
ARIEL LIANG: Steve, since we're waiting for Heidi, do you want to talk to Olivier about some of the suggestions you had with the vendor, on updates? I'm wondering whether you have any quick updates to share with Olivier.

STEVE ALLISON: On the vendor?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Heidi's dialing in now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm on.

STEVE ALLISON: It looks that of last night, ICANN Legal has finished its review of the contracts. Hopefully by the end of today we'll have everything signed by ourselves and the vendor and they'll be officially on board with us. I did two hours with them this week and gave them an overview of discussions we've had up until this point; creative direction on what some of our priority issues are that we want to address over the coming weeks, and really just helped scope out the project for them.

It was a lot for them to digest. I told them to take a day or two to think about our conversation, and hopefully today or Monday we'll get back together with them and start talking about some of the vision they have

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.

and a plan of action. We'll have the cadence to make a start. That's my goal at the moment.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks Steve. Maybe we can start our discussion about their homework; feedback on the top topics now, with Olivier first. Do you want to do that first?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes. Hi everyone. I've got more than just five topics. I think there's so much that's going on. We're trying to look for taxonomy aren't we, for all our different topics. The way that I've looked at is maybe not all – because I think I would have probably lost or forgotten some – but look at the main topics we've been dealing with in prior statements. I looked back at the list of statements we had and how I could qualify that; looking at not having a single keyword but several keywords.

I'm not sure if I've been going off on the wrong tangent of being able to put several keywords to one statement, or are we looking at having a single keyword?

STEVE ALLISON:

It's up to you guys. I was thinking what would probably be the most robust would be that over time, just like your Wiki does, the topics that are relevant to you guys will grow organically. It doesn't mean we don't think through what those topics are, as they're generated, but it's possible you have a topic for WHOIS, and you could have a topic for privacy.

Then a statement comes out in WHOIS privacy. The way I'd envision this playing out is that you still have two topical pages to talk about privacy; as the foundations of why privacy is important, and then a page on why WHOIS may be relevant to them.

Then when the public comment comes out on WHOIS privacy it can be tagged to both easeily and then it will show on those relevant pages. Then when someone's looking it up; whether they look it up for WHOIS or privacy, it shows them in both contexts, but it's only the one item that's created.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's what I felt was probably the best solution. Let's look at the list. The first one is the one we always use in our example – WHOIS. I think WHOIS should also be equated to RDS – Registration Data Services. I think they both go together, or we could have them as two different keywords, but as we know, WHOIS is going to be replaced at some point, maybe sooner rather than later, with the RDS. That was one, or two, if you want to make it one or two.

The next one was the RAA. I think that's one that's very important. We could have it as RAA or we could have it as "ICANN contracts". I thought "RAA" is more likely to be more [Tweeted 00:06:07] than "ICANN contracts". Would you say something else than that?

STEVE ALLISON: No, I think that's fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I say under RAA. I know there's the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and the Registry Accreditation Agreement. The thing is, we always call it RAA one way or the other. I know there are two different documents so we might have to differentiate between the two.

STEVE ALLISON: In the future, which could be come relevant, is the Registry/Registrar Accreditation Agreements.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly. I've put that under RAA. Maybe it would be contracts or something. There's also the PIC Agreement. There is all sorts. Then there was also IDN. There was one header called "reviews" and that deals with all of the organizational reviews that At-Large is often asked to comment on. We're seeing a new round of gNSO review but there's a lot more than that. Then there's also some special reviews, which is the AOC. I thought AOC was an important tag to have on there.

STEVE ALLISON: AOC would be separate from reviews?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, because some reviews are non-AOC linked and some aren't. the ATRT Review is actually directly linked to the AOC. Not only that, in the future we're probably going to see the AOC go away as it gets replaced by something else. It's good to keep reviews separate from AOC. As one looks at the archive in the future, reviews will go all the way from day

one, where there wasn't an AOC but there was another contract in place. At the time it was the JPA, the Joint Project Agreement, which as you know has disappeared.

That's one. Next, IANA stewardship transition, I think that's a specific thing. We could just have it as IANA. Then there's new gTLDs. We've really looked at all of our statements, and the ones that deal with the new gTLDs differ completely from the ones that deal with other matters of the gNSO or the ccNSO or others. New gTLDs is a separate thread. DNS is a separate thread as well. The DNS part is more to do with technical issues, and some of it might be dealing with DNS certificates and things like that.

Compliance has its own tag. Compliance is very important. Security. In there, that's anything to do with, often, things that deal with the SSAC, but not directly related to the SSAC. There's also the Board Security Working Group as well. There are a number of things that go under security. We start going into the specific issues; like trademark for example. Trademark is another important tag to have on there. Privacy is an important tag.

STEVE ALLISON: Are you talking about trademark security or trademark as an intellectual property mechanism?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, intellectual property. Maybe we should have it as IPR rather than trademark, sorry. Intellectual property rights. Sorry about that. Then

we've got privacy, which is also important. Then law enforcement is another one. That's a tag that can be used for a whole lot of reasons. Then there's what I put as GDD, which many people don't know yet, is the Global Domains Division. That's the operational part of the domains. That's an important one as well.

Then we've got accountability and transparency. We've kept that separate from the AOC and from the reviews, because for example right now we've got an accountability and transparency thread that has got a cross-community group and a whole number of things, and that's not directly related to the AOC. Then I had a tag for technical, because we seldom have statements on technical issues, but sometimes we do, so when something is technical as opposed to something being policy then... We could have technical, operational and policy. Three more tags that could also be in there.

I think it starts getting people confused when you put in too many general tags like that. I thought capacity building was important, because these are significantly different to our statements that deal with policy issues. Of course, capacity building doesn't fit in any of the above.

STEVE ALLISON:

Capacity building is a topic that's not really related to the policy development work you do, but more about doing engagement for At-Large, or engagement for Internet governance in general? What is it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All of the above – primarily engagement of end users in ICANN processes. That’s the way we see it. Capacity building – a statement regarding capacity building might be a statement on the ICANN Leadership Training Program; that the ALAC sends a statement to the Board about the Leadership Training Program and commends the work of the Leadership Training Program. That would of course be under the capacity building agenda. It would not be any policy issue whatsoever.

STEVE ALLISON: Got you. Not policy but still statement based.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There could be a statement on that, yes.

STEVE ALLISON: Is it also activities and events as well, or is it mostly around statements?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would be for everything I think. If we develop a taxonomy for documents then that probably would also for for everything else.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a clarification – is this for the correspondence of policy statements page that we’re focusing on, or is this in general?

STEVE ALLISON: It's in general, however there could be a one-to-one relationship between some of these. I don't know what the solution would look like. I'm just trying to get a sense for, if we could think functionally, what are the topics that are of most importance to At-Large? Then the next logical step is, in what way is this relevant? For example, why is WHOIS important? We don't want to talk about every issue within WHOIS that's important, but we want to communicate enough so that a reader of the website would be able to say, "I understand why this is important. I see the statements that are ongoing around WHOIS.

I see the activities that are taking place around WHOIS and who's involved around this topic." It lays the groundwork for all these statements and documents to be classified properly.

HEIDI ULLRICH: As we often do within At-Large, we separate things. You're alluding right now to policy process, and maybe we could add one more, which is capacity building and outreach activities. Capacity building/outreach. Two different things. One is inreach, one is outreach, but that's to do with increasing the engagement of existing and new members. Do you think that might be the way to go?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I agree with you. I've got more, don't worry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm just wondering if we can start lumping them into... Under policy we have what you're talking about; WHOIS, etcetera, but I'm just concerned that [unclear 00:15:56] is going to need pruning before we need it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The way I thought of this taxonomy is that these are keywords that we need to tag each one of our statements with. If you do a search on one of those statements, the title of a statement might be, for example "Comments on the reduction of expenses in Istanbul". That has to do with finance, budget and strategic planning, but if you do a search for budget then you're not going to get a positive on that because it doesn't actually mention budgets in there.

I'm putting myself in the shoes of someone who's going to search for a statement and say, "I want to have anything to do with ICANN finance." They're going to have finance, budget and planning as one tag and that will be on all of the statements that relate closely or remotely to finance. That's the way that I saw it, and that's why I gave it such a large list of names.

At least when we then have that large list of names, we know what we can tag it with and not have to actually think of new names and then duplicate those names by having something like, "Finance and money."

Then you've got the keyword money, keyword finance, and the two are unrelated to each other. Sometimes, some statements are tagged with money, some with finance.

STEVE ALLISON:

As we go through this list, we can start to think, after we've got a list of topics in this taxonomy, if we need to prune it or consolidate items, I think we can do that. Knowing the list up front, like how broad it is, and then analyzing it for how much information is too much information, what is the proper way of communicating some of it, we can deal with it as we go along. We can test it out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I'll go through the list. I haven't got much left on that. We had technical, we had capacity building and outreach. Next was finance, budget and strategic planning, which I think can all be one tag, because they're all dealt with by the At-Large FBSC. Then finally I was going to suggest the category of affected SOs or ACs, because there are some statements that deal with gNSO issues, some with ccNSO issues, some with ALAC and some with the GAC and so on.

I thought the tags of ALAC, GAC, gNSO, ccNSO, Board, staff, etcetera – all the different component parts of ICANN were important as well, because then you could really say, "I want to find out all of the statements we've made with regards to ccNSO matters." Then you can find all the statements on that when you do your search.

Or any statement that was sent to the Board, if we tag it with Board then we'll have all the statements that we sent to the Board, or any statement that was sent to gNSO that requested public comment, we'll just tag it with gNSO. You get the idea. That's the end of my list.

STEVE ALLISON: A couple of comments. Some of these I think are really good, and they hit on probably some of your most critical issues that you guys are focused on. There is a few of these that, as we're going through them, think are probably too generics. We need to either break them down a little further, or identify if they're still relevant. For example, the SOs and ACs, that in my mind is not a topic in the taxonomy. It's who it may apply to. Maybe that's a whole different type of information that we collect. It could be that some of these topics apply to SOs and ACs.

Some of these topics apply to different RALOs or specific Working Groups or completely different organizations entirely. I would remove it from the taxonomy as it relates to the functional topics we're focused on, but it probably lives somewhere else – when somebody's doing searches on these statements.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It would be a different search field, effectively?

STEVE ALLISON: Yes, I think so. Finance and capacity building make sense, but I think the topic for technical is too broad. What I'd recommend in doing is not have one for technical, but as technical topics come up, if there isn't a topic that exists, then it should be identified. I don't know. Maybe there are so many technical topics that they need to be lumped together. I don't know how that works out, but I'd say technical, policy and operational are maybe too general. Accountability and transparency makes sense.

GDD is probably fine, although you may get some overlap between GDD and a lot of other topics. Maybe that's okay. Law enforcement, privacy, intellectual property – all fine. Security and stability is fine. Compliance is fine. DNS for example is a technical topic. New gTLDs is fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We discussed the new gTLDs separate from the GDD because of the fact that they do follow a special track.

STEVE ALLISON: Yes. You're going from application process to once you're operational there's a whole bunch of other topics. Take GDD. Say we had a GDD page that said, "Hey, this is what GDD represents." There could be 1,000 statements that we make over the next year. You could say, "GDD is broken out into onboarding, and GDD is broken out into how you pay your bills and how you do contracts," and then you'd leave it as that, and as statements come in they can be tagged to GDD. Then it makes sense.

The rest of these I think are all fine – IANA, reviews, IDN, and then WHOIS, RDS. I think those are really good. One thing Ariel and I were looking at earlier today – and it might be something worth looking into over the next week – is on the opinion section of the website, we aggregated a lot of content from Circle ID.

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry, just to interrupt you, do you want me to share my screen?

STEVE ALLISON:

Yes, you could. From Circle ID we aggregate a lot of their news articles. We were looking at the RSS feed we were pulling in, and what we found was that Circle ID has some similar topics to what you just mentioned, and then some. I think they have a really interesting breakdown that we might want to consider not necessarily aligning 100 per cent to, but where we have alignment, try to use the same terminology so that we have consistency across different community assets. I put in the chat the circleid.com/topics. Ariel, can you pull that up really quick?

You've got a lot of interesting notes there. This page I think is a really good organization of functional topics that might be relevant to us. Some of those may not quite align. You might want to break them down further; for example Internet governance is maybe too broad. Some of them are really interesting and we might want to align them. Where we have alignment it allows people to have consistency across these different websites that they're already using.

There are other reasons why as we move forward through the discussion that we'll call out. This might be another thing to take some time and read through, and see whether there are additional topics that we may wish to pull into our taxonomy over time. The second thing I wanted to call out about this taxonomy is that it's okay to have a giant taxonomy, as long as it's something that we can maintain. However, what I want us to think about is at any given moment, how much of the taxonomy is at play?

Are all of these topics ones that we're working on throughout the year, or some portion of the year, and some during other portions of the year? The answer to this one forms how we design a lot of these pages. If we only need some of it at a given time, we don't want to overwhelm a user with information that's stale, unless they want to do a deeper research on their own. We want to show them as fresh, active topics, at a given moment.

When we think of it from a correspondence perspective, it's more about yes, we want to show them the taxonomy, we want to give them the research tools so they can find anything, but when we think about showing people the most current issues that we're working on, or the topics that the community is focused on, we want to show only the portions of the taxonomy that are live; lively. Does anyone else have taxonomy additions for this list?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we are cheating by looking at the taxonomy of Circle ID. All jokes aside, I'm very happy with that as well. That's a good move.

STEVE ALLISON: one thing is that I like the backgrounds they wrote for each of them. We discovered not too long ago that they have all of this. It's really interesting, because it's similar to the philosophy we've been thinking about; that we'd have topics that really lay the framework for why the topic is relevant to our community, and then the statements, the public comments or the specific issues within that topic that we're reaching out

to our community members to provide their comments on can be much more granular.

Cyber crime is a giant topic. There could be 75 statements in a year on cyber crime, in theory. For a reader of the site, they may not care about policy and regulations. Then they're like, "Cyber crime, that's exactly the topic I'm focused on." Now they get a dedicated little window into cyber crime. That's the philosophy there.

ARIEL LIANG:

Dev just joined. Dev, do you have anything to add about taxonomy?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Sorry for being late. One thing, in hearing the discussions, I think one of the possible ideas for the taxonomy is also tagging the relevant At-Large Working Groups that could be involved or could take part in the discussions relating to a statement. For example, the IDN Working Group. If you were to search by a taxonomy of Working Groups... If I've joined a new gTLD Working Group I can then see all of the topics that this Working Group can be involved with and see how all the statements have dealt with the topic in times.

I don't know whether the thing is to assign taxonomies to the various Working Groups so that it can be searched for – for example, registrant rights, there will be WHOIS and this the EWG Reports and so forth. I don't know if the thing is to have the actual names of the Working Groups in the taxonomy, or just have categories, in a sense. The

Working Groups would be like categories, and those categories would have taxonomies assigned to it as a pre-default.

STEVE ALLISON: I have a follow up question on this. I don't know the taxonomy of Working Groups well enough yet. The question is, are there more Working Groups than there are topics in our taxonomy, or are there items in our taxonomy – for example compliance – that would have multiple Working Groups working on multiple issues within compliance?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I don't know how to answer that. I'd say that various Working Groups have a particular focus on a particular topic, on a particular item of interest. New gTLDs, that would be focused completely on new gTLD issues and anything related to the new gTLD program. Registrant rights is dealing with all of the issues related to the registrants, and that includes things such as WHOIS. The IDN Working Group is focused on IDNs and so forth.

STEVE ALLISON: The way our taxonomy looks at the moment at least is that there may be a topic called WHOIS and there may be a topic called privacy. There's a Working Group that's working across both of those topics on specific issues that are of interest to them, it sounds like. Registrant rights would potentially tie to privacy and potentially WHOIS.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Correct.

STEVE ALLISON: What I would envision is if we happen to have a page for WHOIS and a page for privacy, and we have a list of all these specific issues that we're working on within those, those issues are tied to the Working Group. I think that's the way we call it out; is we don't have a Working Group for every single one of these topics. Within the topic, as we're working on an issue, Working Groups are maybe formed or consume that issue and work towards a product. If you were looking at a WHOIS topic page, it would say, "We have 15 draft statements that we're working on."

If you want to research these statements it will tell you what Working Groups happen to be working on those actual pieces of work. I would think. I could be wrong. Maybe that's not quite right.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think that's correct.

STEVE ALLISON: I need to spend time researching how the Working Groups fit together in this grand scheme of things. Is there a procedure or process for how we form a Working Group? I know there are these different types; there's standing, there's ad hoc. How does ad hoc work? Does anyone create one?

ARIEL LIANG: Olivier, can you answer that question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Both the ad hoc Working Groups and the standing Working Groups have to be created in a formal process by the ALAC. Even Task Forces are created that way. Ad hoc are for a single issue. A Task Force is a smaller thing than a Working Group. It is a different category, but I don't think that ultimately we need to make such a big difference between a Working Group, an ad hoc Working Group and a Task Force. They all serve the same purpose in the end, which is to get people to do things.

I think we shouldn't really focus too much on that, because it's always difficult to remember, "Was this a Task Force? Was this a Working Group? Was this a Sub-Committee?"

STEVE ALLISON: It's not so much distinguishing the difference between them that's important. What is important is that when we think about the readers of our website, they're at least interested enough to know what group is working on a specific issue, and maybe similar to that is how does one get formed so that they can begin working on something? Where do they go to figure out which group is doing what kinds of work? Are there Charters to the groups? There's a lot of confusion of tying it to the actual process of having an artifact built.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You can see the Wiki page. On each one of the Wikis, when you click on it, there's some kind of standard interface giving you various details. Click on one. IDN policy, let's see that. In there it's got a very short

description. It's got a contact. It's got the mailing list. It's got the name of members in there. It's got a thing with meetings and events, things like that. I'd imagine a website that shows some information would probably have the description in the contact there.

The members change all the time and I think it would be difficult to deal with this if it wasn't directly user changeable. That's why we keep that on the Wiki. Whether it's a Working Group, a Task Force or something else, it doesn't really matter, but we do have to have them all on there.

STEVE ALLISON:

Sure. There's an initiation point of the process where it's been decided that a statement will be drafted, and then either it's assigned to a Working Group or a new one is created?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

A new one is not created. The way that it works is you have an individual taking ownership of this and saying, "I'll produce a first draft." It could be a Working Group. It could be a Sub-Committee. It could be one of those entities that's already there. It could be somebody on the ALAC or it could be several people working together within the community who are saying, "We're going to pick up the pen and produce a statement between the three of us and we'll propose it over on the Wiki."

The way that it works is not as set as saying, "The procedure is that you need to go to this Working Group and this Working Group will make a

decision.” There’s more flexibility to it. I don’t think at the last call we shared the way a statement was drafted. Do we have time for that?

STEVE ALLISON:

Sure. I’ve seen some of the Wiki pages on the way a statement is drafted, but procedurally, the in-between is something I’ve not fully grasped yet. If we’re going to have it where any individual or group can become a penholder, I get how they can go through that process. What I don’t understand is how are these Working Group formed, and for what purpose? Is it so they can individually talk to each other and say, “This issue is of importance. We’re going to become the penholder for it,” or are they doing things outside of the PDP?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Let me try and do this. Let me request control for the screen. We’ve got the PowerPoint presentation here. We work as bottom-up, from ALS to the RALOs, all the way up to the ALAC. I think that’s pretty much straightforward. The way that it works when you’ve got a standard bottom-up process is the ALS says, “We wish to comment on something,” or someone in the community says that. They’d first engage a discussion within their RALO, and if there is consensus within their RALO, their RALO would engage other RALOs.

Once they’ve engaged other RALOs, if there is consensus or at least some significant weight for this to move forward then the RALOs would engage the ALAC. This process that goes from here to here might take just a few hours, because of the speed at which email goes. Then it comes down to if there is consensus at ALAC level, people would either

discuss it on the list or the topic would be discussed during an ALAC call. It would be a case of, "We need to actually have a statement on this." At that point, the ALAC would carry the statement.

In such a case, you would effectively have that statement put on the Wiki. In fact, even very early on, at this stage I think, you've probably put the statement on the Wiki. Once it's on the Wiki, there's this overall thing where the ALAC asks for comments. People add their comment on the Wiki. You amend the statement accordingly and then the ALAC issues the statement. Once the final statement is done it needs to be ratified. If it's not ratified it goes straight into the bin; just like all the other statements where someone said, "No." If it is ratified it goes over to a statement.

The early stage over here is not as smooth as one would think, because I don't think we wanted it to be so strict and formal as to stop people coming up with all sorts of ideas. It's a very open process to start with, in the open days. If you look at the response to a public comment request, that's a much more structured process, because ICANN asks for the comments, there's an ALAC discussion on the comment, there's a RALO discussion on the comment, and then you get the same kind of process with feedback as earlier, but in a much shorter amount of time. Here, from this point over to this point, you might just have 21 days.

STEVE ALLISON:

Nowhere in here do I see Working Groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're absolutely correct, for two reasons. One, when I first put this diagram together we didn't have that many Working Groups, but secondly, the Working Groups are not shown as a separate entity. They should be probably. We say "at the ALAC level" and of course ALAC and all of the ALAC Working Groups that are associated with it. Would you believe it, some RALOs now also have a RALO Working Group so I guess it would come in under comments, or here somewhere.

STEVE ALLISON: It's not so much then that the Working Group is drafting a statement, it's that they're really working around providing feedback to the process of finalizing a statement?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It would depend on the nature of the enquiry. If it was something that's very well defined, like the IDNs, we have a Working Group on IDNs, which has people in there with all of the knowledge on IDNs. Anyone in At-Large who has knowledge on IDNs would be in that Working Group. what we do is to basically tell the Chair of the Working Group, "Get your Working Group to have a look at this and tell us." If on the other hand it's something to do with WHOIS policy then we also have a Working Group on Registration Issues, which does deal with WHOIS and all of that.

Sometimes it's WHOIS and a new gTLD, so then we also have a Working Group on New gTLDs, and then we might have some ALAC Members whom are interested independently on those topics. We wouldn't rely specifically on the Working Group to come back with an answer,

because it's a much more open topic where the knowledge about this topic is not only restricted to the Working Group itself.

The Working Groups really serve a support function and the reason we've put Working Groups in At-Large is because there came a time when there was so many different topics, if we were to discuss all these topics on the same mailing list, people would be flooded with 300 emails a day. We have to compartmentalize the work into Working Groups. That's the way we've arranged it. We're doing this halfway with the policy, but not fully, because by the fact that these are ALAC statements, we always have to inform the ALAC at some point of that going on. Our primary port of call is the ALAC.

STEVE ALLISON:

Let me see if I can summarize. I may have missed some of it. To summarize, the Working Groups that are formed aren't intended to necessarily generate draft statements, but to be used to have conversation and discussion around topics or issues. It's used for people to be in the loop on topics of interest, because there's the mailing list associated to the Working Group. Then to serve as SMEs on specific focuses that would provide insights? I think that's what I heard so far.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. That works for me. Dev, do you have any thoughts on that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No, that's pretty much it. I agree.

STEVE ALLISON: Let's say we continue to use Working Groups exactly the same way we do now, and nothing changes on that front, what I'd expect to communicate through a website is that if people are interested in a specific topic or a specific statement that may be generated, there may be – there may not be – a Working Group associated to that topic where a conversation is taking place, outside of the formal At-Large information that's being communicated.

As in, there's a statement that's been completed or that's open for comment – it's really the nitty-gritty discussions that are taking place. You want to be a part of the Working Group if you want to hear those conversations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct.

STEVE ALLISON: In a future state, it's not that I wouldn't think a Working Group is still valuable, for many different aspects, but it would be valuable I think, to external readers, especially when we're thinking of growing engagement, to get the conversation out of just threaded email, and pulling it into an environment that allows people to see their ongoing discussions, the past discussions, and the current topics within that discussion. Things like forums are really good for that, because it gives you a mechanism that persists.

That might be a place where we're like, "Hey, by the way, within this topic, on this issue that we're drafting, there's a whole bunch of things going on; a lot of commentary going back and forth. If you're interested, that's where we put it." It can continue to remain status quo, being on the mailing list, because I know people are very comfortable with it, but I think it's exclusionary in nature.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is on the one hand. We do have one problem though, in that the technical capability of all of our members is not the same across the world. Some would have real problems with following the discussions on a website. They would rather just be able to download it at some point where they have connectivity and be able to read it through their email.

STEVE ALLISON: Good to know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just so you know, we have some members that have to access from very remote locations, that pay a dear price for the number of megabytes that they download and have found significant cost in being on the mailing list and receiving all these emails. It would be quite unlikely that they'd be able to follow on a live thing or like that. We do offer a Skype chat. We do offer a number of ways to have people take part.

STEVE ALLISON: Yes, maybe integrate it? It's very valuable to know that bandwidth is a factor. Got it. We don't have a lot of time left. We're going until 11:00. We have 30 minutes. There are a couple of other topics I wanted us to touch on. Ariel, do you want to share your screen? Just by the nature of talking about the taxonomy, we've talked about current issues. This current issues page, unless I'm missing something, doesn't have any value outside of what we've already talked about for the taxonomy. Unless there is something else missing on this page, I think the current taxonomy suffices or replaces this focus.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This page is outrageously out of date. You can see current issues dating from 2009. I suspect we're dealing with stuff I haven't even heard of.

STEVE ALLISON: As an AI, if someone can do a sanity check and make sure there's nothing, as they skim through this page, that we're blatantly missing? I think we can probably move on from here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If at all. Because current issues change regularly, it would be worth this page being easily updateable either by At-Large staff, or without having to go through the overall lengthy process of going through the webmaster, because issues change on a monthly basis.

STEVE ALLISON: The issue topics change, the ones that are relevant change, or completely new topics are created?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm going to resort to Heidi answering this one, because Heidi has done an excellent job on working on these monthly policy briefs. She probably has more of an idea of how varied the topics are. I'm in the middle of the trenches, so I'm rarely able to find out if we're moving from one topic to another. I'm under a waterfall.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, are you talking about the monthly policy updates?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. You've seen the shift in issues. Are we mostly talking about the same things or is it varied?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's a good idea; that we could put those on this page. Right now we're doing some that every month are pretty much updated, so we do the monthly policy development article, which notes the policy advice statements that the ALAC have approved, and a very brief summary. We also have a RALO one now that we started two months ago. It's called the "RALO Roundup" and it's a article that lists the activities in the various RALOs. Then I usually do something on the ALAC and then we have something on the ALSes.

STEVE ALLISON: What's the purpose of these?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is the monthly policy update that all ACs and SOs, all the staff, create. Actually, the one for September just came out.

STEVE ALLISON: Is it like a newsletter?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, it is. It's very popular. We have over 5,000 subscribers. I think that's an outdated number.

STEVE ALLISON: It's email?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's email. It's on a link.

ARIEL LIANG: I can pull it out.

STEVE ALLISON: I can take a look at it offline. That's fine. Here's what I would propose as a start.. . I've seen this before. It's really well put together by the way. I like it. Maybe we'll try and use some of the style of this.

ARIEL LIANG: One thing I want to add is for the ALAC part of the policy update, it's just a repetition of the summary part of the ALAC statement. Please take a look at one I've prepared for this month. This month we have one standing statement for the two-character domain name topic. This is the link to the statement Wiki page on the key points of the summary points. These have already been published on the correspondence page as well, so it's just published again on this monthly policy update. The others are the same statement and we put the link in this policy update here.

It's nothing really new, but if you want to make it more outsider-friendly, we may need to brag a little more about what the topic is about and make it less technical, and probably make it less detailed so people can have a quick understanding of what the hot topics are for the month. If they want to read more about those topics they can go to the correspondence page to read it.

STEVE ALLISON: Sure. If I may propose a summary, what I would think is we talk about current issues. The terminology I'm using, we can always change all of the phrasing later. If we think of topics, the topics should by their very nature remain fairly static. Whether a topic is an active or inactive topic is something we would be able to quickly turn on or off so that people's

view of that topic is small enough for them to be able to consume without being overwhelmed.

When we think of what we have as the correspondence page, that would have the entire taxonomy of topics, and it can grow as much as we need so that people can do the proper research. When we think of this current issues page, this could be displayed a number of different ways. You could think of it as an index very similar to how Circle ID has their index of topics. The newsletter that Heidi is referring to should be tied somehow to what we currently call announcements. Maybe the name changes to news and media, very similar to how ICANN.org does.

Then people can sign up for the newsletter and continue to get that newsletter. Whether the content of that newsletter changes... Or latest news is fine. Although, I'd propose that news and media, something along those lines, implies that there's something more than just news within there. You guys could do spotlight articles, you could do blog posts, you could tie in the Circle ID RSS feeds that are relevant to the topics that you want. There's a whole slew of things that you could do in that section outside of just announcements, but it's something we can hit on.

As far as current issues go, I would think that this type of page would reflect the taxonomy that you proposed earlier, and then only new items show up on that page because as an organization, At-Large has curated content and background around a new topic. It's a very thoughtful process. It's not like ad hoc, "We added a new one today." Because every time you add a new topic it's more content that people have to

think about. We really want that to be a smaller subset of the giant taxonomy. That's my proposal at least; that it would be that context.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just thinking, the At-Large social media, the fact that that is regularly updated, maybe the thing is to just... I don't want to create an additional process to come up with additional content. If we're doing the process already to create content, then let's use that wherever possible. Maybe what could happen is that the Twitter feed could be embedded to show what the latest news is and what's happening and so forth. I'm just pointing that out as a suggestion. I'm sure that in the social media, the policy updates are also Tweeted regularly. I think I've seen those before.

[unclear 01:02:10] process in place already to maintain that type of discourse. Maybe that [unclear 01:02:23] duplicated on whatever is needed, and just leave it like that. So when something is posted on Twitter it would also show up on that page, without having to manually edit it.

STEVE ALLISON: Yes. I'm hoping by the end of next week we'll have some sketches and some storyboards to begin going through different ideas with you guys. I don't know if they'll make it in for this first week but I'm hoping that some of these social components that don't require much or any overhead will get in those sketches. We can then communicate some of our ideas around that and see what resonates and what doesn't.

ARIEL LIANG: For the social media feed, I am responsible for sending out the Tweets and posts every day. I didn't really send the content based on the category, so if something new pops up I will do it. I think it would be good to place it on the homepage or somewhere else, rather than the current issues. If we make the current issues as the taxonomy landing page based on the topic, social media is a little messy for that.

STEVE ALLISON: I understand. We can play with some ideas earlier in the week Ariel. Hopefully we'll get some time to do that. If not, maybe it's like a polishing touch that we add to some of the work that we do next week. If some of the ideas don't work then they don't work, and hopefully we can iterate on them quickly.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

STEVE ALLISON: We've got 22 minutes. If we can maybe talk about the announcements? Actually, I lied. Can we talk about opinions? Opinions – we've already hinted on this a few times – my understanding of this page is that it's an RSS feed of the Circle ID website. It looks like it pulls in everything. I could be wrong, and I could do some homework and figure out what it actually does, if we don't know.

I wanted to know if anyone has any strong opinions about what this portion of the site currently does, whether it does it well, and whether they think there's a functional need for it or what.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have to admit, I've never even read that page. Take that as my answer.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Even more embarrassing, I don't recall seeing that one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You don't even know it exists! Even better. One of the things is that this page effectively duplicates myicann.org, without the customization angle. That one is pretty much, I would say, obsolete. I gather it was probably added to beef up the site a little bit back in those times, and there was no such thing as myicann.org. Here you don't want to duplicate myicann.org. I would actually say, get people to subscribe to myicann.org, but this we don't need to supply ourselves.

STEVE ALLISON: I don't know what the long-term strategy of myicann.org is, so it would be something we'd want to first look into. We don't want to build something and then have it go away. However, I have two posing angles on the opinions portion of this site. The first thing to call out is that this is someone else's content. They have an RSS feed. Usually people supply RSS feeds so you can have an RSS reader and pull in this content so you can read it in your email and things like that.

What we're doing is republishing someone else's news, which can be okay, it's just good to have a relationship with the person you're doing that with. It drives traffic to them. It's great for a lot of reasons. It's good to have a relationship with the person that you're aggregating content from. My two views are these: the first is that I don't think it's a good thing to have someone else's news being aggregated into your site randomly. For example, "Amazon wins bid for .buy." I don't know if that's relevant or not to anything that this organization is doing.

It may be, and it may not be, but if we go down this path of publishing content that's not actually related to the work that's tied to our mission, then people lose trust in the content that we're displaying to them and then they stop going to the pages. One view is this: if we publish someone else's content, it should be with the twist of our own perspective. We say, "Circle ID published a really interesting article on .buy being purchased by Amazon. What do people think about that in relation to..." and then a topic that's related to us.

Now you're starting a conversation. That's one perspective – that we put even more effort into the work we do and we curate that content. We add our twist to it. Obviously that takes time and energy. If we don't want to do that work, we could either not display this data, or we can aggregate only the topics that tie to the topics we already have in our taxonomy. Ariel, do you want to hop over to Circle ID and show them that topics page again?

On this page, every one of their topics has that little orange button. Those orange buttons are RSS feeds, which means all of the news, blogs and conversations that take place within Circle ID on that topic can be

aggregated. Now, when we have a topic page on domain names, security or WHOIS, which is in that list, which is also in our list, we can have a very small section of our site that's saying, "By the way, there's a whole bunch of other conversation and opinions going on in this world around this topic."

Now they have supplemental information, but it's tied very specifically to the topic of interest to them. Those are two perspectives where we could either use this or not use it, but they should be focused on what someone is expected to get out of it. Turning on the fire hydrant of information to them, people click on the page and then they never click on it again. They forget why they were even there. It's an idea we can play with. It doesn't have to be a first cut of it. It can be something that we add in the future. We can focus on our top priority things, but it's interesting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The concern I have is the distracting factor of having this feed in the work of At-Large. As you mentioned, if we were to have something like that, it would need to be specifically focused or curated or something. I don't see any intelligent machine being able to perform such a curation that every article displayed would then be really to the point. Especially looking at today – and I'm just looking at the articles that were selected there – of course this is not all of Circle ID. Some of the stuff here is nothing to do with At-Large.

STEVE ALLISON:

What's interesting as we're going through this – Ariel mentioned something I think very valuable – is that a lot of the discussions that are taking place in the Working Groups or on the mailing lists or wherever, they're referencing some articles on this site or some other site. There are a lot of important articles being passed around via email that should be surfaced so that people can see that there are important things going on that they may not have known about. We don't necessarily have to have At-Large curating all the content for the At-Large website.

I don't remember who it was – maybe Dev – that mentioned having the social media aspect; where if someone says something it can be surfaced. Maybe part of it is people can surface topics on a certain hashtag and that will show up on our site if we click an approved button. That could then be a mechanism for them to pull in content that's generated outside of our own curation efforts. There are a lot of ways we can go about pulling in the relevant topics, but we don't want to just do it haphazardly, which I think we all agree on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

What you're looking at here is a live wall, isn't it? I've seen this sort of thing being used. It's a live news feed? I can't remember what it's called. Dev, you're the champion of these things.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Some thoughts. Let me start with the title. Obviously that title has to change because it's obviously not our opinions, or the At-Large opinions. In terms of bringing up content, yes, a lot of discussion happens on emails and social media. Those are the primary public facing ones.

There's an internal Skype chat, on which sometimes conversations happen. I'm not sure if I'd want to make that public. It's more for internal-facing private conversations within the At-Large.

If there is a way to somehow pull the latest email topics and content from all the various Working Groups, from all At-Large mailing lists, and there's a number of them – maybe those messages could be brought onto a page like this? Any new emails on the new gTLD mailing list or the ALAC mailing list, or the latest ones, there could be a system that could pull those emails and show the conversations in At-Large, something like that?

STEVE ALLISON:

That could be something. It's worth exploring; that there are conversations taking place, and some of them have really important information that we may want to surface to people that aren't in those conversations. It doesn't have to be the number one priority, but I think it's something that should remain on our radar and look into.

The interesting thing is that if you guys happen to solve this problem, it happens to be a problem that all the other organizations, all the other Working Groups, happen to encounter – that there's so much information that's happening in email and it never gets out to the rest of the world. It's an experiment that we could potentially try to tackle at some point. It doesn't have to be the top priority.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: What I've suggested is that we have RSS feeds for all of the mailing lists. We could pull in all of those things and then remix accordingly, like [unclear 01:15:27] from each of those mailing lists.

STEVE ALLISON: That's interesting. Noted.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I don't know what... I know that ICANN is running a fairly older version of Mailman, which is used for maintaining the mailing list. If it can be RSS-enabled, and you could pull that information up, you could just take five of those items from each mailing list and do them as a Pinterest type of board; as to say what people are talking about in At-Large.

STEVE ALLISON: What's interesting about that is that it would require a mailing list per topic, because you wouldn't want a one mailing list that people were talking about all these different topics and now you're adding clutter that's not related. It's really tricky. We'd have to spend some time and really analyze the conversations themselves.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I mean there is a lot actively happening in the individual mailing lists. Yes, there's a lot of that. Yes. I tried to filter into various tags for each of these things, and it's like 30 or 40 tags.

STEVE ALLISON: Does the Wiki have a list of all the mailing lists?

ARIEL LIANG: I'm also in charge of the mailing lists. We have all the mailing lists listed in an Excel spreadsheet, because we update them constantly. There's a webpage that has all the mailing lists archived there, but it's not comprehensive. A lot of mailing lists are not active anymore, and actually it's a bit project to update the mailing lists. We have over 100, but not every mailing list is active.

STEVE ALLISON: Sure. Maybe what we'll do is table the topic and just know that it's something that we should address at some point. There's no way this can trump all the other work we're doing. It could take up all of our time, but as an AI, Ariel, can you send me the spreadsheet that you have now? Even a snapshot is good enough for me to think about the breadth of this work.

ARIEL LIANG: Sure.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I just posted a link, because I was facing the same challenge here, of [where/what 01:18:17] mailing lists. The Mailman interface for showing those lists is actually not very intuitive at all. It's very confusing. In fact, a lot of it is stuff that isn't updated at all. The task is finished and it's there. I guess it's good to have it as an archive, but it's all intermingled.

STEVE ALLISON: At a minimum, I feel like a first instance of this site should be able to inform readers, especially new readers, of what mailing lists exist and which ones were most recently active. Otherwise, people have no clue of knowing how to get involved with the discussions taking place. If nothing else, that would be a minimum requirement; some page that represented where conversations were taking place and the steps they take to get involved in them, because it's super confusing.

I work at ICANN and I can't tell you how many times I'm like, "How do I get on that mailing list? Who do I talk to? They're asking me ad hoc questions and I don't know how to respond to them. I just want to be in it." If it's hard for me, it's hard for everyone.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Take a look at that Wiki page I posted in the chat. I tried to segment it into the RALO mailing list, the ALAC mailing list, and then selected At-Large Working Group mailing lists, where you could read the archive.

STEVE ALLISON: Okay. We have seven minutes. Do we have any final comments or questions? Do we want to do any recap?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: What is "contacts" about?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just before we run off the opinions, are we keeping this or are we scrapping it?

STEVE ALLISON: As we go through the design process I would suspect that the opinions page itself would be scrapped. One thing we could do – although I don't know if it will be done during this first cut of design – would be propose different options that we can look at in the future. For example, it could be only pulling in feeds from different blogs such as Circle ID on the specific topic.

Another one would be to manually curate some of the content, and then finally the last one would be to have [unclear 01:21:10] conversations or something like that tied into those pages. As an opinion page itself, I don't think it needs to be a top-level menu item. It doesn't really add the value that people are looking for.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For the contacts page it looks fine.

STEVE ALLISON: I wanted to get into announcements a little bit. I think that we've happenstance landed on this topic a few times, and we only have five minutes left. One thing I was thinking is that we have announcements currently on this announcements page, as well as on the correspondence page. What I am proposing as a solution is that – and I know we'll rename some of these sections – the correspondence page would never have announcements on it. The point of the

correspondence page, as far as I understand, is really to publish draft statements and get opinions on them.

Whether they're statements or other types of artifacts, the intent for that section was to get insights from the community so that they can get a final draft in. Then ultimately, it's to show the outcome and the impact of those statements. There should be an outcome that it influences. I wouldn't put announcements in there. The announcements themselves could actually probably be a little broader.

As Heidi mentioned earlier, we have newsletters, we have news that is taking place, we have At-Large announcements, we may have RALO-specific announcements – there's a whole taxonomy around announcements themselves. In fact, there are events that could be tied to announcements. The announcements section of the site could probably be exploded a little more into something very similar to how the correspondence page works, but geared towards the news and the activity that's happening within the various groups.

I think we can come up with an approach and then just propose it to you guys and see what we're thinking. If it's overkill then we can scale it back.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It sounds like the announcements and the current issues seem to be verging on the same thing. I could be wrong on that. From the discussions on the current issues, it touched on a lot of what the announcements are. I understand what the announcements is. It's the actual formal press releases, for lack of a better word, issued by At-Large

about what is happening. The way you described the announcements there, in terms of the policy updates and so on, I thought that would be what the current issues section was going to be like. The announcements page and current issues could possibly be merged?

STEVE ALLISON:

Some announcements are not directly associated to a topic. For example, an election. You guys do appointments and election. That's not related to WHOIS. I'd say there are some announcements that are completely independent of the topics that we're working on. Others are related and should be able to be tagged with the same exact taxonomy so that when we have a topics page it happens to aggregate the same exact announcement, so we write the announcement once, and you could go to an announcements page and look at all the history of announcements.

You could go and find an announcement that you were looking for. If you happen to be on a topic-related page you get all of that information brought into one consolidated window of that topic. You get the announcements related to it. You may get the Circle ID aggregation related to it. You'll definitely get the open statements that are tied to that topic and the closed statements that are tied to that topic. The announcement is created once.

The way we would implement this is the content management system allows you to create an announcement and you tag it with the appropriate tags. Then it happens to show up on the pages that it's relevant to show up in. If somebody wants to go and research, they go

to the announcement. If they want to just get a single perspective on the topic, they may happen to see announcements there as well. That would be the way I'd propose implementing something like this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think you're proposing the Rolls Royce and we're still thinking by a horse cart at the moment.

STEVE ALLISON: We can do one piece at a time. We don't have to develop all of these things and overwhelm everyone. We'll have to do a couple of pieces of this one at a time, and then see what resonates, what's overkill and what we're missing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Don't get me wrong, I love the Rolls Royce. I'm a little sick of the horse cart. It's just that we're not thinking that far yet, so when you're telling us about all this you're not getting the, "Wow," great response, because we're thinking, "Oh my goodness, is this even possible? Wow!"

STEVE ALLISON: My goal is to get us to work in a vehicle. Then we can figure out all the different ways that happen to be available to us to get there faster.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. At the moment... The vehicle is an interesting way to describe what it is at the moment. It lacks wheels.

STEVE ALLISON: We'll put some glean on it and then wheels.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see where you're coming from, and I think that... Is it something that's being used already in other websites and that has shown its easy usability? Because ultimately there is this thing of the difference between an iPhone and a phone by anyone other than Apple is the intuitiveness of the interface and how intuitively people seem to be breathing through information, not even thinking they've just been reading 20 pages. It just feels right.

This is where I think you've started to come into now; where we're starting to think of the intuitiveness of people coming onto the site, rather than going through our silos we've been working on so far, where we say, "You want a statement? You go to the statement part." "You want an announcement? You go to the announcement part." Bang.

STEVE ALLISON: I agree. Your analogy is really good, that Apple thinks about the human factors involved, and we'll definitely do that, but a lot of what makes them so capable and so successful is really the way they market it. It's the care that they put into reinforcing their contact with people. I think there's 1,000 ways you can build a good vehicle, and if you don't foster than growth with the people then it won't matter how good your product is.

I think we can build a good car, that is intuitive, that will do its job, and then the success of that isn't fully dependent on the car being built well. It's how we communicate it, how we transition people to it and how we drive people to the site, and how we keep them there. There are a lot of other factors that influence the success of a good product.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a very good point.

STEVE ALLISON: Apple is a marketing genius.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I totally agree with that, and of course they've developed a religious following over many years, but there was this twist that the Apple product had, where the product itself does matter. You can actually see that, as far as interfaces are concerned, with Nokia. It's completely made a mess of their... The product itself, technically speaking, is better than anything else out there, but when you actually look at the intuitiveness of the product they just would not be able to sell it. They could spend five times as much money as Apple does.

They would not be able to sell that thing, because people get so frustrated in the use of the product. What we have here is an audience that's very frivolous as well. They're very varied. They have various different reasons for coming to the website. We need to be able to captivate them in that. I think that you've got the right idea already on how we can captivate their attention.

STEVE ALLISON: Sure. Maybe as a closing statement, something that I want to encourage us to try and do – not just this week, but in general with this site as we feel ownership of it – is I'd encourage us to try and experiment with it and not be afraid to create an experiment and then see it fail. There's no best practice for the intuitive layout for the At-Large website. It's us hypothesizing about who our audience is, experimenting with something and then trying to get the feedback from the audience.

Then it's being able to create trust so that they know that we can pin it around things that don't necessarily work or to reinforce and validate things that do work. If we can show that level of competence, they will be more willing to come to you and say, "I want to change this," because you've proven to them that you can react. I don't think it's okay to miss the mark and provide something that maybe scares them or doesn't quite do what they're expecting it could do, if we could show that we can be reactionary when we miss something.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That works for me.

STEVE ALLISON: Final comments?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: None from me. I guess you've got a handful of information here now.

STEVE ALLISON: I have a lot of information. I plan on sitting down either today or early next week with our design vendors. I opened the floodgates to them and I think they're probably a little nervous. Hopefully by the time I sit down with them they can share a little bit of their vision with me and we can lay out some of the concrete next steps so that, in my mind, a very important milestone for us is that by the time we meet next Thursday, early in the morning, I want to be able to share some work we've done. That might be sketches or little storyboards.

I might actually bring them to the meeting as well, to begin pulling out additional information they may need to ask questions about or to figure out what our feelings are about certain things that they've been doing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Early in the morning?

STEVE ALLISON: Yes. This time that we've met today is probably the best. I have a lot of conflicts over next Friday and the following Monday. We'll have to work around that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Gisella has my agenda, so it probably works. I don't even know.

STEVE ALLISON: For the ICANN staff we have a WhatsApp call next Thursday. If we wanted to meet even earlier in the morning, that's fine by me. I'm a morning person anyway. We'll have to figure out something.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Neither one of our calls is in the morning. Right now I see we have the WhatsApp special five-year...

STEVE ALLISON: I'm pretty much free from 10:00 to 14:00 Pacific. That's the only window of time I'm available. It would be really important to do that on Thursday. Friday I'm out of the office and Monday I'm on a plane so I won't be available. I think we're all PDT by the way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm all fine for that. I can see my calendar is clear. I suppose you don't want to wake up at 14:30 UTC. I think that's 6:00 or something. You don't want that.

STEVE ALLISON: I like being awake in the morning. I think clearly. At the end of the day you don't want to ask me any questions.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We'll work this out. I'll see what I can do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. Just one last word. When you see the designers and so on, there are two things that many in our community are very twitchy about. The first one is the amount of bandwidth required for a service. Something that is ultra fancy is probably going to be great for a few people but then you're going to get a lot of people annoyed. You will have done all this excellent stuff and yet they will say, "It doesn't work with me, it doesn't work where I am. I live in XYZ and we don't have such a passkey." That's one.

Second one is we have a significant portion of our community that is interested in deprived communities, and in that one has the disabled communities. You do have to make sure that the website will work with these readers for people that have bad sight, etcetera. I think it is Worldwide Web Consortium, W3C things to do with that. Again, I know that sometimes when things are more fancy they don't read well using auto-readers.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's something that Anthony could feed into. Also, just years ago, when Chris first arrived he mentioned that. Steve knows all about that.

STEVE ALLISON: A couple of comments: as far as bandwidth, noted. It will come into play in the implementation of any of the wireframes. They could do a really fancy wireframe and then when we get into implementation we take that into consideration and we may augment, strip things out, lower bandwidth images... There are a lot of things we can do to make the pages lightweight.

Then around accessibility, there are two things. The first is that accessibility will be part of the actual design, but more so it's tied into the implementation when we get into that. It's tagging images, it's having good descriptive metadata text and things like that. That's really something that comes in when we have developers on-hand. This happens to also be an entirely separate project as well that we can piggyback on as this site grows.

We'll be doing analysis across our various digital assets so that we can provide best practices to our [dev 01:38:41] teams and provide requirements to our [dev] teams and soundproof those things. We'll do those in tandem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Noted. I wasn't aware of that and I thought that maybe you needed to know that upstream so that you don't dig so much in one direction and then think, "Oh, if we've got to make it W3C compliant on disability issues then we don't need any of this stuff we've been working on for the past two weeks. That's the last thing you want.

STEVE ALLISON: We'll ask our designers for recommendations on what they do with their other clients. We're not the only people in the world that want accessibility and that want lower bandwidth support. Maybe there's a simple way that when you hit the site it takes a look at your bandwidth. I don't know. Maybe it takes a look at your bandwidth and says, "Do you need a low bandwidth version?" and then it flips the screen on them. I

don't know. There are lots of possibilities. We will take them into account.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Is this Friday evening for you Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, and I'm just about to leave in about an hour's time for much drinking.

STEVE ALLISON: Fantastic.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well deserved.

STEVE ALLISON: Thanks everyone for the time. I really appreciate it. It's been good success so far. Hopefully in the next week you can see some of the fruits of all our labor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I hope so.

STEVE ALLISON: Thanks a lot.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I look forward to it. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]