NATHALIE PEREGRINE:	The recording has started and I'll do the roll call. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody. This is the At-Large Metrics Working Group call on the 19th of September 2013. On the call today we have Maureen Hilyard, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. We have apologies from Sergio Salinas Porto, Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Darlene Thompson.
	From Staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Cheryl.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	We're a very lean group in today's call. Before we started the record we had in fact gone through the list of people who had responded to the Doodle poll, and we do have a number of apologies that were listed. Of course we could probably add Alan Greenberg to that list. It would be a courtesy to do so because we do know he's engaged in the activities of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team meeting in Washington, along with Olivier.
	There is no difficulty, as far as I'm concerned, in formally continuing with the call, but we do need to note that our aim was to have a reasonable cross-regional representation on this grouping. What we have got in fact is only Asia Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, and of course AFRALO on the call.

Both North America and Europe undoubtedly could have been quite reasonably served by having Olivier and Alan on the call, but they are dealing with ATRT 2. So I'll put it to the call to see whether Maureen and Tijani want to continue. I think there is merit in continuing, because we are able to. And in fact we have Olivier! Our esteemed leader has joined us!

We are virtually getting down on bended knee, Olivier, and we're delighted to see you because you can hold the flag for Europe. If you could find Alan we'd be right and have a full cross-regional grouping. That's fantastic that Olivier has popped into the room and will be listening to the recording. That makes me feel a lot better, and of course we know Alan will certainly get himself up to speed. We can give him all the penholding – that'll make him happy.

Can I just ask for an indicator in the room or to the audio track, is there anybody who objects to us continuing on? I'd like to continue on and at least get the ball rolling on this stage of work. So I'll leave a small pause and anyone who does not wish to continue can make themselves known. I see Dev saying he's fine. Maureen is saying she's fine. We'll assume that Olivier's silence is agreement, and the same for Tijani.

I'll shall wear the neutral hat but take a vested interest for making sure that we do our best guess on what North American views will be on things. It's unlike that we'll be making deep and meaningful decisions here today. This is just a kick-off call. Let's get the show on the road.

Well, that certainly goes for welcome and attendance and a little longer than we'd planned. We are 12 minutes now into the hour but I still think that we'll be able to get through today's meeting in good time, and that of course, you'll notice with our timings for the Agenda that they are ranges. So in a perfect world we may even be able to have this call in a shorter timeframe than is our maximum of 90 minutes.

The most important part of our work, and we do remember that the Metrics Sub-Committee of the Rules of Procedure Working Group did contribute to a number of sections of the soon-to-be sanctioned and enacted new ALAC Rules of Procedure. But the particular section that Nathalie has popped us on our screen is part of the rules, and specifically Section (9).

Now, there are some other rules that we can look at. We have already contributed to metrics and measurements and performance criteria discussions, but if we focus, for today's call, specifically on the performance metrics and the remediation aspects of Section (9). Our work, as we continue it, is not to deal with the remediation aspects, so let's make this clear.

We're about the measurables, how meaningful those measurable can be and how we may be able to come up with measureables and metrics that are not only relevant to the At-Large AC, which will be a foundation and name-stay, but also going to be applicable and useful to the RALOs and most importantly the At-Large structures and individual members who are represented in a couple of our regions.

We have a wonderful head-start on this because as we'll see a little later – and in the Agenda we will be going through Rule 9 to start with – I'm delighted to say that right back in the beginning of our Working Group we had an excellent contribution from AFRALO and the AFRALO group has already put up – and it's already been out for public comment already for in excess of 12 months now – some proposals for At-Large structures.

So when we get to that point of our work we've already got a template and some fantastic baseline work for us to look at. But what we're also going to have to do in this particular Working Group is not just ruminate ourselves, it's going to be our job – and that's why it's so terribly important that we have regional representation on our meetings – to also take these discussions back to the RALOs meetings, but also to ensure that the voices of the At-Large structures that are component parts of our At-Large organizations get a chance to have a look and contribute to these discussions.

We do know from history that this is one of the highly inflammatory topics that the matters of measuring volunteers and how volunteer performance needs to be measured is extremely volatile, and we might have some cultural differences and regional points of view to try and find a consensus way forward on. But that's the job ahead of us.

Let's now look at Section (9) in the new Rules of Procedure. These were no doubt familiar to everyone on this call but because of the record and because we've got a number of people that have sent apologies for this

new-stage kick-off meetings, read through some of these on the record if you will indulge me.

The first thing I'd like to do however is say to all of you on the call: I would suggest that we would probably break up into some Working Teams and take different leads for running these discussions. So if there's any particular part of these already-created performance metrics and rules that we're going to look at today that you have a passion on… Can we get Maureen back onto the audio please? That would be most helpful.

All right, well, those of us who can… Welcome back Maureen. If you want to click the full screen option that would be terrific. Let's have a quick review here. If there's a section here that you're particularly passionate about and you would like to take lead on things, do make it known in the Adobe Connect room or just shout out and we'll pencil you in.

Of course, because Alan's not here we could give it all to him and that could become part of the remediation of not being able to attend a call. That's a joke. I don't think we need to look at the definition and to establish again why the community believes that the ALAC representational role needs to have sets of expectations of performance that the community can trust and carry out.

The principle is quite reasonable, however we do have to make sure that these things can be measured, can be comparable and can be

reasonable and of course that the community expectations are going to be well established and clearly understood by all.

If we're going to set them as measures for the At-Large AC Members, it may be likely that any or all of our measures may be applicable to the leadership of regions and indeed the leadership of At-Large structures. But we also need to think, throughout all our discussions, what do we expect at each level. What I'd like to do is have you think along the lines of absolute musts, what would be highly desirable and what could be acceptable.

And if we think in those layers, and perhaps even make suggestions and annotations in our work that are at three levels, we may be able to give the community enough flexibility and yet maintain enough integrity. Let's look at 9.1. This is probably the simplest for everyone to agree on and indeed the simplest for Staff to measure. That's the overriding expectation that all At-Large AC Members must make regular and significant contributions to the At-Large AC, At-Large and ICANN.

Now, I'll stop there and I want to make sure that we understand that and we can now translate to our RALOs and ALSes what this extremely important albeit short sentence is – that what we're asking, what is mandated and what we need to measure is that ALAC Members are making regular and significant contributions to not only the At-Large AC but also to At-Large, which one presume is [00:16:00] at least Regional At-Large Organization activities, but could actually be measured at the ALS level and not necessarily via the RALO – that's something we're going to have to discuss – and of course ICANN.

How are we going to measure that? What tools are we going to propose? How easy is this for Staff to measure and record? And most importantly, how does the Chair of the ALAC have the flexibility to say what is or is not satisfactory? So even on 9.1 there is a fair bit to discuss. Let's open the floor on that briefly. I'm going to join discussion and review together because we started late, so bear with me. We won't go through two and three separately, I'll build them in together.

Would anyone like to make some proposals or…? I don't see your hand Tijani so please just… Maureen, go ahead, followed by Tijani. [pause] Nathalie, can I get you to check on Maureen's audio. We'll go to Tijani and then back to Maureen. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am so happy that we have begun working on these metrics because, as you remember, Cheryl, we began that in Dakar, discussing it. And you said "inflammatory". Yes, it was really inflammatory. But you said something that I don't agree on. You said it was a culture problem. I remember that all cultures, all regions, have the same sensitivity about metrics.

I think that metrics are really necessary. If we want to be serious we need to set up those metrics. We are not… We are voluntary so we are not paid, but we are committed to work. So we have to work. There is a minimum that we have to do, and this is the metrics. So I believe that this time we need to really set up metrics. We've spoken about it but

we never wanted to set them up because there were a lot of people who were aggressively against them.

But I do think that perhaps we will not be very sharp, very… Do not be any [00:20:01] or any penchant or any… But we need to assess what Members are doing. I am witnessing that some ALAC Members never did anything, and this is not normal in my point of view. So going on, setting those metrics is very important. This time we have to go ahead. We have to work. We have to get more people into this Working Group so that the discussion will be wider with more points of view.

We have to try and have consensus on any of those metrics, but we need to set them and we need to use them in the future. So I think the way we can go ahead is that we need to define the area where we need metrics. We have to define them and ask every Member of the Working Group to think about and give his input from the next call. And if we do that we will start having something written that we can improve on from one call to the other. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Tijani. Maureen, do we have your audio organized now?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Cheryl, can you hear me this time?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can. Go for it Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [laughs] Okay, thanks. This is to Tijani – I think he's raised a lot of the things that I was going to raise as well. I think it's to do with metrics… Can you hear me better now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a bit fuzzy. If you speak slightly slower I'm sure we'll make it out. Go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I'm not quite sure what the problem is. It's got to do with the definitions of "regular and significant". What is a regular and significant contribution? Does each need defining? Did you get that? Shall I write it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is there more to come? I see you're typing. I did see Dev's hand go up so we might get Maureen to pen…   What I heard was primarily agreement very much with – not everything – what Tijani had said, but that Maureen wanted to focus in on a couple of points, which she's going to put into the chat. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hopefully I come to you loud and clear. Tijani captured a lot of what I was going to say. I think that because what it's coming down to is "the devil is in the detail" and what is the specific metric that measures the Member's performance? And I remember the discussions on not quite this topic but when we were trying to do At-Large structure metrics, and of course when there was initial consensus on the concept of it, when it came down to the actual details there was significant disagreement between the RALOs on how to implement which particular metric would be used and in what quantity as well.

So not attending five meetings out of 20 meetings would be okay in one RALO, but in another if they attend one out of 20, that's fine. That's an exact, recent example. So I think that… Well, I think 9.2 captured the key methods – meeting attendance; which is something that's easily measurable. This is more teleconferences and face-to-face meetings, the participation and the decisions and votes of the ALAC, I think that could be measured by the number of comments made on the Wiki and/or the comments made on the ALAC mailing list.

In terms of tracking who's involved in the various At-Large and ALAC Working Groups, and of course the attendance on those Working Groups, I think is also something that could be measured. So I think that's all I have to say at this point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I see Olivier has popped back into the room, which is extraordinary seeing as he's deeply committed to the meeting in Washington. Part of

his brain is with us and we appreciate that. He might even type something at us if we get too far up track. But the reason I wanted to mention Olivier is that under the rules, the remediation starts very much with the involvement, not only as…

Well, we hope it doesn't get to the point where the RALO is saying to ALAC: "we have noticed on your established measures that one of our representatives, in our opinion, is failing to perform," we'd like to think that the ALAC has, via the Chair – I'm sure Olivier's opinion here will be very important as well – has stepped in before it becomes a complaint situation.

But we would be having a system that sees continuous improvement and a quiet conversation along a corridor or over a phone line saying: "have you noticed that it's obvious to the community that you've not attended any of the meetings in the last three months?" or: "have you noticed that the publicly available listing of voting patterns shows that you've not voted on any of the votes that we've called?"

Yes, you're right Dev, there is a measure, but it's always not just black and white. I am playing devil's advocate here – I hope you will realize that; you know how passionate I am about measurable and metrics –, it isn't always clear if we just have fewer tick-a-box, "there or not there", "did or did not", measurements. You have brought us to 9.2 and I think that's a really good place for us to spend a couple of moments on as well now.

What 9.2 is is the no-brainer, the easy thing: meeting attendance, participation in votes at the ALAC and participation in ALAC Working Groups. And most importantly, as well as those other bodies... I've just managed to scroll totally away from 9.2. And I do want to make sure that I have got it properly recorded from the record – 9.2.3 – participation and role played in ALAC Working Group as well as those of other bodies within ICANN.

Let's look for example at someone who has a particular ability to turn up when the meetings begin and gets their name always marked off, but does not in any way, shape or form contribute to discussion. We would there have the attendance part but not the contribution part happening at the meetings. So the attendance aspect, or as 9.2.1 says, "or sending a prior notice if it's not possible" is an easy measurable and is something that we do record – and we need to think about how we record these things – at the beginning of each of our meetings.

We'd need to think as a Working Group how we are going to ask the ALAC to present that to community review, and we can talk about that after we do a little bit more establishment of the baseline, is equally similar a task. We do already record who votes on the ALAC and always voting yes and always voting no or occasionally abstaining is something that's recorded on individual votes.

But Heidi, correct me if I'm wrong, we don't have a running tally of that? A region, for example, would have to go through the vote announcements to see a voting pattern. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Could you please repeat that? I didn't catch the beginning part.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Looking, as Dev pointed out, at meeting attendance – and we have a dashboard tool that can show meeting attendance, both face-to-face and formal ALAC ones, and I'm sure such a tool can be created for regional activities as well as if that need was there – but for 9.2.2, the decisions and votes in the ALAC, we have the voting tool reported, so we have those who have participated in a vote and we have those who have not participated in a vote recorded with the vote announcement.

                        Do we have a running tally of that anywhere?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I don't believe so but I can ask Matt if [big pulse? 00:32:34] could generate that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Just wondering… I'm not suggesting that is a measure that needs to be publicly reported, but it's the type of issue that we probably need to ask the RALOs, and by that one would also assume their At-Large structures, is that a measure that they would find useful? We probably also need to put that to [sneezes]… Thank you Dev – he's just typed "bless you" – hopefully my soul is still in tact after doing that. …That if it is a desirable measure it is certainly something that if [big pulse?

00:33:45] can generate as data noted in the chat, it would save Staff time and that would be very good.

So let's make a little side note there about how we measure and how it is recorded, on 9.2.1 and 9.2.2. 9.2.3 – participation in the roles and the ALAC Working Groups as well as other bodies within ICANN, that one we have a static record, all ALAC Working Group to my knowledge have a list of Members, and all of the calls of Working Groups obviously have an attendance sheet.

But Heidi, I'm going to come back to you, as far as I know there isn't… Do we have, even on a work group-by-work group base, a running tally of attendance and activity? Now, Nathalie, I know you know very well that other parts of ICANN do run this type of tool in as much as… I do apologise; there is an awful lot of noise on the line… Nathalie has in recent times been responsible for sending out, which goes to the list at least for gNSO Working Groups, which are often much larger than any of ours, an attendance record for each meeting.

That's one way that one part of ICANN has made a more public measure of who's active. And again, in the gNSO world, when any report of a gNSO Working Group goes through either the public comment process that they do in a policy development or pre-policy development discussion framework, whether that goes into a public comment or indeed whenever something goes to the gNSO Council, there is always an annex, which is an Excel spreadsheet showing each of the listed Members of the Working Group and exactly which of the meetings they attended.

We don't do that. Do we need to consider that we could or should? And more importantly, how much of an impasse on Staff time would that be?   If [Big pulse? 00:37:06] can collect, and we can collate the voting data, that's fine. If all else fails we could just do a copy and paste from the reports that are sent out – that wouldn't be as much of a problem I guess, but if we need to take that data out and put it in some other form, then we're now looking at a Staff time allocation.

Every time we allocate or ask Staff to do something, that's time that they're not assisting the community with something else. So we need to keep that in mind. Just on 9.2, all of those things one can find ways of measuring, and reporting to the community in a greater detail than we currently do – and this Working Group doesn't consider that. We have stated in the rules that these measures will be publicly available. 9.3 says that.

And the work of this Working Group, I think, needs to focus quite a bit of its attention on this 9.3 aspect of the how and what we propose as the publicly available, the dashboard figures or reports, however it is that we're going to propose to do it, information going to be. We also need to recognize that whilst it is the ALAC itself under 9.4 that is to say what percentages of some of these measures is acceptable or unacceptable, we've very much written into the ALAC rules that there is a meeting of interests with the RALOs.

Because 9.4 states that the ALAC is empowered to set the threshold, which the Chair or RALOs could use to monitor performance. So we are publicly required to publicly report these measures, and the ALAC is

empowered to say what is or is not satisfactory performance. And it may be that there'll be some flexibility and even some exception clauses in that sort of thing.

Let me give you an example to think of between now and our next meeting – the situation where, because of some form of illness or timing of meeting, which renders someone unable, perhaps because of their work commitments, to attend regular calls, that person would technically be seen on whatever public reporting tool we have as 'not attending' any or all of the meetings.

But that same person could be, whilst they're not attending, reviewing the audio tapes and transcriptions of the call, contributing to whatever list activity is going on, and indeed as I've experienced personally in a Working Group in the gNSO world, being a primary penholder and an absolute essential to the contribution of the activities. And yet, they may never actually attend one of the scheduled calls.

So we have to build exceptions in here. This Working Group would also need to make a proposal hypothetically along those lines that would say if we were reporting publicly that sort of annotation of contribution might need to be made public. We had a dashboard system on meetings, for example, that changed color from green to yellow and then red – like a stoplight system –, which shifted through that color range, depending on how many meetings of the At-Large AC Members attended.

And we certainly had Members that felt it was quite horrific to suddenly shift from green to a somewhat hotter hue, when they through no fault of their own attend a meeting face-to-face and that sort of thing. So we need to consider that as well. Can I have some discussion on how we think we can put flexibility into that empowerment, in terms of setting thresholds clearly? Under 9.4 both the ALAC Chair and the RALOs themselves are required or able to monitor performance.

Do you want to have a discussion now or do you want to just note for the record that that is going to be probably, almost a complete meeting's worth of topic? I see Maureen typing. You can try and talk, we may hear you. Have a go with the audio Maureen, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We had her muted due to noise but now she's unmuted. Maureen, could you try to speak please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I suspect I can hear her typing. She makes a point that says different sorts of participations are covered in 9.2.3. Indeed they are, and we do need to tease those out. But I see Dev, and yes, I agree – Tijani has said that that particular topic needs to be discussed in a complete call. I could not agree with you more and we will need to do that. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I agree. 9.4 regarding thresholds probably requires its own call. My immediate thought on that would be that the thresholds not be so rigid as to… You miss one meeting out of five and that's it, you're out. It has to be thresholds where there's a notable absence. If you're in the middle of the pack in terms of all the statistics then I would say there doesn't need to be a rigid, objective criterion of 50%, 40%.

But if it is consistently low in a variety of factors, like 0% – that would be a key one [laughter] – or 10%. But going back to what you were saying about 9.2; you mentioned that someone couldn't attend a meeting but then not say anything, or they could be there and then opening a browser tab and doing whatever else and not paying attention to the meeting, and they're only there to put a tick next to "I was on this call".

What could happen is you could measure who attended each meeting, whether any text was mentioned in the chat, and given that all the meetings, have transcripts, whether there's enough… I don't know what the threshold would be, but if there was a presence of that person speaking during the teleconference. Something like that? And in my mind it's a complete absence.

So if you see somebody who is attending the calls but then you don't see anything in the chat or the transcript, then what exactly is happening? And I agree, a person may not be able to attend calls due to illness or whatever, but are playing roles within that Working Group, like the penholder or contributing on a mailing list, and meaning that they are following the discussion.

Maybe they couldn't attend that call because of the schedule, but they listened to the transcript and says, "here, I have this to say." That needs to be recognized in some way. Those are my initial thoughts.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Dev. Those are extremely good thoughts, because how we do that is going to be the meaty part of the work we need to do, but also how we ensure that the community understands that is the almost equally challenging part. We don't need to have… The presence of data in a public way does not mean that data is useful. And I think we need to make sure that the information that is publicly available on these metrics is useful and is easy to use by the RALOs and the At-Large structures.

So the what to do is probably not as difficult as the how to do it, and more importantly how useful it is when we create these thresholds and indeed the measures and the tools. Tijani, over to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Cheryl. Even if I think that it is not useful to discuss now, because we would be obliged to re-discuss it on the next call, because we are very small as a group now, but Dev, you are dragging me into the discussion now. I think that attendance itself is an effort, and this effort has to be measured. So, you can come onto the call and not say anything, not write anything on the chat. You are there, so you have made an effort.

For sure, any contribution is another effort. So the measurement of this effort should be with multiple access, and we have to evaluate each kind of effort so that we will not disadvantage people who are not very talkative but who are efficient, and we don't have to disadvantage people who are efficient but don't attend. So we have to… The criteria must be with multiple parameters.

I think that this is something that we have to write and propose for the next call. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Tijani. I must say, I think you've raised some extremely important points, because it is going to lead us to another aspect of our work. And I want to come back to that, so if you could all think on what Tijani has just said while I deal en-masse with the remainder of Part (b), Section (9) of the Rules of Procedure. I just want us to establish an understanding and see whether you all agree with me:

From 9.5 on it talks about the ALAC having the right to withdraw appointments of ALAC appointees, it talks about how the Chair is empowered to deal with performance and remediation – that's the Chair of the ALAC. One would assume that regional rules, in some future point in time, could perhaps reflect bad for themselves as well. And we do need to think about regional harmonization and rules while we're doing all of this.

And indeed 9.7 talks about the types of actions that could happen in terms of that remediation process. 9.8 goes on to make sure the ICANN ombudsman process is arranged and part of the suite of coping mechanisms, and of course 9.9 I'm going to read for the record, because between 9.4 and 9.9, they all talk about the things that are not what our Working Group needs to care about.

That's pretty much the ALAC business and that would happen as a response to a measure and degree of performance that we are trying to establish not being held or met. So let's assume that our business is not to deal with those, but we do need to have a look at 9.9, and I'll read that for the record now. 9.9 states: "the ALAC is empowered to publish an adjunct document, metrics of remedial actions for ALAC Members and appointees."

So that is the title that the adjunct document must have to: "describe in fuller detail the metrics mentioned in Paragraph 9.2 to 9.4 and actions referenced in 9.7." So the rules are ask us or state that the ALAC is required to publish an adjunct document. Our work would be very much the first part of that adjunct document description; that the description in fuller detail of the metrics referenced in 9.2 and 9.4 is the work we will be doing – and I'm going to ask you to all agree on that –, or modified or not.

But I would like to propose to you, and I'll just nudge my sleeping husband to turn his alarm off, which has just started to go, that actions described in 9.7 are not the business of this group. So, I need you to now think of a response in two parts. Do you first of all agree that is the

work of our group to create the material that can be used by the ALAC in the adjunct document list in 9.9 that is as follows: "the fuller description of the metrics detail in Paragraph 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4. If you agree with that as our primary objective, could you indicate that you do agree – either on chat or via popping up a green tick?

I'm certainly going to agree because I'm bias and I think that's exactly what we should be doing. But I do want to make sure that that is the thought of the meeting. And can we just look into our crystal ball and assume with everyone else on the call agreeing that Olivier no doubt would, and I'm pretty sure Alan probably would as well. So that's good. We've established that.

My next question might be somewhat more difficult for you to answer. I'm going to just clear my 'agree' before I ask the question. Do you agree that it is not the work of this Working Group to discuss or further outline the actions referenced in Paragraph 9.7 of the ALAC Rules of Procedure and that that is the At-Large AC's business to elect or select or identify a way that that material can be prepared?

So, do you agree that it is not our business to deal with the actions referenced in 9.7? And that's probably going to take you a little bit longer to decide. Ah, Maureen's jumped in with an agreement, as has Dev. I'm waiting for Tijani because I don't want to bias it. Well, I will do. I'm certainly in agreement. Good, okay. That's hugely important ladies and gentlemen and I want to thank you all very much for that, because it would have been a massive piece of work otherwise.

Tijani, I saw your hand go up. Please, go ahead. You might be muted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello. It wasn't a hand. When I removed the green tick my hand was raised, that's all. I don't have anything to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [laughs] Sorry about my giggling but I did very much want to make sure that we, at least, could set this parameter for this Working Group. I'm going to take an AI to modify with Staff our Working Group page and put at least these primary objective – they're not the only objective that this Working Group may have – but report to the Wiki and therefore the world, and raise at the ALAC meeting next week, that the Working Group would be positing to the ALAC that this is one of our primary purposes and that we are definitely not going to be dealing with the 9.7 section.

If that's the case then we've now got a fairly well-established paddock to run in and we now need to get a little bit of planning done on how we're going to do our work. We've heard in today's discussion – and both Dev and Tijani have brought this particularly to the forefront of our thoughts here – that there may need to be a multi-faceted or perhaps layered approach to a number of these metrics.

And I wondered, because we have the benefit of Dev and Tijani's experience in measuring tools and effective abilities of reporting, whether what we should be doing early on is experimenting or making

some proposals on how this publicly available material might need to be presented. And Dev, your Technology Taskforce Team probably has the best possibly handle on capabilities and alternatives here, but I wanted to make sure – and this is where I'm going to call on Tijani to temper all of this conversation and act as the economic rationalist for us all.

Whilst I trust in my conversation Dev and his Team – and indeed any and all of us, but I'm particularly looking for the leadership of Dev on this – could bring in a lot of concepts and mechanisms that we could use as dashboards or reporting tools.   And Dev, I don't care if it's just a spreadsheet with colored columns – whatever works works, right? But we've already established, even in today's call, that it's probably going to need to be annotated.

We certainly aren't just going to have a red and a green box or a simple go or no-go. I think we've probably established that already. This means that somebody or something is going to have to not only data collect and dump information in, but a subjectivity has to be there. As soon as we bring in subjectivity we bring in who does it, how is it done?

And I've got to look towards Tijani to act as our economic rationalist and make sure that every time we come up with an idea of how something can be measured and what it should be that is measured, his job is going to be to make sure: "and how much time does it take and who is able to do it?" question is asked.

Because I'm quite sure Heidi would love to have a Staff of 110, but she doesn't. Well, she probably doesn't want to have a Staff of 110 because

she'd do nothing else than line manage and human resource, but she'd probably be more happy to have more Staff to do the work than her Team does. But unfortunately, they probably aren't going to do that for her. But we do need to make sure that it's humanly possible and indeed financially possible to do that.

Tijani, because you've worked so very well with the general economic rationalists in our world, with Dev and his Team, I'd like you to make sure you keep us on the straight and narrow on all of these things in our future discussions. So Dev, if you can help us come up with all the crazy ideas and Tijani, if you can help us make sure that we don't need another five people on Staff to actually do it [laughs], that would be great.

I'm going to ask Maureen to take the role of acting in some way as a benchmark on how useful these tools are to the regions and the ALSes. So every time we come up with something in our future deliberations, Maureen, if Dev comes up with the idea and Tijani says: "this is fine but it's probably not going to be practical in the following ways," or: "this is fine but do we realize it's going to take this much more time or funding?"

We only need to recognize that. We don't need to say whether that's a go or a no, but if he brought that forward we could deal with it. And Maureen, I want you to be the human factor. I want you to say: "this is crap! It's all very good to have that but what does it mean?" Or: "that's fantastic but how does that get used?" So I want you to play the… Well,

I thought you'd be good at that. She's pretty happy to liaise between Dev and Tijani. But I think we do need those three levels of checking.

So I'm going to ask you guys to take the ownership of those things. I'm going to leave… Olivier has obviously got a vested interest in this because anything that is measured and is not meeting the recognized standards of performance is clearly in the Chair's remit to deal with. And I'm sure he will jump in at any time when it's not going to be practical or it's creating a nightmare for him.

Maureen has said she's also going to own the passing of these ideas onto the ALSes and get feedback. That's fantastic. Maureen, I'd like to empower you to work directly with Staff and just keep us informed as a Working Group on how and when you might be polling the ALSes. For example, it might be quite useful if Nathalie gives us a little practice and experience on the polling tool that exists within the Adobe Connect system.

There are a bunch of tools that our meeting equipment has that we very rarely work, and you might find for example that giving you the capability of putting up a poll question and visiting each of the RALOs over the next couple of months and giving them a quick poll question and then… You don't have to stay for the rest of the meeting. You've got the data and you can leave again.

That's one way you might want to go forward. So again, you come up with the crazy ideas and I think you'll find that it's not all about putting out [01:06:25] polls and things like that. There are a whole lot of cheap

and cheerful tools that we have access to and just don't use regularly. So I'm going to task Nathalie and Maureen to get together. And Dev, if the Team there hasn't come up with something you think would be a good idea to use and your Taskforce is aware of, I'd like to make sure that we engage our community and Maureen's ownership of going out to the ALSes is going to be extremely important here.

Anything that can make that job easier – if you want to toss that across via the list and to the girls to perhaps work with, that would be good. Heidi, I'm going to ask your indulgence, because if Maureen is going to interact with the ALSes and RALOs, obviously she will work hand-in-hand with at least one of the representatives from each of those regions in each of those things. And Maureen's very good in making sure people feel properly recognized and engaged.

But I do want to make sure that the leadership for each of the RALOs are comfortable with this, and to that end I would suggest that she's probably also going to have to liaise with Silvia in her capacity as working with the RALOs. So Heidi, I don't know how you want to own that allocation of task, but if you could make sure that the right conversation happens between Maureen and Silvia on this… I don't want to have us jump on any toes.

I don't want us to try and get… I think Maureen should be involved. I want her to feel that she's already had an entrée card given by the leadership in the RALOs, and if Silvia could facilitate that I think that's the appropriate way. Unless of course Heidi comes up with an alternative, and that's totally within her rights, but it appears to me that

working with Silvia on that aspect might be very important. But if Maureen can own that I know she'll do a good job, but we do need to make her job as easy as possible.

I'm going to leave that up to you girls to sort out and get back to us at the next call. I've mentioned that we're probably going to need to report back to each other via list. I think it is a desirable thing to copy in the list on things that you are planning or doing, or send a short report back on things as they progress. And that means that people who aren't on calls don't have to go through the complete call recordings and transcripts – although they will be made available quite promptly – for each of our calls.

I have personally found them extremely valuable to get up to speed on things that I've missed over the various§ years. So that will be happening. But I do want to ask, are there any collaborative tools or work practices that you all think we should be using? Dev, is there anything that's testable or hot off the presses or that you're excited about from the Technology Taskforce that you'd like to suggest we use? Or do we just stick to Wikis, lists and virtual meetings?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hi. Well, I have to say that the Technology Taskforce has been using Lucid Meetings for quite some months for conference calls, and I must say I've gotten really accustomed to it. I think it's an easy way of setting an Agenda and then driving the Agenda forward, in a sense that because… Well, Lucid Meetings offers the facility of keeping track of

what's being presented as a topic and how much time was spent on it. It requires a more timely set up, to set up the Agenda beforehand. But I think it works out quite well to ensure that all the points are covered in the Agenda.

And if you are running out of time then that means you need to adjust the Agendas to put less stuff on the Agenda or add more meetings and calls. I also find it much more forgiving on all the machines. It's not as hardware intensive as Adobe Connect.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So are you suggesting that you'd like us to run our Working Group meeting on Lucid in future, or that any Work Teams that we create might benefit from that? Or both?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: The Work Teams might benefit from that, I would say. It depends on how frequently our meetings would be on the metrics. I think it comes down to the frequency of the meetings between now and Buenos Aires. If you would like to… I don't think it's worthwhile to do a switch now at this point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, in that case could I suggest…? I'd love to have an opportunity to use Lucid Meetings. I need to have hands-on experience with it. I certainly know the background of it and I think it's well worth trying. So

let's make the following proposal, that any of our Work Teams – Maureen, that's anything you want to do with any of the other people, and Dev, if you're doing something with Tijani that needs to be work-shopped with a few of the regional people.

Let's assume that any Work Team activities will be set up into Lucid. That between now and Buenos Aires we will probably speak with Adobe Connect, but I'd like to review that after Buenos Aires, because the nature of our work will have changed significantly by then and we should be left as a Committee as a whole and large fluffy bits and more into deep and meaningful.

Let's look at this frequency of meetings, which jumps down to Item #6, but that's all right, I'm [01:14:07] with the Agenda and I'm assuming Lucid will be too. Between now and Buenos Aires I had thought this Working Group would probably need to meet fortnightly. I'd like to know what you all think about that. Maureen's typing. Oh, I've got you all typing.

Maureen's saying meeting in the working hours for me is a problem because I'm competing with other issues. Of course. Understood. At the moment Maureen we're not talking about the time of the meeting, just the frequency of the meetings. But we will certainly get back to the time of the meeting. This was one that the Doodle poll said but we can change that. "Frequency isn't a problem." Thank you for that Maureen.

Dev and Tijani, do you think fortnightly is a yay or a nay?

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Cheryl, are you proposing four calls between now and Buenos Aires?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is that fortnightly? Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think it's not enough. If you want to have something ready for Buenos Aires it's not enough.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hang on, I'm talking about the whole Working Group meeting fortnightly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Oh, okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm hoping that component parts will do as they need to do and get back to us. Okay, so let's lock that in. Dev, what's your point?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Fortnightly meetings are good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I missed some of that Dev, could you say it again?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I said green tick. Fortnightly meetings are fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. That's good because now Staff can try and organize it, at least from a frequency point of view. So we have a meet fortnightly. Maureen has noted that working hours is a problem. Maureen, how much later or earlier than this time would be good for you? Can you let us know? Now, I'm not suggesting that we're necessarily only going to have a fixed time, but I did want to know what time-range Staff needs to put on Doodle.

Let's work this out. Four hours ahead, any time before 8:00 am, that's before 4:00. That certainly doesn't bother me and I'm quite sure Africa and Europe would be delighted with that. Okay. Nathalie, can you make sure we've got a Doodle timing that is at least pre 4:00. These are the times that I absolutely detest. I detest doing meetings between 1:00 and 3:00 in the morning, but there you go. Tough on me.

The other thing I want to establish before we ask how that Doodle's organized, is what do you all think about a rotation of time, that what we do is perhaps give a Doodle with greater choices of time, but that we look at the three most popular times and rotate around them? Or do we tick a time and then just go around the clock, so we have eight-hour

shifts between those time zones? What do you think is the best way forward?

Tijani, I'd like to see what your desires would be on that. Pick the three most popular times and rotate, or the two most popular times and alternate? Or pick a time and then shift it around the clock? Or not? Tijani? Fixed time for Tijani. Dev, your view?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'm quite willing to accommodate rotation, having a time and rotating it. Once there's enough advance notification of that meeting. It's up to the other Members. I'm flexible.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, you, like me, are pretty flexible as long as it gets in the diary early enough.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that we need to try and find a common time for everyone; a time that will be convenient for everyone, and we make it a fixed time. This is better because it's something I note it on my Agenda and I will not forget, but this week we will not have it in the morning, we'll have it in the afternoon.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. All right then. So to that end, Nathalie – you have a good knowledge of the time zones that not only those that are on the call today are on, but the rest of the Working Group. And also you know those times when we already have commitments –, if you can take on the mammoth task now of trying to sort out a Doodle, to make it clear that this is for a fixed time for fortnightly meetings of the Working Group of a whole between now and Buenos Aires.

And make sure that we fit in some times that are pre-8:00 am Maureen's time. We might just ask Maureen, how early can we make those? Is it between 6:00 am and 8:00 am your time, or 5:00 am and 8:00 am? And what about your evenings? You don't have to tell us now, but if you can certainly let Nathalie know, maybe with two sets; either end of your day? Because we're more likely to find a time if we have your ideal times of am and pm in the Doodle poll.

I think we will find a time that meets the Europe and Africa as well. So that would be good. And the Latin Americans and Australians will just wear it. [laughs] Dev, as I was saying to Matt, is probably up all night. It doesn't matter if it's morning, noon or night. And Olivier is a Chair so of course he has to be available 24/7! So let's do that.

I would like to just finish of Item #6 on our Agenda now, which is, do we wish to have – and I apologise to Heidi for not being able to get back to her to establish that we would or would not be having a face-to-face meeting in Buenos Aires, but we haven't had this meeting until now –, a face-to-face meeting in Buenos Aires? If so, I'm assuming it would need to be a 90-minute slot.

So that's the question. Do you want to see if we can find a 90-minute slot, but certainly nothing less than a 45-minute slot, in the Buenos Aires schedule? If you could indicate a yes or a no in the chat, yell out so the audio can hear it or put a tick… I see Tijani putting up a tick. And Dev. I'm certainly happy to have one. Maureen is, and Olivier will be there if it's humanly possible, and he can be in five or seven places at once.

Heidi, the answer to your question that I have neglected responding to on a meeting possibility is yes. The Working Group would very much like to meet in Buenos Aires. Now the question is when, and that I'm afraid we're going to leave totally up to the Staff.

Nathalie, you're going to have to have a look also at any clashes that are going to come out from the NomCom as well, but my guess is we would probably be wanting to meet – either if there's space where Working Groups going to be meeting in parallel on the Sunday, or it would be a Tuesday activity if possible. And obviously, as Tijani has said, do try very hard to not have a conflicting time.

So Heidi, can you explain…? The meeting schedule is full. There's likely to be a conflict over another At-Large meeting. Is there a time when there is a minimum risk, do you know? Can you advise us on that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I'm just looking. You've asked for a 90-minute session but if you're willing to have a 60-minute session, Sunday at 8:00 to 9:00 is a possibility. I don't know if you're available for that? Monday lunchtime,

13:00 to 14:00 is available. Shall I keep going? If you don't mind going over… Let's see… No, Tuesday is packed. Tuesday you're going to conflict either… Tuesday is not a good day.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's ignore Tuesday. Tijani has asked very much that we try and choose a non-conflicting time so let's stick to those. Tijani, do you want to speak while Heidi is looking through the…?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes please. Heidi, what about the slot that we planned for the joint meeting for the groups for the Capacity Building, for… The Wednesday afternoon?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier has asked that that remain in case we need more time, so I'm going to confirm that with Eduardo, but he's asked that that slot remain as is. There is a slot if you don't mind meeting during lunch, on Wednesday between 13:00 and 14:00. And that's basically it. We've heard now that Monday afternoon is likely going to be a black-out period, so that limits issues, and then we've also heard that the public forum is going to most likely be Thursday morning.

So that means that the wrap-up session is going to be moved to Thursday afternoon. So again, you couldn't perhaps meet Thursday in

the late afternoon? I don't know the time but it might be 15:00 to 16:30 on Thursday?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's recognize that Thursday afternoon it's quite possible that some people's travel arrangements will kick in as well, and we might be better to try and avoid that unless we have to.

HEIDI ULLRICH: What about the lunchtime then? What about Wednesday, 13:00 to 14:00?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, let's put it to the meeting. We've got 8:00 Sunday morning, so we're having a 60-minute meeting, that's established because that's the time that's available. We've got a 60-minute meeting. It's either going to be Sunday at 8:00 or Monday or Wednesday at 13:00. I've heard that Sunday is fine for Maureen, but now she knows the rest of the options. Can I just ask, is there anyone that has a preference for the lunch options over the breakfast option? I'm not fussed one way or the other.

If there's no objections to either of those, do you want to get this done as early as possible in the process, in other words either the Sunday morning or the Monday lunch? Or do you want to look at all three? Maureen's easy. Good to know.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	May I add one item? I do note that the Metrics Working Group is scheduled for an update during the ALAC policy discussion part one on Tuesday morning.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Well, I think we certainly wiped Wednesday out. So we're now looking at the Sunday first thing, and I'm seeing from both Tijani and Dev that Sunday, let's do it then. So Heidi, if you would be so kind as to slot us in for 8:00 Sunday morning, and we will do our best to find a space that at least allows us to bring a croissant and coffee in, if not have a croissant and coffee available. Do we know what the arrangements for "breakfast meetings" are in Buenos Aires yet, or not?
	Sometimes we've had to bring our cups of coffee and a croissant in with us and at other times we've arrived and there's been a proper coffee and a piece of cake available. Do we know what the…?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yes. Breakfast is included. We're going to be asking everyone to have their breakfast prior to that. Additional coffee at the meeting? Likely no. Catering costs are extremely high in Buenos Aires.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Exactly. That was the reason for my point, to make sure that we were very clear. So it'll be 8:00 in the ALAC room in Buenos Aires, and we'll have all dined before, so there's no problem bringing coffee into the

room obviously, to those of you that need your intravenous transfusions of caffeine in the morning. I'm sure you'll be able to do that. Terrific. Okay. Nathalie, can I ask you to make sure that is blacked out in my diary please? And therefore [01:31:12] and no one else in the known universe does something silly like triple-book me.

And the same would be appreciated if you could pop it into Olivier's diary and of course if you have control of anyone else's life – I don't know if you manage anyone else, but just pop that in. That would be great. Okay, I apologise for us being ten minutes over time at the end of this meeting, but then we were ten minutes over time at the beginning. We will be meeting a fortnight [10th? 01:31:42].

We will have a Doodle poll. We'll be meeting at a fixed time. We now have our meeting in Buenos Aires organized. We have a couple of AIs. Are Staff clear on those? I've got one to work in the Wiki, and there are a couple with Nathalie and Maureen working with each other and I'm quite sure that Dev will come up with some concepts on how we might be able to actually set up some of these metrics, because it's quite clear that we're going to have to have a layer approach.

Nathalie's noted that she's going to send the AIs through at the end of this call. I'm going to quickly hop back to Item #5, which I doubt we will have very much of but is there any other business? Hearing none, seeing none, and thanking you for spending an extra ten minutes of your life with us today, but noting that it did take us ten minutes to get what we could consider a regionally-represented quorum together, I'd like to thank you one and all.

If we can get a bit of list discussion and activity going that might encourage those who were not able to join us on the call today to get involved. Thank you one and all. This call is now completed. Bye for now.

[general goodbyes]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]