GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Communications Coordination Work Team (CCT)1 April 2009 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Communications Coordination Work Team (CCT) teleconference on 1 April 2009 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate,

in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription

errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should

not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-cct-20090401.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#april
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Mason Cole - Registrar Constituency - Chair
Chris Chaplow - Commercial and Business Users Constituency
Steve Holsten - Vice-Chair, gTLD Registries Constituency
Catherine Sigmar - Registries Constituency
Jaime Wagner - ISPCPC
Antonio Tavares - ISPCPC

ICANN Staff in attendance:
Julie Hedlund - Policy Consultant
Robert Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director Ken Bour - Policy Consultant
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: I'd like to inform everyone that today's call is being recorded. If you
                 have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Mason Cole: All right, thank you very much. All right. Hello, everybody, Mason Cole
                 here. We're going to go ahead and get started. Julie, can I confirm that
                 you're taking notes for us?

Julie Hedlund: I am taking notes, Mason, thank you.

Mason Cole: Very good, thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Can I do a roll call for the record please, Mason?

Mason Cole: Yes, please. So I'll start. Mason Cole here from the U.S.

Glen DeSaintgery: And we've got Chris Chaplow on the line from...

Mason Cole: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: ...from the Commercial and Business Users Constituency; (Jamie Wagner), ISP; Steve Holsten, Registry Constituency; (Katherine Sigma), Registry Constituency; and for staff we have Julie Hedlund, Rob Hoggarth and Ken Bour and myself, Glen.

Mason Cole: All right, thank you, Glen. Did we miss anyone?

Glen DeSaintgery: Ah, yes, we - I have got no apologies from anybody.

Mason Cole: Okay. All right, very good. Thank you, Glen. Did everybody receive a copy of the minutes from the last meeting? Yes?

Steve Holsten: Yep.

Mason Cole: Okay, good. I'd like to approve those. Could I have a motion, please, to approve those minutes?

Steve Holsten: Yes, I will make the motion to approve the minutes.

Mason Cole: Thank you, (Steve). Is there a second?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, Chris Chaplow, second.

Mason Cole: Thank you, (Chris). Any discussion to that motion?

Chris Chaplow: No, I think the minutes are great.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I do too. Thank you.

Chris Chaplow: I couldn't have done them.

Mason Cole: All right. Can I assume that's a unanimous approval?

Steve Holsten: Yeah.

(Jamie Wagner): It's okay. I approve it.

Mason Cole: All right, thank you very much.

Steve Holsten: Yeah, for the benefit of the recording I too - I had commented
                 separately to Julie that I'm amazed that she made sense of our
                 meandering brain storm session in such an organized fashion. So
                 thank you.

Mason Cole: Good job, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Well thank you very much, but I can't take all the credit. Ken made
                 substantive revisions to what I had recorded. So I think we can thank
                 him as well.

Steve Holsten: Yes, very true.

Mason Cole: Well thanks to both of you then. All right, so let's take a look at the agenda. I just have - I don't have that many items. I know we need to discuss some things. Is there anything else that needs to be added to the agenda at this point? Because really what I'd like to focus on today if we can is the work plan itself and start pricing some work out. So is there anything else we need to cover? All right.

Steve Holsten: I can't think of anything.

Mason Cole: Okay. All right. So, Julie thanks very much for sending out a copy of the work plan as it exists. And by-the-way, when I talk about the work plan I'm referring to the checklist that we're using really just to keep track of the work itself. I think as we agreed before there's really no point in having a checklist and a separate plan. It would just be repetitive. So has everybody had a chance to review the checklist and see and understand what's on it?

(Jamie Wagner): No, I wasn't able, (Jamie Wagner).

Mason Cole: Okay, (Jamie), we'll make sure you get a copy. In fact, Julie, do you have a copy handy that you could quickly email to (Jamie)?

Woman: Antonio Tavares joined.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I do actually.

Mason Cole: Okay, good. Hello, (Antonio).

Antonio Tavares :   Oh, thank you very much. I'm sorry to be late.

Mason Cole: That's okay. Thanks for joining us.

Antonio Tavares :   Yeah, okay.

Woman: Could you send to (unintelligible) also.

Steve Holsten: I know that it was one of the two documents that was sent out on Friday at 6:15 pm Eastern Time in addition to the minutes. There was both the minutes and the draft work team recommendation checklist.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Woman: Mason, I found it.

Mason Cole: You do have it?

Woman: Yes, I do. Thanks.

Mason Cole: Okay, okay, good. Julie, if you wouldn't mind sending a copy to (Jamie), I'd appreciate it.

Julie Hedlund: I'll do that right away. Thanks.

Mason Cole: All right, thanks. So it's a good document. It's comprehensive in terms of I think understanding what we already have agreed to put on our plate in terms of making recommendations. But I'd like to ask if there's anything on here that we know we would like to add at this point. Does anybody have any input into that?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, I've got a number of little points. I think everything in there - I don't think there's anything that I don't agree with that's on the list, but I think there's a couple of things that we might consider delving in.

Mason Cole: Sure, yeah, go ahead, (Chris).

Chris Chaplow: Should I start away?

Mason Cole: Yeah, please.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. In the first section on the Web site the languages other than English that was brought up quite a lot of times in (unintelligible) and at various points, so that might be worthy of an item all on its own.

Mason Cole: You mean creating a recommendation about having the site available in other languages specifically?

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: Because that's - that comes up a lot of times when you go through the documentation, the LSC, the BCG and so on.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: We just touched on it last week, but also about the Web site usability review including reviews of the statistics.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: I'm not sure if it's a recommendation or it may be a work item, but I was thinking about some sort of content inventory. I'm not sure where that's going to come in to us because at the moment it's quite a big job to click around the GNSO Web site to take stock of everything that's in there. Somewhere along the line that's going to have to come into our thinking, isn't it?

Mason Cole: Yeah, by that you mean inventory of the content as it currently exists and then try to take out things that are no longer relevant.

Chris Chaplow: No longer relevant; things that should be in it just from a pure content perspective.

Mason Cole: Okay. Okay?

Chris Chaplow: Okay, also a place for the low visibility of the GNSO but from the non-technological recommendations.

Mason Cole: What do you mean by that?

Chris Chaplow: I mean by that -- let me just go. I've got a note here. Let's see, Page 48, which built the recommendations about -- yeah, Page 48 in the GNSO. It's only in the LSC, Item 3.2 and the external visibility of the GSO. There's quite a lot of comments through the documents about this. But they're not necessarily talking about technology. I think this was also mentioned in the minutes.

Mason Cole: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: It's a place to bolt on any comments. Perhaps that shouldn't go under the Web site. Perhaps it should be under somewhere else. I'm not quite sure where to put it.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I understand. Okay.

Chris Chaplow: Another one about - another seam that seems to run through this ability to stakeholders to find out what's going on. And I'm also thinking about with people have mentioned (unintelligible); people have mentioned overviews of what's important and what's not important and significant. So it's not necessarily a technical thing. It's somebody that's going to have to alter these subjects.

Mason Cole: Okay. Okay?

Chris Chaplow: Okay. And just before I hand over to somebody else, just to tidy up the problem in the recommendation around the document management, I think on the version of the checklist I've got I think there's a sort of mismatch there where we've got the second problem is poor organization in document management. Then I think the recommendation is a different recommendation.

Mason Cole: Yeah, okay.

Chris Chaplow: So it's almost creating four sections in that way.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Can I get in the queue?

Mason Cole: Yeah, go ahead, Ken.

Ken Bour: Okay. With respect to that last point, we talked about this on the call last week. There's some terminology issues that we're just going to struggle with a little bit until we get it nailed down. But what's in this checklist, the fourth one under the first big heading says, "Content Management." But if you look at the word, authoring, versioning, workflows, check in, out and so forth, and even the multi-language support which is something that we talked about just a second ago. That really does embrace the document management requirements at a high level.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, then. So it's just a question of changing the wording of that problem then, "Poor Organization and Consistent Document Management?"

Ken Bour: Yes, in fact I think that if you took all the words after the colons we could probably regroup them better than they are here. Not that these aren't okay, but we heard on the call with ICANN staff two weeks ago, Mark Salvatera made a plea with all of us not to use content management when we meant document management.

              And the original business requirements that I participated in developing did not follow that request. Content management - in other words, a document is a piece of content, right? And so if you talk about content management, it can indeed absorb documents. But for the purposes of ICANN staff they would prefer that we say that we not refer to document management in that context.

              So content does in fact include things like documents, but when we use the term document management we're referring more to the versioning, authoring, collaboration elements of it than we are just to

get storage, access retrieval and how it gets named and populated and in what kind of form it gets put out there.

Mason Cole: Yeah, that's a good point. We don't want to confuse people.

Ken Bour: Yeah, and unfortunately in this technical world it's very difficult with the terms and what they mean. You almost have to say every time when I use this, I mean that.

Mason Cole: Yeah, yeah. In fact in our final recommendation document we probably ought to make that clear.

Ken Bour: Yeah, a glossary.

Mason Cole: Yeah, right. Yeah, our own dictionary. Okay. All right, (Chris), did you have any more to add there?

Chris Chaplow: Just looking. Just some notes about the formalized channels. I think there was some discussion about how deep we get into that. But the themes that seem to run through this and the words I've got is "transparency, open meeting, telephone calls versus face-to-face," which is the LSC Recommendation 15. So those are just - that's about it really.

Mason Cole: Okay. All right, good. Those are very good suggestions. Anyone else have anything they'd like to see added?

Ken Bour: This is Ken again.

Mason Cole: Uh-huh. Go ahead, Ken.

Ken Bour: On the last call I raised - this is an over arching question which is there isn't really anything that I saw in the BGC report or LSC for that matter. But I'm wondering if the team wouldn't be interested in taking on the question about the quality of communications within ICANN.

And by that I'm talking more about the effectiveness of sharing meaning, right? So there's one whole element that we can make communications spiffier, faster, more colorful, you know, quicker, all this stuff that deals with the technology world. And that's a hugely important thing to do of course.

But I'm wondering too, we talked a little bit on the call last week - I'm trying to find some examples of this. Meaning we could create almost if you would a netiquette, kind of a set of guidelines for ICANN about things that we can all do that just makes the communication between parties more effective.

Like I raised one that I find is kind of interesting in ICANN. I find that emails frequently people don't take the time to address their messages to anybody. You know, "Dear Mark, Dear" - or even without the dear, "Joe," "Harry," you know, "Sue," "The Policy Team," "The GNSO Council List." Emails are just created and then they are (unintelligible) and copied and blind copied and nobody takes the trouble to say really who is it intended for and who's got the action item on something.

So, you know, that would be an example of a netiquette kind of guideline that we the Communications Team might publish as part of this wholesome set of recommendations that would be about improving communications within ICANN.

Someone I guess on the call - I can't remember - I guess it must have been (Chris) or (Steve) raised another example which was, you know...

Steve Holsten The other example you were going to reference, Ken, was my note about how everybody essentially replies "All" to these lists. So even if you're just saying, "Okay, I'll be there"...

Ken Bour: Or, "Thanks."

Steve Holsten: ...or running to the sender, these lists end up sending it to pretty much everybody. So that I think is another one that you had mentioned as a sort of voluntary guideline in terms of netiquette.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I understand your point because the end result of that there's - it ends up being a lot of wasted time and space. And like if you look on a discussion list, for example, you might have, I don't know, 20 emails in a string and only one them really is critical.

Steve Holsten: Right.

Mason Cole: Right. And it makes it more cumbersome to find data or something that you're really looking for. Well, I do think that - you know, and I'd love to hear the rest of the team on this too. That I do think there's room in our recommendations to make - I don't think we have to get way, way down in the weeds, but there is room to make recommendations about things that can have a positive impact on the way that the GNSO interacts and that makes it more effective and less cluttered. So I don't mind taking these suggestions. I actually think they're useful.

Steve Holsten: Yeah, and my initial I guess perception of being on the receiving end of all of these "reply all" emails was if there is this openness and transparency mandate that everybody is very self-conscious about, then they don't even want to say anything on the side without broadcasting it to the group. But that seems very insufficient and time wasteful.

Mason Cole: Yeah, we all need to use common sense. I was just make some notes while you were talking, Ken. I think in our recommendations if we - it's a little early to do this, but I was thinking that we could divide our recommendations into three sets.

One would be tools for communication, which are some of the things we've already talked about like the Web site or a document management system or what have you.

Another area would be content itself. And by content, I mean the content of our communications. Meaning, you know, let's avoid excessive sort of the diplomatic speak that seems to pervade ICANN and speak more in, you know, plain everyday language. You know, the content should - you know, we should have effective translation capability, those kinds of things.

And then the other area would be process, which is, you know, how communication is facilitated, right? For example, you know, we may find that the - I don't know. I'm just pulling this out of the air, but it may be useful to make a recommendation for example that the GNSO has, I don't know, a regular monthly communication to all of its stakeholders maybe by email or I don't know, something. But, you know, that would be an example of process. Any thoughts on that?

(Jamie Wagner): With only the content. This is (Jamie) talking.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

(Jamie Wagner): And content would be first because I think all tools would have to share the same content too.

Mason Cole: Okay, yeah, all right. All right. You know, that's a good point. Well as I said, it's probably a little early to do that. But, you know, some of these thoughts and ideas can be categorized I think in certain ways that will make it more - that make it easier for the GNSO and the Board to understand.

(Jamie Wagner): Please, only one question.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

(Jamie Wagner): When you say, "content," the example you gave was more of a style. And I would rather think of a different type or configures of content that I think we should like a probably comments, faction and it would relate with document management processes. But public factions and I would - the factions and the type of categories of factual definitely would - subjects that would be classified, you know.

Mason Cole: Okay.

(Jamie Wagner): Is not only a matter of style, but...

Mason Cole: Yeah, that's a good point. Okay, thank you, (Jamie). All right. Okay. So any other input on this subject here?

Chris Chaplow: One of the things I found as a relatively new member is the sheer number of acronyms used at ICANN. It's bewildering.

Mason Cole: Good point.

Chris Chaplow: And I think - well as some sort of recommendation on this or an up-to-date glossary that's continually updated.

Mason Cole: Good point. Thank you, (Chris). Okay. Anyone else? Okay. All right. All right, so does anyone else have anything that they'd like to add to the work plans that currently exist? Okay.

I'm going to make a proposal. I think we talked about this before. But again, I'd love to hear what the team thinks. What may be useful to start organizing our work is just to get an outline of a recommendation document prepared. It doesn't mean that's what it's eventually going to look like. It's just a way to start feeding information into a central place of storage so that we know what's done and what's not.

So with everyone's permission I'm going to open that document and we can use it to aggregate whatever work results we produce because eventually it's going to need to go in there anyway.

The question then comes to how we start dividing this work up because there's a page and a half now probably soon to be more like two pages of things that we need to look into, find information about, you know, be intelligent about and make recommendations on. So, you

know, I suppose we can approach it any way we feel like, but there does need to be a way to start allocating this work out to the folks on the team.

You know, I might propose that, you know, we take a look at the document and if there's an area that interests you, you could volunteer to tackle that issue. Or does anyone else have any other ideas?

Steve Holsten: This is (Steve). It seems to me that the first section of the checklist is all very technical with respect to the Web site. And it's basically coming up with business requirements. We talked about how many of those are already in progress in a report that Ken Bour and his predecessor (Penelope) had done.

I think if somebody has particular expertise in drafting business requirements, they would be good people to volunteer for that particular portion of the work. Any takers?

Chris Chaplow: I got a specific interest in the Web site. I mean that's my area of field and it's probably is everybody's interest; that one as well. I don't know specifically our business requirements. I do know that it's a good document we've got and that first section has got a great kick start already, hasn't it?

Steve Holsten: Well, I would be happy to jump in on that section along with you, (Chris), if you'd like because I think we can work together with Ken Bour.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, yeah.

Steve Holsten: (Unintelligible) from here too.

Chris Chaplow: I'd be more comfortable with that. Yeah.

Steve Holsten: So why don't you and I tag team into that initiative.

Mason Cole: Okay. Very good. Wow, that was easy. Thanks guys. All right. So I have (Chris) and (Steve) down to tackle the Web site. And I'm going to assume that anyone else who has interest in contributing can join up at any time, right?

Chris Chaplow: Yeah.

Mason Cole: Okay. All right. Right now looking at the document is there anything else that anyone specifically would like to volunteer to take on. Or, you know, we don't have to settle all of this right now. We can do it over email as well. But if you see something you like, you certainly have an opportunity right now to speak up for it.

                   All right. Well, I'll tell you what, let's take that part offline and I'll open an email thread among us to talk about how to get that sorted out from here. All right. Any other objections? Ideas, thoughts?

                   Okay. Once we get the work plan finalized, Ken and Julie and Rob, it's my understanding that we owe that to the broader OSC. Is that right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Mason. This is Julie. From my understanding that's correct.

Mason Cole: Okay. So we just need to submit it to (Chuck) as a chair and say - you know, as a matter of information and say, "Here's what we're going to focus on."

Julie Hedlund: That's exactly right I think.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Ken Bour: Well do you think he'll want dates and some breakdown of how we intend to parse it?

Mason Cole: Are you asking me or Julie?

Ken Bour: Anybody.

Mason Cole: Well, we should probably give him some. I'll be glad to ask him as well, you know, what physically do you need so that we know what we need to deliver.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, Mason, this is Julie. I think if we can that we come up with some preliminary deadlines or milestones. I'm sure that he would appreciate that.

Mason Cole: Yep. I'm happy to do that. Okay. Very good.

Chris Chaplow: Mason?

Mason Cole: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: Sorry. One area that I don't mind holding my hand up for is to do the translation and the language side of things.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: It's just an area of interest, a smaller one further down.

Mason Cole: Okay. Thanks, (Chris). Okay. All right, got it. Okay. All right. The next item on the agenda is we need - I believe this is our last weekly meeting. We're not meeting next week. There's the Passover holiday so we're not meeting on Wednesday. But we do need for the rest of our time agree to a meeting schedule. So I don't want to presume anything. You know, does anyone on the team have thoughts about meeting frequency and - well meeting frequency going forward?

What we've agreed to I believe as a team is an October 1 deadline for having our work completely finished; no later than October 1, if not sooner. So between now and then, you know, how often do we need to meet to make sure that we - you know, we're progressing as fast as we need to?

Steve Holsten: I would suggest every other week.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Steve Holsten: I think if we go to once a month that's only five meetings and...

Mason Cole: Right.

Steve Holsten: ...and that's not enough.

Mason Cole: I agree with you there.

Steve Holsten: Once a week may not give people enough time to tackle substance. I think we ought to - so we'll skip next week for Passover. I think we should meet the following week. I think Wednesdays at this time are generally good for me. I presume they are for others since we've had them already. So I'd say let's meet next week and by that point have - or excuse me, two weeks from now; by that point have divvied up the work according to the checklist. And, Mason, I guess you would add some of those other suggestions on top of the checklist...

Mason Cole: Correct.

Steve Holsten: ...as well. So maybe we - two weeks from now divvy up the work and from there move to an every other week meeting schedule.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Steve Holsten: That's just my suggestion.

Mason Cole: Okay. Any other input from the team on this?

(Jamie Wagner): Yeah, well I think we should confirm - have anything for that meeting and not - but try to make a first approach to an agenda until - for all of these meetings, okay, in order to - everyone to make space in their schedules.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I'll make sure and send out a meeting request for everybody so that we have it on our schedules.

(Jamie Wagner): You know, at least we should agree on the time frame that is suitable to everybody. I think this schedule - meetings every other week at this particular time would - can I assume that will be the case?

Mason Cole: Well I believe that's what's being suggested. Yes, this time seems to work pretty well for most people. And yes, instead of weekly we would go to every other week.

All right, so anyone else want to - have a different idea? I mean that sounds reasonable to me, but if somebody disagrees then, you know, we're wide open here.

Chris Chaplow: It's okay for me. I mean send out the schedule for the next couple of months on that basis I suggest.

Mason Cole: Yeah, okay.

(Jamie Wagner): I would only ask for them to be confirmed in advance.

Mason Cole: To be confirmed?

(Jamie Wagner): Yes, even though we plan for these and reserve a time in our agendas. It should be confirmed with a...

Ken Bour: With a reminder do you mean?

Mason Cole: Oh, yes.

(Jamie Wagner): Yes, two days advance notice.

Mason Cole: Oh, okay, I understand. I understand.

((Crosstalk))

(Jamie Wagner): ...because sometimes, well, okay?

Mason Cole: Okay, got it.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry, this is Glen. Will it be all right if send out a notice then before each meeting? I mean, you know, days in advance. Is that what you are requiring?

Mason Cole: I think that's what (Jamie)'s asking for, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Mason Cole: If you don't mind, maybe a couple of days before each meeting.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, that's okay.

Mason Cole: Yeah, just sending out a reminder that we're meeting.

Glen DeSaintgery: And then just to get straight. So the next meeting will not be on the 8th, but will it be on the 15th...

Mason Cole: Yes, that's correct.

Glen DeSaintgery: ...of April? And then not the 22nd?

Mason Cole: Correct. But, yes on the 29th.

Glen DeSaintgery: But then again on the 29th? Okay, that's fine. I'll get that out.

Steve Holsten: Glen, when you typically send out those notes about the call-in information, that's an appropriate reminder in my opinion.

Mason Cole: Yep.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, okay.

Mason Cole: Thank you, Glen. And then we also should set a time in Sidney for a face-to-face meeting. But we can do that as we get closer to the meeting.

                Okay. Any other business for us today?

Ken Bour: This is Ken.

Mason Cole: Yeah, Ken?

Ken Bour: Just a quick update if I may on the discussions that are continuing to go on with the ICANN staff.

Mason Cole: Please do.

Ken Bour: Okay. We had a conference call yesterday. Julie, Rob and I with the principal leaders which are (Joyce), (Thomas) and (Reesa) and (Agis) and I guess (Roman) and maybe one or two others from the ICANN staff. (Joyce) is our project leader. And what she's going to be doing is

creating a charter document for this work, especially around the technology stuff, right?

And the general approach that we kind of talked about is that the project scope would be very inclusive. Meaning that it would cover everything that we've identified so far and that was included in LSC and Board recommendations around technology.

Their suggestion was that we prioritize the requirement's work sort of maybe like this. On the basis of sort of implementability or doability, you could take a look at the entire set of requirements and we could work a long time, months even, to say, okay, now we've specified a full complete set of requirements only 25% of which is actually achievable in a short time frame or in any reasonable time frame. Some of the requirements might not be achievable even over the space of years just because - you know, we talked about this before, like document management.

To do a robust document management system that is automated, multiplatform capable and so forth and so on is simply not achievable because there are no industry available packages that would meet ICANN's requirements today. It would be some kind of a kluge or integration of multiple pieces and it would be very difficult, maybe even too expensive to achieve. But there are some requirements that are implementable and we could start to see incremental improvements if we tackled those first.

So that's just a heads up as to the general idea of where we're going with this. And maybe we can - the three of us that are going to work on requirements can take - we can take advantage of this knowledge so

that we start scoping our work on the pieces that I can indicate will be the ones that - I mean, we will tackle the requirements work in phases. Does that make sense?

Mason Cole: Very much so.

Ken Bour: Because what the ICANN staff is now saying to us is, "Hey, if you give us a set of content management requirements, we'll start building it."

Mason Cole: Right.

Ken Bour: "We won't wait until the end of four months before all the requirements are done. We'll actually get started soon." Which means that by the time we get to October 1, in addition to having a full set of requirements developed, we might actually have meaningful live improvements in the Web architecture that are actually either delivered or in the process of being delivered or being beta tested, you know, and that would be a real strong feather in our cap I think.

Mason Cole: It's an excellent suggestion, Ken. It really is.

Ken Bour: All right. So that was sort of mini report on where we are. And it's probably going to be a couple of weeks yet before we have that charter.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Ken Bour: But since I'm trying to maintain a liaison between us and the ICANN staff, I'll make sure that none of the work we do in the interim is counterproductive to where we're heading.

Mason Cole: Good.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Mason Cole: Good. Thanks for having our back on that one.

Ken Bour: Yeah, okay.

Mason Cole: (Steve), did you have anything to contribute there?

Steve Holsten: Nope, I have nothing more to add.

Mason Cole: Oh, sorry. I thought I heard you trying to get in there. Okay. Any other business today?

(Jamie Wagner): Just a question. Your recommendation is to start implementation in which time frame?

Mason Cole: Ken, do you want to address that?

(Jamie Wagner): Because as I understood implementation would begin - what I agree while we are still doing complete business requirements since we have something about (unintelligible) it could be already starting to implementation. But is that - am I correct? Is that suggestion that was made?

Ken Bour: Yes, we would take the full set of requirements and we would say, okay, this set, this subset - it would be better to work on this subset now because we know that there are technology solutions. ICANN's

already picked a platform of choice, Drupal. So we could actually work on that first and then get people building and developing a Web site that has all those requirements in it.

While that's happening, we would go back then to the next set of requirements; it might be collaboration tools or document management issues or something along those lines while the implementation is continuing. So it's sort of - you think of it as maybe an agile development or prototyping methodology kind of an approach where you take a piece, start work, then take another piece, start work.

(Jamie Wagner): Yes.

Ken Bour: And we'll make sure that we are not - the danger in this approach is that you start your building process and then you discover a requirement that makes you have to go and start all over again.

Mason Cole: Yeah, we don't want that.

Ken Bour: And we don't want that. And I don't think there's much danger of that to be honest.

Chris Chaplow: No, I think if we understand it is a demo and there's an opportunity there if the - you know, (Mark) and the team are jumping at the bit as it were. And also for people to give feedback to what we're doing as a team, it's so much easier to do that from some sort of working model than a paper document.

Ken Bour: Exactly.

Mason Cole: Yeah, good point.

Ken Bour: That's the whole advantage of this sort of prototyping or agile development methodology approach is that you actually get to see as it goes.

Mason Cole: Yeah, yeah, okay. Very good.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Mason Cole: All right. Thanks, Ken. Other business? Well, folks, we're in danger of actually doing this in under an hour -- excellent work.

                 All right. If there's nothing else, then I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Steve Holsten: I will make that motion to adjourn.

Mason Cole: Thank you, (Steve). And someone needs to second that please.

(Jamie Wagner): I second.

Mason Cole: All right. Thank you, Jamie. And I don't think we need to have any discussion. If there's no objection, then that'll be a unanimous yes on adjournment.

Steve Holsten: I was not so formal last week just so you know, Mason. I think we just said goodbye and hung up the phone.

Mason Cole: Now we can go to that model too. All right. If there's nothing else, folks, then we'll adjourn for now and we'll speak again in two weeks and talk over email.

Steve Holsten: Sounds great. Thank you very much.

All: Thank you. Bye.

END