
SINGAPORE – At-Large Technology Taskforce Working Group
Thursday, February 12, 2015 – 08:00 to 09:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, this is co-chair Glenn McKnight and Judith Hellerstein. We have remotely on the call Dev. We are going to proceed with our call today. We have a lengthy slideshow and we have an agenda set as well.

Dev, I'd like to turn it to you to give the overview.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much, Glenn. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I'm the chair of the Technology Taskforce for this session. Judith and Glenn are co-chairs of the Technology Taskforce. [inaudible] in Singapore, I'm sure they're there [inaudible] question.

Let's begin with our presentation. We have four items on our agenda. Next slide, please.

Introduction to the At-Large Technology Taskforce. Two, we're going to be looking at the implementation from the At-Large Summit II recommendations that were [allocated] to the Technology Taskforce.

Three, we're going to review web conferencing tools for use by ICANN and At-Large. Then, four, we're looking to get some community feedback. What should the Technology Taskforce be looking at? Next slide.

Let's introduce the Technology Taskforce. Next slide.

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.

So the Technology Taskforce came out with a recommendation from the At-Large Improvements in June 2012. In particular, the recommendation from the improvement project said that there needs to be a Technology Taskforce to introduce to At-Large Structures selected information, dissemination, communication and collaboration tools and provide training, and [inaudible] communication and collaboration needs considered and met by At-Large Structures and the RALOs.

[inaudible] technology either currently in use by At-Large or elsewhere in ICANN, and to identify and review other technologies as they become available. Next slide.

So this is a review of all the Technology Taskforce members. I note again I am the chair of the Technology Taskforce since its inception, but since our [inaudible] Los Angeles meeting, Glenn McKnight and Judith Hellerstein are co-chairs. We have a diverse membership. We do need some more persons from the European region. We'll get to that in part four. Next slide.

Just to summarize the Technology Taskforce. Who can be in the Technology Taskforce? It consists of members from the At-Large community and we welcome anyone from the At-Large community to join us.

We have conference calls at least once a month. Sometimes two meetings in a month. There are two links there. We have a work space where we document our activities, and also our main page on the At-Large Wiki.



Just to also mention one of the things that I think people think of when they hear technology that they have to be some super guru technology [inaudible] and that's not the case. It's [inaudible] interest in testing technology and getting feedback. That's extremely valuable and it's what we absolutely need to help At-Large. Next slide.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Excuse me, Dev. Somebody joined us on Adigo. I just wondered who that is. Dev, I was just going to ask, somebody has joined us on Adigo, if they can identify themselves.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: They may have dropped off.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, sorry. Go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Well, I was about to actually turn it over to you. Now that I've given an introduction of the Technology Taskforce, next we will be looking at is the report of the implementation of the At-Large Summit II recommendations.

Either Glenn or Judith, which one of you is going to . . . ?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'll take up now. We're talking about now the ATLAS II recommendations that were assigned either to the Technology

Taskforce alone or to the Technology Taskforce in combination with the Accessibility, the Outreach, or the Social Media teams. Next slide.

As you see here, a complete list of all the recommendations can be found at this link. Next slide.

Some of these recommendations, as I mentioned, were allocated to the different groups, and so as you can see by the link [inaudible]. Next slide.

So we're going to focus on a couple of the main recommendations that were assigned to us, which is – right now we're going to be talking about recommendation 10 and 11, which are very similar in some ways because they both deal . . . One deals with language services and the other deals with how we can increase outreach and accessibility to different users and how to make sure we get cultural diversity and gender diversity. So these next few slides that we're going to be discussing are going to be on that.

Recommendation 10, you can read what the recommendation was. What we've done is we evaluated two different Adobe Connect plugins for live captioning. One from Adobe Connect and the other one that was produced by CaptionFirst. We did them at two different calls. One was the joint Accessibility with Technology Taskforce meeting, and then the other one was also an Accessibility one earlier last month. Next slide, please.

This is a sample of – we decided to choose that the CaptionFirst was a much better layout. This slide shows you the difference of the two layouts of Adobe Connect where they break up the sentence because



it's word-by-word and the CaptionFirst, and the different abilities that the CaptionFirst slide has on them. So it was decided that this layout is much better. Next slide, please.

So, also recommendation 10, they talk about different language services. So at At-Large we do interpretation in Spanish and French and Russian. It is possible to get captioning in English, Spanish, and French. We probably could get it in other languages if we investigate other points, but it's also available for those. Interpretation and captioning, our goal would be to done on requests by people who are requesting the different language services. If they're requesting Spanish interpretation, we may have a request for Spanish captioning. Likewise, French and similarly.

Besides the ability of it being accessible, the captioning also provides help for a lot of our members who are in bandwidth-challenged countries where the bandwidth is very limited and they cannot engage or participate as well on Adobe Connect. So this would allow them to engage more and participate more in monthly meetings and in other working group meetings.

As well as where English is not the native language. Say the captioning is only done in English, they can easily better engage with the meaning while seeing the captions the written language. Next slide, please.

As I talked about, 11 is very similar in the sense that it also works on trying to make services access across various criteria whether it's gender, cultural diversity, user needs. So some of those issues, I was talking [inaudible] also related to 11. This is a summary of what we've done, working 11.



There are some issues with the mobile version of Adobe, but that should be maybe corrected in the next few months as Adobe more integrates work on HTML 5. We've been in discussions with the WC3 Taskforce who have been working on that. So we're very hopeful that in the next few months that will also be worked out. If we go forward, this could be work on all platforms that we have.

We are hoping – since we do not offer the services, we don't have a take-up of the services, so we're hoping that once they get offered that we'll have more awareness and more of a take-up of this as it becomes more.

In that line, we are also putting in a special budget request to conduct a pilot to live caption either RALO meetings, ALAC meetings, working groups or even webinars. Next slide, please.

Along with live streaming, we've also looked at video captioning of movies, as this is also a layer to recommendation 11. In this vein, we took a look at on one of our [call two] examples. One was a tool called Craptions to Captions, which is an open source tool for captioning videos. This is an excellent tool we found. This tool is mostly useful for people who actually own their own videos. It's not as well used for people where they want to capture someone else's video.

In this case, we've looked at another tool called [Amara], which allows anyone to make subtitles on any film whether they own it or not. So this you could either put subtitles in many different languages. And the vocalization . . . Since Glenn was instrumental in this area, he'll say a brief word on this.



GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Since I've been instructed to a brief comment, Craptions to Captions was developed by an Australian chap who is seriously deaf. It's a fantastic product. What's interesting about Ken, he has an interesting blog that you can follow. He makes a really important point. If you rely on the captioning from YouTube, you'll find it extremely poor. So he makes a very easy process of actually converting it – as he says, Craptions to Captions.

Now, [Amara], on the other hand, it has a crowd collaborative crowdsourcing capability. Very interesting model. A little more difficult to queue up and do it. You have to be a little bit more careful, but this is consistent to what Judith has been doing with captioning with the web conferencing tools.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Thank you, Glenn, for that. The [Amara] tool is used by a lot of different Internet societies who find it very easy and a very easy way of translating different tools. Next slide, please.

The Taskforce has also looked at different translation tools such as Skype or Google Translate and there's a bunch of new tools that are coming out all the time. So we've looked at a couple of tools. The Taskforce is also working with the IT staff to have a new version of machine translation tools for the LACRALO meetings and mailing lists, and that has been a very big and strong demand within LACRALO that we've been looking at. Next slide, please.



DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to talk about this issue of LACRALO machine translation, because I am from the LACRALO region, and if you [heard] of the LACRALO mailing list translation [inaudible]. Just before the Singapore meeting, I had a conference call with Silvia Vivanco from At-Large staff and [Josh] from IT staff to go over the issues related to the new version, which is an improvement but there still seems to be some technical glitches worked out.

We'll be looking to have a special [inaudible] look at the detailed issues. You can go to that link and read a good summary of the history and issues and some of the [inaudible]. But we aren't looking to try to see to deploy this new translation [inaudible] before the next ICANN meeting, which will be in Argentina. That's it. Back to Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thank you so much. This slide Glenn is going to talk a little bit about these next few recommendations.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, Judith. I'll do this slide and Dev will carry on after. As you notice here in this recommendation, it was allocated to two groups which Dev is deeply involved with as well. So the large part of this information is coming from Dev.

As it states, the ICANN needs to be sensitive to the fact that social media is blocked in certain countries and in conjunction with technical bodies promote credible alternatives.



This has been consistent to our sessions that we've been trying to promote on alternative DNS and [TOR] sessions here at ICANN. We didn't have one at this time, but we indicate here some of the things that we can do and perhaps it's something we can look at in the new year sessions. We can probably do a webinar on this topic.

Very interesting tools we did for group chat, including Slack, HipChat, and [inaudible]. Again, any suggestions from the community on other tools for our sessions would be welcome. Back to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I see Murray has his hand raised. Murray, you want to make a quick observation on this slide?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I just wanted to get in briefly. I put some chat in about social media. But translation. I came across – I don't know how we'd integrate it, but a really interesting mobile app where you hover your phone over Chinese characters and Mandarin characters and it changes it to English. So it's reading pictures and making a translation on a mobile device. I don't know how you'd integrate it into the system, but I just wanted to let you know that it exists and I've used it. It's really handy when I'm in China. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Murray. Next slide, please. Okay. This [inaudible] recommendation 26, and it's quite a lengthy recommendation. It says that the current policy management processes within ICANN are

insufficient and ICANN needs to implement a workable policy management process system that's available for use across the ACs and SOs.

I'll read it for the record: "In order to enhance knowledge management, improve the effectiveness of all ICANN volunteer communities, improve cross-community policy-specific activities, enhance policy development metrics, facilitate multi-lingual engagement, create a taxonomy of policy categories, and provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers."

This is allocated to three working groups: this working group, Technology Taskforce, Social Media Working Group, and a Capacity Building Working Group. Next slide, please.

What I wanted to talk [inaudible] about is what exactly do you want in a policy management process system? I thought I would just highlight a few suggestions for what we want in a policy management process system.

We want to be able to quickly find historical information on a policy issue, so when we want to search for WHOIS, you can get a report on all the WHOIS activity that's happened in ICANN within a particular timeframe, and also see the [inaudible] made by [inaudible] ACs and SOs on those policy issues. So the system needs to have that policy history [inaudible] in a manner to allow for such queries.

So the second thing that we want, we want to be able to subscribe to policy updates [inaudible]. One comment/concern is that we are inundated with e-mails upon e-mails and notifications about every



single policy issue. A person who has a keen interest in [inaudible] specific areas – for example, IDN – they should only be [inaudible] subscribe to receive updates on that specific policy issue that is of interest to them. So this is where taxonomy needs to come in.

Also, a system that could [inaudible] into action if a person commented on a particular issue in the past, whenever new related policies [inaudible] for comment, you could be notified automatically without you having to manually subscribe to each policy as it comes out.

Another issue we want is to track deadlines for responding to policy comment. Because we have multiple comment periods happening simultaneously at different stages – one is first draft [in process], a statement being voted on, a first call for comments, etc. The system should be able to update the calendar in order for the AC or SO to track and manage deadlines. Next slide.

What we're also looking for is the ability to read policy issues and updates in [the] language. So a person should be able to subscribe to notifications when policies are available in their language to review, and also be able to see the announcements in their own language.

Having the policy review process more accessible to mobile users. With more and more persons using mobile devices, phones and tablets, the policy review process needs to be more accessible to such users for them to engage in the policy process.

The sixth item – by the way, I put an ordered list. It really wasn't a priority list. It was just to be able to reference. These are suggestions presented in no particular order.



Six, to reduce the manual duplication to disseminate information. A lot of effort is expended by the ACs and SOs. Support staff can normally copy and paste text in order to disseminate policy information to the various communities and to the wider public. Wiki pages being created, [inaudible] being drafted and sent to the various lists to share on social media.

A system should offer sharing mechanisms. A person wanting to get the word out can do so more easily rather than trying to [inaudible] cut and paste to send it out.

What do you all want in a policy management process system? These are just some of the things we are thinking of. I'm looking forward to have your input in that. Next slide.

This is some of the other things we are doing regarding recommendation 26. The At-Large website redesign is underway, and part of the work that we design helps to try to provide a policy background on policy issues as well as to create a taxonomy of policy categories and to highlight the policy metrics. [inaudible] statements are posted on [inaudible] IANA, etc.

And a mock-up of the website has been provided. I do believe this was presented in an earlier session earlier this week. What the Technology Taskforce will also be doing based on our discussions and calls is [inaudible] policy development processes at the regional Internet registries. It is suggested, and I believe even an ICANN board member suggested that we need to look at how the RIRs handle policy development and see what could be adapted for use by At-Large and ICANN. Next slide.

Okay. I could take the rest of these recommendations. Or Judith, Glenn, you want to take it on? Okay, hearing silence, I'm hoping I'm still connected. Let me just continue on with recommendation 29.

Recommendation 29 talks about implementing an automated system or tracking conflicts of interest. What we're looking at is to use [inaudible] for syndicating RALO topics across all the RALO Wiki pages.

Glenn, I see your hand raised. Go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Dev, I'm aware of our position on this, but have you been interfacing with the Capacity Building Working Group on how different their interpretation of this action item is?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Glenn. Are you referring to recommendation 26, the policy management process; or recommendation 29?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, it's 29, the one we're on right now.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you. I don't think I have any recollection of what is happening on the Capacity Building Working Group side of things. With regards to the Social Media Working Group, we did have a preliminary discussion on this issue and one of the things we are looking at is what could be easily shared via social media. So [inaudible] input on the Capacity Building Working Group side of things.

Murray, I see your hand raised. Do you have a question on this slide?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, or more of a comment. I have been using the confluence area for trying to track topics of interest to me and there are some tools there that seem to work reasonably well. I realize that not everybody is on the confluence Wiki, and I don't know whether there's policy issues with that. It has some value for me, so that's where I'm using it at the moment. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Murray. Another good point [inaudible] highlights sufficiently enough. Indeed [inaudible] can subscribe to particular Wiki areas to see if there are updates in the area. So if they're interested in the activity of a particular working group or working groups, they could just track the changes. So I think perhaps that [inaudible] highlight it. So thanks for that suggestion.

What perhaps the Technology Taskforce can do is probably highlight that aspect for regular At-Large users as to how to track changes to Wiki sections.

Going back to the slides, what we're also looking at is looking at Wiki add-ons such as confluence [questions]. There's a link [inaudible] look at that add-on. And [inaudible] applications that could allow for crowdsourcing of topic discussions. We haven't begun evaluation of that, so that's something that's on our to-do list. Next slide.



GLENN MCKNIGHT: Since you may not have video, I'd like to welcome Olivier and Beran to the room. They have joined us as well.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, and welcome, indeed. Okay, just to go quickly through the rest of the recommendations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've actually been following since five minutes after the start of the call on my portable iPad device walking around. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, thanks, Olivier. I did see [inaudible]. Just going back to recommendation 31, we got [inaudible] research the use of simple tools to facilitate participation and public comments. We have identified a tool called [Liquid Feedback] and are planning to review that in a future Technology Taskforce session.

And recommendation 39, ICANN should encourage open data best practices. I think that actually this is a useful recommendation. A lot of information produced by ICANN is already public, but it's not really stored in an organized way for that information to be collated and be used. You have [inaudible] Wikis possibly and [inaudible] chats and so forth. So we are going to be reviewing [inaudible]. There's some links there that I put there.

I think this is also again an example of how open data could exist. Right now we are trying to create a single engagement map which are mapping what in a particular country, whether that country has ALS

structures, whether they are in the GAC, whether they are [inaudible] ccTLDs [inaudible] ccNSO.

The team that's currently working on it – Maureen, Ron Sherwood, and myself – we have to pull the information manually from the various community webpages. So [inaudible] available in an open format, we could mix and match and come up with different comparisons. Next slide.

Okay, section three. That completes our ATLAS II section. Does anybody have any comments or questions regarding the ATLAS II?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Dev, we have a question here from Glenn McKnight.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. Go back to the last slide. This is one of the two major areas that came out in the recommendations that's a big, big task. So as you can see, I've done a little bit of work on the open data issue in terms of just scratching the surface in terms of resources. But it's going to be a long haul providing this information as well as our knowledge/information system. So I'm not sure how we're going to tackle this one, Dev, but it's like an elephant. How do you eat an elephant? You eat it one bite at a time. So we need to really analyze this one in depth. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Okay. Thanks, Glenn. I think, Gunela, you have a question. Gunela, you may be muted. Okay, Gunela, we're still not hearing you so you may be muted. Can you send it in the chat?



JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Gunela, if you want, we can contact you on Adigo, on the phone.

ARIEL LIANG: I'm checking with Adigo.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. While Gunela is going to be typing a question, perhaps in the interest of time – Gunela, do indeed type in your question about this. We can come back to this section. Perhaps we could look at the section three, which deals with the web conferencing tools. Next slide.

The Technology Taskforce has been reviewing a lot of web conferencing tools other than Adobe Connect. Sometime I believe two years I guess, there was a discussion within ICANN as to Adobe Connect being replaced, and I think [inaudible] Technology Taskforce [inaudible] if it's going to be replaced, we need to make sure that it's with a system that [inaudible].

So with that, we started over time reviewing [inaudible] web conferencing tools other than Adobe Connect. In doing that, we had to create special conference calls with Technology Taskforce members testing each of the solutions we are looking at, such as the feature set, usability, the cost, what is available, works on Windows, Mac or Linux, or [inaudible] applications and so forth.

So we produced a comparison table and it's a very large table. I put on the slide there some of the solutions that we tested, and on that Wiki page you can find links to a more detailed summary [inaudible]. So the



TTF is going to be looking to come up with recommendations for possible use by At-Large Structures.

I see another hand there. Murray, is there something you want to add to this slide?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Murray, if you want to take the floor while we wait – or Gunela, are you ready to talk yet? Did you resolve your microphone issues? If not, we can add you and put you on the phone. Just let us know.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Can you hear me?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Fantastic. Thank you, Ariel, for un-muting me from the Adigo system. In regard to a number of the ATLAS recommendations, I'm wondering if there is a process for the TTF to be preemptive when it comes to various tools that ICANN is looking at introducing, and that might already be happening, so that we are testing those tools right at the beginning of that selection process for ICANN.

For example, if we talk about accessibility – and there are particular tools that ICANN are looking at across the board – then the TTF has a chance to test them early in the piece rather than after they've been introduced.



I'm just wondering about that process and how we can streamline it.
Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Gunela. Okay. To answer that question, indeed it would be desirable if we can have a session with the various [inaudible] in ICANN that are looking at these types of decisions. [inaudible] ICANN IT staff, for example, are looking at the LACRALO machine translation and how to solve that.

Regarding Adobe Connect testing a plugin, we've been talking to quite a few members of IT staff in that.

I would say yes, but obviously the decisions that ICANN – I mean, for something of that nature, they obviously have a lot more dedicated personnel and [inaudible] to do that evaluation.

I think that we will likely be in a position [inaudible] for them to ask us and to get feedback from us rather than just suddenly implementing it and then we have to then comment afterwards. [inaudible] to do so, because we have to improve the system.

An example of this was when there was internal testing by ICANN for Lucid Meetings, which was a web conferencing tool. What we did was we switched to Lucid Meetings ourselves and used it for several our calls and then provided feedback, [inaudible] reports and so forth, which they did accept and try to [include] the product. I would say [inaudible] it has been happening.

Okay, I'm seeing some hands. Murray?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thanks, Dev. Just an observation on web conferencing tools. Throughout ICANN meetings, I've been running a remote hub and ICANN's been very effectively using the Skype channel to integrate with [four] remote hubs. It's kind of a somewhat universal technology that people seem to be able to grab quite well. My observation was that, in some cases, the channel, video and audio sync was superior to that of Adobe Connect. [inaudible] Adobe Connect in one window and Skype in another window.

So as far as things happening, I just wanted to let everyone know that was quite good. Perhaps the ICANN tech guys are using Skype for a particular reason. It would be interesting to maybe get some input from them at some point. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSING: Thanks, Murray. Indeed Skype has been very popular since it is a multi-platform, instant messaging, chat and now video. And it's now been much more improving on the mobile platforms

I've noticed that [inaudible] some disadvantages in how chat processes work and that it's a very ad hoc process to run a chat session with Skype.

There are three good chat applications such as Slack, for example; or HipChat and so forth which are [inaudible] structuring conversation. Actually, what's more important is it also allows a better message search. You can search across multiple channels as opposed to Skype



which you can't do that, which is one disadvantage. But thanks for that input.

Judith, you had a comment?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. I also want to welcome [Adrian] and Evan to the Taskforce room. They're here in person. Since you may not have video to see it, they are here.

I also wanted to add on the tools, we're always looking at some new tools. There's a new tool that people are using now called Zoom. We're always trying to keep in mind some tools that may be able to have lower bandwidth requirements in Adobe Connect and may not have all the features but can help out others participate and engage. So we're always on the lookout to investigate other tools that may not have all the features we need, but have some critical features and might work well for some others on a Taskforce. That's [inaudible].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thanks, Judith. Let me just continue this slide because we have one more item on our agenda. The Technology Taskforce has been looking at – and I think we can look at other web conferencing solutions and let's come up with our proper recommendations for possible use by At-Large Structures. Next slide. Great.

Just to circle back to Adobe Connect, as Judith mentioned, there's going to be possibly some changes to the future versions of Adobe Connect. What the Technology Taskforce has done is developed a one-pager



about Adobe Connect to help ALSes to help use Adobe Connect effectively. For example, connecting a microphone and so forth.

Also, the Technology Taskforce will be looking to evaluate two Adobe Connect plugins that [inaudible] tested. And there's two plugins, one is an engagement index which [inaudible] interest or metrics. There's a social media Adobe Connect plugin that will allow the use of [inaudible] I understand it within Adobe Connect.

With that, I think we can now [inaudible] over to section four, Judith or Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you, Dev. Let's move on to section four. It's really important to get your feedback on what we're doing right and what we're doing wrong. We can move to the next slide, please.

This was one of the ideas as a technical taskforce as we produce travel tip. We distributed the digital copy to everyone and we had printed copies on the first day on Sunday for distribution in the kits. It was quite simple. Judith did a great job. In this first issue was the issues such as what mobile carriers are available in the public transit.

So this is a different newsletter. This was focused on technical survival tips for people who are with ALAC. So any critical feedback is welcome, please. Again, we'll do the same sort of idea for Buenos Aires. All of this material is saved. The rough material, much longer than this one, is on the Wiki. Next slide.

Now this is an opportunity. I'd like to start this with I'm going to put some people out directly. Gordon has been a phenomenal force with us. He hasn't attended our sessions in person, but he's been really good as a Linux guru, evaluating our conference tools and also reviewing stuff by remote. I know he's got a lot of opinions. If you can indulge me, if Gordon is there, Gordon would you mind starting off, kick off this discussion on your opinions of what we're doing right, what we're doing wrong, what are some of the recommendations we should be going forward. Over to you, Gordon.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Had to do it, didn't you, Glenn? I did have some notes. Some of them got kicked off during the discussion because they seemed to be [rather] covered.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Gordon, could you speak up please?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Yes, will do. Is that better? Is that better?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, it is.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Good stuff. Because it's February and I've been burned myself, one of the items I'm going to repeat that I have mentioned before is some of



the tools that we have looked at for some smaller jobs reading – you need to take some care in selecting them.

There was an unfortunate situation with one tool that we really looked at and was a very, very good one that disappeared from public view for a number of reasons. Some due diligence really needs to be done for some of the tools that we elect to look at.

It happened to me and a lot rather large organizations with another tool, and that's just recent. That's the reason why I bring this up.

There are a number of other things that we should probably be doing. I find it difficult myself to bring [inaudible] in my own mind I think because I'm so buried in the swamp of the things that we've done. I've been on the Technology Taskforce about since its inception, so I am kind of buried in the [inaudible] of some of the things that we've already dealt with.

That's about as far as I'm going to go today. We'll see what happens when this next year's working sessions start. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you so much, Gordon. Any written material for dialogue would be appreciated into our discussion thread on the Wiki.

I want to turn to Murray. Murray is doing one of the hubs. This is I believe the second time he's doing it. Murray, can you talk about the hub and activities, experiences, and share with us some of your thoughts?



MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes. Thank you, Glenn. I haven't really written all these down and I put a few things into the chat. I'm just very impressed with the assistance that we're getting from technical. This is the second remote hub I've done, so you learn a bit more every time you do another one.

There were a couple of hiccups happening, but it's very well-organized because we're stitching Skype together with Adobe Connect. My experience has been a very positive experience from my perspective. I know in Africa, due to limited bandwidth sometimes there are issues. [inaudible] staff probably will have a debrief from their perspective on technical things, and I was going to suggest that we bring that into the Technology Taskforce agenda and perhaps invite the staff members who are on top of the technology to join us for that. I'm happy to assist with that.

After everybody has a breather after Singapore, I think it would be good to add that. Just generally, a very positive experience. It worked well for me. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you, Murray. I'm not going to let you off the hook on this. You and [Corey] are going to get scheduled to do a discussion on your experiences and best practices. If not the next call, perhaps the next one. Dev, Judith, and I will work with you guys on the schedule if that's okay with you.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: That's great with me. Hold my feet to the fire. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Will do. Thank you. So I'd like to turn to anyone else on the Adobe or Adigo, and then I'll turn to the room. Is there anyone else that would like to join into the discussion?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I see Olivier's hand raised. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. I was very impressed with your presentation about various ATLAS II recommendations and the work of this working group and the progress that has been achieved since the last time that we spoke on all of these.

As you may or may not know, we were going to present an update to the board about a handful of ATLAS II recommendations, and one of them was number 26, which when I say that number you probably are well aware it's the one about the policy management process system.

We were just going to provide the board with a few details on how progress is coming along, but unfortunately we ran out of time during our meeting with the board, so we didn't actually go through the slides and so on, which doesn't matter because of course there are future meetings with the ICANN board and future ICANN meetings.

The question I had for you was whether you had any idea forecast in the sort of direction we were taking on this. We did see ICANN IT including Ashwin Rangan earlier this week, but did not touch on this



recommendation. We touched on other IT related aspects including the new website, etc.

I just wondered whether you had an idea, just a rough idea, of the kind of timeline we're looking at by which this working group would be able to provide first draft of the specifications that we would be looking in a policy management process system.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Olivier. I'm thinking what we've done, we've done [inaudible] seen in the slide as to what we want for a policy management process system. I do note that there apparently seems to be a misunderstanding as to what we're trying to do.

I think that's the first step in trying to understand what we want a system to really do. I am thinking what could happen is that – well, if you want to get the other ACs and SOs on board for them to [inaudible], perhaps these [inaudible] concepts could be shared with the ACs and SOs.

I guess what we can do, we can try to present a report or slides or whatever and I guess the ATLAS II Implementation Group could review that, make sure it's okay and then submit it to the various ACs and SOs for their comment and get more feedback or input or support on the ideas of the policy management process system. So it's not just seen as an At-Large request, but all of the communities wanting this system.

In terms of timelines, I'm thinking that we could probably try to shoot for in time for the next ICANN face-to-face meeting. By that face-to-face meeting, all the communities are more aware that perhaps a more face-



to-face discussion can happen to discuss the policy management process system further. That's my first thought on it.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, Dev. We're really running short on time. I'd like to turn to Gunela. She's in the queue. Please?

GUNELA ASTBRINK: This is just a very technical comment. Can you hear me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, I can.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: It's just a very technical comment. I'm finding that the audio is quite difficult for me on this Adigo bridge with some people sitting around the room. I will very much look forward to, hopefully, a real-time text transcription of meetings like this, especially for remote participation not necessarily who have a hearing impairment. I'm just hoping that budget proposal gets through and working groups like a Technology Taskforce can benefit from it. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks so much, Gunela. We appreciate that. We only have three more minutes before we have to leave. I wanted to wrap-up and thank everyone for coming and to thank all the remote participants for being active throughout the year.



If you have any suggestions or comments of what we want to talk to about the next coming years, next coming months, we have a Wiki page where we take suggestions on that. So please give us your suggestions. We want to make the focus on what your issues that you're most concerned with about.

I'm thinking right now, unless anyone has any burning desires for the two minutes left that we have, we will thank everyone for coming and thank everyone for getting up earlier in the morning.

Dev, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I just want to close off. Just two observations. One, it's great to see so many remote participants attending this call. I'm really glad for that. Thanks, everyone, for attending. Just to note another action item that Murray I believe [inaudible] to, and that's probably for the TTF to develop an instruction or one page to explain how ALSes can track topics. I think that's an important item that I think the TTF can do. That's one another additional action item.

I see Olivier's hand is raised. I guess, Olivier, you have the last word, given there's one minute left.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Dev. That was just a quick response to your response regarding recommendation 26. We'll follow-up afterwards. I've been told by Heidi who's sitting next to me that there's a lot of things going on at ICANN internally as well about these [inaudible].



On the one hand, you know that the SO and AC chairs have launched something that is going to work on this as well. Progress hasn't been that great at the moment, because as you know, there are other very pressing issues.

I think the way we can continue forward is the way that we've done it so far, which is to follow-up on what Ashwin Rangan had asked us, which was to produce a detailed spec sheet of what are requirements where – at the very moment, we're not looking at needing the spec sheet tomorrow. I have a feeling it's going to be a matter of months, if not perhaps as many as six months, until the time when anybody is going to be able to act on any spec sheet.

So we have plenty of time in front of us and I would suggest that we go for quality in a longer amount of time rather than speed and compromise on quality by trying to do it quickly.

So just maybe time-tabling 15 minutes or 10 minutes per call. I know that this working group meets weekly. Ten minutes per call just on quick updates and just getting people's minds to contribute would be really helpful. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Thanks so much, Olivier. And as we have now reached the top of the hour and there's another session in this room coming up, so we're going to have to close the call. We'll see many of you in the NARALO open meeting in one hour. Please come back and join us for the NARALO monthly meeting then. Bye from Singapore. This is Judith.



DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, everyone. Very good meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

