STEVE ALLISON:	Just to reiterate, we are in a work of progress in this document, and I'll begin sharing my screen, if someone can permit me? While we're waiting for that, what I wanted to call out is the main intent of this document. It's a work in progress, but what we'd like to accomplish is for one to share Ariel's and my understanding of what this vision is. It will take time to digest that, and that's totally okay.
	Ultimately, what we want to have come out of today and maybe the next couple of days is constructive criticism, identify the concerns that we may have; whether it's terminology, whether it's the structure that we're proposing, the features that we might propose. We really want to think creatively together, not be afraid to critique and feel and sense of ownership of this. It's not just our vision, it's all of ours.
	Ultimately, what we need to come out soon is we need to formulate a shared vision of this information architecture. It's not that this can't change over time. We're experimenting. We're trying to feel our way through this process, but what we are short on is time for the meeting. We want to have some hypothesis of what this future site will look like, in a presentable format for the meeting. When we get into the meeting itself, it's easy for us to communicate that these things can change and that we welcome the feedback.
	We're not afraid of that, but we do need to get to a pretty solid state with at least what our proposed architecture is. Ariel and I think we have at least the building blocks of what that will be now,

and we'll go through that today and then give you guys time to digest that, going forward. Okay?

Okay. What you're looking at is our proposed information architecture for the website. We're still working through some of the details with the design team, so some of it may change. You can see actually there's a lot of comment and conversation going back and forth, so that we're feeling our way through. What I wanted to do to start us off is just look at this table of contents and talk to you about what this vision looks like. Then we can get into a couple of specific pages, if you like. We could talk about the intent of them. We could figure out what's a good logical next step, after we're comfortable.

The current proposed architecture has a couple of main top-level items. We've got our homepage. That's very important to us. It's one of the pages that we want to have a design for for the meeting. We'll get into the major features of it, but the intent of that homepage is actually serving two audiences, so it needs to have some harmony between that newcomer audience and that more experienced member, to not only hook the newcomer but also show enough of the robust activity that's taking place within the site, so that experienced members don't have to do guess-work in finding what stuff is being updated within the site.

There's a little harmony there that we need to bring together. Second is the news and media portion of the site. The news and media is a portion of the site that will be the one-stop-shop for all of the news and media. It will potentially house announcements, if you guys write spotlight-related articles, if there are opinion pieces that another blog might write about that we want to bring into the

site, things like calendar events or meetings – all of that can be housed within a news and media section of the site.

What we envision is that this is more of an advanced experienced member tool, for them to keep abreast of what's going on, that they may have missed. It's like a search portion of the site, but geared towards news and media-related items.

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry to interrupt. Besides it being a search tool for experienced members, we also want this to prompt the interest to new members and curious outsiders, so that they have an understanding that we have a very dynamic community – every day something new is happening. We'll try to hook them through this section as well.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a question – I see down below, way down below, is the events calendar, and you had just mentioned that this news and media would include a calendar?

STEVE ALLISON: The exact layout I don't think we've fully figured out. The event calendar is one of the caveats. We haven't quite figured out if we visualize the events in two or one place, but at the end of the day, announcing an event existing is news and media. Maybe events calendar gets integrated into that. We haven't quite figured that one out yet.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I would never see that. I would want to see something like "News, Media and Events".

STEVE ALLISON: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: If that would be okay with everyone. I really would never guess that I could see a meeting schedule under "News and Media".

STEVE ALLISON: "News, Media and Events." We'll have to play with some of these concepts and get something that works right. The next section is primarily geared towards newcomers, although it's still very valuable for experienced members, and we'll get into this – there's this "Explore" section. The process that we want to walk people through, especially newcomers, is really to start them off with an exploratory process through what At-Large is, what the core mission is, what the work is that they're doing today, and then guiding them through how to actually become involved in the processes. "Explore" starts them there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: When I see "Our Cause" I'm used to seeing some for-profit or some sort of NGO development feel there. Maybe "Our Mission" might work better for At-Large.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Heidi. Right now what we see is just a pending… This is still a work in progress. We haven't figured out the exact wording for everything yet, it's just basically a demonstration of our thoughts and progress. That's a very rough draft. We can definitely refine that wording later on. I think Steve can tell us first about why we break those sections, in this session, and then we can go to the wording and content of those sections?

STEVE ALLISON: I do want us to be able to think through and think critically on whether even the message, the intent, of each of the sections reflects our expectations. "Explore" is broken down into three categories – it's this question of who we are. Whether it's our mission statement, it's something the reader can either agree or disagree on. They either agree that we're relevant to them, and that entices them, or they don't agree. If they do agree, the rest of this is really supplemental – like understanding our history is valuable – but it's supplemental to just giving them context.

What we're calling the "Organization Diagram", maybe we just call it "Our Structure" or something like that. We want to then hint to them that there are lots of different bodies within At-Large doing different things, and that should always go back to our cause. It should be just enough information to let them know that all these groups are doing different activities tied to our cause, or "Our Mission".

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, "Our Mission". I think "Our Cause" is not ICANN.

STEVE ALLISON: Noted. That "Who Are We?" question we want to pose in the context of why they care. It should always go back to why they care about reading this information or why they should care that our mission exists at all. In doing that, it reinforces what their role will end up being, or could be, in the larger At-Large community. What naturally follows that is, what are the things that we're actually working on?

We expect that this portion of the site would be an introduction to the types of topics that are currently relevant to At-Large, or maybe a broad overview of the types of issues that we work through, potentially some case studies. Something to give them some concrete examples of the things that we're doing. Then it would follow with, "Okay, now that we've given you an overview of what we actually do, here are the actual bodies and the work they're performing. This would potentially be the perfect location for the ALAC's profile page. The ALAC can then start curating content around that.

Same thing with the RALOs – this could be the perfect location to call out, "Here are the different reasons that are being represented and the specific things that they happen to be doing." This is really good content, not only for newcomers but existing members now. Same thing with structures in Working Groups. Specific Working Groups might want to broadcast the type of work they're doing, and that leads naturally into the next question, which is, "What

opportunities happen to exist within these organizations?" or, "How is it that I become involved with these groups?"

We'd expect that each of these pages could call out the types of opportunities that exist or the, "if you want to know more about how to get involved with this, click here." The last part of that – here, it looks like we're missing that – is "How We Work", which would be the last part of what their exploratory process is. That would talk about the tools involved – if Working Groups are working on the Wiki it would be like, "These are the steps to get your Wiki account."

Then once you have your Wiki account, "Send this email to this individual and then you're in the Working Group space," or whatever the mechanics are that are involved. Those would be a natural location for that type of content. In addition, the "How We Work" could include content such as the overall processes or procedures that we go through for different activities. The PDP would be a great location for this type of content. We could even get into the procedural about how we go about doing voting or how we go about collecting comments and incorporating those comments back into the final draft of the statement.

These things provide transparency but it also gives us avenues to call out opportunities to people. As we're talking through the procedure of providing comments, we say on that page, "Here are some of the statements that are open for comment." All of these things are opportunities for us to call to action the newcomer and experienced member, if they happen to be on these pages. Thats' what we are today considering for the "Explore" chunk of the site.

It's allowing people to do research on who we are, what we do and how we go about doing it.

The next phase in this process that the user would go through, once they've done exploratory work, is actually discovering something of relevance to them. This is what we call "Discover" and again, the wording may not be right, or it may be, but the concept hopefully resonates. It's once you've done all this research and you're sold that this is of interest to you, now the question is, "What do you want to do?" and that's where "Discover" comes into play. You're finding something of relevance.

The main elements within "Discover" that we wanted to cover are the topics. The actual active topics that people are working on within the community so that we have dedicated pages for those topics, as well as the "Policy Advice" section. The "Policy Advice" is what we previously called "Correspondence".

Again, I don't know if this word captures exactly what it needs to do, but our understanding of what "Policy Advice" is that it's really just a location of where people can find statements, based on the various filters or categories of information, and then dive into either providing commentary, becoming a penholder, seeing At-Large's position on a previously closed statement. That's what we view this "Policy Advice" section of the site to be. It's really a search mechanism with all of our artifacts contained within it.

"Events Calendar" we've discussed. Maybe it gets brought into "News and Events". We'll skip that for now. The final two things that Ariel and I discussed were "Metrics" and "Experts" and neither is really [unclear 00:16:18]. Across the site there is all kinds of

data that's naturally being updated, and a lot of stuff can be pulled out of that, such as how many open statements we have, how many ALSes have applied, how many have been voted in.

There are all kinds of metrics, that just by the nature of updating the content within the site that we can now visualize, and potentially get to a point where we're visualizing it over time. It will be really interesting for people to see the growth over time of ALSes in different regions. This is a perfect opportunity for us to provide a window into what's actually happening across the community.

Finally there's "Experts" which really actually dovetails into another project going on at ICANN about open profiles, where we can have a platform across all of the organizations within the ICANN community for people to create profiles of themselves. Then we can visualize that data within our site, as we need to. We could identify an individual's publication, or their credentials or events that they might be attending. It's something we wouldn't be ready for in the first couple of phases of this. It's something that we could start thinking about, like what type of information do we even want to display to our community, and what's relevant to them for finding the people that they want to find?

The last category is the "Make A Difference" and this is really something that ties into the newcomer experience, which if you think about it is we've sold them on an idea, we've told them all of the interesting work we're doing, and now it would be nice for them to have a consolidated location where they can find all the opportunities that are relevant to them – whether it's as an individual, or within a group, or as an ALS. This is really a place

that we want to be able to broadcast, based on the different perspectives, what type of opportunities are out there for them to actually get involved with.

It's something I don't think we've fully fleshed out yet, but we know it's very important for us to be able to showcase how you get involved in the various At-Large groups and opportunities. That was the fire hydrant approach to this. Ariel, do you have any initial comments to add to it?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Steve. I just want to add one comment, which is why we've broken the sessions up as they are. You can imagine a site trying to achieve three goals, and these goals are in the order of level of commitment. The first one is "Explore" and it's for somebody who happens to stumble upon the site and they get into the site and looks at it and doesn't really have any concrete aim. If we can grab their attention and let them explore further, then we've achieved the first step, which is giving them an opportunity to see the world of At-Large. That's the "Explore".

The second, "Discover" well, we can definitely change that word to something else. The main objective for that step is for the people who will gain more interest than just an accidental stumbler. We want this more interested visitor to research things he or she wants to know about At-Large. Then this is a little bit more specific; about the policy issue topics or the people that are experts within the community. We wanted to create that opportunity, for the interested people, to gain more knowledge about At-Large in a more structured way, and also to help them discover in the way

they want to. That's the second step – "Discover" or "Research" or "Learn". You can change the words later on.

With the third way, "Make A Difference", we can also change that word into something else, like "Engage" or "Join" or whatever works here. It's the final call to action; to let the newcomer and inexperienced people be more engaged with the community and be part of us. That's the final objective there. That's how we break down into these three sections. That's one thing I want to add.

STEVE ALLISON: Thank you. Maybe we could just open the floor. We're definitely into getting into the nitty-gritty of any of the pages you think might be interesting. Maybe we could talk more broadly just about conceptually, if we think that we share this vision, or if there are things that we're concerned about or things that may be missing or not reflected properly. I think this would be a good time for us to capture some of that.

ARIEL LIANG: Any questions or comments?

SILVIA VIVANCO: I have a question and I think Olivier also asked about how interactive is this, and what part of the site will be interactive, for members of the community and for people that would like to have some interactive features?

STEVE ALLISON: I can talk to that a little bit. If we're looking at this Table of Contents there are a couple of pages within the site that are more interactive than others. Let me at least call out the things that aren't as interactive to begin with. The homepage is meant not to be interactive. It's meant to be an aggregation of a lot of the content within the site, and it's meant to serve two purposes – one, intrigue the initial newcomer and then have them dive further into the site. We want to hook them and intrigue them.

Then two is show the robustness of the activity going on. We'd want to aggregate some of the news – maybe only the most important news – to the top of the site. We want to have some kind of key metrics within that homepage to show people some of the activities going on; such as open statements, statements that are closing, things that have been voted on – all those activities that are happening around the Working Groups. It's a perfect avenue for us to do that.

Third, we want to potentially pull out some of the conversations that are taking place within the At-Large community. Having some connection to your social media strategy may become relevant to the homepage. You can see the homepage in itself isn't so much an interactive tool, as much as it is a tool to get people to dive into some of the more interactive elements that they're looking for. Its main purpose is for the more experienced members to remove the guesswork so that they don't have to guess if there are new open statements. We will inform them if there's relevant content, so they can dive right to it.

"News and Media" however is something that's a little more interactive. Even though we are on the back-end writing a lot of this content, what we want is a tool that allows people to discover the news and media that's relevant to them. There are lots of ways that we can think about doing that, and we have to explore some of those with our design team. Just off the top of my head, some of the ideas are maybe somebody wants to change their perspective on "News and Media" to be based on their specific region or specific Working Group or a specific topic that's active in the community, or an event.

All of these ways that they could change their perspective are the interactive elements that we'd give them so that they could see the right [names 00:25:28]. Similarly with the calendar you could think, "If we've got 10, 15 or 20 events in a given month, that in itself is too much date to consume, if you're trying to figure out which events are relevant to you. We want interactive elements built into those event-type tools so that they can see the events that are geared towards the perspective that they want to have.

"Explore" is a section that I would imagine has more static content than dynamic content, and it's more of an informational section, but there may be elements of that that become interactive. I don't know if we've fully identified what those would be, but at a minimum I think what we're looking for is to tell the story about all of the work that's happening and giving people context – so it's a little more static in nature. It still has opportunities for us to give people calls to action, so that they could dive into the more interactive pages, but I think the nature of it is to be a little less interactive.

When we get to "Discover" this is really when a lot of the interactive tools come into play. For example, the "Topics". Now, this is an opportunity for us to broadcast the most important topics that are being worked on across the community and to give people the research tools so that they can not only teach themselves about the topic but see the related news about those topics, see when there are events or open statements on those topics, and to actually participate in the PDP.

So "Topics" and "Policy Advice" is really when you start seeing a lot more of the interaction between the reader of the website and the content that's placed within it. "Metrics" and "Experts" are more static in nature, even if the information is dynamically updating itself. I would imagine most of it would be infographics. Potentially some of those infographics over time could be a little more interactive, but until we get a little more mature in our process it's really hard to identify.

The "Make A Difference" is probably also a little more static in nature, even if the content itself is dynamically updating itself, based on the information in the site, I'd imagine it's less of an interactive tool and more of just a nice layout of information that's available and the opportunities.

ARIEL LIANG: Just to add to that, Steve, with an explanation about the "Explore" area – even though the content on the site can be a little bit static, that doesn't mean we can't direct people to the interactive part. A lot of the interactive part is actually the community Wiki. For example, under the "Organization Structure", like the RALOs, they

have their Wiki page for all those RALOs. If we identify some of the very dynamic parts of those RALO Wiki pages, we can create opportunities to direct visitors to the Wiki so that community members will have their platform to engage in ongoing work and update their content.

Just in short, the static part of the site can also serve as the gateway to the interactive part of the Wiki so that we can connect both these parts together in that way.

STEVE ALLISON: Just to make sure I understand, when we say "interactive" we're referring to the collaborative nature of the work we're doing? Is that correct?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, unless Olivier or Dev has a different opinion?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, for example, the community members input their [call names 00:29:43], they interact, they start talking through the Wikis in the community section, so you can link it to the site?

STEVE ALLISON: Absolutely. We're not proposing, at least in any near term, to change any of that process. Whether it's effective or ineffective, we want to continue to harness the collaborative nature of the Wikis so that we don't break everything all at once. If in the future we find opportunities that we want to pull out of the Wiki because

there's a more natural home for it on a public-facing site, then so be it. As it is though, it seems like the PDP is working as designed and we don't want to break it. We really just want to point people at it appropriately.

ARIEL LIANG: I think Olivier has his hand raised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to ask a very similar question to what Silvia has asked and word it slightly differently – ask how much of the site is static versus it being dynamic? In other words, I see there are a number of news feeds and things like that. Are all the pages going to have some dynamic content on there, or are we going to see some parts of the website that will be static and that might then require some webmaster intervention to update?

I'm just trying to find out how much of it could be updated directly by At-Large staff for example, or how much of it is fed by RSS feed or whatever other feed you're using.

STEVE ALLISON: Until we get into a conversation with an actual dev team and know what they can actually provide us, it's tough to accurately know how much of the content is stuff that we'd have to rely on a web admin team for, versus our own staff. The goal that I'm trying to push us towards, and the web admin team is comfortable with this goal as well, is to provide us the content management tools to

maintain and to create the pages that we need, and to maintain those pages, on our own. There is a little balance there.

Sometimes we want to create something that's a little bit too unique and it requires us to do the work with the web admin team or even potentially a dev team to support a new request. Especially once we're up and running though with pages that have static content on them, those are perfect candidates for us to own our own publishing responsibilities. It's something that I think the web admin team will support us in.

When we get to a point where we're actually doing development, one of the initial requirements will be in setting up a content management platform with all the proper roles in place so that we can log in, manage our own content, and publish when we want to publish. I think that we probably move at least one of the main bottlenecks that we've had in the past.

ANTHONY NIIGANNII: I know Ariel mentioned a while back that the information can be overwhelming. When I think of it from an accessible perspective, when I hear information like looking at graphics, the metrics particularly, I'm not sure if the metrics are accessible for people with disabilities yet, because I'm not sure how interactive some of the screen-readers are when it comes to that type of multimedia presentation. The other point I wanted to make was, having a [unclear 00:34:17] background, one of the things I would look at is how we can engage the audience in helping them think, helping them feel and helping them do.

I know in the document you talked about that you like the call to action from the Michael J Fox Foundation, which was really good. I looked at that and I liked that. I think if we put something right on the homepage that is a call to action… A challenge I've seen for a number of these forums is getting sponsorship. If we put that out in front we give the people an opportunity to not only become involved in all the At-Large stuff, but as well as an opportunity to think about how they can donate to that as well – whether that be time, energy, resources, even funds would be great.

Looking at [unclear 00:35:10] that was the term I was looking for, as the introduction to people, like that elevator speech that can draw them in. When it comes to the accessible part of a website, if you have that initial text in the beginning, and those who are visually impaired already have in the back of their mind, once they hear that then, "Okay, I can participate this way, that way, or I can even donate." That was my comment.

STEVE ALLISON: To the accessibility, normally, if we were going through this process the way I would manage it myself, I would have a dev team working with us in tandem, and they would be significantly more involved in the architectural side of the design work. We don't have that resource available to us at this time, so the path we decided to take was to envision the solution that we want to put in place, and then when we do get those architectural and dev resources, it will be a task for us to now reconsider what we're proposing and come up with solutions that are actually usable. It won't only be just the value side, which we're doing today, but

producing a solution that's also usable, and obviously within the budgets that we have.

That part will come into play. It's something where I think it's okay for us to hold off on. It's okay to design with that in mind, but then when we get that architectural resource in place, I think we'll be able to do some negotiation with them, discuss what is and isn't possible, and then tweak our design to take that into account. I agree with the call to action. What we want to do for this homepage, especially for the newcomer perspective, where the newcomer's the sponsor, whether it's an individual Internet user, is to give them enough of a call to action without being overwhelming.

What we don't want to do is have a little widget on the page with 35 things that they can do right off the bat. It's too much. They're not even committed to us yet. A sponsor is itself an audience, and it's maybe something that we have to consider for the homepage, but then outside of that I want it to be as concise and clear as possible so that we can just drive them a little further into the site. The more you drive them into the site, the more committed they will become. I think that's one of the main goals.

I noted that we should potentially be bringing in another audience that we might not be fully capturing, which is more of a sponsorship level person.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Really excellent work, Steve and Ariel. Many thanks for that. Just some comments – under "Explore", which again, we're not sure if

we're going to use that… I'm sort of happy with that but I'm less happy with "Discover". Under "Explore" there I would suggest that we might need something like "Our Hot Topics".

Then maybe even in addition to that "Our Perspectives On ICANN Issues" or something maybe a little smarter than that, but something where it has the hot topics that ALAC is currently working on, and then in general, if people want to know what are the ALAC or At-Large's views on certain issues, maybe just a spot where that could be. The Beginner's Guides would be a good source of that. Matt did one on ALAC policy, so there's a lot of general information in there. Literally, a cut and paste might be useful for that.

STEVE ALLISON: Before we move on from this topic, let me respond. We're currently calling what we do would be a perfect location for where we're talking about the topics that we're working across. I have a question though. Do we consider issues and topics different, distinct definitions, or are they one and the same, or are they tied together?

HEIDI ULLRICH: "What We Do" would be policy and outreach and capacity building and engagement. It's not just policy. I think that somewhere this needs to be this distinction of, "This is what policies do," but I would say even the majority of our members are more interested in doing outreach and engagement than doing policy work. Olivier,

you may echo that because of the struggles we have with getting penholders, but that's what it is, in my experience.

STEVE ALLISON: I think it would be a valuable AI for us to come back within the next couple of days with short, concise descriptions of what we mean when we say we do policy development which I think we all have a shared vision for.

HEIDI ULLRICH: At-Large does not do policy development, they do policy advice development. Ariel, maybe take a look at the Beginner's Guide on ALAC policy. I think that text is already in there.

ARIEL LIANG: I have read through a lot of the Beginner's Guide paragraphs, but they're not written in a way with the audience in mind, so some of the things they write about policy advice development is to be expanded or clarified for people who don't really have much knowledge about ICANN or At-Large. I don't think [unclear 00:41:15] will be sufficient.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, then the Beginner's Guides are not meeting their goals if you're saying that they're not reaching out to beginners, because given their name that's their aim – to reach out to beginners – as well as to reach out to people who are just coming in as participants or active participants within At-Large.

ARIEL LIANG: What I'm saying is they give a really good foundation, but we'll probably have to revise some of the wording or expand on it later on. That's going to be the content development phase. We don't need to be concerned with that too much at this stage.

STEVE ALLISON: Ariel, maybe what we could do, as an offline AI, is take these four items and propose some form of content, even if it's not exactly right, so that we have placeholder. It will give us a sense of the amount of content, the type of messages, and if we want to tweak it over time that's totally fine. I want us to at least call out major topical sections that we want ot talk through.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can you go back up to the main first page please? Under "Organization Diagram" I'm not sure if you need that full name, as it just means our organization? Then "Organizational Structure" that diagram would go there perhaps. What I saw missing here, maybe it's not highlighted as I thought it might be, given At-Large activities, is that they also do a lot of capacity building and engagement. I don't see that there. That's something that might need to be brought out a bit more.

STEVE ALLISON: Before that, I heard you say policy, outreach, engagement and capacity building?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Capacity building yes. Also, some big projects. Anthony mentioned it as well. We've had now two Summits and we'll likely have more. We will have more. Then also, in about the same time frame, there are organizational reviews that are pretty major events. Maybe that's something, those two big outreach projects and inward-facing projects, that needs to be highlighted as well.

STEVE ALLISON: I would think when we talk about the "Who We Are" we can say that we do policy, we do outreach, we do engagement, we do capacity building, and then when we talk about the "What We Do" I think that's a perfect avenue for us to say when we're talking about doing policy advice development, there are case studies and policy advice topics that we've done in the past, or active policies that we're hinting at diving them into so they'll actually do research on those. Then you're right, when we start talking about outreach we say, "These are the things that we're doing in outreach; we do major summits and events."

HEIDI ULLRICH: Summits are more engagement than outreach. Summits are more engagement, I would say.

STEVE ALLISON: Okay, well, we'll get the right content in the right order.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Finally – I know I keep going back to this – but under "ALSes" – and I got commitment from IT by the way when I was having a meeting with them earlier this week, on really improving the global interactive map of ALSes. I don't know if Jeff told you about that, Steve, but I'm happy to show that to you. I think you've already seen it, but I'm really keen on getting a much better map than we have currently.
STEVE ALLISON:	Sure. While we're on the topic, you and Jeff met to talk about improving the "ALSes" portion of the website?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	I just brought up, among a laundry list of requests, that for the ALSes there's a global map now that was really great five years ago. It was just a Google Map with little pins, and we'd like something… I think it would be great to have something much more modern, much more up-to-date technically, where when you click on it… Again, I cite the example of the map that IT did for Compliance.
	You would literally click on an ALS, you get their name, maybe you get a photo of them, and current activities. Then when Fadi or someone else in the community or within senior staff want to know, "I'm going to be in this country, which ALSes are there?" and they could click on it. Right now we need to literally cut and paste from our contact database and send it to them.

STEVE ALLISON: Maybe we'll just take a note to circle back on this offline because I'd be interested in knowing what came out of the conversation, if you're going to get extra budget to do something specific like that, because…

HEIDI ULLRICH: We didn't get into that detail but I'll have to talk to you about that.

STEVE ALLISON: Fantastic. It's part of what I think our plans are anyway. Any way we can get additional support in implementing the vision we have here, the better, because there's more ask than we have funds to do, and we'll have to prioritize it. If you can get them to commit even more then that's fantastic.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. [unclear 00:47:11] fiscal year, but we'll see. That's really it from me at this point.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Heidi. Also just to add one other thing you touched upon, for "Our Work" you broke them into four areas – policy, engagement, capacity building and specific projects. Our current thinking is we demonstrate our work based on [unclear 00:47:42] the community. The work ALAC does, the work the five RALOs do, and the work the Working Groups do. We want to show it based on the groups that have responsibilities. This is an open question. We don't know whether showing the work based that

way is better, or if showing the work based on the category of work is better. I hope I conveyed myself clearly.

STEVE ALLISON: What Heidi brought up was a really concise way of organizing it by the type of work we do. When we get into the details of that we can talk about who does policy advice development and we can talk about the groups within that. Maybe hold off on talking about each of the groups and what they do until you get into the how you do it section or something. I'm not sure.

The group is only as relevant as the context of the work they're doing, and if someone knows the kind of work that they're interested in, they want to go and find that. They might not know what the regional ALSes are doing. That's something they'll want to figure out.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, but I think what Heidi's proposed is a pretty good idea. Next, Olivier and Dev.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I'm looking back now at the table of contents and the information architecture, since this is our starting point. I understand this is effectively giving us a hierarchy of the pages and how they're going to be sitting together. Is this correct?

STEVE ALLISON: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have a question with regards to having under "Explore" who we are on the one hand and what we do on the other, and effectively having ALAC, RALOs and the different RALOs underneath. Under "What We Do" I thought these would be more "Who We Are". "What We Do" is more a case of the Working Groups and how we work and this sort of stuff. Could you please expand on this? I don't quite understand how the organizational structure works with what we do.

STEVE ALLISON: This just ties into what we're just talking about with Heidi – that there are two perspectives that we can take. If we think about one perspective about what we do being policy, outreach, engagement and capacity building, each of those functional activities that we're doing as a community are performed by different members of the community. Different groups are interested in different functional activities.

When we think about what we do, what we do is done by different subsets of the community. There is some natural relationship. I don't know if it necessarily belongs there or not. Maybe the groups that do that work is part of how we do it. I agree that also part of who we are is the groups that compose the community, but then if you start getting so far into the "we have and ALAC and we have different RALOs and ALSes", if it doesn't naturally lead the conversation further for a newcomer, what it does is actually confuses.

Now they have this giant structure and they're not really sure why it's relevant. We have to be really careful when we're talking about who we are, that it's always keeping in mind why this is relevant to the reader. Why do they care what our structure is? They only care so far as knowing what those groups are doing. I don't know what the exact answer is yet for the content breakdown, but I think we have the pieces of the story. We just have to organize them appropriately, and maybe we don't have it quite yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I can add then, then the organizational structure, which isn't really an organizational structure because at that point that means it would be reflected in the organizational diagram, the "What We Do" is effectively just going to focus on what the ALAC is doing at the moment, and then looking at the RALOs; what is AFRALO doing at the moment, etcetera, and it's not going to go into the description of what is AFRALO or what is APRALO? Is that correct? It's just what they're currently doing? Correct?

STEVE ALLISON: It can be that, or it can be what is the type of work the RALOs do? Maybe we do or maybe we don't show what they're currently working on. I don't know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think a one-stop-shop is seeing what all of these are currently working on. That would be quite fantastic, because it changes a website from being a website that just reads like a book, to a website that actually shows things happening. There's

EN

one thing that at the moment I keep on getting reminded about, and it's the way that Apple does things, with their iPhones and things, and how others do things. Apple have the edge always.

For some reason it just gets people to want to use their bloody devices more, and others are just sometimes frustrating and you want to chuck the device out of the window – although yesterday Apple buyers have chucked their device out of the window for an unrelated problem. On the case here I'm wondering how we can entice people to really be captivated by this and think slightly differently, instead of just having something that says, "This is what the ALAC is, this is what the RALOs are" and so on.

We should have something that really shows that this community, irrespective of what the hell it is, and if you want to find out what it is there is a way; you just hover your cursor over the term and that definition comes out or something comes out. Just hover the thing over there and boom, you've got this thing coming out. Then you can read quickly about the ALAC, you want to learn more, you click on the ALAC and then you'll get to a whole bloody page, but really most people just want to find out really quickly what the ALAC is doing.

They don't want to be taken at a tangent. They just want to find out, "Okay, what's going on now? What is the ALAC working on today?" Because the majority of people that I speak to, who don't know about At-Large and about the ALAC, the first question is, "What do you guys do?" It's not even a case of, "What is the ALAC supposed to do?" because then you can recite the bylaws, and that still doesn't help them, but it's a case of, "Today, what are you working on? What's the stuff that is really bugging you at the

moment? Why do you have six hours of conference calls every day?"

It's this sort of stuff. I think that would be really enticing for people. This is just a personal thought, and maybe this is the way you envisioned it as well.

STEVE ALLISON: Let me try and summarize and make sure I understand. I still think there's value in being able to communicate to a completely new newcomer. What it is you intend to do and what is your mission. ALAC has a specific purpose, and being able to communicate that on a generic level, there is value in that. It puts people on the same page. To your point, it's also extremely valuable to know what they're actually doing.

Maybe that is the natural place for it – when we introduce ALAC and when we introduce their purpose, we also happen to be dynamically showing the actual activities that they're working on – whether they're votes or whether they're providing final statements… Whatever the actual artifacts are that they're creating. Maybe that is the logical place for that data to show up.

ARIEL LIANG: Just to add to Steve's point, actually, can you guys click on "AFRALO" in the Table of Contents? It's under RALOs and under "Organizational Structure". Click that and it will take you directly to the section that we're writing about, the vision of the AFRALO page. It's actually quite comprehensive and we actually used the one-stop-shop as the vision there. Everything you want to know

about AFRALO is held there. We have all the generic information – the background about AFRALO key members. We also touched upon the interactive map that pinpoints the ALSes spread out on the continent.

Then we also have the ongoing work in AFRALO. If you scroll down you'll see "News and Media", which is the major announcements in the RALO, and "Events" and "Elections" and all those things. That's one way that we think maybe we can [treat 00:58:00] people to understand what's new with the RALO, by having this metric board that shows numbers. For example, in AFRALO how many ALSes exist, how many are pending applications, how many statements are being drafted by AFRALO Members.

We'll just have the numbers there and they'll update themselves. It just would give people an understanding that the RALO is dynamic and working on something. Then when they click that number they will see the detail about their work. That's why under "What We Do" right now we have just the RALOs and ALAC – because we cannot envision them as the one-stop-shop and we don't want to break them into a description about what a RALO is, and then have another section about what we do. We want to integrate them together. That's the vision we have right now.

STEVE ALLISON: Maybe a final point on that is when we think about ALAC or a specific RALO, or maybe even in the future ALSes will want to show some certain level of activity on what they're doing on behalf of the community, we need to identify what the types of activities

are they're performing – and I'll need help doing this. What is it about ALAC that we want to broadcast? Is it the votes? Is it specific publications? Whatever those types of metrics are that we can call out, we should work together to start identifying and brainstorming what those are so that we can include them in our designs.

ARIEL LIANG: Dev has a comment.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Ariel. First of all, a great amount of work has been done. I can see that one of you took this and poured your heart out into the details of this. I know that's often the hardest thing to do, so kudos. My question goes back to the map, on when you go back to the top, and to what others may have touched on. It goes back to this thing with the organizational structure. I'm not sure whether "Organizational Structure" is really the terminology, and whether it should be described as "What We Do". It's really just how we organize.

To my mind, the "Organization Diagram" is simply just breaking down how At-Large is organized. I think what should happen is also that right now you've got it as a top-down approach, where it really should be split. It should be the ALSes, the RALOs, the Working Groups, and then the ALAC, because we really want to emphasize the bottom-up way we work. This is presenting it as ALAC being the be all and end all, and it's really not supposed to

be the be all and end all, it's supposed to be the Working Group feeding into the policy advice and so forth.

That's one of the goals you'll want to do. I'd flip it. You talk about ALSes and the type of structures that can become ALSes, then these are organized by region with the RALOs, and then within the RALOs you have the global At-Large Working Group, and then there's the ALAC itself and so forth. I'd describe it that way. I think the title "Explore", I'm beginning to think more and more that I think it can't remain, because I don't think "Explore" isn't really conveying it. The "Who We Are" is really the more appropriate title, or the equivalent, "About Us" whatever the wording is. "Who We Are" should be instead of "Explore".

STEVE ALLISON: To your point on that, "Explore", the way we presented it, includes not only who we are, but also the work we're doing as well as how we go about doing it. We had to encapsulate it into some term because calling it "Who We Are", that's only one piece of that. Whether "Explore" is right or wrong is a separate point. We can play with that word, but "Who We Are" is only one element of a newcomer or an experienced member understanding some of the components that go into the work that we're doing.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I get you. I think "Explore" is a little too vague. It doesn't convey what the section is trying to do, but I understand what you're saying. Going back to what other people were saying, with regards to the RALO section, what I think will also have to

happen is that this should be mirrored onto the landing pages on the Wiki for each of the RALOs. So what we design here has to be exactly what happens for the RALO pages. Then probably what can happen, to make it more dynamic, is you create a special landing page that's only editable by the Executive RALO Leadership Secretariat.

Then those messages are pulled in and put onto the At-Large website, by the RALO Chair or something. Those types of approaches. Again, you don't want to duplicate it, by creating one section that's on this website and then we have a RALO landing page that's a different thing.   Just have one.   That's my philosophy. That's one thing. Regarding cataloguing the work that the various Working Groups are doing and what RALO Working Groups are doing, maybe the taxonomy aspect could be used here. If those types of work activities can be tagged…

If there's a RALO Working Group working on RIRs then it would be tagged appropriately.   That Working Group would be tagged accordingly and therefore a search would then bring that up. If a person is from that region and is interested in those issues, they may want to look at that as a way of discovering what their interests are. That comes back to more the "Discover" and how you discover what you're interested in, and where can I find like-minded persons in that region, so I can have a conversation with them? That's it for now.

STEVE ALLISON: Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No thanks. That's fine. No further questions.

ARIEL LIANG: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. I don't put my hand down. I think we've reached a maximum content intake here.

STEVE ALLISON: Yes. That seems fair. Maybe I could do a couple of summary points. All very good content today.

ARIEL LIANG: Olivier's raised his hand again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. For a split second things went blank and suddenly it came back. It's just to do with when someone starts on the website. Would it be an interesting thought to perhaps have a box that comes out and says, "Who are you? Are you a beginner or are you a seasoned ICANN person?" Would that be a good first step in being able to channel people to one side or another?

STEVE ALLISON: Potentially it's something we can bring up with the designers. In my opinion, to me, it distracts a user and they'd really want to close something like that, but it's something we could even do as an experiment. When we get into our beta tests we could do implement something like that where it pops up. We can measure who's closing it, who's actually clicking on it, who's irritated and leaves the site. It's definitely something we can explore.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The reason behind this is that in each policy development, everyone discusses what the best way is to get people to bring their input, etcetera. Apparently the European Commission, on their intranet, when you register and things, it asks you what kind of stakeholder you are – are you a government employee, are you a private sector organization, are you a not-for-profit? The content of the site is different depending on the category of person you are.

People don't get overwhelmed by information at that point, so they might think, "Goodness, there are too many choices in front of me," people that are newcomers would just have a simple interface of saying, "That's the sort of stuff you might be interested in," and all the more advanced stuff is kept on a backburner. For those that are seasoned ICANN-ers, then you'd have the easy stuff on the backburner and the stuff that you might be interested in would be on the front-burner. Just a thought.

STEVE ALLISON: Sure. Stanford does this – you come to their site and it's already geared towards the prospective student. However, you might not be the prospective student. You might be faculty and staff, you might be a parent, you might be alumni. Clicking these links will change the perspective of the site. It's not so cumbersome that it's in their face and they must choose it, but it becomes an element of the navigation where you can quickly change your perspective and remember the context of the user as they go through the site. There are different ways that we can consider that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's very cool. I like that.

STEVE ALLISON: It does add a lot of complexity in terms of the number of pages that we're building, the layout…

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think that's going to be something in the future. That's wonderful, but…. Maybe under Alan, but I don't even know about that.

STEVE ALLISON: It's definitely worth entertaining that idea and thinking about it over the next couple of months. I think it's something we can even propose to the community as a concept to think about. As we go through the first beta of the website, having them think in that context and think about the things that are good or bad about the

current version. That way it gives us time to really build that properly. If I can consolidate some of our thoughts…

HEIDI ULLRICH: One quick point here – when Olivier mentioned his last issue, something that struck me was is there a place there for individuals? I know that we have ALAC, we have the RALOs, we have the ALSes, but there's nothing for individuals.

STEVE ALLISON: You mean about what individuals are doing?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, because At-Large can be an ALS or individuals. To have a page for individuals; maybe individual activities, if you're an unaffiliated member, etcetera, but just a page where if you're an individual, either a current or prospective one, where would you go?

STEVE ALLISON: To do what?

HEIDI ULLRICH: To do activities? We get questions from individuals about, "Can I join At-Large?" Somewhere there should be, "Okay, you can join through an ALS or as an individual."

STEVE ALLISON: A couple of quick points then. When we talk about the work that we're doing, when we talk about the policy advice development, we can talk about it from various perspectives. Somebody is a penholder. Somebody is providing comment. Somebody is doing voting. When we're talking about the things that we do, they're perfect opportunities to call out the types of individuals or groups that do that work. Those are avenues to call them to action. You could have a list of the current open comments and say individuals can provide their insights to this, or, "You can provide your insight."

Separately from all of the other areas that touch on this individual, I would call out this "Make A Difference" as somewhere where we'd want to be very specific about depending on who you are and what you're interested in, there are all kinds of different opportunities. What Olivier mentioned earlier about having different contexts or lenses to look through, this is potentially a perfect page for us to experiment with something like that – where they could make a difference as an individual or make a difference as a group of people, or they could join a group of people.

That's the page where I'd think we could consolidate a lot of that type of content, but it would also be hinted at throughout the rest of the site.

ARIEL LIANG: Definitely. I think if we talk about NARALO under "What We Do", we will definitely touch upon the structure of NARALO – like the ALSes and the unaffiliated members, so when we talk about that section, maybe we'll have a call to action box on the side saying, "If you want to join NARALO there are several ways for you to do

that," including if you're just drawing out the unaffiliated members. We'll touch upon the individual area when we discuss the RALO activities.

HEIDI ULLRICH: What about something like "Join us!" as a call to action?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, that would definitely be possible. We just need to figure out the wording. We also want to work with the designer because they may have more creative ideas than us.

STEVE ALLISON: You're saying "Join Us!" for "Make A Difference"?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, or… Well…

STEVE ALLISON: Because it's more than joining.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

STEVE ALLISON: We can play with the ideas. What I wanted to do is get us comfortable at least with the structure, and I think Ariel and I need to do a little bit of homework and clean up on some of the sub

elements of "Explore". As we do this, we can tinker with the way the pages look, the names on the pages, the language. All of that can easily be tweaked. We need to at least have enough of a shared vision for the structure so that we can produce some hypothesis to present and discuss with the community.

ARIEL LIANG: Olivier has his hand raised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Old hand.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Olivier. Steve, do you want to do a wrap-up? We have about ten minutes.

STEVE ALLISON: Just to conclude, this is a work in progress. Everyone that has the URL can come to the page. At this stage I've put it in a suggestion mode so you can write all over this page and we won't lose any of our information. It's totally fine. Or you could add comments, but I'd really encourage everyone to skim all the way through before they start providing commentary. Just think about it for a few days and see if it resonates or if there are things about it that really irk you.

We've taken notes today, and we'll go back trough some of those exploratory topics and clean it up. Outside of that, I would really think about each of the elements, think about the features we're

proposing, think about the story that those features tell and the capabilities that provide this. See if we're missing something, or see if we're not effectively communicating something that's valuable.

I'd really encourage us all to put our heads together on that, because over the next week I'm going to rely heavily on the designers to take what we have and to start concepting around those things. We don't have that much time left. It's not that we can't continue to do work with them over the coming weeks and finalize some of these products.

ARIEL LIANG: I echo Steve. Please take a detailed look of what's been written under each section. The basic structure we did was for each section we wrote the intent, which is an overview of what the session is serving and what our goals are for these sections to achieve. The major features for consideration is the second part of each section. It's how we think this page will look in our mind and what the elements are and how those elements work, in a way.

These are our ideas and we definitely want feedback from all of you and to see whether these are feasible or whether we need to include other content there as well. Please take a look at the document in detail. I will follow up with each of you to get your feedback. Steve, do you want to talk about the schedule for next week? Maybe on the next call that we have with the vendor?

STEVE ALLISON: I think we need a little more time. I'll be out of the office tomorrow and on Monday, so my next touch-point with them will be next

Tuesday. I'm hoping they've made some concrete next steps on some of these concepts – at least some of the easier concepts – so that we can all start actually looking at all of the stuff that we're at least talking about. I'll touch base with them and get next steps with them, but maybe early next week we can prep the group with some more concrete expectations.

ARIEL LIANG: Any more questions? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Steve, should we wait for you to update that document that's online before we give it another read? I note for example that at the beginning of the call Heidi had mentioned that "Our Cause" was not the right term for it and that hasn't been updated. I know you've made notes and so on. Shall we wait until you've made notes and then you can give us a green light taking a new look at it?

STEVE ALLISON: That seems reasonable. Ariel, what's your schedule like for today and tomorrow?

ARIEL LIANG: I have availability for the rest of the day. Tomorrow we have two calls for Olivier and I think Dev for one call. Tomorrow's not a very busy day, but I only see my calendar…

STEVE ALLISON: Ariel and I will get together. We'll do our best to do as much cleanup as we can over the next day or so. Then we'll send out a communication to all the stakeholders and let them know when it's in a state good enough. There may be some stuff in there that's not quite right still, and that's okay. We'll do the best we can with the time we have this week. Expect an email either later this evening or later on Friday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I know Gisella's put a note in there that I'm going to be traveling next week. I've just sent out a note to try and obtain a mobile phone over in the place where I'm going to be, or at least a local SIM card. We might be able to do. We might be able to do a call at the end of next week, but you just mentioned that you're going to be out of the office for a few days as well, so maybe a call next week would be premature?

STEVE ALLISON: It would be nice for us to at least schedule maybe a Friday call. Maybe it's a short call, but just to introduce to you guys, hopefully by then we've made some strides on some of the designs. There's a coupe of things that we need to start thinking about in addition to those designs. I want to bring in the designers to start talking through, stylistically, some of the elements that we want to put in place. There's a need for us to continue to have the weekly call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What I'll do is send Gisella what I know of my schedule at the moment and where I'll be. Hopefully we'll be able to find some slots for us to speak.

STEVE ALLISON: Okay. I'll also coordinate with our vendors because I'd like to bring them in for some of those style guides and to introduce some of the wire framing. I'll at least let them know that it's something that we need to do next week, and then it may be early next week that we coordinate everything.

ARIEL LIANG: In the meantime, please feel free to use the commenting function on this Google Doc and put your thoughts in the detailed write up of each section. I will work together with Steve in cleaning up this document and in the meantime we'll refer to your comments too. Please feel free to start now. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you Ariel.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Steve and Ariel. Excellent job. Thank you everybody for being on the call for so long. I know it's a big chunk out of your day, but it's really valuable. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]