
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Website Revamp Private Call on the 11th of September 2014 at 16:00 UTC. On the call today we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Anthony Niiganni, Steve Allison, Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Laura Bengford. We have no apologies. From staff, joining us shortly will be Heidi Ullrich. On the call we have Ariel Liang, Kathy Schnitt, Gisella Gruber and myself, Terri Agnew.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. I apologize for the late start of this call. It was caused by our previously late arrival of the Chair of the call. Welcome. We are going to be discussing the website revamp. I believe that Steve Allison and Laura Bengford will be able to assist us in this. I'm not sure about the flow of the call. I believe first we'll have a PowerPoint presentation. I see that it's come up on the screen. Welcome Steve. Ariel has been working with you on this. The floor is yours.

ARIEL LIANG: Hello everyone. I think I can start the presentation. Firstly, Steve and I will introduce ourselves. I'm Ariel. I'm the Policy Coordinator for At-Large. Steve, you can introduce yourself.

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.

STEVE ALLISON: This is Steve Allison. I'm on the Product Team with ICANN, the Online Community Services Group. I'm a Product Manager.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Steve. Just to create a frame for this presentation, Steve and I have read through the community interviews for the website, which were conducted in 2012. We created the project charter for this project, based on our observations of the interviews, as well as some of our educated assumptions. This is the proposed product charter, and if you have any comments, questions or feedback, we welcome you to provide us with them. We'd like this to create opportunities for discussion. It's not a set plan. It's still subject to change.

This is the frame for this presentation. First we will walk you through the Agenda quickly. We'll have a quick discussion about the project background and the current situation of our website. Then we'll lay out the goals for the revamp project. Then we'll discuss the traits of our target audience, visitors, for our website. Then we'll discuss the scope of this revamping project, as well as the responsibilities and constraints of the people involved in this project.

Then we'll talk about the risks, which are the factors that may impact our project negatively. Lastly, we'll have a quick overview of the timeline of this entire project. However, all these things are still subject to change, so this is just a proposal. At the end we'll open the floor for questions.

First i'll give you a quick overview of the background of this project. The ICANN At-Large website came into existence in 2005. It was initially owned, designed and launched by a few community members. In 2007 ICANN took over the domain name, which is atlarge.icann.org, and the website has been managed by At-Large staff mainly. Throughout the years the website has gradually become obsolete and there are several factors contributing to this change.

First is that ICANN started to focus on developing the Confluence Wiki, so the community put major effort into building and managing content on the Wiki instead of the website. The second factor was among the At-Large team there's a lack of staff and resources to frequently update the information on the website, and also follow through proposed changes – in the past.

The third factor was that the At-Large website actually went through several reiterations. I learnt from Olivier and Cheryl that we used to use a system called Socialtext, which is similar to the Wiki for developing the website for At-Large. We went through several revamps on the Socialtext and during those revamps a lot of historical information from the community was lost. That was a shame.

The fourth factor is ICANN has rolled out the new ICANN.org website and a lot of the web admin resources were put into the revamping for the major ICANN site, so the At-Large site didn't get as much time or emphasis on redevelopment. These factors contributed to the current obsolete status of the website. In 2012 IT Teams proposed to create a new website for the community. For this project, 11 community

members were interviewed in order to get information and insight about the ways to improve the website.

The process stopped because of abrupt change of some key IT staff. It left our website in the current state it's in now. Now Steve will talk about the current situation of our website.

STEVE ALLISON:

Thanks Ariel. The current situation that we're pulling out is really a fact-based effort. What we've done is we've pulled some analytics from the current website, just to call out some behaviors that we see for new and returning visitors to the website. I apologize that this slide is a little hard to see from the specifics, so I'll just call out what I've highlighted there in red and circled in purple; that across all of the major pages that people visited on the website, they quite frequently, 60 to 70 per cent of the time, immediately leave the site without even exploring any other click.

Sometimes that's a good thing. Oftentimes it's not a good thing. It means users aren't exploring. They're not seeking out what they're looking for, and they don't have confidence that if they did seek out what they were looking for that they'd end up finding it. There's all kinds of reasons why that could happen. At the end of the day, whatever our goals are for the website, which we'll get into next, we won't be able to achieve them if people don't have [confidence 00:08:59] to seek out the right information and to find it.

If we go back real quick, just to reiterate, some of the reasons why you can see that is there's too much information, or they can't figure out how to navigate around, or the information is inaccurate or out of date,

or the user uses search mechanisms and it doesn't actually pull out what they're looking for.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you Steve. Just to add one point – if you look at the statistics, the bounce rate, a lot of visitors come to the homepage, and once they look at the homepage for less than two minutes or so, they will leave. They don't have the need or want to explore further. Based on this statistic you can see that our way of conveying information on the website is pretty ineffective. This current situation is our reason to revamp the website completely. For this project we have four separate goals.

The first goal is to make this website an educational opportunity for visitors, so the website can tell a clear story about who At-Large is, what the community does and ways for people to get involved. That makes outsiders, new ALS Members and all those target audiences to understand about the community. The second goal is engagement, which means we use the website as a way to prompt those visitors to further engage with the community. There are many ways they can show this engagement.

For example, if someone has seen the information about ALS applications and they want to apply to become an ALS for At-Large, that will be a way to realize that engagement goal. The third goal is the action, which means we want people to not just be part of the community, but also work in the way that communities do. For example, if in the website we can clearly explain how ALAC statements are made, why they are made, and provide those channels for people

who are interested in policies to write a statement or comment on a statement, then this website is successful in realizing this action goal.

The fourth goal is social, which means we want this website to be a platform for people to connect with each other, among the community. They can also spread information about this community throughout their social networks. These are the four goals for revamping the website. Then I will talk about the target audience part. Actually, Steve and I will collaborate on this. I will talk about the common traits of the target audience, and Steve will go deeper into the psychographics, meaning the mentalities of the target audience.

After we analyzed the interviews of the community members, and also our observations of the community and the website, we have identified two target audiences. The first is the primary one, which are the newcomers and curious outsiders for the At-Large community. They can be the incoming and new ALS representatives, ICANN [staff 00:13:12] like Anthony himself, Next Gen students, and also the Summer School of Internet Governance students.

The secondary target audience is the seasoned community members. These two target audiences have a lot of common characteristics. First is where they're located. Actually, a big majority of them are located in the United States, and we got that data based on the Google Analytics from the past two years. 25 per cent of the visitors are living in the US. The other countries you see on the slides, two to four per cent of the visitors come each from these other countries, like China, Japan, Russia, UK, France, Australia and Argentina. This is where they live.

The second characteristic is their demographic features. They're both genders, but more are male. We don't have this data from Google Analytics, but based on my data collected from social media I've seen a lot of our online visitors are male that engage through the At-Large community through many social online channels. They're college educated or above. If they're students then they major in science technology, engineering and related subject areas, or if they're professional then they work in the IT or related industries. The third characteristic is their interest.

They're either interested in Internet policy issues, like the broader ones like Internet governance, privacy and those areas, or ICANN-specific issue areas dealing with the domain name system. The fourth characteristic is their desire. For the primary audience, they want to influence ICANN policy or promote end user interests in those policies and make a difference to the future of the Internet. This is what they want to do.

The last common characteristic is their influences – who influences their way of working or influences their knowledge, or the many subject matter experts in those Internet policy areas, or media that are reporting those issues. These are the common traits between the primary and secondary audiences. Next, Steve will talk about the mentality for the primary and secondary audience.

STEVE ALLISON:

Just to reiterate as we're going through, you can see that Ariel and I have made a lot of assumptions, and some of them may be correct and

some incorrect. As we're going through, keep the comments and questions in the chat going and we'll circle back around on any of these slides. When we're talking about our primary audiences, we've come to the conclusion that there are two, and within those two there may be some individuals that care about some of these items, some that care about all of them.

Firstly, when we're talking about newcomers we have these individuals that have these three main needs when thinking about an organization such as our own. One that does advocacy or pushes for change needs to engage these individuals. This is our set of assumptions for what these individuals believe. The three are: becoming informed, becoming more connected with the community itself, and then ultimately moving those individuals to becoming active.

Within those, there are a lot of types of questions that those individuals might ask themselves, or statements that they might make to define who they are – such as why does our organization exist and what drives it? What's special about this organization versus another, and in what ways are we making an impact? These are things that almost validate why our organization is doing what it is doing. When we're talking about getting connected it's giving them a point to reach out to the community and ask questions to feel like they're a part of that community and be able to identify individuals in that community that they can associate with.

Lastly, once they've got those two elements, they want to know how they can help out. What is it that they can offer in the community? They want to think about the specific topics that are relevant to specific

regions that they might be a part of. There should be ways to quickly take action on those things. Separately from this, issues that they may be interested in is knowing what issues are up and coming – which ones are we actively working on? Which ones have due dates coming up? Then the last thing is about events taking place that they may be interested in.

It's not necessarily events that they may have a responsibility or expectation to do something in, but just something that they can be a part of. That would be one of the first steps for a primary audience. Then as we put the next slide up, I think what we'll see is at some point, when a newcomer becomes active in the community, they graduate into the secondary audience, which is the rest of the community. There are many different types of interest that the rest of the community can have.

We can probably expand these into multiple smaller personas, but at a high level presentation. We wanted to try and call out one of the major themes that we felt there was. The first being thoughts during community and driving decisions. We found that in our understanding of the correspondence element of the site, that people were going there to become a part of the discussion that was taking place. It may be individuals that aren't a part of a specific Working Group; that want to voice their concerns or their insights and potentially even start a lively conversation that leads to quantifiable outcomes. That's the first thing that we saw.

The second theme is keeping in the know. I hinted that a little bit around correspondence, but it's about, okay, you know the history of

this organization, you know why it's here, but now you want to keep in the loop of what else is happening around you that you may not be aware of – how we're continuing towards our mission, success stories are important, and sometimes even failure stories are important. It helps people light a fire and become more active. Then sharing progress towards our goals and objectives. Sometimes having quantifiable indicators helps people figure out how much more involvement they should be putting into a community like this.

The third is sharing information. Having an ability to be social, outside of just the confines of our website will create a broader audience that we may or may not know exist. It will at least give us an arm to reach out to those people and potentially increase our engagement. A lot of people, when they're doing good work and can see the good work, if we have that original content on our site, we should provide them mechanisms to share and empower them to do so.

The fourth is tracking events. Basically, it's very similar to how we have the calendar today. It's keeping people aware of events that are taking place, and things that they may be interested in. It's setting expectations so they know what they can do to help out in those events. It's also just having a historical record of these things so that people can see what we did and how it relates to what we've been able to accomplish.

The fifth is getting personal. I don't know if this is necessarily something that the site itself can facilitate, or if it's really an organizational thing. Across non-profits around the world and advocacy groups, getting personal and reaching out is showing appreciation to the individuals or

the organizations that are keeping a [unclear 00:23:12] mission is really valuable. Sometimes it's all the difference in the world for getting volunteer to continue to support us. I think that that's a key for the secondary audience – feeling like the work they're doing is appreciated, because it is.

The final is to show support. I think Ariel might want to speak to this a little more clearly than I am.

ARIEL LIANG:

For the show support part, for example if there's a major campaign going out, for example ATLAS II going on, we can use the website to publicize that info and encourage the community members to share this information across their social networks. That's a way for them to share support. There are different ways to do that, and I think that's similar to sharing information as well.

STEVE ALLISON:

Thank you. One thing that calls out is we're really trying to target what it is thematically about these personas that define who they are and what makes them tick. It's not necessarily to define the solutions to the website, but we think capturing these types of questions will help ourselves as well as our developers and designers to think about these individuals when they are developing solutions. I can see in the chat there's discussion about the Wiki; do we [unclear 00:24:55] that information from the Wiki? Does this information belong here or there?

A lot of that is in the solutioning part of it. Understanding who our audience is will help us think creatively. We're purposefully not putting solutioning into some of these, so that when we do get to it we can use this almost as a stakeholder in our discussion. For the scope slide, this is really a combination of scope and responsibility. What we're trying to call out here on the left in scope is responsibilities in the Product Team as we go through this effort.

We're really calling out that what we're going to do is develop some artifacts that not only get us to a redesigned website but also help us communicate to the community how we got to this point, so that when we go through our first presentation and get feedback, it doesn't feel like we just did all of this work in a vacuum. I think some of these artifacts; doing activity mapping and audience targeting, style guides and wireframes and our beta prototypes, those things will lead us naturally to being able to almost sell how we got to how we are, and then provide validation in the process.

The things that are out of scope, not necessarily things that don't have to be done and won't be done – but are out of scope for the Product Team as we go through this – is doing new qualitative and quantitative research. Given the time and the budget that we have available to us, we're not going to be able to and survey the entire community again. We're going to use the data that we have. We're going to try to incorporate some feedback into the process so that we can work iteratively when we get into the development process.

Doing a full-scale survey effort is quite time consuming and lengthy, so we won't be doing that. The second thing that's out of scope is that

there are literally thousands of pages within the At-Large website. We don't have the bandwidth to analyze all of it, but over time that work must be done if we're to launch a new website. Earlier today, Ariel mentioned that over previous redesign efforts, information was lost, and artifacts are no longer a part of our community.

That's not what we want to have happen, so at some point an effort needs to take place to make decisions on some of the older information. Do we archive it? How do we archive it? How do people know that it's archived? Some of the effort of taking old content and deciding what to do with it won't be included in this initial effort of a website re-launch, but it must be done, and we'll have to come up with a way to assess the responsibilities so that it does get done.

Some of the other items here are really similar, but at the end of the day, the last thing I want to call out for out of scope is really this development of new content. Again, it's something that has to be done, and I really want to rely heavily on the community to think that this is something they should own, and get assistance; whether it's through our Coms Department or however we go about it, to think up how to write new content.

I'd really encourage that if we're going to launch a website, content is king. We need to really think that no matter what mechanisms we put in place, it won't be sufficient if we don't really think creatively about what messages we want to put there. We'll need to be writing new content as well for the site, and potentially even planning out a content calendar of concepts that we want to author and publish, so that we can

continue to have fresh, authoritative content on our site for people to come back to.

Those are the things that I want to call out for out of scope for at least this design phase, probably for some of the development phase, but not necessarily out of scope for the whole life of the website.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you Steve. Actually, connected to some of what Steve said about out of scope, those are out of scope for the Product Team, because for example creating new content and reorganizing existing content is not something in their ability to do, because they're not really familiar with the subject matter. These responsibilities will fall naturally to the At-Large Team. I'll just give you a quick summary of the two key responsibilities.

One is reorganizing the content that neither belongs to the existing information architecture, nor has been analyzed for the inclusion in [unclear 00:30:29] information architecture. That's a big responsibility – reorganizing the content. The second responsibility is generating new content to support the [to be 00:30:44] information architecture and the wireframe. This too falls mainly to the At-Large Team, but of course other parts of ICANN can be included in this effort. We can collaborate with the Coms Department to decide on new content and the way to articulate them.

Also, to answer Heidi's question, this should be done after the wireframe, the design of the website, is completed. If we don't have an

effective design and are clear on the understanding of the audience, the content generated will be ineffective. We can't be too rushed on that.

Also, the website has been out of date since at least 2010. A lot of current issues are about issues in 2009 or 2010, so we just have to look forward and not waste energy in filling the gaps between 2010 and 2014. That's really not necessary. So we'll look into the content part after at least the LA Meeting, when the design is pretty much finalized.

STEVE ALLISON:

If I may butt in for a second, we do happen to have some really well-written content already in some of the Beginner Guides and throughout some other areas on the site. Where content is a little disorganized or may be complicated for us is around some of the deeper pages within the site. Where we do have good content, it may be sufficient for us to be able to just, during this first wireframe and design effort, to be pulling some of that content out of those areas – even if it needs to be edited and modified over time, it can give us a direction to start moving some of these designs as we're working through it with the designers.

Some of that we will do in tandem, but Ariel's right – some of this is a larger term effort.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you Steve. That's a great point. Connected to the responsibilities, I also want to clarify some of the constraints that our team is facing. The first is for me, I'm a Policy Coordinator and also have worked in other areas for At-Large, like social media and elections, so I have limited time

for the website revamping project. That's one constraint. Steve also has other constraints. He has several projects going on for different types of websites, and the At-Large website is just one of them. That's his limitation in this project.

I know we have Dev, Olivier and Anthony, the three community members, to work on this project, but every week they only have two to four hours to meet together and discuss the progress, and you all have many packed scheduled with other things. The fourth one is that we'll work with an outside vendor for producing the design for the website. They're outsources, but they haven't been contracted yet, and they also have a limited commitment, based on the budget. We need to take that into consideration, and if they haven't been contracted quickly, that will impact our schedule.

The fifth constraint is that IT staff of ICANN will be mainly developing the website after the design is produced, but the resources haven't been allocated yet, so we haven't got a clear understanding of who is doing what for what period of time, and with which how much commitment. Those are the unknown things.

Lastly, which is an overarching theme for a constraint is that we do have a limited budget and time for revamping the website. We just need to understand all these things to have a realistic expectation. Steve will talk to you about the risks that may negatively impact the project.

STEVE ALLISON:

Thank you. We have four major risks. The first is all of us are busy and we all have different things that we're working on, but we need some

level of feedback loops and ownership to get work done. I think at the present time we're estimated to have a one-hour session mid-week, which I think is probably sufficient, but there may be some takeaways after some of these meetings that will require us really think through some of the work that we're being presented with, so that we can continue to guide this project along. I think it's a risk where if our time and availability is not enough, it impacts our schedule and how quickly our designers can iterate our ideas. It's a big risk for us.

Secondary is content reorganization. It's out of the scope that we're going to do the entire reorganization, but decisions will have to be made on what to do with some of that. As a risk to the website itself, if that isn't done, we run the risk of losing information or we'll have cluttered information again. In general, if that work isn't done consistently and if we don't feel like we have a sense of ownership to continue to organize and curate that content properly, we'll sit in three years with the same exact problem that we have today, which is the same exact problem as we had three years ago.

It's a big risk to any of these projects, that we have to really consider the ownership in curating and organizing content. The final risk is the development of the functionality. We're very time-dependent. If we want to hit the deadlines that we're going to propose to you, we need to have the development team working pretty rapidly with us on ideas. It's going to require [unclear 00:37:40] this team, which we don't currently have. It's something I wanted to call out. We haven't procured services for this team, and I don't have a date given to me on when those developers will be available.

It's something we'll keep tabs on an obviously keep everybody informed on, but it's a risk to hitting any deadline that we communicate to the community. Even tied to that is that we still haven't finished contracting with our design team. We're hoping to have that done this week so that it can begin with us next Monday. It's a risk that if we miss having our contracts finalized this Friday, they'll flip a week in their scheduling. I don't know. Our timelines are so tight that it will probably impact our delivery of a finished product for the meeting.

We're doing our best to get that going quickly. For the timeline, this is really just darts thrown at a dartboard, but it's something for us to use as a baseline and as we learn more about the depth that we want to take the website and we learn more about the resources we have available to us to get us there. We can shift and communicate it accordingly, but what we're looking at for the first delivery is that we'd have an initial design ready for the ICANN 51 LA Meeting.

What we're getting at is that we'd have wireframes in place that align to the activities that we think are most important, and they would represent the major functions that people would have on the site. Those wireframes would also be in enough detail that you could see the styling that we're choosing, the color schemes, the buttons – a very finely-tuned set of designs that will tell a story to the community. In addition to that it will have all the activity diagrams and personas so that it supports the story that we're telling. That's what we're trying to do for the first meeting.

We want then to collect feedback from the community as we ramp up a development team and start building a prototype of this design. It

would be great to have a beta prototype of some level of functionality that lets people see the vision working for the Marrakech meeting. It's a little ambitious to have that up and running, but it's not impossible. Depending on the support we get and the feedback we get, that's a goal that we want to shoot for. From there, it's really just an iterative development process; bringing in the community as often as we can to get feedback from them, and continue to shape the final pieces of functionality with the budget we have.

As we go through this process, in theory the website could never end. You could think up a million ideas and only have enough money to solve the top ten ideas. You could think up ten million ideas and only be able to solve the first million ideas. As we go through this process we'll start to identify many ideas, and then we'll have to quantify which are the highest priorities first, and then we'll continue to knock those out.

The ultimate goal here is that sometime in April to later in 2015, we'll have a polished-enough product that we can launch that website as a replacement of our existing atlarge.icann.org website, and then continue to iterate on that to the phase two, phase three items that we're still hoping for.

ARIEL LIANG:

This is the end of the presentation. We welcome any questions or feedback you have. The floor is open. Thank you Steve.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Ariel and Steve. As someone who has been frustrated for the past four years on the current At-Large website, this past 45 minutes was pure bliss, so thank you for this presentation. The floor is open now for questions or comments from the participants here. Whilst everyone else gathers their senses, after being hit by such wonderful news, I had a couple of questions. The first one was to do with the customer base.

With the customer base that you were looking at, at the At-Large website being primarily meant for outsiders, are we therefore making the conscious decision that the community website – in other words the Wiki – would be primarily working for the insiders, like the nitty-gritty work, the working spaces, etcetera?

STEVE ALLISON: If I can answer that, obviously for future iterations of this website, I think it's something that we could bring into the fold and discuss more deeply. We can analyze it and figure out ways to make a site like this more interactive. I think that despite some of the deficiencies as a community Wiki, it is a proper place for people to do collaborative work. What is missing is the channel from that community Wiki back to your public-facing website, to communicate and potentially even spark discussions with people who aren't working within specific Wiki spaces.

Yes, my vision is that the community Wiki would probably remain as-is, or would be a separate effort to reorganize or improve that part of it. It wouldn't be so excluded that we wouldn't be considering what elements

within those Wikis should be pulled out and be more prominent within a public space like the atlarge.icann.org website.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you for the question Olivier, and thank you Steve for explaining the relationship between the Wiki and the website. Also, just to add to that, Dev asked in the chat that even for outsiders, when they Google “At-Large” the Confluence Wiki comes up in the search results and they can access the Wiki, browsing the content there. The problem is the Wiki doesn’t have a very effective language page for the community.

It just looks very technical and complicated, and it doesn’t have a very effective navigation for people to understand quickly. So to have a website that is public-facing and especially tailored to newcomers will be very effective, if we give a landing page to the community. Also, based on the analytics provided by Google, 63 per cent of the website visitors in the past two years are new visitors. They have never been to the website before, so this is their first opportunity to have an impression or understanding of what At-Large is.

Only 33 per cent are returned visitors, so we can assume that they are the people who are already involved in the community. They come back to the website to track announcements or meeting information, or they already somehow have a grasp of what the community does. If the majority of the visitors are new visitors, we should put more emphasis on them and regard them as a primary audience. We should tailor the materials for their interest. That’s just one thing I wanted to add.

STEVE ALLISON:

A final comment to add onto what Ariel is saying is that the analytics that we have is historical data. As a group, as a project team, we can choose whether or not these two target audiences are the audiences that we want to target. If we choose to target someone else, that's fine. Then I think we'll see over time that our analytics will change. It may be that our newcomers increases, or maybe the percentage of newcomers versus returning people decreases, because they're coming back, they're reusing the site, and they happen to be active as well.

The analytics are good for telling us some of the issues we have today, but at the end of the day it's up to us to choose who our target audiences are, and once we're comfortable with that we'll build analytics to support our progress towards those goals.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this Steve and Ariel. A follow up question on this, looking now at the content itself, how much of it is going to be static and how much of it is going to be dynamic? Obviously you touched on it as some content will have to be constantly updated, some content will remain static for a specific length of time – sometimes forever as well; maybe the bylaws might remain for a long time. So did you make provisions, or did you have thoughts on how much of this would be directly updatable by Ariel, or how much of it will have to go through this reorganization by the web team if content needs to be changed?

STEVE ALLISON:

I don't have a good enough sense to give you a quantifiable answer to that. What I would just call out though is that more broadly, outside of

the scope of this project, I think it's important for any organization to start coming up with a content strategy, and based on what their capacity is, what are good objectives to try to achieve, and then work within those confines. As we're going through this process, I think the majority of what we'll be proposing, at least in the initial design of this, is stuff geared towards the newcomer stuff that we can write once, that will get them in the door – that hook.

From there it comes down to, okay, now that we've got the foundations in place and we have enough good content to walk them through the process, to show them what we work on, how we work on it, and how to become involved in it, then the stuff that's a little bit more dynamic, or the stuff that's changing rapidly, is around the stuff that we're working on – like the correspondence statements. I didn't want to get too far down into this today, but blog posts or interesting success stories. Those are things we can plan out over time and figure out what resources we need or the ones we have, and then work within those confines.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. I think I was looking specifically at for example the correspondence statements, as you just touched on. Part of our out-facing is going to be not only what we do, but also what we produce. The statements, the correspondence, is really the core work of the ALAC. That is highly dynamic, because we do produce in excess of 50 statements a year. They have to be displayed or found easily. They have to be searchable. There are a whole number of things. The current system for displaying our correspondence just doesn't work.

It used to work when we had seven statements a year, but it doesn't for now. That's why I thought I would mention this very early on, for us to make sure we're not just running on a parallel track where you think that we're just dealing with a static content informing people, informing users that don't know At-Large. Of course, it's super important. That's really needed. The next thing is being the tracking, that sort of stuff.

You've touched further down, on one of the pages, the tracking of where we are with regards to policy, etcetera. Of course, any tracking is going to be highly dynamic because we keep on moving forward. That was the reason. Finally, I had one last one and that's a quick one. You mentioned At-Large was to generate the new content. That's well understood. Who will generate new artwork, if artwork is required?

STEVE ALLISON:

The artwork I would imagine would fall under the Product Team for now. For the length of the project, a lot of the artwork that we've done for other projects has been done in parallel with the Coms Department. They'll help us source vendors to do that. I don't know over the long term who will specifically will be helping us do that, but it will fall under the product team to help and facilitate that. If it's artwork that's tied towards content, it may be something we can talk to Laura about offline. We could take it as an AI to figure out the best practice for going about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. That brings me to two more questions. On the artwork and on the look of the website, is there a will to coordinate the looks of that

website with the looks of the other ICANN websites? In other words, the corporate identity of ICANN?

STEVE ALLISON:

That's up for discussion actually. As we go through this process with the design team they're going to build us what we call a style guide. That style guide will inform whomever helps build functionality for us or pages for us. It will inform us on how to go about doing it – color schemes, text fonts and sizes, imagery and things like that. They will build that artifact for us. It will be done with our feedback. If our desire is to align some of the elements to some of the other organizations within the community, and start building consistency – which is something I'd recommend – then that's the direction we'll take.

If we have a different rationale and a different perspective, we'll take it, we'll discuss it and we'll figure out a good course of action. I would say that you guys have as much ownership over the direction to take as anyone else.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Steve. Finally the last question, which is a two-part question, is have you already had a look at the other websites within the ICANN sphere? The second part of the question is, what makes At-Large different? What are the differences you've noted between At-Large and... Not looking at the current At-Large website, which by the way we can just trash, but what makes At-Large different compared to the other communities out there? Are their needs vastly different? This sort of thing.

STEVE ALLISON:

I don't know if their needs are vastly different. What I think will help define their uniqueness – and this is really one of the persona items that I have listed – is that it's something I think we should work to define and be explicit about. When I think about At-Large as an organization, I think what makes them unique is in the way they want to interface with community members and people that aren't a part of Working Groups, and integrate their insight into the artifacts that they're publishing. That I think is a little unique, and it's not necessarily that we've incorporated into it.

In theory, a lot of the problems that At-Large is currently tackling are problems that other people within the IT and larger community are also trying to tackle – figuring out how to get consensus on topics, and figuring out how to keep people informed on things that are happening around them, and doing it in a way that's still actionable. I don't know that it's necessarily uniqueness, it's just maybe trying to communicate that uniqueness in a larger ecosystem of non-profits. The second part of this is around... The first part of your question, was that website-specific?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

The first part of the question was about the specificity of this website; the dynamisms of it. That was all.

STEVE ALLISON:

Right. For the dynamic portion of the website, there will be some stuff that I would assume update itself. We'll keep people abreast of things like key statistics that help quantify what's happening in the site, and [unclear 00:57:33] discuss it is being generated and updated by us manually, potentially. A lot of these things I think we'll get into in more depth as we go through this process. I wanted to call out a couple of Als that we could potentially even pick up in tomorrow's session, if there's availability.

The first is that you hit on correspondence. It might be valuable for us to do a [unclear 00:58:03] around what the current process looks like for correspondence, what the pain points are for going through that process, and not only from an outsider's perspective, but from our own internal content management perspective – what is the pain of having to do 50 updates a year? From my perspective, it doesn't sound like a lot. If we can tackle both sides of that coin, I think that would be valuable for us to do.

Then you had a question on styling. I think that's something we could take as an AI, but probably postpone for a while. We'll do a sit-down effort with the vendor at some point, called mood-boarding, where they help brainstorm different ideas. That will help guide us towards a style that we can adopt. Whether it's something similar, whether we reuse portions of ICANN.org, if we choose, or whether we choose to have something a little more unique, that's up to us to discuss and figure out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Excellent. Thank you. Any other questions from anyone here? Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Ariel, Steve, Laura, thanks for this presentation. I think it's a lot of things to chew on. I think a concern I have is how do we balance the dynamic and static natures? I think we could focus on a static website and perhaps achieve that relatively easy, because the information isn't really changing; the history of the ALAC, the ALAC bylaws and those types of things. My concern is how we do the dynamic aspects, because the dynamic aspects are what happens on the Wiki. This is going to be where Steve could give advice.

Can information be pulled from the Wiki to be shown on the website? For example, how many ALAC statements have been issued since 2014? That type of thing. That shows that we are buzzing with activity. We have so many calls happening. These are the calls happening this week... All this types of things. I think one of the challenges, and why the At-Large website stopped being useful for so many seasoned At-Large Members, was because it was not up to date, in terms of what meetings were happening and so forth.

I think part of my thinking is that we should strive to develop a process whereby information is entered once and shared everywhere, rather than developing information being updated on the Wiki, and a parallel process being to update the At-Large website. Ideally it should be done and shared and distributed.

STEVE ALLISON: If I can step in and call out something for us to track, maybe it would be valuable for us to come back in a separate session, after we've spent some time and research? It would be valuable to hear from you guys,

within the Wiki what are the major activities that are being created; the major pieces of content that are being created there, and over what frequency? There are certain Working Groups within the Wiki, and they're all having events and they're all being managed differently.

Us building a mechanism to pull that out is going to be very difficult. It probably won't be as effective as we're looking at. Before we start thinking about the solutioning of it, maybe we can come up and quantify a little bit, what are the most important activities that are taking place in the Wiki? How frequently are they? Then we can talk around, is this the right type of content to pull out into the public site? Is it not? Is it just enough to reference it? We can figure out what the right medium is to communicate it, so that we can manage enough of this data.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Steve.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Steve. Next is Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier. Thank you again Steve and Ariel for an excellent presentation. I'm also relieved, as Olivier mentioned. I have three questions, and apologies if you've mentioned them. The first one is the multilingual aspect – whether that's going to be within scope, hopefully it is, or without scope – and how that's going to be brought in. The second question is on accessibility. Anthony, do you feel that this is

going to be something that's going to be within the first stage or later on? It could [still be 01:03:54] for the sight-impaired.

Thirdly, Dev, maybe you can comment on this. On the last attempt to update the website, the last step that was managed was that you and Matt were supposed to go off and look at the correspondence page, which by my understanding has the largest number of articles and pages. I'm just wondering where that is and how that fits into this current updating. That seemed to be the real barrier. I'm not seeing that as a great concern here on this call.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, okay. Regarding that spreadsheet, the problem that we had with this was that apart from having time to do it, ultimately, [unclear 01:05:10] content that needed to be deleted. I noted that in that whole spreadsheet – and I can find the link – was that there were some duplicates of information and obviously those would be removed, but all the correspondence would have been important. The challenge is how do we organize the correspondence and make it accessible so that if persons wanted to find out all the At-Large correspondence on WHOIS or on new gTLDs or whatever, they could search for it.

The way we would have to do it is that we'd have to break up all the correspondence, chop it up by year, and then go to each one and target, "Okay, this is new gTLDs, this is WHOIS, this is ICANN process." We have to come up with that taxonomy first, so that people can search by it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Currently it's chronological order. It goes back to 2007 on up to the current end of the month, end of August. Sorry, are you saying that it should be reorganized by topic or should there be a better search aspect for this.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Obviously the chronological order is important, but we have to create the taxonomy, like new gTLDs, WHOIS, which would generate [categories 01:06:53]. Say someone is interested in the WHOIS issues and wanted to find out how WHOIS has evolved at At-Large, they could search for it. Or for opinions on ccTLDs. We have to generate that taxonomy. Can those correspondence with the appropriate taxonomy? That way you could then search it and you could then search it over time and so forth. It's not about resorting it as such. It's really resigning a taxonomy to each of the correspondence. I hope I'm making myself clear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Dev. Actually, Matt and I had worked on a taxonomy for a while. I'm not sure where we went on that or how far we went on it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Not far.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, it was down to lack of time, assigning keywords, etcetera. We managed to develop a taxonomy or nomenclature with regards to the

numbering of our statements and numbering of correspondence and things, but certainly not on the side of the keywords. This can be worked out very quickly, and I think maybe Dev's Working Group will be able to work this out. Looking at the timescale that we have here, as long as we've got something that's done by the end of the year, I understand the web team will be able to pick on that.

I'm a little concerned with the time it's taking right now. We're starting to focus on specifics. I see Ariel has put her hand up, and then I guess afterwards we'll probably have to adjourn this call and continue the discussion tomorrow if that's the plan as far as the call tomorrow is concerned. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you. Just to add, on the correspondence page I worked with Olivier producing the majority of them, since I came on board. One thing I felt confused about at the beginning is first you had to click several times to see the statement in a PDF format, and a lot of statements have similar [staff intro 01:09:10] and the format is the same, so this doesn't really add much value.

Besides taxonomy, we'll probably also need to think what the best way is to present those statements in a beginner-friendly manner, by reducing redundant information. That's something we can think further on. There's no need to go deep into this specific topic. We can continue this in later meetings.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent Ariel. Thank you. Any other comments on what you've heard? Steve, you're also welcome to input any feedback here before we meet tomorrow.

STEVE ALLISON: I think we're making good progress. If we have time, I would encourage we maybe do a deep-dive on correspondence. That might be valuable for us, because it's a new topic for myself as well. Think about the things about correspondence that make it challenging. As Ariel pointed out, taxonomy is one. If we can start organizing, even loosely, what a taxonomy may look like, and then the ways people may want to manipulate that taxonomy – like you were saying, an entire topic through its lifeline, not necessarily just a timeline of topics – those are going to be really valuable pieces of information that we want to capture in this recording.

Then when I sit down with these designers we can start brainstorming different ideas to bring back to the table for you guys. Start thinking about some of those. Then also think about, just in general, the pain points in using something like the correspondence. What are we trying to accomplish and why are we not able to do it? Those would be important things that we can bring to the table for tomorrow's discussion, if that's the topic we choose.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Steve, I think there's possibly [unclear 01:11:20] in terms of other issues like the SSAC and the GAC, because they issue correspondence as well, on a regular basis. I would think that if you come up with a common taxonomy, that would also apply equally to the GAC and the SSAC and the RSSAC, in terms of if you wanted to search correspondence by a particular topic issue like gTLDs, WHOIS, IDNs, whatever, that could be helpful.

I guess the question is, [unclear 01:12:05] really get into the wireframing and stuff – and perhaps this could be shared tomorrow – do you have some little wireframes for the ICANN website, to show what was done for the ICANN website in terms of wireframing? Then I think that would also help us with, "Okay, this is how the ICANN.org website was looked at, and then we can now look at those same principles or ideas for looking at At-Large content of how it should be wireframed." This is a thought.

STEVE ALLISON: That is a good thought, and it's definitely something I think we can bring to the table. What I think would be valuable, before we jump straight to wireframes is to spend some time thinking about just activities we want or think would be valuable, so we can take the two personas that we've defined, and some of the questions that we had in that presentation, and think about, "Okay, how would we answer this question about this persona?" "What activities can we provide them or would they expect to do within our site so that they can check it off their list?"

For example, I can tell you very honestly that I don't know enough about the correspondence portion of the existing site. At a minimum, we need to know what the intent of that portion of the site was, and whether or not it's fulfilling that intent. We can start talking about those activity-level functions of the site. Then around that we can say, "Okay, these are the five most important functions. Of those five we're going to do these wireframes to represent them." Then when we go to the community we can say, "Here are all the activities that we want to happen in the site. Here's what it will look like." Then we can discuss it from there. I think it will lend naturally to getting to the wireframing of it, but I think you're absolutely right. We can bring in other concepts so that we can begin thinking about and exploring different ideas.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Steve. I was going to suggest one more AI. I don't know if it needs to be done right away, but in the near future, Ariel could take you through the correspondence page and also the policy development page on our Wiki to show the two layers of insight into the correspondence – the finished product on one side and then the way we build it on the other. That will certainly help you understanding the overall importance of the correspondence as being something that's our core product.

If we can't make our product accessible and certainly searchable, easily found, and for those newcomers and seasoned ICANNers to be able to use that easily and find information like this, it's going to be very difficult. That's the point. Right, we're 15 minutes beyond the end of the time that I arrived on the call, and certainly half an hour beyond the

official end of the call. I really thank everyone for this and I look forward to the next call tomorrow, which I believe is at the same time. Ariel, can you enlighten us as to what we will be speaking about tomorrow please?

ARIEL LIANG:

Based on our discussion today, I think – Steve, please correct me if you like – we can discuss what are the key activities of At-Large, which can potentially be presented on the website. We'll figure out what content we want to show, based on the questions of the two target audiences, and we identify them clearly. That will be helpful for wireframes and all the later steps. We'll just have a brainstorming session on what to present; what type of content to present on the website.

STEVE ALLISON:

Yes. I don't know if this is possible, but something based off the conversation today and the importance of the correspondence section, it would be good to spend 20 minutes upfront talking about hypotheses for activities to be performed in the site, and then do a cutoff and for the next 40 minutes really discuss the existing correspondence section, what it was intended to do, what the major actions are that people are trying to accomplish, and then ultimately to what end – what is this worth to them?

If we can accomplish that and figure out how that's currently working, I think that will also be valuable in informing the activities as we evolve them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. We've got the AIs for you and Ariel, Steve, but we've also therefore got an AI for community representatives, and that's of course Anthony, Dev and myself, to be ready with questions and with what we really value about the correspondence, and what features we'd like to see in there. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm very impressed and I'm also comforted. If you're happy Olivier, 'im happy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Heidi. I'm delighted. I'm so delighted. I'm just about to go and have dinner. I thank everyone here for this. This has really brought on my appetite. I might even order a bottle of champagne. Who knows? I've been waiting for four years for this, and this is like a birthday present. Thank you everyone for having attended this call. Speak to you in 23 hours time. I look forward to following up on this. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and good night. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]