

---

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the At-Large Social Media Working Group call on Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> of October, 2014, at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Jahangir Hossain, Leon Sanchez, Sarah Kiden, and Evan Leibovitch. Just joining us now is Pavan Budhrani.

We have apologies from Seun Ojedeji.

From staff, we have Ariel Liang; and myself, Terri Agnew.

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

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Terri. Thank, everybody, for coming onto this call on relatively short notice and just before the very busy calendar, before an CANN meeting.

On our last call, we had started to go through the various post-ATLAS II recommendations that were assigned to the Social Media Working Group, with a look at to see how it could be implemented by the ICANN Board or staff, or even by the ATLAS community. We started looking at several of them, and I'll put the link in the chat here.

So we had gone through at least four of the recommendations – I believe five of them, actually. So now we're going to look at one of the

---

*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.*

---

key ones that's for the ICANN Board, Recommendation 26. Recommendation 26 talks about the policy management process system.

And I'll just read the text for those who haven't read the Recommendation 26: "Current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable policy management process system available for use across the SOs and ACs in order to: enhance knowledge management; improve the effectiveness of all ICANN volunteer communities; improve cross-community policy-specific activity; enhance policy development metrics; facilitate multilingual engagement; create a taxonomy of policy categories; provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers."

Now, this was tasked to three working groups: this group, the Technology Taskforce, and the Capacity Building Working Group. Both the Capacity Building and the Technology Taskforce has had meetings before.

With regards to the Capacity Building, that group decided its main input will be on how enhancing knowledge management will be achieved using a policy management process system.

And with regards to the Technology Taskforce, some of the key points that were brought up were regarding the last three bullet points, "facilitate multilingual engagement; create a taxonomy of policy categories; and provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers."

---

What I want to do is open the floor for comments and suggestions as how the Social Media Working Group can help document this recommendation more fully for the Board to understand, and how the Social Media Working Group could help in the implementation or monitoring of this recommendation.

The floor is open now for any comments or questions.

Okay, well, let me just add a few more words about this. Some of these recommendations, especially the ones for the ICANN Board – those are the ones that are shaded in yellow – are going to be discussed with the ICANN Board. As I said on the last Social Media Working Group call, what the ICANN Board has said is that while we appreciate the ATLAS II declaration and its various recommendations, there were questions or concerns as to what specificity of these recommendations and what do you want the ICANN Board to do regarding these recommendations.

So our task here today is not so much to try to develop the policy management process system. I mean, if we could have done it in a short time then we probably would have done this years ago. But this [inaudible] document – well, we have an existing policy management system. We have a Wiki page that is maintained by Ariel Liang, the policy coordinator from ICANN staff, whenever there is a policy up for public comment.

Let me put it this way. Do you think that the current policy management system works well in terms of social media, and that it's easily shareable?

I see also on the chat that Glenn has also joined the call. Welcome.

---

Well, I hope people are hearing me. So let me just continue elaborating a little bit more on the previous point. “Improve the effectiveness of all ICANN volunteer communities” was one of the ideas for the policy management process system. Now, if you look at how to improve the effectiveness of the volunteer communities, I think one of the concerns that was brought up by the Thematic Group 5 was that right now, the policy management system is kind of like a flood of e-mails when it comes to policies coming in.

So what happens is that a policy is announced, it’s not very clear from the policy whether it’s geared toward a particular interest or person in At-Large. So a person – it tends after a while to be deluged with all these public comments coming in. It’s kind of like, “Well, this is a fast-moving river. I don’t want to step into it.”

If they had a particular interest, what could happen is that the policies could be tagged with a taxonomy. So if you are only interested in seeing IDNs, for example, Internationalized Domain Names, you could subscribe to this policy management process system and see only by key interest are IDNs and new gTLDs, and anything related to that, those public comments would get more attention or a higher [look].

What I think could happen is that if you have tied this to some media [inaudible] to this system, you could then receive a tweet on this policy out for comment, either on Twitter or Facebook or so forth.

So, that’s one idea I’ve had for the idea for the ideas for how the Social Media Working Group could make a contribution in terms of its monitoring, ensuring that, when the taxonomy is created and people

---

are subscribed, they could subscribe for the social media accounts and therefore receive updates to their social media accounts. And then the item would be there, they can then re-share that immediately to their followers in order to gain wider interest in this policy that is up for public comment.

So, I've now talked for quite a bit. Any thoughts or comments on this so far?

ARIEL LIANG:

Just to add on to what Dev just said, I can talk to you about what I did so far on Twitter about policy and about public comment request. So when the first draft is uploaded, I will usually tweet and I'm asking people to comment on that. Then when the final draft is ratified, I will also tweet it so that some people may archive that tweet and archive the location of that final draft.

I have seen people interacting with this type of tweet, but it's usually the same person or same people doing that. Definitely there's some space for improvement. And also, regarding a recent public comment request, I usually sent announcements through ALAC Announce, just to say the At-Large workspace is open for this public comment request.

For the recent one, I added one sentence saying, "If you're interested to become a penholder, please contact staff." As a result, I actually received three people then requesting to be the penholder.

I think if this is a good way to encourage more volunteers to hold the pen drafting ALAC statements, we can probably use that Twitter just to

---

solicit more penholders so people will know they can actually be a penholder even though they are not ALAC members. So, I think that's one way to improve that process.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks for this, because I guess this is the immediate question for you. All this type of posting to the social media is done completely manually. For you, you have to manually copy and paste information from the Wiki and so forth, correct?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, we don't have auto-posting right now. And I don't suggest we have auto-posting, because I don't think it's effective to use the same format and wording for every tweet about different public comment requests. We just have to vary the way to say it, and hopefully we'll have more interaction from our audience. So I manually tweet them.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I suppose it's more time to actually compose a tweet, try to post about this public comment in an interesting way. On the flip side, if you automate it, the danger is that it becomes repetitive, like "public comments [such and such] URL," it then becomes, I guess, potentially monotonous after, again, the flood of public comments that keep happening over time.

What do other people think about that? Do you think that the policy management process system needs to be automated by some method

---

of automation, or should it be handled manually for At-Large social media?

One thing I'm also thinking is that perhaps what can happen to policy management process system, when people are viewing the policies in the system, they could have shareable links, social media sharing links, so that they themselves can tweet about this particular page.

This is how all these websites and so forth, they have a sharing button where they can share to their own social media channels. So perhaps our policy management process system should have that type of sharing function as part of the website, so that they themselves can share and leave a comment on it directly. Like, "This is a good thing," "This is a bad thing," or, "People need to read this carefully," what have you.

Any comments or thoughts?

Glenn, go ahead. You have the floor.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Hi. I think the manual system works well, especially if one puts substance or relevance of the picture, of the post, that it connects to a paper or it connects to some kind of value-added statement. And that's the value of a social media editor is that they're putting in relevance.

I follow a number of people on Twitter, and the best group of people that I've seen are actual journalists. They've done a really good job at putting, in a very short number of words, I guess you would call it a pithy statement to go with the observation. So that's a whole skill set.

---

I think we need to probably show some examples of really good – and we’re not talking people saying, “Hey, I’m having a coffee, look at me,” or, “I’m walking to work, look at me.” Not a selfie-type thing, but really intelligent dialogue. Back to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I see Pavan is also saying that doing it manually works better since it adds credibility, and if it’s automated, people will sense it and feel it’s just news from elsewhere.

So, okay. All right. These are good comments. Any other comments from anyone else? Okay, I’m seeing Leon typing something. Feel free to take the floor, Leon, if you wish.

LEON SANCHEZ: Hi, can you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, we can hear you, Leon. Go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: I was wondering if there’s a chance that we can share the [inaudible] account between some members of this group so we can take turns in tweeting, and that way we can just share the burden with Ariel of giving the maintenance to the account. Maybe we can try that. That way, we can help the staff also in managing the account. What do you think?



---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, I think that is an interesting question to ponder. I'm not sure if it's falling under the policy management process system. Go ahead, Ariel. Do you want to respond to that? Go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Leon, for the suggestion. Actually, I think it's doable if we have a plan, how to do this sharing, tweeting, this type of mechanism. For example, if we can plan out some tweets ahead of time – for example, for the Recommendation 26, the last bullet is “provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers.” What if we have a series of tweets just to talk about policy development in At-Large and now we develop that content via a series of really short tweets with links that give readers more information to discover different aspects of policy development.

And then we have a community member, for example, to do that series of tweets. Now we schedule a time to tweet this series of tweets out and with a defined hashtags. For example, #ICANNpolicy, or #ALACpolicy. Then I think it's a way to share the burden, and in the same time, I think it's a meaningful way to tweet those contents together in a series. I think that's probably one way to do it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Ariel. Just reading what people are also posted in chat. So Leon is [inaudible]. To answer Evan's question, what we're discussing is how policy management process system, as part of Recommendation 26, should it be automated to auto-tweet or auto-share information whenever there's a policy out for public comment, or when there are

---

certain milestones in the policy development process – like first draft posted, ALAC vote starting, ALAC vote ratified, and so forth.

But the consensus so far seems to be from this group seems to be saying that's not a good idea, it needs to be curated manually, if it's automated it becomes repetitive, etc.

Leon is also saying that having more persons involved in tweeting this information regarding a policy – Ariel cited the policy development history – and again, that recommendation also comes back down to a person really has to be in the know as to the history behind a policy whenever a policy is presented for comment.

There is a short background. And mind you, I have noticed in recent policy discussions that are posted for public comment, there is a background included in the document, which gives a little bit more background as to what has happened regarding this issue before.

The thing is that this is not easily accessible. Like if somebody wants to search the history behind WHOIS, new gTLDs, IDNs, it's not easily accessible.

So, going back to the social media aspect, if more persons were involved in the social media sharing function of this policy management process system, it could help curate the tweets pointing to history, policy development history, improve the multilingualism of this so that persons that speak other languages can really effectively create a tweet that is easily shareable or more easily understood, and therefore hopefully more shareable amongst those different language communities or different culture communities.

---

Sarah, so sorry about that. Please go ahead. Sarah, you might be muted. If you're on the phone bridge, you press \*7 to unmute. If you need to connect to the Adobe Connect, you have to activate your mic. Okay, Sarah, you can go ahead and type that in the chat, then. Thanks, Sarah. Looking forward to hearing that contribution or question. Any other comments or questions while Sarah is typing?

All right. One other aspect regarding the taxonomy, and Ariel [inaudible] on it, regarding the taxonomy of policy categories, perhaps the taxonomy itself could be used as hashtags. Say is a policy has a taxonomy of IDN, for example, or it could also consider – I think the social media group would help very much in the taxonomy because that taxonomy can be a potential source of hashtags, no?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Dev. I think that would be a good idea, with the taxonomy as a hashtag.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSING:

Sarah has just typed out a comment. Thanks, Ariel. Sarah just [inaudible] is that she wanted to comment about Leon's suggestion. If we agree to have more people to manage the Twitter account, there should be some sort of moderation.

Sarah, that's an interesting point. I suppose, then, what we can do is that's part of what the Social Media Working Group can work on is how do we make that sort of system where there is some sort of moderation. Maybe what it is is that, like how it works for ATLAS II, we

---

funnel the information to Ariel in terms of the curated text, pictures, and so forth. It made it easier for Ariel to then just take that and re-post, rather than Ariel herself having to actually trying to curate the information on her own. I think that's probably how that process of moderation that could occur.

Okay. So I think two areas where Social Media Working Group could write some comments onto this so far. The Social Media Working Group could help with the taxonomy of policy categories, and in some ways to try to make sure the taxonomy is not too long. Maybe suggest other words that may make more sense to a wider public audience.

For example, although many people within ICANN know about IDNs, it's quite possible that maybe we need another word for it. For example, multilingualism or something like that. I'm just speaking off the top of my head. So, making those taxonomy more accessible to those persons not heavily involved within ICANN. So that's one aspect.

Second aspect – and I guess this is not part of the policy management process system per se, but that the ICANN body needs to – I'm trying to think of how to word this. The ICANN Board needs to help staff needed to help manage the sharing of policies via social media.

Perhaps that is the key recommendation that we want to get the Board to look at, and that social media is an important component in today's Internet, and the policy management process system needs to help make the sharing of this information much more better.

---

Comments on the wording of those two points? Agree, disagree? Okay, sorry, Glenn, go ahead. I didn't your hand raised there. You may be muted, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi, Dev. Sorry about that. Can you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, we can hear you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I don't know what that was. Yeah, many of us were on another call and I do apologize. Can you please tell me which item we're looking at in terms of the ATLAS II recommendation?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sure. We are looking at Recommendation 26. This is regarding the policy management process system that ICANN should – one of the recommendations that ICANN should implement this workable policy management process. What can the Social Media Working Group do in the help of implementing, or in regards to giving particular advice or clarity for the ICANN Board to help with the implementation of this recommendation?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you so much. I've already given comment on this item from a Technical Taskforce perspective, but I recall that Garth has been

---

advocating for this kind of system for about a year, and it's unfortunate he's not able to be on this call. But I think he's got some valuable insights on how to implement a system from also a social media point of view, but unfortunately he's not on the call and I cannot add what he suggests. But perhaps we should follow up with him as well.

DEV ANANG TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Indeed, I hope Garth can get involved in either one of these working groups, either Social Media or Technology Taskforce, to talk more about it maybe a NARALO call, or he could send it by e-mail, some of his thoughts regarding this, Glenn. So if you want you could [inaudible] with him, and of course all contributions are welcome on this.

Okay. Any other quick thoughts regarding the two outcomes for Social Media Working Group? Is there another aspect, when you read the recommendation?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dev. So just to go back to the point that Leon raised about more people help manage or develop content for the At-Large Twitter handle, I think if we want to further explore that aspect, recently Olivier helped with the Ukraine [IGF] just by tweeting and mentioning the handle of the At-Large account. Then I quickly got that notification and I was able to re-tweet it. Or, I used the content he tweeted and I revised it a little bit and now I retweet. So I think it's a pretty good mechanism for doing that.

---

Recently I've been retweeting quite a little bit from other people's handles, too, when they mention At-Large. So maybe that can be a way to share the burden among community members. If you can mention our handle's name with your own tweet, I will either re-tweet it or I will edit and re-tweet. So that would be a quick way of doing that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Thanks. I agree. I think that would be a very good start. It's what happened during the ATLAS II summit, I think it worked very well. We used that [inaudible] to send you information. Once we include the ICANN At-Large or mention ICANN's At-Large Twitter handle, you could then pick it up and then re-share it quickly, far more effectively than you manually typing it out and trying to find a photo and so on, all on your own. I think that [inaudible] keywords would be [inaudible] hashtags.

Does anybody have any comments on how the wording of the recommendations Social Media Group could help generate and help develop the taxonomy of the policy categories? Make sure the taxonomy is more accessible to newcomers, curious outsiders. Two, ICANN Board needs to make the policy management process system more – I'm trying to figure out better wording here. Perhaps other persons can help come up with a suggested way.

ICANN Board needs to help make the process management process system more social media accessible. That's probably a very poor wording. I think if we want to say that the policy management process system does not lend itself to easy social media sharing of information, and this policy management process system has to be designed to make

---

that goal of making the content more easily shareable a priority. How does that wording sound?

Okay. I think that could work. Any thoughts or comments? Going once, going twice. Okay.

This was probably the key recommendation to discuss. The other two recommendations we can discuss on another call, since it's related to ones that are highlighted in yellow, that are the ones that are going to be discussed with the ICANN Board I believe is on the next Tuesday actually, I believe.

Since we have more time on it, let me just throw out a question regarding this policy management process system. Do you think that what we need to make this thing work, and I guess [inaudible] implementation phase, maybe they should have a social media account for all of the different taxonomies. So you have ICANN policy, IDN, ICANN policy, and then what happens is that when at least that kind of system where social media [inaudible] taxonomies kind of automated – at least that part of the automation can occur to at least alert milestones achieved in the policy management process. Just throwing it out there as thinking out of the box. Any thoughts? Okay.

Like I said, that's just an aspect, just something to think about. I always like to delve into the minutiae of how these things work, as an engineer. So that's just an idea that I was thinking of, just hearing [inaudible] discussions.

I'm not seeing any more comments here, so I think we could then move on to the next agenda item and that's regarding the co-chair for the



---

Social Media Working Group. As you know, my term on the ALAC ends after the LA meeting. And, given that I've been also co-chair of also several working groups, I think it's important that in order to allow for each of the working groups to be more manageable, I think that a co-chair is needed for the Social Media Working Group.

I think also it's important that if there's any work that needs to be presented at a public face-to-face meeting, I think it's important that somebody who is able to attend those face-to-face meetings should be made a co-chair so they could chair such a face-to-face meeting. So I do want to suggest that we have a co-chair for the Social Media Working Group.

I'm going to suggest, and I hope people will agree, I would like Leon Sanchez to be co-chair of this working group. Leon is a phenomenal user of social media, and I think also because he has been a very [inaudible] user of social media, he has the expertise on how social media works. I think his insights, and especially also in terms of multilingualism in terms of Spanish and English, there can be more presence in our Social Media Working Group in how to engage other communities.

I see a comment from Olivier, and I'll get back with that. I'm going so suggest that Leon Sanchez could be the co-chair of this working group. Can I see green ticks regarding this, or any comments [on these other points]? Going once, going twice, going thrice. Okay.

Leon, any thoughts [inaudible] to say a few words?

---

LEON SANCHEZ: If the group decides and agrees to have a co-chair, I would be more than glad to co-chair this group. I consider it a big honor to serve the community in this working group. So yes, if it's approved, I would be more than happy to take the responsibility. Thank you for suggesting me as a co-chair, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Leon. I think we need to [inaudible] to share the workload and have organized the work of the various working groups. Thanks so much for that, for accepting. I'm seeing no objections from anyone on that. I'm not seeing any Red Cross marks or anyone raising their hands. If there's any consensus on this call for that. Great. Excellent.

So that agenda item for the co-chair for Social Media Working Group has been done. Let's go back to – I see Olivier had disconnected and he's asking a question: "What are the action items for agenda item number two?"

Regarding the Recommendation 26, I don't have the text, unfortunately. I'm not seeing the text on the screen now. I can reload it back. There are two aspects on which the Social Media Working Group will be working to implement Recommendation 26. Two parts. One, the Social Media Working Group will help design [and] generate the taxonomy of the policy categories and make sure the taxonomy are more accessible to newcomers or [curious] outsiders.

Two, the Social Media Working Group will make the recommendation that this policy management process system – the ICANN Board needs to make this policy development process more easily shareable via

---

social media. That's what the policy management process system needs to be designed with that in mind.

So those were the two key points on this Recommendation 26. Do you think that is sufficient, Olivier, or you have a comment or question on that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Dev. I just have concerns that we're meeting with the Board next week and we need to provide them with an update on what we're doing. I don't know who is going to be drafting this update, whether each one of the working groups will draft the update and the follow-up ATLAS II implementation team will be presenting this to the Board, or whether there are other ways to do this.

It's clear that we're not going to have completed recommendations, so the update [path] needs to be the one that we can [inaudible] forward with. But I'm just concerned, now, that we have all these working groups. I had asked on a recent call that we would have an action item to have all the chairs of all of these working groups speaking before coming to Los Angeles, and I don't know where that is. So we basically have no deliverables at the moment. This is a concern.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Olivier. I agree. I do recall that action item that came out of a call, I think it was on Friday. I think it was the Accessibility Working Group call on Friday. I believe that was an action item taken. I have not seen any Doodle or anything of that sort. I do agree that perhaps that

---

needs to happen before LA. Our time is running out. I suppose staff will get back to us on that.

Going back to the Recommendation 26, how long is this – just a time frame, Olivier – how long is this Board meeting happening with the ICANN Board meeting, with the ALAC ATLAS II Implementation Working Group? That’s only going to be an hour. Am I correct? Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Dev. This is just going to be an hour, indeed. It’s going to be the meeting of the Board with the ALAC, and it’s just one of the topics. It’s on Tuesday from 8:30 until 9:30 a.m. And the first part of the discussion is discussion on the ATLAS II recommendations and observations, and the second one is the Board of ICANN believes that ICANN itself, the institution, is a stakeholder in the IANA Stewardship transition proceedings and the accountability process.

I believe that the answer to agenda item number two will take all of one minute, which will involve either a yes or a no in the answer, which means that we have 59 minutes with the Board to discuss the ATLAS II recommendations and observations. And we really need to have something for the Board, to present to the Board by then. Otherwise, we’re just wasting the time with them.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. We do have ten minutes, so we can discuss this more. As I recall, the Capacity Building Working Group will be trying to come up with something to discuss. Because I think the consensus was obviously we

---

can't showcase a design for this workable policy management process system, because that requires a lot more time to do.

But I think what we are going to do is point out the shortcomings of our existing policy management process system, the inefficiencies of it, and therefore these aspects of [inaudible] multilingual engagement, taxonomy [inaudible] etc. etc. etc. – these points shows us that this is not happening at all with the existing system. I believe that was the outcomes coming from the Technology Taskforce call and the Capacity Building call last week.

So I know there does need to be some work to be done to flesh it out, I agree. And I know the clock is ticking. I think that there will be support for this. Point out the shortcomings of the existing system, and these points that we are saying of an effective policy management process system – to enhance knowledge management, improve effectiveness, improve cross-community policy specific activity – all of these things need to be pointed out as this is not happening now with our existing system.

I will try to work on the document myself. I think we need to create one single page for this Recommendation 26. I believe the Technology Taskforce has done this already, and I'll find the link and share it with all the groups. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Dev. I would recommend that we perhaps just formulate what we are planning to do on this. It doesn't need to be very long, but I think that we – tell me if I'm wrong – but I think that we are

---

okay with moving forward with designing the knowledge management system and proceeding forward with putting together a list of requisites for this and seeing what the Board tells us on that.

Of course, one of the questions they will ask is whether we've asked any of our supporting organizations or advisory committees on these things, and I think the response will be as simple as saying that everyone else is already busy doing other things. So the ALAC does what it has always done, which is to look forward and do things whilst everyone is just dealing with a single topic.

That probably is the way forward. One bit of feedback that I have been given with regards to Ashwin Rangan, he is the Chief Information and Innovation Officer, but what I have been told, though, is that he would have very little to do with a knowledge management system. Not a knowledge management person at ICANN. Question as to who is going to be dealing with this knowledge management, it seems that there is no answer to that for the time being. But at least we can speak to him and let him know that this is coming up, and we will formulate a formal request on this topic.

I think that's what kind of feedback we can provide or follow-up we can provide to the Board, and engage in a discussion based on this. We might have questions already from the Board as to what do we mean by this. And as long as we're all clear on what we mean, and I think you might be asked, or I might point at you and say, "Well, expand a little bit on this." And as long as we're prepared for this, we can get by and let the Board know that this is not a recommendation that we're just letting drop.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry, I didn't quite catch that last sentence that we do want to let the ICANN Board – we cannot [inaudible]. Can you repeat that last sentence?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. I was just saying that this particular recommendation is something which we are going to tell the Board that we are following up with. And you might be asked to provide a few more details. I might call upon you during that meeting so as to let the Board know where we're going on this, so that it's not something that we're going to drop as such.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I get you. Yes. Point taken. Glenn? I note the time is ticking here, because know there is another meeting at the top of the hour. Go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Can you hear me okay?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, Glenn, we can hear you. Go ahead.

---

GLENN MCKNIGHT: This is a really, really big issue and you can extensively answer this. You do not have the [inaudible] to get into this kind of detail on how it works, what it costs. The who, what, where, and how on the knowledge system, would take you a lifetime. We need to keep it brief. We don't have the [inaudible], we don't have the time to provide the full details that are probably required. I think we suggested a good idea. I think we shouldn't sweat the small stuff. That's it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Thanks, Glenn. Any other business? I know that ICANN L.A. meeting is happening beginning this week, Saturday. I'm just wondering if there's any particular aspects of the social media plan that we need to implement. Ariel, do you have any thoughts or comments on this?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dev. For ICANN 51, we're going to do similar things like what we did in the ATLAS II. We will have the live tweeting for each At-Large session. I will need all of you to help me with that in a similar fashion. For example, when I start you on our group chat asking for pictures, you guys can take a picture and then send it over to Slack or send an e-mail to me. So we will implement the same way of doing that. I will tweet the text content, and the thing I need help is [inaudible] pictures. So pretty much that's the extent of tweeting.

And then if you want to tweet on your own, you can mention the At-Large handle, and I will have that handle be monitored. So whenever you tweet something with the handle, I can quickly re-tweet or edit and re-tweet. We will do that for ICANN 51. I just want to make sure you



---

guys are all clear about what is expected and understand our mechanism of doing that. So it's still going to be the same with the ATLAS II.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Ariel. So we will be using the same system as ATLAS II, using Slack for the members of this working group to send the messages to you, and then you can then take that messages quickly and re-share it. Actually I'm thinking even for those persons who are not going to be there in person, given the Adobe Connect sessions now have a much better cameras, and the camera is focusing on the speakers as they speak, screen captures can be done from that [inaudible] to say such-and-such making a point about whatever person is speaking about.

That can happen. We'll probably have to then create different channels for this thing to work. I need to now modify update these channels, and I guess that is something you and I could work on, Ariel, as an action item. Is that okay?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. I'm actually creating it right now.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, very well. Glenn, I know that you had concerns about the cameras not being used probably. And I agree it hasn't been used properly in the past at all. But I think the attentions, especially from the London meeting, and I think especially after the NETmundial with how the

---

remote hubs worked and the big emphasis on the remote hubs, also providing two-way video of certain sessions.

I noticed at the London meeting, the staff had cameras, at least two cameras for each of the ALAC sessions, and were able to pan and zoom to speakers on either the front or the side of the tables. I noted that improvement at the London meeting. So I now it wasn't happening before in previous past meetings, but I think ICANN does seem to have a better sense of it now since London. I think it's going to continue for this and other future face-to-face meetings.

I think that's about it. We're just about running about time. I know some persons are going to try to join this other conference call. Again, thanks for attending this call. Obviously we'll have the Skype chat and of course the Slack system in place just so that you can continue the conversation online.

On behalf of myself and now thanks also to Leon, again, for accepting the co-chair, this call is now adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**