
NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. This is the At-Large Metrics Working Group call on Thursday, 6th of February 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Oksana Prykhodko, Darlene Thompson, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. We have apologies from Tijani Ben Jemaa and Baudouin Schombe. From staff, we have Gisella Gruber, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Nathalie, and apologies for crackling noises on the audio track, but you can either have that or apparently not hear me.

I just wanted to, before we start going into in any of the action items, that we have – and they are up on screen now – thank you very much, Nathalie. To not that there was a little hiccup in the agenda which I'm sure is just a matter of the cut-and-paste from the October agenda coming across as the draft agenda for our February meeting.

I have gone as far as square bracketing the dial-outs] which were listed after I added my own name in and also the apologies from Tijani. I wasn't sure whether or not – because they were exactly the same listing as in the October – as to whether or not they're accurate.

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.

I'll go back in, ladies, and remove those square brackets, but it's probably a good thing if we're going to just cut-and-paste one agenda from one month to be a draft for a following one to make those spaces blank until we confirm later so it's a little less confusing for people like me.

Moving then into the review of the outcomes and action items of our last meeting, which was in fact our Buenos Aires face-to-face meeting, and again there is an errata here. I've just noticed it. Sorry. I apologize.

In the agenda item two, there are no open AIs, so we'll just be going through the action items from the At-Large Metrics Working group as listed on your Adobe Connection screen. The open AIs that are referred to on that agenda in fact is also a carryover of cutting and pasting from the previous meeting.

Thank you, Alan, for your private note to me. I appreciate all the support I can get.

The action items that are open, I think – let's quickly go through them all – will all be covered by the reporting. Although we probably do need to check when Maureen talks about the work that she's doing in her sub-team whether or not she's had success working with some of the additional people who offered assistance during the Buenos Aires meeting and just to double check that when Dave is giving his update that he does let us know what, if anything, has happened with the attendance issues.

Moving on then from the action items, let's jump straight into it. Although before I do that, please, may I have an indulgence, just a

request? When I was reviewing the notes, the transcript that is linked from our meetings page for Buenos Aires, I did find it – and I don't know whether it's just me. Alan possibly is the only other one I know who regularly goes through transcripts. But I did find it just the tiniest bit disconcerting that, in fact, what is attached to our meeting section is in fact the transcript of the whole morning session.

Now, you may not think that's all that annoying, but if you're trying to scan through pages and find things, there's a vast difference between scanning between 158 pages and scanning through I think it might have been about 28 or 30 pages.

So if I could prevail on staff – not as a matter of urgency, but just when they have time – to open up that transcript document from ICANN 15 in Buenos Aires and cut just our part out, which I think only runs about 28 or 30 pages, and have that listed on our public record. It will make going back in the fullness of time a whole lot easier. It certainly it would have been easier for me as I was doing a review. So we might make that a little AI out of today's call.

Okay, jumping right into it then, before I open up to the specifics on the work team update, could I just ask if there is anything anyone wants to raise – I see Olivier – coming out of the Buenos Aires meeting? So if you've kind of reviewed and had a look at any of the issues, even if they weren't raised anything specific in the Buenos Aires meeting, please make your thoughts known now. Over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed. Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you. I'm just asking, with regards to what you just mentioned about the transcript, can we just follow up on this afterwards? Because you touched on something, whether the transcripts are just one go for the whole morning, or whether your section was a sub-part of the whole morning.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, we can follow up. I can assure you what is listed on our meeting page for the Metrics subcommittee is 158 pages of transcript. That is your whole....

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's very bizarre, indeed. Thank you for alerting us to that. I wasn't aware that the – if you were part of a wider reporting in the ALAC morning session, then fine. But if it's a separate working group thing, then I would have thought that both the recording and the transcript would have been separate. So I'll ask our staff to keep me in the loop on this as well, please, because it might be the case for other meetings as well, and that certainly is accessibility issue for information as far as I'm concerned.

I won't waste any more of your time. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello, Olivier. We will look into this because normally they are separated. So we will definitely look into it. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And perhaps, Olivier, just to finish up on that, it might be appropriate just to remind all of us in going through the transcripts – that includes people like you and me, Olivier – to make it really clear when a session is ending and the session is starting when things seem to be continuous in a morning's activity.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Understood. Thank you. Yeah, let's do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because having looked at the transcript neither of us did that very well. If you read what was being said, you'd know it's a transition, but if wasn't made clear this is a hard stop. Please note this, transcribers. And maybe we should be doing that. We'll get it better.

So, who would like to go first – Maureen or Dev? Seeing as we don't have Tijani today.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: I don't mind going first.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Thank you. I must admit I've put on the [inaudible] workspace, I use that as my sort of like load everything that I got from anyone onto just so that everybody could see the sorts of conversations that were actually coming from the various groups.

There was a range of comments and commentaries and things. And I think what I tried to do over the last week was to just sort of like summarize. We would probably rather talk about this later in the meeting. I'm not quite sure when you want me to talk about it, but we should probably summarize.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Now? Okay. I think one of the things that I think the overriding thing that I was actually sort of like getting from everybody was, of course, the whole metrics thing and counting and that sort of thing wasn't sort of like seeming to be appropriate. There was not – can you hear my roosters?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yup.

MAUREEN HLLYARD: There just didn't seem to be any real – and I can appreciate that because we knew that was the feedback we were going to get. I think that of the feedback that I got from NARALO – [inaudible] sessions with NARALO/APRALO were very forward in their contributions. But I think that what I got out of it was that people wanted to be more output generators. Like what were people doing in these groups? Not so much that they were attending, but what were they actually contributing to the group?

So the main outputs were [inaudible] that it was more performance-oriented in relation to their task output. So what I did was, just this morning while I was waiting at 6:00 this morning, was actually sort of outlines. I'm not quite sure if you're on that particular page, the [inaudible] workspace.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just break in there? Is it possible, Nathalie, for you to go and grab that off the page that Maureen is referring to and pop it into the screen please? Because certainly I can't follow a link if we've just put the link in, unfortunately.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: I will check that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Keep going, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Because there was a problem about who would actually do the monitoring, who would do the counting, who would do all those little tasks, these were things that came up in discussion. It was probably thought that perhaps the ALAC members themselves could take more responsibility. So this morning I thought I'd put together like, for example, my task list up. Does everyone – is it up there?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Could you just put the link into the chat so, first of all, those who can follow links can put it up there.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: I have got the link. Yes. Oh, hang on, sorry. I've put it somewhere.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Maureen. Appreciate it. Back to you again.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Yeah, so if you can get into that link and go down to the bottom of the page, what I've actually got is a sample of what sort of groups people were involved in and positions that they hold. Because one of the things that came up too was that if you're on the ALAC, you should be actually showing leadership.

The leadership role is actually very important, so therefore there should be a predominance of involvement that actually shows leadership and probably a little bit more contribution and a little bit more leadership in

the actual contribution role within each of the working groups. It's just a sample, just something that I thought of now.

Olivier gave me a sample of what the GNSO was doing, and theirs was more numbers oriented. I think from the sessions that I was actually getting from, the contributions that I was actually getting from the members who have contributed to this discussion it was that they just needed to know more about not so much the numbers but what it is that people were actually doing.

So if you go right down the very bottom of that, I think you can all scroll down. It doesn't go right down to the bottom.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've been to the end of page six, which seems to have all your comments but not the work you've been recently referring to.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Staff, [inaudible] copy-and-paste the comments that Maureen has put in. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Yeah. The actual comments made by members hasn't come through. But I didn't get any feedback from LACRALO after the meeting. I've got comments from all the groups over the period time from Buenos Aires

and after. It sort of gave me a pretty good picture of what it is that people are expecting, and the numbers thing doesn't go down very well.

So it's actually trying to find an alternative that meets the needs because this is one of the things that I think we were trying to get from NARALO. What is it that they actually want? What kind of information do they actually want to know about if we're looking at performance [inaudible], what is it that they want to know, that basically they need to know?

So what I've actually listed in my recommendations and my reports and in my sample table is really, as I said, only a recommendation and I'd really like some comments. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I'm going to ask at the moment – and, Alan, I see you've got your hand up. And what I'd like to do is ask you is it germane to this or to another section because I'd like to actually have a discussion on this now and open the floor to what Maureen has just presented.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's very germane to this, what has been.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go, sir. Go for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. As a diversion in the cold lands up North, we've just celebrated Groundhog Day, where the groundhog tells us whether winter will continue forever – and by the way, the answer was yes. The movie Groundhog Day is centered around that, but this sort of things being repeated over and over again, ad infinitum, and that's the feeling I have at this point.

Is staff in a position to put up the rules of procedure in the center box?
Is that a yes or a no?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I believe they will be.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. When we get there, I'd like you to scroll to Section 9.2.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Nathalie. It is happening, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The discussion is well-focused that Maureen has reported, but we've already had it. The rules of procedure we spent a long time – remember, this group is supposed to be refining what is in the rules of procedure – and the rules of procedure already lay out some guidelines. And when we get 9.2 up, you'll see that we already had this whole discussion.

Okay, we have our own scrolling, so if you scroll down to 9.2, you'll see what I'm talking about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Which is about page 13, I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: About 40% down into the document.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, I've just dropped, but I haven't dropped out of the Adobe room.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay. I'll read it for those who can't scroll themselves or can't look at it themselves as soon as I get it on my screen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: "A variety of metrics will be maintained related to quantifiable performance aspects to ensure that all ALAC members and appointees are aware of their performance" – and there's something wrong with the document I see, so I'll read it from my screen – "and to support the chair in the responsibility of monitoring such performance. Such metrics will include but are not limited to

-
1. Meeting attendance, which includes sending prior notice if attendance is not possible. Attendance will be based on individual ALAC sessions for meetings held during an ICANN meeting.
 2. Participation in the decisions in [votes] of the ALAC.
 3. Participation in roles played in ALAC working groups as well as those of other bodies with ICANN.”

So all of the things suggested by Maureen’s working groups are quite appropriate and suitable, but we’ve already made that decision. Our challenge is to figure out how to do it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for that, Alan. I think, if we can somehow project the table that Maureen has put together based on the feedback from her sub-team’s work which of course is all about building trust, consensus, and understanding of these performance metrics out at the edges which after all is where they are most relevant.

I certainly when I look through the six pages that were put up just a minute ago from the workspace could only see at the end of the sixth page the first I could see Silvia was something that was a comment from Winthrop. I couldn’t see a table that I believe Maureen was referring to.

Without holding up that conversation too much longer, I think what we do need to do is all go now and have a look at this proposal from Maureen. Because after all, it’s very clear to any of us who’ve been in this game long enough – by “this game” I don’t mean just ICANN but

metrics and measurements in general – that purely quantitative is not the answer and truly qualitative is often onerous.

One of the things that strikes me – and without having looked at your table, Maureen; I do apologize for that, but I can't multitask too far just at the moment; I've only got two screens open – is that now that we have transcripts I think virtually unless otherwise requested work groups of any significance at least meetings have the routine transcription process applied to them, providing they are recorded, of course, that does mean that we could from a tabular approach link activities that individuals have.

For example, if you're a leader – if you're a chair of a working group committee – you're going to be not there and you're not running the meeting, then you're not being a chair. So you're going to be dealing and contributing or not the chair anymore.

But if you're just an attendee at a work group or work team activity, there is a possibility of quick scan and measure should anyone desire to do so. I'm not suggesting we should say staff or people need to.

But I think if we just link some of the more quantitative stuff, such as the GNSO is doing, to some of the qualitative stuff that can be drawn making sure, for example, that transcriptions are always available and accurate somehow at each of the meetings, it's then fairly simple for people to go through and do a sample test. Maybe we do need to sample from time to time.

Perhaps if a question of whether someone is contributing or not is raised, one of the tests that could be applied would be a quick review of

some transcripts of the work group or work groups to see whether not they appear as contributing in at least an auditory fashion, remembering that's not a perfect measure either because of course sometimes we're doing more on chat or in the other ways, such as showing agreement or disagreement in polling, etc. So none of these things are perfect, but I think what we need to do is get a combination that works.

Now, whilst we're on this subject, one of the things we might want to do is a little test case, and I would suggest we could do a test case on our own subcommittee. If this tabular approach that Maureen is suggesting goes ahead and with some refinement, I suspect it will be quite useful as a tool.

One of the things that might be well worthwhile is applying it to a couple of ALAC's own work groups or subcommittees. I'd certainly be happy to have it applied to our own. Knowing – and I would encourage you to go to our basic wiki page and look down the list of people who are listed as members of this sub-team – and those who've had regular attendance, we could certainly do better in our own measures with a few exceptions of the usual suspects, of course. They're all wonderful, and I love you all dearly because you all turn up and do the work.

Alan, your hand is still up. Are we still on the same topic?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, my hand is up again, actually.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. I can look at the table that Maureen referred to, and what it is is a table that each person can contribute showing what they've done in the last six months or year or whatever it is or month and how many meetings they've attended.

I'm sympathetic that we're worried about keeping staff's load to a reasonable amount, but I guess my inclination on that kind of methodology is we will end up having staff spend far more time bugging people who haven't gotten around to it and then integrating all of the individual submissions so that it's usable by the chair or by anyone else looking at the overall reports.

So I think we really, although we have to be cognizant of the staff load and I thought Dev's group is looking at that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we should be focusing more on not how we get the attendance metrics – that's methodology which is understood; we may be able to refine it and automate it to some extent – but how do we get the other non-quantitative ones into a form which is usable?

I think we're going to have far more substantive problems in this area both in collecting, assimilating and making available from a personal point of view that kind of information. I think that's what we need to encourage, these kind of discussions, the direction to go in.

Maureen's group I think was essential to get past the stage where we understand that, yes, we need more than just metrics, and yes, the other things are difficult. But I think now we have to start focusing on how to do those in a way that's usable. As onerous as collecting attendance is, it's a well-understood technology. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Certainly, Alan, and thank you for that. I would suggest what we should be doing – and remembering we're going to hear from Dev in just a moment – is intending to exactly bring that topic back to the wider table.

So in our reporting and our small sessions that we have I believe on the Sunday morning in Singapore, that's exactly what should be doing: coming back to our ALAC and regional leadership and wider community and saying, "Thank you. We heard what you said. Here are the plans as we see them at the moment. We'd like your opinion on these."

Over to you, Maureen, and then we'll go to Dev.

MAUREEN HILLYARD:

Thank you, Cheryl. Yeah, I was just going to say that I think that, even just putting that table together which I just did this morning I must admit, was sort of like a culmination of the comments that were coming

from interestingly the APRALO team. I was going to say it's just a recommendation that we can actually put to the members and get good feedback in Singapore. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. I appreciate the work you've done. Also, I think you've actually teased out a lot of good feedback from the ALSes and the regions. I think, as Alan said, it's a very important fact that we've gone through this exercise. I don't regret this exercise at all. I think it's essential. I think we need to take the exercise a little bit further.

But what I'd also like to do is ask each and every one of us – and here I mean not just "us" at this meeting but us in this work group – to have a look at what you've put together, Maureen, and perhaps put some feedback on the link.

So to that end, Maureen, when you've perhaps done a little bit more of mind modification and smoothing off of what you've put together as you say in short order today, if you'd be so kind as to send a link to the list and remind them that at this meeting we resolved that we would all have a look at this and do some intercessional between now and the next meeting activity on this.

Just while – and before I go to Dev for his feedback and he's probably got food for thought based on our conversation so far and I'm sure he's keen to look at options for this tabular approach and what our [inaudible] are saying – I can't help myself with Alan raising Groundhog Day again and just mention a particularly delightful image with the photo image with a caption on it about Groundhog Day.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I just sent the URL, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good, good. Where the wolf is just saying that it basically ate the groundhog. If winter was continuing, it was going to eat it. So it's a matter of killing the messenger. And that's something of course, Alan, we're trying to avoid in this particular situation. So I do hope you'll all look at that link and find it amusing. I certainly did, especially as I'm one who tends to run with wolves.

Now, on to Dev and remembering, Dev, to feel free to talk not only about the attendance issues and whatever happened in the BA meeting and the feedback on that but also any brainstorming that you might have had go through the old brain cells while you've been listening to Maureen's reporting.

Over to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you, Cheryl. Well, in terms of [inaudible] to really look at the mobile apps and so forth, and we've identified one: a program called Attendance2. I'll post a link to that in the chat. I think this probably works quite well. It imports and exports comma-separated values [inaudible] files, meaning that it will work well with importing and exporting data once we have it in our spreadsheet.

I've been trying to look at ways of how we could sort of automate the quantitative aspects of these metrics because I know one of the things about this is that it's seen as tedious to try to reenter this information again and so forth.

Unfortunately, I have to say I don't think it's going to auto-train to automate it. It's not going to work very well. It's just subject to too many problems in Confluence, and all it takes is just one little edit or one person to edit something and the thing just breaks.

So I am going to conclude that the only way to really effectively do this is that each working group, including the ALAC, has a spreadsheet for attendance. What happens is that after the attendance is taken after a meeting, there's a link that either staff or the chair of the working group can click on and then add that information afterwards.

I think also automating it with trying to do it with Confluence, there's also a risk that if Confluence is updated or even swapped out for another wiki platform, then again the system breaks. I think we need some sort of platform sort of independent from that so that the statistics can be reproducible at any time that we want to, both now and in the future.

So what I'm thinking of is that you have separate spreadsheets for each of the working groups, and then there will be one spreadsheet that can be used to pull the information when you want to try to do a query.

Okay, so if you want to try to do a query of report summary, it will be able to pull all of those spreadsheets and then come up with a

summary. Okay, this person is involved in these working groups, has attended X out of Y meetings and so forth.

You can then build on that and add quantitative aspects like, for example, counting the words in transcripts. If you can automate that aspect, that could probably also then be pulled into the spreadsheet.

So I know there's an AI that says I have to work with staff, and I don't think, unfortunately, that has happened as well as it could have. So I will follow up with staff and look to get some of the key information in the required formats. So I think we could try to use the attendance tool mobile app in time for the Singapore meeting.

I think I'll stop there, but just to note that I'm hearing the issues regarding qualitative analysis. I admit I don't really have a good effective solution for capturing that right now, but I'm still thinking of it.

So I think I'll stop there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Thank you very much. I do appreciate this particular work. I would like to not only leave that AI then open but also just ask if we can have some feedback from staff. I'm thinking here particularly Nathalie and Gisella because they are very aware how much work or otherwise it takes to do the quantitative analysis and recording that is already done in, for example, GNSO world. I'd like their ideas on that.

I know you will pursue it further with them but also remembering that now, of course, we've got Gisella back and this is her particular baby. It's something that she's had a huge amount of experience in – the good,

the bad, and the ugly of metrics and measurements – as part of the thing she’s done from the very start for us.

So I’d be very keen not only for her to obviously work with you and bring some ideas into the process as well but also look at the practicalities and what is actually duplication of time or otherwise.

But probably perhaps maybe she can formulate a reaction to Dev and maybe a commitment to have a separate conversation with him outside of this meeting to get back to us for next time. While you’re doing that, I’ll go to Alan. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I was going to suggest something similar to what you just said. I’ve participated in an awful lot of GNSO working groups, and I’ve never heard the comment made that keeping the attendance and keeping spreadsheets is an onerous task. So I guess I’m really interested in understanding: is there a difference, or is it indeed onerous but no one complains because we’re all good soldiers? I just wanted to put a tick mark beside what you just asked. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Great minds are thinking alike. Actually, Alan, it’s good to see that there will be a call with Dev. So, Dev, there is no escaping. Dev is going to track you down. So that’s it; that’s a done deal. That will be sorted out for little more time devoted I think for this topic of this sub-team at our next gathering.

I did want run today's call for 60 minutes, not the 90 minutes that was listed on the agenda. That's another thing I didn't address on the agenda. So just so you all know, I'm only planning the next 15 minutes or so for the rest of the meeting.

Can I ask now – now that we have the chat that Maureen was referring to, Maureen's table, up on screen – if you'd like to all just take a moment of two to have a look at it again. And, Maureen, back to you just to do a brief talk through again so we know exactly what we're looking at and what you're suggesting. Back to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILLYARD:

Thank you, Cheryl. I think one of the things I was thinking about trying to get at was that people from amongst the conversations that I was getting – and I think there were some very strong points coming up from a lot of that, what people were actually doing, what ALAC members were actually doing in the groups they were participating in – and these are just the more recent ones that we just had meetings about and the responsibilities that I've actually taken on.

But it does explain a little bit more about what [inaudible] word involvement – it's not just attending. Although we've got attendance listed, it's actually more of the participation and the contribution that people make to their actual working group. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just ask the question then: now I'm looking at this, am I to assume (and I think I am to assume) that these figures – 28, 16, 30, 13, etc. – are hours?

MAUREEN HILLYARD: No, no. They're the dates. They're the dates of the meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so that's not really clear then. Okay, because I looked at that and I thought....

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Yeah, yeah, because this where I'm [inaudible]. This is something to be discussed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure. And to that end, there might be aspects of this that would be better managed in a spreadsheet where the dates and things are done. As Dev was saying, in that system it's in a more automated fashion.

What I might do as well then, Dev, is to make sure you understand what this is proposing as well for your conversations. So maybe Maureen needs to be engaged now in your sub-team's activities just for this next little section.

Thanks very much for that. I just wanted to go back to that so we're all clear because I certainly wasn't. I was a little concerned about some of

the hours you were spending if that was the case. I did want to know what it was.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: No, not that much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks a lot. Now that said, it is quite possible for us to do something additional for people who are taking leadership roles and make some assumptions. For example, we may be able to make an assumption and give “credit where credit is due.”

But someone who is not only serving as chair, for example, of a work group but is actually performing as chair of work group – and those two things don’t always go together – that they will be perhaps for every hour or 45 minutes or 90 minutes (we can decide later) of actual meeting time there will be half as much time or twice as much time (again, we can decide later) but an amount of time that is assumed in preparatory. That should be credited as well, I think.

These are things that we need to talk on in our next step. Can I ask, is there anyone on the call who wants to raise any issues, points, or make any contributions to either Maureen or Dev, something at this stage?

Not hearing anyone and not seeing anyone, I’d like to go back to the question Oksana raised earlier in the chat, and that is: what if there is a misunderstanding or misconnection? Oksana, that’s very much where those outreach education and ongoing reporting with explanations needs to be made.

And I think it's incumbent on, in this case, the ALAC and individual ALAC members to make sure that their constituent communities – their regions, their RALOs, and of course the ALSes and the individuals in all of those categories – either have a clear understanding, or if they don't, have access to material which helps make that clear.

Something, for example, that comes to mind is that we might need to put together a little video or a little piece as the online education tool. This is the type of thing that would lend itself quite easily for some of the online learning tools that are being explored elsewhere in ICANN and used for the Academy.

I think what we should be doing is utilizing tools that are elsewhere being developed within the organization not just coming up with brand new things ourselves. So there are a lot of ways we can skin the cat but absolutely, Oksana, we need to be very certain we don't breed misinformation and misconnection.

One of the things I wanted to put out to both the sub-teams now – and that's particularly obviously Maureen and Dev, but I guess too maybe it does fit into Tijani's as well.

I wondered in terms of additional metrics and measures, it's not so much a metric and measure but a mechanism, whether between now and our next meeting you would like to consider and review and perhaps make some comments online how we would feel about having not an ordered system – which I think a lot of this concern about time taken and amount of commitment being made is getting caught up in the continuing reporting/auditing that might be required on these

metrics – but rather more that we set up a mechanism that has a component of peer review and not only have peer review but a compliance mechanism as well as peer review.

So for example – and let's just use this Metrics sub-team – as chair, should I not have a requirement on me to notify non-performing or underperforming members on whatever measures are existing that they are failing to perform? And if they are failing to perform, ask them is there a way that we can assist them or do they need to change the category to either? Either leave the group or become only an observer, not a contributor, to the group?

Is there going to be some merit in having a point in time where in each activity or in the ALAC perhaps quarterly or at each of the face-to-face meetings – those are three times a year – whether they go into closed sessions and they have a frank and fearless conversation with each other about who's pulling their weight and who isn't and how, indeed, those who feel they're working harder than others are can feel either vilified or vindicated and how those who thought they were doing all right but others aren't thinking that they are can be assisted to come up to speed?

I'm not suggesting the complexity of 360 reviews – although that is possible. The other way, of course, is a complaint system – having a mechanism by which Maureen can complain directly to me as chair of this working group that Great Aunt Mary Smith who has put their name into this group and has not attended or contributed a single thing should be spoken to.

I just want to throw that out there and sort of get the grease on the wheels for that for next time. And now I'll go to Alan. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'm going to comment on that, actually. I have a little bit of a problem with it. Those of you who are on the rules of procedure may remember me making a comment asking why we have rules like these about metrics when other groups don't, and the answer was it's because in the past we have perceived problems. We perceive those problems in general without having to look at the metrics. They're just the justification or the backup for it.

The kind of thing you're prescribing almost presumes that there are going to be significant problems. I guess I would prefer starting from the other side of saying, "Let's presume the norm should be people are doing work and we can identify the others."

So devoting time to a self-evaluation, which in our ideal world says everything is just hunky-dory but devoting time on a regular basis to that I think sends the wrong message.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, just on that, can I just say a self-evaluation versus a peer-review, they're two different things.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, and a self-evaluation which clashes with people's image of you I think is going to set off alarm bells and that's reasonable. Going into, as

you were suggesting, closed sessions and reviewing everybody I think is somewhat problematic. That doesn't mean the chair and one or two other people may not do it privately, but I wouldn't have any formal defined activity. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. All right. Another option there, of course – and again, this is all just food for thought for future conversation – you may have somebody's role. Some of the vice chairs or somebody from this committee could, in fact, perform an as required or ad hoc function on this.

Now, I'm not sure whether Olivier or Darlene had their hand up first, but I'm going to go to Darlene anyway. Over to you, Darlene.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Sorry, just unmuting myself. Further to what Alan was saying, I think it should be a bit of both. There should be a peer review group but also maybe a bit of self-evaluation. Now I don't think you should have to evaluate every last little thing you do, but I don't think it's really hard at the end of the month to say, "Here's what I did" in a short paragraph. "I helped to do this. I helped to make up a something" in a very short paragraph.

So I don't think that this is overly onerous. And if I know that at the end of the month I have to put in a short paragraph about what I've done in a group, I'm going to pay attention a lot better and make sure I'm doing

stuff so that I can say at the end of the month, “Yeah, I didn’t attend one meeting, and I didn’t do anything.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

DARLENE THOMPSON: So I think both would be very useful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that. I noticed that Fatimata is also coming in in support of that. It just strikes me in terms of the reporting of such self-evaluations, if indeed that is what you end up suggesting this could be, very simply put, this is something that does lend itself to being put on an individual’s wiki page.

And it may very well be that ALAC members should have a wiki page just as some of our liaisons do. And that this type of continuous reporting can be housed there along with the links and lists of what they are supposed to do, what they’ve been assigned to do, what they’ve put themselves up to do and be engaged in in a very similar line to what some of your liaisons already have been doing.

That would mean that people could view it as they wish and when they wanted to but also that people could have updates by just watching the page. So an ALS member who’s interested, an ALS regional leader, could just get an update when their ALAC representative increases their reporting or changes their page.

Darlene, is that hand still up, or will I go to Olivier.

DARLENE THOMPSON: I'm sorry. Go to Olivier.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Over to you, Boss.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Very interesting discussions here and certainly an interesting suggestion with regards to having individual members of the ALAC having pages that they would need to update.

That reminds me a little bit like some of the e-government initiatives that are taking place in several parts of the world where MPs – Members of Parliament – and other politicians are trying to effectively build better bridges with their community by having a page where they really show and tell them what they're up to and what they're doing and allow for people to respond to them and ask them questions directly. That's definitely something I hadn't thought about.

I didn't put my hand up to answer this, actually. I was going to just answer a question which I think Alan asked – or maybe not asked, but he mentioned that we appeared to be the only part of ICANN at the moment that is really spending much time on these metric things. Yes, the GNSO has some metrics about attendance in working groups and so on, but it doesn't appear to be actual performance metrics as such, at least not to my knowledge.

I'd like to see the things in a little bit of another way. I've seen that Fadi and his management team have implemented or are in the process of implementing a lot more metrics and ways to be able to track the overall health of the organization of ICANN – the organization and the staff structure.

I think that I usually see this as [inaudible] and also being able to establish what is the overall health of the ALAC and being able to sense the pulse of the ALAC. Finding out if we're doing well or not is something which I think is particularly important, especially when having some ex-members of the ALAC and even some outsiders that keep on accusing the At-Large Advisory Committee and the regional leaders and those people that are traveling to meetings as being freeloaders that are basically just there for the plane tickets and are not doing any work whatsoever.

I can't allow that to happen and we need to have the metrics not only as a thing to point out the people who are not doing any work but also to be able to have real proof of the work that we do and the work that our individual members do. So looking at it, as Alan said, in a very positive way rather than just focusing on the negatives. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sure. I think blowing your own trumpet is always a good idea. It's all about these days I think we call that "building a brand me." It'll just be a brand ALAC.

Okay, Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I guess I support a lot of what Olivier said. To be clear, when I said other groups aren't focusing on it, it's not that they're not keeping attendance. It's that they don't seem to be focusing on it as a problem.

Certainly from the GNSO point of view, I think it is against the culture of the GNSO to point to a council member and say, "You're not doing enough work." That just wouldn't be done, not in today's world anyway. So it's almost we're not allowed to speak of it. We will survive if you don't do any work, but we do track it.

I think the issue of defending us in the eyes of the rest of ICANN and the world, sadly, is a very important issue. There are people – and one or two very prominent people – who have very, very negative things to say about ALAC and its members, and At-Large for that matter, about not pulling weight and not doing any real work and doing this only for the travel.

We need to be able to counter that. Unfortunately, most people make those comments in venues where we don't have an opportunity to counter them, but nevertheless we do need the information. And that's the reason why the core issues were inserted into the rules of procedure, so it's not discretionary. It's something we need to do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: The trick is to find out how to do it in as painless a way as possible and in as effective a way as possible. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks for that, Alan. I am aware that I've snuck over my 60 minutes of the 90-minute time allocation, but I'm going to try to keep the rest of this meeting as short as humanly possible. But I do want to move quickly to ask if there's any other business.

If no one's got any other business, then I'm going to split and review our action items after we go through the next subject on the agenda, which of course is our next meetings – note the plural – in Singapore planning.

The Singapore meeting: we will be having a work group meeting 8:00-9:00 in the morning. That's 08:00 to 09:00 local Singapore time on the 17th [inaudible]. That's absolutely wrong. What time are we – 11:00, isn't it, Heidi, on the Sunday in Singapore?

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sunday morning in Singapore, anyway. I'm pretty sure it's not in the morning at 08:00. I think it's later than that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, that's actually in the afternoon. That's only an update. That's correct. That's only an update, or did you also want a face-to-face?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Well, in the update, how much time did we allocate? Was it 40? 15?

HEIDI ULLRICH: 15 minutes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 15 minutes. Okay. In that 15-minute update time, I really would like to have Maureen and Dev working almost as a team with the rest of us, obviously, to present this how we currently think we will be able to have the metrics reporting that sit with Section 9.2 of the rules of procedure and take it to the next step.

If at that same time we're in a position to also discuss things like individual ALAC member pages which fits in with the self-reporting, continuous disclosure and continuous review model, and the opportunity for peer review and, yes, probably even a small complaints procedure, then I think that would be great as well.

But what we need to do is keep it sharp and short but not spend any time in that 15 minutes going over how many meetings we've had and what we've decided to do. Rather, focus on a presentation of "How does this look? We think this meets some of the criteria, and have we missed anything?" conversation.

To that end, that's what we'll be doing in the update. I guess I should ask you: do you wish to have a face-to-face meeting specifically for this

in Singapore, or shall we try and work immediately after Singapore based on the feedback we get?

I'm not seeing people desperately keen to have a separate face-to-face, which is good. It means we get a little bit more in our agenda, but it does mean we do have to have our presentations nicely worked out for that update in that 15 minutes.

Heidi, if you'd be so kind as to send to the list the exact timing of that on the Sunday update in the afternoon, that will be terrific.

I'm assuming that we will be meeting again, well and truly before Singapore. I'd like to ask you now: do you want to meet in a fortnight? If so, we'll get a Doodle put out.

I'm suggesting we meet in fortnight. No one's screaming no, so we'll pop a Doodle out for that and pick up a little more – thanks, Darlene, for agreeing with that – a little more on what we've discussed here today from both Maureen and Dev's sub-team point of view and also integrate what if anything Tijani wants to bring in from his perspective, from his team's perspective, as well.

Now, the action items which I was about – we've got the ongoing action item which is with Dev and staff and we're now including Maureen in on that.

But the next agenda item was in fact, sorry, the meeting for the next agenda was doing a review on this tabular approach. Maureen is going to, so there's an action item on her but then an associated one on the

whole of the team to just play with this tabular chart that she put together today and put it out to the list.

And we will spending a bit of time in our next agenda in a fortnight looking at this and particularly getting feedback from Dev and, obviously, from staff in particular a little bit more about how we can come up with some clear proposals and solutions for the Singapore meeting.

With that, I'm about to close, and it will just be ten past the hour, which means having started five minutes late we're pretty much tracking to time.

But a little birdy told me it's Dev's birthday today. I wanted to suitably embarrass him with everyone applauding or, as I'm going to do, sing a verse of: "Happy Birthday to you/Happy Birthday to you/Happy Birthday, dear Dev/Happy Birthday to you."

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Cheryl. Wow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to do a Mr. President version, but I just didn't want that on the public record. I prefer that for video, anyway.

All right, guys, thank you for your time, your energy, and your input. Maureen and Dev, if you need anything from me, just let me know. I'm here at your beck and call. Obviously, after our meeting in a fortnight,

we're also going to have to gather together as a small sub-team to prepare ourselves for our reporting on Sunday in Singapore.

Okay? Goodbye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]