
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. On today's At-Large Metrics Working Group call on Tuesday, 18th of February at 17:00 UTC we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Fatimata Seye Sylla. From staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Just taking you through today's Agenda, is everyone in the room as well as on the phone? It looks like that's the case. Can I ask first if there are any additions or changes to the Agenda before we get started? Not hearing anyone getting my attention and not seeing anyone waving at me in the room, let's assume that's a no.

Okay, the usual [zero? 00:01:13] for this Working Group is that everyone should have taken the time and had the energy and inclination to look over the Agenda from our last meeting, which was the 6th of February. To that end, I'll assume you're all happy with that. I just want to double-check one thing. I think when I looked at this... Or was it in fact the APRALO one? The summary minutes were not there.

Yes, that is the case. Can I ask staff if and when there will be a summary of minutes on the linked page from the 6th of February? Silvia, would that be you?

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.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Normally we are not taking summary minutes, we're only taking Action Items, because we have a transcript posted between 24 and 48 hours afterward, so the transcript should be there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, the transcript is, in which case one of two things: we now need to make sure someone trawls through the transcript – I did, I don't know that everyone else did – and make a note of any high points and holidays that were mentioned. Or perhaps we could have some sort of additional rounding up in the Action Items section that comes to the end. I'll have to ruminate on that. Perhaps we can discuss that later.

If we're not taking it then why on earth do we have the link? One of the two things has to happen. We either have a link with something there or we don't bloody well bother with the link. Right now at 4:05 am I don't care one way or the other, but let's either get rid of the link off the standard meetings for future, or we'll have a contemplate and see how we'll have something that is there.

I certainly went through the transcript. I had to so I could double-check the Action Items and also prepare some of the Agenda. That's the only thing from that. Does anyone else have anything else to raise on the 6th of February meeting?

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may, I'll make sure that those summary minutes... My apologies, they're not supposed to be on the meeting pages. They'll be removed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. That makes it easy. People like me look for things and wonder why they're not there. That's all. Terrific. That's solved that mystery. Let's move straight onto our Action Items then. We have a continuing Action Item, which I think is actually going to be picked up in the main Agenda. It's for Dev and Maureen to work with staff and discuss attendance meeting record tools, mechanisms, etcetera.

I think that might have expanded slightly to include opportunities and options for some of the self-reporting mechanisms, such as the tabular approach, which Maureen will introduce to us. We'll leave that until later in the Agenda. #2 was for staff to review the transcript from the Buenos Aires meeting.

I haven't gone back and double-checked this, from the 17th of November meeting, but the link to the transcript – which of course would have horrified anyone if they were going to be using that instead of meeting notes – was some 158 pages in total because it had the whole morning session, not just our 8:30 am meeting. We only needed the first 30. Silvia, was that rather large transcript cut into two parts and just the bit that belongs to us left with our meeting records for the 17th? Yes or no?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Sorry, can you repeat your question?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I certainly can. I want to know what's happened with Action Item #2. While Silvia has a look at Action Item #2 we'll move onto Action Item #3, which is one for Maureen and one I know we've all done because I saw

lots of interaction on the list. She's going to be talking to this later as well on the Agenda. We can tick this one off as done.

Maureen definitely sent the link and had the discussion on the Sample Individual ALAC Member Meeting Table, which we discussed at the last meeting. Thank you for that Maureen. I look forward to hearing more about all that shortly. Silvia, back to #2?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes. I am working with Gisella and Julia on organizing this Action Item and the transcript.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific, thank you. We'll keep that one open and hopefully get back to it. Olivier, did I see you wave your hand briefly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. I was just going to comment on the format of the Action Item. They're missing a little box next to it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They are, because I had to put them into the Agenda and I didn't have the time, the energy or the inclination to find how to put the little boxes in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: On the Action Items page they're not there either!

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, that will be funny about that too. I wonder why. If they'd been there Olivier then the cut and paste would have been very simple. We'll make that an observation and hopefully you and I aren't the only ones to observe that. I did actually trawl around a few minutes trying to find where the little boxes come from, but I couldn't do it so I basically thought I'd give up and move on.

But thanks for that Olivier. Hopefully it will mysteriously happen at some future point in time. Moving onto #4 – it's something that I don't believe we've had a particular discussion on between the last call and this one. It's something that we also have a small amount of time on today's Agenda for. During that time we'll hopefully we'll work out whether or not we need to have a separate meeting or not.

That's an Action Item on myself – Cheryl –, Maureen, Dev and Tijani, because we're going to be presenting in Singapore in a 15-minute update, and we should look at concepts for how we're going to do that presentation. Whilst we've convened we haven't actually gathered together yet to do any of that work.

That brings us to the last one, which we certainly have done. That was for staff to send out the Doodle for the next meeting in a fortnight, and we know about that because we're here. So a slightly longer amount of time spent on Action Items than normal today, but a number of these will be picked up during discussion in the Agenda.

Before we move onto that, which will be our update – and I'll hand on primarily to Maureen next, to have a look at how the conversation on

the tabular approach for which I'm loosely calling "self-reporting" came along – I'd also like that next section in our update from our Work Teams to also include any comments from all of you, and any interactions that Maureen, Dev and staff have had, going back to our Action Item #1.

If there aren't any questions or comments on the Action Items, other than Olivier's astute observations on the lack of boxes, and not just my inability to copy and paste from one page to another, I'm going to hand over to Maureen. I look forward to going through some of the comments and feedback that happened. Over to you Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you Cheryl. Yes. I got some quite interesting comments back regarding the table. To be honest I didn't expect it to be an overwhelming success. I just thought I'd put something out there that might be seen as a little bit radical and that perhaps people might comment on. Again, I think that we ended up – as we do with other comment situations – with really the same people who responded.

But that's okay. I think that they came up with some comments and views that would probably be pretty common across others, and perhaps they hadn't responded because someone had already said what they wanted to say. I think it's one of the things that we had to take note of: "Why don't people respond when they're actually asked to?" We're coming across those sorts of things; that the sorts of things we're asking in other areas are definitely coming to the fore in this respect.

Glenn of course, in his comment, which were a little bit unrelated, was looking at other areas in which we could be looking at metrics. They

were outside of our brief really but provided some important things to be looking at when we're asking people to identify with what it is they're doing within the ICANN system.

EURALO, for example – and I'd had this situation before, when Wolf had said that the request to disseminate the information to ALSes, he didn't think that was a priority for EURALO. We're getting back some feedback, a little bit, but it's not totally ALS feedback. The information that we got most out of was from LACRALO, and even when I was speaking to them in Buenos Aires, they were quite vocal about the whole metrics thing – viewed with a bit of suspicion I think.

I thought I got some very good comments from Fatima about the possible views of ALAC members towards the whole metrics thing. I think that when we had the discussion – and I'm probably going into Dev's area about what we could propose to do in Singapore – we took into account and discussed quite at length about what had been said particularly from LACRALO and other sorts of comments that had been made in previous discussions.

Before I go back onto that, the only other comment that came back was from Garth. I think NARALO has actually participated well in this discussion, but I think it gives an example of how RALO leadership can actually help to... It's going to be [inaudible 00:14:28] that that level to get people to understand what their role is of an ALS within the ICANN system, and how important that feedback and that reporting model is.

This is even within the RALO itself, so that they can get a better understanding of the ICANN system of ALAC is, and perhaps contribute a

little bit more. As such, this would be from an ALS level, so that they understand what's required of them. Then when they get to ALAC it should be a natural progression, we would hope.

In my report I added my own notes. I did say to Dev that he was going to report on this, but this is just from me. I just wanted to put down the sorts of things that we talked about. It was a really good meeting. I really do appreciate having that meeting and that discussion, and including Gisella and Natalie into that discussion.

We were looking at, what is a practical way or measuring, but without being too intrusive on people's time, because we're already asking them to do a whole lot of other... To be part of Working Groups and to attend all these meetings. How can we manage a metric that takes those things into account and can record them, but not expecting anyone to do anything more onerous?

Very simply – I'll let Dev talk about it more in his session – I think we decided that we would have a quantitative measure in the attendance, as has been happening before. Gisella showed us models from the gNSO and what the expectations were. Some of them were a lot more intricate and complex than what we're actually aiming to do. We want to get something that's simple but at the same time provides a meaningful set of data for us.

So there's that quantitative attendance register that is already within the system, but Dev's going to create... He got an Action Item yesterday to create a simplified spreadsheet that could be used. The second part of it is – and I think Olivier brought it up at Buenos Aires – about the fact

that it would be good if ALAC members provide a report on what it is that they're doing; either at the face-to-face meeting... [Audio cuts out 00:17:55].

So that's the second part of the [inaudible 00:18:05] looking at, as an introduction to the whole metrics thing, that ALAC members would be assigned a Wiki page where they can load their own reports onto it. Because those reports are primarily for RALOs, but ICANN in general, they don't have to be in English. It can be [a schedule? 00:18:36] to their ALSes. That could be in another language.

There's a host of things but the third aspect related to this was two [sets? 00:18:52] of metrics. That was also another issue that arose out of our discussions, and discussions I'd had previously as well. I think what's come out of it is I think we're really overloading staff. What we wanted to do was take that RALO responsibility away from staff and perhaps give it to the Secretariat staff.

The Secretariats would only have to look after their three ALAC members; so they're only recording information about three people on the ALAC. Those are just recommendations that we spoke about yesterday, and no doubt Dev will have some more. I'll leave it at that and answer some questions, if anyone's got any.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Maureen and Dev are going to speak further on some of those issues shortly. Before we get into too deep an analysis though, I did notice Alan's hand go up fairly early in the process, and then the rest of us can formulate some interactions and feedback for you. Over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. Two comments: I put my hand up right at the beginning when Maureen was commenting on the fact that few people comment, and asking the theoretical question, “Why don’t people bother to comment?” I think the reason why is related to the reason why asking people to do self reports might not be all that successful. Getting people to do things on a regular basis has been proven to be really hard. That was just a statement.

A question at the very end. Maureen, when you were talking of offloading work and having the Secretariats do it, I assume that means that staff will still keep the meeting attendance, but the consolidations – to summarize everything for a given ALAC member – would potentially be done by the RALO Secretariat. Is that what you were implying?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Hi Alan. Actually, no. I was assuming that if there was just three people that they’d have to keep a record on... Dev is devising an application that is simple with regards to completing, as far as attendance is concerned, that that would be their responsibility.

We were talking about would it be too onerous... Secretariat staff attend the face-to-face meetings, and the ALAC meetings, so it would not be too onerous for them to take on an additional role with responsibility for their three members within their RALO system. Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: But if we talk about the attendance rate for any given meeting, there are people other than ALAC members and Secretariats at those meetings. We still need a complete record of who's in attendance at each meeting. So I'm not sure how one can distribute that?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, that's a [inaudible 00:23:33]. That responsibility is outside of the ALAC metrics, which I'm looking at. I'm just looking at the ALAC. If staff are responsible for the others, that's fine. With regards to the ALAC members I'm looking at Secretariat. That's a recommendation and also taking into account the roles and responsibilities of the staff for other membership attendance as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but that's at the RALO meeting. Secretariats don't necessarily attend the ALAC meeting. I'm just trying to understand it, it sounds... I guess I'd like to see it ready. I'm a little bit confused at this point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible 00:24:23] APRALO. No, we do need to talk on this further. The APRALO Secretariat at an ALAC meeting, let alone an ALAC-based Working Group, [audio jumps 00:24:42]... Even month, probably leading up to the regional monthly meeting, to ascertain [inaudible 00:25:26] with the ALAC people for the region, NomCom [audio jumps].

That's certainly not going to reduce the volunteer time aspect. I don't think it's a good thing or a bad thing, I'm just thinking, Maureen, we need to discuss this in a little bit greater detail, obviously with them as

well, [inaudible 00:25:56] much ease there is to individuals recording things on their individual [audio cuts out].

SILVIA VIVANCO: Cheryl, your voice was cutting out in some parts, so maybe if you could type out your ideas we can... Some people cannot understand you, and I couldn't understand a big part of what you were saying.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I'm now disconnecting my microphone and my other headset, and I can assure you I'm not going to type out what even you described was a lengthy diatribe. The answer to that is no. There you go. I'll raise any germane and of interest comments I had at a later point, or not at all. Basically we need to talk a lot more about this. Maureen, go ahead and then I think Alan's hand was still raised.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just wanted to say that what we've done is make a recommendation. It was a record of our discussions, and we're certainly aware that this would be completely outside the "light box" to be asking. So I can totally agree that there's still a lot more to be spoken of, but we're putting it out there and we'll see what happens. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Maureen. Part of what I was going on about was in fact the fact that I think this is a topic that I think has a lot going for it, as well as a lot of issues that need to be discussed, and I look forward to the discussion,

but clearly only when I'm holding my phone literally to my ear, which for an hour and 90-minute calls is unexciting.

Maureen, if there are no more questions specifically on the feedback, I wonder how you feel about us going directly to Dev now and getting a little more on some of the tools, etcetera? I also want to bring Tijani into the discussion for two reasons. He wasn't able to join us at our last meeting, but also he's looking specifically at the linkage to the specifics of what is not 9.2 of the ALAC Rules of Procedure.

Maureen, your hand is still up. If you'd like to just respond to that, and then what we might move to is Dev, and then feedback from Tijani. That must have been an old hand. Alan, thank you very much for that advice. That's fantastic. If only I had that sort of system that would be wonderful. Right, I'm assuming that my voice is still clear. What I was hoping for was for Dev to now pick up on his part of this feedback. Over to you Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much Cheryl. I do see Maureen's hand still raised, in case you want to...? Okay. Well, what I've been trying to do is looking at ways to somehow remove much of the tedium of trying to put together the statistics regarding ALAC statistics on metrics. Over the past few weeks I've been trying to look at various ways to do it.

I already said on the previous call that using the Wiki alone wasn't working out, because it's just not... Bringing parts of a Wiki page into one Wiki page is simply too cumbersome. What I've started looking at is a way of using a spreadsheet, and I've been using Google Spreadsheets

to do this; to try and pull some of the information from the Wiki and then once it's in the spreadsheet then manipulate it to get some information.

[Sighs]. That was a huge sigh, for the transcript record. It's been challenging, but I can show you some of the information that I've done. I'm going to try and see if I can share my screen, because it is a Google Spreadsheet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Dev, it looks to me that you do have the control ability, because you've got the little yellow color.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I'm assuming what you should be seeing is a spreadsheet titled "ALAC metrics version 4". What I tried to do was to look at the 2013 ALAC meetings page. That page had a whole list of all the previous meetings held in 2013, and what I had to do was use something used in Google Spreadsheets; something called ["Expat" 00:31:54]. It's essentially a form of being able to import a web page and manipulate various parts of the HTML code so it only accepts certain parts, and so forth.

What I had to do was to, in the case of being able to get all of these URLs in, I brought those all in, and you can probably see the whole long array formula. I suspect nobody's really interested in understanding how it all works but... I was able to get all the URLs cleaned up. One of the big

challenges has been the inconsistency by which the meeting pages were set up.

For example, some pages didn't have dates in the title, some did, and so forth. I had to really go into the Wiki and start cleaning those up to make this all work seamlessly and with one statement being able to pull in all of those URLs. Once I did that I also extracted the dates from it. You can see that in Column A there. Once I started doing that I then began looking at how to bring in the information.

Now, this is the second challenge. Each of the meeting pages are slightly different in how they're structured. When I'm trying to pull in information from one section, it's the fourth item in the Wiki page and one meeting, but then it's the sixth item in another meeting page. What I've been doing is trying to...

It's going to be a manual process from this point on, but it will be slightly simpler in that I'll simply go through each one, alter the snippet where I'm going to pull from, see if it's the relevant one and then copy and paste, so that I have the text of the persons attending and so forth. I do note that for each of the meeting pages, again, it's broken up into several lines.

You have the English channel, you have the Spanish channel and the French channel, and then things like the Liaisons as well are also listed separately. It requires separate pulling in on all of the information. I'm going now to sheet number four. You can now see what the idea is of what I'm trying to do.

These are the ALAC members from November 2011 to 2012, and I think we're going to have to group these metrics that way, simply because that's when the slate of ALAC members, at the end of the AGM, is set for one year, until the next AGM the following year. I should mention that for some reason we don't have this on a record on the Wiki; of the ALAC members for any given year period.

On the Wiki I see various notifications on who's been elected, who's been selected, but there's no formal record of this, so I had to pull this out of previous emails to get this final list of 15. What I've also done here, if you look from Column C onwards, I pulled the dates going across the screen; starting from 2012 and going all the way to 2013.

Then what I'm trying to do now is use part of the Google Spreadsheet to look at the piece of text that I've captured from the Wiki page and assign a "present", "absent", "apologies" type of selection. That's where I've reached. It's so cumbersome with the actual "if" statement to make that happen, but I think you can see the framework of where I'm going with this now. I think I'll stop there and pause for any questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Dev. I'm exhausted just listening to this. This was, a, a much more extensive and manual task than I had hoped it would be and, b, I think brings up a couple of important points that if we're going down this particular pathway there is some pro forma consistencies in reporting, as well as perhaps some new desirables of reporting.

You've also picked up on a few things I'm sure Olivier is making little slide notes on as well. There are some clear gaps in some of the things

that have been done. Specific questions are now open. I think I saw Tijani first, followed by Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. Even if I missed only one call I feel that I am one year behind you. You did a huge amount of work. Thank you Maureen and thank you Dev and thank you everyone. I have a question, Dev, here. I don't understand what you've tried to do. If you're trying to have the history, this is one thing and I agree with what you are doing.

If you are working for the future, I think that we need a much simpler way – and there are simpler ways – to record the attendance of the ALAC members, for example of any other structure members. I think that the more simple way is the tool; the more we guarantee that it will be used.

I think that we'll ask staff to record the attendance for each meeting, but we need this Working Group to have a standing group, a standing sub-group, who's always checking every month, for example, the status. If staff forgot for one meeting then it's easy to recover it, but if staff forgot for one year, a meeting, then it would be very difficult to have the information back.

So I think that sure, we will ask staff to help us in keeping their information recorded, but we also need a sub-group from this group to always, every month, be checking the information and making sure that all the information is already recorded in the right way. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Tijani. Dev, did you want to respond at all?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Tijani, the main idea behind trying to do this was to try to minimize the bulk work of having staff literally manually going through each of the meeting pages and trying to go back and forth, toggling between the spreadsheet and the Wiki page and trying to record all this information. I think what I'm trying to do is making this as easy as possible, so that it becomes easier to compile it year-by-year.

Then this can also be used as a template for Working Groups, because now I can extend it for a Working Group and come up with an attendance record for that Working Group and see whether persons who are joining the Working Group are actually participating or not. That's the idea behind it.

I didn't want to really have staff go through a double process to put it on the Wiki pages for the meeting, the attendance record, and then have to enter it again into another system. One, that's tedious, and it's also prone to errors when you go back and forth. That's the idea behind what this spreadsheet was trying to do; to automate that and reduce that tedious double work. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that Dev. Alan and then Maureen. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I guess I'm looking at this and saying we're going to be transferring work that was, to some extent, clerical to a programmer, because as Dev mentioned last week on another issue, but related, any change in the Wiki or in the formatting of the minutes, this thing is so sensitive.

I would have thought that a more practical way of doing it is for every class of meeting – whether it's the ALAC meeting or a Working Group or something – a spreadsheet is created and maintained for attendance at that meeting. I think it will be a lot easier to standardize on the format of the spreadsheet, and then be able to call from the spreadsheets the attendance for any given person, than working from the minutes or meeting notes.

There are just so many variables in that, and it should be a lot easier to standardize on the spreadsheets that we use for each meeting, and do the cross-tabulations on those, instead of trying to retrieve it from the raw data. Just a thought. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for that Alan. I do notice that there are even Wiki page pro formas for gNSO metrics and things, that might also help.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, those have been designed but they don't seem to have been filled in. Anyway, just a thought.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But I think standardization is the key here. [Overtalking 00:43:15] Maureen and then Tijani. Agreed. Maureen and then Tijani.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Cheryl. Just a comment on what Alan has said. I think what Dev, in our discussions yesterday, said, is that he's attempting to provide something that's really user-friendly. For the home page, for example, maybe if you started by looking at that very last sheet we looked at, like what is the end point.

Although that's a little bit more complicated than what we were talking about yesterday it was something that he'd prepared for this meeting. It does give us an indication of what the home page could look like. Underneath it, on the back end, is a whole lot of technical detail that people don't need to see. They don't need to know that it's there, but the collection of the data on the front space is basically what is important.

In order for that to happen, as you say, the data is being gathered from various Wiki pages and they have to be sent, they have to be consistent. Otherwise, the work that Dev's doing, that requires specific details, just isn't going to work. I think that primarily what we're looking at now is that the expectations that we're making of ourselves with regards to metrics means that we're going to have to look outside of what is the norm.

We're going to have to do something differently. I think we're probably looking at it more, and it does involve the technology. I think that's the reality of we're going to collect data that's going to be meaningful.

What Dev's doing in regards to pulling together... Why are we putting information on a Wiki if we're not going to use it in some meaningful way? I think that's where Dev's coming from. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Maureen. Yes, that's a very important perspective. While we go to Tijani I'll ask Dev – because we've got his screen – could you take us to that fourth page that Maureen mentioned? I think that might also give a lot of us a good perspective, if we're going to tie this into an individual home page.

I think the most important issue here is one of both standardization of materials recorded, and how they're recorded, and having wherever possible an automated and non-human-failure point of collection, and for it to be collated and sent somewhere. We might have to work on exactly how that's done or where it's drawn from, but this is definitely heading in the right direction.

Wherever we have a human involved, be they staff or volunteer, we've got a potential point of failure. Now, that doesn't mean that there's no potential for failure on the tab three that we're looking at on Dev's screen. We have a hash value next to Sala, so stuff can happen. But at least it's something that pokes out at you as an error field or whatever.

Tijani, as I come back to you I also wonder... You've raised the new point for us, and that is the ongoing function of some form of small group of ALAC-endowed humans to crosscheck or keep an eye on these metrics. I think that's another point we probably need to come back on as well. Over to you Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. I would like to come back to the proposal of Alan. I don't think it's a mad proposal. I think it's an interesting proposal. Standardization can be guaranteed if we do the spreadsheet or the record sheet as well as it can be done. I understand your concern, Cheryl. You want to it to be done automatically without the human intervention, but what about the human intervention on the Wiki?

When you collect the information you'll not find them where you expect them. The human intervention is always there. I do prefer, as Alan said, that the record sheet for each meeting is... Anyway, we do the call at the beginning of each meeting. This call is what the record sheet will have inside. So it's something we'll do in any case. I think the Chair of each meeting has to have this record sheet and at the end of the meeting sends a copy to the staff.

We will have a copy with the Chair of the meeting and a copy with staff. This is crosschecking, and we can make it as standardized as possible if we want. I think we need to use the simplest tools to reach a more or less good result. I don't agree with an automatic process, but I have to guarantee that this automatic process leads us to accurate data. This is my problem.

Firstly, we can start with that and see if we can improve it in any technical way. I reiterate my proposal that a sub-group of this Metrics Group has to be a standing group to check from time to time, with a fixed period, the consistency of the recorded data, because it will be the basis of the metrics that we're trying to implement now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Tijani. Can I just say, it's not so much an Action Item, but I'd like to make it a future Agenda Item to have a placeholder in our future Agenda. I doubt we'll get to discuss it in our next meeting, which may even be Singapore, but if not we must try and discuss it before then. But the concept of the function of a small standing group I think is very important. It has my support Tijani. I'll make that very clear.

Obviously it is the ALAC's business to consider this however, not ours, as a Working Group Sub-Team. All we can do is make that as a recommendation and put forward some advantages and hopefully very few disadvantages to it.

It would also tie in with something else we discussed on the last call, Tijani, and that is that regardless of how this all ends up, there may be an opportunity for a small complaints procedure, which could be something as simple as an error or omission or modification of records. I don't want to use the term "alteration" of the records, but for example the value judgment aspect of things.

For example, the Chair of the ALAC may decide that someone's contribution via a way that's not an analytical measure has well and truly compensated for what's deemed a lower-than-optimal performance on something like attending a face-to-face meeting. For some reason they may have been unable to be face-to-face at two of the three ICANN meetings a year.

That's just an example but you know what I mean. At that point it was suggested last time that perhaps some sort of complaint or review

procedure may be desirable, and if that's the case then your proposal on a small group in a continuous form may very well have more than one purpose. We probably need to think of that as well.

If you can all make sure you sanity-check me as Chair, in making sure we come back to this point in a future Agenda, I think that's a very important one. Dev, I'd like to see if you could perhaps respond to some of what's been brought up, but I see some of it is opportunity rather than problematic.

For example, the discussion even in chat about how the Wiki needs to be utilized, etcetera, that still means that you could have a higher confidence and less fiddling with how the data is collected. You've had a lot of manual input, for example, in what you've described. Where we have our standardized meeting page, it can very well be going into a more traditional spreadsheet system that Alan was proposing.

Or it could be an embedded table, so you've got "present", "absent" and "apologies" listed. In way that is more tabular and therefore more easily visually collected or collected automatically when we go down that way. So back to you, Dev, just for your response. Then if there's not a lot more then I think we might want to talk about where we go to next with this particular part of our program. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Cheryl. Back to what Alan was saying regarding what could happen is that we standardize on the spreadsheet layout and then the staff, as part of the [per? 00:55:05] recording for meeting attendance, once they fill it out on the Wiki they actually go into the spreadsheet and

enter the information. Indeed that can be done. It's really just to look back on the past history.

One of the things I'm trying to do with this approach is because the RALOs themselves are asking for metrics, in the sense that they want to know... if they wanted to track how many people within their region are getting involved in the various Working Group, for example... This type of system can make it easier to pick up piles of statistics, rather than the tedious, laborious way of going through every single Wiki page and entering everything manually.

I should also mention that the idea behind the... I would say it's not a fully automated system. It's just pulling information into the spreadsheet for me to manually cut and paste afterwards. It's not as if right now the Wiki breaks... The table in sheet four changes would be broken or anything like that. The reality is the other sheets right now, sheet one, two and three, wouldn't really be seen.

Once the information is collected then it's collated and those sheets can then just be removed. So it's not really a super-automated system. There's still a manual verification in making sure everything winds up, so to speak. I think that's all I really have to say. One of the things we're also looking at in terms of automation, with things like face-to-face meetings, is using that mobile app to capture the information of meeting attendance.

That could then be exported as a spreadsheet and imported into this spreadsheet. This can have both the attendance at face-to-face meetings and attendance on the conference calls. Another thing we can

also look at... I'm going to experiment... I know one of the discussion points was, "Well, a person may actually attend a meeting or conference call but could then be taking a nap for all we know, if they don't contribute or say something."

What I'm trying to look at is, while I'm pulling information into the spreadsheet, whether I could try to pull in information from the transcript and from the AC chat log. The AC chat logs are on the Wiki pages. It's not so much to do a qualitative analysis. I think the goal here is to look for the absence of contributions, rather than trying to over-evaluate the quality of any contributions being made.

That's what I'm also trying to do – to bring together a spreadsheet and have that available for review by the RALOs and so forth. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much Dev. As ever, we always end up with more to think about when we have these reports, which is why Tijani noted how much was done in our last call, because of this type of interaction that leads us to so many new options and possibilities. But I think this is very important work and I want to thank you, particularly because of the nature of how much manual intervention you've had to do in this design.

We do recognize that that wouldn't be an issue when you've got standardization and other sorts of tabular approaches. It's not going to be a problematic system we're designing. It's a smarter system and that's certainly the intention – to not only not have staff burdened, but also not having the volunteers burdened either, regardless of which volunteers are doing these things.

I just wanted to pick up, before I go to Alan and then Olivier, a couple of things that have come through on the chat. Maureen had an observation that some Working Group do not have Wikis. I'm delighted to see Silvia's response saying they all can, if not should, if not do. My question back to any hypothetical Working Group, or even Sub-Team of a Working Group that didn't have a Wiki page is, why on earth not?

I'm pretty sure that what we need to do is make sure that the Wiki space is seen as the master repository here, so we may have to make some changes, but that's all right. It doesn't look like it would be too onerous. What we might need to do is do some things such as... I notice for example, with one of the newer versions of the Wiki update, there are some pro forma notes pages, or meeting pages, that are there.

If we're having Working Groups and Sub-Teams of Working Group, and we don't want to have a burden on staff for setting up meeting pages, we might need to make sure if any of us using the tool templates, that they always work with whatever systems we pick up as well. Dev, I think your Technology Taskforce could probably keep an eye on that type of thing if needs be as well.

Perhaps we may need to actually shift some of what we're doing to a more template approach, and look at whether that template is staff-driven or whether it's tool-drive, or create one by staff and then make a new template. It's easy enough to do too, apparently. I have Alan and then Olivier in my listing. Olivier, did your hand go up first? If so, jump in. If not, I'll hand over to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Adobe Connect still manages the hands that they're in the order that they came up on. As Dev was talking it dawned on me this issue of qualitative contributions. In general, for those who are overseeing the meetings where there's a Chair or the ALAC Leadership Team or RALO Leadership, things like that, it's pretty obvious who's contributing and who isn't.

I wonder whether it's worth the effort to create that kind of overview on a regular basis, as opposed to a query tool to say, "I think we're having trouble with Cheryl. Let's go in and see just how many contributions she makes," and things like that. You still have to develop the tool, but it may make more sense not to run it regularly but only when there is perceived to be a problem. Just a thought. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think it's a very good thought. I heard a noise that sounded like an affirmative but ruminating noise from Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It was an affirmative one, yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did you want to respond before we go to Olivier?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No. It's an interesting concept and a good idea. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I actually think that's very attractive; if we look at... Specifying that the role of team leaders or Chairs, it may be that a far more qualitative color code or system could be brought into is somehow, and that would be able to contribute early to the Chair of the ALAC for the more onerous tasks that they have under the Rules of Procedure to do any remediation, etcetera.

Whilst we talk to the onerous tasks of the Chair, let's hear from the Chair. Over to you, Olivier. Are you on mute?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. I was just going to ask Dev whether he'd considered the use of handles for each one of the names. The question I always have with regards to these automated sheets and automated reformatting, where you just scan Wiki pages and put them onto tables, is that as soon as there's a little typo in a name it doesn't pick it up. Then you don't get consistent results.

Is this the case? Would the use of handles, for "CLO" for Cheryl and "OCL" for myself, and others, would they help with the consistency? Or would there be no difference? Maybe it's no difference.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, I would think in fact that you'd then have to double-check from the Wiki record, for example. The Wiki record has the full names, and yes, there are spelling errors. I already discovered a few spelling errors in some of the attendance records and I just went in and changed it on the Wiki itself formally.

The handles weren't affected because you'd then have to assign handles to all the information being pulled from the Wikis; from all the meeting pages. So it won't save any time. If anything it would take more time. It wouldn't save any time. In the comparison in sheet four, is that once I'd pulled out text from the Wiki page, I do the comparison. Basically it's an "if" statement that says "present" or "absent" or "apologies". That's it.

We can then copy and past afterwards for the final text for the permanent record, so to speak. That's it. I do note Darlene's comment. Some persons do have the same initials, that's true.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

That's a very important point. Olivier, you still have your hand up? No? Okay. Just on that, Dev, I got rather tempted by something Olivier was saying then. It would be a two-pronged approach. When I recently set up a meeting for a new group I did use the currently provided Wiki meeting template, and what it was asking me to do in the very beginning of setting up the meeting page – and of course we could modify that to meet our needs very easily.

I thought it was very interesting that as soon as one started to put in a list of proposed participants, though it was trying to act as an invitation mode... As soon as you put in my name as a registered Wiki user, and the same would go for you and most of us, it would come up with, "Do you mean me?" and I would just say, "Yes, I mean me, not some other CLO."

But also, what one could very easily do is just use the "@" and as soon as you start with "@CLO" or "@C" it would give a list of what was the

nomenclature for the personal space and the personal identifier within the Wiki. Two things are happening there. First of all, we already want at least all ALAC members, but hopefully all leaders and anyone else that wants them as well, to do more in terms of having their own Wiki pages. It could push people that way, or have their own Wiki log on and identifications anyway.

Secondly, it would stop that error and spelling variation that you were talking about, providing we didn't have multiple personas for any one individual. If we did, we'd probably just need to know about them. I think, Olivier, what you've suggested is still a very viable option, if we take it and use it through the mechanisms that the Wiki tool is actually offering us, and that is with this "@name" ability.

Now, with that meeting page, Dev, which I also wanted to mention to you – although I'm sure you've already gone through it, but I just wondered –, because the meeting page tool indicated to me that as soon as I put the "@CLO" for example in my list of participants, it would then come up with "Cheryl Langdon-Orr" and a hyperlink to my space. It would also specifically invite me to the meeting.

So if we've got little clever things about sending me invitations, I'm wondering if there might be other little clever things that could be exploited in some of the automation. I'm not asking for answers now, I'm just making an observation that tools developed we may find more advantages to, to being able to collect data in a more secure – and still need a humanized side, don't get me wrong –, but more automated manner.

Now, because I dropped out of the Adobe room, I don't know if anyone put their hand up during that. Did anyone want to make a comment on that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just a very quick follow up on that Cheryl. Indeed, that type of handle could work if... How the attendance record is currently taken is it's taken in the Adobe Connect room, so it's typed out in there and then it's copied and pasted after the conference call is ended and then copied to the Wiki so to speak afterwards.

Again, staff could... You could start typing a few characters and make it the handles to ensure the consistency and spelling and so forth. That would just be an extra step. Or a change in how staff does the recording of attendance records, where instead of typing it into the Adobe Connect room they would edit the Wiki page at the very beginning of the roll call and type it in. That's just an observation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that. Just in response – and I wanted to pick up on some of the discussion that's going on in the chat – first of all it could go the reverse way. One could have the call coordinator, and this may mean that we have two layers of information. An invitations list, in other words everyone who should be at the meeting is listed, and then an attendance list, which is the next section down, which shows who attended, who sent apologies, and who was simply absent.

Now, we could still use those Wiki handles for each of those things, but it may very well mean that what staff would do would be record it in the Wiki at the beginning of the call and then copy it to the Adobe room, not the other way around. There's no down side.

It would just copy the hyperlinks into the notes section in the Adobe room, and there's no more onerous time-consuming effort required on staff. I think we just need to be smart about how we design these things that we're talking about and proposing here, and obviously [inaudible 01:12:50] input.

But Maureen asked a very important question, which Silvia also supported as an issue to discuss, and that is if we go down the automated system of a Wiki base, would that take the onus on reminders, etcetera, from staff? Rest assured Maureen, from my perspective, all of the updates, reminders and sharp pointy sticks that staff use with us to get us to respond to Doodles and remember that we've got calls that are essential.

I couldn't manage my life without them, that's for sure. I don't think it would be a replacement in my view, it would simply be a slightly different modus operando. For example, if you go into the Wiki to do whatever business you're doing, with whatever page you're wanting to do it with, it matters not one iota why you're in the Wiki.

As soon as you go into the Wiki you would see the invitation from whatever Working Group was putting up its meeting minutes and planning. If you're in the Wiki you'd get that additional invitation, rather

than that be the only way of inviting. We do need to recognize that not everyone is Wiki-wise.

However, we would be expecting at least our ALAC leaders and other regional leads and team leaders etcetera, perhaps even ALS representatives, to be Wiki-wise enough to have a Wiki log-in and a Wiki page, as basic as it may be, so that these handles could work. But we do need to recognize that we live in a mobile environment.

We need mechanisms that come to our phones and indeed our wristwatches these days, as well as what used to be the equivalent of a plain old telephone system – it's now good old-fashioned email. So I don't think we'd drop it off, Maureen. Rather I think it would be an adjunct to, and may indeed be a preferred mechanism, to some people. It's giving more choice, not taking belts and braces away.

We've taken about ten or fifteen minutes longer than I had planned for the discussions that we've had on our first couple of Agenda Items. I think what we've had is a very important and I think very concept-developing discussion/reporting. Just before we move to Item #4, which is our last [thesis? 01:15:28] substantive business anyway, which is planning for our Singapore meeting, I just wanted to come back to Tijani.

I want to see whether there's any particular input recognizing these are just personal perspectives. Based on this quite extensive deliberation and discussion we've had, particularly from the work Dev's done and the proposals that some of us have had, is there anything that concerns you about looking specifically at those Part B, Section 9.2 to 9.4?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. I think that the discussion was very important, and we need it, we need to have this discussion. We're now building the tools of our system of the metrics system, and building the tools on tier consensus. It's much better in going one way that the others wouldn't understand and wouldn't like.

Regarding the metrics themselves, I didn't do anything from Buenos Aires. I was too busy in the last few weeks. I think the most important thing is the feedback from the RALOs and the ALSes regarding the parameters that we put in our metrics proposal. I don't know if Maureen had the full feedback from all the RALOs, all the regions, and if she had it then perhaps we can work on them to finalize our metrics, using those parameters.

I'm sure we'll need a discussion about them, because even if we have the point of view of all people, we'll have a very divergent point of view that we need to try some consensus or some middle way to have everyone recognize himself in this work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Tijani. Yes, the ability to get the trust, the consensus and the understanding on these performance metrics, they are, as Alan pointed out at our last meeting, a done deal. They are Section 9.2 to 9.4. 9.2 is there. Therefore we have to find a mechanism of having a fair, accurate and un-onerous record of at least that this group has also talked about further embellishments, and I don't think we should stop doing that.

I think we can always try and build a better model. But we also have a bunch of baselines now with the Rules of Procedure now being finalized

and adopted, that we do have to run to. To come back to what we're going to do for Singapore... Just before we go into that Item, Tijani did raise the input you've got Maureen. Could I get...? Staff, it seems to me that when I try to move pages that's when I'm getting knocked out of the room.

If we go to page eight on what you have on screen now, which was Maureen's observations... Maureen, first of all, two things whilst that's coming up: let me thank you for the interaction that you've undertaken, which was actually above and beyond the call of duty for you. You do always perform above duty, which is why we like you.

You've closed a communication loop, if not the conversation loop, on a lot of these issues for people. You've got back to the contributors, and I wanted to particularly note, for the record, my thanks for that. I think that's a wonderful method that you're setting for us all. It's something I'm sometimes not particularly motivated to do. I was going to say I'm not particularly good at doing it, but I actually am good at doing it, I just choose not to a lot of the time.

I wanted to note your extra efforts you have got back to all of the contributors. Maureen, is there some of what you were putting in your 11 points there that now, having had these conversations at this meeting, you want to either review, come back to or embellish on? Over to you Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you for your comments Cheryl. Thank you everyone. I think in our discussions yesterday, I think it's important for example – and Tijani

could be available for it as well – if Tijani and I, probably talking about the sorts of things that we'd like to propose in Singapore. As you said, we won't propose something that's... From their viewpoint is simple but it actually does achieve, at a small step perhaps, towards what we're wanting to do in the long-term.

So perhaps there are some things related to who has responsibility and what do we actually want to do. Dev suggested that we have another meeting in a couple of weeks' time anyway, with Gisella and Natalie, Tijani and staff. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Excellent. That would be good. I'm wondering if it's possible then for us to have a little space, a new Wiki page – and this is actually an Action Item, other than a carry-on Action Item that we had from earlier –: I'd like a new Wiki page linked to this call. This will do. But it will eventually be the one that will be associated with our update and report for the Singapore meeting.

So let me be very clear, Silvia: it does not need to be linked to the Singapore Agenda yet, but our intention would be to build our presentation and do a discussion and development of what we'll be presenting in Singapore as our update. Then just before Singapore, when we're happy with it, then we will link it to the Singapore Agenda, okay?

Right. I have a call waiting, and anyone who's calling me at 5:30 in the morning is important. Alan, can you manage the meeting until I come back into the call, please? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can. I'm not sure what's left of the meeting at this point. Staff? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've come back to you. I don't want to be with you. Alan, you just do it while I sort things out.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think there's anything more that we need to do in this meeting, unless I've missed something. I was asking Silvia if there is still something on the Agenda that we need to do at this point?

SILVIA VIVANCO: No, we are through. It's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have five more minutes. Do we have another meeting scheduled already, Silvia? Is anyone still here?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev...

SILVIA VIVANCO: We have [inaudible 01:24:30] 21:00 UTC, so in a few hours.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, but do we have another meeting scheduled for this Working Group?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Oh, for this Working Group you mean? Well, this is dependent on you. When do you want the next meeting? We'll send a Doodle and schedule it whenever you...

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we've come to closure at this point. Dev and Maureen, as the main workers, and Tijani, are you ready in a week or do you want two weeks?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I would recommend two weeks.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Two weeks. Date and time?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suspect this time is as good as any, unless anyone is objecting strongly?

SILVIA VIVANCO: No? Okay, so we'll do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. In which case I thank you all for attending the meeting. It's been an interesting one. Let's continue with the work. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Great. Thank you very much everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]