
GISELLA GRUBER: Website Revamp Task Force call on Monday, the 23rd of November, at 1900 UTC. On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Olivier Crepin-Leblond. We have apologies noted from Ali AlMeshal. From Staff, we have Ariel Liang, Laura Bengford, Jeff Salem; and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could also just remind everyone to please state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, and over to you, Ariel.

HEIDI ULLRICH: People, I'm here as well, Heidi.

GISELLA GRUBER: Apologies, Heidi. Noted.

ARIEL LIANG: Hello, everyone. Today, for our call, we have a really short agenda, but we do have a big session for discussion. First we will talk about the ALAC page that we're in the process of developing. That will be only five minutes. Next Laura will give you a brief update about the current tasks that we're doing in terms of company migration. We're building a new functionality called [ARS] application tracking. So we will give you that update.

And the majority of this call, we're going to dive into the mock-up of the Get Involved page, which is the page that's most challenging for us to

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.

create. Jeff will lead the discussion on that. And that's pretty much it for today's call and thank you very much, again, for your time participating.

I'm going to share my screen, and walk you through the ALAC page. We haven't completely finished developing this page. That's why it's not in the new atlarge.icann.org. But you can at least see what it's like. Right now, we are placing this page under community, and if you'll click the drop-down, there's ALAC in this menu. And under [inaudible] the page. Right now, it's just HTML. The links are not working yet, and we're in the process of building the admin function of it, so that we can change the content. But now you can see what it looks like from the public [facing] site. It's very similar to the real page, where we'll have brief description of what ALAC is, and what it does, and a link how to a specific page for visitors to read more.

And then on the left, we have some key resources. At the first, we will have some links, and the link helps you a particular part of ALAC, like the Leadership Team, General Member [inaudible], a Liaison page, and former ALAC. We haven't figured out exactly how to organize the information, but this [part] will just kind of link up to people's profiles.

Next, we'll have the organizing documents that are very similar to the RALO page. Right now we have put the organizing documents in the wiki, so that will link up to the wiki pages. But it's a possibility we can move them over to the website.

The next section is about meetings and events. It will link up to the wiki page as well, to upload the monthly teleconferences, and also the

teleconferences of ALT and now we want to make this as a gateway to those pages.

Of course, policy [advice] development is a big part of the work of the ALAC, and we will use this space to link to the policy pages on this new website for people to research and read the past [advice] statements.

And we also have some other kind of hot links, such as the capacity building webinars, and the At-Large summits pages. We also have reports the liaisons and working groups share. We think maybe this is also a page we can link up to. That's the left side.

On the right side, we will feature the ALAC members and liaisons. Now we have three. These are the chairs, the vice chair. The picture will be updated, of course. And there will be a link called Explore Profiles, and once the visitor clicks it, it will take them to a page that lists all of the ALAC members and liaisons.

That will be kind of similar to another page I will show you. It's like the ICANN Board of Directors. There's one page on the ICANN website, looks like that. We may do something similar for the ALAC members and liaisons.

After that will be a featured section that the admin can put text, photo, a link, and feature one particular thing in ALAC, an event or some other activity.

Below that, there's "What's New?" That's also similar to RALO that we'll pull from the Google Calendar for the upcoming calls. Also we'll pull content from the policy page about the public comment that the ALAC

is working on. So these are automated. And then, of course, some news items as well.

I saw.. Nobody raised hands earlier? I didn't take note. Any questions or comments about the ALAC page so far?

ALAN GREENBERG: Only that the photo should have more head and less body.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Understood. We also were thinking about another way to show the profile in a more concise way. This is the policy page of ICANN, and that shows the policy department. And that's how we're showing the staff profile in this manner. Maybe we can do that too. This an option we're considering, to [inaudible] more head than the body.

Any other comments?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the board format is pretty good.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, understood. Thanks, Alan. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Ariel. On the policy page that you briefly showed us, there was some noting of the country for some people, and for others, there was no noting of the country. Is there a plan to be noting country

locations for At-Large, or are we going to remain without countries listed? For example, Bart Boswinkel is obviously from no country at all. He's from another planet. He's not listed as being from a country. David Olive is not listed [inaudible] either.

ALAN GREENBERG: We try not to say that, in public, though.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a joke. Some are listed. Some are not. So the question is not actually with regards to the staff, but with regards to At-Large, is there an interest in listing the countries?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. We'll do whatever you prefer. So we'll have the country listed then. Also, back to the policy page, this is the link to the ICANN profile, and I think only Olivier has the ICANN profile among the people in this community. Alan, I don't think you have one. Dave, I'm not sure that you have one. If you have one, you can integrate better.

Okay. I guess we are good for this section. Laura, do you want to give a quick update on other progress? Other things we have been working on?

LAURA BENGFORD:

Yeah, sure. Hi, Ariel. Thank you. Hi everyone. I just wanted to give a quick five-minute update on some of our other areas of progress. We are very much focused on the content migration, and making sure we have all of the pages on the existing At-Large website moved over to the new website so we don't lose or forget anything.

Most of the content, in going through the full review, is represented on the new website that we have here. There are some exceptions. What Ariel and I are focused on right now is making sure that we crawl across the website from the front end, and making sure that we have filed places, or are planning places to put that content and move it over.

We're in the process of putting together a generic basic template that we'll use to migrate those single pages over. Then as a second check, just to make sure we're not going to lose anything, we've had the web technical team run a crawl for us with a list of all the links. What we will be doing, as we normally do with cutting over to websites is making sure that we have a strategy to redirect pages to their new home on the website, in case people have bookmarked, and doing a little bit of due diligence around that.

That's a very short update. It is a lot of work, and we're already finding a few areas that even on the existing At-Large website that aren't going anywhere. We found some examples of links out to the old wiki social text, which existed before the current version of the wiki. We think we've found where those links are, and we're going to try to correct as much of that as possible on the new website.

The second thing that we're very active – and this is also in the category of contents that is on the existing At-Large website that we need to move over. There is an At-Large structure application form, as well as a tracking process of the status of that application, and where they are in the process. We've taken a look at that process, and reached out to Nathalie from ICANN At-Large staff who works with that process, and we're looking at some good improvements there. As Ariel is showing, we have this page here where you can select the region, the status, and look at any of the ALS applications that have been submitted and what their current status is.

What we've found in looking at this process is that today what happens is a form is filled out to become an At-Large structure. This form results in an e-mail to At-Large staff. At-Large staff takes the data that was submitted in the application via e-mail, cuts and pastes it into a Word document, spends about an hour formatting it, and then posts it through our web admin for it to appear on the page. Anytime a status is changed, another request to web admin is made to update the status so it appears correctly here on this page.

What we are proposing to do is a much more streamlined process that will make it much easier and eliminate a lot of those manual steps. What we're going to do and what we've done in other places on the ICANN website, for example, is a form can automatically be submitted, saved to a database, with a light admin capability to update the status. That way we've eliminated the manual process of formatting text that comes in rather raw into a Word document and sending it over to web admin.

In a nutshell, what we're looking to do is create that same form with the exception of the data that, once submitted, it will be saved to the database. We can immediately have that information of that pending application, if we wish, available to show on the existing At-Large page. Maybe, Ariel, you want to pull that up real quickly.

Our idea is that we can go ahead and save the submission in the database, and At-Large staff can make a determination and update that status. We could show at the bottom, or somehow visually, that an ALS application that is pending has been submitted because the process might take about three months, from what we understand, for the application to get accredited and approved. It would give us the benefit of seeing right on this same very page that we already have designed for ALSes those applications that are pending without having to create a separate page and integrating the two.

That is our idea and our proposal for improving this area of content on the existing At-Large website. That was a really quick explanation, and we'll have more to show on that. But that's kind of the idea and the recommendation that we're proposing. Yes. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. You've heard some of these words from me before, but now that you've looked at the existing website, they may have some meaning. It is absolutely mandatory that all of the lists, selections, pictorials that relate to ALSes be drawn from the same database. Now, that database may have to be moved by hand from one place to

another, or reformatted, but the source information must come from one place.

If you go back to the previous list, the one where you could do database queries onto the one we showed before that... That's the one. Stop now. You'll note a couple of things on that list. There are ALSes in various different states. We would not want an ALS that is in the process of being accredited to be listed as an ALS. Moreover, you will find on this list ALSes that have been de-accredited. That particular list is an exhaustive one. Now whether we need that exhaustive list or not is an interesting question. But just pointing out that list is an exhaustive one, number one. Number two, an awful lot of the information on that list is wrong because it is populated by hand right now. And although you said every time something happens, a change is propagated, not so. And typos are made when those changes are propagated, and so on and so forth.

So there's lots and lots of errors in it, but one of the important things is that is an exhaustive list which is not what we would want to show as current ALSes, although from a staff or management point of view, we may want to access those other ones. But they shouldn't be necessarily something that are showing as official ALSes.

Now, the chart that we are showing in the middle pod right now does include ALSes that are in a state of formation, and does include ones who have been de-accredited. It's not 100% clear to me we need to show those on the web, although clearly we need records that reflect that.

So, as we go forward, yes, I strongly support everything. It has to come from one place. Now that doesn't mean it dynamically comes from that place. There may be times where you copy the data over once a week, once a day, once a month, depending on whatever's appropriate. But it's really important that the information we show is actually accurate and correct. Thank you.

LAURA BENGFORD:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. Appreciate that comment. That was what we were thinking also in terms of having it in one database. I asked Ariel to pull the dropdown here of the status because I think if I'm hearing what you're saying, and I think we agree, not all of these statuses are appropriate to even show on the website – on the page in the new website.

For example, someone was de-certified. We can add some business logic to decide which status should be shown on that ALS page, and we still would have the ability to show in the admin, or in another community facing page the other statuses.

So we need to think that through a little bit better on what the business roles are, but I think the main point of having it in one database, and coming up with the right logic to show what is right to show, and to maybe present in a different way, or not show [inaudible] information is something that would be fairly easy for us to do once we figure out a little bit more on how that might work.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Whether we would want – the default definitely should be only real ALSes that are currently certified and operational. We may also very soon have a category of suspended or something like that. I'm not sure if they should show or not. There are legal reasons why we may not want ones that are in the approval process, or for that matter, decertified to be able to be displayed at all from the website. We have bylaws that we're not following right now, which implies some confidentiality, and there are issues related to that. So we're going to have to think through it.

That doesn't alter the fact that the original source data has to come from a single place, even if we don't display all of it on the web.

LAURA BENGFORD:

Okay. Thank you, Alan. And I just wanted to note, before we go over to Olivier that we do understand that there is a taskforce working on the overall ALS criteria and process. We do understand that there are things like you pointed out, Alan, that could be changing. Okay, Olivier, I think your hand is up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much. Notwithstanding the fact that we do have to follow our own bylaws, I do like the fact that we are also very transparent in these processes. Currently, as far as At-Large structures are concerned and de-certified At-Large structures are concerned, we actually have a wiki page that shows the process, and that shows the actual decertification of these structures, and who they are, etc.

We pride ourselves on transparency, on everything to be transparent, and to [stop] having stuff that is hidden because for whatever reason it is, I don't think is correct. I think that we need to say, for the sake of transparency in showing what we've been doing, and that these have been de-certified. They are de-certified and they're listed as such. There is no log-in or anything like that on there.

As far as the various pages of certification are concerned, for the process to certify, I agree, we might not need to say precertification, and in progress, etc. have so many of these things. Certainly, as Alan was saying, we need to have a very reliable record we can appoint to. And I would also show that the ones that are not certified as an At-Large structure would also have to be there. The reason for not being certified should also be there. Some others might think differently, but I think that for transparency reasons, we need that. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Alan has his hand back. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just a comment, Olivier, there are currently rules in place that we ignore on confidentiality during the certification process. Whatever we end up with, we need to decide on what the rules are, and then actually follow our rules. I'm not going to debate whether it should be transparency, or hiding everything, but whatever the rules are, we need to follow them, ultimately. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I agree with you, Alan, but I think that the things where we break our own rules is confidentiality of the application itself. In other words, any private part of the application, the names, the contact details of people and this sort of thing. Unfortunately, the way we're doing it at the moment is to have an all-or-nothing attitude where the actual application form is sent out.

Originally it's sent out on the internal mailing list, but then when the RALOs ask their colleagues and peers, they actually send it on their public mailing list. In Europe, we've actually had one organization that was a privacy related organization that pulled out when they suddenly saw that their application had been sent out to the wider mailing list – the EURALO mailing list. We actually had to delete that from the EURALO list mailing list records archive manually, which wasn't very good.

So, yes, we are breaking the rules. I'm not sure whether it's directly website related. It could be a process-related thing as well. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, all. I think that this can be a discussion for the ALS Criteria Expectation Taskforce. So let's table this discussion, and let's move to the next about getting involved, which is the main goal for our call today. Jeff, are you able to share a screen? Yeah, you're back to the AC room. Let me make you a host, and you should be able to share a screen. And, Jeff, do you have audio.

JEFF SALEM: I'm dialed in via phone, so I should have audio. Can you hear me?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, we can hear you.

JEFF SALEM: Thank you great. I'm trying to share my screen, and it doesn't seem to be working.

ARIEL LIANG: I can share my screen. I'm just going to open a PDF mock-up if that's what you wanted to share.

JEFF SALEM: Yeah, that'd be great.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

JEFF SALEM: The first thing I want to talk about are the challenges we face in designing this page. There are two pretty significant ones that I want to bring up. We don't necessarily need to resolve them, but I just want to present what our challenges are in designing this page.

We have two versions that we're going to look at that kind of addressed the nuances of these issues. I want to preface by the fact that yes, there

are challenges with this page. These are definitely drafts that we want to consider. So we're very open to feedback. In fact, we want your feedback. I think a lot of what you're going to hear from me are probing questions for you guys to consider while you review these pages, and maybe actually even, rather than solve these problems now, you may want to take these questions home and digest them.

So the two big challenges that we have are first, in defining requirements as to what this page is trying to accomplish. The second is more about not just At-Large, but SO/ACs in general within ICANN, and the challenges that they present.

So in talking about the requirements for this page, they're basically surrounding getting involved. The big problem is that getting involved was too broadly defined. We're looking at getting involved as not just joining At-Large, but in regards to learning about At-Large, becoming a leader of At-Large, and as you'll see when you dig into this page, there's a lot of goals that we're trying to accomplish. Ariel, if you want to scroll down the page, you'll see that there's a lot going on on this page. Like I said, it's because we're trying to accomplish a little too much in the broadly defined Get Involved.

We may – and again, I want to kind of pose this as a question to you guys in looking for solutions, but we may want to reign in that definition from learning about At-Large and becoming a leader at At-Large to just joining At-Large and focusing on what that means.

A lot of the learning about At-Large is actually on other parts of the site, the About At-Large. So we may be doing ourselves a disservice by including that content on this page too.

The second challenge that I want to talk about is just the concept of joining At-Large. Like I said, this applies not just to At-Large but all the SO/ACs. It's very nebulous as to what it means to join, and the why I would join. Specifically to At-Large, there's a more complex issue in that "what is it I'm joining?" Because I can join an ALS. I can join a RALO. I can join At-Large. I'm not clear, as a user, what my avenue is. Should I be joining in ALS? Should I be joining a RALO? What is it I'm trying to accomplish?

Added to that problem is the fact that I can technically join a working group and start working within At-Large, without joining anything. So at that point, what is the benefit of joining? Why would I join At-Large when I can simply just join a working group and get cracking?

So, these are the two really broad issues, and there are challenges that we're looking at. Those being said, I think it's best to walk through our solutions here, and you'll immediately understand how those challenges come into play here.

In the first example—

ARIEL LIANG:

Sorry, Jeff. Alan has his hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let Jeff finish first.

JEFF SALEM:

You want to walk through the page then, and then we'll kind of...

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes, Jeff.

JEFF SALEM:

So, you'll see that the page is broken out into three larger chunks. First is New to At-Large, and then below that, you'll see Contributing to At-Large. Then further down the page, you'll see a section devoted to leadership opportunities within At-Large.

So, these were defined by the requirements. And like I said, we may want to revisit addressing all these three needs on a single page. But if we do it, I think this is one of our proposed solutions. That is having a section at the top of [inaudible] New to At-Large that would direct users to that other content scattered throughout the site, or potentially on ICANN.org that serves as a primer to what At-Large is and what we do, etc.

The next section is about contributing to At-Large's efforts. Here, what I want to focus on is this first purple box that we have split in two. You'll see that I'm distinguishing between what I'm calling grass roots support, versus formal policy advice development. For me, both as an ignorant user, and as an ignorant [UX] person, it's not clear to me what the

difference is between just contributing to a working group, and actually joining At-Large. So this box has kind of served as a tool to address that.

So on the left, we've got content saying, "How can I help?" It's a grassroots support about basically quickly getting involved in At-Large and diving in. Whether it's joining a meeting or joining a working group, but getting involved without necessarily joining any formal entity. And then the right-hand side expresses why you would join a formal entity. It says, "Formal policy advice development has a formal process. In order to vote on policy, you need to be a member of an ALS or RALO. And so, while this copy here is [Greeked] out, that's what I see this copy articulating, why one would join either a RALO or an ALS in order to be a part of that formal process.

Like I said, this box serves to address those two kind of disparate needs. Then following the box, we present the actual opportunities that one can jump into. Those are grouped similarly to the left and right-hand sides of that box, in that there's volunteer opportunities within At-Large that anyone can join and quickly get involved in more procedural groups, not working groups.

Then the second section here is the more formal avenue of policy advice development, where you can still join the group and potentially work on drafts, etc. But the more formal process is actually joining At-Large as an ALS or within a RALO to kind of work on that actual policy advice development.

Working further down the page, we've got leadership opportunities. I'll start by saying that what we're looking at here represents a worst-case

scenario in that it's going to contain a lot of content. The page is meant to be dynamic in that it would only present opportunities that are open.

In this case, like I said, it's a worst case scenario in that there are many leadership opportunities that are open at this fictitious state of time. So while the page has a lot of content right now, I would suspect that it wouldn't have as much content as this mock-up would and currently has.

That being said, we'll walk through the content. The first section that we have here are RALO leaders. This is meant to represent current positions that are open. For instance, we've got the AFRALO chair, the AFRALO secretariat vice chair, are all leadership opportunities that are currently open and active. So you've got the date of when a deadline for nominations is so that you can nominate someone in time. Again, this is a holistic view of all the opportunities for RALO leaders that are currently open.

Then off to the side, it's suggested – it doesn't necessarily have to stick, but there should be some sort of supplemental content here that tells you a little more about what's going on.

In this case, I've got, as an example, who's an ideal candidate, where we talk about the roles that are currently open, and exactly what that role entails to help guide users in selecting a nominee for that role.

As far as the actual mechanism here, while we do have a big button to nominate a colleague, because we are working towards the MVP here, while it would be actionable, it's essentially just a mail-to link that would open your e-mail browser and send a message directly to the

secretariat. In the future, I would suggest that this would be more actionable, and that it gives you a form to fill out to recommend somebody, or something a little more complex than that.

Like I said, for now, while these are buttons, they're just meant to be mail-to links that would send e-mails to the secretariat who normally collects these e-mails.

Moving down to the next section, we've got the At-Large Advisory Committee. Off to the right, we've got another example of supplemental information where we talk about open leadership team roles. This would be – while there's the status of being an ALAC member, there are also roles within ALAC that are represented. So this distinguishes between just joining the committee as a whole, and the specific roles within the committee. Again, this is just an example. We could fine tune this content on the right. There's another need that's more significant here.

Below that, this ALAC section. We've got the ALAC liaisons, which basically just talk about the roles of those liaisons. If you're actively recruiting, or actually, this is – I'm sorry. Liaisons are not recruited, they're appointed. Basically, this content would again stipulate that, and express to users that these roles are appointed by the committee itself.

Below that, we've got the Nominating Committee and Board of Directors, which are both outward-facing leadership groups. Again, up to the right we have boxes that talk about who an ideal candidate could be. This could be other supplemental information. It's meant to

basically expound on the roles that are being filled here, and help guide users to select a viable candidate.

So before we get to questions, I just want to quickly take a look at the second option, and talk about a couple of the differences. Then we can talk about everything as a whole.

So in the second version, the big distinction you'll see is in option A, we have that big purple box that talked about volunteering versus formal policy development, and we have those options presented side by side to help users – or I guess to clear that nebulous aspect of “what am I joining?”

In the second option, we ignore that problem, and we talk about contributing as more separated instances. So we devote the first chunk here to strictly volunteering and tell that narrative. Off to the right, you'll see that we have more regional-centric opportunities that would drive users to the RALOs to look at more specific opportunities within RALOs that may not be applicable to At-Large as a whole.

Then lower down the page we've got the formal policy advice development. Off to the side, we've got a big callout that's “How is policy made?” where we can devote a lot more content to developing that narrative and expressing what the formal process is for policy development, and again, explain why a user might want to join a formal entity within At-Large to be part of that formal process.

So that being said, I think we can open the floor to discussions about anything and everything. Both the two approaches, and the challenges that we face, etc. So, I guess we'll start with Alan, and go on from there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. There's many, many things to discuss. First of all, there are many ways to participate in At-Large. Up until very recently, the only one that we ever focused on was creating an ALS or having your group join as an ALS. That has resulted in some of the problems that we have right now because it was the only way. In fact, as your page points out, in some cases, you can join as an individual member. Not all RALOs allow currently. And, you can simply participate in work groups without being a member. And, I think we want to emphasize all of those. So, that's number one.

And, we want to try to explain the differences. It's a difference in commitment, among other things. It's a difference in whether you have a particular interest that you want to work on today, or you have a more widespread interest which is going to morph from one area to another. I think we do want to have all of those listed and identify them, and try to differentiate between them.

Next, we go on to an area of philosophy. I have some very strong views. There are some other people who differ with me completely. And, specifically, I believe that we should be setting expectations reasonably. And, on a page which is saying how you can get involved, we should not be pushing leadership positions. We should not be pushing committees or other groups where we strongly want experienced people.

Now, there are some people within At-Large who believe that everything should be open and we need new blood, and having no experience should not be an impediment. I feel very strongly that's not

the case. Yes, you need new ideas, but you don't want to dangle positions of chair of a RALO to someone who's never participated in At-Large before. It's an elected position. They're not likely to get elected. Why should we taunt people, and why should we set expectations incorrectly?

There's examples under some of the working groups you have of groups where we very much want experienced people. We want people who understand what we're trying to do. There's no point saying, "Why don't you join the CROPP group?" Well, a CROPP group is selected by other groups. You cannot campaign to be part of it. You must already be involved in the community. And there are other groups that are similar to that. Nominate someone for chair. Well, the chairs of both the ALAC and the RALOs only come open every couple of years. And, at that point, the nominations in many cases are only allowed to be made by certain people. The only people who can nominate the chair of the ALAC are ALAC members. The only people who can nominate someone for a RALO chair is someone who already belongs to the RALO.

You started your description by saying you were overreaching this too much. Part of it because some of it's not applicable at all. Now, there may well be a need for a webpage talking about leadership positions. But it's not the Get Involved page because that's not, in general, what we're looking at, certainly from my perspective. I can go into a lot more specific details, but I'll stop and let other people talk if anyone else has anything to say. Dev? Olivier?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Jeff, for this. A lot of information here, and I guess it comes back to what's the key focus of [inaudible] as you pointed out. I [inaudible] from two things. You're looking at [inaudible] persons – those who don't know anything about At-Large which is for outreach purposes, and those that already are in At-Large. Therefore, this is more for engagement – this for engagement purposes. So, I kind of wondered if [inaudible] in such a way that...okay. So, if you don't know about At-Large and you have to then explain, "Well, [inaudible] get involved, I think you have to [inaudible] make the case as to why you should care or [inaudible] what At-Large does should pique your interest.

Then, you delve into, "Okay. Here's what we are doing in terms of activities. We have working groups and [inaudible]. We can follow the activities of working groups." And, I think I agree with Alan in that we probably shouldn't emphasize the leadership roles and so forth at this point, especially for those newcomers. [inaudible] that are already At-Large [structures]. I think then he could probably focus a little bit more on the [inaudible] At-Large community opportunities and so forth. And then, perhaps, he could probably indicate [inaudible] leadership roles or positions available and so forth. But, for newcomers, I don't think it's very important.

My initial thinking is that Get Involved has to be oriented towards a target audience. And, you have to then point them into two different sections. If [inaudible] learning about At-Large if you're already in At-Large. That's my initial thought.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dev. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Ariel. I'm getting a little confused because we were seeing about the Get Involved B as being the more recent wire frame, if I understand correctly. Or, is it the A one? I thought the B, the second one. At the moment, you've zoomed on the A here. Which one is the latest one? It's the B, isn't it?

ARIEL LIANG: We're considering both.

ALAN GREENBERG: They're two options, Olivier. From my perspective, I'm looking at the title. Get Involved New to At-Large. I like that title. That's the title we need, but now we have to tailor the stuff under it to match the title. That's in my mind.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. I am less concerned about the over-engineering of this thing than actually having the information there. I prefer the B

layouts because it does have things which are a little more... Just the way that it feels somehow in looking at the way that things are connected.

If we are worried about the fact that everything is on one page, should we think about actually providing the kind of needed level of skill to join these things? In other words, if you're going to join a working group that is, just an imaginary working group, that looks at IRTP part D, you might think some people... Beginners might say, "Oh, that sounds like an excellent acronym. I'm going to do that."

Should we indicate the level of skill required for joining that group, whilst if we have a group that deals with something that is more straightforward or that is good for a beginner, then we can bring them into this as a first step? Because you'll have so many different levels of skill, it's going to be very difficult to say, "Well, we need to just let this type of skill set know about this and this type of skill set know about that. So, I'm all for having all the information on one page. But, anyway... So, that's my contribution. Thanks.

JEFF SALEM:

Can I follow up with a quick question? And, that is that... Yes, basically. I think we need to present options that are clear to users. As a user, I'm not sure what I'm supposed to be [joining]. I just want to get involved, basically. I guess my point is one can be new to At-Large without being new to the issue and/or the grouping in and of itself. I might know what At-Large does but still be new to At-Large. So if we're kind of forcing new users down the path of learning more, we're neglecting those users

that know what they're doing. They just don't know which group they should be joining, if that makes sense.

ARIEL LIANG:

I think Alan's next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll try to be more prescriptive. Sections that are talking about leadership roles which are only open for seven-day period once every two years and can only be nominated by specific parts of the community don't belong on this page. So that probably eliminates 40% of the page and makes it more manageable.

Description on Get Involved of working groups or committees where we are not looking for newbies, I think, also do not belong on this page. They may belong on a full list of all working groups but not on the Get Involved page. On the Get Involved page, I would think we would also have some non-At-Large working groups where we're looking for people. There's [inaudible] periodically where we're looking to populate things. They have more interesting topics than we do, to be honest, in terms of what things mean to real people. So, that's stuff that is not on your particular list.

I agree with Olivier that if you're going to dive down into a specific working group – and I'm presuming if you click on one of these links that I can't quite make out, it would give you a description of what qualifications we want from people, why would you want to join, that

kind of stuff. We're not going to try to capture everything in a two or three sentence description on this page.

Back to the top in terms of your concern that there are many ways to join, yes, there are. And, I think we need to put some effort into scoping those out so that they are explainable to people. And, as I mentioned before, this is something that's a work in progress, and it's going to be changing. But, I think that's exactly what we want to do.

When someone says, "Hey, At-Large," or they get a business card from someone and they go to this page, we want to show them the various options they have. And, we want to try to put them in some words that may make sense to them and tell them there are different ways they can contribute.

I don't think we want to whitewash to this point. We want to simplify it, so it's not complex. But, at the same time, we want to present the various options because we know in the past when we haven't presented the various options, we've ended up with people doing the wrong thing.

So, I like the way you're overall going, but now we need to tailor this page to things that will really be meaningful to the new person that's coming along. I'm not sure that's something we can do on this call in the next 20 minutes. But, I think that's how we have to go forward.

JEFF SALEM:

I think that we can at least get in the right direction. So, to back pedal a little bit regarding the leadership, I hear your advice or your feedback.

Dev kind of seconded it, and I was leaning in that direction myself. So, I think that we should just consider that a done deal and say that we'll address leaders on a separate page. And we can take that offline now.

The next thing that I wanted to ask you, you brought up the issue of kind of an exhaustive list of working groups and how this page may not be the place for that. It was my understanding that this page was exactly that, that this was basically the place where we would have the exhaustive list of all working groups. If that's not the case, then I would ask where is that list or where did you expect that list to be?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't know. I didn't make that decision. So, I'm not sure.

JEFF SALEM:

If this page is titled Getting Involved, then I don't think that's the place for the exhaustive of all groups. I mean, for instance, we have a group that's currently working. It's going to disband soon, but currently, it's on the books – has been for a while. I'm trying to adapt to the new ICANN meeting format.

It's really not very good to have people participating in that who have never seen an ICANN meeting before. They just don't have the context in which to do that. To have the CROPP Review Team which is explicitly selected by other groups within ICANN, and nobody is able to say, "I want to be on it. How do I get involved?" It doesn't make a lot of sense to have that one described on the Get Involved page.

We have a group, the ALT, the ALAC leadership team which is made up of only ALAC members. Everyone can't just put their hand up and say, "I want to be involved."

That's the kind of thing that I'm saying. If this is the introductory page, I don't think that's the definitive list of all working groups that we might have.

JEFF SALEM:

Okay. To the end, these working groups that require vetting of some kind, how is that vetting currently done? I guess my question is more towards... It sounds to me like this is a business requirements issue and less about a design issue for the page. Is that true? Is there a formal vetting process that's followed?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, it depends on the group. I mean, I can tell you how the CROPP group is selected. You'll see somewhere else there's a finance and budget committee. And, there's an outreach committee. Those two committees select the member for the CROPP group.

The members for the finance and budget committee is... There are three components. You can sort of just volunteer to essentially be an auditor of the group. But the formal members are selected by the ALAC or by the RALOs. So we have groups where anyone can join, but they're in a different status than the ones who were formally appointed by some group. It's like in the US, you can see involved in government. Volunteer

to be the Secretary of Defense. That's not how the Secretary of Defense is selected.

AREIEL LIANG: Olivier has his hand raised, as well, Jeff. Olivier, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that was an old hand, actually.

OLIVIER CREP-LEBLOND: It's not an old hand, no, but I think Dev had his hand up before mine. And then, for some reason, you dropped him [for the backup]. And, I'll speak after Dev.

DEV AND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Just to say that I understand that not every working group needs to be highlighted, but you can surely highlight a list of public facing working groups that are open to all, in terms of meetings being open, etc. I think you have to especially have to highlight [inaudible] I just said, it's part of the onboarding process. Because the working groups, I think, are the key focus area for involvement. It's not the RALO. And I guess this is something where not everybody agrees with me. To me, it's the working groups where everything should be happening, not so necessarily at the RALO level.

So, okay, don't list every single working group. But, let's list all of the public facing working groups that are open for anybody to attend and so forth. That's my suggestion to you.

AREIEL LIANG:

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREP-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Ariel. I'm going to go in the same direction as what Dev has said and offer the following suggestion. I like the way the layouts – the working groups are laid out as they are with their little intro and so on. Perhaps, each one of them should have two things. One, saying if it's open or closed or by appointment. Secondly, the level of knowledge, suitability for a beginner or a seasoned ICANN person or whatever, just as a guideline.

There are some working groups like the finance and budget subcommittee which are by appointment only. But, the work of the working group is entirely open. Therefore, the work space and the mailing list should be linked to this.

Similar for the CROPP Review Team. It's all open. You can actually see all of the CROPP deliberations and discussions. Well, the actual process pages are publicly accessible at the moment on the Wiki. There are some, which as we know are totally open, and therefore, people could join.

So, if there was just this parameter thing if it was open or closed, it would let people actually browse through the group, perhaps even

follow the working group by looking at what it does but not actually join the working group as such. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I really have no problem with that. It's the concept that you can get involved with all these working groups by joining them that I was objecting to. If we have some of the working groups where instead of join, it's listen in or whatever the appropriate word is or when's the next meeting. I have no problem with that. That's good. But we have to really delineate those that someone can join from those that are there for someone to get a feeling for what's going on and listen to. In some cases, they can even talk. It's a different class of membership as it were.

So maybe this is the definitive list of all working groups but clear delineation for which ones we are looking for workers for and which ones are there essentially for their education and illumination.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Just following up onto that – and perhaps the things should be that join probably should not be the immediate link for every single one of these things. It could be just, as I say, listen in. I'm not sure what the exact word would be but something along that line rather than say join. Or, maybe follow the activities or something like that. And that way the updates and whatnot and meeting notifications and so on, they can... Well, they see all the notifications and they can jump in when they feel comfortable to do so, rather than join.

ARIEL LIANG:

Jeff, back to you.

JEFF SALEM:

Okay. So, all that feedback was extremely helpful, so thank you very much. I think what I'm hearing is basically the approach we should be taking is that there's two levels of engagement. There's kind of open enrollment, for lack of a better term, where anybody can kind of join a working group, get their feet wet and participate. But then there's a groups of groups that require either formal vetting or an informal level of experience, we'll say, that's desired in order to participate.

So we'll gear the page towards those two groups. I think the first group... I think that we will take a similar approach to what we've got here for the At-Large organizational groups. Obviously, we'll revisit the list to make sure that it's accurate. But the primary call to action for those less formal groups can remain kind of joined. But the more involved/vetted groups that will follow [inaudible] call to action.

I think what I do is list them similarly to this list of working groups. However, I think that we'll provide a little bit more information in that we'll either specifically identify what the vetting process is, if there is a vetting process. Or, if it's just an informal kind of level experience, maybe like a bulleted list of the qualities that we're looking for for people who should be engaged in that group.

Then, maybe instead of the join call to action, there's no specific called action and it's maybe a "mail to" link to the chair of that group or the secretary or something that's kind of in a less actionable call to action,

let's say, that kind of gets them in touch with the right person to join the group. It's not an explicit join mechanism.

Do you think that approach, in general, will solve our problems here?

ARIEL LIANG: Anybody? Alan, that sounds closer to what we need.

JEFF SALEM: Okay. So, if that's the case, then... Like I said, this has been very, very helpful. So, I think it should be very easy to quickly knock out another version of what we've discussed. I should be able to share that within the next couple of days. I'll let Laura and Ariel figure out exactly how we want to distribute and get feedback. But I guess that's it from my end. Thank you very much. It's been very, very helpful.

ARIEL LIANG: Laura, do you have anything you'd like to add? Because I do have a couple of things.

LAURA BENGFORD: No. I think this is all good feedback. I'm just following and listening. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks. I think there's one question I'd like to have clarified. Are we happy with the way we represent information of policy advice

development in the Get Involved page? Now, based on the mock-up [inaudible] working groups that are policy topic related. Now, we do think it's [an opportunity] to use Get Involved to direct people to the policy advice statements that ALAC made or direct them to some kind of info page to understand how statements are made and why they're made and those kinds of information. So, are you also happy to have that on the Get Involved page, or are you thinking it should be in a separate place? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, that definitely belongs there. I think it should be wider. I think it should be formal policy and policy advice development and include selected GNSO groups where we're looking for people with user experience to participate.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you, Alan. Another comment I have is right now, we put joint At-Large, this blue button, was formal policy advice development section. The reason we did this is because if you're not an At-Large [inaudible] member, you probably can't write a statement on behalf of the ALAC, or participate in the formal process of developing advice. But do you think it would be good to have a separate section just to talk about the various ways to become a member like becoming an ALS member or create ALS or be an independent member, things like that. So, Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought that's what the top of the page was for.

ARIEL LIANG: So, for the top of page is more like beginner's guide or...

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. A little bit farther down.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. Now, it's too far. You were in the right page. Just look lower. Go to the top.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Oh, you mean] contributing to our efforts? This one?

ALAN GREENBERG: You've got it.

ARIEL LIANG: So, what I was—

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that's where we need to delineate the various, different ways you can participate.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Okay. Jeff, do you have anything you'd like to ask about that? What [inaudible] was trying to ask is about the process related to information, you know, how the accreditation process works for ALSes, or how you become an individual member for RALO, things like that. But, okay. So, Alan, your feedback is to have that at the top – the layout...

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so. Now, we may want a statement later. We don't have a policy right now saying, "Do you have to be formally part of an ALS or a RALO or you know, an individual member to participate in a working group. We don't even have a way of knowing. I mean, right now, we have people joining groups that we know because we happen to have talked to them one day, that they were a member of a specific ALS. We don't know that formally.

Look at some of the members of the IANA issues group. Some of them have Japanese names. Olivier knows they're members of ISOC Japan or of a specific chapter. But they don't declare that anywhere. They're just workers. So, we need to specify what qualifications you need. Do you need to be a formal member or not? But, that doesn't stop us from actually describing what the activities are that we're doing. We're hoping within a small number of months every RALO will have an

individual member classification. Therefore, there will always be a way someone can join.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Alan, for that input. So, any other comments or questions about this page?

JEFF SALEM: Actually, I realized that I neglected to mention something early on that I wanted to, and that is that I think Alan's aware, but I'm not sure if anyone else is aware that we are actually working on a separate project for GNSO right now that is actually a recruitment and tracking tool for working groups. So, while we're developing this tool specifically for GNSO, I'm on the project. I've already opened requirements up to GAC. I'm thinking about At-Large. While we haven't engaged you directly... Well, actually Alan sat in on a meeting a while ago.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan was not aware of that.

JEFF SALEM: Oh, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe Alan attended a meeting about it, but Alan was not aware of it.

JEFF SALEM:

So, yes, as I said, we are developing this tool for recruiting and participating in working groups. So, I think my point is that this page is essentially going to be short-lived because I suspect that the solution that we built for GNSO, we hope to be applied across all SO/ACs in the future. It's a long-term strategy. But, at the same time, we are focused on that application. It is being developed. And, I think that'll provide a huge opportunity to resolve some of these problems more holistically in the future. So, I just wanted to kind of bring that up.

I also want to suggest that maybe sooner rather than later Steve Allison and I maybe demonstrate the work that we've been doing on that project, just to kind of show you guys the direction that we're going and see if maybe we wanted to advance that conversation with At-Large and start talking about specific requirements that you guys may have for that tool.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sounds good.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Jeff. Any other comments or questions before we close this call, and we will end earlier it seems like. Laura, anything?

LAURA BENGFORDE:

Nothing for me.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. I guess we're done for today. Oh, I'm sorry, Dev. Go ahead.

DEV ANAND-TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. So, based on this initial feedback [inaudible] and develop a C version of the Get Involved page, [inaudible] make that available to the outreach and engagement groups for their comments. So, maybe somebody in that group might have some better insight or might [have an idea] of how to approach this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Super idea, Dev.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dev. We'll make sure to put on the Wiki for a working group to comment on the mock-up. So, thank you for that. Yeah. I guess we're done for today. Thank you very much all for your time and input. I really appreciate your contribution. So, this call is now adjourned. Thank you for attending.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all.

JEFF SALEM: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, everyone. Thank you. Bye-bye.

ARIEL LIANG:

Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]