

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, and welcome to the At-Large Technology Taskforce call on the 18<sup>th</sup> of May 2015. On the call today we have Gordon Chillcott, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Evan Leibovitch, Beran Gillen and Judith Hellerstein. Our guest speaker today is Chris Gift, and we have an apology from Ali Al Meshal. From staff we have Ariel Liang and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much, and over to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, and a very good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Chair of the Technology Taskforce. We have a packed Agenda, so we might go a little bit beyond the hour. Let's get right into it. The review of our Action Items, there are two Action Items. A Wiki page to be created about the remote hubs requirements and dos and don'ts. This Wiki page has been done. Obviously it has to be populated, but the actual Wiki page has been done. Also, Dev to add a review of Global Meet, a conferencing solution to test.

This was brought up during the remote hubs discussion with ICANN staff at our previous Technology Taskforce call, and it has been added. I haven't figured out when we'll have time to do it though. We might have to try and do a special purpose call for that, and we probably could discuss that on our next steps. Those are the two outstanding Action Items. The next Agenda Item is the outcomes from the FY16. There

---

*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.*

---

were two technology-related proposals that were submitted by At-Large to be budgeted in the FY16 budget. One was the creation of e-books, that Glenn McKnight has been looking at, and the other is captioning. I think Glenn is going to come in later on the call. Judith, do you want to talk about the captioning aspect?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Sure. We did get funding from the core for the captioning proposal. I'm still waiting for... Heidi hadn't had chance to talk to Josh last week, from the IT staff about it. Once that's happened Heidi will brief us. There's a bunch of people who sent me their names, and I have all the names who'd like to be part of the Committee that decides on the pilot. One idea I had is we need to figure out a way to catalogue all the requests from different RALOs of which meetings they want captioned, and then to figure out which one we'll choose a month, because we only have three a month.

We need to have more information from Heidi before we start going. Maybe Nathalie or Ariel can give you an update on that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thanks Judith. Let me ask a quick follow up question. Is it that the captioning program will be using Caption First service that we demoed on the Technology Taskforce call? Or is ICANN itself looking at a totally different captioning solution.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Well, as we are using AC for our calls, AC, as you recall from our demo we did last year, only has three providers on there for the Adobe pod. We know that Caption First has their own pod, which we liked, and which we decided was a better pod. We don't know if other people have pods also. We don't know anything about that yet, but possibly Josh could follow up on that. Unless a company has a pod that works with AC, we will use it. Right now we've tested both the Adobe pod and the Caption First pod, and we determined that the Caption First pod is preferable.

Possibly, they would probably still start using those, but I think the idea is if there's another vendor who also has a good pod that works, we'd be happy to try them out too. I don't want to say it's only Caption First, it's just that that's what we've tested so far of the two pods that are available in AC. We liked the Caption First, because we thought it was higher rated, and that was the majority opinion of everyone who was on the call, including the ICANN staff. Again, I bump it up to staff. Maybe Ariel or Nathalie who are here on staff will have a chance to talk to Heidi and can give us an update of when we can get more information.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Judith. I don't know if Ariel or Nathalie have that information, but feel free to chime in if either of you do.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Just to let you and Judith know that I've received no updates from Heidi regarding that, but I've relayed the query and Heidi will get back to you as soon as possible.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Great. Thanks Nathalie. Now, one of the things mentioned in the FY16 budget as a line item was funding for something called [Cabi 00:06:33], and I believe this is the website for [Cabi]. [Cabi] describes itself to be able to do document collaboration, and I believe, if you recall previous discussions, some of the AC and SO Chairs in LA were talking about the concerns of how to - especially within the GNSO and SSAC - about the complications with dealing with document collaboration; you're emailing documents to one another, and the challenge of keeping track and up-to-date. I believe [Cabi] was one of the solutions that's been looked at to try and alleviate that type of problem.

Perhaps this might also offer some benefits to At-Large. On the call is Chris Gift from ICANN, who can tell us a little bit about or show us some more information about what exactly is [Cabi]. Chris, can you take the floor and tell us more about [Cabi]?

CHRIS GIFT: Sure. Thank you very much Dev. Yes, [Cabi] is a tool used by a number of standards organizations to develop standards and policies. It's used by a number of standards organizations for their Working Groups to develop standards and policies - technology standards, but basically all types of standards. It's used globally by, I think, over about 125 organizations. Given that the working methods of standards bodies are very similar to the way we work in terms of the Working Groups, we thought it would be a good test. When we looked around, that was the

---

one that was most similar in terms of features and requirements we were looking for.

Right now, we're in the middle of a proof of concept. I don't want to call it a pilot. We're trying to test two ideas. The first is, does automated administrative help assist the secretary to amend the Working Group? Because there's a lot of activity around a Working Group in terms of onboarding new members, signing them onto a mailing list, making sure their SOI is kept up-to-date, or they have one that's for this Working Group. There are some aspects in [Cabi] and those types of systems that will allow you to automate some of those features. So we're testing that and saying, "Does that truly help or just add another layer of effort to everybody?"

A second idea we're testing is to look at it and say, "Does a very structured environment, such as [Cabi], assist the Working Group in preparing documentation versus an unstructured environment, such as a Wiki space, which is far more free-flowing?" Again, these are very much tests that we're conducting right now. You can look at the [Cabi] space that we have for ICANN. I'm going to put a link in here. You won't see anything when you go in. I don't believe there are any documents or calendar events uploaded right now, and this is very bare bones, but you can at least get a sense of what's there.

So far, the pilot has been going on for a few weeks - or the proof of concept has. We're starting to get an initial sense of progress for how it's being used. I think we'll have an official report - not an official final report, but a preliminary view of the effort - in about two/three weeks. We want to have something out in time for the BA Meeting. Murray, I

---

understand about the structured platform should help, but what we're finding is that people aren't participating in the structured platform like we'd hoped. We're not sure whether that's just because of training issues or just people don't have the time to participate fully. We're going to continue to investigate this and try to better understand what the problem is, or if the solution is not the appropriate solution.

In any case, we'll have a report out soon and we'll keep moving forward - either finding another solution to look at or finding another path forward. Hopefully that makes sense. Does anyone have any questions about how we're proceeding?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, thanks Chris. I think one of the things that attracted me from reading the documentation was the notifications. Just to remind you how the policy development works: if there's a decision that there should be a policy comment on an item that's open for public comment, a Wiki page is created and some penholders are assigned to write a first draft, go to comments, then write a second draft. Then a final statement is ready to be voted on by the ALAC. It's all pretty much done manually, in the sense it's all done on the Wiki and somebody has to keep updating the Wiki and sending out an email notification when the first draft is done, or when the second draft is done and so forth.

So the notifications aspect is something that's interesting. It appears to be a way of the system can send out a notification one time when the penholders are assigned, or a notification can go out to At-Large or a relevant Working Group, et cetera. That's something that's attracted my

---

attention, and maybe this might be useful for At-Large. I think Evan has his hand raised. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I'm going to assume that in a platform like this, like just about any other, you can subscribe to something and that is to follow the issue. So when somebody makes a change or some milestone is achieved you automatically get an update mail. The fact that one of these platforms will say, "Okay, I want to get it in a weekly digest," or something - as soon as there is some change to a situation, I'm going to assume that this does this, like so many other platforms like it will do it. That was just my point.

In the concept of following along with something, even if you weren't a frequent participant in the calls or whatever, you could subscribe to an issue and be notified as there were changes, or when there was a call for a vote or a call for finalizing the draft or something like that. My guess is that if [Cabi] is anywhere near the type of platform you're talking about, it's certainly going to have that sort of feature to it. Thanks.

CHRIS GIFT:

Yes, Evan, it does have those kinds of public subscription features for events, that when a particular event occurs you can be notified of that, for the public, as well as for Working Group participants. As far as Olivier's question about walking through, the way it works is that [Cabi] or tools like this provide a great number of features for administratively onboarding and managing a Working Group. It's a one place for someone to have all your calendar events, your document repository for

---

all the documents associated to that Working Group, and then notifications around those events - it also ties in voting. I'm trying to remember what other aspect it does, off the top of my head.

The beauty of it is that it's all linked to your Working Group membership participation. For instance, you can have different types of members participate in the Working Group. You can have observers versus full participants, and events will automatically go out to different people depending on their participation level. The vote may be called, but then that will only go to participants but not observers, and then you can automatically track those votes, send reminders out, and so forth. The same goes for documents. As they're posted up to the document library, notifications go out for people to review the documentation and so on.

The nice thing about it is that it's a fully integrated system so that you don't have to send out email calendar events separately for uploading a document event, for instance. Whenever I create a calendar event I can automatically associate a document that was uploaded. Then people can see the content of the meeting and so on. The last thing is that also it includes a whole emailing system so that the list is part of the Working Group. You're not seeing that online right now. The list happens within the context of that Working Group and is managed by the system. It has a great many interesting features, but it does assume a fair level of participation by the Working Group participants in terms of using the system.

Right now, I think the test is a little vague - or maybe not going as well as we'd like, because we're also running it in parallel with the Wiki, so I



---

think people are probably defaulting back to the Wiki. But again, a lot of this I need to check with Steve Allison, who's running the pilot. Regardless of how the pilot turns out, this is a proof of concept and we're still learning a lot about these kinds of systems as well as how the community can interact with these kinds of systems.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks Chris. Olivier, your hand is raised. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev. Just one thing to keep in mind when testing these systems is also to make sure [unclear 00:18:29] to use, and certainly for modest users, the screenshot they pointed us to in the chat certainly shows an interesting screen but I felt it was very cryptic. We do have a number of people who are not well-versed in these things, especially when it comes down to our international audience. I think we'll probably need to do some work to make these things as self-explanatory as possible, like in the Apple interface type thing. When things become intuitive and people don't start seeing this as a barrier but more as a chance they can use. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Indeed. Any other thoughts or comments? My next question for the Technology Taskforce is: should we get involved in testing this solution? I think I can see a need for it in terms of the policy development, but I'm worried about our bandwidth ourselves. Chris, can persons be added to this to test [Cabi], from the At-Large?

CHRIS GIFT: Very easily. We can spin up another group, because the Working Group that's using it is an active Working Group - it's the DMPM Working Group. They're trying to use it in the context of doing their work, but we could easily spin up another At-Large Working Group or just a test group, and you guys can kick the tires, see what you think. That could easily be done, any time.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. We may take you up on that Chris. Murray?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I'm trying to get a sense of what was lacking in the Wiki that the new system could complement. Quickly to Olivier's point, if we're getting something new to learn, there's always friction to make that happen, or is there actually something lacking in the Wiki? I don't know, because I haven't done much policy work to this point, but I was just wondering, Chris, whether that was a super problem? I'm speaking from a position of ignorance.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to answer the question, from what I understand of [Cabi], just reading the [Cabi] features set, what it helps with is in the notifications that go out during the policy development cycle. What happens is that the ICANN At-Large staff, Ariel, to be precise, is the one that handles the Wiki for all our policy comments and so forth. She creates the page, she sets up the first draft, and then the ALAC itself picks out who'll be a

---

---

penholder in order to get a first draft and second draft and so on. But at each step of that whole process, it works, but there's still a lot of manual back and forth to make that happen.

What [Cabi] I think can potentially do is alleviate those types of notifications, and be able to track the deadlines, rather than you having to manually go to another calendar system to track the deadlines. That's really the key possible benefit. I think the question is, by a take of hands, if there's any objection, shall we ask for some persons from At-Large to take the tires off [Cabi] and see how this works? Or we could simply as Members on the Technology Taskforce list if they wish to join the testing of [Cabi]. Going once, going twice. A link has been posted by Chris there. I'll review that after.

I'm not seeing any objection. I guess an Action Item is to find persons willing to test [Cabi] to see how it could work for At-Large policy development. Ariel has pointed out in the chat that [Cabi] can allow for Members to potentially vote on statements, whereas we then have to set up an entirely separate voting system using Big Pulse, which is the next manual step that's created, whereas [Cabi] can potentially alleviate all those manual setting up of tools. Thanks Chris. This is very interesting. It's a very good platform, I think. Any other questions?

Moving on. Unfortunately Glenn is unable to make this call, so he can't speak to the e-books part, so let me move ahead to the next Item, which his a review of post-ATLAS II items for the Technology Taskforce. Nathalie has created a PDF. Fantastic. I'll zoom in a little here. Thanks Nathalie. Recommendation 10 talks about the next evolution of language services. Nothing more to add to that. Captioning is now

---

included in the FY16 budget, so no need to talk more about that. Recommendation 11, we already made some progress.

We've demonstrated some of the captioning technologies for videos, and we'll be demonstrating the Skype Translator preview at the end of this call, which does machine and voice translation of Skype conversations. I also have an update on the LACRALO translation tools and a possible new approach for that later on in the call. Regarding Recommendation 26, which is the policy management process system, I think nothing new has been added to this. I think we're going to have to probably [unclear 00:26:18] work to provide a better update on it, in time for the BA Meeting. Nothing new has been added from our previous calls.

Recommendation 17, I do have some updates regarding "the use of social media being blocked in certain countries and provide credible alternatives". Just to note something regarding group chat, there's been some new developments within the past two weeks. HipChat, which is run by the Atlassian, which is the maintainers of the Confluence Wiki, HipChat has acquired Hall, another group chat service, and it's also acquired Jitsy, which is the videoconferencing solution that we also tested a few months back. I think Atlassian is looking to improve HipChat because of the competition with Slack.

This is something to note: also, the Social Media Working Group is supposed to be researching alternative social media platforms where traditional ones are blocked, so I believe we'll be having a Social Media call soon, so I hope there'll be some progress on this AI. But in terms of using several tools that could be used to encrypt communication, such

---

as Tor, I have a list of such tools. There are tools such as Syphon, Lantern, IE2P Anonymous Network, and the Tor project itself. All of those types of tools are multi-platform, open-source, and essentially allow for communications to be encrypted so as to allow for services that have been blocked in one territory or another.

I'll add that to the Wiki as soon as possible. Regarding Recommendation 29, which is the ALAC automated system, Glenn was working on a template or survey form that will capture the information from the RALO Chairs and Secretariats. One of the concerns is that the RALO Chairs and Secretariats aren't updating the monthly RALO list in a timely manner, and it was felt that perhaps by using a survey or Wiki or form, that the information will not only be more complete, but it makes it easier for the information to be re-shared. Unfortunately, Glenn's not on the call and I don't have the link to the templates he did in the Google Doc. I believe it was discussed in the Secretariats' group, but I don't know if Judith has any information on that.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes, I can post it in the chat. We did a template. The idea for the template was to mostly give it to RALO Leaders as a guide - not only for the monthly Secretariat report but also for different Working Groups. The form, which we're still looking for comments on, the idea is then that what was in there will generate into a spreadsheet. Glenn and I and Dev were discussing how we could turn the output of the spreadsheet to feed into different Wikis or other things so that RALOs who wanted to add pictures or other things in the forms could do that. I don't know.

---

Dev, did you get a chance to test out the links and see how we could implement that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Unfortunately, no. I haven't had chance to look at that aspect of the template. Sorry. Judith, do you have the link to the template?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, I'll post it in the chat. I have to look it up. It was on the other call, so I just have to take it from there. Maybe staff can be faster than me and can post it in the chat too.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Thanks Judith. Just to answer some of the questions in the chat, Ariel we're going to be testing Zoom. We have to test Global Meet and Zoom in terms of the conferencing solutions. We'll talk about that later in the Agenda. Indeed, the At-Large website re-design may have some impact on Recommendation 26 and how we handle or monitor our policy development process. Murray has also mentioned that PGP is also very useful for private emails. Perhaps we can add that on the link. The challenge is how we can actually test these solutions. I'm not sure if we have the bandwidth or the capability of testing is properly, but I think we could probably note all these platforms.

These are the various options that people can look at to use to be able to use the services that are blocked in their territories. I was on Recommendation 29. Hopefully Judith will find the link to paste in the chat there. Going back to Recommendation 31, ICANN and the ALAC

---

should investigate the use of simple tools to facilitate participation in public comments. One tool that we were looking at is something called Lumio - an online tool for collaborative decision making. I'll post the link there. Beran is the one that took the initiative. Beran, are you able to take the floor to tell us your thoughts about this?

BERAN GILLEN:

Yes, I'm here. I did test out Lumio, but I felt it was a bit restrictive. I think it's only meant for projects. It's not really very open if you want to use it for something like what we're doing. What exactly are we supposed to be using it for, Dev? Is it supposed to be to replace the AC, or a specific reason?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

It was really just to be useful for addressing ATLAS Recommendation 31, which says that ICANN and the ALAC should investigate the use of simple tools and methods to facilitate participation in public comments, and the use of crowd-sourcing. The idea would be that potentially with a system like this, you could post something for public comment and you can use a system, perhaps Lumio, which builds itself as an online tool for collaborative decision making, to guide public comments.

BERAN GILLEN:

I just thought it wasn't as easy to use as I thought it would be. I found it a bit difficult to find menu items and things like that. I also felt it wasn't doing as much as it should be. It was a bit restrictive. It was too simple, in a way.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks Beran. Just to give some ideas, if you check the website, there are no mobile notifications or anything of that sort. You really have to go to the site and get your notifications. You'll see your notifications on a dashboard page and you can join multiple groups in Lumio. The way it works is something like you create a proposal, and then the discussion happens when they need that, and persons can express support for it, and as people express support for it you get to see how many people agree, abstain, disagree, and I guess vote [a block 00:36:27].

So it flows in a sense. I get what you're saying. It seems to be more designed for desktop rather than mobile. That's a fair characterization. Even though there's no mobile app, actually the app does work on mobile devices, but there's no native pushed notifications, for example. Chris Gift has also pointed out IdeaScale is another tool. We probably also need to do an evaluation of it. Another tool we also noted was something called liquidfeedback.org, so we have to do the testing for that as well, but we can probably do the testing for IdeaScale as well. That was the tool that came also out of the ATLAS. It was mentioned a lot. Okay, let's see... "Use IdeaScale for the Panels." Chris, I can't remember which panels you're referring to. Can you elaborate?

CHRIS GIFT: Remember we had those four Panels that Fadi started a while back? They lasted a few months. One of the Panels Beth Novak was a Chair of,



---

they used IdeaScale to solicit ideas and topics from the community on technologies. It was used relatively successfully.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks Chris for reminding me what the Panels were. Yes, I do recall there were Panels, and that it was used for gathering feedback. Thanks for refreshing my memory on that. The next AI is to add IdeaScale for testing, as per Recommendation 31. Regarding Recommendation 39, open data, I don't think we've had any progress on this aspect of how open data should be done within ICANN. Chris, has there been any updates on internally as to what's happened at ICANN regarding open data since our last call when you talked about it?

CHRIS GIFT: No, there's been an update about it. The only thing I can add is they're very technical in part. We are looking at actively investigating, changing or advancing our infrastructure for our website that would allow us to service APIs to a lot of the data that we currently have within ICANN. If we take that step it will make all those APIs public so people can automatically consume the same data we use to construct the websites, to publicize them, to surface them to the viewers - they can use that same data in another way. So that's a form of open data; probably not exactly what you were thinking.

But even that, we're probably about three-quarters of a year to a year away to achieving that, if we do choose to go down that path. If we do, we'll be very public about it and be very open and solicit feedback about that before we do so.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Those were the post-ATLAS II items for the Technology Taskforce. Any other questions or comments on these ATLAS II items? Let me ask the question for planning purposes - and perhaps Olivier is the person to answer this question: I know a lot of the attention is being focused on the IANA stewardship and ICANN accountability - is there any particular timeline in terms of the ATLAS II items that are supposed to be addressed? There were about 36 Recommendations. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Indeed our aim was to try and do as many as possible, as quickly as possible. It's going to be a year since those Recommendations were drafted. By the time we reach BA it will be roughly about a year. It is a bit disappointing that we haven't managed to report back and implement the great majority of them. We have done a few. We've actually sent them to the Board. We haven't actually even engaged in getting the feedback from the Board yet and at the same time there's very little bandwidth that our community has to do significant work and present the results to the Board.

I'd even say there's very little bandwidth on the Board for this topic specifically. As a result, it's not planned we'll present anything to the Board on this topic when we meet them in BA, and hopefully by that time the IANA stewardship transition, ICANN accountability, will be either passed, or be less of an oxygen taker in the room. But hopefully by Dublin, which is the AGM at the end of the year, we should just continue our work and present the results, and maybe not close off on

---

all of the Recommendations, because some of them may take more than just one year to implement, but at least present a significant batch of them to the Board by Dublin.

I would say that if we do present anything on this occasion in BA, it's pretty much going to go unnoticed by the Board and probably going to, if there is any request for the Board to ask on things, it's probably going to be quite unlikely that the Board will act on anything at the moment. The air in the room at the moment is really taken by accountability and IANA stewardship transition. It's something we couldn't have forecast a year ago, and so that's why I wouldn't really push it too hard. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I guess the way to proceed would be to steadily progress and document this more thoroughly so that when it can be presented not only to the ICANN Board but to the At-Large community, everybody will be on board with it. Murray, go ahead.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Just a question for Olivier on his last comment. I recall there was a lot of positive comments, and we made a presentation of a specific group of Recommendations to the Board after London. I was wondering whether that presentation is still... Because there was a process to a very specific group of Recommendations presented at a Board Meeting. Is there a presentation still around that we can refer to going forward?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We did give a presentation. I think we actually provided two presentations. We had one that we provided when we met in LA with the Board, and with an update. We also had a presentation that we gave to the Board when we met with them over in London, but that wasn't really very significant, because we haven't drafted the Recommendations yet. We have a second presentation that we were going to present to the Board during the Singapore Meeting, and although it was on the Agenda we ran out of time and other topics took precedence.

So this remained in our coffers, as one would say. I think perhaps it would help if we had the ability to look at both these presentations and perhaps follow up, as a group, on the first set of Recommendations that we sent to the Board - so on the first PowerPoint presentation - and also maybe try and beef up our response and build on the second presentation that was ready. If that could be done as an AI that would be really helpful as a way forward. Thanks for mentioning those, Murray.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Indeed, yes, I'd agree with Murray that it would be a shame to lose the momentum. I think what we probably do need to do is to go back to those presentations that were done in the LA Meeting, and the one that was planned for the Singapore, I'm sure you could find the link to those presentations somewhere on the Wiki, and then look to update that in time for our next meeting, which may not happen in time for BA, but could possibly happen for the Dublin Meeting. Any other thoughts or comments on ATLAS II?

---

Okay, so next steps regarding conferencing solutions and the remote hub documentation. I wish Glenn was on the call, because he could probably speak more regarding the remote hubs aspect. Nathalie's putting on the screen the list of At-Large hubs that were done for the past three meetings, starting with the London Meeting. A lot of ISOC Chapters and quite a lot of diversity from the LA Meeting across the board. One of the things we were supposed to do is the Wiki page is up - but we need some penholders to really drive the documentation of the remote hubs; the dos and don'ts. Murray?

MURRAY MCKERCHER:

I'm the one on the call who's operated a remote hub, so I do have that experience, and perhaps I should try and hand some good practices over. I know technically speaking the ICANN staff had very good implementation to help us and the assistance during the event was helpful as well. But there's a broader process of trying to engage the community ahead of the actual remote hub, so my thought was I guess there should be some process to say, "Here's a particular item that's of interest to this group in this part of the world," and educate those people ahead of the actual remote hub event.

Then it would make it more meaningful for everyone. That's my comment. There is something to be done. Perhaps staff and I can work on that. Happy to do so.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Indeed, as someone who's had experience, with the entire remote hub process, having applied for and set up the actual remote hub and so

---

forth, I think your expertise will be very valuable in helping documenting. In terms of the document, it's to actually present to prospective ALSes what they need to have in place, or the dos and don'ts, as the AI that came out of the remote hubs discussion that the Technology Taskforce call had, stated, on our last Technology Taskforce call.

Perhaps Murray... I'm sure Glenn would also be a person to involve too, because he also did the remote hub in New York, so I think Murray and Joly could be the key penholders to help try and draft the dos and don'ts for the remote hubs. I see Ariel has her hand raised.

ARIEL LIANG:

I just want to add one thing. Recently there's been a development on ICANN remote hubs, and in the future the ICANN DPRD Department will be leading remote hubs for future meetings, but for the ICANN 53 Meeting, At-Large staff will still lead the publicity and also setting up the survey, application form, and those things. Then the DPRD will shadow the process and in ICANN 54 they will lead the process. This is just as an FYI. Also, if Murray and Glenn plan to draft that dos and don'ts document, I'd appreciate it I can connect with Murray and Glenn about that and convey that information to DPRD so we're all in synch.

Also, the GSE will participate in this ICANN 53 remote hub organization because it's in the Latin American region. It's a bigger process right now, and we'll try and make it more in synch and coordinate it. I think it's good to share this information with you. I want to make sure that I can

---

convey the information from our community to the relevant department. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Ariel. A new acronym within ICANN to be more acquainted with. I think the AI will be: Murray, Glenn and Joly to work on the remote hub documentation. I posted a link to the transcript from the meeting of the Technology Taskforce that discussed the remote hubs. We can look at the transcript and from that gather some of our ideas from that. We're coming up to the top of the hour, but I did mention we are going to be going a little beyond our time here to talk about the Skype translator preview.

Just to quickly update also on the conferencing solutions, I will start the conferencing solutions in a Google Doc first, and then what's been happening also, apart from the times I've been doing the document, is there seems to be a lot of changes happening in terms of what to do and so forth. I will make it an AI: "Dev to post the link to the Google Doc to the Technology Taskforce list." Just to update also on the LACRALO mailing list translate, I'd better share my screen here so people can understand what I'm going to be talking about. I did a simple picture to illustrate what's happening here.

This will lead right up to the Skype translator preview immediately afterwards. One of the challenges is when I share my screen the whole AC collapses, so sometimes I can't see the chat. All right. Just to go into the background of what the LACRALO mailing list translation is, how it works is we have two separate links - the LACRALO EN and the

---

LACRALO\_ES. A person who's emailed to the LACRALO EN list, the trans bot account translates the email from the EN to the ES, the trans bot will then post that translated email to the LACRALO ES, and those persons subscribed to that LACRALO ES receives that email and then replies.

A similar process happens in a reverse fashion for when a person is posting to the LACRALO ES list. The trans bot takes that email from the ES, it machine translates the email to English and then posts it on the EN list, and persons receive it on the English list. The progress on moving to a translation bot that's powered by Google, it's happening, but it's happening very slowly, primarily due to two things: one, there's only one person on ICANN staff working on this - Josh Jenkins, primarily - and he's doing this in his spare time.

The second is of course a lack of [unclear 00:57:00] getting involved. Even though there's quite a few persons from LACRALO involved - myself, Humberto Carrasco, Alejandro Pisanty, Leon Sanchez - that are on the testing list, for the most part it's been me trying to post links and testing the engine and writing up bug reports. So one of the challenges I think has been happening - and the challenge with this type of system I've designed is that one, this doesn't [unclear 00:57:49], so if you wanted to add Portuguese for example, which is another spoken language in the LAC region, or French even, it becomes much harder.

Because what happens then, [source 00:58:07] of the material because it's now trying to translate and re-translate machine translates when people reply back and forth, the quality of the text suffers. That's been a challenge. One of the things I've been thinking of - and I had a private chat with Josh, who's the ICANN IT person working on this, about



---

coming up with a slightly differently direction. The slightly different direction here is this. Here's how it will work. Here's how the potential new direction for the new design could happen:

What happens now is there's one LACRALO discuss list where everyone's able to post to, and what happens is the user posts to the LACRALO discuss list, the trans bot then translates that message and posts simultaneously to the LACRALO EN and to the LACRALO ES, and then those persons subscribed to those lists can receive it, but then they can only reply to the discuss list. What happens therefore is that the discuss ES and EN become essentially announcement lists where people can get announcements, but when they reply it goes back only LACRALO discuss.

The benefit of this is one, it scales to multiple languages. We can add Portuguese, we can add French to this, and so forth, and the original text of the posters is [teemed 01:00:17] in a coherent format, and in one location so that if there's any discrepancy you can go back to the discuss list and do your own machine translation to find out what the person was saying. I see Olivier has raised his hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to ask, at the moment, if you send a message in English to the Spanish list, to LACRALO discuss, yes, it goes through in English and doesn't get translated. What sometimes people do is send both to the English and the Spanish list and then you see the message post in its original form and the translated form, and sometimes I don't know which one of the two is more legible, as such. You do need to get

---

people to choose which one they want to send to, and I don't think it's actually quite clear.

Are you saying here that LACRALO discuss would sent to the trans bot and the trans bot would detect the language that's used and then translate it to the other languages? What happens if it's sent in a language that's not understood by the trans bot? If somebody writes in Russian, let's say, does it then get sent by default to the English list?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Indeed, this is another thing that was occurring to me, because I'm dealing with that frustration myself, and I'm a person that's subscribed to both the EN and ES lists, so it gets very confusing when people start posting double to both lists, and the result is [not pretty 01:02:20], let's put it that way. It gets very confusing. I'm thinking this approach would actually alleviate that, because there's only one list to post to, and the persons will then be posting to that one only. In theory, if there's a different language that's not supported, what could happen is first of all the trans bot could pass on the message as is.

If somebody did post in Russian onto the LACRALO discuss list, the trans bot would simply post it as is, untranslated, to the EN and ES lists. It will handle it much easier, I think, than how it works right now, where the trans bot automatically, for the EN list, its core function is that whatever's being posted to EN, it machine translates to ES regardless of what it is. Again, disaster results when somebody posts to Spanish and the machine translates into Spanish, which again makes it very confusing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Another question Dev. Now, when you have implemented the system where you've got the LACRALO discuss that will then channel through to EN or ES, if one posts to the EN and ES lists as well, would these be automatically redirected to the LACRALO discuss list? If they were duplicates, would you then just have one that goes through, rather than three messages?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: What happens with this new direction, the EN and ES lists would be like announcement lists. We're thinking that what could happen is that the trans bot will change the "reply to" field in the email to the discuss list so that when they click "reply" it will go back to the discuss list, even though you may be subscribed to the EN or ES.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But often people have in their address book the EN or ES list already there. Sometimes in fact the mailers add this automatically as you type the first characters. It would probably be also helpful to have the publicized old EN and ES list would have to be pointing to the LACRALO discuss list, and perhaps the triage discuss list would have to send to either EN or ES. It would have to use a back-door or something. I don't know. I think that's possible.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: The thing is, Josh agrees on this, and I think this will simplify things a lot from the current model of how they've been doing it for years now. It's

---

---

early days yet for this. He says he'll try and set that up and see how this works. Hopefully the challenge you're presenting can be alleviated. If the email goes to the EN list, the worst case would be to simply post it back and say, "You can't post to this list. You've got to post to discuss." But I'm thinking this will make life a lot easier, because it will have one source of original emails, attachments are kept - those types of things. All of those problems we're having right now could be better with this new model.

I see in the chat here there's something called Discourse. I've heard of this, and we probably should try to look at that as well. I've only seen the page, but I think we should add this to the test for testing as well. We could probably add that as an AI - the use of Discourse for the Technology Taskforce to test. Any other thoughts or comments or questions? Okay. The only downside of this is that unfortunately, unless we have a miraculous breakthrough in terms of more people working on this problem on the ICANN side of things, I don't think there's going to be a new form of the mailing list translation announced at BA, which I'd have loved to have done.

Unfortunately this problem on the mailing list will continue on a little bit. Hopefully not for too long, but it won't be solved in time for BA. Okay, indeed, Chris, it would be good to have that discussion with Josh and see what could be done. Our next Agenda Item is to look at the Skype translation system preview. What I'm going to do is open up Skype Translator Preview. I'll go into some background here. What's going to be happening first is I should get a dial-out from Nathalie to my phone. I will then mute my AC audio and then hopefully people will hear the audio through Skype translator through my phone.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Is this Skype Translator something that's available at the moment?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: What I've done is I've muted my AC audio and now dialed into the phone bridge. Are you all hearing me?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I can hear you Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I see Ariel is online. I hope you can see my screen. Ariel, let me open up another conversation. Let me show you how this works. The Skype Translator Preview only works for Windows 8, and you also have to have a Microsoft account. What will happen is that you can use your Skype account to merge with the Microsoft account, and from then on you'll use your Microsoft account to this Skype Translator Preview. How it works is that I can enable translation for each contact. I could turn it on and specify the spoken languages. There's only four spoken languages; Chinese, English, Italian and Spanish.

I don't know why French was not allowed, or [unclear 01:12:09], but those are the four spoken languages. Also, you can specify the chat messaging. If you can see on my screen, there are a lot more languages specified here. When I type, what happens is you'll see Skype will now translate. Just to answer the questions in the chat, you need Windows

---

8. I'd say Windows 8.1, I guess, and/or a Windows phone, or running the Windows phone mobile OS, such as the service, et cetera.

Now, the translation will work for communicating to regular Skype accounts. It's not as if both persons need Skype Translator Preview - only one person will. If you're looking at the chat right now, it's translated this into Chinese for me. When Ariel types in Chinese it's translated to English for me. Let's see if we can now do a voice conversation now with Ariel. Ariel, are you ready to have a voice conversation?

ARIEL LIANG:

Dev, just as a disclaimer, if you hear the voice translator from my line - because I will be speaking Chinese, I will be interpreted into English - it's not 100 per cent precise and may say something that's not what I mean. This is a disclaimer. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

All right. Yes, the translation is not perfect, so you might see some strange results, but it is quite amazing to see it in action. Skype Translation Preview can only be downloaded from the Windows Store, and for that you need a Microsoft account. That's why it only works on Windows 8.1, and Windows phone OS. Let's do this. Ariel, are you ready?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I'll be conversing with Ariel in Chinese.

ARIEL LIANG: [Speaks Chinese].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hello Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: [Speaks Chinese].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: The weather is very sunny.

ARIEL LIANG: [Speaks Chinese].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Let me talk back to the AC room here. What's happening is that as I speak the message is transcribed by Skype, so as I talk you can see the text happen in the Skype chat. Also, a machine voice speaks the Chinese to Ariel. Ariel, if you want, you can also type in something and it will machine translate it back, so as she speaks in Chinese it will be translated. Ariel, can you say something?

ARIEL LIANG: [Speaks Chinese].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: The machine voice is speaking English after the machine transcribed what she said.

ARIEL LIANG: [Speaks Chinese].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: As you can see, it's not perfect.

ARIEL LIANG: [Speaks Chinese].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Any thoughts or questions on the AC? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. My question is, I understand that Ariel on her side is able to hear the synthetic voice speaking to her in Chinese. I understand this was going to work the other way as well, but I can only see the text translation. Is this a feature or is this a bug?



---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Let me see if I understand you Olivier. Can you repeat the question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: When you were speaking, I can hear that Ariel on her side gets a synthesized version speaking to her, the translated version, in Chinese. But when Ariel spoke, I saw what she said being translated to English and put into text, but I didn't hear a synthesizer synthesize what was said and speak to us like Stephen Hawking. Is this a feature? Is it meant to be like this, or are we meant to hear voices on both sides?

ARIEL LIANG: I can probably answer that question. When I heard the Chinese interpretation speak Chinese, I replied in Chinese, and then that reply was interpreted into English as well. So it's both ways. I don't know whether you heard that English interpretation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I didn't. I just read the text, but I didn't hear the synthesizer say the text. I don't know whether it was meant to be that way or not.

ARIEL LIANG: I think it's because Dev is on the receiving end. He probably heard that. I heard that as well. I'm not sure why it's not broadcast in the AC, but we both heard the English interpretation as well.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Indeed, I was hearing the English as Ariel spoke. There's a pause, because if you think about it, what's happening is the voice is captured, sent to Microsoft, transcribed, then machine translated, and then a machine is then speaking the English words, so there is some delay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. Because we're on the AC we didn't hear the response. It didn't come out. I guess you're probably listening through headphones, so we couldn't hear it on the AC, but that's fine. If it works both ways that's super. Really impressive. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Obviously we have to speak slowly in order for the translation to catch up. I have to say, it is quite impressive that this is happening in real-time. It's like the stuff you read in books, the [Babble Fish 01:24:41]. Are there any more questions? I'm looking at the AC chat. As far as I understand it, Evan, this only works one-to-one. It will not work in a group chat. Yes, it only works for one-to-one.

ARIEL LIANG: [Speaks Chinese].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hopefully you've gotten the idea of how the Skype Translator Preview works. The other thing also is that the conversation, at least for the Skype Preview, is being sent to Microsoft, so all this information is going to Microsoft, so this conversation is not totally private. Again, it's quite

---

impressive. The transcribing, I'm surprised, works very well in English. Part of me was trying to think maybe we could use this as a captioning tool, to get a transcript! Okay, so any other thoughts, comments or questions? Okay. All right, I think we can end this call.

ARIEL LIANG: [Speaks Chinese].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, take care Ariel. Bye. Okay, so I think I can end this call now. Any other comments or questions? By the way, also, there's the ability to save the transcript of the call. Indeed, the spoken languages only work for four. The instant messaging transcription, they support a lot more, which makes sense, because it's essentially just taking the text and machine translating it, like Google Translate. Yes, lots and lots of languages. I'm just surprised French wasn't one of the spoken languages. Okay, in terms of next steps for our next meeting, I'll talk to Judith and Glenn with regards to our next options.

I'm thinking we will have to have another Technology Taskforce call towards the end of the month, and possibly even [unclear 01:30:02] this call to look at data conferencing solutions. Okay. All right, seeing no further hands raised, I'd like to thank everyone for attending this call. This call is now adjourned. Thank you all. Have a great morning, afternoon, evening. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**