

**GNSO – ICANN Sydney Meeting**  
**GNSO Open Working session**  
**Communications Coordinations Team**  
**Date: 21 June at 11:15 local time**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing at the Communications Coordinations Team Meeting held in Sydney on Sunday 21 June 2009 at 11:15 Local time. 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.

>>MASON COLE: All right, good morning, everybody, let's get started, if we can. The agenda for the day is up here projected on the board. I'm in the middle of trying to pull up a document here that I think will be helpful to our discussion but let's start off with a role call so we know who's here and as we -- as we -- as we go around let's just introduce ourselves and where we're from and who we're representing, so can we do that? Jeff, can we start with you?

>>JEFF ECKHAUS: Jeff Eckhaus, ENOM registrars constituency.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I'm actually sitting next to Adrian Kinderis who is late. I'd like the scribes to record that, please. My name is Stephane Van Gelder, I'm from INDOM France.

>>TEREZA BARTOSKOVA: Hello, my name is Tereza Bartoskova from the Czech Arbitration Court and I'm just an observer here.

>>ZBYNEK LOEBL: Zbynek Loebel from the Czech arbitration.

>>CHRIS CHAPLOW: Chris Chaplow from andalucia.com in Spain and representative of the business community, constituency.

>>RON ANDRUFF: Ron Andruff, member of the business constituency, member of the operating steering committee, alternate, and also GNSO operating work team, GNSO operations work team.

>>JULIE HEDLUND: Julie Hedlund, ICANN staff.

>>SCOTT PINZON: Scott Pinzon, ICANN staff.

>>ZUO RAN: Zuo Ran from China Organizational Name Administration Center.

>>FLAVIO WAGNER: Flavio Wagner from the Brazilian Internet Governance Committee.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Carlos Afonso from the Brazil Internet Governance Committee.

>>KEN BOUR: Ken Bour from the ICANN policy staff.

>>ROB HOGGARTH: Rob Hoggarth, ICANN staff.

>>MASON COLE: Thanks very much, everybody. It's good to see you, a good turnout like this. Oh, I'm sorry, Steve are you on the phone with us? Anyone else on the phone?

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: Yeah, I'm on, hi, Mason.

>>MASON COLE: Good. Good to have you, Steve. Now Julie's pulling the agenda back up because we --

>>JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry. Sorry, technical difficulties.

>>MASON COLE: Computer problems. I know we just for the benefit of everyone in the room, this group has been at work since the Mexico City meeting and we've been charged with providing the board a set of recommendations about how the GNSO can more effectively communicate with the board and with the broader ICANN community, and the GNSO board. We've set ourselves a deadline for October to have our preparation -- to have our recommendations made to the board an IDN gTLD fast after a period of going through the process of identifying what the board is saw as problems and some issues that we saw ourselves in terms of communications difficulties we're -- don't worry, it's going to be fine -- what we did is we divided the workup into -- up into four parts and created subteams to address those parts. And right now we're in the process of preparing really our recommendations document and I'd say we're probably about halfway through that so what I'd like to do if I may is just go from team to team and get a brief update and then teams, staff, anybody who's ready to contribute that and then as we describe that if anybody else in the room would like to contribute thoughts or ideas to what those teams are doing I think that would be very helpful so let's start with subgroup one which is dealing with the Web site and the GNSO Web site and our document management issue. Ken, would you like to lead off?

>>KEN BOUR: Sure, thank you, Mason. Steve, do you want to have any comments out there from space?

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: Out here from space. Well, one thing I didn't get was who all is on the call today. Is it the entire team, do we have Zbynek and Helen and Julie and Ken and Mason?

>>MASON COLE: Everybody is here except Helen.

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: Okay, great. Yeah, I think actually the agenda that set out the status was very sterile and complete and I have relied very heavily on Ken to give the status updates each time since he's been taking the (inaudible). So I guess I won't add any editorial

comments, but just to let Ken lead off.

>>KEN BOUR: Okay, thank you, I'll do that. I would like to just acknowledge that the subgroup team who has been working on what we're calling the GNSO Web site replacement project, that team is Chris Chaplow, who is sitting across from me there, and Steve Holsten who is on the horn back in the U.S.A., and myself as the staff facilitator and helper.

What we were able to do, the three of us, was to create a first draft of a set of business requirements for the GNSO replacement Web site. It's also being characterized as the GNSO online presence or Internet presence so that we don't get completely tangled up just with the idea that as a page or a Web site, but more of a complex series of functions and capabilities that we would like to deliver to the GNSO. The business requirements draft was completed at the end of May, and that was version 1.0. Subsequently, thanks to Marc Salvatierra, who is the ICANN webmaster, web designer in corporate affairs, he took some time to go through our business requirements in great detail and made a lot of constructive edits and changes and suggestions, terminology and things that we weren't capable of doing on our own as accurately.

And so we've since published version 1.1 which is now the current latest version of that and it's clean, it's not red lined, it's, you know, in pristine condition. I'm not sure if that's a sufficient update for now and whether you --

>>MASON COLE: No, that's good. Actually, I have to -- I have to say, this subteam has made the most progress of anybody so far in terms of developing recommendations and business requirements so thanks to Ken and Steve and everybody on that team for all the hard work. Anyone else in the room who's here, observing, would like to offer any thoughts or suggestions, Ken, yeah.

>>KEN BOUR: I'd like to comment for anybody who has looked at this document or who is about to look at it, it's intended to be written, and we use this term called "business requirements," and it's an attempt to write what the need is, right, so the perspective that we have when we try to describe what kinds of functionality and feature set the GNSO needs, it gets written at that sort of business need level versus a technical level so there's nothing in this business requirements document that will specify anything like a platform or a particular way to deliver a capability. That's the next step, right? So if we -- if this document has approval to go forward, what we would like to do very -- the next step, is to -- for me and our team folks to meet with Mark, I'll probably take the lead on this, and really start to sit down at the design level and I believe that the platform of choice within ICANN right now is Drupal. And so -- and Mark is a Drupal expert, and he has consultants who are Drupal experts, and we will be taking the business requirements and then driving them down to the design level to see how they might actually look when they get

developed. And that's where our subteam will continue to work on this project, what we'd like to do is to get in sort of a iterative or agile development kind of methodology with the corporate affairs technical staff and start turning out versions of a replacement Web site project that folks can look at and play around with and interact within and comment on answer then it can go through changes and so forth and so on so that's where we're heading.

>>MASON COLE: So one point, too, so that if I may just offer a bit of context, when this team first convened and started discussing methods for improving communication, what we wanted to avoid is a tactical approach, we wanted to take a strategic approach and not, for example, rely on the Web site as a panacea for solving the problems of GNSO communications. There's probably a tendency in this community to think about technology as the automatic go-to idea for solving a problem. And we wanted to take a broader view of that. And the Web site may or may not be -- I mean, it's an important component but it may or may not be the best solution to -- ultimately to improve communication between the board and the GNSO. It's an important step, but we wanted to make sure that that wasn't the only thing that we focused on. All right, so other thoughts on Web site document management, et cetera? Yeah, Rob.

>>ROB HOGGARTH: I'd just like to acknowledge that the corporate affairs team has been very supportive with respect to this project. Kieren McCarthy, our general manager of POP participation has just joined us as well.

>>MASON COLE: Thanks for being here, Kieren, appreciate it. Okay, let's go to task three which is soliciting meaningful feedback. Zbynek.

>>ZBYNEK LOEBL: Okay, so we discussed two basic directions: First one, we had a very useful conference call, the localization team with representatives of the ICANN localization team. And we verified that it seems that the localization policy is consistent and it seems that it's working pretty well. We had a couple of questions and also questions where it was reasonably answered. And then, actually, we just brainstormed several times among ourselves with Helen about some -- some ideas how to improve the -- how to get better feedback, et cetera, and we actually planned to get together in Sydney and to try to write something. So Helen should be here and -- at least that's what I understand. And we plan to produce something actually here in Sydney.

One of the ideas which we are brainstorming about was something like a special commands forum or a Web site which would be -- which could be referred towards the registries and registrars as a sort of a logo which they put on -- they can put on their Web sites and which would go directly to like a Web site which would ask the readers to provide feedback and so on. So in this way, the request for feedback would not be just on the Web site of ICANN or related institutions, but if, of course, on a voluntary basis. So on the Web sites of the registries

and registrars. So this is just one of the ideas, but we want to -- unfortunately, we have not come to writing something, but we plan to do it during this week.

>>MASON COLE: So if I understand what you're saying, you're looking -- you're looking at ways to make sure that end users and others who have a stake in how ICANN operates become aware of ICANN and its operations because right now there are too many who are just really insiders to the game, right?

>>ZBYNEK LOEBL: Exactly, this is -- yes, right.

>>MASON COLE: Right. So spread the word beyond the stakeholder groups and everyone else into the broader user community in a way that's relevant so that they understand why ICANN is important, why it's important to contribute and gives them an avenue to do that, right?

>>ZBYNEK LOEBL: Yes, this is correct. And this is one of the ideas. Another idea is to -- that perhaps there is too many acronyms used in the communication and it would be good to have a comprehensive vocabulary of the acronyms, et cetera. So these are just a range of ideas which we have discussed repeatedly, but again, unfortunately, due to time constraints, we were not able to put something in writing.

>>MASON COLE: Okay.

>>ZBYNEK LOEBL: We will do it.

>>MASON COLE: Thank you, Zbynek, good. Ken or Rob, anything you'd like to contribute there? Julie?

>>JULIE HEDLUND: No.

>>MASON COLE: Anyone else? Yeah, Stephane.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yeah, thanks, Mason. Just want to come back to what was being said and ask a question. I understand you haven't had time to go into the details of how we could do what you're proposing which is to provide better communications to non-GNSO SG ICANN insiders. Have you got any leads that you could give us on how that could be done? Because, you know, public participation was mentioned earlier on this. There's a lot of avenues that exist already. You have a blog, you have obviously, a comprehensive Web site, you have lots of people twittering and blogging about things. How could we organize -- I mean, do you have any ideas on how to organize all that to make it available to people who have just on, you know, ICANN insiders who basically are going to be deluged by acronyms, things that they don't understand?

>>ZBYNEK LOEBL: Yeah, no, as I said, I mentioned two possibilities, and, which are just on a brainstorming level. So one possibility is to

-- to have like a special logo which could be, which would be offered to registries and registrars to put it on their Web sites. And the logo would -- would -- access to special Web sites, or which can be in the form either of a Web site or -- or public forum or a blog. With specific requests for -- to provide feedback.

So this is just one option. And second possibility which would be discussed is to create a comprehensive vocabulary of acronyms.

>>MASON COLE: Stephane, yeah.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Sorry. That acronym thing, doesn't that exist already, or is that something we're working on at the council level? Getting confused, sorry, jet lag.

>>MASON COLE: Adrian?

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: I think what Stephane's referring to is, I came up, I think it was the last meeting, with the idea of putting together a glossary on behalf of the GNSO Council and especially during the public forums and I think Kieren McCarthy has responded to this anyways, but to have an idea of a publicly viewable glossary whilst things like the public forum is on so that when someone mentions a PDP about the OSC your eyes don't roll around in your head, you can go very, very quickly to find out what that means 'cause I --

>>MASON COLE: Sorry, no, go ahead -- yeah, that's good. I was going to ask Kieren if he'd like to contribute anything here. It would probably be pretty relevant, Kieren?

>>KIEREN McCARTHY: Yes, so this is what I spend a lot of my time trying to figure out how to do, how to put the work that we do in a broader context.

With regard to the glossary, the problem we faced and the staff are compiling about 10 different glossaries that are being built up over the years, exactly with this sort of process, not to have a go at the process, but everyone started drawing up different glossaries and they've all been kept on people's laptops and on various Web sites. So there is compiling. And I think the best way we'll find to do it is the translation manager, Christina, is compiling them all so they can all be translated so that our translations are also consistent. So the idea which I put to her not that long ago, a couple weeks ago -- she thought it was a good idea -- was to put it on Wikipedia and just stick up a multilingual glossary that we -- a first version and then you stick it up on Wikipedia. Which tends to work. And I can't see that that many people would want to deface GNSO terminology, I don't think it's that exciting for most people. So that's the part of the problem, the problem was that everyone creates their own glossaries in all a slightly different -- I feel if you've put it on Wikipedia and leave the community to figure it out itself without having to go back and

forth.

With regard to the use of plain language, that is a consistent problem, and I know that the public participation full committee are looking at it and they're looking at executive summaries. I've been pushing for the use of plain English since I took the job. And it's a struggle. It's much better, but it's -- I think it's more of a cultural thing, we create acronyms before we even know what we're talking about, you know, sort of -- and they don't -- often don't mean anything. My favorite is IRT which even when you know what it means doesn't really mean trademark protection.

So it's a struggle. If anyone's got any ideas, I'd be delighted. We are trying to produce on staff more clearer, less technical, less lingo, more plain-English text and I think it's getting there, but it's still a long way to go.

>>MASON COLE: Okay, hold on, Ron and then Adrian.

>>RON ANDRUFF: I wanted to pick up, Zbynek, on your comment about making out a GNSO logo and putting that somewhere, but I didn't quite understand. So the idea is that all of the contracted parties or the stakeholder groups, everybody relative to the GNSO would, then, have that and that would be a direct link to the GNSO site? Is that my right understanding?

>>ZBYNEK LOEBL: Well, it can be like that, or it can be slightly different. It would not be -- it would not be mandatory. But basically so -- so -- and it would not access the GNSO Web site. But it could access specific parts of the GNSO Web site just with the most current issues which needed feedback, which needs feedback. So the idea is that basically how we -- how we -- how we are thinking of it, that this may be a logo which could be on the let's say broader participants including registrars, for example, or registries, and it would -- and then basically the readers, or the users which would simply click on the Web site of the registrar or the registry, would see the logo, would be able to click on it, and would access Web site asking for comments on specific, most up-to-date issues.

>>RON ANDRUFF: So that my understanding, then, is that it's more about public participation and issues as opposed to just a link to the GNSO site?

>>ZBYNEK LOEBL: Yes.

>>RON ANDRUFF: Thank you.

>>MASON COLE: Kieren?

>>KIEREN McCARTHY: I have a possible suggestion you might want to look at which is I've been using a thing called Woofoo, actually,

there's -- on the front page now there's a usability study which I would urge you all to go and have a look at for using the Web site. And one of the good things about Woofoo -- it's not just Woofoo, there's lots of these things -- is you can embed that code. So someone can set up a form, a feedback form or whatever and then you can provide that code to whoever wants it and they can embed that form into lots of different sites. And the great thing about that is you're not compiling all the information into one spot which makes life much easier.

>>ZBYNEK LOEBL: Yes, that's exactly what we have in mind and we just need to sit down with Helen and brainstorm a little bit more about it and put it down on paper.

>>MASON COLE: Okay, Adrian?

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Yeah, Adrian Kinderis.

I want to pick up on one of Kieren's points. And I think Kieren should be commended on all the work he's done within the communications realm since coming on board.

It's the generation of acronyms that, for some reason, as an industry or, you know, within I'll call ICANN the industry, we seem to be very quick to develop new acronyms at every meeting. Even such -- and Kieren brought up the IRT acronym.

But I sat through yesterday an IRT information session, and I swear there was at least another 10 new acronyms that had come out of that working group.

You know, so it just seems to be forever evolving. And I think as we move and as we get more a grasp of multi language, multiple languages and multiple cultures, that acronyms don't necessarily serve us in such a good capacity. So, potentially, there needs to be some education by the different chairs or different working groups and have that filter through is that, where possible, try to keep the language -- so it's not only a reactive measure. Potentially, it's a proactive measure as well to ensure that we don't continue to go down paths of having to create a steeper learning curve for folks to come that are new to the table. I hope that is helpful. >>MASON COLE: Yeah, that does make sense. I think what I heard you saying was that the longer you don't participate in ICANN, the harder it is to get literate with ICANN. Very good point.

Stephane, you had something?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Mason.

I think there's two main issues. There's the acronym issue. I don't think you can avoid acronyms. You go into any subject, any



subject that requires some kind of -- call it expertise, for want of a better word. And you'll always have acronyms. You'll always have special vocabulary. You'll always have things that, I mean, any hobby that you have, you know, you'll have special words in there. And outsiders will always face that wall coming in to the subject, coming in to the topic.

So, obviously, a glossary is a great idea. It's a great way of understanding things. But I'm not sure that you can fight special lingo when you're in a specific topic all the way through. I think there has to be some way to decode that. But there's another issue that I see which is just the -- the wealth, the sheer amount of information that you have to tackle coming into ICANN. I mean, look at the preparation coming into this meeting. For the last couple of weeks, it's just been, you know, email alert after email alert, report after report. These reports are like 120-page documents when they're not 200-page documents. So, you know, I tried to read some on the plane coming in and fell asleep halfway through. So first time I've ever been able to sleep on a plane.

So I think we also have to work -- you know, if we're looking at communications, we also have to work on a way of precisizing that? How can we get -- how can we condense that flow of information so that we can come out with -- I don't know. There's been -- in the past we've seen the Wiki do an ICANN quickie thing. We've seen Kieren, who I absolutely agree with what Adrian said earlier on. Kieren has done a fantastic job. And, you know, we've seen things coming out that have tried to simplify the information.

But isn't there some way that we can just provide one or two sentence updates on what's really happening? What do you need to know about the IRT? Basically, there's five sentences there. They've got five recommendations. And then, if you need more information, just go in and look for yourself. Just provide the links and go in. But, if we try and explain it more than that, then you just lose people.

So, you know, I'd also like to see us work on something extremely short. Just to break down documents in an extremely summarized fashion.

>>MASON COLE: Kieren?

>>KIEREN MC CARTHY: It's worth pointing out that I think -- where did it come from? I think it came from the improving institutional confidence consultation. And I think the board is going to vote on Friday on a series of measures for this. And one of them is to write more executive summaries in simplified language. And one of the committees is going to pick up the work for how to do that. So it is recognized and there is a sort of board level review of that. So I think it's coming. But it always goes -- as everything with ICANN, it goes a little bit slower than you want it to.

>>MASON COLE: Adrian.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Without laboring a point, I just wanted to pick up on something Stephane said. I think we can avoid acronyms on occasions. And, you know, rather than calling -- IRT is a bad example. But uniform rapid suspension system. As I said, there's 20 of these things came out of the IRT report. But just call it that. Yes, it's a little bit more cumbersome. But for those in the room, you now understand what I'm talking about. If I just sat here and rattled off 5, it's so divisive. It separates those that know and those that don't know. I tend to think I'm fairly in tune with what goes on at ICANN. But to sit in a meeting and for me to sit and Google what the hell that acronym was, for those that are attending ICANN for the first time must be incredibly intimidating.

So my point is, I guess, that, where possible, you know, even if there is an acronym, when you're sitting in a meeting, there should be some sort of etiquette that says, especially in public forums and councils -- and I know we spoke about that in our public council meeting that we do -- whilst we have an audience, let's ensure that we don't use acronyms. Let's turn it back on us a little bit. Not just put it to one person. Don't dump this all on Kieren's lap. Put this all back on each one of ourselves as stakeholders within the industry to want to work harder to make sure that we're engaging everybody.

>>MASON COLE: I think, if I may -- I don't want to speak for you and Helen, Zbynek, I think what this subgroup is doing is looking at two questions. The board has identified that the original study that looked at where the GNSO was falling short said we're not getting enough meaningful feedback from enough people, right? Who are impacted. Okay? So then the questions then that Zbynek and Helen are trying to address are how do you make people who are unaware of the impact that ICANN has on their lives aware of it in a way that they can understand? And how do you open new avenues for communication to make it easy for them to contribute to the process or to give their feedback? Right? And so now, tactically, right, strategically what you do then is exactly what Zbynek and Helen are doing, which is how do you distribute the information about ICANN in new ways where people will find it and understand it. And then now what we're all talking about is how do we make that easier? Well, we avoid things like acronyms. Right? You know, we -- what have you. Whatever the recommendations are. So did I make sense there? Does that seem like what you're doing, Zybnek?

>>ZYBNEK LOEBL: Yes, yes, exactly. I think so, yeah. And the issues like even the acronyms vocabulary. Because, if -- I also think that unfortunately, we have to live with acronyms. So this summary explanations, et cetera, if necessary, can be part of the vocabulary even.

>>MASON COLE: Do you want to speak, Zbynek, any more about the

translation work that you're doing?

>>ZYBNEK LOEBL: Actually, the localization was -- our localization work was very positive, in my personal view. Because we simply verified. We had a couple of questions. It was very interesting for me. Because the arbitration code, I was involved in a project where we had to put up with 21 languages. So it was also personally interesting for me. And we had a couple of questions. And all the questions were answered by the lady responsible for the localization. And the answers were very satisfactory. So it seems that there is a consistent policy within ICANN and within GNSO regarding the localization texts or the texts which would be localized that there is an effort to develop consistency in localizations, meaning that there is sort of -- there are tools being used to adapt the vocabulary. And the lady, unfortunately, I will not give you now a name. But she definitely knows -- yeah.

>>MASON COLE: Christina Rodriguez?

>>ZYBNEK LOEBL: Yes, Kristina. Thank you. So she definitely knows her job. And she is trying to create and maintain a system and so on. So, in fact, from my personal view, really did not have anything to add to this.

>>MASON COLE: Kieren or Rob, anything you wanted to add to that?

>>ROB HOGGARTH: My only observation there is where there may need to be some in form of gap analysis or whatever is taking the existing translation system that exists within ICANN and then matching it with what the true expectations are for the GNSO. In other words, the capabilities are there to provide the translations. What particular documents do you all think require that or what pieces of them? Are they executive summaries like Stephane refers to where you're taking some shorter version and you're providing that translation? Do you also provide the full translation for the document? In what languages? Those -- that type of analysis, I think, would also be useful at some point in time and in terms of a recommendation.

>>ZYBNEK LOEBL: Yes. I think, actually, that the transcript of the conference call which we had is very useful also in this respect. And we would edit or we would work with the transcript in the material which we are going to prepare. Yeah.

>>MASON COLE: Okay. Stephane?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Mason. I think to try to answer Rob's or try to come up with a few suggestions there, one of the problems that we have in trying to answer our own questions is that we're all talking to all ICANN insiders. So, Rob, when you ask, you know, what kind of material would foreigner -- not foreigners, non-English speakers -- require. Strike that, please. I'm French, so I

can make that kind of a mistake.

If I look at people in France, the take that they have on ICANN, I'm sure that they will never go in to the level of detail that Zbynek has just suggested of reading a conference or a meeting transcript. Because they are just too far away from everything. So perhaps there, once again, you have two levels. You have the pure translation that you do all the stuff that's coming out of ICANN where it's kind of like a U.N. system where you translate everything word for word because the ICANN community isn't all English and they all need to understand. And then for people -- non-English speakers that want to come in to the ICANN process, there, I'd suggest that we once again go back to the summary, the precis, whatever that is. And try and just -- I think it must not be word for word. It has to be easy enough to get into that people can come into it quickly without having to labor through the full ICANN process, as it were.

>>ZYBNEK LOEBL: Yes, exactly. I fully agree. And, in fact, it seems that the current approach of the localization team is exactly the same as we prefer to answer the conference calls, et cetera, et cetera. There is consistent policy.

And the team is in play executing the policy. And I think that this is the only way how you can resolve the issue of multiple languages. Because you cannot satisfy everybody. And so the only thing is to develop some reasoning behind that policy and to then -- then to be -- to simply follow the policy.

>>MASON COLE: Kieren?

>>KIEREN MC CARTHY: So I wanted to flag up -- this has been an issue. The translation has been an issue for a while.

And the counterargument that we get is well, it costs a fortune and no one reads it.

So we set up a system which I hope some of you have seen. On every page on the ICANN site at the bottom is the 10 languages that we've sort of agreed we would do. And nearly every page is in English. If you click on that, then it brings up a popup box. And it says in that language -- so say it's Chinese. You click on Chinese. It says, "I would like to see this page in Chinese." And you click that, and it goes back to a form of the back end that we can see. We can see how many people have clicked on particular pages for particular languages. And then, when it gets to -- when there's a clear demand. We've got hundreds with just one. When there's a clear demand, when it starts getting to about 10 to 15, we then translate that page and put the translation bar at the top. So just to make you're aware of that. That's a way that the community can say I want to read this page in my language. And then we can see the back end, go and translate it.

>>ZYBNEK LOEBL: And also you develop the policy of the summaries and the localization of summaries, as I understand.

And then it is clear that we have to be reminded also the issues which is necessary the multiplicity of languages bring. And this is not just cost but also possible time delays, et cetera. So --

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: I didn't exactly get that. Did you say that you gauge demand and then you decide to translate?

>>KIEREN MC CARTHY: So we translate an enormous number or increasing number of documents. Every document gets translated in the five U.N. languages. And every major document for -- what do you call it? -- for participation, public participation gets translated into 10 languages.

But, in terms of all of those pages on the Web site, we don't know where to begin. It would cost millions and millions of dollars to translate everything.

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: Sure.

>>KIEREN MC CARTHY: So we put code on every page of the Web site. So that, if people say, "I want to read this page in my language," you can click. And we pick it up. And we can see it. And so oh, lots of people wanted to read -- the first one we did was UDRP, which was unusual. I thought the first one would be the "About" page, or the first one would be the comment page or the gTLD page. Actually, the first one all the demand came in for was the UDRP page. So we translated that. And then the next one is "About" page. So on and so forth. So it's just a system by which we can translate all the material according to what the demand is. >>MASON COLE: It's a method of prioritizing so you don't have to do everything at once. You let the community prioritize what's most important, right?

>>KIEREN MC CARTHY: Yes.

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: That definitely makes sense. It is a bit of a chicken and egg question. Unless you know what it says, you can't necessarily know that's what you want to see. But I also agree with you that you would spend an inordinate amount of money and time translating absolutely everything.

>>MASON COLE: Have you had that problem, Kieren, with, you know, people not really in the first place being able to identify what it is they want translated because they don't understand what they're reading?

>>KIEREN MC CARTHY: It's a horrible vicious circle. Because I don't know because they don't follow ICANN because they can't understand what it says. So it's -- you know, where do you break it?

I'm of the view that at some point we'll get to a point in which, say, a Chinese speaker, Arabic speaker will suddenly be able to follow a lot of things. And then I think we'll suddenly see a lot of people appear where they didn't appear before. But it's an impossible question because you don't know.

>>MASON COLE: Right. Adrian?

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Perhaps something Stephane was saying earlier here is that the executive summaries become important. So maybe the executive summary is the part that gets translated, not the whole document. And then they can then indicate I'd like to know more about this. So sort of pick up on probably a couple themes that have been going around here. If each -- start again in English.

If each page had an executive summary down at the bottom or whatever it was in each of the language just simply saying two or three lines about what this page meant and now I'd like more information, I think that's much more helpful.

>>ZYBNEK LOEBL: It is my understanding this is the way that the localization policy is actually developing. Yeah.

>>MASON COLE: Okay. Any more input on this issue? I want to make sure we cover everything.

>>SCOTT PINZON: I would like to get this team's opinion on another view. No one has talked yet about information architecture. So, in other words, if I'm a newcomer and I care about -- we'll just take for an example DNSSEC. And I come to the GNSO page to see what is being done about DNSSEC. DNSSEC isn't anywhere. I see here are the documents that are drafts. Here is the Wiki. Here are resolutions. Everything is mapped through the grid of who said what and when they said it. I wonder if there is interest or if -- you know, from these folks on also having dropdowns where you can track by an issue and maybe come to a central page for IPv6 or DNSSEC or whatever it is. And then I think outsiders may track more efficiently coming in that way than by having to understand the whole ICANN structure before they can even track an issue.

>>MASON COLE: That's a good question. Anyone? Kieren?

>>KIEREN MC CARTHY: I'd like to make you all aware of a usability study which we've just started which is what we this survey on the front page is about. And we've hired this group called Revere Group who are experts in this field. And they're looking at exactly that. So they're going to be interviewing people and following those surveys and looking at what do people want? Who are the people coming into the site? And part of that will be what to figure out what they're after and to change the architecture.

I think my personal view is what they've got as websites is a mix between what the staff create, because the staff are doing the work, and this sort of mismatch of what different parts of the community want. And that's not the best way of doing it.

We've created an insider Web site for insiders. And part of the problem is it's very hard, if you're not an insider, to figure out what's going on.

So part of that usability study that's currently ongoing, which I really recommend everyone get involved with, is to figure out exactly that.

>>MASON COLE: When is that scheduled to be completed?

>>KIEREN MC CARTHY: We've got a schedule to have something to show for the Seoul meeting. But it never, ever works out like that. So I've got a real schedule of probably the end of the year to have something solid or something to show inside of you or what do you think.

>>MASON COLE: All right. Thank you. Chris and then Ken.

>>CHRIS CHAPLOW: Just to point out we have started to take this on board. We deliberately decided to go into that detail wasn't appropriate in the business requirements document. We're hoping, obviously, by doing the prototype with Mark, that will be an opportunity for people to comment on what they see there and give an opportunity for that feedback to come in.

>>MASON COLE: Thank you. Ken?

>>KEN BOUR: I wanted to chirp in on that too, Scott. This is Ken Bour.

The business requirements document did absolutely mention the importance of information architecture and the sort of taxonomy issue which derives exactly from exactly the same point that you're coming from. How do you find anything, right? And so we clearly did not do -- we have not done that work yet. But the requirements for a robust and user friendly taxonomy or information architecture were clearly specified in these business requirements. So that's going to be a design level issue. And we've already started doing some research around how you go about that. Like you can catalog all the information that you have like on the GNSO site, and you can put little index cards and you throw them on the floor and you try to group them -- there's all kinds of different techniques for going around that. And, in fact, Chris Chaplow has had experience with doing that very thing with cards and sorting them out on tables and having lots of different people group them that way. That only deals, of course, with the GNSO side. And Kieren's clearly looking at a much larger information architecture problem at the ICANN level to which our piece would hopefully fit in.

>>MASON COLE: Okay, thanks, Ken. All right. Anything else on this area?

Okay. So going to task 4, which is the one that I managed somehow to assign to myself talking about improving coordination with ICANN structures. And let me just give some context about what that means.

In the original report, the LSE identified four areas where they thought the GNSO could better coordinate in terms of communicating to the board and to other ICANN structures. Better transparency, more open meetings, a published set of minutes of their proceedings, and, hopefully, more interpersonal interaction rather than just over email. Telephone meetings or especially face-to-face meetings as much as is practical.

So, when we first tackled this area as a team, we discussed whether or not the LSE list of problems, frankly, was comprehensive enough. And we decided probably it wasn't. So we have some other things that we included on there, some of which we already talked about now. The terminology that we use to discuss our work, right? We tend to lapse into the technical or sort of diplomatic speak that may be offputting or difficult for a new person to understand. Or it may even be too cumbersome for the GNSO to communicate effectively to other bodies.

As we also talked about a tendency to overrely on technology. Things like Wikis and listserves and other things like that that, while well-intentioned, may clutter up the communications process more than it needs to be.

There also has been identified the idea that there's lack of visibility into the board's own discussions. And this came up -- I'm representing this group from the registrar's constituency point of view. This came up in the registrar's group because the question was put to us how can the board interact better with the constituency during the ICANN meetings, during constituency day?

And one of the things we discussed was the fact that we don't really know what the board does with the input once we give it to them. And I imagine that's probably true in terms of other -- even the GNSO or other bodies within ICANN that have the occasion to communicate with the GNSO or the board.

So these are all being laid out -- all the input from all the subteams are going to be laid into a document that is going to represent all of our recommendations.

And from my part of this, for this task, I've been identifying those problems and then starting to look at what's currently being done inside of ICANN and then what's not being done, where the gap might exist. So I'm in the process of doing that. So, with that as context,



I'd like to know if, first, Ken or Rob, if you want to contribute anything to that point of view. And then, second, if anybody in the room here has other things they would identify in terms of opportunities for ICANN structures to better communicate with one another. So let's start with Ken and Rob, and then I'd like to open it to everyone else.

>>ROB HOGGARTH: I just think it's a good approach to look at it going both ways. I think that's the appropriate context to put it in definitely.

>>MASON COLE: You mean in terms of the board's own communication outward or GNSO's communications outward and then the communications inbound to those as well?

>>ROB HOGGARTH: Yeah. I mean, I think your primary focus is on how to have a level of comfort that the GNSO is doing its job in communicating but a recognition that there is a two-way street. And you may be more -- I don't know -- identifying solutions but certainly issue spotting for potential ways to understand better what the processes might be. And that would be useful input, for example, into the board committee that Kieren was mentioning earlier, the public participation group, which is looking at what are better ways for the organization to communicate particularly at the board level?

>>MASON COLE: All right. Thank you. Ken?

>>KEN BOUR: I'm not sure if this issue is appropriate or not in what you're looking at, Mason. But in recent times I've become aware of the ICANN code of conduct. In particular, there was a public forum that was held recently. I might have mentioned this on one of our earlier calls.

And some of the behavior that I see in writing and probably a little less so in person face-to-face, but certainly in writing, it's abysmal. It's just really awful. And it strikes me that there might be something that could be said in your work around not only how to improve communications but how to make it more civil. So that's just a thought.

>>MASON COLE: It's a good point. And one that from my point of view, we should embrace, I agree with you. I think it's much easier to say things -- I don't know -- in the heat of the moment behind your keyboard when you don't have to sort of back it up in person or really have to interact in a real way with another human being. That doesn't contribute to working together. It detracts from working together.

>>KEN BOUR: Right. And one of the things that -- sort of a practical recommendation that might come out of it could be to have moderated forums. That takes work, and it takes staff and so forth. But people can put things out there, and they can call people slimebags

and every other imaginable thing. And it just sits there. It doesn't ever get pulled down. It -- no one responds back and says that's inappropriate. So maybe a recommendation comes out that says we should at least do something along the lines of moderating these public forums, especially what issues are real controversial.

>>KIEREN MC CARTHY: That's not a bad idea. I don't -- I think it would have to be self-moderated simply because, whenever I've come up with an idea and it's taken off, it becomes impossible to keep it up. Because, when something kicks off there's just thousands of -- you see the number of emails that everyone gets.

But you have things like -- I'm thinking of slashdot. I don't know whether you know the Web site slashdot. That gets self-moderated. People vote comments up or down. And then you can select whether you want to see comments above or below this number. I think it goes up to 5. You say I only want to read comments 4 and above. And it just cuts out all the rubbish, all the fighting with people. But you don't say to people I'm not allowing to you say anything. You just allow people where they want to cut people off.

>>MASON COLE: Okay, Chris.

>>CHRIS CHAPLOW: Actually in the business constituency we've just moved to moving across to having an unmoderated forum we've moved the other way there's a question I want to ask Kieren the mailing list, are they moderated in an extreme cases if someone is on there that's taken down or are they just totally unmoderated.

>>KIEREN McCARTHY: There have been one or two, I remember with regard to public comment periods we have a policy because some people say or at least claim that they're surprised it's been published and I remember we put some wording on every time, public comment forum, by the way, by clicking this, it will be published. So when anyone asks for it to be taken down, we review whether it came before or after that date when asked that it be taken off. We've had spam, which is a pain, and have we ever cut anyone off? No, I don't think we have cut anyone off. But we have said to people this is not reasonable and usually the community does a pretty good job of saying this is not reasonable so no, I mean, there's very, very limited moderation and I'm not sure that's always a good thing. Sometimes it is, sometimes it isn't.

>>MASON COLE: Okay, good, thank you for raising that point, Ken, I think that's very valid.

All right, any other ideas, comments, issues? Chris?

>>CHRIS CHAPLOW: There was some talk earlier, actually, on our own mailing list about a cross-constituency mailing list. Is that something that you're picking up or it's to be picked up?

>>MASON COLE: In my area you mean? No, yeah, I'll be happy to pick it up. Okay, other thoughts? Okay. All right, any other business to bring before this group today? We're in danger of actually finishing early. Are you sure we want to do this? All right. Steve, anything else you'd like to add on the telephone?

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: Well, I'm thinking that it might be useful in the interest to take the Stephane Van Gelder approach and take people from foreign language and send them to London so they could learn English with a great accent, I think that would be a very beneficial thing.

>>MASON COLE: Can you set up an ICANN fellowship for that, how about that?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: As long as you call it the Van Gelder fellowship.

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: I would like to see that. The only thing I would add is we within the registry has been debating the transparency issue about the lists that we use and whether there should be open or closed lists and I think you alluded to that within the registrar constituency too, that there is -- there's a balance that needs to be struck between open and candid conversation and not shilling communication by allowing people to speak their piece but then having it open and available to the rest of the world and I'm not sure exactly what the proper balance is. I don't know if everything they say every moment of the day be on the official public record, but at the same time, enough of that has to be out there for folks to feel like there are not back-room sessions being had. And maybe there should be different standards with different constituencies versus ICANN at large but I would be interested in hearing what you or the others in the room have to say about that topic.

>>MASON COLE: Sure. Any thoughts on this, anyone? Steve, if I understand your question, it's how to strike a balance between transparency and having discussions mainly online being public so that they see the light of day versus things that deserve to have some privacy and areas, thank you, need to have privacy to encourage meaningful contribution, is that right?

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: Exactly right. Because as I understand it, some stakeholder groups have two lists. You probably know very well if the registrar constituency has an open list and a closed e-mail list, which gets more traffic? I'm not sure what the right balance is, but I think that's a discussion that merits some attention.

>>MASON COLE: Stephane?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I have to say something after Steve's introduction anyway, so no, I think it's a very -- it is something that we've grappled with, as Mason knows, in the registrar constituency.

And it's something that we've also given some thought to in the GNSO Council.

One solution is to sometimes close things off and sometimes have fairly open meetings and that can happen with meetings, mailing lists and everything where you can have two levels of communications -- of communication. You can have meetings that close off for an hour when you just want to have private discussions and you want -- it is true that when you do close things off, people tend to say things that they never do otherwise. When the mic's open and the scribes are there, you know, most people, I'm, I'm an exception to this rule, but most people tend to shut up and, you know, watch what they're saying. Which sometimes means or leads to unproductive communication and so that's why sometimes we close meetings. That's one -- one idea. It does tend to promote a kind of conspiracy theory about nontransparency so that's a problem. And the mailing list issue is actually the same. We -- the problem that we have had in the constituency, and Mason will correct me if I'm wrong, is that we ended up with one list where no one would dare post because it was public and so everyone would, all the members, you mean, would just use the other lists, so we basically had one list just die on us.

So I don't know what the solution is there. But it's -- maybe that's a kind of mix of those things can help.

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: Yeah, and we in the registries constituency have also thought about having some more detailed minutes of meetings or some other manner of communicating if not a verbatim transcript or a fully open list. I don't have any "therefores" or solutions at this point on it but rather to raise it as an issue that I know ICANN faces tremendous scrutiny about anything that is closed and not fully opened and most people in their own self-interest would rather be able to speak privately and only claim things publicly when they choose to, ICANN is itself able to provide in that way, and I'm not sure whether the more individual subgroups should be allowed to do so or not. I have a personal -- by allowing people to speak privately on some matters and then come out with a public position that they're willing to share with the rest of the world. I think that tends to lead to more productive discussion so anyone how, that's it. I don't want to jeopardize Mason's thoroughly meeting end.

>>MASON COLE: That's okay, you've still got seven minutes, you're doing fine.

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: (Inaudible), okay.

>>MASON COLE: No, it's a relevant question and it may be one that's difficult for us to find a definition for. I mean, you had to define whatever the border is between things that should be discussed privately versus things that should always have transparency. It's -- it may not be possible to do. Rob, do you have something there.

>>ROB HOGGARTH: Yes, sir. The dialogue has brought up a number of points that I was going to run through. One other thing very quickly so as not to jeopardize --

>>MASON COLE: You're doing fine.

>>ROB HOGGARTH: You know, part of it is looking back at your goals which is additional communications to facilitate participation in the policy development process. So you almost have to look at what are the considerations, what are you trying to accomplish with some of these goals.

It's that interest in, for example, someone who hasn't been able to make it to a meeting, you want them to be able to hear the recording so that they can be up to date and consistent with the rest of the group. The issues of transparency are there because of those very concerns, suspicions, paranoia, whatever you want to call it, among a broader group of people about what's going on in other communities.

If you look at a lot of the public comments, not just in the GNSO improvements area but with respect to the existing constituency renewals or reconfirmations or if you look at some of the comments with respect to some of the new constituencies that are proposing to be recognized by the board there's a lot of community interest in understanding who the members are. So open mailing lists. Having access to public communication tools like forums or mailing lists and the rest. So all those have to be, I think, factored in particularly as this group looks at general recommendations. You're not going to necessarily be dictating but you want to be able to package some of these discussions for the broader GNSO, I think, to crunch on a little bit as well.

One area of, I think, of interest, when you look back last year, and the board created the special working group on GNSO Council restructuring, there the group came together and said, "we really don't think our deliberations would be useful for valuable if people were looking over our shoulders. We understand we're going to be consulting with our own constituencies and those groups, but we don't want people looking over our shoulders right now." And so the agreement that that group reached was we will deliberate in confidence, you know, among ourselves but every call will be recorded and transcribed, and at the end of our efforts, then it will be opened. And they stuck to that commitment. So there was really a balancing of helping the deliberations and the negotiations go forward but at the end being very open about what the process was so that people who are interested could go back and look and see what did the GAC representatives say, what was the registry constituency's interest here. So there are ways I think to balance things moving forward.

As a work team I'm not quite sure at what level you want your

recommendations to ultimately reach and I think you'll have to discuss that as a team but I think identifying some of these issues would be certainly helpful for the broader community once you're done.

>>MASON COLE: Yeah. All right, thank you, Rob. Very good. All right. Anything -- yeah, Ken?

>>KEN BOUR: Just a question, Mason, as to where the business requirements document is in terms of publication or distribution or circulation. Has it --

>>MASON COLE: No, it's not been circulated. I know we talked about that that it would be useful to do that near in the Sydney meeting so that we could get some community input. And I just haven't taken that step yet. There is a broader OSC -- I think there's a broader OSC meeting, isn't that right, coming up? Or are we not meeting? No? I thought that was up in the air.

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: Mason, aren't you going to draft an accompanying press release?

>>MASON COLE: Yeah, right.

[ Laughter ]

>>JULIE HEDLUND: There is an OSC meeting and that is in conjunction with the GNSO operations work team, but that's the only OSC meeting.

>>MASON COLE: Beyond that, I might take the step of publishing the business requirements to the OSC itself and asking for some input from there.

>>KEN BOUR: The reason I bring it up is because, like I mentioned earlier, it's my hope to actually get with Marc Salvatierra, the week after we come back from Sydney, assuming he's available, and to actually begin working on some design and project structure and that kind of work. And if we had any input or feedback on the business requirements from those in the community who have had a chance to look at it, that would clearly be helpful.

>>MASON COLE: Okay, all right, I'll take care of that. All right, anything else? We're two minutes away from closing time.

>>CHRIS CHAPLOW: Obviously, we're around here all week, so if anybody wants feedback, they can sort of track us down in a corner somewhere and --

>>MASON COLE: And beat us up? All right, if there's no other business, then we will adjourn at this point. Thanks everyone for coming. Bye, Steve.

>>STEVE HOLSTEN: Bye. Have a great day. G'day.

>>MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve.