not only see that we're making progress towards our mission, but that they can reference stuff, so that they can remain informed and that they can take action on things that are relevant.

So, or to, you know, to refer back to historical context as well. So that part of it is a mechanism, the second part of it is the reference point is a

mechanism that we can build. But the first part is really difficult is, we need to define how this process happens, you know. How do we go about defining what things we're going to respond to, and how we're going to pick an issue that's now relevant to the community.

I think that's going to be a big challenge for us. But if we don't do that, no matter how much technology we build, it will be confusing. People won't know how the process gets started, and how to become part of the process and so the volunteer work will be lower. You know, you'll get a small selection of people that write and that will be it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

It's Olivier speaking. The scope of the comment defined in the ICANN bylaws, where it says in there, and that's how broad the scope, it says, the At Large advisory committee is the primary organizational home within ICANN [inaudible]... The role of the ALAC shall be to consider and provide advice on the activity of ICANN in so far as it relates to the interest of the individual end users. And so then it goes on. It says, "This includes policies [inaudible] ICANN supporting organizations, as well as the many other issues for which community input and advice is appropriate."

The ALAC which plays an important role in ICANN's accountability mechanisms, also coordinate some of ICANN's outreach to individual Internet users. So that really... So our mission is framed by, consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN in so far as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users. That's how broad it is. I say

we can comment on anything and everything as long as it relates to ICANN, and it relates to Internet users.

And so it's typical to then narrow it down further.

STEVE ALLISON:

That's fair. So maybe what we do is, okay, so we're very upfront about that being our mission statement, and then we talk about maybe we keep it fresh. We talk about all the current issues that we're focused on a the moment. And then we should have an introduction... If we're going to spend the effort to have a statement on something, we should pose, we should frame that problem so that people can understand that problem.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Well this is okay.

ARIEL LIANG:

Sorry, I can't raise my hand. But I have a quick question. Also a question for Olivier too, because when we address a public comment request, the ICANN website has all of the background information that we copy paste to our wiki. And I'm just wondering if we can somehow extract the most important information from this background information provided by ICANN, will that help the reader understand what the issues are?

And they will also link to a specific document. For example, there are topic comment requests on that universal acceptance of TLD draft

roadmap. It has this draft roadmap here, and if somehow we find out a mechanism to summarize all of these, then will that be sufficient to provide the background for this request? It's just a question, not a suggestion.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It's not enough. I mean it's important... Go ahead. I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, no, go ahead Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, this is Dev. I would think Ariel, the response to that, yes the information is useful, but I think it comes back down to the why should I care? Or why is this important to me column. I'm thinking more and more that this is probably has to happen for each of the policy advice statement, because universal roadmap, for someone who speaks another language, I don't they will immediately recognize that this is something that's important to them.

Unless they want domain names in your language, then this is a really important view. In fact, this is super critical for them actually. This is probably their most important issue ever, in dealing with ICANN policy, if that's the core issue. But they really won't understand it if it's not in that column or paragraph as part of the, why should I care column.

I mean, all of those details are important because obviously when you have the [inaudible] ...then you've got to do the research and

understand where it is coming from and all of that. But I think that the policy advice page, and I think this is where... And that why should I care column, why is this important to us column, that field could also then be transferred after the statement has been developed or not, and set on the final correspondence page.

So then when people are researching, they can see, oh okay, this is something that's important that [inaudible] IDNs, or you know, so. So yeah. So I think having that one paragraph, which might be a little bit lower, but I think that's much easier to do than to try to write that whole descriptive text, which is kind of semi-duplicating what the ICANN background is, I would think. And then trying to embellish it and send the writing, or with an essay as to why this is important, and the history of it, and so forth.

In my mind, that's too much work. Maybe that [inaudible] as to why should I care column, I don't know what else to call it. Why is it important to me column. Just that one paragraph. And then that should trigger somebody, oh, okay, that's me.

STEVE ALLISON:

So if we were able to own our own content publishing, right, have our own permissions and we were empowered to update these pages as we wanted, would this overhead feel significant or not significant? Because it's being written already, it's just not being published here. I guess that's a question for Ariel.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I was going to give the floor to Heidi, who had her hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier. Just coming back to that Dev, I recall that about a year ago, Matt and you started working on a page that was linked to the policy advice development page, listing all of the statements and why they were important to the end user. But that was sort of discontinued after a while. Do you recall that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Vaguely I do recall that, because I think this is what I feel, and why I'm bringing it up as to why people should get involved. Because I mean, I don't think we really made any much progress on it, to be quite honest. Either way, we developed it, but then yeah, it's just something that there wasn't enough time...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. It was supposed to be something that Matt was the penholder on, and it didn't get very far. There are actually, let's take a look Ariel. There are, maybe... No it's not that one. Early engagement, click on that one, I think that's the one. I didn't even see that. There we go. I think, no.

[CROSSTALK]

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. I think, as I recall, what was happening was that we were trying to automate this as much as possible, and then it just became, because it's so many changes to the ICANN public comment pages, it began, the syntax of the page it became impossible to do. So yeah, but I think that why should I care column, I think that... The thing is, I don't know the penholder can shape something as to why this is important.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, I mean, well coming back to that Dev. If the penholder does not know why the issue is important to the end user, then they shouldn't be the penholder, quite frankly.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes exactly. Yes.

STEVE ALLISON: Yeah, it's not about just having a summary of your response, but it's a summary of the issue.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Ariel, maybe you can follow up with Matt on what happened to that page. It's not, I'm not finding it. That's not the one.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I don't think it made that much progress. This is Dev.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, but that's something that's useful. I mean that does, rather than the summary... I agree with Ariel that the summary that the staff person produces for the public comment is useful, but then it needs to go further for the At Large group and why, how, what kind of impact this issue might have on the end user.

ARIEL LIANG: Just to [inaudible] on Heidi's point, I was talking with Lars and [inaudible], and they told me about their revamping for GNSO website. And they actually developed some static content for different issue topics, and then they just write a bunch of information there to show people why it's important for them.

I was thinking, if a similar kind of mechanism for At Large, like if At Large is focusing on just a few different topics, key area, we can develop a very detailed background information for those topics. So that, you know, one [inaudible] statement that's related to that topic, we don't need to write every time why it's important for the user. We can just refer to that already developed topic page, so they can discover more and see the progress.

So if we think that way, maybe it's not too much work, if we can identify all of those top topics, and then we give time to develop a really good, like one on one, explanation as the background for those topics.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That goes back to that taxonomy landing page. [Inaudible] but instead of the taxonomy, it will be a topic. WHOIS, IDN, ccTLDs, etc.

STEVE ALLISON: We're up against our time block here, but I did, if everybody has the availability, there is one more piece of this that I'd like to get some clarification on. If we can change gears just a little bit. We've talked about something really important, which is anybody can really respond to a statement or draft something, if it's important to them.

And I want to understand a little bit about this process. I would suspect, and Ariel and I have talked about it a little bit, that if there is ICANN public comment, it's very easy for us to have a mechanism that pulls in those public comments, and then it's front and center, and whether we choose to respond or not is really a formality of picking somebody to respond to that public comment.

But what I want to know is, what is the process today? Just irrespective of the website, what is the process, if somebody has an issue that's important to them within the ICANN world, how do they make it known that they want to write something about it?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It is described, and I believe there is a flowchart available.

STEVE ALLISON: That would be great to have.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: ...talks about how that, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier here. I've done a little flowchart on this. There is an ideal way and there is a real way. So, ideally, someone should first speak to their RALO, so the regional At Large organization. And so this issue is really important for us. That regional At Large organization should then bring the issue to the other regional At Large organizations, and say, "This is something that's important for us. We've got some [inaudible] on this. Are you also interested in drafting something?"

And if we have critical mass in the regional At Large organizations, bearing in mind that our ALAC members come from the five regions, then the ALAC will pick it up. Somebody will basically create a page, a wiki page, somebody will pick up the pen, and a first draft will be drafted, and then that will go out for comment within the At Large community by sending an email out to the At Large list, mailing list.

Comments will be collected on that wiki page. Then a second draft, and sometime even a third draft, might go and be amended because of the comments that are left on there. If there is no consensus under discussion, if we have very vastly different views, as the ALAC chair I would notice this and say, "I think we're not going to go very far with this."

And so the statement will probably never come out, because it's highly likely that it will not be voted positively by the ALAC. But if there is consensus, then the closing date for comments is made, a final statement is drafted, published, and then there is a vote that. Ballots

get sent out to the 15 member At Large advisory committee for them to vote on this space, and then ratify it.

And then it becomes a natural statement that we can translate to [inaudible]... So long as process, that's the theory. In practice, it's slightly different in that some people will take their point of view directly over to the ALAC, and the matter might be discussed directly on the mailing list, or on an ALAC call, and so there would not be this thing where it starts first in the RALO, and then moves over to the ALAC.

STEVE ALLISON:

Is it... Why do they not use the process that's defined? Is it too time consuming? Or confusing?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

There are two things. On the one hand, it is a bit time consuming, and on the other hand, the RALOs would have to play their full part in the policy development and the policy discussions. Unfortunately, we don't have an even playing field on that. Some RALOs are more responsive on policy, some are not. And we also have the problem of language, which if you look at some RALOs work in Spanish and English, and so they might develop a statement first in Spanish before moving on further.

So that's why it's not even between the RALOs, unfortunately. I've told the RALOs many times the ideal way of doing it, I don't think we've had that much success so far in having the RALOs push policy issues, except maybe one of them that has, on several occasions, post policy issues. It has not been as smooth as the theory.

STEVE ALLISON:

Okay. So just out of curiosity, if, let's say we had a future state where we didn't use email as often. I find that email is really hard for us to go back and see an entire conversation, although it is possible. Let's say we had something... So a lot of organizations that try to do consensus building, they have these platforms called [idea-ation] platforms, basically it's a discussion board that you can vote.

I don't know if you guys are familiar with, like, how Reddit would work or something like that. They can be a little more formal than that. And if you work for a really good example, Starbucks has like a Starbucks idea website, where people can propose ideas and they can have discussions around them. And at some point, it gets critical mass, and then it becomes something else actionable.

So maybe something like that would not only capture the conversations that need to take place, but allow something to hop from idea to, it's now included in our formal process. So maybe it's food for thought that stuff that's happening like that, is a great place for a website like this to build that critical mass.

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I would suggest that you look at that Dev. It's a good first step before the statement drafting comes to the wiki. Once we've moved on over to the wiki, all of the discussions on that, we really try and ask for

people to discuss on the wiki, so we can actually keep track of the discussions, rather than the mailing list, which sometimes gets...

STEVE ALLISON: I absolutely agree. Going through the wiki, it's shown that it's a great process. So I wouldn't propose changing it until there is a need to do so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're looking at an earlier stage. Dev, you've looked into that with the technology taskforce.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. If you remember during the ATLAS 2, this is what they call crowd sourcing concept that's coming in, to where they already have this sort of more interactive discussion to try to get a, hopefully, faster consensus.

STEVE ALLISON: Right. The first discussion, and my understanding, is discussing whether or not the issue is relevant and what are the boundaries of that issue. Once someone has decided the issue is worth trying to come up with a solution for, a statement on, then the collaboration, the whole focus of the conversation should change to, what is our response to this issue? So there are two different discussions.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Right now that happens on the wiki, on the wiki page itself. And it has happened, you know, because the ALAC [inaudible] when they decide, well there is no need for a statement, but then somebody could raise the issue, and then people respond.

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The initial stage has always been on email so far. So I would agree with you that it might be interesting for that, gaining that critical mass part, we've done on email, and it's only when it gained that critical mass that it moved on to the wiki. Having a prenatal discussion on some kind of system, might be something to look for.

I don't know, Dev? Would you say that would be helpful?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. I would think that would be helpful. And I guess [inaudible] concepts [inaudible] for thematic group five to look at. Try to figure out what kind of system could generate a buzz or discussion as to, is this important or not important?

STEVE ALLISON: Sure. And maybe the wiki has the technology to support it as well, and it's just a different space than the wiki for, you know, at the prenatal discussion, as you called it. But what I'm calling out is that, at a

minimum there is a need for a public facing website, for someone to be able to say, “Hey, I didn’t know that this discussion was even taking place. I had no idea. I didn’t know that the wiki had this conversation taking place.”

And now they know something is ongoing that they may be interested in.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, I like that idea, where basically from the wiki, you know, once the webpage is kept more up to date, that would be the first place that newcomers might come to, and so there might be a little path or something easily accessible saying, you know, main topic discussions now, or main, you know, policy developments. Yeah, current policy discussion topics, or something like that.

That’s, join now, or something like that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

That’s all what we’re looking at right now, or what we’re working on right now, and then [inaudible], and then the correspondence page, I would say, is more the historical archive, or it’s probably the correspondence to be say what we’ve done, as a final statement and so forth.

STEVE ALLISON:

So maybe one last question for us today would be around the wiki. Just so that I can do some extra homework on it. One, I don’t intend for us

to like rebuild any parts of your wiki, I think that you're doing a lot of stuff really well there. Are there other wiki spaces related to At Large outside of policy development and that process?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh my gosh. Yeah.

[LAUGHTER]

[CROSSTALK]

STEVE ALLISON: I just want to know if the answer is yes, I want to know some of them to start looking at. I want to make sure that we're not missing any other major functional things that people may want some form of linkage between the At Large website and the wiki space.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, perhaps, I know we're running out of time. So, can I suggest that Ariel and myself have a meeting with you on that, and just go through the main other parts of the wiki?

STEVE ALLISON: Sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There are lots of them. There is RALOs, so the regional At Large organizations who have space in the wiki, of course, any other process like At Large improvements, like meetings, all of that is all based on the wiki. Each one of our conference calls is on the wiki, such as the one that we're having at the moment. And all of that also needs to be found. But we're using the wiki for that.

In a way, it is a little bit like looking at the backstage from the front facing website, and so I guess you have seen that, you know, we really see our things as two ways. The front facing website with just the window, and then had all of the stuff going on in the background, which is, I must say, probably quite incomprehensible to anyone who is not a seasoned veteran of that organization.

It would be absolutely great to be able to provide fast tracks to these backstage areas for anyone who is more interested. I just fear though that the complexity of it is going to give you a headache.

[CROSSTALK]

HEIDI ULLRICH: ...there is a lot. I have to say there is a logic there. If someone would just sit down for 30 minutes, they would get it. It's quite logical.

STEVE ALLISON:

But we don't have 30 minutes. So but what I will say, after us going through the deep dive on correspondence, I think what we found is, there is a way that we can present enough information that will get people to each of the collaborative areas that they're looking for, within correspondence.

And I would think as we go through and think about the other collaborative spaces, maybe not all of them, but a lot of them may have a way where we can present that window into it, so that people know where to go for certain reasons, and we can use At Large as the storefront. We don't necessarily have to pull all the data out of there, we just have to let them know what is happening inside of there.

And then they can go there when they need to. So. Okay. This was, I think, a good conversation today. I think it would be valuable for us to sit down with the designers and kind of concept some ideas for getting people from A to B.

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I'm pleased to... Are we planning more calls? Or what's the next steps from here?

ARIEL LIANG:

This is Ariel. So Steve and I have discussed this earlier. We plan to do one call next week, because Steve is going to get the vendor onboard

and have a deep dive with the vendor. So, we won't have two sessions next week. So likely going to be Wednesday, and I will work with Gisella to send out a Doodle poll and find a mutually convenient time for us to get together.

But before that, I think we should have some homework to do together. Steve, what do you think will be the most important thing that we should tackle before the call? Before the call next week?

STEVE ALLISON:

It's really open for discussion. So a couple of things, real quick. Any day Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday next week at any time, I'm flexible. So if you guys just what to just kind of coordinate amongst yourselves and just let me know, I'm fine adjusting.

Another point to make, it seems like both of our last two meetings went about an hour and a half, maybe we just do one session a week and then maybe set our expectation, either do it at an hour or all of us feel fine being committed to an hour and a half. It seems like it takes us a while to get in the groove of things, but it has been valuable.

As far as the topic, it's open to discussion. There is a couple of things that we talked about today that could be valuable if we want to do some further work on. Some work around the taxonomy maybe valuable to us? Some work around considering those landing pages off of an issue, and what types of information may be relevant to presenting audiences may be valuable.

So if people want to brainstorm some ideas on that, I think that would help us in the long run. You know, working on how, in what ways we can frame the problems that, our current issues that we're working on would be valuable. And then outside of that, if we want to consider new topics, there is some areas within here that I don't fully understand yet, and the three of them that are relevant, that I think are relevant are announcements, current issues, and opinions.

I don't know if those, all three are the same topic, if they're intended for different things, and potentially as a future state, what would be great to have in those things, or if we could have all of the wishes in the world, what would we do with those three things. So if we want to do a little thinking around those, we can rejoin next week and do a similar session as we did today around one of those three topics.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Steve, it's Olivier. Can you say again, it was announcements, statements, and opinions, is that what you mentioned?

STEVE ALLISON: It was announcement, current issues, and opinions. So we may have touched on some of them today, we may not have, but I think looking at them in depth as we did today, and validating, or excluding, or extending the discussion around that would be valuable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Okay. It's Olivier speaking. I think that next week, certainly a 90 minute call would probably be better. It does take a few minutes for

all of us to get into gear. And I thoroughly enjoy the face time, so thanks very much for spending the time with us. And anything else to be added? Heidi? Anyone? Ariel, do you wish to announce anything else or can we just close the call?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think this is great, thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. I think, I definitely need to listen to the transcript again, because I was sharing the screen and didn't take notes, but if there is anything we can do like offline, I think we should do that before we get together next week for another long discussion. So I will follow up with all of you after.

STEVE ALLISON: Thanks Ariel.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Definitely that's great. It's Olivier speaking for the transcript. Ariel, you're going to have trouble listening to the transcript, you might listen to the recording and read the transcript. [CROSSTALK]

With that in mind, it's okay, thanks everyone for this call. It's been very helpful, and this call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]