TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Pre-ATLAS II Webinar on the topic of Rules of Procedure on Thursday, 29th of May 2014 at 21:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call as it's a webinar, but if I could please remind everyone on the telephone bridge, as well as the computer, to mute your speakers and microphone when not speaking, as well as state your name when speaking – not only for transcription purposes, but to allow interpreters to identify you on other language channels.
	We have Spanish and French interpreters. Thank you very much for joining. Back over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Terri. Welcome everybody to this last of the set of Capacity Building Webinars that we have been staging in the run up to the At-Large Summit. This webinar is going to be dealing with the Rules of Procedure, which is a bit of a strange term when being translated in other languages.
	It's effectively the bylaws by which we operate, and it's important to know what the bylaws are and how they come up and work, because it's a set of rules that we work, and not only work, but define what our work is. That's the aim of the call today.
	To learn about this, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who is the Chair of the 2014 Nominating Committee, but was also an ALAC past Chair for a great number of years. We also have Alan Greenberg, who is the ALAC Liaison

EN

to gNSO. Why do we have these two people speaking to us now? Because Cheryl was know for a very long time as Queen of Procedure, and Alan was the main drafter for the new set of Rules of Procedure that were recently adopted by the ALAC. The two experts are at hand. I'll pass the floor over to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. I think the first question, which you've attempted to answer, is why are we having a webinar on Rules of Procedure. In the general sense, I can't think of a more boring topic, however there are parts to the Rules of Procedure which are quite relevant to ALSes, to RALOs and to individuals representing ALSes. That's where we're going to be focusing most of the effort.

The Rules of Procedure are not only to talk about how the ALAC operates, but the finest structure and the responsibilities of the various parts of the ALAC, and the various roles people play. Those are the parts we're going to be focusing on more.

You've all seen this picture before if you've attended any webinar. We use it all the time. It shows the general hierarchical structure from ALSes, to RALOs, to the ALAC. The key point from this perspective is the fact that two out of every three ALAC members from each region are appointed by the RALOs. That means by the ALSes representatives to the RALOs. That's the really crucial part that we're going to be looking at. I think we're not turning it over to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I'm going to very briefly take you through, to take sure you all understand the structure, as well as the front function. It is structure and function that's defined within the Rules of Procedure. It's something that ALSes interfaces between your communities and the groups of people in your organization, who are interested in these things.

You'll often hear people talk of "the ALAC" and when they're talking about that, they're often meaning At-Large. We do try and differentiate that we are all At-Large. You are members of ALSes, or individual members who are At-Large in their own right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we've lost Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm hearing Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not muted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, then it might be me that has a problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. I think that after all these years your neural pathways block me out. I understand that. What awe have as the ALAC is the 15-

EN

person Committee, which is that At-Large Advisory Committee. Ten of its members are selected by the RALOs. Two per RALO. It's you and your ALSes that make up those RALOs, and you are directly responsible for sending those two people per region, to serve two new terms in overlapping years.

It's your responsibility to make sure you understand what type of things they'll be required to do and what the expectations on them are. That's one of the key reasons we're going through this very exciting topic of Rules of Procedure. The 15-person ALAC has ten, who are selected by the RALOs, and five who are selected by the NomCom. That's one per region. That's another topic we could talk about another day.

At the moment myself and five members, one from each region, who have been sent from the ALAC to serve on the NomCom, are deliberating on not only the people who take leadership positions in the ALAC – one per region – and this year we're appointing for Europe and North America – but also a number of other key positions, including Members of the Board of ICANN.

Within the ALAC structure you then have a very important unit called the ALAC Leadership Team. Under the new rules, it's called ALT. That refers to the ALAC Leadership Team. It's five members. One per region. One of those will be Chair of the ALAC, one or two will be Vice-Chairs, and two or three will be non-titled ALAC members. That's the key leadership team, who were named differently. We'll speak about that later when we look at a little historical context. You also have, serving as part of the ALT, the Liaisons from the ALAC, who serve to the ACs and the SOs.

EN

They act in what's called Ex Officio capacity. In other words, they contribute to the meetings, they report to the meetings of the ALT, they attend the meetings of the ALT, but if anything was to come to a vote they hold no vote. They are Ex Officio. Alan, anything from you that I've missed? Next slide then.

ALAN GREENBERG: The ALT, which by the way, for those who've been around for a while used to be called the Executive Committee, or Ex-Com, before the rules were rewritten. It's an interesting group. It has no powers as such. The only powers it has are those actually invested in the Chair of the ALAC. The Chair may on occasion delegate things to members of the ALT, or in fact to any member of the ALAC.

The ALT essentially works to make sure that the ALAC itself, during its meetings, can focus on issues that are important. There are a whole host of issues that come up, that don't warrant discussion of 15 people, and don't warrant taking the time of 15 people, but the decision aht need to be made.

In a different world, if we had more of an autocrat for a Chair, the Chair would simply arbitrarily make these decisions, or perhaps vest them in staff. In general we like to make sure there's regional input into all decisions, and the ALT does things related to that. For instance we review meeting arrangements, we go over the detailed agendas, we look at all comment periods ICANN puts up, and tries to decide if there's a good reason that ALAC should get involved or not.

If there's a lot of controversy, we might turn it over to the ALAC to discuss. We try to essentially get rid of the administrivia, so the ALAC can focus on important issues when it meets at its once-a-month meeting, or when they meet in person at ICANN meetings.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: On that Alan, other bits of administrivia are great examples at the moment. A lot of the reviewing and meeting arrangements, whether they're the monthly meetings or the big London gathering for the ALSes and representatives, and they also work as an interface to make sure action items that are assigned to various individuals… and of course ICANN staff are tracking properly and are being addressed.

It sounds really boring and sometimes it can be, but without keeping the engine running with those activities, you'd find the ALAC meetings would be far longer than they already are. I don't think any of us want that. It does double-up, if not triple-up, the number of meetings and the hours spent by the ALT. What that does is allow the ALAC as a whole to run more efficiently.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This was a previous slide but you'll notice I highlighted the part that says ALAC members are selected by the RALOs. It is arguably the most important part of the ALS responsibilities; to select good ALAC members. If the ALAC members are not selected properly – if we do not end up with an At-Large AC that can do its job, then the whole concept of having At-Large involved with ICANN falls down.

EN

The credibility of At-Large and ICANN really depends on the quality of the ALAC members and their dedication. The ALAC has a responsibility to ensure that ICANN can succeed. If ICANN doesn't work properly, then having a good At-Large has no meaning whatsoever. We have the responsibility of making sure that when user issues are discussed within ICANN, within any part of ICANN, that they're addressed from a user perspective.

Now, that doesn't mean users win out and trump every other reason for making a decision, but we want to make sure things are fairly discussed, and make sure users are part of the part of the equation when decisions are made. Ultimately, users are the several billion people that use the Internet, and they're the ones we're here for when push comes to shove.

The RALOs and the ALSes have a responsibility of selecting ALAC members that will do their job well. What does well mean? That depends on what the responsibilities are, and for that I'll turn it over to Cheryl. Before you continue, I want to make one more comment that I think is important. Right now we have a pretty good ALAC, I'll be honest. We probably, on average, have a better ALAC than I've seen before in my seven years in At-Large.

Some of the things we'll be discussing over the next little while, that Cheryl will be bringing up, are because we have had problems before. We have had situations where ALAC members – both NomCom and RALO selected, simply did not pull their own weight, and did not contribute sufficiently. That pulls down the whole organization. That's why we're focusing so much on making sure that you, the people who

EN

are going to select the next ALAC members, understand what you're selected and why. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Picking up on what Alan's said here is vitally important. Part of the motivation for reviewing and renewing the new Rules of Procedure that the ALAC now runs under was to make it really clear what the members' responsibilities were. We're not going to belabor this point, but we need you to understand that these are the expectation you should have on the people you send to serve on your behalf.

ALAC members need to serve on behalf of the ALAC and the At-Large community, and those beyond you – all that are connected as Internet end users, and all the people who are yet to be connected as Internet users – by acting for the good of the entire ICANN community. That means you have to think about what the greater good is. ALAC is not a place for the division of opinion, for bringing personal or particular geopolitical biases to the table.

One has to be able to present those are issues to be considered, but one does not make a decision in the ALAC based only on a particular and sometimes quite polarized point of view. We expect them to attend all ALAC meetings, and they're at least monthly. That's inclusive of face-to-face meetings, so that's all of the ICANN meetings, where the ALAC meet with a very heavy schedule. When not possible, they should provide notice that they're unable to attend.

EN

This is something we need to do better. It's far easier for Olivier and the ALT to plan a meeting efficiently and effectively if they know who's going to be attending, and who will not be attending. When one does not attend, it doesn't mean that one does not contribute. The best of their efforts need to be made by the ALAC member to send a note or material of briefing that says, "My opinion on this is –" or "My regional view on this is –".

If there is a topic of important that is on the agenda. Not being at a meeting via teleconference or physically, does not meant that an ALAC member, even an absent one, cannot contribute. They should and they could. They also need to prepare for, and actively participate, in all ALAC discussions. That includes the email list, the Wikis, and various other members of interaction. Many ALAC members will spend some time Skyping or in back-channel conversations.

I can assure you that right now, Alan and I are also in Skype. I sent him a "hug" a little while ago, when he sent me into the conversation one slide too early, and he apologized for it. You might want to look at people who are comfortable multitasking as well. The main theme here is the success of ICANN and the success of ALAC. It depends on how good a group of people served on the ALAC.

Next slide. Just continuing on, ALAC members must take part in all ALAC-consensus decisions and votes. These are things that are very important. It's not just the vote. There are a lot of online votes put out by the Chair of the ALAC. It's very easy for your ALAC members to say, "Look, here's my voting record," because the voting record is public.

They also need to contribute to the consensus decisions, and it's by consensus that ALAC, in most matters, would prefer to operate in.

You need to make sure that your ALAC members are contributing to the building of consensus, and contributing to what points are raised during those consensus conversations.

TERRI AGNEW: I apologize for the interruption, but we did lose our Spanish interpretation. If we could pause for a moment? I'll let you know once they're reconnected.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not a problem. I just wanted to note, Anthony, that techniques for consensus is a very good tool. If you Google it, there's a whole bunch of mechanisms, and a key term here would also be "influence". A lot of things talk about building influence in group activities, and also about people building consensus. If any of you would like to pop questions into the chat at this time, Alan and I would be happy to address any points raised. It's very important that you're all aware what the best mechanisms of communication are, and that does include back-channeling, I'm afraid.

TERRI AGNEW: They're back now. You can continue at this time. Thank you again.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Terri. Welcome back to the Spanish channel. Sorry you lost audio. I'll just backtrack one point to make sure you haven't missed anything. I was talking about the need for ALAC members to actively contribute to consensus decisions, and to show you, as the At-Large community, that they are contributing a voice that's best representative of perhaps your view, or perhaps just wider views, into the conversations, to build consensus.

Also, it's to also bring other influence, if you have a regional view that's of some difference to that of other regions. You need to have other ALAC members who are actively participating in the ALAC work teams. That's often shorthanded as WT. You'll also see that there are work teams or work groups that often occur in the gNSO, or the ccNSO, and we encourage ALAC members to be engaged in those other bodies' work groups and work teams as well. Preferably they should also take a leadership position, in at least one or more of the work teams in which they participate.

On that matter, I think it's important to note that Alan is an idea example of the type of ALAC member who has taken key leadership roles, and has led, being the Chair, of a very important PDP Working Group within the gNSO. When we say we'd like ALAC members to take leadership positions within our own work groups and work team, all those in other parts of our organization – the sky is the limit, because you have an example here already where Alan has already led the way. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. The responsibilities of the ALAC member, it's at one level easy to list the specific tasks – you must come to meetings, you must vote, things like that. The more general ones are the harder ones to describe, because they don't translate into specific actions that you can just tick off. If the ALAC and At-Large people within ICANN do not play a leadership role, guarding the interests of users, that's entering the conscience of ICANN from a point of view of users. No one else will likely do it.

It's a really important issue. It's easy to understand it if you look from a historical point of view, but up until a number of years ago, before the ALAC became as effective as it is now – and it is reasonably effective – there were often discussions that would impact users in a very significant way, but they were never mentioned. That's the kind of thing we want to make sure never happens again.

That's why we're focusing so much effort and discussion on trying to make sure we have ALAC members who will contribute, and who won't just contribute in a narrow way, but in a much wider way within ICANN in general. We expect ALAC members to take that seriously. If ALAC members are in a position where they can no longer meet the responsibilities, then we hope in discussion with the Chair for instance, we will either find ways to make sure that we can make use of them properly, or that they resign, and people have an opportunity to name someone else who can make the obligations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I can jump in there before we move to the next slide, I just wanted to take the opportunity, before we move away from work groups and work teams… We've got such a great group of keen and interested participants on today's call, just to remind them, through a little advertisement – that the work groups and work teams are open to members and active participation, well outside the 15-person ALAC.

What we'd all love to see, and I think the ALAC would love to see, is to have much wider participation from all of you in these work teams, in these work groups. There's absolutely no reason why you can't take – as I know you've heard in other briefings, in preparation for the ATLAS meeting – that there is no reason why you can't take roles as penholders or as assistants to other more experienced work group people, and you can take leadership roles.

You don't have to be in the ALAC to do this. It's in the responsibilities of ALAC to do. I'd really want to encourage anyone who wants to explore, be more participatory in work groups, to ask your RALOs to get some of us old hands, to perhaps set up another bit of training for a webinar or mentoring that can help you do that. Back to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Let's look for a moment on ALT responsibilities. We talked a little bit about what the ALT does. Someone who is willing to take on one of the leadership roles within the ALAC, obviously must be an ALAC member to start with. What it comes down to is they're expecting a higher level of responsibility, a higher workload then a normal ALAC member. There are more meetings, and there's a stronger

EN

obligation to do work in-between the meetings than there often is within the ALAC At-Large.

As I mentioned earlier, or Cheryl did, we're still having a problem of getting people to contribute to Wikis, to mailing lists, in-between meetings. With an ALT member they don't really have that option anymore. If you cannot do that on a regular basis, then you're really not willing to take on the load of ALT team member. Although the ALT is carefully regionally balanced to make sure we can get input from all of the regions in an ALT discussion, the ALTs have a very strong responsibility to act on behalf of the best interests of the ALAC, and not necessarily their region.

That's a hard thing to do sometimes, when you strongly believe something, but that's not the end result or decision. That is what you have to do on occasion. Honestly, there are not often times when the regions are battling each other, but there are times when one region has strong feelings, compared to another, and those have to be addressed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, this is not just regional views, of course. When I served as Chair of the ALAC, I – I think, very effectively – promoted and was a good agent to get a change, which the community wanted as a result of the review that went on at the ALAC at the time. It's something that I do not believe, and my core values do not believe in, as a good idea. I have put my personal opinions on this particular aspect to the side, even though I have plenty of opportunity to perhaps bias the outcomes, in leadership you don't do that.

You do what is for the greater good. To that end, I spend more than 12-18 months of my life promoting something that I actually don't believe is the right thing to do, but the community believes was the right thing to do. It hasn't worked out too badly after all. Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. The next item we're going to talk about is liaisons. We've talked a bit about liaisons to the gNSO, the ccNSO. We have four formal Liaisons to the gNSO and ccNSO, the two major operational groups, setting policy for gTLDs and ccTLDs. There's also the SSAC, and we also have, interestingly, a Liaison to the .mobi gTLD. That was part of their commitment when they originally took responsibility for .mobi, and signed the contract that they would include user input into their decision processes.

The responsibilities of the Liaisons are large, and we'll talk about it in some detail in a moment. Essentially, these people are acting as the conduits for information, back and forth between the ALAC and the other groups. The Liaisons are authorized to speak on behalf of the ALAC. That's a critical issue, because in many cases there may be a discussion within one of these organizations, that the ALAC has not discussed formally. How can you speak on behalf of an organization that hasn't actually put their thoughts in order?

It's up to the ALAC to pick someone they trust enough to understand the important issues to At-Large, so that they can speak, and perhaps predict where the outcomes are going to go – making it clear, of course, if something is not a formal statement of the ALAC, it can't be

represented as such – but it's essentially someone who knows the subject matter inside out, and can interact with this other group as appropriate, and essentially function as part of the other group.

The Liaisons to any of these groups, be it the ccNSO, the gNSO, or the SSAC, essentially function, for all intents and purposes, as a member of that group. They may not have a vote, but they are essentially part of that group and have to operate within those constraints.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on that Alan, that's very important for the community to understand. In some cases, for example within the SSAC, our Liaison to the SSAC operates as a fully-fledged member of the SSAC. To that end, much of what they may be doing is strictly confidential, until such time as they put out a report. In that case, a huge amount of trust has to be invested in that person, because we, as the At-Large community, needs to know, with all the Liaisons, that they will act – and you must have faith that they will act – in our best interests.

In the case of the SSAC, it's one of those times where this may not be as visible until reports and things come out. Of course, the work that Alan has done, over the last six or seven years, as Liaison to the gNSO, is very obvious. It's literally only the absence of a vote that makes a difference between him and any other gNSO Councilor. To that end, Alan, I think you're probably the longest serving one still there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am, indeed. Luckily, that will come to an end. Just like with leadership positions that Cheryl was talking about a moment ago, when and if your position as a Liaison differs from the overall position taken by At-Large or by the ALAC, clearly the position presented has to be the one that's the formal position. In discussions it may well come out that the Liaison has a personal view that's different, but one also has to make sure that there is no misrepresentation. That nothing which is just a personal view is characterized as being an ALAC position.

Similarly, when a Liaison reports back to the ALAC and to At-Large, one has to be very careful to make sure you're reporting what actually happened, not what you would prefer to have happened. It's an interesting position. If you can devote the time and effort that it takes – and it does take a fair amount – then it's the kind of thing I encourage people to look into. The way to get there, of course, is to start participating in Working Groups, get a feel for what's going on, and then slowly, your level of knowledge and responsibility can increase.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on that – and there are a couple of questions in the chat that I might cover – some of the questions regarding Liaisons will be answer in this next slide, but one of the things that needs to be seen by ALAC… ALAC is the appointing body. It's ALAC that decides on who's a Liaison to external groups, because they are Liaisons of the At-Large AC. They're acting on behalf of the wider At-Large community, but they are Liaisons of the ALAC.

The ALAC would like to see people who've already established a good deal of trust and influence in the receiving bodies that they may be sending to. If one has aspirations, for example, of becoming a Liaison to the ccNSO, you would want to see someone who the ccNSO community already listens to, respects, and understands the way that that particular part of ICANN works. Each part of ICANN does have its own, unique ways of working.

To that end, I had the honor of serving as the ALAC's Liaison to the ccNSO for a few years. When I was transitioning out of that role, the current ccNSO Liaison, Maureen Hilyard, who's sent her apologies to today's meeting, attended pretty much all of the Working Group activities, other than full Council meetings, that I did for almost a year. There she was; mentored, trained and integrated, and therefore easily accepted, with a high level of trust and influence that's required.

So when she took on the role it was relatively seamless. I think that's important for the community to understand. These are critical roles, and they're not ones one gives to one's friend. If people can't get the influence in the name of the At-Large community, then they shouldn't be in the role.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just realized we're running a little late, so I guess we should try and go quickly through it, and then have some time for a good question period. A small issue, though important, is the length of appointments. Virtually all appointments that the ALAC does – and we're talking about internal within the ALAC, or external, as Liaisons or appointees to other groups –

are one year. It's from the end of the annual general meeting, which is typically the last ICANN meeting of the year, until the end of the next one.

The Chair is a slight exception. The last ALAC review recommended that the Chair sit for two years, because it requires a fairly steep learning curve. Although we haven't had many Chairs in recent years, they don't turnover all that quickly. They did suggest two years. What we ended up doing was essentially saying that the term is still a one-year term, but it's automatically renewable, once, if the person still meets the criteria and still willing to serve.

There are no term limits within the ALAC, for any of the positions. Typically there are a small enough number of people who are willing to serve. The ALAC itself has a fair amount of turnover that we can't control, because there are term limits in many of the RALOs. We decided, when we were looking at the rules, to not impose artificial limits on stopping someone from serving, if the ALAC wishes them to continue serving, and if they're willing to continue in that capacity. Cheryl, any comments on this before we go on?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I think we can move to the next slide. That picks up on Konstantine's question. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The process on how we select people varies from position to position, and they're detailed in some excruciating level of detail in the Rules of

Procedure, should anyone care. Liaisons are an exception, in that although for most positions we go out and essentially look for volunteers, and then have a decision based on consensus or a formal election, depending on the specifics, for Liaisons, should the ALAC choose, the ALAC can simply reaffirm them as the Liaison, without going out for a formal selection process.

The considerations the ALAC takes in making any selection are, first of all, the wiliness of someone to serve, and their ability to carry out the job. There's an issue of continuity versus new blood. Now, it's good to get new people into positions, and it's also good to have people know what they're doing. It's a balance. A decision has to be made, and it gets made by the group, literally depending on what the important issues are for any given position.

As Cheryl already mentioned, for Liaisons, there's a certain level of trust, which makes the position far more effective. If the person can become part of this target organization, when I'm sitting on the gNSO and I say "we", I don't mean ALAC, I mean the gNSO. It's a little bit of a split personality issue, but you have to be able to bridge that gulf if you're going to fit in in your own organization, and in the one you're a Liaison to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on that, it's perfectly reasonable for a receiving organization – in other words, the organization that the appointee is sent to – to have their leadership contact the ALT or Chair of the ALAC and say, "You need to change. This is just not working." They will do that, believe me. To

put someone in who's ill-equipped or ill-prepared or incapable of doing the role, not only does our effectiveness as At-Large harm, it can actually do reputational harm to the individual.

This balance between rotation and new blood – this bizarre desire for "Democracy", which to be honest absolutely amazes me sometimes, which is where you get arguments for compulsory rotation, etcetera – [unclear 00:44:29] effectiveness, it's something I will argue very strongly against, and I have done for years and am not likely to change, but believe me, there's a real risk for occupational harm for a job badly done, just as there is a huge reward for reputational building, for a job well done. Back to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. One last comment, you mentioned the term rotation. Periodically when we have discussions, and it's certainly happened a lot during the Rules of Procedure discussion, the concept of should we be rotating any given position among the five regions. Whether it's the Chair, or a Liaison position, or an appointee to some group or another. I find it an interesting statistic that I cannot recall, in my seven and a half years, a single instance of any appointed person being accused of favoritism to their own region.

Literally. Maybe I've missed one, but I cannot recall a single instance of where regions were badly served because a particularly officer, from a Chair, to a Liaison, to an appointee to another sub-committee, is badly served because of regional disparity. I think that speaks well to the selections that the ALAC has generally made.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As you move to the next slide, I just want to pick up on Konstantine's question and Olivier's response regarding a yearly call for candidates. In the case of Liaisons, of course, there is no need for a yearly call. The ALAC can choose when and if they are satisfied with the Liaison they had appointed, they can simply confirm, via annual confirmation, of continuation in the role, providing they're satisfied with the person who's in the role. That is a change from the old rules to the new rules.

Olivier, there is not necessarily a yearly call for candidates for all positions, at all. Olivier, perhaps I shall do a pop quiz with you on the Rules of Procedure [out of copy 00:46:42] in London.

ALAN GREENBERG: That being said, for non-Liaison positions, there is a call, although in many cases the incumbent is the only person to volunteer and no one tries to run against them. That's a conscious decision.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's okay too.

ALAN GREENBERG: Onto Cheryl's favorite discussion, performance.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is where I get very excited. Performance metrics, measures. Something that is tangible out of this. The new rules have performance requirements. This is hugely important, because it's you, as the At-Large

rank and file membership, who now have the ability to ask how well and also measure how well, the appointments you are responsible for are doing. All ALAC members must make regular and significant contributions to the ALAC, At-Large and ICANN.

It's in our rules. This is a quote from our rules. It's very easy to say but it's particularly difficult to measure. There is a sub-committee of the Rules of Procedure Review Group, which has continued on its own right, talking about and developing metrics; the ability to measure these things. Some of these things are easy measures. We can get attendance and we can measure it. We can measure voting. You could be attending a meeting and not contributing to the meeting.

We're looking at ways of getting the hard measure done – how active participation can be measured, and the value of the contributions. I'm not going to do it now, although I'd be so tempted to spend another 90 minutes talking about it, but take a look, if you're interested, at the work of the Metrics Group. They need your input. They are coming up with ideas for getting these hard measures done.

The easy stuff is easy. It's the hard stuff they need help on. There will be an opportunity, and a call during London, for people to join that group. If you're as excited about this as I can be, come on down. I'd be very pleased to have you join the group.

Good old remediation. Sometimes things just don't work out. in my day, in the dim, dark, distant past, with Cheryl Langdon-Orr as Chair of the ALAC, we sadly did have some people who were appointed to the ALAC who were not pulling their weight. They were not performing as

well as the majority of the members were. There was very little, if anything, we could do about it. With the new Rules of Procedure that is not the case.

We have specifically referred to the new rules, and called a mechanism for remediation. It involves working with the Chair, and all the traditional mechanisms, to make sure remediation is fair and reasonable. It's terribly important to realize that the remediation process is not a criticism, per se. It's an effort to improve performance issues. If one ends up in a situation where one is suggested to be guided, or micro-managed, trained or encouraged, so that a situation can be remediated, one should take that as a building of expertize exercise, not as a personal criticism.

That works in real life, just as well as it does in the world of ALAC. It's intended to fix, not to punish. However, if remediation fails, and we'd hope this is rare, if ever, and if only in extreme cases we now have rules where it's possible to revoke the appointment, and that is all appointments, including those of the NomCom. We can fix our problems, and if we don't, we can fix the fact that the person is still there with the problem. We can remove leaders and we can remove ALAC members.

Coming to the end, guys. You've lasted beautifully for us, and we do appreciate the attention, and particularly the questions in the chat. Virtually all of the ALAC meetings are open. This is an opportunity for each and every one of you. It says so in our rules. Anyone can attend an ALAC meeting, a ALT meeting, any of the Committees, and any of the

work group meetings. Many if not all of the work group and work team meetings in the other parts of ICANN are not also open.

We definitely want to encourage you all… This is how future ALAC members can be nurtured and developed and built, and this is how future Liaisons and leaders can be nurtured and developed and built. All of you need to consider getting involved in the meetings, by attending. They also allow you to measure the performance of the people you send. Formal members, generally, are given the speaking priority.

If you were attending an ALAC meeting, ALAC members the Chair would recognize first. If time permits, you will be as welcome to speak as anyone else attending the meeting. That's a very important rule and it's one that you should all cherish.   The Working Group members, particularly Working Groups outside of the ALAC are now, in the main, more open to people. We'd like to encourage more of you to join, and perhaps learn from the more experienced members, who have many years of Working Group experiences, on how to be a top performer.

It's terribly important that we come up with a mentoring program to increase this participation. I know this is something that will probably be an outcome of your London experience with ATLAS II. A number of the regional plans for engagement are going to look at, certainly in Asia Pacific, and specifically in the Oceania region, for example… We have huge cultural differences, vast language differences, and terrible time zone differences to deal with.

There is a plan, as in many of the regions, to look at working locally, at a regional or sub-regional level, on matters, and then using trust of

individuals to feed those opinion [people 00:54:32] in, to the ICANN or ALAC Working Groups. Next slide please Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give one or two sentences first, before the next slide, because the next slide simply says "questions". Mentoring, as you mentioned, is something that we're talking about more. We need to do it more. Within Working Groups, one of the things that I'd like to see is if someone has an interest in a Working Group, they should be able to approach the ALAC and say, "I have an interest in this Working Group. Can someone spoon feed me and help me to understand the issues?"

Just diving into them, sometimes, it's very difficult to get up to speed quickly. It's that kind of thing that I think we need to do more, because just expecting people to volunteer and start working on their own is a very difficult challenge for many people who have not done it before. I think that's a target of where we want to head. If we don't, I expect people on this call to call us on it, and make sure we do. If any of you want to get involved, call us on it and make sure we do provide help. It' our responsibility. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hear, hear. I think with the next slide coming up we're open for questions. I've tried my best, as has Alan, to deal with as much as we could while we were going through. If there are any outstanding questions that we haven't dealt with, please bring them forward to us now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Thank you to both of you for these. The floor is open for questions, and if you wish to ask a question, please put your hand up, or type it in the chat and we'll try and read the questions in the chat as they come in, or we'll hand the floor over to you to be able to ask your question. I was just going to add a couple of things, whilst people think of a question to ask.

The first is with regards to getting involved, and getting involved in the Working Groups, and getting some experience in being able to run calls, take part in Working Groups, and then moving onto leadership roles. I think that both Alan and Cheryl have explained this in a very good way. I've found that in general, At-Large is quite a friendly environment to start being involved in policy activities.

It's an excellent stepping-stone to get involved more in gNSO Working Groups, and also after, while there's also a logical step to take a leadership role in the gNSO Working Groups, or in the Cross-Community Working Groups, of which there are likely be more and more… The Cross-Community Working Groups that are co-chartered by more than one of ICANN's SOs or ACs. They are particularly important, and as we've mentioned in the chat, the mission that we have is important.

As we bring forward the points of view, and we defend the interests of Internet users, we cannot purport to be representing them in any way, but if no one else brings forward the point of view, or defends the end user interests, then if we don't do it, no one else will do it. It's really important to gain more knowledge and more experience in our

community, and then be able to go out there, act, and take leadership roles and responsibilities in the rest of the ICANN volunteer structure.

That said, there have also been some volunteers that have ended up being employed, which is a good thing. They've been employed in the organization in the multistakeholder system, or multistakeholder ecosystem, as we'd call it. It's sad for us, because we see them go, but it's great for them and I guess it's also good for us, because we see that we have people that are growing, and certainly learning an enormous amount. Alan, do you wish to add something to this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I wanted to add a general statement that I realized I was going to say, and I forgot about it. We talk a lot about teleconferences and conference calls. An awful lot of the work of Working Groups is done online on teleconferences. I must admit, before I came into ICANN, I had spent several decades of a career, which involved a fair amount of teleconferences and conference calls, which I was singularly unimpressed with.

I rarely found teleconference calls to be an effective way of doing business. I was very dubious, when I came into ICANN, that this is actually how we get work done. I learnt very quickly that if a call is managed by someone who really knows what they're doing, and there's some discipline involved, teleconferences can be very effective.

It's just a bit of a learning curve that I had, and those of you who may not have had that kind of experience may wonder how you can really work over the telephone. It can be done though, and it's something that

we right now do very effectively, throughout much of ICANN. That's just an interesting insight. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I just wanted to pick up on two points that came in through the chat. One is from Gunela, asking if I could explain more about the regional input into Working Groups, bearing in mind that they're still at planning stage. The answer to that is yes I can, Gunela, but I think it's something we should save for London. I want to leave you all wanting more.

Alan, I, and others, are happy to sit in a little talk about that at some point during your London schedule, even if it means standing up during a lunch or breakfast and doing a presentation. Certainly Alan, I and me, and others, as leaders current, past and present, have a lot of experience with working through informal presentations as well as formal ones. I just wanted to note, Oksana, thank you for your valuing of our presentation.

I'm not sure a cooperation between two highly experienced Liaisons, to other parts of the organization, should be seen as "odd cooperation," because unless we were very good at cooperation, we wouldn't be very good at our jobs as Liaisons. It's probably why this tag-team today, which is a little different, you realize, and might I say has not been

rehearsed, has gone the way it has. If that's all there is for questions, I guess it falls to me.

I'll give Alan the last word, which is a rarity. I usually like the last word. I'd like to thank you all for the great attendance, and the positive feedback we've got. I look forward to perhaps acting as a mentor to any one of you, as you want to take your pathway or encourage others into a pathway into future work on the ALAC, or another leadership role. Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: You said almost everything that I was going to say, except I look forward to seeing you all in London.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm running this call, but I've not seen all the questions answered yet. I saw there was one in the chat, which was asking if other groups or organizations are currently under consideration for establishing a Liaison. Was there a proposal process to recommend new Liaisons? I thought that was an interesting one, from Konstantin Kalaitzidis.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can answer that. The answer is probably no, at the moment. There is discussion of a gNSO Liaison to the GAC. If that every comes into being, and there is some questions whether it will or will not, then I think the ALAC would want to step in line and say, "Us next?" The linkages between the ALAC and the GAC are probably better than with the gNSO right now, and the need is greater for the gNSO, because of the overlap

in issues that the gNSO is setting policy on that may be of interest to GAC members.

That one is a possibility. I haven't heard of any other ones within ICANN at the moment. We did have a Liaison to one of the parts of the gNSO, the NCSG at one point, and that's died away. I haven't heard a strong push from either side to reinstitute it. I think the answer is if the issue comes up, we'll consider it. There's nothing that is immediately in the works, that I'm aware of. Our Chair may know more than that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Finally, you will hear the term "liaison", which is what we tend to say is that little 'L', because the ALAC also sometimes appoints a formal Liaison to a Working Group. That would be when a Policy Development Program Work Group is working on a matter that is so important to the At-Large community and to ALAC, they want to have a formal conduit between that Working Group and the ALAC, with regular reporting. You do have that layer of Liaisons as well.

That's covered in our rules as "other appointments". I'd encourage you all to read the Rules of Procedure. I'm happy to quiz you all on the Rules of Procedure at any time. If I'm not busy, Alan's not busy or Maureen's not busy, we can always help you through the joys of the Rules of Procedure documentation. We're happy to bore people on what I think is a very exciting topic. Can I just say thank you all, and sorry to be over time, but we hope we've covered a whole lot of interesting things for you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have one more quick comment that came about because of what you said. Cheryl described one of the other meanings of liaison. ICANN has a tendency to love certain words, and we like them so much that we use them all over the place with completely different meanings. The term "consensus" is a word that we use in ICANN, with at least a half-dozen completely different meanings, and expect everyone to understand which meaning we're using at the right time. "Liaison" is another one. If you want to be part of the ICANN team, you're going to have to get used to it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, boss. We're finished.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I thought I'd never manage to get you to finish this call. The topic that you're relating to is fascinating, and particularly important, since these are the rules by which we operate. They are somehow, as you said, different. I would say they're pioneering, in many ways. I noted there was a book suggestion put in the chat, from Anthony Niiganii. There was a book suggestion in there with regards to finding consensus.

I should also recommend another book. I'm not being paid by the publishers of the book, but this is something that I use to learn a lot about how to run meetings. That's "Robert's Rules of Procedures". It's a very big brick, but it certainly is a great help in being able to certainly run tidy meetings. We don't fully use "Robert's Rules of Procedures"

here, but we certainly use a great many of them when all else fails. A lot of people, when they wonder where to go, they turn to that.

They are translated into other languages as well, all available on your favorite website. With this, we're greatly over the time limit for this call. Thanks to both of our presenters. They've been absolutely great. Thank you to all of you who've been on this call. There is one more thing for you to do, and that's to fill in the little document that was attached to the invitation for this call.

It provides some feedback on how the session happened, and this will be helpful for the group that's organized the calls, to be able to evaluate them and find out what could be improved the next time we perform such we perform such a call. I think, due to the number of people on the call, that capacity building webinars are something we're going to continue doing, even after the At-Large Summit, because there is a need for these.

Thanks to everyone, thanks to staff, and thanks very much to the interpreters who have remained the additional ten minutes past the official end of this call. This call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]