| CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: | I'd like to welcome you all to today's At-Large Metrics Working Group. I will assume that the recording is running, and I will ask if staff will do the roll call. Thank you very much. |
|---|---|

| SUSIE JOHNSON: | Yes, the call is being recorded. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone, on today's At-Large Metrics Working Group call on Tuesday, 4th of March at 17:00 UTC. |
|---|---|

We have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

And from staff, we have Silvia Vivanco and Susie Johnson.

Thank you, and over to you, Cheryl.

| CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: | Thank you, Susie. We'd also like to note, for the record, apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond. |
|---|---|

I also see, in the Adobe room – did I hear you, Susie, mention Baudouin, or not?

| SUSIE JOHNSON: | Oh, no, I did not. Please excuse me. Baudouin Schombe is on the line, too. |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: | Thank you. Is there anyone else on the line or in the Adobe room that hasn't had their name recorded? |
| OKSANA PRYKHODKO: | Oksana Prykhodko. |
| CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: | Oksana. |
| DARLENE THOMPSON: | And Darlene. |
| CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: | Yes, thank you, Oksana. I had heard you. I wanted to note you were here. And Darlene, yes? In fact, you're both in the Adobe room, and we certainly did hear you join the call. Two more names to add, Susie: Darlene and Oksana. |

Hopefully, with a couple of hiccoughs, is the meeting now open.

Moving onto agenda #2 – Silvia, can you hear me? Are you on the audio chat, Silvia Vivanco?

| | |
|---|---|
| SILVIA VIVANCO: | Yes, I can hear you. |

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Good, thanks very much.

Just as we move on to the review of the last action items, I have put in today's agenda a new symbol, which I'll explain in a moment. I would like for you to have a quick look at the question at the end of the first of the action items that I noted from last week's call.

Moving on to the action items and then looking at any of the outcomes from our last meeting, there seem to be only two primary action—three primary action items, one of which is definitely clear, which was to hold the meeting in two weeks' time – which we are, because we're all here.

The second one – in fact, the first as listed – was to start to create a new wiki page to consolidate comments and ideas. This is comments and ideas which is also in preparation and planning for what we present in Singapore.

A little later, we do have a small presentation, which Maureen has prepared, and I want to thank Maureen for doing that.

This work group is to review the page before Singapore, obviously. Silvia asked for me to let her know the title of the wiki page. "Singapore Presentation" will be fine, but I really don't care what it is. It makes no difference at all, it could be "Bleu Cheese," as far as wiki pages go.

We did agree with Silvia when she [inaudible] me that the child page should be linked off the major work group one. But I did reply not to have it directly linked from our major work group wiki page yet, because obviously it's a [inaudible] space for us and we didn't necessarily want

people stumbling over it by accident and interacting with us before we present.

I did ask, however, that when the new page was put up as a trial page that we had the URL sent.

Now, I have been travelling, Silvia, but was that page, first of all, set up? And secondly – probably more importantly – was the URL sent to the list?

SILVIA VIVANCO:     I have to check. I don't have an answer right now. Let me check, and I will get back to you on this. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you. Before this call finishes, please, because this was an action item listed from a call two weeks ago. It was pretty important, particularly for the preparation of our reporting in Singapore that it was done. We've already lost two weeks on it, if that wasn't distributed. If it was distributed, then thank you for that.

Indeed, I certainly didn't receive a link to it, because I've looked at every e-mail that was associated with your name and I can find no evidence of the link URL to such a page being sent, which means that action item remains open – as far as I am concerned – until you tell us otherwise, Silvia. To that end, I've got a great, big, yellow warning symbol next to it.

Let's move on from there. Now we're going to move to our usual update from our team leaders. I'm going to ask, depending on who

wants to run first, Dev or Maureen, and then we'll go to Tijani. You two want to wave at me in the Adobe room to indicate who wants to go first? More importantly, to let staff know whether or not Dev is going to share his screen or Maureen is going to have PowerPoint running.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Go ahead, Dev. Sounds like you got up first.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Last week, I shared a spreadsheet that was trying to look at ways to make it as painless as possible to try to bring in information from the wiki so that it can be analyzed and crunched with the spreadsheet.

Let me go and share my screen. Everybody should be seeing the spreadsheet. I pasted the link already in the chat for the spreadsheet, so if you wanted to open it up separately in your browser window and look at it there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Dev, that's terrific for everyone who isn't forced to use a mobile app. Because, of course, within a mobile app, one only has one choice and that is to stay in the app.

**EN**

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     Okay, well, I'll try to describe it as best as I can.

Our last meeting, I was able to pull a list of URLs for the various meetings that happened within given ALAC members AGM. As an example, we're looking at some ALAC members from 2011 to 2012.

On this first sheet, I have a list of fifteen ALAC members from all the five regions. What I was able to do is to transpose each of the columns, all of the dates of the meetings. What I was then able to do was to come up with a macro to allow a way to measure where a person was present, absent, or apologies.

The way I did it was that—it's a slight manual process, and it had to be that way because each of the meeting pages has the information stored in slightly different locations, so it was not really possible to do it. But it was much more easier, because each of the meetings are hyperlinked in the spreadsheet: I could go to a meeting page and select text where the participants are listed, and then just copy and then paste it in the one cell. In this case, it's cell B21 for the attendants and A22 for the apologies.

Those [inaudible], the first A column is essentially doing the calculations, and then I cut-and-paste each of the meeting dates, going horizontally for each of the meetings.

It's a long spreadsheet. It scrolls quite a bit. There are some meetings which I don't have attendance records for, and that's for the actual face-to-face meetings listed. So in 2011, 2012, those are the meetings in Beijing, Durban, and Buenos Aires.

I have to [inaudible], and so I can now have for the ALAC members showing which ones out of 12 meetings, how many were present, how many were absent, and how many sent apologies. Those are in the columns from B to E.

What I did, I can plot this out on a chart. I'm going to switch now to sheet three of the chart to show this chart. It's color-coded: blue is present, red is absent, and yellow-orange is apologies.

I did it this way, which is a stacked bar chart, a horizontal bar chart, because what it does – for me, visually – I can see from persons without pulling more than six, more than nine. You see blue, and therefore, you know that they were high attendance record. Where you see a lot of red going in the other direction, it means that it's something of concern. Some have—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Someone should be [inaudible] a phone call.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:   That's one thing. I think we can generate attendance statistics relatively as painless as possible. That's one thing.

The second thing I was working on is something I was experimenting with, and that is how do you count participation? This person has attended, but did this person interact in any way during the call? I have to say, I think I managed to figure out a way of how to automate that aspect.

**EN**

I'm going to switch to a folder here. What I did—I hope everybody's seeing my Windows Explorer now.

I took a PDF from one of the transcripts from the meeting, 2012 November 27th meeting. What I did was I converted it to a text file. I'll just open the text file. You can see it kept the formatting of it.

I was trying to figure out a way of counting how many times a person interacts during the call, and I think I chose a quite simple thing. Given that the transcript has the names of the person in capital letters followed by a colon, I can then count the number of instances where that occurred. Then I wrote a batch program to do that.

If you look at [Count Test] ALAC English – and I posted that link in the screen – this is the automated output from running a batch file for each of these names, how many times that is found in the text file. This gives an indicator of how often the persons talked during the conference call.

You can see in this case, in this conference call, Olivier was the most active person, followed by Alan Greenberg and so forth. You can see also which persons were there. I haven't done the comparison in putting this into the spreadsheet and all that, but you can see the ideas where I'm going with this now.

I think I'll stop there and hear any questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thank you, Dev. I think that's extraordinarily useful on both counts.

I note from the chat, Maureen also likes the idea of the graphics, the bar chart of the attendance record, particularly from a community perspective.

I think the auto-count based on transcript now that, in particular, we have transcripts of everything we do being so promptly put in, and the fact that you managed to automate it, whilst it doesn't give us a qualitative mechanism of measurement of participation, it certainly does give a good quantitative one.

What we probably need to do in whatever output that you manage to create – and I fear not that that will be forthcoming promptly and effectively – is ensure that the person who is Chair and who will be numerically making a somewhat disproportionate number of interventions is annotated so that they don't appear, in the statistics, as being artificially too vociferous but, of course, are still contributing. And one would note that if the Chair was having a disproportionately small number of interventions, it may be that we need to look at how they're managing their work, as well.

Maureen and Oksana and Darlene are coming in behind my round of applause to say in chat how amazing and impressed we are with this.

I see Darlene's hand. After Darlene, I suspect Alan might have something to say, whether or not he's put his hand up yet.

Over to you, Darlene.


DARLENE THOMPSON:     Thank you, Cheryl.

As you say, Cheryl, this is all good quantitative output, and what we also need is qualitative. However, I think there is a crossover between the two and you, I believe, alluded to it in that you're seeing also the number of times the person spoke.

If the person has never spoken or has hardly ever spoken, then that also goes over to the qualitative: are they just sitting there listening? Are they putting into the group at all?

A lot of these quantitative measures can give you an idea of the qualitative, as well. That's it.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, Darlene. I couldn't agree with you more.

I'm going to get to you, Alan, but Maureen has put her hand up.

Maureen?


MAUREEN HILYARD:     Thank you, Cheryl.

I just wanted to assume the fact that I like the idea of having the graphic. One of the things that still came up – and I mentioned it in my PowerPoint – was that people felt that the measures were aimed more at negative aspects.

I think that if we can show it is a lot more positive, and sometimes words get in the way, so the graphic for me with the community, it's a more user-friendly way of passing across that information.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maureen. I couldn't agree with you more.

Of course, the advantage of graphic representation also is that it's language-neutral and it's very difficult to misinterpret.

Tijani, over to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Cheryl.

I do love the graphic representation that Dev just showed. It is with dual red and orange, it's very expressive. Also, the way he is trying to quantify the participation of the [inaudible] looks very good, for me.

Supposing that the transcript is are always there, this is something that we should be sure of that because some calls and some meetings didn't have transcripts. This will, perhaps, make a problem for the data collection.

Last time, I remember that we spoke about a simpler way to collect the data for attendance. We said that we should make it easy and not depending on external factors, external elements.

This was what we said last time. Now I see that Dev continue with the data collection from the Adobe Connect or from the transcript.

It's good, but assuming that the data are displayed in the right way so that every time we can take the data where they are. This is one

concern; it was one concern last time. I don't know if there is something done to solve that.

This is the main concern for me. Otherwise, I applaud. I really thank Dev for this work. It is very good, very expressive, and my only concern is about data collection. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thank you, Tijani.

Before I go to you, Alan – thank you for putting your hand up, I prompted you about three times before you did that, I was getting concerned! I just want to respond to Tijani and your points in two ways.

The second primary issue that I noted you raised, which was the regularity or predictable way in which these things are collected, to my knowledge – and Heidi can correct when I go to her for the other point, if I'm wrong – transcripts always go with the capitalized name and then text to follow. In the absence of a name being identified it does, I believe, put in "SPEAKER" or "UNKNOWN SPEAKER."

There will be high degree of predictability for the scripts that Dev's written to use; and Dev's jumping here, as I am mistaken what I believe is the case to be true.

Now it may be on the odd call transcript that we have a huge or perhaps disproportionate input measured on this tool by the very-useful person known as UNKNOWN SPEAKER or SPEAKER. That should be an issue that we can deal with, first of all, because these are indicators – they're not go or no go.

If we have UNKNOWN SPEAKER – which may be that someone has continuously and regularly failed to identify themselves, which we all try to do but each now and then we don't manage,  or it may be that the quality of the audio line is such that they're unable to be properly identified, even though they are identifying themselves or trying to identify themselves.

There is a technical or behavioral problem that we need to address, anyway, so I don't really see too much of a downside there.

To your first point that you raised, though, Tijani, and that was the very important one on how regularly now or if it is guaranteed that all, if not most, work groups and similar calls are recorded and therefore, from the recording, transcripts are made.

I thought that was now pretty much standard procedure, but I'm now going to ask Heidi to do two things, and that is to respond to that question: is it now standard procedure? If not, I suggest we probably consider we could recommend that it is, for transcripts to be produced from the recording – assuming that all calls are now recorded as a matter of course. Secondly, that I am correct in that the standard mechanism of the transcript has the capitalized name or the term "SPEAKER" or "UNKNOWN SPEAKER."

Then I've got Alan, and I've got Darlene. But first of all, Heidi!

HEIDI ULLRICH:                    Thank you, Cheryl. Hi, everyone.

For the first question, Cheryl, yes. My understanding is that all calls now have their transcripts, unless they are special calls that are particularly asked not to have recording or not to have a written transcript.

In terms of how unknown speakers are noted, I would need to double-check with that, but Cheryl, I think you are correct, it says, "UNKNOWN SPEAKER."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hopefully, Tijani, that calms some of your concerns. Do let us know in the chat if that is not the case. If you don't mind, Heidi, if your staff could get back to us and just confirm – or more importantly get back to Dev and Maureen and confirm – that that is the case as Dev takes this scripting and reporting exercise automation to the next level. That would be greatly appreciated, and we will in fact make that an action item. Thank you.

I have Alan, and then I have Darlene. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. For the record, I didn't put my hand up because you said you were going to call on me, but then you kept on skipping me, so I put my hand up to reinforce the…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought you were ducking and covering. I was being kind.

ALAN GREENBERG:      I was just a good servant following your instructions. You said you were calling me; I didn't raise my hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:   [inaudible], I promise.

ALAN GREENBERG:      Onto substance: first, a couple of suggestions, and then an overall comment.

On the transcript one, I would suggest two things. First of all, that comment interjections, interventions that are relatively short be ignored. Specifically, a Chair – if the Chair is doing a good job, is not making an extensive intervention between each speaker, but simply calling on the speakers in order. Those interventions should not be counted. Omitting things with less than ten words or something might be a way of doing that. I'm not trying to give a specific number, but just a thought.

I look at the example that Dev did, and Dev, maybe you can answer a quick question: was this a whole meeting that you're showing the statistics of?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:   Yes. This is from the 2012 ALAC meeting.

**EN**

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I find it rather problematic, because a quick count says Olivier spoke three times as much as all the total people. In other words, he spoke three times in between every other person speaking. I think something's wrong with it. In general, he shouldn't show up as being a speaker more than once between ever other speaker. You may have a minor glitch in the numbers.

One of the ways of getting quantity is also to note the total number of characters that they spoke, for instance. That may give a measure of the amount of the interjections or interventions, so just a thought on that.

I like the idea. I'm a little bit worried that the format is not quite as consistent as we think. I also have worries that on translated calls, the speakers who are speaking may not always show up properly, giving them an extra level of disadvantage that those on the main channel don't have.

So a number of things to think about, but I like it. The format is probably standard enough that we can build something around it.

I share, however, with Tijani, the concerns over the first one. I love the chart. The chart is marvelous, and the colors are optimal in terms of displaying the final information.

My gut tells me that since we are going to have attendance charts for meetings – that is, we are going to have a spreadsheet for ALAC calls, a spreadsheet for Metrics Working Group, just because we want to be able to, in reports, report back on who has had attendance, who participated, and things like that – that the consolidated ones were

more likely to be able to build a tool that's usable by extracting things from the individual meeting spreadsheets than from minutes.

I just see that as too problematic for a whole bunch of reasons. I applaud Dev's skill in putting this together and making it work, but I'm not really convinced that it's something that can be done on an ongoing basis. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Dev, I'm going to give you right to reply on all of this, but let's listen first to Darlene and then Oksana.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Darlene?

DARLENE THOMPSON: Actually, my question was directly to Dev, and then I might have a comment.

I think it's a brilliant idea taking this right off the transcript because then it's easy to pick out the names. What I'm wondering, though, is the chat also included? Do you also pick people off the chat? Because we get a lot discussed also on the chat. I don't mean to be looking a gift horse in the mouth, Dev. I know how much work you must have put into this, but I'm just wondering if [inaudible] as well.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, I do plan to look at the chat records as well. I can do that as part of data mining to search for the name and see how many times it occurs. I could search for the words at the beginning of a line. So say somebody's talking about somebody in the chat. That's not going to be picked up. It's only at the beginning of a line, which is when somebody inputs a new chat in the Adobe Connect.

I am going to try to look at pulling that information also. I would say the thing is always to just get lined up the URLs for all of these chat records in one spot, and then do the analysis. That's probably the trickiest part. Again, it probably might be a pseudo-manual thing, just because the meeting templates aren't standardized to the extent I could just grab the information.

It's going to be the attendance, the intervention – maybe that's the better word than "contribution" – the number of interventions made by the persons during the call, and the AC chat.

I think that once I have those three indicators, you will have an idea whether a person attended but didn't really participate at all.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Thank you, Dev.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Dev, and in fact the absence of such clarity in participation may in fact mean that we have a technical issue. Again, we can do that.

There are times as Darlene has said that, for whatever reason, one's primary contribution to a meeting actually comes in via chat rather than via text.

Alan has raised the very important issue of how we compensate for the effective measurement or recognition of contributions made during a calls that use simultaneous interpretation. To that end, we may have to look a little bit deeper or retrain our Chairs to somehow do something in particular. Although I would assume that [inaudible], the name of the person that the [inaudible] interpreter is using at the beginning of sentence or following an [inaudible] "insert name speaking" at beginning of sentence.

With the same skill that you're indicating, Dev, that you can pick up the beginning of sentence in chat, you may be able to apply that to those situations, as well, but that would be almost a second filtration, I suspect.

It does, of course, bring me to the point of suggesting, Dev, that if we have a lack of continuity in meeting templates and where things are being stored, it's probably easier to fix that than it is to make things too cumbersome and manual, if everyone agrees this is a good idea.

Heidi has asked a question, and then I'm going to go to those—I did drop in and out of the Adobe room a couple of times, so I'll have to check with you on whose hands have gone up and down.

Heidi did ask who will be producing the chart and counting the participation. That's a question that I'm going to go back to you for, Dev. If you'd like to respond to Heidi's question, that would be useful.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: To answer the question, I think maybe Heidi missed the beginning when I showed how this was done. I think someone from staff can take this and work with it to fine tune the batch files that do the counting and so forth.

I'm looking because I want to save time on this. I don't want to be manually doing this myself. I want to make this as automated as possible. I'm thinking that someone from staff can do this. It's not a manual process to count the number of interventions, for example. I want to make this as automated as possible or as quickly as possible.

Once I was able to line up all of the meetings and get that done, it was just really copy-and-paste the meetings from the previous meetings attendance records. So it's just really cut-and-paste, copy-paste, copy-paste, albeit for 12 meetings. You could get it done in 20 minutes and just churn it out.

I really want to be able to apply this also to RALO metrics as well. I know metrics is important for in terms of measuring At-Large, ALS participation, engagement in their RALO or in At-Large working groups and so forth, to the point where it's being considered as part of their operating procedures to monitor that and possibly sanctions against that At-Large Structure for not participating.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Consequences may arise.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     Consequences, that's a good word.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, Dev. Dev had been very careful up until his "sanction" statement to use such delightful terms like "interventions" after I led him there and then "indicators," which of course these are. These are not some sort of quantitative measure that will be taken down and held against someone. It is, in fact, a good health check for contribution and general indicator for contributions or intervention count.

There is, as Darlene pointed out, some indications of qualitative, on the assumption that if one participant or several participants make no intervention, they are probably making a small – if any – contribution. That's a question that then needs to be tested, for example.

We would also need to look at – and again, Dev, this is not something to add on to your ever-growing, amazing toolbox of things for us to use – of course people who are totally restricted to activities by e-mail, these contributions will also need to be considered.

And it will be the sum total of all these [then] which would be the most useful.

Under those circumstances, of course, I've made a long intervention, as opposed to what Alan was suggesting should be simply 10 or 15 words or less between speakers. That may indeed be how Olivier gets 100 interventions, because he – like me – often do that rather vociferous thing of also clarifying points, repeating other people's points, or bringing the conversation to what we trust is the next level.

Oksana's hand was up on one of the occasions when I dropped out of the Adobe room. Can I ask you, Oksana, if you're still on the call? You may have dropped out of the Adobe room when I did and been unable to get back in. Do you still have a question or comment? And if so, go ahead now, and then we'll go to Tijani and then Darlene.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO:     Thank you, Cheryl. I'm on call. I'm not on Adobe just now.

I would like to comment and to congratulate Dev with excellent work. I would like to do the same for EURALO. I have one proposition regarding interventions, for example, how to choose the most resulted interventions.

These interventions will be reflected in action items or agenda of any meeting, since any such interventions have to be valued more. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, Oksana. Dev, would you like to respond to that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     Thanks, Oksana.

The way the number of interventions is measured is by looking at the transcript. If you look at the transcript for most of our meetings – well, definitely for all our ALAC meetings and all of our At-Large Working Group calls and RALO calls, for that matter – it's formatted in a very

specific way where the speaker is identified in capital letters followed by a colon whenever he or she is speaking.

What I did was I came up with a sort of program to just count the number of interventions that that person has made. The next step will be to integrate that back to the spreadsheet. That's in a nutshell how it works.

Once I supply the program with "Just count these person's names," it will generate the file to say how many times that person spoke. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:        Thank you, Dev. Tijani, over to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:            Thank you, Cheryl.

Dev, for the attendance, you took the data from the Adobe Connect, isn't it?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:   I took it from the wiki record, which is the final record for meeting attendance.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:            Okay, thank you.

If we will adopt this method – and I think that with the wiki it's more easy to use the data from there – I will suggest for the staff to make a standard format for the wiki page, so that the place of a table of two columns, attendees and apologies, those who are not in the attendees or the apologies column, they are absent.

If we can have this table always at the same place, so that Dev can go and collect the information immediately and directly, this is the way we can do it automatic.

If we change the place or if we put it in the text, I think it will be more difficult for Dev to use it. He will be able to do it, but it will take more effort. This is my first point.

My second point, regarding the Adobe Connect chat: normally, the Adobe Connect chat is used for, "I am dropped," "I don't hear you," "LOL," "I agree," etc. It is not for substantive contribution, except for people who didn't have a possibility to speak because of a technical failure or something like this. For example, I never use it except for, "I am dropped," or "I don't hear you."

Some people are using it to discuss, even if they have the possibility to speak. The best is that they speak up. It is better because it will be on the transcript and it will be recorded, and the participation will be recorded there.

If we use the chat, we may record participation that is not in the substance. I don't think this is helpful. I do love the way to measure the participation from the transcript record but not from the chat. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:   To your first point, I think we alluded earlier, Tijani, there will be huge necessity – if this system is adopted, and I sincerely hope that the ALAC will consider it and adopt it or something like it – to have absolute consistency on the wiki pages and the data source points that this capturing will be done from.

To your proposed two-column model, I would like to suggest it is actually a three-column model, so that we do have the absent names clearly listed as well. Otherwise, we would run a risk of having the need for someone who literally never contributed being picked up in some other way.

If one had "Present," "Apologies," and "Absent," where "Absent" is a listing of people who have given no reason for not indicating that they will be on the call, that can always be changed later after a call to an apology if they do one retrospectively. I don't think anyone doesn't expect those these days. To your second point, yes. What I'm saying, there is wholeheartedly support that proposal.

I put up a disagree marker when you were talking about ignoring metrics from the chat. I think, Tijani, that yes, I see and identify the problem that you're raising, but these are indicators. They're not go or no-go things.

I would actually suggest that, for many people, they are having very substantive contribution through chat. For whatever reason – language perhaps being one of them on non-translated calls – their contributions should be recorded.

Might I point out, Baudouin by joining today's call has made an affirmative and supportive contribution that we all can see in the chat saying how much he appreciates this work done by Dev. And noting that his English, of course, needs to be considered as he's saying that to the best of his knowledge as he is following this English conversation in a non-translated call.

That automatically flags to all of us that we have limited his participation by the technology we are offering to this call. The fact that he's making these affirmative – albeit infrequent – contributions in chat, I think it would be a bad thing to not recognize and capture.

I won't go back to you for the other matters at the moment, Dev, because I want to move to Darlene and then to Alan.

Over to you, Darlene.

DARLENE THOMPSON:     Before I say what I was going to say, Tijani just got me thinking about the chat. Even if in the chat someone puts, "I agree," isn't that – and three or four people do – doesn't that show a very strong support? Shouldn't that also be considered as being participating? It isn't much, I realize. Also, if he wants to take those out, then if it's something of two or five words or less, we could ignore it, basically.

What I was going to say, though, is I hope that these metrics get out on a fairly frequent basis. I'm thinking quarterly. They might serve as, rather than something that one might have to take sanctions on, is if I saw like in my last quarter that I missed three-quarters of the meetings

and I didn't say a word during the meetings that I did attend, it would [inaudible] my mind. I would think of how I could participate better. It might actually [inaudible] people into improving their participation in group [inaudible] those charts, they are very explicit. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, Darlene. I think you should just take that as the compliment but also the proposal that we will be, of course, discussing. We will, of course, have a full, frank, and fearless discussion on all of this with the ALAC and the At-Large community yet to come. None of this is go or no-go, we're just getting general consensus in the work group.

Alan, to you. I know you've put a few things in chat, so you could perhaps state those as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I'll ignore most of the things in the chat. People can comment if they want.

Darlene's last comment triggered something, however. I wonder how much of a good idea is it that we want people contributing just to up their count? We have a hard enough time getting through meetings anyway. For everyone feeling they have to say something otherwise they'll show up as zero is just a little bit troublesome.

We're now talking about quantity versus quantity. When we focus too much on quantity, that's what people will inherently make sure that they meet the targets on.

Just one thought in talking about chats, and it's a comment that I've made before. The chat is particularly difficult to use because people say, "Yes, I agree," and you don't have a clue, going back to it afterwards, what was going on in the meeting at the time.

There is, I believe, an Adobe Connect option which is rarely used to put a timestamp on the chat entries. I'm wondering if perhaps we want to – if we're going to treat chat as more of a substantive way to say something in a meeting, we really need some context so we understand when it's being said and what else is going on at the time. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, Alan. Just before I respond to that – and I do want to respond to that – Darlene, your hand is still up? Or is that an old hand?

DARLENE THOMPSON:     Sorry, old hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, Darlene. I just didn't want to miss a new hand.

Very valid points, but I do think that we can work around those. And I want to come to some of those suggestions shortly and get back to Dev. And then I want to move to Maureen for her reporting as well.

Of course, the time timestamp issue, Alan, is one that yes, we should certainly consider using. What then it does is encourage a more usefulness of the chat contribution, and I'm all for that. But I would

suggest that almost an embellishment of our job is not have out of scope.

We're looking at mechanisms to measure contribution. Not the value of the contribution nor are we particularly – although we would like to feel there was some qualitative work to be done here, I know, but just specifically with these call counts – nor are we, I suggest, trying to make the usefulness of the contributions in some way improved.

Now the time stamping – which you know I like, as well – makes creating sense from a meeting, particularly if you've got to build it in retrospect. If, for example – gee, let me use an example from today's meeting – if when the Chair of a meeting was to try and capture the action items from the previous call, and when they went to the wiki page for that previous call, there was in fact no action items either on the page or page in existence.

Then, the next thing the Chair would need to do is go to an e-mails received regarding the action items, which is one way. If there was no e-mail – in this case, there in fact was, thank you, Silvia, so I can hobble the action items together that way – then one would have to go to the transcript, etc., perhaps even to the chat.

Of course, the usefulness of that would be greatly enhanced by having timestamps so that comments from chat could be linked with agenda items, let alone the transcript. I should note, of course, that the transcripts as yet are not time stamped.

And that is something else that we may do later on, even if it was every 10 or 15 minutes during the transcription to note the 10 minutes into

the call, 20 minutes into the call, or whatever unit of time we think. That's almost another story, but one worth pursuing, not necessarily in our pre-Singapore work, however.

With no other hands waving at me, I also wanted to remind everybody these indicators, all of these indicators – with the exception of attendance, which is specifically mentioned under rule 9.2 of the ALAC Rules of Procedure – can in fact be for public viewing, less details. We could take it to a point where all of this is very usefully and quite automatically collected and collated, and Chairs of working groups, Chairs of ALAC, leadership teams of ALAC and regions can get access to it as will or desire takes them that way.

What is seen in the public forum – and indeed, even perhaps by the participants themselves – Darlene, going back to the usefulness issue that you raised – to motivate participants would be for any given meeting a "Yea" or "Nay," a checklist of online audio or transcript contributions. It can be "Yes" or "No." It could be three colors or it could be sixteen colors or it could be the data. That may also ameliorate some of the concern that was raised by you, Alan, in terms of people going, "Me, too," and just padding it out, as we have seen.

Sadly, in the past – even with list contributions – when we suggested that it was a requirement for people to contribute to e-mail list, I think we had things like the national holidays of about 200 countries recorded at one point. "Happy birthday and congratulations to Botswana on their national holiday," really ought not count. There might be other ways we can manage that. With the smart people we've got on this team – and

here I'm particularly focusing on you, Dev – I would be very surprised if we couldn't get our workaround if the ALAC desired us to do it.

I'm very aware that we have spent a lot longer than I thought we would on this, but I don't believe a moment of the time we have devoted to this review in this agenda has been wasted. I think this is stunningly important work.

I am seriously considering suggesting that an action item on staff should be taking out teammate insurance on Dev. I'd hate to think what would happen if he gets hit by a bus before he finishes his work. We'll have to hire a team of consultants to continue on with the scripting he's designing. We might just have to wrap you up in cotton one day. I'm actually only partially joking when I'm saying that. If this was my project, we'd have a whole lot of teammate insurance being opened on you very, very quickly. However, it's not mine; it's ICANN.

With the apologies to what is going to happen to the rest of the agenda, which is huge compression, I just want to ask Maureen now if she would be so kind as to go through her part of the reporting and, of course, make any additions or embellishments to what Dev has presented on behalf of both him and her.

Over to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:    Thank you, Cheryl.

I just asked Susie to put up the PowerPoint, but starting from the feedback that I got from the consultation process, the beginning part. I

use PowerPoint a lot for myself to organize my thoughts about different things, for my very simple mind, completely different from Dev's very technical and complex mind. I'm very simple.

One of the things that was important for me was taking note of the consultation that I'd been involved in. Taking on board what people were saying about what they didn't like about, perhaps not ICANN, but their own experiences of any type of metric.

This page the feedback starts from is an accumulation of the parameters that we'd actually posed to them as well as models that we had for their feedback on.

The feedback that we were getting was that it was a little bit over-the-top. For example, the last metric where it had the "Achieve/Not achieve," I think that once you put in a negative connotation, people focus on the negative side of things rather than looking at the positive. I think this was something else that we had to look at. It's all written here, basically the feedback that we got about the model that we were presenting.

I think the main thing, too, that needs to come up here was they were very keen that we took note of the fact that people have lives. They're volunteers, and they do have lives outside of ICANN and that we weren't to impose too much on them as well as the participation and contribution that they were already making. If we could perhaps focus on the tasks that were actually required of them.

Can we move down to the next one, Susie, please? I don't have any control of them.

Right. The next one was looking actually at some of the problems that they had. Of course, one of the things that came out of the consultation was that they – and it's been raised, Darlene and others have raised it today – was Dev's model. Once you got a statistic, how do you know that something doesn't actually show what actual contribution?

That's something that we have to balance up. How do we balance up so that we've actually got not only the attendance and that type of participation but other types of contribution besides participation?

The other thing was to do with who manages the metrics, and that was something that we discussed with staff. That's something we have to work through about how easy it is to manage the counting in that [inaudible].

It's one of the reasons why if we've gone down the track of perhaps we need to take some of the – we're looking at metrics. We have to put some of the onus of the measurement onto the ALAC members themselves.

Can we have the next one, please?

The recommendations that came from the contributors were mainly a focus on leadership. I think that this is where, in our deliberations about what would be appropriate, we've looked at the fact that the ALAC members are the leaders of their community, and therefore they should be accountable for their activities in some way and show some leadership in that respect.

Indicators – as you've mentioned, Cheryl – was a pretty key term that was used a lot. How do we incorporate indicators into this model, taking into account the sorts of things that people have mentioned?

eDemocracy tools was something that came up from NARALO, which in light of the work we're doing online and what we're trying to achieve in our communication between ALAC and the community, I think that that's a pretty good model to be looking at. We're looking at ALAC members producing a brief report.

There was only, actually, one group that actually looked at underperforming. I put it in because there were some in the group saying, "You're focusing too much on the negative." The underperformance of the ALAC members is in the Rules of Procedure. The beginning of my presentation of the PowerPoint was looking at the differences between the 2008 model of Rules of Procedure and the 2013 and model and the change of focus. Looking at how ALAC members who are underperforming are actually dealt with is pretty specific in the rules.

The next slide, please, Susie?

The quantitative side of things, I have said very briefly that Dev's attendance sheet would look at ALAC meetings and teleconferences and working group meetings, but that's sort of like looking pretty much into the future. We've only been focusing on the ALAC meetings to date, and already it's looking really, really big. I would probably scrub the other things.

My view was that an attendance sheet and especially the graphic would give a visual representation of participation, which is a more comfortable view of what [inaudible].

We would get onto the how do we measure the contribution that ALAC members make. This is where we took into account the indicators that people worked out were important to be recorded. The only one who – especially with the range of working groups and meetings that ALAC members attend – that would be very difficult for anyone other than the ALAC member themselves to actually be able to explain exactly what is that they do and what impact they feel they've had on that particular meeting through their contributions.

I, too, felt that action items were – like [inaudible] – they are an indication of what follow-on, what impact they're actually going to have in that particular discussion, situation.

Also, in the Rules of Procedures, it does say participation and roles in working groups, and so leadership responsibilities in those working groups should actually be expressed in their monthly reports as well as the other roles that they have.

In a wiki, the wiki does enable other people to respond to their report. I think this is where that eDemocracy comes in, where the community actually has an opportunity to interact with the ALAC member, himself or herself. I think that this feedback from the community is a good opportunity using the wiki.

I have later on in the thing said that if they can't use the wiki because this has been identified as a problem at times then staff is always there.

All they've got to do is send their report to the staff; the staff can put it online. I don't think that that's an issue.

I think that that's basically it. What I was going to do after this was perhaps, Dev, just put a sample of what the community page would like for attendance and similarly to do a mock-up, actually write-up our January/February report to give them an indication. We're not after a novel. We're just after: what have you done, and what impact do you believe you've had in that situation?

Any questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     I don't see anyone waving at me.

Here we go, Tijani. Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:        Thank you very much.

Thank you, Maureen, for this presentation. I want to thank you certainly, you and Dev, for your hard work. Thank you very much.

Now, I have a very important remark. What is the aim of the metrics? What we want to do with them? What is the aim? The aim is to say: "This member is very active, this member is less active but still active, this other is not active." That's it. This is the aim of the metrics. If we don't have this information, the metrics will be useless.

That's why I say that we are still in the same position as we begun. It's right that we had a set of metrics. You decided to reduce them to two. They are not two, in fact. There is one plus one very huge in which you put all the others. It's okay, I don't disagree. That's good.

We know how many meeting you attended, and we know what was your activity: How many working groups did you participate in? Did you Chair any one, etc.? What was your participation in the meeting? Yes, we have all this. After that, what do you do with this? The evaluation is not yet set.

This is what we have to do, and I think that we have to go there. I know that we are frightened by this step because we have a lot of pushback from people. People don't want to say, "If I don't attend the meetings, I am not active," for example or, "If I don't participate actively," etc.

We have to do it. I am not speaking about what will happen after the assessment. We are not yet there, and I am not speaking about that. I am speaking about the assessment, about saying, "This person or this member is active, is very active, is not active."

This is how we will do that. We need this step. This was the parameters that we wanted to set, but now we don't want to do them. Okay, but give us another way to make the assessment. This is my point, thank you.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thanks, Tijani. Maureen, to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:          Thank you.

I think that one of these really, really important things was that I referred back to the Rules of Procedure, and Susie has put the 9.1 and 9.2 sections up on the screen.

The Rules of Procedure actually say that metrics will be devised related to quantifiable performance. It says that it's to ensure that members are aware of their performance and the Chair will get support for monitoring that performance.

It mentions, too, that the three areas are attendance, participation, and role. I have focused on this because I think that this is very positive. This is actually asking ALAC members to identify their regular and significant contributions.

I think one of the things that we came up with is people can be really, really active. In particular, it may be not be in the actual ALAC meetings, but they're very, very active in the working group. They're making significant contributions which probably aren't being measured in our original graphic, which is the ALAC meetings.

If we're looking at just attendance, that's fine. But the impact that they're making is at that other level, at that working group level. I think that we have to acknowledge this and enable them to express this, hopefully, in their monthly report. That is to say, what actions have actually come out of the activities that they've been involved in?

From my perspective, I've gone outside of those very statistical, parameter-type things that we started off with. I'm actually looking

**EN**

more at how people can actually qualify what it is that they're doing in their role as an ALAC member to advance the services that the ALAC provides for its community and for ICANN. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thank you, Maureen.

Alan, over to you. Sorry, go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:    No, you can go ahead if you want.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    No, because I was about to wrap up the call, so I suggest you go.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Oh, okay. In that case, I'll be relatively quick.

I think we need to keep focus on—I made a snarky comment in the chat about how many people would want to have their day job performance evaluations done by an automated tool. Those performance evaluations may rely on some metrics that are collected, but they're done by a person.

I think we need to remember that the ultimate evaluations of people are going to be done by people here. They're not going to be done by the metrics; the metrics are triggers.

In most cases, we know the people that are problematic for one reason or another. We don't need the metrics to prove it. The metrics may prove it to them. The metrics may demonstrate that there's an issue.

I think we need to make sure we're not going overboard on this. These are aids. These are justifications and background documentation. It's not the be-all and end-all, and I think we need to remember that, that ultimately, if we are going to take any sort of remediation action, it's going to be taken by a person. It's going to be taken by a person who is convinced there is a problem and says this confrontation – which is what it is – is worthy of it.

I think as we go along with this, yes, we need metrics. We want to collect them. But let's make sure we're not going too overboard.

That wasn't the comment to what Maureen said. It's just that I think we need to draw focus back to the fact that these are aids to aid the human beings who are going to have to do the actual evaluation and take action if there's a problem. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, Alan. I'm going to ask you to repeat that at the end of our presentation in Singapore. I was always planning on introducing all of this very much as a description of a set of useful threads from which a tapestry can be built – or a rope or a whatever. We'll see how we go with the metaphors later.

Maureen, and then I see Silvia.

MAUREEN HILYARD:         Thank you, Cheryl.

                         People should be able to write in their own language, too, their report.
                         That's really important.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Hear, hear. Thank you. While I'm thanking people—Tijani, go ahead! I'm
                         not thanking you, Tijani. I'm letting you speak. Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:        Shall I speak, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      "Over to you, Tijani," were my last words. Yes, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:        Okay. Thank you.

                         There is a second point. I would like to continue on what Alan said. I am
                         not speaking about the remediation. We are not yet there. I am
                         speaking about the tools for remediation, if there is a remediation. The
                         tools will be setting clear rules, more or less, to give the person who is
                         doing the remediation, to give them the tool to do their mediation.
                         That's what I am asking for.

                         I am not asking about remediations or about sanctions or about
                         [permissions] or anything like this. No, I am asking about assessment
                         that—or give the threshold if you want, but give something for the

person who is doing their remediation so that he will do it according to something, not absolutely subjective, absolutely according to his mood. It's not normal, I think.

Second point, very important: I don't think that a wiki page for each member on which the others will comment will be a good thing because it may create big tensions. If I write in my wiki my activities, what I do, etc., and someone write after me and say, "No, this is not good. You have to do more. You have to do that!" etc., this will create tensions and perhaps it is not a good thing to do. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, Tijani.

Yes. I'm sure we would recognize that the commentary may be problematic. That said, we can finesse all of that sort of thing a little further down the track. We haven't even got to the point where there is consensus. We can finesse that, but we need to get to the point where the ALAC even accept that before we need to worry too much about finessing it. I agree with you, all of these sorts of things will need finessing.

You raised a point about the tool requirement for assessment, and you also mentioned the very important wording of "remediation," which of course we have enshrined in the ALAC rules as well.

As someone who has had the task in the real world as well as in the volunteer one of assisting people down a pathway to either resignation

or improvement, the presence or absence of these types of measures is hugely useful and even in the remediation process.

If we've got a sufficiently transparent and accountable system – and this goes to Accountability & Transparency as well – then we also have measures that you can say, "Now, what we would like to see over the next x-number of months, weeks, or days is an improvement from this that we are seeing in what we are measuring to this, which is what we've agreed you should be able to do given your current circumstances."

There's all sorts of usefulness to these things. I think in your first point, I think the working group is in absolutely rampant agreement with you, Tijani. I don't think these are counterpoints; I think there's a contributory.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm about to go to Silvia, but I'm painfully aware that according to the calendar setting up this meeting even though mentally I had it as 90 minutes, it was only 60.

SILVIA VIVANCO:           It's 90 minutes, so we are okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, that's good.

SILVIA VIVANCO:           I just wanted to make a very [inaudible] comment…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Yes, feel free to interrupt. Go ahead, Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO:     Yes. I just wanted to make a quick comment on Tijani's interventions regarding the ultimate goal of this metrics exercise.

As I was listening to all the arguments, I was also thinking about, "What could my point of view as staff member, what is the value of this? Apart from measuring and improving performance, etc., and even remediation."

From a staff point of view, there is a lot of internal reporting within ICANN staff. For me, already this work is so very useful because I can show how the At-Large community is thinking ahead and actually serves as a pioneer in terms of measuring performance ahead of many other groups. I'm bringing this value to ICANN as a whole.

The ultimate goal may be to [inaudible] performance that there is an immediate goal that has already been achieved, that it is to improve, one, the visibility of the At-Large community within ICANN and to help us as staff who request maybe some more resources to improve performance in some other way.

This work is already, from my perspective, bringing some good feedback from staff members. That's what I wanted to say. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Silvia. That's a very important intervention for two reasons.

First of all, it's going to bring us to a point in some future where our volunteers are more able to show that there is a return on investment for them, and in our community that, I think, is very important.

I would like to note the comment in the chat from Heidi as you were speaking, Silvia, where she gave you big plus-one and said, in fact, while on this call, she's been doing reporting similar to what you are discussing.

This clearly fits into my adage of, "Never do any one thing for any one reason." Not only are we working to make the rule under 9.1 and 9.2 – just generally 9, in fact – easy for the ALAC, we are also aiding staff and internal function as well.

The few minutes we have left in our call – and I'm relieved to see that despite I think the fact that the original meeting page did say 60 minutes when I checked it – which gave me a heart attack I'll hasten to add – I'm glad we're all committed to the 90. That's very important for me.

I'd like to, if no one objects then, move on now very briefly to ask Tijani – who of course is one of the work team leader, but his is the holistic lynchpin role of ensuring of everything we do come up with goes back and is effectively operating with the whole of rule 9, but specifically 9.2.

Tijani, you've had a couple of interventions today, but I do want to give you time for feedback and reporting because I know you've sent an

apology for a previous meeting or two and that you were disappointed in that. The floor is yours, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Thank you, Cheryl.

First of all, I have interacted with Maureen during the week regarding the result of her collection of information from the RALOs. She said that after discussion, the working group decided that it will get rid of this principle of parameters and go only for recording the attendance and have a report from the members. That's what I was saying a few minutes ago.

If I assume that the working group has already adopted that, I think that I wouldn't go further in the work I did before because it was based on the principle of parameters that we have to agree on all together. I even proposed in the past that those parameters can be different from a region to another, according to the culture or according to specificities of each region.

If the working group got rid of this way to work, I don't think that I would do anything more about what I did in the past.

I would like to know if we definitely got rid of this principle of parameters, of metrics with parameters that we will define after that if we have the parameters, so we will know exactly how to define an active member, a more active member, a less active member, etc.

If we continue in this way, there is no problem. We will have a complete report in the next week about what can be done. But if we got rid of this principle, I have nothing to do more.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Tijani.

Just to go back to the parameters work, and as I recall them, the parameters were also closely linked to consequences of where one fits within the spectrum of fully active, less active, or least active, and that's not your language, Dev. It's just words I'm using for the spectrum which you describe.

For example, there may very well be – I personally think it's quite justifiable – in some cultures, to suggest that if one is uninformed or has not contributed to a process or a debate or a function, that perhaps one should not be exercising one's vote. In other cultures, it would be considered quite the opposite, and in fact, any trained monkey who can push the button can vote.

I'd use my own pseudo-democracy in Australia as an example of that: we have compulsory voting, and people, as long as they get their names marked off, are counted as having contributed to the voting process. However, the quality of what they contribute or, indeed, how they vote is highly questionable.

There are issues that are still yet to be grappled with. In terms of setting fixed parameters, that's something we have yet to go through and agree upon. There's nothing discarded in your absence at all. It has simply

meant that the majority of the work that has been done has been in the part of our work that is looking at how we record metrics, regardless of whether or not parameters are to be set, and how we will socialize this whole process, as well of the very important work of looking at tools to make this as efficient and as effective and as reliable as possible.

Unless someone else's memory varies greatly to mine and that as some point we had a consensus on the disregarding of the parameters proposal, I don't think that it is, in fact, the case.

I'm just looking at chat. I see no indication from anyone to suggest that I've had a fugue state and missed a consensus on parameters.

Of course, as Maureen is pointing out, parameters themselves are only indicative. This is where it is the parameters may need to be set with that human aspect, as Alan raised. There may need to be language developed which might be including sentences such as, "To the satisfaction of the," and you can insert the words "ALAC Chair" or "general ALAC member performance" or "At-Large leadership team." For a work group, it could be "Sub-team leader," "Group leader," "Pen holder." There are all sorts of ways we can still finesse that.

With time being what it is, can I ask that this is a matter that we pick up later? I'm sure that we will specifically pick it up and finalize it before Singapore. If you believe in the next week you could have some text so that we can discuss this and raise the awareness while we report in Singapore, that would be greatly valuable. Is that possible, Tijani? I see a green tick from you. Excellent. Thank you very much.

Just as I'm about to wrap up the call – and yes, I am wrapping up the call without moving to the next part, number 5 of our agenda, which is the fairly important discussion and planning for the Singapore meeting. Not so much dates and times – that's fixed – but our actual process. I just want to come back to Silvia. Do we have that wiki page set up, or is that being done as we speak?

SILVIA VIVANCO:          I haven't done it yet. I was waiting for this call to end to make sure that I put it in the right place.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:          Terrific, that's good.

Going back to my earlier reply to you after the last call a fortnight ago, it can be a child page of the main section because we don't want people to have to drill down too far [inaudible] to find the page. We don't need to put an actual live link from the main page, but we do need to send the URL out to our whole work group so that we can all access it. If someone finds the page, I don't have a problem. I just don't want to particularly advertise it until we go live just before the Singapore meeting.

To deal with section 5, I would like to ask at least a selection of you – if not all of you – would you mind meeting next week, perhaps at the same time and on the same day if that works? I'm going to ask Susie and Silvia to check the calendar to see whether that will work with other calls.

We will have a single agenda item for that call and that is it to look at what we have managed to put together on that wiki page that Silvia is creating.

On that wiki page, Silvia, I would like to have the links to the work Dev has already presented and anything else Dev has put together between now and then. I would like to have a PDF of the PowerPoint that Maureen has given us. I would also the reporting that Tijani indicates he will be sending in the next, hopefully, just before the meeting if not a little bit earlier will need to go up on there as well.

Most importantly, any comments and suggestions and fresh bits of data, including any mocked-up pages. You all have wiki rights, so make a page. Put together a mock-up of what you're talking about. I would suggest linking to pages such as the one that some of us have personally and creating pages such as Maureen and her group have been talking about might be very good ways of showing rather than talking through what we mean at the Singapore meeting.

Let's gather all our mock-ups and everything else and bludgeon together a resource page so once we went over the cover in detail in our 15-minute allocation, we can leave them with a link and they can browse through the material at their leisure.

The action items that I've seen collected today I don't think need any more annotation or expansion than I thought. Silvia, are there any action items you want to repeat or go over with you?

SILVIA VIVANCO:           Sorry, can you repeat that, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:       Yes, I was asking you did you need me to go over any action items with you before we finish the call.

SILVIA VIVANCO:           No, I think I got it. Thanks!

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:       Excellent. Okay, terrific. Thank you very much. If I could just ask that we confirm our call for same time next week? We'll slot it in for 90 minutes because sometimes planning for a presentation which is only 15 minutes long will take that length of time. We also want to make sure we have this resource page that we will be working on next week pretty much ready to go because some of us will be getting on planes shortly after that and heading to Singapore.

Same time, same place, same length of time for the meeting. The only thing required on the agenda other than the usual administering of roll call, etc. will be what is today's item #5, discussion and planning for Singapore and, of course, the new wiki page, which will be our resource.

We'll make it 90 minutes, Heidi, because I'm always happy to give people's life back, rather than take more than I'd planned, and I've already done that today.

Thank you, one and all. I do appreciate the amount of work that has gone on, particularly the quality that I believe for a group of volunteers you are producing. I would be proud to be paying significant dollar in the real world for this process of feedback and reporting.

Before I let you go, I just want to respond to one thing that Alan said on whether or not automatic tools would be something that people would be comfortable with having their KPIs and their reviews done.

I have a considerable feeling that even in my lifetime working with review processes, I'm pretty sure there's been a number of tools and they weren't human that were doing assessments. Occasionally, assessments I had to deal with and occasionally assessments of me. The best we can perhaps is work on a balance between the automaton and the real world.

Baudouin, thank you very much. I, of course, appreciate the fact that you have to follow all of this in English. Please, feel free to contribute to the wiki pages in French.

Bye for now. Thank you, one and all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**