

Gisella Gruber: We can start the recordings now, would you like me to do a quick roll call for you Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes please. Thank you very much.

Gisella Gruber: Welcome to the At-Large Metrics Subcommittee call today on Monday the 28th of May. On today's call on the English channel we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yaovi Atohoun, Cintra Sooknanan, Alan Greenberg, Roosevelt King, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Tijani Ben Jemaa will be joining us shortly.

On the Spanish channel so far we have Sergio Salinas Porto. Apologies noted from Adam Peake, Baudoin Schombe and Andrew [Moliguare]. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself Gisella Gruber. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. I would also like to welcome our interpreters Sabrina and Veronica and also remind you to please state your name when speaking for transcript purposes as well as for interpretation purposes. Thank you, over to you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much and welcome all. We're going to pick up pretty much where we left off last week, sorry not last week; it was a fortnight ago wasn't it. But I did want to take us back to a little bit of a review

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

first. What you've got on the screen is the Rule 5, qualification, criteria for liaison.

But if you'll bear with me and just look to the next point in the agenda where we've got the continuation from the last call, in today's agenda on the Wiki, so not so much in the Adobe connect room, but those of you who are able to look on the Wiki space you will see that we have got a whole bunch of live links to each of the rules of procedure that we had gone through briefly and identified as being interactive with some form of Metrics discussions.

So if you've got your laptops and computers and tablets open and you're able to look at the Wiki pages as well, that may help you in today's discussion, but more importantly what I'm hoping to do is sort of cluster them together and tie them through today as to have little sub things within.

So back to the normal part of the agenda, I just wanted people to be able to prepare themselves for that. If we have a brief look at the summary minutes, which I'm looking at them posted in English from the last call on the 14th of the 5th, 2012. We have a list of a few things which were really very general conversations and discussions rather than specific to a particular rule. We certainly identified that we're focusing in terms of must do between now and Prague on the metrics that set the appointed, regardless from where they are appointed, in other words the nominating committee positions and the regionally At-Large organizational appointed positions, the metrics that are to be established for ALAC member – note we're using the word "members"

and not “delegates” and other things, but ALAC members – needs to be our priority.

But we also agreed that liaisons and appointments made by the ALAC are going to get our particular scrutiny. I’m not going to go through each and every one of those dot points in the notes from the last meeting, but I think the takeaway messages are we’re going to narrow our focus just to the ALAC, in other words the 15 members regardless of where they come from. And we’re also going to focus particularly on appointments made, which we’re going to include in that “appointments” bucket.

Liaisons to the SOs and ACs – that’s capital L liaisons. As well as the liaisons that the ALAC appoint to various work groups and subcommittees both internally, in other words those that belong to the ALAC work groups or the ALAC family, and those outside. So for example, if you find yourself as a member of the At-Large community appointed by the ALAC to be a conduit, a liaison to a GNSO or a ccNSO or even a regional internet registry policy process, not just as a member but as a formal role, that we will also be focusing on what we have as expectations there.

We highlighted that minimum participation was something that we need to have as sort of a layered approach, but there are a set of expectations that the At-Large community that put their trust in their representation by the At-Large Advisory Committee have. In other words they expected to be able to turn up albeit not necessarily 100% of the time; they expect them to have a voice at whatever table they are

at, not just be there in physical presence but to actually be there participatory.

And they also with a little of measurement that we started to discuss last time, should be able to have some form of redress or recall ability. And to that end we are going to have to then dovetail the expectations of what the At-Large community have in terms of the minimum requirements and what happens if you don't keep up with those into not so much rules of procedures that were narrowed particularly on measurable, but on things like recall.

So amongst those rules that I've highlighted for your tracking pleasure is the recall. At the moment the rules of procedure only focus on recall of ALAC members, but we did discuss that we have tested and simply need to continue to formalize mechanisms where we need to replace nominees from the NomCom. And we also need to have a situation where a formalized system of redress which is repatriation and retraining happens before removal. That is something, that actual rule change has to go back to the parent body, the rules of procedure one which was meeting following today's call. So we just need to make sure those things dovetail.

I saw a couple of hands go up and now I've seen them disappear. Alan, your hand's back up so over to you.

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. Two things, first of all, the second one which I'll say first because it dovetails in with what you just said is to what extent is this group responsible for recommending the action taken if performance is

not satisfactory. Clearly that's part of the rules, but are we expected to make recommendations or are we just trying to set the expectations in this group?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's a worthy discussion. I think my personal response to that is that I thought this group – oh dear somebody's dropped off hopefully not Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'm still here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The expectation and that's one of the reasons that many of you are in both layers of the work group – you're in the Rules of Procedure Work Group but you're also in the subgroup which is focusing on the metrics, the measurements. But let's see if everyone else agrees with that Alan. Is that your view first of all?

Alan Greenberg: That was certainly my view and that's why I was a little bit worried that it sounded like we were starting to get into what actions do we take for recall and what actions do we take for non performance, which I didn't think was the mandate; that's why I asked the question. To go onto my original point I was going to make though, I think although we're calling this group "Metrics," I think it's important to understand that we're, I think we're really looking at two different issues.

One is indeed metrics, things that are measurable. And without trying to say exactly what do we do if someone falls below the threshold, what things should we be measuring, should we be tracking. And the second one is expectations, which are not necessarily completely measurable, although probably most of us can judge if someone is meeting them all the time or never. But I think under the generic terms of “metrics,” I think we want to include the more fuzzy expectations that are not necessarily measurable but important to put in writing. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

That’s a very good point. And what I might do is take us almost off topic for a moment to explore that further. But what I’d like to do first of all is just check with the work group because we’re well represented today and I do thank and compliment you all for such a great turnout. In fact if we were doing the metrics on the Metrics Group the Metrics Group members would score very well. Sorry, I couldn’t help myself. Is there anyone in this subteam that feels that keeping our focus particularly on what is to be measured, and to some extent how we are to measure it and where we set the bar on those measurements, is the business of this group?

But what happens when a failure to maintain the standard we set is the business of changing the rules of procedure. Is there anyone who disagrees? I think there should be the separation between the main rules of procedure group and this subcommittee. I’m not anyone other than green checks, I’m seeing hands raised. Alan, your hand is raised is that...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah just a very quick one. I think it is reasonable that as this group sets metrics or the fuzzier expectations, that we add some parenthetical comments about what kind of enforcement we would expect and what kind of actions. So I think it's quite – I don't think we're changing the rules here, but as we're coming up with the metrics we may well decide that "these are the things we want to track but they're not really things that we want heavily enforced," or comments like that. So, advice to the groups, but not necessarily setting the rules. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. So in fact it may be thinking a little bit along the lines of a shopping basket where you can have one very large and obvious something or other in it, but you also can have a whole grab bag of things. And provided the basket is full and looks good, we're all satisfied.

Alan Greenberg: Perhaps.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific. Well that's my metaphor for the day. Tijani, you have your hand raised, go ahead please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you Cheryl. I do think that the work of this sub-working group is absolutely separated from the Rules of Procedure Working Group. What we are doing now is something that the Rule of Procedure Working Group will use to change the rules, but what we do now, as

you said, is to find what we want to measure and how we will measure it and at what level we have to put the bar, as you said. So, indeed two separate jobs, and the result of this working group will be used by the other working group. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Excellent. I think we're all very much in agreement there and that makes it so much easier because I'd like to, for those of you who will be on the follow-on calls, I'd like to ask the Rules of Procedure Workgroup later today, their meeting begins as our meeting closes, to consider what I think we might be able to make as a recommendation to them. And that is whilst we will be putting out performance metrics and the expectations together for the community from a community perspective, it would be very helpful if the Rules of Procedure Group would consider changing, fairly radically, the way the current rules are partitioned up into something that still has subsets, still has classes of rules but that are treated rather differently. And I'll come back to that in our more general discussion later.

Just to give you an idea of what I'm hoping to suggest and have the agreement of this subteam, this working group on metrics, propose to the Rules of Procedure Group is that what we do is we have a set of general expectations – now these are not qualifications as such, but they are criteria which we believe are ideal for people who put themselves forward to particular leadership roles to have.

Then there's a layer of much more specifics. The things that are applicable to everyone who operates in the name of the ALAC. Be they a representative in a work group in a regional internet registry policy

process right down at the edges, or to some extent an ALS representative. In other words, whenever you're wearing the mantle of ALAC and At-Large, here is a set of core expectations the community has of you. Then there's a layer that are specific to whether you're in a liaison role versus an ALAC member role. Then there's a layer of if you happen to be in the Executive Committee of the ALAC, there's these things versus this is just all ALAC members. And sort of package it up that way.

At the moment, based on the UNGA rules, we sort of have – it's a valid model, but it's a model that talks an awful lot about criteria and qualifications. It's not well suited to volunteerism and the safe and trust that we need to have as community members in who we put forward as leaders. So that's where I'd like to head with the other work group and I just think that would be a piece of advice or request that we may as a subgroup of that group want to suggest to them, and certainly discuss fully in our face to face meeting in Prague. Tijani, go ahead again please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Yes thank you Cheryl. You talked about the ideal criteria. Yes, we have to define the ideal criteria, but also we have to define the minimum criteria. I feel from your speech that the mood of this working group is almost for nothing. If it is only to say "yes it is preferable that it would be like this" and that is all, so why we have this working group; why we want to change the rule of procedure. I think that we witness a situation that made us say "we need criteria," "we need" – I would not say qualifications, but I would say "minimum involvement that is needed, that is compulsory for any member." Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So Tijani if I may interpret what you're saying, as Alan was indicating, there will be a range of things, there will be some things that are perhaps less critical and some things that are more critical and how we measure these needs to be tempered. And what happens as a consequence of those measurements needs to be clear. You are also suggesting then Tijani, to make sure we have captured this correctly for the record, that there are going to be a core set of expectations that are mandatory, for the want of a better word. Oh dear that's my line.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. So as we go through on each of the metrics, we probably need to classify them as whether these are mandatory or desirable characteristics. Would those two terminologies work for you Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So staff, can we make sure that we start using the language of "mandatory" and "desirable?" And that will help us sift and sort as well. For some reason, and I have so many screens open I do not know why it looks like one of me is here in the Adobe Connect room and the other one has stepped away – there is actually only one of me, I'm just here

multiple times so don't be confused by that big red bar thing next to my name in the Adobe Connect room. You do have my undivided attention team, it's just I've got so many pieces of equipment open one of them has obviously gone off to sleep. Terrific.

So looking now at where we were up to, which was the working group rule 5, let's not get caught up in the language that this rule has. Let's not worry about the fact that it says "all information and criteria." What we need to be focused – somebody is very busy this morning. What we need to be focused upon is that on the matter of Liaisons, now these are capital L Liaisons, this is Rule 5 capital L liaisons. These are the people that are appointed by the ALAC to represent and act on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee, and by extension the At-Large community, into the ACs, the Advisory Committees and the SOs, the Support Organizations that are the other structures in ICANN.

So these are a little bit like diplomatic missions. These are positions where as Alan, as a perfect and long-serving example, sits on the GNSO Council table for all intent and purposes he is, and I'll ask him to speak on this in just a moment Alan, he is the ALAC at that table. It is a non-voting role within the Council, but it is an equal, for all intents and purposes other than the things associated with voting such as putting motions and seconding motions etc, etc, these are high profile positions. These are roles where the highest degree of trust and public scrutiny are associated with them.

And so it may be that what metrics we wish to put forward for our capital L Liaisons have a far more mandatory set of expectations than we might be associating with some other levels of representation.

Before I ask Alan to perhaps give us the dirt from one who has served so well and so long in such a role, I see Olivier. Please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Cheryl. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the transcript record. Two questions – well one thing and one question. One statement being all the liaisons, as Heidi has very rightly written in the chat, all of the liaisons are appointed by the ALAC except the SSAC liaison, which is formally selected by the SSAC. And it's also important to note that the SSAC liaison is actually a full member of the SSAC, so is appointed as a full member of the SSAC. So we make recommendations to the SSAC and the SSAC then appoints that person. So they actually do have, as far as I understand, they do have a voting power there as well.

That's one thing. The other thing and it's a question actually since you've been around for a little more time than I have been and I do require your direction on this one. We have an IDN liaison which is not a liaison to any, well I'm not quite sure was there an IDN group, was there...it's a special animal so I thought you might wish to say a couple of words on that. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Well it's a special animal that probably needs to be put down, have its head removed and mounted on a wall.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm not sure how that will be translated or interpreted Cheryl, but let's just keep this to something a bit more civil please. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay sorry, I couldn't help myself. My talking on capital L Liaison, and being very specific about them being the appointments made to the SOs and the ACs, was to pick up that point Olivier. Some of what we need to deal with and what we need to be aware of and what the rules are covering off, for example the rules refer to very particular rules about how the GNSO liaison will be appointed. They don't actually go into those details as Alan has always found interesting, but they do refer to the fact that it should go into those details.

They're all historical artifacts. It's all about the fact that we had a GNSO liaison before we had these rules of procedure developed because it was something that was a very important aspect of even the interim ALAC. So some of these things are written in such a way that how we've classified them in the current rules is a little misleading. And the IDN liaison is one of those things. There was in fact, before even the interim ALAC, a President's Committee. The precursor to what we would currently refer to as a community wide or cross-community review group. This was a group of people who were selected from all component parts of ICANN to look at the wonderful world of IDNs.

That closed off formally in, I think, 2004 or '05. But there was in fact, once upon a time, something which wasn't an Advisory Committee in the full terminology of how we refer to the Government Advisory Committee, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee or the At-Large Advisory Committee, but it was in fact an advisory committee via

the President and CEO into the Board. So there kind of, sort of, used to be a need to have a capital L Liaison. But that exists no more.

And so I would separate that IDN issue away from this particular set of discussions where what we're talking about is a hugely important forward facing to the community and other parts of ICANN, but quite specifically these people – and in the cases as Olivier rightly pointed out – the SSAC of course they are full-fledged members. And that you should also note team, will affect the matter of the rules of procedure of current rule 11, which talks about recall. You cannot in fact recall an SSAC liaison from the SSAC. You can't. Because it's up to the SSAC to decide whether or not a member of the SSAC and our liaison is a fully fledged member of the SSAC and endorsed by the Board as an appointment, whether or not that person is functioning to their criteria.

So we have our criteria, which I think should be equitable for all of the ACs and SOs, those same high level helicopter view standards should be the same. But what we do need to realize is if we are not happy for whatever reason with someone who we have sent to the SSAC, and the SSAC has accepted as a full member, we can and we have in fact done this so there is precedence, we can have a new appointment made to be sanctioned as the formal liaison from the ALAC. But it is quite possible, and it was in fact the case, that the person who our community deemed unsatisfactory to continue in the role – in other words we didn't feel they were doing enough of what we wanted them to do.

They weren't representing and acting in the best interest of the ALAC and At-Large. That person still continued as a fully fledged member of the

SSAC, but that was because the SSAC liked what they were doing in terms of their technical expertise and their input into the SSACs business and policy and procedures. So there's a slight difference between the ACs when it comes to the SSAC. Not only in the way that we make recommendations, but whoever we put forward should fit these high level criteria. I think we should all agree on that. Okay.

But if we say we don't want Fred Brown to be the ALAC SSAC liaison, we want Mary Smith to be considered for the SSAC liaison, and there's also another name that we could put forth perhaps but we could just put forward one name for them to accept or not, but we can't pull Fred Brown back. The SSAC, if they want to, can keep them and they have done that in the past. So that's more of a Rules of Procedure and Consequence issue, but we do need to be aware of it.

That doesn't mean that the high level metrics should be any different. I see Fatimata first and then I see Alan. Go ahead please. Fatimata it's all yours. You may be muted. Star 7 to unmute. Yes, that's better. Go ahead Fatimata.

Heidi Ullrich: Cheryl this is Heidi. We're just working on what's going on. Fatimata you are unmuted.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Fatimata please go ahead.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Hello, can you hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, perfectly. Go ahead.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Okay thank you. This is a question of a matter of clarification about what you just said Cheryl about the first liaison who is not doing the required job from ALAC and appointing a second one. And what do we do about the first one? Is he going to stay because he's accepted as he is within the [good group] and we just appoint a second one like that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well Fatimata because we've actually done this I can tell you what happens. We withdrew; the ALAC withdrew the status of ALAC liaison from association with that person's name. The ALAC put forward after exactly the same mechanism as all other liaisons appointments are done. We called for expressions of interest and we put a group of expressions of interest before the ALAC. We selected, I think at that stage it was two not three alternates who we felt were going to be appropriate, and who stood up in front of the ALAC in Cairo actually, it was at the Cairo meeting, and put hand to heart and said that they would indeed be able to function to the standards that we would so desire.

And then the SSAC chose from between those names, went through their vetting process and had that person, one of those people sorry, appointed. That liaison then served several years in that role. In fact until a resignation occurred. So from our point of view we made the switch no problem at all. From SSACs point of view they simply changed

the classification of someone they had from ALAC liaison to simply a member of the SSAC. So nothing happened. They just did the same work they were doing in the SSAC and that was fine as far as the SSAC was concerned. But we segregated it from being the formal ALAC liaison.

And the new ALAC liaison operated alongside the previously appointed person, as far as I could tell over the years without so much as a hiccup or an issue. And I don't know, I would have to check, but I believe that the original person who we sent but who was not meeting our particular criteria is still functioning perfectly well from an SSAC point of view within the SSAC. And that's fine because that's their business. But from our business we withdrew our endorsement as being our capital L Liaison and offered new names and they were selected from and that went perfectly smoothly and it happened between one ICANN meeting face to face and another. So it was a less than two month process, because the appointment was made and the Board endorsed at the following meeting.

So it actually went quite smoothly, so we do have the precedence and there was no bad blood and no problems at all. Alan and then Roosevelt; Alan go ahead please.

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. We've beat this one to death almost, but I'll add another couple of blows to it. I think the problem is, and no offense Olivier, but you said we cannot withdraw the liaison to the SSAC. That is incorrect. We can withdraw the ALAC liaison to the SSAC as Cheryl has just explained. What we can't do is remove that person from sitting on the

SSAC. That's an SSAC decision. So the only difference between the SSAC and other committees is number one, the SSAC is not an advisory committee like some with a mandated membership. The membership can be drawn from whoever they feel is appropriate.

And they have to accept our liaison, we can't just put a random person on without their agreement. But other than that we can withdraw that liaison. They can stop sitting there on behalf of the ALAC. We cannot kick them out of the room. That's an SSAC issue. But I think we have to be careful on the nomenclature. We can say they are no longer an ALAC liaison. What happens after that is not our problem. And by the way I think that person just has left the SSAC because of other commitments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Ah, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

I understand what you certainly two said. [laughter]

Alan Greenberg:

Well you may have agreed. Anyway, the last person I heard it from was you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Olivier I had no idea you and I were so interchangeable, that's kind of scary.

-
- Alan Greenberg: Okay you were going to call on me to say some other things, but I'll...
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I want to get to Roosevelt first and then come back to you. I want you to tell us how practical all these things are going to be. Go ahead Roosevelt.
- Roosevelt King: Roosevelt King. My only concern is mostly the way the rules are written. When I look at the rules, [Rule 21], it says there is no requirement for a liaison to be a member of At-Large Advisory Committee.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.
- Roosevelt King: What is that saying? Who is actually, what is the requirement for being a liaison? And that's not the only point.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you for that Roosevelt and I think it's an important point. It's one of those rules that are existing that I would argue very strongly, and Alan this is probably going to lead to your introduction to the wonderful world of liaisons, is a very good point; because we expect a high level of involvement from the ALAC members, the 15 person ALAC. They've got the work of the ALAC to do, they've got the workgroups of the ALAC to
-

be involved in, they've got a whole lot of things that we want them to be doing, which is just ALAC.

If you happen to be an ALAC member and you happen to be in a liaison role, as Alan has served in, then provided you've got the human bandwidth to do both as Alan has done more than admirably, one might also say superhumanly, that's great and that's good. But when Alan for example, no longer was appointed by the Nominating Committee as an ALAC member, it would have been a tragedy to not have him continue to serve in the role of liaison to the GNSO. So without that rule that says "the ALAC can appoint a liaison, but you don't have to be a member of the ALAC to be that liaison" we would have lost the corporate knowledge and long-standing experience that Alan has brought to the field, for example.

So I actually think that's a very good rule. It may be that you are an ALAC member, but you do not have to be an ALAC member. It may be that you have served as an ALAC member in the past, but you don't have to be a currently serving one. And it may be that you've never served as an ALAC member, but you have a particular set of personal skills and experience that make you ideal to be the liaison into an Advisory Committee or a Support Organization.

And let me give you a potential example there Roosevelt. As yet, but perhaps in the future, we don't have one now but we may in the future, with the Government Advisory Committee if they were to agree to take a liaison from the ALAC, that would be a formal seat at their table, non-voting observer status but a seat at their table. The voice could be heard and you would be an integral part of the activities of the

Governmental Advisory Committee, but not a voting member. So, observer status, voice heard, but clearly not representing a government.

If that was to come to pass, we would want someone with the highest qualities and standards and understandings of how governments and intergovernmental conversation works. I suspect we would probably have to look very carefully at who we put into that role. And that would be very unlikely to be in the same human body as a currently serving ALAC member at the time. It may be, but it may not. So Roosevelt that's a really important one you've brought forward and it's one I would argue should stay as a rule. But we're interested in the metrics. We want to say what we expect out of that person. And what we expect out of that person is a bunch of standards.

Roosevelt you're hand is still up, do you have a follow-up question before I go to Yaovi?

Alan Greenberg:

And sometime to Alan.

Roosevelt King:

The thing is this rule cannot stay as this. It has to be [spelled out]. I mean after that long dissertation trying to explain what it means, it obviously cannot stay like this; that it must be spelled out in some form. We need to state here what is the requirement for a liaison.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Absolutely. That's what we're about to try and get into. Thank you very much Roosevelt. Yaovi can I take you briefly now please?

Yaovi Atohoun: Okay, can you hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes we can perfectly, go ahead Yaovi.

Yaovi Atohoun: Yeah thank you. I think Cheryl you explained the reason behind point 5.1; that is a good point. I'm in favor to put it there because as people may think that because it is a liaison this person should be necessarily an ALAC member. But as you said, you may have somebody who was a former ALAC member of good quality and that person even not member of ALAC at all. This person can be a good person to play this role of liaison. So having this statement I think is a good point to say that we don't need necessarily an ALAC person to be that liaison because somebody can have experience, can be a good candidate to play this role.

So for me, this one is a good point. That is a good explanation you have given that clearly people, somebody who has as you said before in the past was an ALAC member or not at all can play this role. That's a very good point. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Yaovi. Alan, I'm going to go to you know but what I'd like for you to do is try and grab in a couple of things to your points. And I just see Sergio so I may ask for you to wait just briefly while Sergio makes intervention as well Alan. Alan, what I'm asking of you is two layers of

information. I want you to bring the team with you on why not just 5.1 but 5.2 and 5.3 and all of that listing that we currently have are or are not practical and should or should not have metrics associated with them. But I also would like you to make very clear to the team the type of metrics that are realistic.

And I think we might need to end up with two buckets. You might for example if there is an overriding set of expectations from within the GNSO, I assume you have to comply with those as well as whatever we put together. So I'll get you to deal with that, but first of all if we can very briefly, Sergio over to you please. Go ahead Sergio.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Thank you Cheryl, for the record, this is Sergio Salinas Porto. Just two things, first, I agree with the last point raised; that is that Alan should review this because he has a lot to contribute. However, I want to state for the record that if there is any amendment the amendment should be treated as a special case and we should mention ALAC participation in the GAC as a special case, but we should stick to a logic in that ALAC representatives should be ALAC members. Especially when we see that some people representing ALAC should precisely voice ALAC voice on the whole and not on an individual basis. So I think it's important that an ALAC representative should be an ALAC member. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you Sergio and as someone who has got reasonable experience in this field, including a serving as a liaison whilst not being an ALAC member, remembering that ALAC members are 15 people, 5 per any

year of the ALAC being appointed from the Nominating Committee and 10 in any year being appointed by the regional At-Large organizations. I most respectfully would suggest what we need to do is be very clear on what we mean by ALAC members. ALAC members are either NomCom appointees for two year periods, or RALO appointees for two year periods in rotation.

The ALAC operates in a very open way and to date has had the liaisons, be they liaisons to the Board when we had them or liaisons which are Bylaw mandated i.e. to the SOs, the GNSO and the ccNSO specifically, and to a lesser extent the ACs as ex officio, in other words they are an integral but not appointed part of the ALAC. And I'll ask Alan, and I see Carlton's hand up too, I'll ask Alan to cover that but I'll also see whether Carlton is pointing out. We can take that to the rules of procedure group rather than discuss it here. And I'll argue long and hard with you on it in that space, but what we need to do is set the actual expectations and I think that's where Alan is starting now.

Carlton I noticed you took your hand down is that because you'd like to move to Alan's intervention? Okay great. And Maureen said, for the record please, has mentioned in the chat that if we're looking at measuring liaison participation, we need to look at what we're actually measuring and how. And I believe, seeing as Alan is the most long-standing and experienced liaison on the planet in the name of the ALAC, that he's got the ball now on this one. Fatimata, is your intervention needing to go before Alan or can it wait till after?

Fatimata Seye Sylla: This is Fatimata. I just wanted to add one more question to my first question. I put it in writing but I think you didn't see it to answer me so that's why I'm asking it again. What if the liaison is an ALAC member? [Is it a person who is doing] the required work (inaudible)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sorry. Maybe I did not hear you. Can you just say the very beginning of that again? Were you asking do they not or are they not? Start again.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: I'm asking what would we do if the liaison, if the SSAC liaison is an ALAC member and he's not doing the job?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alright. Well, if any of the capital L Liaisons are doing a good job there's no problem. If they fail to meet whatever criteria you've set, then there is a problem and we will have rules in place and precedent to deal with that. It does not matter whether they are a member of the ALAC or not, because it is not inconceivable that they may be performing to whatever metrics you have established for membership of the ALAC. In other words they're turning up to a given proportion of the meetings and etc and etc and we're all happy with them, but we're not happy with what they're saying in the GNSO Council or whatever. That can be separate and be dealt with.

What I'd like to do is announce whilst this conversation has been extremely important because what we're talking about is the high level

principle for all representation in the name of the ALAC. We haven't got down to the nitty gritty in today's call, but we will have to continue after we have a hard stop at the top of the hour. I'm going to go to Alan now and ask him to finish to the top of the hour and because I'm in charge of the next hour, feel free to go slightly beyond it Alan.

And we'll wrap up there and I'm going to ask Gisella then to just tell us what we do logistically, do we, those of us who are on the next call stay on this line or whatever. But I do then want to suspend the rest of the agenda and we're going to take it to the list and to the Wiki. Alan, please I apologize for keeping you in the side wings for so long, but we did need to get all those questions clear. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg:

Alright. I'm known to be concise but I don't think I can really answer the question even if we go over a little bit. A couple of things, way back when when this conversation started, there was the comment about the IDN liaison. I think we need to not be hung up on the term liaison. The rules of procedure currently apply for appointing liaisons and appointing others. If the position happens to be titled liaison by the group we're going to it's a liaison. If it's not, for instance the appointment on an AOC Review Committee, it's still someone appointed by ALAC or recommended by ALAC, but it's not called a liaison. Let's not get hung up over the expectation. I think the expectation should be the same in both cases.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you.

Alan Greenberg:

In terms of sitting on the ALAC or not, I will tell you from personal experience that the GNSO role, as I suspect the ccNSO is, is pretty well a fulltime volunteer commitment. It's a heavy fulltime volunteer commitment. ALAC is a heavy fulltime volunteer commitment. For one year I served on the GNSO, I served on the ALAC and I was an ALAC vice-Chair. Now I'm lucky, I have a lot of energy. I can take on heavy jobs. I'm semi-retired and have control over my own time and I could decide to do that. That's an unreasonable expectation to demand of anyone however if they don't choose to. So I think that it's absolutely crucial that the wording, the wording in the current rules saying – and by the way we talk about 5.1 but 4.6 is also a key one.

And together they say the person need not be an ALAC member, they may be. They will typically be a former ALAC member if not currently, but there's no requirement. For instance for the GAC position, should it ever come into existence. I can think of someone who's a former GAC member and happens to have enough interest and knowledge of the ALAC that they might well be able to represent us. So I think we need to keep the flexibility, but don't put unreasonable expectations in saying the person must be a super person in order to take on these roles. They're going to end up not meeting expectations or having people who just kill themselves. Unless they happen to be just in the right set of circumstances.

Now, in terms of actual expectations of what you want from the liaison, and this comes back to the previous discussion. If all the liaison is going to do is put forward official statements of the ALAC, you do not need a

human being you need an email account. Because the normal of formal statements that ALAC will formally approve on any given issue in a timely manner are the statements that we formally issue and you can simply send a copy to the GNSO.

For a liaison to be effective you want someone to actively be representing the interest of the ALAC and At-Large on the other group. Much of that is going to be without having gotten advice ahead of time. I think our rules are a little bit lax in that they should put a requirement that the liaison attempt to get input from the ALAC and At-Large where appropriate, which is not there right now. But if you're going to say this person can only say things that are official policy, don't waste the spot and ICANN should certainly not waste travel funds on it. It's not worth the effort. That person is going to be sitting in a chair and eating meals and you're not going to be getting any real value on it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you Alan.

Alan Greenberg:

Hold on, I have to switch phones it will take me one half a second. The whole point is that the person there has to be able to speak from a context of users and At-Large. Most of what that person is going to be saying is going to be on the fly and adlibbed. Hopefully the large majority of it is going to have some coherence and point of view from ALAC and At-Large. There will be occasional times where that will differ where the person will say something and find out after the fact ALAC didn't agree.

So the person has to be careful to make sure that it's clear when they're speaking on behalf of ALAC, when they're not – and no matter how clear you are some people will misunderstand. That's inevitable. But from the point of view of ALAC confidence in the person, the important issue is to make sure that that person has an understanding of what the ALAC is likely to react, what the hot buttons are, what the issues are, and then be able to act on it. And of course, the person is only effective on the GNSO if they do speak, if other people have reasonable expectations of them, which means they also have to participate not just in the Council meetings but in the other workgroups and activities of the group.

They have to become a real valued part of the community because only if they're a valued part of the community are they likely to be listened to when the crucial policy issues come in, and there are no other voices on the GNSO for instance on behalf of users. There are some other Council members who on occasion have opinions that coincide with user issues, but not necessarily on a regular basis. So it's a really important rule. And the same is true for ALAC and At-Large nominees and appointees to other groups.

But you have to put the process in place to pick someone who can speak on your behalf without having the benefit of being given advice on a regular basis on every specific issue. Otherwise they're going to sit there like a lump of clay, maybe absorb things and pass it back to you, but not really be impacting the impact of that group. And that's the reason in my mind that we need a liaison.

To just report back we can appoint anybody to listen to the conference calls after the fact, to listen to the mp3's and tell us what was said. In the case of the GNSO they have an audio feed that goes in parallel with the meeting. Any number of people can listen in on what's going on. That's not the crucial issue in my mind. It's having someone participating and acting, being valued as participant in the group that we're looking for. Thank you. I have other things to say, but that will do for now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you Alan. That's good. And what we'll do is we will pick up with where we are leaving now in our next call. But I will actually be asking us to do a little bit of homework on this matter. But those of you who are on the Rules of Procedure Workgroup can stay on the telephone lines, but do need to change the Adobe Connect Room. And if you would be so kind Gisella to just Skype me that link, mainly because I want to leave what I've got open open and I'm having technology challenges this morning. If you are in the Rules of Procedure Workgroup please go and enter that new Adobe Connect Room now, but there is no problem staying on the telephone lines.

Ladies and gentlemen we haven't gotten far through our agenda today, but we've done a huge amount of very important groundwork. And I think what we're going to do is not go into the Rules of Procedure Workgroup with some very clear issues that we want them to tidy up, to look at high level stuff for all appointments. And then subset down into the specifics. So, hard stop now. A lot more online and on the Wiki's

between now and the next meeting. And Gisella will be getting to us on the details of the next meeting. Alan, final word, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: No, I was just going to ask that people who are dialing into the other meeting are dialing into a different Adigo conference number, are they going to merge with them.

Gisella Gruber: Alan, Gisella here. Everyone who is joining the ROP, if you'll please kindly stay online. We're going to stop the recording now and Adigo will start a fresh recording for ROP. All the other people...

[End of Transcript]