

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Communications Coordination
Work Team (CCT)29 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 29 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/gns0/gns0-cct-20090429.mp3>

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#april>

Participants on the Call:

Mason Cole - Registrar Constituency - Chair
Chris Chaplow - Commercial and Business Users Constituency
Steve Holsten - Vice-Chair, gTLD Registries Constituency
Helen Laverty - DotAlliance Registry c

ICANN Staff in attendance:

Julie Hedlund - Policy Consultant
Robert Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by.

The conference is now being recorded. If you do have any objections you may disconnect at this time.

Thank you please go ahead.

Mason Cole: Thank you.

All right, Glen we should call the roll please.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes. We have on the call Mason Cole, leader of the call, chair; Chris Chaplow, and Steve Holsten.

And for staff we have Julie Hedlund, Rob Hoggarth, and myself, Glen Desaintgery. Have I left off anybody?

Mason Cole: Doesn't sound like it. All right. Thank you very much Glen.

Did everybody get a copy of the agenda for today which is very short?

Man: Yes.

Mason Cole: All right. Then is there any changes or edits to the minutes from the April 1 meeting?

Okay if not those will be approved as submitted by Julie.

Thank you Julie.

And Julie let me go out of order here for just a minute since the discussion on this might save you a bit of time but you wanted a part on the agenda to talk about recording our proceedings either with minutes or using the recorded phone call.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah.

Mason Cole: Would you like to address that now?

Julie Hedlund: Right yeah. Thanks Mason.

I had not realized before but these - the recordings of these meetings, the Work Team meetings, are being transcribed. And because of that I was wondering whether or not those transcriptions could take the place of detailed minutes.

And then I could suggest if so I would continue to record action items and perhaps any major points of discussion and send those out to the Team following the meetings and post those on the wiki but also include a link to both the transcript as well as the MP3 recording so that people would have the more detailed discussion from the meeting.

Steve Holsten: I think that sounds like a much more efficient use of your time Julie.

Mason Cole: I agree. I certainly don't object to that. That sounds like it'll save you a lot of work.

Steven Holsten: I...

Chris Chaplow: I must have missed this...

Steve Holsten: I think even with - here we are in the Communications Work Team that I'd like to think of fulfilling the openness and transparency mandate but when I think of the MP3 recordings that are made and then will sit out there invariably unlistened to in cyberspace and even all of the minutes it does give me some pause.

You know, I guess the benefit is people have access to them. And if they wanted to they could get them and that keeps participants honest and on task and I can see a bunch of different benefits to it.

But man if there's a way to not require you to spend so much effort in transcribing all of these things and let it rest on a recording and a computer-generated transcription that would be even better.

Julie Hedlund: And I've seen the - I've looked at the transcriptions and they're really pretty good. I guess I would point out that they can be better still if we are always identifying ourselves before we speak and making sure that our mics are turned up so that we can be heard.

But otherwise they seem to be quite complete.

Steve Holsten: And the transcriptions that you have done as often edited by Ken Bour those are actually almost more like meeting notes and if you were taking notes as you listened in on a professor speaking you'd put them in an outline form and you'd tidy them up and that's I think the function that you've served in all this.

But I think that's - knowing that there're competing demands on your time while that is kind of nice I don't think it justifies the amount of effort.

Julie Hedlund: And I should point out that I thought Ken's notes after the sub-team meeting last Wednesday were quite helpful, you know, just as an email with the action items and main points of the meeting summarized. You know, I think that sort of gave a sense to everybody the - you know the things that were accomplished and what was discussed which is really I think what most people are looking for.

And then they can go to the transcriptions and get more detail if necessary.

Mason Cole: Yeah Julie I think we follow that road and free up your time even more. I don't - it's - using the transcription is as complete a record of our proceedings as you can get. So I have no objection at all to do that.

Chris is that okay with you as well?

Chris Chaplow: Yeah I mean I found Julie's minutes very useful. I mean after one or two of the earlier calls, you know, my brain was pickled after the meeting and I really needed those minutes to be able to remember and sort out what had been said.

I didn't appreciate there were any transcriptions. I sort of missed that somewhere along the line. And I agree it doesn't make sense if those are available.

Julie Hedlund: They have been...

Chris Chaplow: (Unintelligible)...

Woman: ...available (unintelligible)...

Chris Chaplow: ...available or is just something that's for the future?

Julie Hedlund: Right yeah. They hadn't been available so you hadn't missed them. They are now becoming available back to the original meetings and then going forward. So we'll have them.

And if there needs to be clarification I am still keeping a few notes for my own edification so I know what's going on. I'm always happy to answer questions after the discussion as well.

Mason Cole: Are you putting those on the wiki Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. You know what I will do is after each meeting I will take - you know, I will indicate on the wiki the action items, some summary or main points, and then also link to the transcript and the MP3 all in one place so that you can, you know, look at that and then look at, you know, the various resources.

Mason Cole: That sounds perfect.

Helen Lavery: Where's the wiki site?

Mason Cole: Oh hi Helen how are you?

Helen Lavery: Oh hi. Sorry I came in late.

Julie Hedlund: Hi Helen. This is Julie. I will be happy to send you the link to the wiki. I'll do that right now.

Helen Lavery: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: You're welcome.

Mason Cole: Okay. Any other input on that issue?

Okay. What I'd like to do now if I may is just get a quick update from everybody for the areas of work that we assigned each other two weeks ago.

So Steve and Chris would you lead off?

Steve Holsten: Sure. And I think very helpful that Ken Bour did put together a summary of the activities we've done on our sub-team.

We talked through business requirements, what they are, what they aren't.

We have looked at a bunch of websites.

We have even looked at the Drupal website which knowing that ICANN is moving towards Drupal it can be a shortest distance between two points to look at some of the things that Drupal offers as being sort of the business requirements.

And the analogy I guess is if you see a car that you like and you look at the sticker on the window and you see it's got air conditioning and leather seats and a V6 engine and so forth that that is one method of short-handing what the business requirements will be.

And we're trying to be somewhat careful not to just necessarily go with a particular technology provider or solution. But if it is in fact the case that ICANN is moving towards Drupal for most things then we would be kind of silly to look at all the other sorts of things that are out there but that are not compatible.

Chris you want to add to that?

Chris Chaplow: Yeah I think really to add that we were also talking about the sort of dynamic versus the static. And by that we meant the requirements that are easier to solve in the short term because the requirements are quite wide ranging and also using the so-called "Penelope document" as a base because it is a good document and we should make use of the that.

And the hope is that before we get too far that (Mark) can pick up some of our early work and start to do some work with a demo site or - that then can actually be used so we'll actually have an interactive version of the report really which could be quite useful for people (unintelligible) really feel what sort of things they're saying.

Mason Cole: I have a question for you guys.

Is attention being given in your requirements - the assessment of your requirements is attention being given to the organization of the site itself?

Chris Holsten: That's taxonomy so to speak. Is it left-hand or top-based in organizing? That's kind of the end state - the finishing touches. So once you've got the car built that's in some respects choosing the color.

But we have all agreed that if we can get these fundamental business requirements set that that is probably the most useful and impactful part of the website design. If it has a million great functions but you don't where to or how to access it then all of that is lost.

So I think each one of us is looking forward to actually digging in ourselves to try to come up with what the organization of the site should be.

Mason Cole: Okay. It just - it comes to mind because I have the occasion to be obviously on discussion lists and those kinds of things and I find that - well we talked about this before. I mean particularly in the GNSO all the constituency sites are different. Their discussion lists are sort of cluttered around all over the place and it's not - you know, it's just not a well-organized effort.

You should be able to go to one GNSO site and from there easily navigate to information that you need or a discussion that you need to participate in or something you need to submit or what have you. And I don't find that to be the case now but - and I'm sure you guys are paying attention to this but it was on my mind.

Steve Holsten: Yeah definitely and I'm trying to remember which site was - Chris was it the ALAC site that we looked to as being a pretty advanced site...

Chris Chaplow: Yeah...

Steve Holsten: ...within GNSO?

Chris Chaplow: Probably of the ICANN sites yeah the ALAC site.

Steve Holsten: There was one that apparently some person took as an individual labor of love and mission to try and make it more state-of-the-art and so that one was better than other sites but I can't remember exactly.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah it was that one. I'm pretty sure it was yeah.

Steve Holsten: It was the At-Large?

Mason Cole: Yeah okay. All right, good. Do you guys want to address the document management issue as well?

Steve Holsten: I think with respect to document management we know that Drupal does have certain document management capabilities and I'm trying to remember Chris is that something that we're doing as - there's phase one which is the easy stuff and phase two which is...

Chris Chaplow: In the difficult stuff.

Steve Holsten: In the difficult stuff.

Chris Chaplow: I think the document management side is most likely in the more difficult stuff. Drupal is relatively limited in what it can do with document management. And of course we're all aware of this platform independent problem.

So yeah we've certainly got to address this one. But that is more difficult yeah.

Mason Cole: All right.

Anyone have any thoughts or input to share on those two - first two issues?

Helen Laverty: Well basically I really agree that it is very hard to find the information. And if you can actually have a site where you jump between different GNSO topics easily it would make it a lot more usable.

Mason Cole: Yeah. I agree. Is that your dog we hear Helen?

Helen Laverty: Sorry I've had to bring her.

Mason Cole: No that's okay. That's okay.

Okay. Very good. All right Helen any work so far with Zbynek on the feedback?

Helen Laverty: I touched bases with her. I actually didn't know until she sent me an email who I was working with so we didn't manage to get together (unintelligible) arrange something. Unfortunately this has been a very bad week for me. I had some notes. I haven' actually located them yet.

One of the things that I wondered as far as translation was some of the expenses seem to be quite high and yet within our organization they're an awful lot of registrars that have very good translation ability like the China registrars for example. I wonder if there's some way we can utilize them to help reduce the cost of translation of documents instead of always paying an outside organization that is sometimes quite expensive and sometimes doesn't have the best interest of cost saving in mind.

Mason Cole: You mean having registrars sort of as volunteers do that?

Helen Laverty: Exactly.

And also while it was something that I found actually in Mexico but when you talk about the different ways of doing characters they - seems to be detailed meetings that don't really assess people that might know. A lot of the registrars were saying why ICANN isn't doing it this way. It's a much easier way to do it another way. So that again maybe lines up with communication.

We have a whole resource of people that are very good at doing them, handling different documents and different characters. And yes would rather pay (unintelligible) who is probably not as interested as we are in actually accomplishing these objectives.

Mason Cole: Okay.

To your second point did I understand you to say that sometimes information doesn't get out from the GNSO in a way that makes people who have something to contribute aware of an opportunity to contribute something useful?

Helen Lavery: That's part of it, yes.

That's definitely a good part of it that they aren't even aware of it. I think sometimes we're not even asking the people that might be in a good position to help but instead ICANN particularly says, "We're going to hire these people at X number of dollars and they'll do it for us."

Mason Cole: Oh I see what you mean. Okay.

Helen Laverty: And I'm just not certain for a non-profit organization whether that's the best way of doing it.

I'm sorry my notes are very rough because I don't have them in front of me. I only just got in so.

Mason Cole: No that's okay.

Chris Chaplow: Can I (unintelligible) in there?

Even for a commercial organization or a small business like mine I mean we're working in English and Spanish all the time and there's many people in the office that do speak or write natively both languages but everyone's very busy and it's sometimes just easier to get something done to just send it out to, you know, external translators. And the cost is about 10 cents per word.

Helen Laverty: Yeah well it's actually - but you would probably have the resources to find translators that would do it at a reasonable price whereas some of these costs seem to be prohibitively high. If you know people that are in the business of doing it...

Chris Chaplow: Well, you know, I'm sort of on home ground, you know, I can get Spanish down to about 6 cents per word and, you know, Russian and Arabic is about 14.

I've no idea what (unintelligible) the figures that ICANN pays. They shouldn't pay much more because you - on the internet it doesn't matter where you translators are, you know, you can access the world and there's a lot of (unintelligible).

Helen Lavery: Yeah no that makes a lot of sense. And actually you're definitely one of the people that should be talked to about how to make sure we get translations done correctly, economically, and in a way that makes sense.

Chris Chaplow: I mean I'm not talking about certified translation and this sort of thing. I'm talking, you know, general business translation not (unintelligible) certified for legal reasons and things like that.

Helen Lavery: Yeah no if it has to be a legal document then it has to be done properly. But if it's an informational document then as long as it's well understandable and again people should be able to comment and say, "Your translation sucks get somebody else."

Chris Chaplow: Yeah.

Helen Lavery: (Unintelligible) do it.

Chris Chaplow: But even from a pure economic point of view, you know, I've given documents to staff members and they spend so long working on them that it would be cheaper just to send it out, you know. But anyway just a comment.

Helen Lavery: Yeah.

Mason Cole: Well it's someone worth looking at. Okay...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mason Cole: ...Helen I would encourage you to get a hold of Zbynek, you know, as soon as it's practical for you so that you guys can...

Helen Laverty: Yeah we need a conference and get some stuff going.

Mason Cole: Yeah okay. All right good.

Man: (Mason). This is (Rob). If I can interject here.

Mason Cole: Please.

Rob Hoggarth: At whatever point you all think it would be useful or helpful I'm sure that Julie and I working with Glen or others could arrange for members of our translation management effort within ICANN to talk with the team or have dialogue whether that's in a future meeting or some sort of separately scheduled time where there can be that discussion about why do you guys do it this way, have you considered that, a discussion about some of the management challenges in the translation process.

I think they would be delighted to hear any suggestions where we could continue to reduce cost, operate more efficiently, and maintain accuracy. So that would certainly be something to entertain and consider for the future.

Mason Cole: That's a great idea Rob.

Helen Laverty: How would we implement that? I'd like to actually do that. I think we had discussions on that last time but who would I communicate to set up a time and talk?

Rob Hoggarth: I could coordinate and do an introduction via email between you and Christina Rodriguez who's our manager for translation affairs within ICANN. She joined just before the Cairo meeting and I think has done some amazing work in taking us from those first baby steps of, yes, you're right, paying too much for translation, to now getting us on a much more even keel.

But I think she'd agree there's still areas where we can significant improve. So I could do, you know, email introduction and then we could separately as part of that sub-Work Team schedule a time and get together.

Helen Lavery: That would be wonderful. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Sure.

Mason Cole: Good. Thank you Rob.

Ken Bour: Hey Mason. This is Ken Bour.

I'm sorry I was a few minutes late. I just joined about five minutes ago before this discussion started. I just wanted to signal to Glen too that I was on the call.

Mason Cole: Great. Hi Ken. How are you?

Ken Bour: Hi. I understand I owe thanks to Steve Holsten (unintelligible) summarizing everything.

Mason Cole: Oh yeah...

Steve Holsten: (Unintelligible).

Mason Cole: ...yeah you do actually. That's true. Yeah.

Steve Holsten: I was actually waiting to say, "Hey Ken will summarize it for us" since you're so on top of it so.

Mason Cole: And then I called on you first.

Steve Holsten: There you go.

Mason Cole: All right.

So Ken we're just running through our work list block by block to get a general update on where things stand in terms of the work. And we just heard from Helen on she and Zbynek had not yet connected on the soliciting meaningful feedback issue. But they're going to do that.

We were just having a discussion about translation and - well you heard it. Rob's offered to put a meeting together. So that's where we are in the meeting.

Ken Bour: Super. Thanks.

Mason Cole: Okay. Okay, all right. So anything else for Helen and Zbynek's group?

Okay. So, on my issue the formalized channels for Council communicate with the Board. Interestingly I've actually been working on this in the context of the Registrars Constituency where I'm a

participant and there was a question posed to the Constituency. I would assume that it was posed to all constituencies but it also came to Registrars about - it was very specific.

It was about how to make interactions between the constituencies and the Board more efficient and more meaningful during Constituency Day at an ICANN meeting.

And so we have put together actually a two-page document that talks about how that might be done. And one thing that I just - I'll just offer up to the group here is when the Executive Committee of the Registrars met to sort of talk about this it came out that we believe you can tinker with Constituency Day or the - you know the methods for communicating with the Board here and there.

The real issue is that there's - frankly there's too much work that ICANN's trying to take on for any one meeting day to - you know, to handle it effectively. You know, in essence the structure of the meeting itself is inadequate to cover the amount of material that's trying to be tackled, you know, during that day.

But I wanted to offer that to you all and just ask if that could be a shared opinion or if you have other perspectives?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Even though I've joined late here I do have a perspective that you're right on. In fact I noticed in many other places, I hope I don't get yelled at for this, but I mean GNSO Council calls, the agendas for each meeting are packed...

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Ken Bour: ...and frequently each item has ten minutes on its agenda. That's a fairly common time block.

The ICANN Board itself typically when it meets has a very full agenda and frequently can not get into the details and substance - you know this may not just be a problem at ICANN. It may be a problem universally but I have seen it in other places. So I think you're right on there.

Mason Cole: Well I realize it's not - that's not our problem our solve.

That's not our assigned task which is, you know, how to do that. But I do think it may be useful to set contacts when we talk about communication that it's unrealistic to think that you can give weighty topics five minutes of discussion and expect that there is a decent outcome to be had by that; that part of the communications problem that we may be having is the fact that we don't prioritize our work, "we" meaning ICANN, the entire community.

And I don't mean that in a literal sense. I mean of course you have to prioritize some things. But by its structure ICANN sort of has to take on everything at the same time.

And I do know, I'd be interested in Julie and Rob's point of view as well as Ken's from a staff point of view, I have talked with folks on the staff who've said, "Look, you know, we're going to start missing deadlines and, you know, there's too much work coming at us."

And it's also too much for the community to thoughtfully consider at any given time. There's just too much out there to think about.

Anybody want to address that?

Chris Chaplow: I hadn't - this is Christopher here. I've not actually seen that one drop into the mailing list or anywhere on the business community. I suspect you're right. I don't have the sort of experience of these Constituency Days to really comment first hand.

Mason Cole: Oh just wait.

Chris Chaplow: But if you can help me certainly put the question together I can certainly take feedback from the business (unintelligible).

Mason Cole: Yeah I'd be glad to do that. And when you meet with the Board, Chris, as a constituency how is that interaction structured?

Chris Chaplow: I've only been to the Paris meeting and I wasn't in the constituency at the time.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: So I can't answer that.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: I can ask (Phyllis) (unintelligible).

Mason Cole: Ken or Rob or Julie do you have any perspectives on how other constituencies tend to interact with the Board?

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob.

In terms of Board interaction on Constituency Day members of the Board divvy up the various stakeholder groups with a small "s" within ICANN. And they go around that day and visit with the various groups.

Outside of the GNSO the other supporting organizations and advisory committees I think make efforts to reach out to either Board liaisons or Board representatives probably similar to what happens in GNSO where, you know, there are a couple of Board members who are elected by the GNSO who will maintain ties or connections or contacts with leadership of the GNSO Council.

But in terms of direct interaction that's a more rare occurrence than anything else. Usually they're more official communications that take place but not a lot of dialogue.

Mason Cole: Well that's what I was going to ask is outside of Constituency Day is there really any meaningful back-and-forth between any element of the GNSO and the Board itself?

Rob Hoggarth: (Unintelligible) I mean and some of you may see this (unintelligible) circulate once the meeting agendas are publicly available. He'll make sure that he sends a copy to the GNSO Council with a heads up.

I think various Board members will monitor some of the forum lists (unintelligible) archive list.

There's almost an effort to bend over backwards in some respects for members of the Board to not be quote-unquote representatives of the segments of the industry that they're from because they (unintelligible) fiduciary responsibility to the organization as a whole. In the past there have been concerns expressed by ICANN General Council that it be very important that, you know, members of the Board are not identified specifically as coming from their community but, you know, represent the corporation.

So there's that tension there but I think an overall agreement as you all have discussed and seen in the BGC report it would be more of an exchange of information whether that's a dialogue, a paper, or something else I think is worth discussion.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

And one of the questions that the registrars had when we were talking about this was frankly we're unaware of what the Board does with the information that we share.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah.

Mason Cole: You know we're not casting aspersions on the Board or anyone on the Board but we sit with the Board itself or not the entire Board but representatives of the Board for most of the day and then they leave and go to the Board meeting and we don't know how the information is shared or how it's acted upon or even if it's acted upon.

So, you know, one of the things we're going to request is more visibility into that. That would be helpful and it would be instructive for us to know that so we could tailor our feedback in a way that's more helpful to the Board.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah because as a community - this is Rob again, as a community you - and as staff have an opportunity to see that when there's a public meeting when everyone's sitting around on stage. But my impression is that tends to be more of a (unintelligible) event...

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: ...as opposed to a real sense of something you might see here in the United States in an open meeting of an administrative body that has various quote-unquote what we call here in the U.S. "sunshine requirements." (Unintelligible), you know, shed light on the deliberative process.

Mason Cole: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: ICANN is not yet that sophisticated and perhaps, you know, this Work Team could fashion recommendations, concepts, or ideas that may begin to sort of approach not only that - how that communication could help the broader community but also how the GNSO specifically could find leverage points to help (unintelligible) that observation of what's going on.

Mason Cole: It's a good point.

And, you know, one thing that I think - again sorry to use the registrars as a constant example but it's recent and it's topical, one thing we're very conscious of is the amount of work that the Board takes on. I mean these are, you know, volunteer positions and the Board's time commitment to its duties is huge and it's only getting bigger.

And, you know, we don't - there needs to be a way to make interaction between the Board and the GNSO more efficient without being too formalized so that it sort of stifles discussion rather than encourages it while not adding more work to the already pretty heavy workload that the Board carries.

That seems to make sense?

Ken Bour: Curious to know how you're going to solve it Mason.

Rob Hoggarth: You've identified the (unintelligible) yeah.

Mason Cole: Well that's as far as I'm willing to go. No, yeah I'm not sure what the answer is but, you know, we'll have to start getting creative.

Helen Lavery: Is it possible to have some type of feedback from our comments (unintelligible)?

Mason Cole: Say again Helen?

Helen Lavery: That we could have some kind of feedback. When we put all these recommendations that we could have feedback. I mean if it's something that the ICANN Board really likes they could say, "We like

this and we used it. The other things were interesting but not really usable.” It would really help us learn how we can help ICANN more...

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Helen Laverty: ...because those sort of - that sort of feedback will be telling us, “Okay we’re barking down the wrong path. We’re taking too much time and we’re not helping ICANN on these sort of issues. But these sort of issues do seem to be of some help.” So we should work more on those (unintelligible) if ICANN takes a recommendations that we give and they come back with just - you know, just a short few lines feedback as to whether there was any result from (unintelligible) or whether it was all useless and they were just being polite listening to us.

Mason Cole: Rob were you about to say something there?

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah.

Helen’s remark I think suggested something again in my mind and it may be something appropriate for the Sidney timeframe.

If this Work Team would perhaps like to invite (Bruce) or (Rita) the two GNSO reps to one of these meetings or to in person meeting in Sidney to have a dialogue along those lines just to get some (unintelligible) perspective as to how they think things could be improved. It could even be an email dialogue with you Mason. I don’t know, or other members of the Work Team to get that sort of perspective input. I’m sure they’d be delighted to provide it.

Mason Cole: That’s a good idea. Okay any other thoughts on this issue?

All right. All right. I just - I have one other question on the work plan checklist. Has anyone thought or considered any other issue that should be added to this that's not already on there?

Obviously we're not looking for work to add to it but, you know, if there is something relevant we should consider it.

Ken Bour: This is Ken.

I don't know if this is relevant or not but I'll just throw it out there. In recent times I have - and so has Rob been part of watching some public forum comments come in to ICANN on various and sundry documents that have been posted for that purpose.

And, you know, a lot of the - some of the comments, not a lot, but some of the comments, more than a few, you know, are just written in bad taste. They border on unethical. They - or at least they border - they violate ICANN's code of conduct.

So where am I going with all of this? I'm wondering if in the communications process there isn't also a recommendation and it may just - it may be just maybe just that. Would it be useful to come from a Working Team that was created to help ICANN just to make the statement that, you know, the ethics and principles and code of conduct is not often discussed and - we don't talk about it very much.

When somebody says something that isn't appropriate it doesn't get called out as often as it probably should. I remember there was one

situation in Mexico where that did happen and a lot of people were very appreciative for that.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Ken Bour: But anyway that would be - that's just a topic that I don't know if you want to - if anybody (unintelligible)...

Mason Cole: No let's talk about it. I mean I just have a follow-up question and I'm not being argumentative by asking this because I actually - your point is spot on but beyond just violating the sort of code of civility, you know, how does - how is anyone in the community or on the staff noticing that, A, the probably is growing, and, B, what specific impact it has on handling work?

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob.

I mean it has come up more recently in some of the discussions about (unintelligible) constituencies and stakeholder groups and I don't know that it so much manifests itself in workload or productivity but where it has impacts is in participation whereas if folks are insulted or feel like they aren't being treated respectfully they will stop participating.

Mason Cole: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: And - or, you know, because of the multicultural personality of our organization, you know, some people don't take well to - you know, take a long time just to participate. And if they are insulted or treated disrespectfully they - or see others treated that way they simply will never come to the table.

Mason Cole: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: And so it's a broader issue of I think trying to encourage dialogue and participation and not allow some folks to bully people out of the debate.

Mason Cole: That's a good point.

Ken Bour: Well said Rob. Thank you.

Mason Cole: Yeah thank you Rob. That is well said.

Steve Holsten: I wonder in the comments whether there can or should be any limit on the number of filings that people that can make. You know, Rob you come from an FCC commenting background and there were certain parameters put on the mechanism and method for filing, the format, the length, etc.

I was struck in reviewing some of the second Guidebook comments that sometimes the commenters just had stream of consciousness: here's a thought and then they'd post it. And then they'd have another thought ten minutes later and they'd post it again.

And so even if you've got 50 comments, ten of them are by the same person who just decided to break it up into one paragraph or thought at a time. I don't know how that pertains exactly to the GNSO Communications scheme because I think this is a much bigger topic than our specific mandate.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, this is Rob again.

That's a real challenge I think because I mean what our public participation folks and many around the world will tell us is we want to maximize opportunities to participate and so that would mean, you know, allowing people to I guess Twitter comments if they wanted to.

Man: Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: But by the same token, you know, the GNSO improvements also said they want meaningful participation. And so what's the right balance there where, for example, one comment forum had over 300 comments and I'm still plowing through, you know, you have (unintelligible) folks spend eight or nine pages very thoughtfully. And then as you know other folks just coming in with various comments a different points in time.

And I think that's a real balancing act that it wouldn't hurt for you all to look into it a certain point, discuss, and maybe share some thoughts or recommendations. But just understand that that becomes a fairly challenging or broad issue.

And while we're talking about, you know, as you're referring to the draft applicant Guidebook that's somewhat of a formal process. How do you manage some of those same communications on just a GNSO Council list or the Work Team list. And, you know, there are a variety of communications and they have to treat different forms differently. I don't know.

Steve Holsten: Yeah I think you guys face an understanding-winnable battle in that regard in trying to accept all comments, dignify them, recognize them.

It's almost like a Congressional office who gets lots of constituent mail and at some point the Congressman can't personally sign letters and correspondence back and so they get form letters or it just doesn't even get read.

And outside of the formal comment period, I don't know how you guys can possibly keep it all straight because I'm sure that often times people send correspondence and they're scattered comments on every different topic that you're currently facing and what do you do? You have to duplicate them all and put them in the file for each of those topics. It's - I think that part of it's understanding-winnable.

Chris Chaplow: Can I just come in there?

Are the current lists - the current feedback lists are they totally unmoderated at the moment? Anybody know?

Mason Cole: I think that's the case. Is it not? Glen, Rob, Julie?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Mason Cole: Glen sorry. Yes?

Glen Desaintgery: All the lists are unmoderated.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Chris Chaplow: I mean anybody knows who's run a forum it is very difficult once you start moderating, you know, where to draw the line between something that's sort of an insult or something that's just a jocular comment.

But if the lists there that are unmoderated then maybe it's worth us rather than simply commenting or making opinions on the subject that we do a little bit of analysis on it and seeing how deep the problem is or isn't it really a problem. I don't know.

Mason Cole: Ken...

Steve Holsten: I...

Mason Cole: Sorry go ahead Steve.

Steve Holsten: I was going to say I tend to think that anybody who makes comments that are in bad taste or outside of the code of conduct that commenter knows that there may be retribution against them even in the form of, you know, Rob is a really fair-minded guy but if he knows that this commenter said something that was a low-blow maybe he won't look as favorably upon what the person has to say.

I think that just as in any human interaction what you say and the manner in which you say it everybody ultimately has to stand behind what they say and that doesn't mean anybody should like to have people behaving or speaking badly but I think ultimately it doesn't get them anywhere. So that may be a place where you have to have a little bit thicker skin.

Mason Cole: Well yeah.

We're a bit all over the map here on this but to sort of wrap it up what I think I'm hearing is that we've noticed an increase in sort of uncivil

participation in ICANN both online and in person. And the problem with that is not only does it disrupt whatever is happening at the moment but it discourages others from participating. And that should be addressed in the report. I think that's valid - or in our set of recommendations.

I'm also hearing that there is structurally - again because of the way ICANN is set up it encourages participation at - with almost no barrier, right. Anybody can attend an ICANN meeting. It doesn't cost anything to walk through the door.

Almost anyone can get on to a discussion list if you're active in a work group or constituency or what have you.

Even if not there are plenty of other places to submit your feedback into ICANN on a myriad list of topics. And not only does that create a volume problem for the staff who's responsible for going through those things but sometimes those comments are snarky or inappropriate or unhelpful and again that's disruptive and it discourages others from participating.

Did I get most of that right?

Man: Yes.

Ken Bour: I'd just make a parenthetical note around that subject of moderation.

I just happened to be up on ICANN's site and I noticed for the first time that there is a section called Blogs on ICANN's site. And so I decided

to go in and take a look at what is in the blogs. Who was writing the blogs? And there is also a capability to comment on the blog.

And in that material in the, you know, sort of the instruction set it says words to the effect of...

Mason Cole: Behave yourself.

Ken Bour: Yeah and if you don't behave yourself we reserve the right to take any comment off.

Mason Cole: Sure.

Ken Bour: And it's pretty explicit and it goes on for, you know, a couple paragraphs it seems to me of basically saying, "And by the way we don't really care if you don't like it either. We're just going to - we're taking the upper hand here and you're not going to turn this blogging thing into something that is..." It's interesting if you all have a chance you might take a look at t that.

But there's a case - I don't know Rob if that was (Karen) or who - you know, who manages that blogging site. But that was an interesting departure for me.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. I will leave it at Steve's comment that, yes, it's very challenging.

Mason Cole: All right.

Well Ken I'm glad you brought this up because I do - you know, I have on occasion...I was in the room in Mexico City when, you know, when - and heard what you referred to a moment ago. And, you know, I'm sure that if I were on the staff end of ICANN I would probably be distressed at seeing what you all are seeing. So I do think it's worthy of our attention.

Does anyone else disagree with that or think that we should keep the focus elsewhere or is that good to include?

Chris Chaplow: I think it's good to include.

I'm not quite sure how far we can go down with it but there's no harm in, you know, (unintelligible) for further consideration possibly.

Mason Cole: Right. I do...

Steve Holsten: I agree with that too. It's - that's an issue spotting one not one that we're necessarily solving.

Mason Cole: Yeah I agree with that. I mean we can certainly make recommendations that - well, let's not get ahead of ourself.

Okay.

Helen Laverty: I think it's a good idea to have a list of what we call correct combat and we basically use our discretion on how much to use on it but if somebody's rally being obnoxious we just say, "We're not listening to you and stop it."

Mason Cole: Right. Okay. All right.

Helen Lavery: On the same term we don't want to stop people from inputting things and sometimes people who are very heating say things in a less than polite politically manner actually do have a good point that we should be listening to. So we don't want to eliminate that as long as they're not too abusive.

Mason Cole: Right. Right. You're correct Helen. Okay. Anything else on our work list?

Okay. Any other business for today?

Ken Bour: This is Ken.

I'm not sure if Steve mentioned there's some additional things happened. I had - I sort of took the point to work with the ICANN IT staff on sort of getting this project charter for our sub-team, our mini team. And yesterday I completed the first draft of the project charter and sent it in to Joyce Thomas. She has acknowledged receiving it. She's going to do some more work.

I just wanted to let everybody know that we had talked about that a couple meetings ago, maybe a few. But that work's actually gotten resuscitated. Joyce was busy on some other assignments and she's now free of those and so she's committed to Rob and I and Julie that she's going to really get to work on that.

So we should make some pretty significant progress in the next work or so or tow on getting the ICANN staff IT group aligned with our team

around the same scope and the same objectives and the same work tasks.

Mason Cole: Okay. Good deal. All right. Thank you Ken.

Any other business?

Man: No.

Mason Cole: All right. We are scheduled to meet again on May 13, same time. And let's see...yeah May 13. That's two weeks from today.

Okay. All right folks if that's it then I will declare this meeting adjourned.

Man: Very good. Thanks (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you.

Mason Cole: All right. Thanks everybody. Bye bye.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Helen Laverty: Thank you very much.

Man: Bye bye.

Woman: Bye.

END