
NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Technology Taskforce Meeting on 16th March 2015. On the call today we have Gordon Chillcott, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Beran Gillen Glenn McKnight, Amal Al-Saqqaf and Ali AlMeshal. Our guest speaker today is Chris Gift. We have apologies from Judith Hellerstein, Seun Ojedeji and Alan Greenberg. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names when speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much, and over to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much Nathalie. Welcome everyone to this call. Before we go to our main topic Agenda, just a review two items from our Singapore Agenda. One was to schedule a conference call with the person involved with doing the remote sessions at ICANN. I'm not talking about the ICANN Meetings, but regarding the remote hubs, and just to get a background behind the technology involved. That's still outstanding. I might need some help from staff on who to direct the invitation to and who's responsible for coordinating the remote hubs. Heidi might fill us in on that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Dev. On the more hubs, did you say you wanted to speak about who was responsible?

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.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's Cory from our IT staff.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks Heidi. I think there's a bit of a lag here, because you're coming in a few seconds afterwards. Okay, that's an open AI for us to invite Cory for a conference call with the Technology Taskforce. The second AI, and I think this was also a recommendation from Murray, was to perhaps have an article or tool to educate people on how to watch pages on the Wiki. Watching pages means you're able to get an email notification whenever that page or even the entire space, or descendants from that main page can be tracked. I've done an animated GIFT on this.

If you click on the link I posted in the chat, I put together a little something to try to visually show how it's done, where you click onto the "watch page" link when logged into the At-Large Wiki, and what to check off when the dialogue box comes up. Does anyone have any comments right now? It's a very short GIF and should display within eight seconds. I'll add some more text to flesh it up a little, but other than that, any comments? I see a "looks good" from Chris Gift. All right. We can probably mark that as closed then and post that to the regular At-Large list and onto the At-Large Skype chat.

Our next Item is a review of the ATLAS II items for the Technology Taskforce. With us now is Chris Gift from ICANN, and he'll touch on at

least one of the two recommendations for the Technology Taskforce. Chris, are you able to take the floor? I believe there's a presentation on screen?

CHRIS GIFT:

Thank you very much, and thank you for inviting me to this meeting. I'm probably going to discuss more than just the two items. Probably the presentation I have is overly broad, and I'm more than happy to cut it short, certainly when I get to some of the other projects. I thought you maybe wanted to hear about some of the FY16 work, and it's also related. Anyway, if you feel it's content you don't want to listen to on this call, but would prefer to have it on another call, feel free to let me know. In this presentation I'm going to talk to four items. I'm going to talk a little about the policy management system, or at least our perspective of that, because I think it's going to be a little different from your perspective. I think we can have a good discussion about that.

Open data, how we view open data and what our preliminary plans are in that area, and then FY16 projects. Again, I think this is where I'm digressing a bit, but I have those lists there, proposed FY16 projects, and then I looked at the Technology Taskforce items you had from the ATLAS II, and I went through some of those to see if that was projected or planned for FY16 or not, so we can discuss the specific items beyond just the two of them. That's my agenda for today. Feel free to interrupt me at any time if you want to talk through any of these things. Before I start talking about the policy management system, instead of talking about it I'm going to take a step back and talk about how we view the technology or services landscape for the community.

I think this is important, because we're ending up in a slightly different place than where we originally started a few years back. Let me begin with that, because when I was hired Fadi came to me and he said very much the same thing you guys are saying. He came to me and said, "We need a policy management system and we need this to be a fully one system, and one that everyone's on, and it does everything from managing policy to managing people's activities, and they're able to see everything that they do and so on." I took that as my starting point, and I started working through. But very quickly I came up with the following constraints and opportunities.

Again, this list isn't a be-all-and-end-all list of issues, but more like design constraints when we're looking at what we need to do for services. You guys can read through them. What's listed here do present some serious challenges in terms of having one system. It's very difficult to have the equivalent of a sales force for policy development, if you have these constraints where people's groups and needs are so diverse; there are accessibility issues or there are means of accessing the content that are very diverse, and there's a wide spectrum of needs. What you see in these constraints have really guided my thinking around how to move forward, and I think other people think the same way.

Back in circa 2014, when we were looking at what we'd need for services - and this is a bit of a mix of things, but nonetheless it's an interesting way to view it - we had three circles, and the third circle says "engage", and we grouped services by three areas. One was where we'd inform people. They're coming here to just get broad information, and we inform them of ICANN's activities. We put services we can provide in that area. The second grouping was engaging people more fully in

ICANN's activities, and then the third was supporting existing members, volunteers, in their policy making and policy advising activities. Then we put the services that we thought were appropriate, in either existing services or new services.

We grouped services like this, and we wanted to see where they overlapped and get a better understanding of where they'd be playing and who they should be servicing, at what time in the life cycle of a person participating. Using them as a model we thought about what the interaction style is for each one. For inform it's obviously people come, get information and leave. For the engage we really looked at it and thought this is something very sticky. This is where we want people to come and do a class, we want them to do online learning, we want people to come and return periodically to look at the public comment. There are blogs that we want people to come back in, subscribe to, read and so on.

We really thought of that, and dialogue was important. We're really trying to look at how people interact, and trying to make sure we can move someone through informing them, to engaging them, into then becoming a regular volunteer. The third was support. Here we really said that in this area this is not sticky, oddly enough. I'm more than happy to have a debate about any of this, by the way. In this area, we viewed it as not sticky. It's quite the opposite, and inherently transactions, and the transaction is actually information. Much like in e-commerce when people are coming to buy something, when it comes to the support, volunteer members are coming to find a particular piece of information.

They come and they do a very specific thing, and then they're leaving. So people want alerts here. Membership is very structured, whereas in the engage it's not structured at all. People are just coming and engaging, but in this area, the participation, the collaboration is structured, in terms of there's a Working Group, there's a Chair of that Working Group, that Working Group may have a policy in terms of work process, in terms of how it makes documents or policy advice. Some groups vote. A lot don't, but there's a few that vote, and that is a very formal process. Then process is just inherent in this whole area, and again, people are striving towards an end. There is a purpose to this collaboration.

It's not just, "I'm coming here just to shake people's hands." The purpose is generally an artifact. It's something people are creating that will then be published in some form somewhere, whether it's ICANN.org, At-Large website, or other fora. So again, a very different model for how people work. We start to look at these and we can see that it's very difficult. Because there's this wide range of services and different models in terms of how people are going to engage with the information, it starts to inform how you see us beginning to think about tools and services. So what we really look at when we look at this is, "Okay, [unclear 00:14:15]." Management is going to differ from group to group. The way [unclear] works on documents is very different from you guys.

There may be some similarities - and we're hoping we can find a tool that meets most people's requirements - but again, there are differences between the groups, and not only that but individuals tend to want to alter documents on their favorite app; write the document on

Microsoft Word if that's my favorite app, or in Open Docs or something like that, and then publish it up to the group in an open format; in a rich text format or something like that. There's great diversity in this, and it presents a challenge to us in terms of how we bring out services and how we roll those out and make sure of the connection.

While we're experiencing some great praise around single sign-on, we don't have single sign-on [unclear 00:15:13]. So this is sort of our worldview, in terms of how we are looking at these things. Over the year, what we ended up working on very early is the things we've highlighted. We ended up focusing on these things, in terms of services. This isn't all that we did. We did do the e-learning, the ICANNLearn. We revamped public comment on the website. We revamped blogs, calendars, and now we've our master calendar where just about anything happening at ICANN is within that calendar.

There are some issues with some of the feeds right now, which we'll look in on, around calendar ownership, but nonetheless we're still very focused on making that a success. We started profiles on ICANN.org. It's the very beginning of what's possible there, and we can chat a bit about what we see possibly going down. Working on some social media, and a lot of other things. We even tested the idea of forums, which actually didn't go anywhere, that was a complete failure. I'm not convinced, mainly because people in the ICANN community tend to rely on emails. So the forums did not succeed, but that may come back again in a more friendly form or when the time is right, or when people see the need for forums.

That's what we looked at or rolled out last year. In the next year, what's in the plan is everything in blue. It's a huge list. I can talk more about those in the third Agenda Item for today. As you can see, we're very focused on supporting the volunteers. This is the area of the policy process management system, in my view, and so we're very focused on this. Right now we're working with SSAC on a possible new document collaboration tool. We're looking to pilot something with them. We are looking to have a proof of concept. We're working with a group within the gNSO on Working Group management, administrative to Working Group management.

That has some notion of policy process within it - very lightweight, but it can hold some notion of a process. So you can put any kind of policy process or other type. It's very lightweight. It's more for administrative tasks of a Working Group - how you onboard somebody, how does the Chair control the Working Group in terms of setting pu calls and meetings and so on. We're in early discussions internally about membership and what it means. It's not so much membership in terms of you come in and you're paying dues. It's not that, it's just we need a central system to onboard volunteers. Right now you call IT when you need somebody onboarded to the community Wiki.

Then they're just onboarded to the community Wiki and maybe to another system. There's no central system or service at ICANN that has knowledge of all of these people and what they're tied into. We're very interested in that; in something we'd then be able to say, "Here's this individual, here are the systems that they're subscribed to." A lot of other things are going on. At the bottom you'll see something about regional discovery there. When it comes to a policy process

management system, we don't view it as a one system. Perhaps you guys don't either. We view it that we're working towards where we stand up services instantly that fulfill a particular need.

It can be a very broad need, such as working with administrative, working with management on documents, or group collaboration, for which we have the Wiki. What we want to do is strive to integrate those as much as possible. So integrate them from a personal perspective, so you have similar sign-on to these services, and then integrate them in terms of data flow so that documents are posted in one place to be automatically posted to another forum, where that's the website or... If somebody were working in a Working Group, they have a folder that say "documents ready to publish," so then the Working Group has completed their work, and when they put that document into that folder, it automatically publishes out to the appropriate purposes.

We don't have to worry about them taking the next step, "I have to send this to Heidi," and Heidi then needs to send this to [Len 00:20:42], and [Len] has to post it, and then the information flows backwards that yes, the data has been posted. We want to do a lot to make sure these things are integrated from... I agree. Single sign-on is definitely on track for next year. That is how we view it. I can talk about this is a worldview on how we're approaching it. I can talk about some detail about each one of these projects we're actively working on. I'm more than happy to have you guys jump in now, or we can do it later. Otherwise I'll jump to the next topic of open data.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Chris. Actually very informative. Does anybody have any comments or questions? Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: This is really quite fascinating. I like to see the mind map you're showing. What I'm suggesting is that so many individuals, especially when they're using different tools that we've seen in our Technology Taskforce, we try to evaluate, from the end user point of view, regardless their platform, also what their abilities or disabilities are. I think an intelligent system allows the end user to not only tailor the site from a usability point of view, but also lets them drill down to areas that they're particularly interested in, and then get the best value out of the experience. That's my two cents.

CHRIS GIFT: When you say that somebody for accessibility reasons wants to tailor this service, can you elaborate on that?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. Some resources that are online are "fully accessible" meaning the videos have captioning, there are tools that definitely would consider what the end user needs are. So I'm just saying that for the 13 per cent of the population that have a disability, and who knows how many within our community - but not just those with a learning disability or some kind of physical disability, but we have such a large population that doesn't have English as their first language. So a lot of the stuff we talk about as being more accessible, it's also very important for those who

would love to see the subtitles in videos, and having really good quality audio sounds on the recordings.

Again, all I'm saying is that, for example, when we see a new policy paper they're primarily just written. There's no effort to convert it to an audio clip that a person could download to their phone or watch this stuff, particularly in an .epub format. I'm just saying we need to be conscious of the variety of modalities to the end user.

CHRIS GIFT:

Thank you Glenn. I appreciate that. It makes a lot of sense, and you know I'm a big fan of that. As you well know, it's technology problems and a great deal of it is actually just internal mindset and processes, which we're very poor at; captioning and so on. It's a process and not a technology issue. I don't know. I'm hopeful that the work we're doing, and you're doing on the Accessibility Working Group and that the Accessibility Report we'll get out of this service that we'll work with will help spur internal change. I know it will stir change within IT and in my team. That's the plan, and that's why we're driving this.

We will instigate processes that say, "You can't put up a video without having it fully captioned," as well. As for the rest, yes, it's going to be a long road, as sad as that is. In a year, year and a half, ICANN as a whole, will hopefully be fully mindful of these issues and is doing the right processes so that the data is fully accessible.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Chris. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this presentation Chris, and just two points. The first is I'm looking at the diagram of the activity and it looks like most of these are geared towards individuals rather than teams. When you look at volunteers you're looking at individual volunteers, but I'm not sure we're spending enough time looking at how we can build teams, or serve teams of people to work better. In that sense, I [unclear 00:27:03] how one would be dealing with tracking, [debation] and institutional training with regards to teams, as opposed to supporting individuals in being engaged.

The reason for my question being that in At-Large we have to build statements as teams, and we find it very difficult in that sense, without the tools that [audio cuts off 00:27:36].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think we've lost Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've finished my question.

CHRIS GIFT: I think we caught enough of your question. I can start addressing it, and if I don't respond fully, please tell me. It's a very good point about teams, and I'll relook at some of this with this in mind. Maybe I can reorient this diagram to show those areas that are very individual focused, or in those that are team-focused, because for instance in my

mind, the document management is good. It's very much a team effort. I may have spoken in terms of one person altering a document, and sure, frequently one person has the pen to start with. But yes, it's very much a Working Group effort. The effort that we're working on with SSAC is very much that - it's how do they collaboratively alter a document?

So we're mindful of that, and it's the same with the Working Groups. It's how does a Working Group effectively work together, collaborate? The Wiki is a great tool for some types of groups, but it's not so good for other groups within ICANN. So we're exploring alternatives - not to replace the Wiki but to augment it in some areas for some groups. But nonetheless, I'm mindful about what you say about not enough there on teams, so I'll definitely take a look at that and see what we're missing or how I can highlight those. The other thing is on memory and tracking. When it comes to that, one issue that I have internally, that we are focused on - it's just a big project so it's going to take us a while, and this is an institutional memory problem that I have - is our website and our Wikis act as systems of record, especially the website, ICANN.org.

Our policies are up on the websites, links to content on the website are embedded within contracts, so it is a system of record. And yet we don't do a good enough job in terms of tracking and managing it as a system of record. For instance, we don't, on the website say, "This page was changed on such and such a date." You can see that on the Wiki, so that's great. That works, to a certain extent, but you can't see that on the website, or at least the way the website is today. So you can say, "What changed on what date, so I can see how this content has evolved?" So to me, that plays to institutional memory, and the tracking

problem, particularly on our website, so we're looking at how to address that.

When it comes to the Working Groups, that's another problem. That's a very good point. We are very well aware of the requirement that when you are altering a document, that we have to track all the changes to that document. We want to be able to track all the comments to the document, all the discussion around the comments on the document, and how that comment was resolved, because we want to show exactly how a document came to be. We don't want to sit there and say, "Here's the end result of an advice or policy from a group," and you can't see the history of it - all you see is the final thing. We ought to be able to see the history of it.

We need that for tracking and transparency purposes. We should be able to come back a year later and say, "Who influenced that policy?" I want to be able to come back and see that and say, "What were the comments and how were they resolved? How did the document start out?" So that, to me, when it comes to document altering, those ideas are very, very important and very top of mind to me, at least as we move through this. I hope I'm answering at least some of your question about that. As for institutional memory, I agree, that's a real problem. That's probably not here, and I should add it. We should add it, somehow. I'll take that on and see what we can do about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. You certainly answered the question. I think we've got an understanding here of what still needs to be worked on. As

I said, just emphasize in the “team” and “teamwork” in At-Large, and of course in Working Groups, teamwork - all of that is needed, and at the moment there’s just so much going on. We have teams that are put together that work together. The problem is because we work in so many different teams it’s very, very hard for anyone to track where they are, where the team is, and track the progress. I’m trying to think of ways that would allow us to track in an easier way than to have to burden staff with having to track things manually.

That’s another problem - the amount of tracking that our At-Large staff has to do manually on all of the processes. If we could have this somehow tracked by a system, it would just make our life so much better and so much easier. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Olivier. I see Glenn has his hand raised?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: A couple of things. Dev and I have had discussions off - and I guess you’d say it’s not within your daily wick, Chris - but a lot of dialogue happens on Skype, whether it’s on ALAC or RALO chats or social media chat, and some of that is extremely annoying, from my point of view, because it goes all over the place. It doesn’t stay within discussion threads properly, there’s no voting process, or stars, or up-votes. So we need some kind of informal environment, and I’ve seen a number of these tools where people vote on something. For example, there’s an ITU innovation grant program now for young entrepreneurs on IT and people submit their ideas, and people vote or get stars on it. Now, it’s

not perfect, but you can definitely see a key idea, and then the thread from that key idea continues.

What we have had with ALAC, somebody gets on a topic about the World Cup and it'll go on forever, or some other topic, and it's not applicable to you, so you just ignore it entirely. You try and bring a topic up that's applicable, and it gets buried within an avalanche of other stuff. I'm just saying that's probably not in your area, but there's so much communication going on informally, outside this mind-map. The second thing is that we have to realize that the future is going to be very short video clips, and if you look at Vine as an example of very short video clips, this needs to be considered within this ecosystem as well. That's it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Glenn. Just to follow up on what Oliver and now Glenn has said, I think one thing that would be useful is looking at group chat applications. One of the most popular ones being Slack. I posted a link to the group chats we've looked at so far. We've used Slack internally, and I'm beginning to think more and more, especially as it comes to finding the history behind Working Group chats in-between calls and so forth, for At-Large I think we probably need to work towards using this kind of group chat system. One, it allows accounts to be centrally administered; you can create all the accounts for all the various persons directly, without telling a person to sign up and adding them in ad-hoc fashion, and there's archiving of messages.

Essentially, the way group chat works, it's like instant messaging but with a hashtag. That's one way of thinking about it. So with conversations, instead of all being in one chunk, it could be segmented by your particular topic, interest, by Working Group, or teams or so forth, and it becomes very easy to move people to join various groups and teams and so forth. That's probably that can be added. I didn't see anything in this mind-map. That's just one thing of note. Chris, can we take a look at the open data aspect?

CHRIS GIFT:

Sure. We use Slack internally. I love it. It's a great tool. It's very, very good. I'm going to talk about open data, and open data to me has two facets to it. Part of it is addressing the problem you just wrote about, Olivier, that there is no real system. There's no one thing that does this. When we did this mind-map we came to the same conclusion. There's no one thing that does it all. We were talking about the services, but what I didn't go into was how we make this connect and get this to work together. This is, to me, the core of the very next slide. This is what we are looking at. This is very much a draft. These are some concepts we're working on right now.

What we want to try to do, because we're mindful that the technology landscape is ever evolving, and new and better services appear rapidly, and that people want and desire different tools, and that people's processes are different - ALAC is different from SSAC - so on one hand we want to try and get people to use the same tools as much as we can, at least for the time being. Where I'd like to get us to - and this is to me the ideal state - is really where a lot of this information is open and

accessible through a series of published APIs. Then what could happen, we still provide a set of ICANN services for Working Groups to work on this stuff together. We absolutely provide that set. To me, that is up in the left hand corner - ICANN web assets.

But at the same time I'd like other people to be able to say, "I don't want to use ICANN's set. It doesn't work for me," which is okay, I want to support that, "but I still want access to a great deal of that data," which I think is fair. Not only is it fair - it's fair for that individual and it's fair for that group, but it's fair for the rest of the world. So to me, this is an open architecture where we can have an open architecture for ICANN and participating in ICANN, but also for other organizations to introspect what's happening within ICANN and to get the data out. To me, there are three buckets of content. There is participant profiles - and by that I mean the public view of their data: what's the name of this participant? What Working Groups are they in? What is their activity?

Again, I know there are issues about people participating from certain countries or areas, but from the same time, it behooves us to have to be very transparent about who's participating. This is a very big thing for us - at least it is for my team. Secondly is the resource library. To me, it's all our content that we have - all our policies, Board resolutions, advice that's in stages of being produced, comments, Working Group data, domain name content statistics, and then lastly a calendar - it's all the calendar information for everything we do at ICANN. To have all of that content accessible through public APIs - we use those same APIs for our own internal systems, and by internal I mean our community collaboration systems.

We use and consume those same APIs and we publish those APIs and that content out to either Internet governance resources or other Internet governance organizations. We can all access them. This is the concept, and we want to do it in this way because if we don't consume that same data and those same APIs, if we don't use them, then it's difficult to maintain them. It's difficult to dedicate resources, to content, to APIs, that is off to the side, that you're not using. It tends to go stale very rapidly. We want to be in the position where we consume and use this same stuff, and then make it open to everybody.

This is our overall view of open data. Where would we host this? We're very open to hosting it on something like GitHub. We're actively looking at it and testing GitHub right now for some internal IT stuff, we're experimenting with it. So this is the concept. Do you have any feedback on this? I'm mindful of time.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Chris. Any comments or questions? I have two comments. In terms of the structured data types - and I could speak from personal experience because this is something I've been trying to coordinate from ICANN for the longest while - I think what we need to have is open data regarding membership to members in the various communities. The reason why this would be useful is because often I want to find out who is involved, from my country, as a particular stakeholder in ICANN. There's a link in the chat that will take you to a Wiki page. Click onto that image to open up a spreadsheet I'm doing for the Latin American and Caribbean strategy.

The idea will be that we need to identify this for stakeholders, and then from that we'll have an idea where the gaps in stakeholder representation are. You'll notice for example that some countries have zero representation in any ICANN stakeholder group. Then you could say, "Okay, let's try to get some stakeholders in, be it government, At-Large, et cetera." That's one thing. But to find this information from ICANN is very hard. Each of the various stakeholder groups structure information in different ways, so it always comes down to a very manual process of going to each of the websites and trying to pull this information onto a spreadsheet.

I think if the data was structured enough to be able to pull information as to stakeholders in the gNSO coming from a particular territory, you can do a stakeholder map. A second example is something that the Internet Society just published. It's the Global Internet Report, and what it also does is when you click on it, it's things like DNSSEC deployment, allocation of IPv4 addresses, ccTLD domains and so forth. So that type of reporting, again, that's probably another example of how it could be produced to get either what's happening in your region, or so forth. Those are two comments in terms of structured data type.

Policies, Board resolutions and public comments are important, but I think there is something that needs to really... Data [tracking 00:46:46] the stakeholder in the various stakeholder groups. That needs to be tracked. That's all.

CHRIS GIFT: Dev, I agree with you, 100 per cent. In my view, that is in the participant profiles bucket. I think I need to blow that out and add more content there so people understand that, but I absolutely agree with you. That should be readily available content - who's participating? From where? What are the issues that are of interest to people in general? I agree with you. I'll make sure that's clear.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No problem. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just to add on what Dev has said, we have two major categories of volunteers - those involved in policy development and those involved with building the organization and building At-Large, as far as we're concerned, and even building for other parts of ICANN as well. So that would definitely be helpful for those who build the organization. But I think that two separate issues as to what tools would be needed for people who build policy, and people who build the organization. So maybe we'd need to keep them in separate buckets. Thank you.

CHRIS GIFT: That's interesting. Thank you for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I could just add to this? One thing that we are doing is to now try and find out what the skills are that each of our members have - that is members that participate in At-Large - and those skillsets would need to

be somehow tracked, somehow stored, and updatable, but we haven't got anything for this so far. That's a concern, because if we have the information then I think we should be able to update it. As you know, information goes out of date quite quickly, and at the same time we need to make sure we can store it in a stable way and pass it on when all of us will be gone, or there'll be new people and so on.

That's important. That's just based on the skillsets of our community, so that they can then help us when we have projects to not only put this out there in the open if we have any volunteers, but we can actually go to those volunteers that have the specific skills for the task and say, "By the way, you have the skills for this, maybe you'd want to take the lead on that." This is all about reaching out to our community, rather than just posting things on a notice board and saying, "If you want to take part, please volunteer." You have to go and grab their hands. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks Olivier. Let's see, Chris, I take it you've seen the page where we've documented what we've been trying to do for the various ATLAS II recommendations, and you've already covered some of the interactions with what is happening in Recommendation 26 and now regarding open data. Thanks for this. What do you think should be our next steps? I'll throw that out to our group as well. Is it that we want to have follow on conversations? Is there going to be CCWG to try to look at these types of process systems, where you'll be sharing this information with all of the stakeholders for them to give contributions? What exactly is happening?

CHRIS GIFT:

Thank you Dev. There are a few things. I have the slide up that has the ATLAS II items. I've marked off the ones we're planning for FY16. Language support is one of them. We were just talking about Recommendation 26, and obviously the open data one, Recommendation 39. Both of those are in progress or planned for this FY as well. How we're going to move through this, especially the policy management process and the document [unclear 00:52:17], what we're doing is several things. Some of this is already up on the community Wiki.

You're going to see us be far more proactive and active on the community Wiki in terms of our content. By "our content" I mean my team's content and how we're working with IT, so some of IT's content. We are going to be putting all our roadmaps, all the projects we're working on, what the next project is on our deck - we want to be fully transparent about our work. I apologize if we haven't been in the past. We're going to do that very shortly. We're working on it right now, putting this content together. How are we working through these very specific projects?

There are two things. We are working with individual groups. We're going to put the content on community Wiki. We hope people follow that content and follow these processes. You're more than welcome to join us in those meetings, and we'll publish those meetings, if you want to participate in the discussions around the Working Group management tool. We are going to have proof of concepts for both of those projects, and by proof of concepts we're going to try a technology

for a few months with a Working Group as a volunteer, volunteer Working Group, and then shut it down.

Then we'll publish the results of that Working Group and say, "Here's what we've learnt of that proof of concept. Here are some best practices and here's what we're recommending." That is going to be a very public process, so expect to see something within the coming weeks on both of those. As for the open data one, this is just the beginning, it's a dialogue. I'm going to hold at least one session in BA on some of these items. I'm hoping you guys can come. That session is going to very much be a dialogue. I don't want to present. I want us to talk about how we can do open data, and what should be in there; what are the first data sets, and things like that. Hopefully that helps. It will be a very public process and it will be up on the community Wiki.

Lastly, if I may, on what Olivier was talking about in terms of skills - and you guys are talking about in terms of understanding who's from where - you should also, as a group, be very aware that we have another project that is brewing, and that is around stakeholder group membership management. That could easily apply to At-Large as well. What's happened is that some of the stakeholder groups within the gNSO have administrative chores around managing their memberships, and they've requested support in terms of automation for managing memberships. We did talk about this the other day, when I was in Singapore and I brought it up.

I had a follow on conversation with Evan and another individual about [CD CRM 00:55:53], but this is something that ALAC or At-Large should consider joining the queue or participating in this process, because a

membership management tool focused on At-Large could help with that. It could help automate processes for ALS applications. It can do a lot of things. Maybe someone from your group can join those discussions as well. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Chris. I think this is all very informative and I really do thank you for this, at least it will give us some more ideas to think about and contribute to. Chris, this information was important for us to discuss. Glenn? Do you have your show and tell?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I did a quick screen capture of what Chris was talking about during his session. You can see a lot of the stuff there actually has application to each of us individually. You can see in the graphic many of the topics are similar to what we've added to our show and tell. What we started to do is we started to populate in the link that I provided for the show and tell suggestions, we're trying to organize the material for people to not only add their ideas but also to rank them; the pros and cons. Please add your comments. I posted this to the ALAC list. Vanda has already responded. She used OneNote and another project management tool, similar to Trillo that Carlton uses. Please add your comments.

One of the tools I'd like to mention this morning, just as a show and tell, is one tool that we used in a session at NTEN. It's Poll Everywhere. What's nice about this tool, gang, is you can also use it different ways. What I'm impressed with in using it is you can go to the website, but you can also use the tool from the cellphone. Any time we have a session

and we want feedback on a particular session, and people only have their cellphone, they can text a message right to the site. Now, what's interesting with Poll Everywhere is it does have a free account, so that's up to 25 participants in the poll, and above that you have to start paying for the amount.

One of the things we had, we had over 100 people at one of our sessions in Austin. Unfortunately, from an end user point of view, two things: it was capped out at 25, so I've no idea what was the most popular, and actually there could have been a show of hands in the room, to be honest. But second of all, I couldn't access the results because I was not a facilitator. So I had some issues there. Those are my general comments. Any questions on this tool? Thank you Dev. He's added a collaboration tool, and I believe he's added it to the show and tell page as well. Okay, I know I'm very sensitive to time.

We'll be doing this every meeting, so each time, if you can come with some other stuff that you've added, maybe talk about your technology and how it can benefit the community, we would appreciate it. The second thing, Dev, that we need to talk about, is future topics. I want to turn it back to you because of time.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Glenn. Any quick comments or questions? All right. Thanks Glenn. I think the problem is a meeting once a month alone isn't going to do any of these topics justice. I think as a next step we should probably schedule another Technology Taskforce for this month. Perhaps on the 30th? In-between now and then we could look to get a

better sense of these show and tell technology tools. If there's no objection from anyone on the 30th? There are probably three other things that we have to look at that we didn't have a chance to talk about. One is doing the report on the conferencing solutions, getting that report done, and perhaps having that presented at the BA Meeting.

I think also, going back to the organization or content, I think this all ties into what Chris was talking about, in terms of how we organize data and so on. The challenge is that our Wiki I think does need to be a little bit restructured, but I'm a little bit unsure as to how to best affect the change or how to demonstrate the possible templates and so forth. That's the second thing. Chris?

CHRIS GIFT:

Thank you Dev. A couple of quick points. One is that I suggest we post a page somewhere where we can start adding these types of technology solutions as ideas? I'd love to see them. I'm going to start capturing what you guys are doing, but anyway, maybe on an At-Large page? I'm sure you already have one. I've got you, it's on the show and tell page. I'll go and find that. Secondly, on what you just said about the community Wiki, we're looking to hire an information science person, or a consultant to help us with the problems with finding information. It's a huge issue in ICANN as a whole. If we get that person on board they may be able to help you in terms of reorganizing the content on your Wiki space.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. That's excellent news. Thanks for that Chris. I think that would definitely be welcomed by everyone in the At-Large community because it's been a challenge to find information. We hear it repeatedly. Okay, excellent. Any final comments or questions from anyone? Okay. going once, going twice. Thanks everyone. Thanks Chris for your presentation. Very informative. Let's continue the dialogue. With that, the next thing will be we'll have a Technology Taskforce call on the 30th. Thank you everyone for attending the call. This call is adjourned. Have a great day, evening or night. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]