

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Communications Coordination  
Work Team (CCT) 25 March 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 25 March 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-20090325mp3>

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

Participants on the Call:

Chris Chaplow (Commercial and Business Users Constituency)

Steve Holsten, Vice-Chair, (gTLD Registries Constituency)

ICANN Staff in attendance:

Julie Hedlund - Policy Consultant

Robert Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director

Ken Bour - Policy Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: This is the transcription for ICANN Conference Call held Wednesday, March 25, 2009, 7:00 pm UK time. Glen Desaintgery is the leader. The call ID is 5889632.

(Steve Holstein): The shorter list, (Rob), is if I told you what not to do. So, let's hold on for a couple of minutes and give other folks an opportunity to join. I know, of course, (Nathan) won't be here and (Chris Chaplow) said he might be joining from an airport.

Coordinator: (Chris Chaplow) joined.

(Chris Chaplow): Hi, everybody.

(Steve Holstein): Are you off in an airport somewhere (Chris)?

(Chris Chaplow): Yes, right, I'm in the airport lounge, so I've found a reasonably quiet corner. So, I'm off to Barcelona this evening.

(Steve Holstein): Great.

(Chris Chaplow): I've worked out how to do the news function on the mobile, so, if it gets to be too much, I'll put that on.

(Steve Holstein): Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Try 6 normally, (Chris).

(Steve Holstein): I guess it's just about three minutes after the hour. We probably ought to get started and if anybody else is daring enough to join, then they can contribute as well.

Now, I understand from (Julie) that there was a resignation from the work team, (Nick Wood). Although, to be honest, I wasn't sure that (Nick Wood) was on the work team. So, I guess we'll miss (Nick's) contributions in any event.

(Julie Headlin): Yeah, (Steve), this is (Julie). I understand from (Nathan) that (Nick) had not actually had an opportunity to attend any of the work team meetings.

(Steve Holstein): Okay.

(Julie Headlin): So, I apologize for that as well.

(Steve Holstein): No problem.

Glen Desaintgery: This is Glen. I do believe, at some stage, (Nick) did send in some suggestions.

(Steve Holstein): Oh, okay.

Glen Desaintgery: That might be on the mailing list.

(Julie Headlin): Glen, this is (Julie). Has the recording started, do you know?

Glen Desaintgery: Would you like the recording to start? I will ask them to start it, (Julie).

(Julie Headlin): (Steve), should we start?

(Steve Holstein): Let's start the recording and then do the call to order and roll call.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. Operator?

Coordinator: Yes?

Glen Desaintgery: Please start the recording.

Coordinator: Thank you, one moment.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you.

Coordinator: The conference is now being recorded, please go ahead.

(Steve Holstein): Very good. This is (Steve Holstein), Vice Chair of the CCT Work Group. Glen, would you please - this meeting is called to order. Glen, would you please do the roll call.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, certainly, (Steve).

On the call, we have (Steve Holstein), who is the vice chair, and who is a registry constituency representative. And we have (Chris Chaplow), who is business constituency representative. And for staff, we have (Julie Headlin), (Rob Hogarth), Ken Bour and Glen Desaintgery, myself, who is the secretariat.

(Steve Holstein): Very good. Thank you.

I think that we have a fairly succinct agenda here, although, I guess I would like to spend most of the time doing a bit of brainstorming in large part about the scope of our mission here and how to best approach this. We've been doing some - a bit of education thus far. A part of what we're going to need to do is to scope out exactly how much we want to tackle.

Ken Bour and I actually met for lunch earlier today and did a little bit of thinking and talking.

The first thing on the agenda really is to review the learnings from the Web team called "Last Week with ICANN." We appreciate the large participation by the ICANN staff at last week's meeting. I personally found it to be useful and also a bit challenging to keep track of.

And I think it was helpful in reviewing the minutes from last meeting that (Julie) put together to even see where things fit into the overall discussion and structure.

When talking to (Ken), he had suggested that he was in a position to summarize, I think, a couple of the big picture points that we needed to take away from last week's meeting. So, (Ken), if you'd be willing to share your thoughts on that, I think that would be instructive.

Ken Bour: Be happy to. I'm going to try, rather than sort of walk through the minutes, I want to take a different approach and we can loop back if it's not working.

The conference call with the Web team, where the whole ICANN infrastructure focused for me a couple of things. First, there are two important sort of high-level ways to think about any major system development activity. And, one of them, the first, I think, and usually the one that goes first, is the requirements development side of it. And so, there was some discussion in that Web conference call around the requirements.

I made reference to a document that (Penelope Wren) and I wrote and delivered to (David Conrad), actually, (Denise) delivered it to him, back in September, that was an attempt to create a full set of business requirements for the GNSO, that was its intent, that's what we did.

And so, there was some discussion on the call about that and I'm not sure how much people remembered all the details, but let me sort of net out what I think was said.

First, that document and I'm going to agree with this accusation because it is sort of - it was developed originally by (Penelope) in the early going and I think she had some outside help.

It came from a SharePoint portal server, Microsoft underpinning. And when I got involved at (Denise's) request to help get that document ready to go, I noticed all of that. And I did my best to try to help (Penelope) and we worked on getting rid of a lot of that. But, unfortunately, I use the example, it's a little cancerous, you know, when you start the whole project with a SharePoint beginning, it's like a cancer, you can't get it all out, so to speak. You clean it up a lot, but it still had that in there.

And so, when other people at ICANN look at the document, they can see that it had a system orientation, not a requirements orientation.

Okay, so where are we? That document has a lot of excellent work in it and it is really, I think, a tremendously useful place to start this whole thing. But it does need to be, if not rewritten, it needs to be cleaned up. It needs to have some of that SharePoint stuff fully extracted from it. And it needs to be done, and this is the second thing that occurred in that ICANN meeting, it needs to be done under the auspices of an ICANN fully-funded or fully accepted project.

You heard some discussion on the ICANN call about creating a charter. Not the same charter that we've already gotten from the OSC, but a charter from the project management auspices at ICANN, which would then take the requirements work that we produce as a team and make it fully accepted and certified up through the ICANN infrastructure.

Okay. So, the second thing that system development activities normally embrace is implementation. I wrote some of this stuff up, by the way, in an email that I put out on the list on Sunday. So, I think what you do normally is you start with, what would we like to see in an improved communications Website and then, after you figure out what you want, then you start building it.

And that may or may not be an area where this team actually wants to even get involved with. If it did want to get involved with it, I believe it has to be thought about in a much narrower context than what the full set of requirements would deal with.

Then, to link back to the Website call, there was a lot of discussion about Website management.

((Crosstalk))

(Chris Chaplow): Sorry, (Ken).

Ken Bour: I hear the airport. Okay, that's great, thanks. (Chris) is at the airport.

So the - in terms of the, sorry, implementation side, okay - then when there was a lot of discussion on the ICANN call about document management. And the reason that comes up is because it's frequently and it was in our case when (Penelope) and I wrote our document, it was a business requirement to produce, to create tools and technologies that allowed people to share and co-author, to check in

and checkout documents, to save versions, to be able to redline and to see who made what comment.

All of that capability is usually wrapped up in requirements associated with document management.

The problem is, from an ICANN technical point of view, it's not implementable. Right? So, when I say it's not implementable, it's not easily implementable. There are problems when you take an organization like the GNSO or ICANN where people come to it as volunteers and they come with Macintosh operating systems, they come with Linux, UNIX. They come with who knows what all. Right?

And people come with authoring tools, some use text based-only tools; some use a sophisticated Microsoft Word document tool; some use, who knows, Lotus. And to try to find a document management system that would let people participate in using all those different elements that I just articulated, seamlessly, is nearly impossible.

Then you heard some discussion on the call where ICANN said, "Well, we doing something internally. We're going to create a document management program." Well, actually, they already started one for the staff. And then I said, "Well, can that be ported to the rest of the world?" And the answer is, "Well, probably not."

Well, how is it that the ICANN staff can do it if GNSO can't? And the answer turns out to be and they said this on the call, they can constrain the environment. So, they can say, we're going to build a document management system for ICANN staff, but we're going to maintain and insist that everybody use Windows Vista.



Everybody's going to use a Dell computer; everybody's going to be on a Microsoft Office tool, like Word, and they're going to specify which particular version it has to be, minimum.

And when you start to put those kinds of constraints around it, then document management systems materialize in the industry that will solve the problem.

Okay. So, the way I look at it, with respect to those tasks that this team has to deal with in the communications umbrella, surrounding improving Website and other technologies, it's really a requirements job first and then, if there's time and if there's interest and if there's a particular narrow scope we could work on, like for example, content management, then we could pick that up and start working on it as well.

Let me stop there and see how I'm doing.

(Steve Holstein): No, I think that's extremely helpful. And I personally think that there are those two things that you addressed. One is what the requirements are and the next is implementation. I think you can't be totally blind to the implementation when coming up with your wish list because, if you are, you'll end up with wish lists that say things like I want a flying car. That would be really helpful if I had a flying car and it's not possible to actually create.

So, there has to be some balance in keeping things bounded within the real world and even potentially within budget constraints, so, I think

first the team needs to come up with the requirements and what the wish lists are. But I don't think that can be done wildly.

Ken Bour: That's a good point and, incidentally, one of the reasons that people oftentimes write business requirements by looking at a real system is they reverse engineer it. They look at SharePoint portal server and they say, "Man, it does everything I could possibly hope for." And then somebody says, "We need a requirement factor. We're not doing anything until we get." "Great, I'll just take everything that SharePoint does and I'll write it as a requirement and then when you specify it, I'll get my SharePoint system. Right?"

I mean, frequently people do things like that. In the world I came from in software development a lot of customers write RFP's that way. They bring in a bunch of vendors, they have them do demonstrations. They say, "We like that one." Then they get the requirements written so that it favors that one and then they award it.

So, you're right. We do have to write requirements that are implementable. One of the ways I might suggest that we do that is to engage the ICANN technical staff as team members, or at least maybe somebody like a (Mark Salviteri) or (Ritzo) or somebody, (Reetsa) could be involved with the team, sort of to keep us from developing something that is not achievable.

Man: Yeah. Now, (Chris) had made a point which you responded to, (Ken), that we shouldn't spend too much time focusing solely on Web sites as opposed to document management, for example.

And I think one of the things we need to do with this communications working group is to decide whether we want to broaden the scope of what we're trying to do or come up with business requirements for - whether we want to do that beyond what those ICANN Board recommendations were.

Because at some point I think it was, I don't know, a week or more ago, (Mason) had sent around a check list, an OCS communications work team, ICANN Board recommends draft checklist. And that's how those general four categories.

There's the Web site issue and the feedback - or the core organization and inconsistent document management session or problems. Then there is the few formalized and institutional channels through which the GNSO may communication with the Board or others.

Was that it? There are only three of them? In any event, if that is what we are taking as our mission or our (unintelligible) then there is a good amount of work that has already been done in those areas in the business requirement document that (Penelope) came up with and that you had worked on, (Ken).

And it's not a perfect meshing, but it does even - that business requirement document does track those areas. It tracks, for example, subsets under Web site. It tracks collaboration tools and (whopies) and blogs and all of those sorts of things.

(Ken): Yes, it is a very comprehensive document and it definitely embraces all of the technology areas the Board cited. It does not address the non-

technology areas that are part of the communication teams set of tasks, right?

One of them deals with improving communications between other ICANN structures. The requirements document is silent on that subject.

Man: Yeah.

(Ken): Other than as tools are developed they could be applied to those problems, right? But they don't explicitly deal with them.

(Chris): Sorry, (Chris) speaking. I think in (unintelligible) on is it three or is it four major subjects and that is that perhaps document management shouldn't come under the Web site, it should be a separate subject however we deal with it.

Man: I would disagree with that. May I just say why? There's - in the technology world the document management is - okay, we use the term Web sites, sometimes we could refer to it as, "Well, it's that thing you go to where you click on stuff." Right? It's the window into the GNSO.

But I look at it as much broader than that. A Web site is a delivery mechanism. It's simply the methodology by which you get to all the tools and all the functions and all the documents and all the content that you need to do the work. And so a document management system would be delivered through the Web site.

(Ken): Right, you would. At least it would be ideally. Right? You could have a document management system that we have today in which everybody just shares emails in a red-line Word document and you try to number them somehow so they don't get all tangled up with each other.

But that's not what we would call - that's not an automated document management system. If we built or if we prescribed that a document management system should be built, it should be delivered through the Web interface. And so as a result, I would put it inside of the Web architecture.

(Chris): Okay, well that can easily - you know, we can write that down as a basis. There was some other questions I had really on the check list and through the documents, through the (LSC) reports and other places, they kept saying, "Low external visibility of the GNSO." And that sort of goes right the way through it and perhaps things like that also need to go into a check list.

So one of the requirements is that the GNSO Web site is developed in a search engine friendly manner. So when people type in (GTLD)'s they'll come across the GNSO Web site ahead of some of the others.

Man: Yes, I think you're exactly correct there, and well said. If and when we get a chance to go through the dark documents that (Penelope) and I worked on, you will see search capabilities as one major category that was originally specified.

(Chris): Yes, and maybe outside our premise, I don't know, if something like should there be in its own logo which is, you know, the ICANN logo

with GNSO under it or something like that, a little bit like the (unintelligible) conferences.

Man: Possibility. It wouldn't be a business requirement for a Web technology but it's certainly tangentially related, I suppose. Yeah, because you...

(Chris): The thing (unintelligible) is (unintelligible) around.

Man: You do ultimately have to pay to (screen) when you do a Web site. So, all those things, you know, the taxonomy of the structure, the, you know, the look and feel, the navigation, all those things have to be specified in the requirement.

And indeed, you'll see those all there if and when you have a chance to read that business requirements document that I sent out a while ago.

Man: Okay, well I guess we need to - so that we're all marching forward and making progress, I guess. We should decide upon whether that OSC communications work team, ICANN Board recommendations draft check list, whether that is broad enough in scope to capture all of the activities that we think we need to address. And (Chris) is suggesting a couple things that it doesn't cover.

It sounds like as to the Website we can fill in a lot of the detail by virtue of this business requirements document and maybe the action item will be with regard to the Web site and potentially the document management system to look at that business requirements document and figure out if there's anything beyond that that we actually want to recommend.

I think that that business requirements document was done over a period of time with considerable effort expended. And I would like to refresh and revitalize that document as is needed, but to build upon it so that we've already got a lot of progress based upon that.

Now, the other areas of the check list beyond the Web site and document management, if those things are not in this business requirements document then that - we need to at least put a little bit more of a structure and an outline as to what we're seeking to achieve.

And I suspect that there, too there are some recommendations from the Board that can guide us. Does anybody else have suggestions or ideas as to how we go about scoping and taking next steps here?

Man: I wonder if as one (start) whether the (unintelligible) anybody's got (safe) suggestions that they have thought the experts, or got experience in certain areas? I wonder if that's the thing that people could sort of volunteer?

Man: It's hard, isn't it, right now, (Chris) when you and I are the only non-ICANN volunteers here. We should start divvying this stuff up here and giving it all to (Mason) and the rest of the unrepresented folks, huh?

(Ken): This is (Ken). I just pulled up the check list; I hadn't done that while the earlier conversation was going on. I wonder if it would be helpful for me just to go through the checklist and tell you which ones I think are, or not, in the requirements document?

Man: Yeah, and I even think that check list, as I look at it, part of the reason I thought there were four items and there are only three showing on the check list, I don't see the language and translation of being - well, let's see.

(Ken): Yeah, there's a translation plan on the top of Page 2.

Man: Top of Page 2. A pair of translation plan for documents associated with policy development. Okay, so that is in there as a subset. Okay, (Ken), go for it.

(Ken): Yeah, and maybe (Julie) can make a - just keep track of this for me. So the first one, which is the visibility. I think that's in the scope. Collaboration tools, portal search, content, business process, that stuff is all - those are categories that came right out of the business requirements that I actually gave to (Julie) to prepare this chart from. So they're all in scope, they're in that particular one.

Man: Yeah, they track very closely and that was part of my question last week to ICANN, did all of this effort stem from the Board recommendations or did it lead to the Board recommendations or which was first?

(Ken): Yeah, that came up on the call, too. And it stemmed from the Board recommendations.

Man: Got it. Which is perfect. So we're all tracking there.

(Ken): Yeah, it went much further beyond the Board recommendations but I think that's exactly what the Board was hoping for. When they say,



“You should go do A, B, C, D,” they don’t mean, “And also don’t consider E, F, G and H if they apply.” And then that’s exactly what we’ve done so far. So, yes, I think we’re tracking beautifully there.

Man: Okay, got it.

(Ken): The next one is institutional channels. I would say that’s not explicitly within the business requirements scope for a technology solution.

Man: Where is intuitional channels, (Ken)? You mean the general category of improving GNSO’s abilities to solicit meaningful feedback?

Woman: Actually, I think (Ken) is referring to the one after that. (Ken), did you skip over the one that talks about system document management?

Man: Oh, I see.

(Ken): Oh, you know, I apologize. I hit the scroll button and I went right to the next page. All right, so I left off on poor organization and inconsistent document management. That is in scope.

Man: It is?

(Ken): Yes, absolutely in the scope of a technology solutions business requirements for the same reasons I wrote in my email and I just described a minute ago when (Chris) brought it up. Document management is a set of enablers, capabilities and tools that would be delivered through a Web interface. And so they are in the scope of generally when you think about building a Web site. And the same thing...

Man: (Ken), when I'm tracking your business of (Penelope) and (Ken Bauer) business requirements document, I see this Section 3.1, all of those collaboration, portal search, content, business processes. And then in 3.2 the shared services. So user interface, navigation, etcetera. Where is then the next? Is that under the platform services requirements? Library storage, security management, deployment? Is that...

(Ken): Yeah, it's actually - okay, and this is one of the - you may remember (Mark Salvateri) making a comment. Some of this is terminology. In the document - if you look three above where it says, "Content Management," you'll see "Authoring, Versioning, Workflows, Check in - Check out, Document Security," those are all document management capabilities.

Man: Okay.

(Ken): It's just that they got lumped in under Content Management. So you can think of a document as just another form of content, and instead of saying there's a document management problem you could say there's a content problem. A content management problem, of which documents are one element.

Man: I see.

(Ken): And so when we wrote the requirements we simply took document management things and we put them under the content management label. Now, (Mark Salvateri) commented on the call. He said, "You know, I really wish people wouldn't do that. Content management

doesn't refer to document management." "Okay, sorry." When we go forward we can fix that.

We can add a new category and call it Document Management and put all of the things that belong under that label and then change Content Management to mean something than it did in the way we wrote it.

Man: Okay. Why...

(Ken): But this is all just - you have to just - this is just linguistic - we're just talking about language and how people - and what meaning we assign to different words and terms.

Man: Yeah, understood.

(Ken): Okay.

Man: I guess we will need to make sure that we have our own separate business requirements for each of those categories under the - to improve the ability to solicit meaningful feedback.

So, if that is (uniquely) a category within the (Penelope) and (Ken) business requirements, then we can just lift it. But in absence of that we probably better either restate it or come up with something new. Okay?

So keep going, (Ken).

(Ken): Okay, so the next one says, "Prepare a revised process for gathering and addressing public comment on policy issues." I would say that that's explicitly not in the scope.

Man: Okay.

Man: Now, it doesn't mean -- it might turn out that in the solution of requirements, right, or in the solution that the team comes up with for developing a process for gathering and addressing a public comment, it says, you know what we really ought to do, is we ought to have a really cool website driven process where people can put their comments on line and they're going to a database and they're searchable and so forth and so on.

And there's certain privacy regulations and if we did that, then it would be in-scope, at least that portion of it, right, because the technology solution -- if we think that the solution to that problem ought to be from the technology side, then that requirement should get cetera written in. Does that make sense?

The next one says, "Take into account developments and technology that facilitate community interaction." I'm not even really sure how to interpret that. It could be so broadly or narrowly interpreted.

Theoretically, if we produce a technology solution for GNSO, that provides document management, content management collaboration, we will have achieved what the meaning of that sentence is, I think.

Right and we are going to take into account developments and technology because it would make no sense to go back 20 years to pursue -- Okay. So that one might just...

Man: That's not in the Penelope document.

Man: Not explicitly.

Man: Thanks. Got it. All right. A translation plan -- no, not explicitly in the scope.

Man: Okay.

Man: Although (Rob) might want to comment here because I think there are people in ICANN working on this problem that might mean we should, if we considered it at all, we should consider it as a last item rather than a foremost item.

Man: Yeah, I think that needs to be a component of the work teams discussion at some point and last fall, the policy team within ICANN developed its own policy for translating documents. It might be useful at the appropriate time to share that for this team for you all to have an opportunity to analyze it and provide feedback. It's just right now been an internal document, but I think it has hydra applicability.

Man: Okay. And the next one says, "Recommend ways to monitor and improve effectiveness." I'm not sure that's actionable as it's written. The next one says, "There are very few --

Man: Come in there.

Man: Sure.

Man: (Unintelligible) is the website and statistics and the analytics, all that side of it. Did you look at that because historically that nobody's paying much attention to that and that might be what she's referring to.

Man: That's an excellent interpretation of that statement and probably we should take that under advisement and say it that way.

Man: Yes.

Man: If we recommend ways to monitor and improve the effectiveness of said technology solution and capability tools, that would help the scenario with them, wouldn't it?

Man: Yes.

Man: Okay. The next one says, "There are very few formalized and institutional channels through which the GNSO Counsel may communicate with Board and other senior representatives across ICANN." And then the recommendation was to improve GNSO's coordination with other structures. I would say that's probably not explicitly in the scope.

Man: Okay. Okay. So we now have a better sense of what is and is not in the business requirements docs that was previously written and I guess if we think of this checklist, again as our wish list, that you made the distinction between it's not technology drive, it's technology agnostic.

We're not writing to a share-point spec. Instead we're saying what we want, are there things that anybody else can identify right now that are noticeably absent from this checklist?

Man: There's a few things that aren't (unintelligible) and I'm not sure I can bring them in now physically other than, you know, comments you made earlier about (unintelligible) and things like that.

But maybe we could put an action on all team members to buy next week (unintelligible) any suggestions of things that we should also be bringing in and then we can rule them out and bring them in on next week's call.

Man: Okay.

(Ken): This is (Ken). I do have a thought. I don't know whether or not I should -- now I'm going to launch outside of my own -- I've been arguing and talking about technology (unintelligible).

But you know, one of the things that I think about when I hear the term communications and I got my doctorate in that field sort of, but I think of you know, it's one thing to increase communications which would just mean we talk more at each other.

But there's quite another area in that are we communicating effectively and is meaning being shared between people well, and are we addressing each other in ways that make it possible for meaning to be shared and there's a whole other surrounding area of this topic of communications and improving it that I don't think is reflected yet in

any of the Board recommended or anything we've talked about or on any of the checklists.

And I don't know whether it's something we want to add or even move into, but I wonder if there aren't some ways that without increasing the actual amount of communication we can increase the quality of it.

Man: Yeah, it sounds a good point and this is the sort of thing that underlies (unintelligible) reality and the various (unintelligible) that we've seen, but nobody is going into any details are they or in the constituency or individuals that come back on their comments into their reports.

Everybody said yes, we want to improve communications, but I think they got tired because this is Point 3 at the end of the list and everybody's just said yes, didn't they, here?

Man: You know, I mentioned a little, just a short little vignette just to illustrate what I meant when I was having lunch with (Steve) earlier. I've noticed that in ICANN, it's commonplace for people not to name each other in email messages, right?

They just write their sentences, but they don't say, "Dear, (Rob)," "Dear (Ken)," or "Dear (Ken) and (Julie)," "Dear (Steve) and (Chris)," you know everywhere I grew up, you always did that. You always said who you were speaking to and you identified them in an addressee list.

Now, that's pretty silly. Well, but you should see how many times I am confused when I see emails land in my inbox, I don't know if they're addressed to me or not. Then you have to go up and look. Am I a cc, a blind copy; am I (unintelligible).



And it's just -- there might be some norms of behavior that we could introduce into ICANN as part of this teams' effort that would improve the quality of communications and meaning that aren't necessarily technology at all.

Man: Yeah, yeah, I'm sure. You know, the two (unintelligible) carefully sort of things, yeah.

Man: Well, I'm struck by being on some of these mailing lists, list the Registries Constituency list or this group, there is a convention that maybe it's for openness and transparency, that everybody essentially hits a Reply All with every conversation that happens within the registries constituency.

If you want to confirm that you're going to attend something or you have a comment, hit a reply to absolutely everybody and it really does clutter your Inbox considerably and it makes it difficult to separate out the wheat from the chaff in figuring out what's actually important and what's just essentially a cc, for your information, if you actually have time.

Man: Another good example -- another great example. There might be just a set of -- the team might be able to come up with a set of 12 high level norms for communications between personnel within ICANN that could in some sense or other significantly improve the quality of communications; I don't know. Anyway, it's an interesting topic, but to me that not one that I've read yet unless (Rob) or (Julie) corrects me here.

Woman: No (Ken), I haven't seen it. Certainly something the team could consider whether or not to come up with a voluntary guidelines where as if they were mandates, they might chase it then, of course.

Man: How about anybody else on the call suggestions as to what kinds of things could be added to this checklist? I think hat the idea of making an action item on all of the work team members to, if you have something beyond the list, add it, and then we'll you know, have to justify it because I don't think we want to bite off more than we can chew here and I guess the Board recommendations are a pretty good indication of the scope of our charter.

I would tend to keep things a little more narrow and try to achieve those. I have a sense that (Nathan) wants to keep our mission pretty broad. So I think adding to or subtracting from this checklist is an important exercise, and once we get the checklist established, then we can start to assign or divvy up the tasks that are sub tasks within the checklists.

And I think, (Chris) your suggesting of identifying people's core competencies is probably appropriate at the time that we are doing the divvying up of the tasks.

Man: Yes. So the things we're not going to have are going to be discarded from the checklists, I think it's useful that we say in the report that we're discarding those.

I mean I actually noticed in the (LLC) document and various others and create a register of all stakeholders on the GNSO. I think has gotten dropped from the Board.

I don't know where that one went, whether that was conveniently dropped, but if so, I think we should say, I don't know that we're not considering that if that's the case. Otherwise, you know, somebody will look at the report and why didn't you pick this one up?

Man: What was that one again, (Chris)?

(Chris): Uh, create a register of all stakeholders.

Man: I think that did get picked up and I think that's in the constituency operations list. But it doesn't say it that way. I think it talks about creating a common, like database or registry of all of the stakeholders or all of the participants and constituencies. (Rob) might have it off the top of his head.

Man: Yeah, (unintelligible) outstanding committees will be able to double-check this (unintelligible) trying to do the same thing.

Man: Yeah, that's right. I think that is in the purview of that other group and (Ken). At least they have taken it on, but we can confirm that, (Julie) and that's part of the Steering Committee's obligation is (unintelligible) report back as leaders of the work team so that the OSD is comfortable that we don't have that overlap.

Man: Yeah, that's great. We've got enough to do; we don't want to fight for more, do we.

(Julie): Sorry, this is (Julie); I got dropped from the call briefly. But I did want to say that, and you probably already covered this, but yes, I can confirm that item creating the registries is the (unintelligible) operations team.

Man: Okay. Thank you. All right. Anybody have any suggestions as to what we cover in the remaining roughly ten minutes that we've got here? I think, in my mind we've made a considerable amount of progress in figuring out what prior work has been done in essentially scoping out the business requirements for at least the web site and potentially the document management issue.

It's not perfect and it does need to be updated, but it provides a tremendous amount of progress and headway and advanced thinking at least. And I know you're in the airport, (Chris), so it's probably hard for you to even visualize some of this and (Ken) was so knee-deep in this that you're probably all too familiar, but for example, when you're on the checklist and you're looking at collaboration tools.

There's an actual business requirements category within that Penelope report for documents which has as a requirement, provide for a document collaboration (unintelligible) and it includes the ability to check in and out the documents locally, offline document library for email clients, major and minor version numbering and tracking;

Support for multiple content types and multiple languages, policy auditing and work flow functionality, preview support. That gets you a good amount of the way there. Wiki is it gives more requirements.

I'm not sure how much additional work we would choose to do within that. Whether we would supplement those business requirements or

whether we would then move to the next step of describing what the implementation of that may look like. Anybody? Reactions? Thoughts?

(Ken): Yeah. This is (Ken) again. I think what we could do, right, is literally just as you did, right? If I want - if we were now on a sub team and we were working on this business requirement and this was our task, was to produce the final version of that.

I think we would go about it the way you just did. We would read a paragraph and say, all right, what do we think about that? And then we might need some expertise to be brought in to tell us for example that the way certain things are said, stated, is not helpful.

For example, in that document in certain places I was not smart enough to know how to take out language that tells other technical people he's talking about SharePoint, right?

So for example, let's just take a simple one because I don't know if this is true or not but it will illustrate what I'm talking about. There is a category called portal services, right, in that document. It's called portal services.

And inside portal services there are a number of different things that are listed just as you ticked off the ones for collaboration. Well, portal services, what if it turned out that's a SharePoint owned word?

And any time anybody who is the (Durple) world or anywhere else in the community of technology people, when they hear portal services they immediately go Microsoft just because that's a word that they have captured and used.

And maybe in some cases they have even trademarked it or copyrighted it. Who knows? But I'm just using it as an illustration. So what we want to make sure our document doesn't do is use terms that are reserved words technically and connote technology solutions when that's not our intent.

So that would be part of the cleaning up activity that we might do. We might actually restructure things. For example, I brought this up earlier - I've got a bunch of authoring and stuff currently under a heading called content management.

Now if we want (Mark Salvatore) to help us he'd rather see that stuff under a heading called document management. And so we might start to redraft this document by taking things, putting them in new buckets, changing some of the architecture layout, changing some of the terminology.

Generalizing in some cases; in other cases may being more specific. We might take some things out because they're too granular. It would be that sort of activity I'm imagining. Let me finish up.

I don't think this first set of activities we should think anything about implementation other than as you generally commented earlier that we don't want to specify put a man on the moon.

Man: Would you say (Ken) and (Chris) in particular, that the initiative that we're undertaking is an improvement process? We're not building from zero but rather we are improving.

And I'd like to figure out with these business requirements that we're skating in four broad categories, are we doing initial architectural blueprints or are we describing the changes that we are going to make.

And here's what I'm getting at. Let's just say that we're dealing with a car and we know that this car, it's got rust on the outside. The blinker doesn't work and the wipers don't work.

You don't need to start describing from the ground up we need to create a vehicle that's got four wheels and that does X, Y and Z. But rather we need to say here's the way to fix this and approach this. We need to fix the blinker and those other things I mentioned.

If you stated business requirements in a manner like we need to be able to clearly indicate other traffic that we intend to make a turn when all we really want to do is say fix the doggone blinker, I think we could expend a lot of extra effort and energy and not be very clear about the actual improvements we're seeking to achieve.

Man: Well, maybe it's a two-stage process because what we're doing with the requirements is saying we want windscreen wipers and then perhaps the second that you just - see, well, the ICANN Web site has got windscreen wipers already but they're broken.

So it needs mending. Or the ICANN Web site hasn't got any windscreen wipers so we're going to have to create some.

Man: I like it. I like that interpretation. I agree with you. I think you can however you want to think about it, the GNSO Web site as we know it is going to die. It is not going to survive this or any other effort.

It's going to die. And even if we don't - even if our requirement isn't what kills it, it's going to be killed by (Mark Salvatore) for completely other reasons.

He cannot continue to support the GNSO the way it's being done now just from a content management perspective. And he said that on the call. He said, "I have to constantly post things in multiple places. If I put it all in a database, which is not now."

"If I put it all in a database then I can reference it more easily. I can move things around." So that's the current site is going to die. Now does that make it not an improvement effort?

I don't think so. You can look at it this way. What we're not doing is we're not improving the car we take to work. We're improving the transportation system that we use to get to work, which might in this case call for replacing the car.

Man: Yeah. It's a real challenge to not be technology focused but rather requirements focused because the easy way to go about all of that is to say I want a car like that one. There it is. That's what I want.

(Ken): That's what I said earlier. That's why people oftentimes start with a SharePoint Pearl server and then they develop; they reengineer the requirements because I've already seen what I like.

And I like it and I'm willing to live with it right? So you're not going to skip all that and move to it. But the people that are in the project management methodology, the people who are in the architecture



positions at ICANN understand that do it right you should really start from the needs and not from the answer.

And the reason that although it's very attractive to do so, sometimes you can find yourself in a pickle. Let me give you a perfect illustration. SharePoint portal server does a lot of things extremely well.

It is really an elegant system for collaboration and sharing and document control and all the things that are in our requirements. But you know what it doesn't do? It doesn't handle Macintoshes and Windows computers seamlessly.

So if you start with the solution and you say boy, it does everything I want and then you spend all the money and you put it in. And then you get a little bit down the road and somebody with a Macintosh like (Rob Hogart) tries to do something in terms of document sharing.

And he says, hey, this isn't working. And they say, well, you'll have to switch your Macintosh to a Windows computer. He says, well, I can't do that. My corporation or whoever I work for, they standardize on Macintoshes.

And guess what - the whole solution comes grinding to a halt because you started with the answer and not with the requirement. If the requirement says it must be multi-platform capable then you don't develop a solution that is singular platform capable. Does that help?

Man: Yeah. Yeah.

(Rob Hogart): This is (Rob). I just - I'm sorry. This is (Rob). I just want to have whatever you guys had for lunch to come up with all these metaphors.

Man: Lobster bisque.

Man: I'll tell you (Rob) and it's just when it's time to conceptualize this stuff I always find it helpful to come up with some analogies because in the abstract this is very challenging stuff.

(Rob Hogart): This is great. You guys are putting it in very good terms I think for the folks who are going to be listening to the recording and others.

Man: Judging by the actual attendance on the call, I would be amazed if anybody is listening to the recordings. All right.

(Ken): We have a communications problem and it starts right here.

Man: There you go. All right. Well, I think that we have done some good thinking on all of this. And I guess for those of us in attendance and I will try to make clear to the rest of the work team who was unable to attend.

The action item is to go to that checklist and decide if there is anything else that needs to be added to it or subtracted. I think the sooner we come up with the checklist as being all encompassing and inclusive then we can start to break it down into subcats.

And I don't know that we've decided for certain that that's the case. I'm still trying to get straight in my own head if this GNSO Web site is

going to die and there is going to be a new one, why it is that we can't just piggyback onto whatever the ICANN site is?

And it would be the equivalent of in this hilt of analogies saying the GNSO Web site is a clunker and we're going to tow it to the junk yard and if the ICANN Web site is a flashy new car we'll have one exactly like that.

And then tailor it a little more specifically to our needs so that's the Web site analogy. That doesn't address communications and that (stuff).

(Ken): Yeah. Let me just comment on that. The ICANN Web site is not the flashy new car that has all the bells and whistles. It is not.

And now there are a few other sites that have been created that do - are in the new (Druple) environment. And they do have some of the requirements that are in that requirements document. Some of them have been addressed.

But only the set that (Mark Salvatore) would put under content management, which means things like document sharing; not document authoring or co-authoring. Document sharing just meaning that the document appears one place and it's shared among different sites.

Things like that. Now what the GNSO Web site is not (Druple).

Man: Okay.

(Ken): So it would have to be redone.

Man: Got it.

(Ken): And in fact that beta site that he walked us through, that's just a starting sort of skeleton framework for what that new site might look like.

Man: Yeah. Got it. Got it.

(Ken): With no functionality underneath. But he was careful to point out that the problem right now is that in the absence of a set of business requirements we won't get document management capability and co-authoring and version control.

We won't get shared workspaces that allow for multiple authoring and all those things are not available today in any of the ICANN sites. Some of them are; some things are much enough.

Man: Got it. Okay. Well, in the interest of time now I think we should adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much for everybody's participation. My friends have a great trip to Barcelona.

Man: We're at the gate now.

(Julie): (Steve), just very quickly (Gwen) wanted me to mention just to confirm that we'll have a meeting at the same time next week. Is that good for everybody here on this call?

Man: Yes it's good by me.

Man: Yeah.

(Julie): And then also she wanted me to note that the following week, April 8 is Passover, the start of Passover. So we may want to query the team to see whether or not we don't have a call that day. It depends on what the team members want.

Man: I think that sounds very reasonable to skip it on that week.

(Julie): Okay. I'll pass that on to her. She had to leave right at the top of the hour. So I'll let her know.

Man: Very good.

(Julie): And I'll also come up with some meeting notes. I'll send them via (Ken) first to make sure I captured what he was saying before we send them on to you (Steve).

(Ken): Be brief (Julie) because there was a lot of repetition there.

(Julie): I know.

Man: I think you're right. If you can make sense of that one hour's worth of brainstorming we would all be very grateful.

(Julie): Okay. I'll give it my best shot.

(Ken): Yeah. That will help.

(Julie): Thanks.

Man: All right. Thanks everybody. Have a great rest of the week.

END