

We Are All Actors  
Act 2, Scene 5  
"Apart Together"

by  
Bob Blakley

INT. A CAFETERIA

HOLLIS sits at a table eating lunch. WENDY approaches the table carrying a tray.

WENDY

Hey, Hollis! Is this seat taken?

HOLLIS

Nope. Be my guest.

WENDY

How's it going?

HOLLIS

It's going.

WENDY

A very Monday Monday?

HOLLIS

It's been a month of Mondays.

WENDY

All alike, or all different?

HOLLIS

It's the same basic problem over and over again - getting people to work together.

WENDY

People problems?

HOLLIS

I don't think so, actually. I think it's tool problems.

WENDY

Really?

HOLLIS

Yeah. We're trying to coordinate a bunch of comments on a new stem cell research bill, but it's really hard.

WENDY

What makes it hard?

HOLLIS

Lots of things. For example, we have to do a lot of rewriting.

WENDY

Why, are people not being clear?

HOLLIS

No; they're being clear. It's just that we're never all together in the same room, so we end up doing things in writing that we'd do by talking around the table before we write - if we were all working for the same organization in the same place.

WENDY

Oh, so, like, one person writes something down and a bunch of people propose changes and the editor has to pick which changes to apply?

HOLLIS

Not quite. To start with there's no editor.

WENDY takes her plate and silverware off her tray and puts the tray off to one side of the table.

WENDY

Why not?

HOLLIS

Because then we'd have to argue about who'd be the editor.

WENDY

Wouldn't it be worth having the argument?

HOLLIS

Only if the argument ended. In this case it's really important that all the participants be on an equal footing - so the only way we could do it would be to hire a neutral professional editor. But that wouldn't really solve the problem either, because it's not really an editing problem, it's a consensus problem.

WENDY

Oh, so you're using writing tools to negotiate?

HOLLIS

You know, I never thought of it exactly that way, but you're right.

WENDY

So you want a tool that supports things like developing options, taking straw polls - stuff like that?

HOLLIS

I think so but I'm not sure, because I've only seen it work badly - I've never seen it work well.

HOLLIS takes a drink of his coffee.

WENDY

What does your process for working on the document look like?

HOLLIS

That's another problem, actually - we really haven't all agreed on the process.

WENDY

Why not just start by establishing the agreed-on facts?

HOLLIS

That's EXACTLY what we tried to do. But even that turned out to be pretty hard. We immediately started arguing about facts.

WENDY

Aren't those easy arguments to settle?

HOLLIS

No, not really. We discovered pretty quickly that we needed good tools for citation and for establishing the authority of the references we cite.

WENDY

But we already have databases of research reports and stuff.

HOLLIS

We do, and some other organizations do too. But we don't all have access to the same databases, and some of the database subscriptions are really expensive so not everyone can use them. Plus it's hard for me to get information about how reliable a reference source is if I've never heard of the source before.

WENDY

So you need something like a register of authorities?

HOLLIS

Maybe something like a reputation system would be good. Like with researcher bios and vitas and awards and stuff. And with organizations' staff experience and so on. Can you pass me the salt?

WENDY

Sure.

WENDY passes HOLLIS the salt and pepper shakers

WENDY

I'm guessing a reputation system wouldn't solve all your problems, right?

HOLLIS

Right. For example, we keep thinking we're getting close to the end and then another big issue will blow up.

WENDY

You mean with new text?

HOLLIS

No, even with old stuff. The problem is we don't really have a way to flag issues, so we just kind of work on the hottest issue first, but we don't put together a complete issues list so we can't really tell how much work is left at any point.

WENDY

Is there a problem with putting together an issues list?

HOLLIS

Sort of. To start with, of course, new issues keep getting generated by text changes we make to fix old issues. But there's another problem too - some things are issues for only a few participants, like maybe organizations from a particular state or region. But they're really serious for those organizations - and the rest of the group gets held up waiting for a subgroup to finish arguing. Plus it's sometimes hard to tell what issues people in a particular region or business sector need to worry about, so we can't even be sure who needs to be included in a particular discussion. And even that's just the tip of the iceberg.

WENDY

What's the rest of the iceberg?

HOLLIS

We're trying to hit a moving target. The legislation we're commenting on keeps changing. We're at a real disadvantage against smaller, more focused groups.

WENDY

Because they don't have to go through any kind of consensus process so they can react faster?

HOLLIS

Right. And since they can make decisions faster they can start lobbying before we've decided what we want to ask for.

WENDY

So the text changes and you have to start the consensus process over again.

HOLLIS

Well, we don't have to completely start over, but we have new issues we have to deal with, so it does slow us down.

WENDY

I'm gonna get dessert in a minute. Are there any other problems?

HOLLIS

Yes, actually, there's one more big problem.

WENDY

Do tell.

HOLLIS

It's hard to figure out who we need to argue with.

WENDY

Why?

HOLLIS

Because our tools aren't all that good at keeping track of the discussions that led to consensus and who took what position.

WENDY

Oh, so you end up having the same arguments over and over?

HOLLIS

Yes, and that's frustrating. But even before we get to consensus, it's sometimes hard to tell who feels strongest about a particular paragraph, so we don't really know who we have to convince to make a change.

WENDY

And that works both ways, right - people don't know that they need to come to us to ask for changes?

HOLLIS

Right. And there really isn't a good way for us to link rationale and history to what we've written.

WENDY

Well, it certainly sounds like better tools would make your life easier. There's lots of talk about "Collaboration Tools" in the IT trade press right now. Don't any of them do what you want?

HOLLIS

Not out-of-the-box; you need to customize them to get the features you want. Plus a lot of these tools are pretty expensive, and a lot of the nonprofits we work with can't afford them.

WENDY

I hear chocolate chip cookies calling, Hollis. What are you going to do?

HOLLIS

I'm not sure yet. But I'm going to look around to see if there's something we could use.