
JULIA CHAVROLEN: Welcome, everyone, to the At-Large Metrics Working Group call on Tuesday, 11 March 2014.

On the call today, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and Glenn McKnight.

We have apologies from Oksana Prydhodko and Holly Raiche.

And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Julia Chavrolen.

May I please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes.

Thank you, and over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Julia. Today, of course, is a very, well, hopefully not too long in terms of longer than 90 minutes. I certainly have something to do by the time 5:30 comes around. But we are going to spend up to 90 minutes on a fairly narrow agenda, which is almost a single-purpose call. But before we make a single-purpose call, we'll just go through the agenda items from the last Rules of Procedure Working Group call.

And if, Silvia, I could ask you to run through those? I think there is one on staff that I haven't seen evidence of, but perhaps I'm wrong.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Cheryl. Would you like me to review, then, the action items?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed, I would.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. So, first I was going to create a new wiki page to consolidate all the comments and ideas and send it to the group before this meeting.

I think I sent you an e-mail with the new wiki page created, Cheryl. I think you received my e-mail?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, not that I can easily locate, Silvia. Certainly, when I put the agenda together, I hadn't found it.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, because I created the wiki page. At the moment, I cannot put it on the – sorry, my computer is also crashing today – so I cannot put it on the page right now. But I created a wiki page for this, so I will make sure that I send it to you and everybody as soon as I can get my computer fixed. It will be done today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure, thanks for that.

SILVIA VIVANCO: The second action item was completed, regarding to check if the non-speaker is recorded in the transcript. And yes, the speaker is recorded as an unidentified participant. So that's how it's recorded on the transcripts.

Okay, the third one is to include the PowerPoint to the wiki page to be created. Okay, I see that Dev has included a spreadsheet on the Adobe Connect. Is that the document, Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, it is. I could upload an Excel one version after, but I've been doing so much modification I haven't uploaded it to the wiki yet.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, so that's in progress, then.

Then, the next one was to schedule this meeting.

And then the discussion and planning for Singapore planning of dates and times, so scheduling of meetings.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep, that's our next agenda item, which is terrific.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Silvia.

Okay, well, if Maureen has managed to get on to the wiki page – which, I must say, I simply hadn't seen, so I'm glad to see it's there. Maureen has found it, well done, team. Dev is going to be uploading his own docs, by the sound of it. I guess we can tick off all of those action items and move on.

Which now brings us to the meat and potatoes of today's thrill-packed and exciting adventure, which is looking specifically at what we're going to be presenting in our very short amount of time to ALAC and At-Large regional leaders included at the Singapore meeting, but recognizing what we would be creating is the set of resources on this new wiki page, which will be reference material.

Oh, my, heavens above! Who on earth is that with squeaking?

ALAN GREENBERG: That was me, sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi, Alan. That's quite an entrance. If and when my brainstem recovers from what was close to ECT through my headset, I'll be able to welcome you.

Yeah, Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, my other line was ringing and I picked it up in such a way that I picked up the handset on the line that I also had a speakerphone open on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, all I can say is I think both Olivier and I – and perhaps the rest of us on the call, but especially those of us who have headsets connected into their ears – hope you suffered as much as we did on that because that was vicious.

Okay, right, welcome Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I've been here for a while. I was just quiet. I made up for it, though.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Talk about making an entrance and getting attention to himself!

Okay, I think I was trying to say what we're going to do in this call, which is to make sure that we're all happy and there's an agreement on this set of resources, this bubble of material that we all make sure is available on the new wiki page that Silvia has put together.

To that end, we'll at the moment have – and I want to thank particularly Maureen and Dev but also Tijani for bringing the group of their work teams back into this very digestible format.

We need to recognize a couple of things, though. Let's spend, shall we say, the next 40 minutes going through what you have all put together and recognizing that that in total – with whatever judgments you want to make – will go on this space.

We need to spend time as we go through just noting which bits we can select out to do in our short – I think it's about 15 minutes, but let's plan for 10 and hopefully we won't run over time that way – minutes' worth of presentation.

Sorry, what?

Silvia says there is the wiki [inaudible]. Yes, I recognize that.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. That's the wiki on the chat.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Thank you. Maureen has shared that. That's fantastic, and yet, we finished with that when we were in the last agenda item.

We'll go through – and I'd like make sure this is a fairly interactive bit. What we seem to have is slide two of Maureen's slide deck up on the screen. I'm going to ask her to take us through.

Maureen, what I'd like you to do is open at least slide-by-slide, to see that from the rest of the group.

Glenn, I'm just curious, because I want to make sure that if you've come here with a particular piece of input for us, that it's recognized and it's

dealt with. With the indulgence of the rest of the group, Glenn, is there a particular piece on today's agenda or in general that you wanted to bring to the Working Group's attention with today's call?

You might be muted, Glenn.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Is that question directed to me or to anyone in the group?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, to Glenn McKnight.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, Glenn, you. If Glenn could contribute something, that would be really good because he's been a major contributor to the discussions that I've had.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine. He's also – he's saying his phone is muted, that he's talking about comments with Dev. That's fine. I just wanted to know when to make sure we bring you in.

Okay. Alright, Maureen, over to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Do you want me to start from the beginning of this presentation, to actually understand why I've actually put these other parts in here?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can you...?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, yeah. I didn't get to it. You got control. I keep giving you control, Maureen, and you just don't take it with both hands and run.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, okay. Well, I started with the 2008 metrics, and I'm hoping that perhaps Tijani can actually just give me a bit of advice.

The parameters that we passed over to the RALOs and the other for consultations, I'm assuming that those were select from the parameters to what was set up in 2008, where we've got the quantitative measures in this table – the 2008 ALAC metrics table – which really focused on attendance and there was a section on voting, whether people had achieved or not achieved the parameters that had actually been set.

What we're actually doing at the moment is not dissimilar to this, except that I think that we're also – like what Dev's doing, and I'm hoping that he will explain all that side of things with regards to the quantitative side of our metrics measures – but really just I wanted to introduce these first two slides, to show that in fact what we're doing at the moment is not too dissimilar to what was actually devised before,

except it's a different approach because the Rules of Procedure that we're now following there's a slightly different perspective.

That's what we got for the 2008. And especially in regards to the roles of ALAC members, in 2008, it was restricted to a list of commitments. What we're expecting now because of what is in our new Rules of Procedures, again, the expectations are different, probably just a little bit more in-depth – not just what they're involved in but how they're involved in it.

Again in this particular, the purpose of this is just to explain what was the past, what was actually devised in the past.

Tijani, can I have a comment, please, about how effective these two measures were actually felt to have been? It was not carried out for any longer than 2008?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No. Thank you, Maureen. The one who can talk about that is perhaps Cheryl because I wasn't there in 2008. I think that we stopped speaking about metrics, or the ALAC members since I was in ICANN, but we started speaking about them I think one year ago or one year and a half ago. So I cannot tell you anything about the history before 2008 or at 2008.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I could speak, probably ad nauseam on all of this. But I see Alan, so I'll let him do that! Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hello? Can anyone hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, are you muted?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Somehow, Adigo muted my line just as I was about to speak. I am speaking now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There you go. We can hear you now.

ALAN GREENBERG: I put the phone to my ear and it said, "Line muted."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I can't say I blame them. It's pretty scary listening to you speak.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not when you introduce me and I was going to speak ad nauseam! I would have done that, too!

Okay. I think the lack of any visible metrics has to do with a combination of things: partly exhaustion, partly we tried to start talking about metrics roundabout that time and got shot down by one or two people so vociferously that we were just a bit shell-shocked. Part the staff changed, and the people who were doing it no longer were there and no one told the new people to do it.

It's a combination of things. I don't think you could attribute it to carefully thought out will. It just stopped happening. Perhaps to some extent, we already knew at that point, in that time frame, who the people were that were problematic. We knew we couldn't fix it by recording metrics.

It's a combination of things. It's just how the world unfolded, not due to some careful decision.

For the record, on what you were talking about about how the rules of have changed. Yes, what we have now is cast in the Rules of Procedures somewhat more, but you'll notice the Rules of Procedure refer to a position description. That position description was adopted quite a few a years ago, so although the rules were not in the Rules of Procedure, they were in the position description in some detail – not that we paid a lot of attention to it, but it was there in theory if anyone had chosen to follow up on it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. Just before I go back to you, Maureen, I think we should also just see if Gisella – I see Gisella is on the call, if she's able to unmute – when she joined, one of the "tasks" back in 2009, once she

managed to make us all work far more effectively during the summit, was to then charge a collection of the existing and ongoing metrics.

It might be appropriate for any comment that she might want to have here to come in at this stage just from a historical perspective. If she can either type or say something, that would be valuable now. Gisella?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Gisella, I think that she's not on the call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: She's on the Adobe Connect room, which is why assumed. She's also the primary staff liaison for this work group. Over to you, Gisella. There you go, my dear.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Cheryl, this is not like me. Could you just repeat?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Of course, because perhaps someone else had your attention. Maureen was just asking about some of the history back from 2008, we had a list of commitments, etc. I was just pointing out that when you joined staff and after you finished assisting us through the summit, you were spending an awful lot of time collecting and collating various metrics. I just wondered, if not now, at some point if Maureen's curious, to fill her in on some of that as well.

If you want to make a comment on why it appears that we stopped reporting, not necessarily recording, a number of these metrics.

I don't think the technology's going to be kind to us today. Maureen, I'll encourage you to contact Gisella offline.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, no, no, no, sorry, can you hear me now?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can.

GISELLA GRUBER: Can you hear me now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought the technology was fighting. Perfectly.

GISELLA GRUBER: No, sorry! Either myself or someone muted my microphone, as I was talking to myself and telling myself.

I joined January 2009. I took this over from [Mateus], for those of you who know [Mateus]. It was explained to me at the same time as we

were preparing for the summit in Mexico. After that, we tried to maintain it, but it kind of fell by the wayside. Then it was never picked up on.

I think several times, metrics were mentioned and whether we were to start off with this list again or try for something new like we're trying now. Then it's five years later and we now.

Unfortunately, I can't help much more than that. The table is pretty self-explanatory on how we used to do it. I think, just from a personal point of view with the table, it was fairly time-consuming at the time when I joined and did not have much knowledge of what was happening and having to deal with the summit at the same time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Gisella, and thank you, [inaudible]. I just really wanted to hear from you on that, if possible, because what it is – and I think this is important for all of us in this work group to understand – is there is no particular evidence that we can find (anecdotally or otherwise) that says any of the metrics we used to use were other than unpalatable.

They were able to be collected, they were probably relevant, they were undoubtedly useful, but they were seen to be unpalatable and, as Alan said, quite vigorously resented if not rejected by a number of ALAC members.

That said, there is no reason why some of them can't be revisited or repurposed. However, what Gisella has said – thank you for saying one of the things I really wanted to hear from you – the labor intensity for

what was probably a banal and somewhat thankless tasks was quite unreasonable.

Of course, that brings us into what Dev is doing, as well – trying to make any collection of any of these things smarter, that we’re working not with unreasonable human intervention and time commitment.

I see Alan and Olivier, and then we’ll go back to Maureen. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you.

A couple of notes. None of the people who objected strongly are here anymore, at least on the ALAC – some of them are still around. At least one of the people who objected strongly at that point no longer is objecting strongly for various reasons.

The other aspect is the – I’ll try to put this genteelly – the staff person at the time had a rather, if not authoritarian attitude, then a dogmatic position.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

That was my job!

ALAN GREENBERG:

That’s correct. It generated a tone that was not acceptable. It characterized by if we had flagged, in those reports, the errant people in

something other than bright red, it might have been more palatable, but there was not a lot of flexibility in that kind of thing.

We're talking about a lot of circumstances which came together and "unfortunate" is, I think, the best set of words that we can use.

Perhaps we would not have chosen to start doing it at all if we did not have a number of really blatant – and I'll use a strong word – offenders at the time.

No other group in ICANN, as far as I know, puts together charts to demonstrate that people are not performing. That may come out of other evidence, but not explicitly. We did that for some strong reasons at the time. I think we need to decide how much effort it is worth putting into this because it is potentially heavily dependent on a manual effort. We need to evaluate what the outcomes are.

I would say just because it's in our current Rules of Procedure does not mean it's cast in stone. Those can be changed if this group decides that it was really a mistake to write something. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Right, Alan. Okay, thank you. Of course, personality issues aside, one of the reasons we want to try and do this effectively is to ensure that we future proof for such personality and performance problems in the next generation of ALAC.

Over to you, Olivier.

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

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfectly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you. I just wanted to complete this story for Maureen's full picture to say that ever since I've taken over as Chair of the ALAC, there have been some members of the ALAC and some people of leading responsibility that allow them to travel around the world during ICANN meetings that have not pulled their weight. I'll be very frank.

I have been tracking this informally, looking at the lists. Certainly, I was aware of Gisella's tables, which had to be all done manually. And in discussion with staff, it seemed to be very time-consuming to be able to keep track of these things.

The reason for my wish that a working group engages in this is for this Working Group to design ways that will not be onerous on staff. In other words, because I would like this Working Group to formally think of metrics and explore the metrics thing.

That would also give rise to some kind of funding, if needed, for some kind of automated system if there is such a need. If a script needs to be drafted by the computing department or by ICANN IT, if a tool needs to be made, rather than having something set up as an Excel document that is onerous on staff.

This is the reason why this has turned into a Working Group. It's also the reason why it's taken five years because we just haven't had the bandwidth. None of us had the bandwidth to come into this. Now I guess we probably still don't have the bandwidth. Enough people are active in our community to be able to take this on as well. I would hope that after the summit, we'll have even more people that will be available to perform and do things.

Yes, I'm sorry to say, even up to now, there are still some members that don't pull their weight. I have tables which I put myself showing a lot of red for some people, but because we don't have any formal ways of tracking this, then these are not published and are not to be shared at the moment. This is for this Working Group to work out. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Olivier. Glenn mentioned – because I believe his phone is muted – that he thought Dev was trying to do this in response to part of what you're saying, Olivier. Of course, Dev and his sub-team in this Working Group is tasked with doing this because we all recognize the need that Olivier has outlined.

More importantly – well, perhaps not more importantly because he's the boss – as an adjunct to what he was saying, we also have the opportunity now as a result of a lot of the feedback and input that we've had over the last couple of years – and I'm not going to apologize for the years it's taken. I think sometimes change has to be wrought by tempering and re-tempering processes until community does have ownership of it.

We've had some excellent feedback. We've had some shifting of hard-held positions into more consensus-built ones. I believe we've also moved towards an expectation of self-regulatory modeling as well – not always self-regulatory modeling, but there's aspects of self-regulatory modeling. That's part of what Maureen and the rest of her team have also put together. By her team, I include Dev, because they've kind of been joined at the hip on some of these things recently.

The point, however, that you made, Olivier, in terms of resourcing all of this is very, very important because if Dev's hit by a bus, we're in big doo-doo. That's just an example, Dev. I'm not planning to have you hit by a bus, I'll hasten to add.

It's just that in a world where talent in volunteers is – and I will use the term – exploited by their generosity to create what will then make a difference to a corporation, we need to watch that very carefully and make sure that we have redundancy contingency planning and succession planning involved in all of that, and so to have proper assistance which is appropriately funded.

That does not mean necessarily going out to consultants who come in, talk to us, and come back and tell us what we've said to them. Yes, you may quote me on that, Olivier. This is a very important thing to hear from the Chair of the ALAC.

Tijani, I see your microphone open. Do you want to speak?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, my microphone is open. I'd like to say that from the history, if we continue on the history, that's right that I wasn't in a development meeting in ICANN, but I came with the summit in 2009.

We started speaking about the metrics years ago, inside the regional leadership inside the RALOs. We had some fights because of that because some people didn't want us to hear about that. People say that they are not accountable to anyone since they are volunteers.

This is a big problem. We have to find a way to solve it, but we cannot solve it by ignoring measuring the performance of the ALAC members. This is one of the things that we have to do, and we have to find a diplomatic way to make it acceptable for everyone.

This is what I wanted to say. Now, I think Maureen is continuing, and I will give my report after her presented.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Tijani. I value, as does everyone in this group, that intervention. It's a very important one.

However, before I give the reins back to Maureen – you see what happens, Maureen? Unless you wrestle those reins from me, I'll keep grabbing them.

I see Alan with his hand up. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I just wanted to highlight something that Tijani just said because I think it's really important.

The argument that, "I'm a volunteer, you can't tell me what to do," has been made I won't say innumerable times but certainly more than once.

The retort, which many of us consider appropriate, often has not been made. I think this group, perhaps, in its rationale for why it ends up doing what it does, needs to make the arguments strongly that if the overall community believes that certain performance is required, then it becomes a requirement of volunteering.

That is, yes, you're volunteering, but you're volunteering under the set of conditions that this is what we expect of you. If you choose not to do it, then you should not be volunteering.

If we have the nerve to say that – and with rational, reasonable expectations – then I think we're on much stronger ground than we were before. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. Big green tick from me. Back to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, everyone. Yes, I definitely agree with what has been said, especially with Alan and Cheryl about what it is that we're actually looking at measuring and what sort of metrics we use, what the outcomes are and how useful they are to us. I think that's what is really important.

If I could just raise Oksana's comment that she made in an e-mail to me earlier, I was starting to feel a little bit sorry for Dev and the metrics that he's actually developing. It's becoming horrendous. When I was reading through Oksana's, she says, "I propose to count the number of ideas, [inaudible], propositions which meet any support from community and also the unsupported propositions and to analyze them."

Then I listened to Gisella and the fact that just even doing the minimal metrics measures and how they just got dropped to the side because it's just too much.

I think that what Dev's actually showing us is that if we go down the track of trying to analyze count and analyze everything, we're going to end up in the same situation and it won't be done unless, as Olivier says, we get into a very complicated but automated system, which can actually do that for us.

If it was, in fact, what Dev's doing at the moment, there's no way unless you've got someone who's going to be spending 24 hours a day, 24/7 for the whole 15 members of the ALAC going through and analyzing every single thing that they say at every single meeting and working group meeting and etc.

I think that taking all these things on board, what we've got to present is something that is manageable, it isn't going to be onerous on staff, it isn't going to be onerous I think on the members themselves, as long as – as people have mentioned today – as long as they recognize that their role on the ALAC as volunteers does have expectations of performance. Perhaps we should be a little bit more forceful, perhaps, on

implementing those actions when people don't perform. They're already in the Rules of Procedure.

I think that that's where people need to be aware that when they come onto the ALAC that all these propositions that are already stated in the Rules of Procedure will actually be enacted.

I have really appreciated the discussion that we've just had and very much appreciate the comment.

Shall I go back to wherever I was? What page was I on? I was talking about 2008 metrics.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Maureen, yes, I'd like to do that, but while you're just scrolling back to that – because you take us with you, we're in sync with you, we're all in sync with Maureen – I just raised my hand because I just want to make a very small point on what you were saying while you are getting there.

The matters of volunteers and accountability with volunteers is a thorny issue, but there are a number of volunteer organizations, particularly those with responsibility, which have as part of the requirement for acceptance as a volunteer to agree that you will abide by the rules. I don't think for something as important as the ALAC – I'm not saying At-Large en masse. I'm not even saying – although I'd be very tempted to – that this could be applied to regional leadership.

The ALAC, the 15-person advisory committee, could very well be asked at some future point in time to not be accepted as volunteers unless they do seek to abide all contract to abide by those Rules of Procedure,

whatever they embody at the time. There are tools out there that have been well-tested to use, though.

Hopefully you've got us scrolled back. I trust, Maureen, that where we've got problems listed in front of us, we're going to suggest answers to those problems?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, I'd like to speak to some of those. Glenn might like to jump in, too, because some of them came from NARALO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. You're more than welcome, Glenn. Over to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, great.

Then we introduce, of course, the Rules of Procedure as they exist for us today and really specify, for example, what is actually in the introduction, first of all.

In the introduction, of course, very clearly states unless everyone's working together – and operative word being “working” – together on the ALAC, it's got to be seen functioning effectively. It can only do that if everyone's doing their job.

But also recognizing the last part of it, where it's important that we are seen to be justifying the amount of money that ICANN doles out for the ALAC, justifying that expense.

I think that is really important to raise [inaudible], in respect to why we're actually making those expectations regarding metrics.

Also going into that section in more depth, focusing on that ALAC members must make regular and significant contributions. Cheryl, I was actually thinking about what you mentioned about when people are elected to the ALAC, that perhaps there should be some sort of agreement that they, whether they sign it or whatever they do, but they have to agree that they will fulfill the expectations of the role that they've actually taken on.

That could include the expectations of the metrics when they're actually decided on, when a decision is made about what it is that we actually use. I just noticed that some of my [inaudible] have gone askew here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: While things are askew, Alan, is that a point to Maureen's current?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, just to bring home something. We only get ALAC members from two places. We get them from the RALOs and we get them from the NomCom.

We can set rules for the RALOs of what the expectations are and ask the RALOs to approve them or to agree. Should they not agree, then we're going to have an interesting position.

The other place is the NomCom, and we are not in a position to vet NomCom appointees, but we are in a position to tell the NomCom in no uncertain terms of what we expect of their appointees.

Just to point out that the sources are minimal, and we should be able to address them in an orderly manner. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just talking about the NomCom appointees, who are they answerable to?

ALAN GREENBERG: I've answered that question before. They are not answerable to anyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is, therefore, why it is important to set the expectations correctly. Once they're there, like appointees to a number of other parts of the organization, unless they are removed forcefully – and our Rules of Procedure does have a method for removing a NomCom appointee, should we choose to go that path – they are not answerable as such.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. So in fact, you said that if they were appointed to the ALAC and there was some sort of conditional agreement, that while they're on the ALAC they'll agree to the expectations and the metrics and etc. You said that if they don't agree, they don't have to agree?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well actually, Maureen, if such a consideration and undertaking was enshrined in some future ALAC – which I might describe as utopia, actually – then any given nominating committee would make it contingent that for appointment, it would be a requirement that they did comply.

It's a pincer approach, but it's a way around a problem that exists now.

MAUREEN HILYARD: When it comes to accountability being in our current context, the accountability is to the Chair. The Chair will make the decision for the ALAC as a whole.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The Chair responds to and tries to remediate with a perceived underperforming or problematic ALAC member, based on what it says in the Rules of Procedure.

Now, that doesn't mean that other people have to bring it to the Chair of the ALAC's attention. The Chair of the ALAC – and I think Olivier has mentioned he's keeping a little black book. He's a bit like Santa, isn't he? He's got elves making lists and checking them twice – that indeed

he, as Chair, keeps a very close eye on all of this. I suspect that the preceding Chair did, also.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yes, I suspect.

Okay. It's all maybe just so I can understand all this as we're putting this together.

Okay, so the whole purpose again of looking at the Rules of Procedure is to look at where the performance focus expectations are. In those very first two paragraphs, we're actually looking at regular, significant contributions and active participation and active roles in ALAC and other working group meetings and things like that.

However, again going back to Oksana's request for an analysis of what people say that actually contribute to action items in a positive way but also an analysis of any negative propositions that they might make, I'm sure that Dev's probably thinking, "How am I going to get all that into this metrics that even just getting attendance actually is a little like a bit of problem." I'm going to be looking at the qualitative and he can look at the quantitative. That's how I see the distribution of our role.

Then, I've gone into the feedback that I got from the – it's a very summarized version, of course, because there was a whole lot of stuff.

I guess, in a way, it's like looking at the consultation. The feedback that I got that was probably relevant to where we were deciding to go, taking into account some of the things that may not have worked in the past.

I think it follows some of them that were coming from personal perspectives, what they'd experienced that they didn't like and what would be more appropriate for us to this track we're going down.

When I'm talking about the original metric models, I'm actually talking about the parameters and the attendance models that I was actually asking them to fill out. These were some of the answers that I got back.

Of course, does anyone have anything that they'd like to make a comment on with regards to this particular section?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah, I do. Particularly, if we're going to use this slide and if we're going to publish this slide, I understand it is what the contributors said but I want you to remove the word "punishment." It does interpret or translate well.

I think we could perhaps have that, on the second bullet point, a concern that there was more focus on consequences of underperformance or not doing a job well rather than rewards for a well-done job or something like that.

I just want to make sure we don't stick up a word that people will get locked into as opposed to a concept, which is what we want them to be thinking about. Thanks, Maureen.

Anyone else? Alan? Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the word that we very carefully chose in the Rules of Procedure is “remediation,” and we should be careful to use it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or whatever is the word that we chose.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is “remedial action.” “Remedial action” is what we had come to. That one’s going to be a red rag to a bull, Maureen, so pull away from that one. I’m not saying change the intent; just change the word.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, okay. But that was the actual word that was used by the...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I understand. The proponent would have said that, but then again, you can imagine what would happen if people quoted me verbatim as well. It probably wouldn’t be very good at times.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I’m okay with that, that won’t happen. Anything else that doesn’t look right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That was my only concern.

Oh, Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hi.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Oh, okay, great. Just a question, Maureen. That bullet point saying measuring attendance alone was not considered particularly meaningful.

I don't know if I probably need to be...I think I understand it, but they were looking at the meeting attendance. When they say "not meaningful," could you say a little bit on that point?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Thank you, Dev. I think that in that particular instance – I think it came up quite a lot – a lot of people said, "When you just measure attendance," what you're doing, for example, is not just attendance.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: There's actually a lot of stuff behind it. In this, it was like measuring attendance – for example, in the 2008 model, it was, "How many meetings were there and how many meetings did they attend?"

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: "How many times did they vote?"

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No qualitative at all.

MAUREEN HILYARD: In that respect, so that people were saying, "How do we know that they're actually contributing anything? They might be there and not say a word." I think that was the main tenor of whenever attendance only was mentioned.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, could we suggest a bracketing or something there that just says, "Value of the contribution should also be measured"? Something along those lines?

Then I have Alan and Tijani. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I think the statement as written is definitely incorrect, because what I think it's trying to say – and Maureen, I think, just confirmed it – is good attendance alone is not an indication of the person's performance.

On the other hand, someone who doesn't show up at all is sending you very meaningful message. It definitely has meaning and has value.

I think this may well be what someone said, but I think we need to interpret it so that it will not be misunderstood.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Cheryl. I don't agree on the part that attendance is not a known significance because it is the minimum commitment of the member.

With my experience, people who attend always are most often participate. Attendance is very important. Attendance is the commitment of the member. The member is there to attend all the meetings and the calls of the ALAC because it is one of the main things they have to do.

When they attend, they will participate. Some don't participate a lot, but most of people who attend are participating. Attendance is very important. Don't negate it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Tijani. I'm sure that there was no indication to – in what Maureen is trying to interpret in this bullet point – to say that it is an unvalued measure. It's a highly-valued measure and in fact, an essential one. I think the point in the feedback she got was it is not a qualitative one.

Over to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay, now, I'm taking note of these comments and will reword these items. That's fantastic.

Okay, anything else on that?

I think, for example, when we're looking at attendance too, I agree with Tijani when they say the fact that people attend every meeting does indicate a measure of commitment and yet also that it needs to be balanced with their involvement in working groups as well and their contribution in that respect.

Any other comments before I move on?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No comments, okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Problems, okay, I think that this is where just measuring attendance alone is examined a little bit more. And I know this comment came from LACRALO about how does a statistic, a number of times that people attend the meetings, how does that actually show that, if they're at an online meeting, that they're actually 100% focused, especially when there's no contributions being made to the chat?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Maureen, you've got to insert that reference to that YouTube video that looks at online meetings. That's an essential for that point, I think.

MAUREEN HILYARD: My little friend outside on my mango. I have mango trees all around my house, and these chickens love the mango trees.

That was one of the problems that was expressed when we're looking at measuring attendance alone.

Attending meetings was not considered a goal. That's where it said that counting the meeting attendance might seem to be irrelevant.

Again, please look at the wording so that I'm not saying something that someone's going to be jumping down my throat, shoot the messenger.

Acknowledging, of course, that ALSes are volunteers. And this second-to-last one about people being overcommitted, it states firmly that people who come onto the ALAC must be prepared to give the time that's actually required. But then I know that at times that people can overcommit themselves to a lot of things so that they'll be able to provide some balance. There are ways and means of getting around something like that.

I think that the most important thing that's actually already been coming up already is who manages us. Gisella is already saying that with the staff, whatever we put in place has to be manageable, otherwise it'll just get dropped off again.

We have to be able to have some sort of metric and an expectation of showing some accountability, showing commitment, showing some commitment to what it is that they've actually come on to the ALAC to do, but without making it too onerous on ALAC members themselves or to staff. I've got a real respect for the work that staff are already doing. We don't want to have them having too much more put on their plate.

Any comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not seeing any in the Adobe room, but I do have one. In fact, it's one with a little cloud next to it. Not a storm cloud, I hasten to add, but a cloud of input.

This is one of the slides which I actually had problems with – having problems with your problem slide – for two reasons: whilst everything that is there is absolutely valid and I understand it, I actually think it belongs somewhere else in terms of our reporting for Singapore.

It's focused far more, other than the last point – and I would suggest the first point or some of what the first point is saying could be a subset of the point we talked about earlier in terms of the value of just measuring attendance rather than a separate problem point itself and to a lesser extent the second bullet point as well.

When we come to the third and fourth, I don't think they belong there. That will belong and is important, and I'm not underestimating its value, but it belongs when we look at At-Large Structure, not those rare – and they should be rare and committed or committable – individuals who put themselves forward to serve on the ALAC.

To some extent, I'd be saying ditch this slide and just look at who manages the metrics, which will lead you into the mix of self-reporting, self-regulation online and automatic mechanisms that Dev is going to talk about.

The other option, of course, is put up the rules and have a complaint space to it. In other words, if there is an expectation that ALAC members will do the following 19 things in the following ways and that is somehow transparent and it's supposed to make them accountable,

anyone who feels they're not doing that can raise that issue to ALAC or, indeed, the Chair of the ALAC, at least leadership team, and have it dealt with.

There's a whole bunch of options, then, coming out from who manages the metrics.

Sorry, Olivier is saying this involves humans and is pretty fair on each other. Temperature of the room. Okay, I see what you mean. Have you read the chat then as well, Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yes, yes, yes. Actually, I take on board what you're saying. In light of the conversation that we've just had, I'm very happy to remove that. I think when we were going through the consultation notes, these were things that were actually made, but I'd rather keep it positive. I'm very happy to remove that slide altogether.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Don't lose it. We'll need it, but just not for this exercise.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yes, exactly. I still think that this is one: who manages the metrics. I think we can actually put that somewhere because it is an important issue and something that I think Dev and I are trying to make it fair on the management of the metrics and not putting it all squarely on one side on the staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep. Okay, next.

MAUREEN HILYARD: So these were moving on to the recommendations, and I think it's from this particular viewpoints that we've come up with the sorts of things that we're actually proposing.

The first one, of course, being that as ALAC members, that they should be demonstrating leadership and that their performance measures should reflect their role as leaders within the At-Large community.

The indicators, for example, that are mentioned here came from – again, I'm keeping them in basically who these RALOs that recommended them – but some of the indicators including that they could mention, for example like in my proposal, that they could mention these sorts of things, like time and commitment, their leadership responsibility, any mentoring roles that they have, team participation, and any other contributions that they may participate in as part of their various roles that ALAC members have with regards to their activity.

The eDemocracy tools were something that came from NARALO. I'm quite interested in those, which is the community being able to feedback on what's actually happening on the ALAC. I don't know that we don't do this for individual ALAC members. It's one of the things that came up as a criticism of the model that I'm presenting and then putting it onto a wiki, which means that people could actually comment on what ALAC members are doing.

As a team, we need to be looking at: is that a good thing or is it a bad thing? If we're looking at eDemocracy, we say that people should have an opportunity to make a comment.

A recommendation came that ALAC members should provide a brief report and that, again, any members that were seen to be underperforming should actually be dealt with. We have discussed that those procedures are already in our ALAC Rules of Procedure anyway.

So any comments on this slide?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm looking, I'm not seeing any. And yet again, I'm going to jump in, and then I see Tijani. And I want to come to just double-check if Alan had something he wanted to say either now or for the previous slide.

I don't like your last bullet point. I don't think it has a valuable place. It has a valuable place in what we're doing, but I don't think it has a valuable place in our recording. It immediately opens up the difference between a RALO-appointed and a NomCom-appointed ALAC member.

We already have a bunch of rules that were carefully wrought to try and deal with underperformance of all ALAC members. I would just drop that point off. I'm not saying it's not important; I'm just saying I wouldn't be focusing on it in this one.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani, and then Alan if it was something he was trying to say. Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you.

Again, Maureen, I will express my disagreement about the comment on the reports.

I do agree and I find it very well the self-reporting. It's a very good thing, and really we need to implement it. But commenting on the reports of the member will create more problems than bring good things.

If people didn't accept to be assessed against a criteria, they don't accept. They said, "We are volunteer; we don't have to be assessed; we are not accountable to you," etc. How will they accept to be commented on their reports, especially if the comment is negative?

This thing may create big problems inside ALAC. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tijani, and clearly such a model will need a good deal of tweaking, socializing, and ownership before it would be successful.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Yeah, I'm going to comment on the last point also.

We very carefully, during the ALAC Rules of Procedure drafting and in related discussions took out the laundry list of things that the Chair would do (or whoever it was that would do) and left it to their discretion.

We're dealing with personnel issues. They have to be done sensitively, and the circumstances around them will indicate different paths to follow to address the issue.

I would not want to see anything prescriptive that would limit the Chair's prerogative, the Chair's ability to respond in a humane and effective way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Did you have a point for the previous part where your phone was muted?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, I wasn't trying to speak at that point. I was just pointing out that suddenly Adigo came on and said, "Your phone is muted." By the way, I didn't unmute it. It seems to work. I forgot it was muted and just started talking and it seemed to work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's all right, I just didn't want you to have missed a point.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I was also unmuted randomly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Random acts of kindness I'm used to. Random acts of muting, I'm a little worried about. I think that goes some extra censorship, my heavens, I can have another conspiracy theory developed in this call!

Maureen, have you got enough useful information and feedback from us on this slide?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Definitely. I have made a comment in the chat that I think that the recommendation should be kept positive, so definitely remove that last point, definitely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Next?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Then we come up to what we're looking at offering. Of course, the quantitative side I'm not going to say too much about because Dev is going to be giving his big spiel about that one.

The monthly report, I think that was that – I tried to demonstrate that – is that the report doesn't really have to be very long, but it just could highlight some of what the ALAC member thinks are significant inputs that they've had to that meeting in any way. That's the sort of thing that they should be able to include.

Again, I had actually mentioned that the wiki would enable comments and feedback from others. In a way, I'm sort of thinking that I guess it would also – and we do have to ensure that people who use the wiki and make comments are aware of the protocols that go with making comments and that perhaps the comments would be monitored and may go to an adjudicator before they go on or something. I'm not quite sure how you could do it.

I don't know what sort of experiences people have had with regards to feedback on many issues and whether people make really rude and nasty comments.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think that we've got to be looking at ways in which we monitoring these sorts of things, but I don't think it's a bad thing for people to be— I'm hoping most of the comments that people get will be positive!

What we've actually got to be seen to be doing is that the one of the metrics is actually managed by the member themselves and the other metric could be something staff could be responsible for so that they're actually sharing that responsibility. It's all not just [a one-sided check].

As ALAC members, we should be contributing to that measurement ourselves really. Let's just go through this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just, yep. Comments quick. Fine.

First of all, welcome, Baudouin. Nice to have you on this call. This is very much a single-purpose call where we are polishing up our presentation for reporting for the work group in Singapore.

Anyone who wishes to bring something into this slide? I see Tijani, and I'll have a place for myself. Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, now, I will do my report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not quite yet. We need to finish with this slide.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Not quite yet, okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: One moment, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, okay, I'm sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: One moment, Tijani. Sorry, I saw your microphone and assumed that you were putting that up instead of your hand. One moment, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, no.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, I would be a lot more comfortable with this slide if you considered making two changes.

The first one is to remove the word “monthly” after the first bullet point at the end of the first bullet point under “qualitative” column and just leave it to read “Individual ALAC member wiki pages will record,” and then have “contributions and any actions items personally involved in,” “leadership responsibilities,” “mentoring and team roles,” blah, blah, blah. I think that will make it a lot more palatable.

In the red line, “Wiki will enable comments and feedback from others,” perhaps to rework it. And particularly cognizant of information and stuff that Tijani has raised both at this and at other meetings that we’ve had, perhaps make the point there that’s more in parallel with the quantitative.

So whilst it gives a visual representation, this will give a social representation of ALAC member activities and, within the confines of code of conduct and behavior, allow for accountability and transparency. Something like that. Do you see what I mean? It takes us away from some of the inflammatory issues and yet still allows for a far more balanced and transparent as well as accountable thing.

Now the other thing, once we drill down into that, we could put up a set of standards for such a wiki page. For example, it would be highly

appropriate if activities in work groups (for example, in GNSO or ccNSO) have to be – even just the title of the meetings for work groups – had to be hyperlinked to the master page that records interactions and meetings and stuff.

That's been someone else's business: GNSO record their meetings and attendance and interactions in one way, ccNSO do it in another. Our member, our ALAC has a live link that people can follow should they need to, but that's more in the titivation.

Any other comments I don't see, so let's move on to the next.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Right. Thank you for that. Yes, changes will be made.

Okay, so in light of the fact that I was actually asking for people to do a report on their activity and it might be similar to what you actually see, it would be different.

This is a part of a short report with only a couple of lines on each of the meetings and what contribution they might have made to that particular meeting, what follow-on was needed or whatever. That they can actually show that they got something out—they either contributed and/or got something out of it that they needed to feedback to the RALO or to their own ALS or something like that.

I think that that is not too onerous. Some people – for example, I've got a list of a lot of things for this month but might not necessarily be each month that it would be that long. For example, at my one working

group, that might you might be involved in during the month that might have multiple meetings.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

MAUREEN HILYARD: There is lots of input that you actually have to do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure. Understood, Maureen. I think it's good to put up an example. One of the reasons I asked you to take monthly out of the slide before this is you can then use as this as example where a monthly report is chosen to be given by the ALAC member.

Of course, there are some times where commitments might not be as regular as requiring monthly. This is a great example. I'm happy to have it as an example, but I'm going to ask you to move to your next slide, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Any other comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nope. Move on.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, yeah. That's what I did. Trying to locate this, of course, is how do you locate it? I think that on each – although, it was difficult to find for all the RALOs because trying to find the RALO leadership pages, which I needed to find for my GNSO report, was really quite difficult. In fact for mine, I just linked it to my name on the leadership page until we [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, I'm just very cognizant of time, so you're getting pressure from me now. This is fine. This is also administration of a methodology, and this is a slide I would delete.

Next?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, and thank you is the slide. Maureen, you're going to have a tweak on all of that. And then what I'd like to know is: at what point in this style of presentation do we move to what Dev also needs to show? I'm going to go to you in a moment, Dev, but Tijani has a piece of reporting that he needs to present and once we listen to that now.

It's over to you, Tijani. I want you, Maureen, to think where you're going to insert that in this slide deck as well. Tijani, over to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Okay. I would like to speak about the metrics, not the content but how will affect the performance.

I think that any performance measurement should be done over a certain or a reasonable period of time. Since the term of the ALAC member is two years, the minimum period for any assessment, any performance measurement, should be at least three months period.

That means that if today we start to measure and you tell me, "A attended two calls," "B didn't attend any one," so A is performance, B is not, this is false because it is not sufficient. Perhaps for the remaining time, it's B who will be always attending and A will not attend.

The minimum period would be, for me, at least three months. This is the first point.

Second point: we said that we would measure the attendance, and thanks to Dev, we have now tool to measure the attendance. It is very good. I think it is wonderful because it is an automatic way to measure it so we don't have any problems here.

For the attendance, there is three cases. As we said: attended, absent, and apologized. I think that we need to find a way to quantify the attendance by having a certain rate of the attendance plus apologize over the total number of the meetings or calls.

This is for the participation now. I think that for the virtual meetings and the face-to-face meetings participation, Dev also gave us a way to measure, to assess the participation by looking at the transcript and giving reports on that, so it is very good.

But for the participation on mailing lists, we may also use automatic record, I think, and Dev has to confirm that. Here, we have to, because the lists are always there, we have certain lists that are defined. An e-mail coming from my address, for example, would be one participation from my side. It can be some way to record participation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah. Just on that point, Tijani. Thank you. Just on that point, Tijani, metrics for the main At-Large lists have been collated since before there was an ALAC, when there was just an amorphous bunch of At-Large. That already exists in percentages. It's still done by Thomas' automatic IBM script.

There have been considerable concerns about how much influence to put on that measure because – as I believe Alan has pointed out in the past – we get people wishing every nation's national holiday a great day and then thanking other people for doing the same. That one's a bit moot and a little bit fraught, but it's certainly a measure that can easily be collected.

Back to you, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, you are right, Cheryl, 100%, but it is an indicator we can have the temperature of the participation.

For the wiki participation, it's more difficult because I think it is not possible to make it automatic because it is very dynamic. We are creating wiki pages every day, and some pages are not used anymore,

etc. You cannot have a record if you want an automatic record on the participation on the wiki page.

This must be perhaps to rely on the member report to know how the participation is. We will know it because we are using the wiki pages, we see everything, but we will not have an automatic record from there.

For the participation on the working group and [inaudible] role there, I think that we can use the transcripts of the working group calls and meeting. There also, we can record the participation and the leadership role from those transcripts. This is also something that perhaps we can do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Tijani, you're cutting a fair amount in your reporting into substantive matters of what Dev has already said is or is not as easy or not easy to do. I just wanted to recognize Alan because I believe he raised his hand on one of the points you were talking about.

Over to you, Alan, then back to Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG:

A couple of things. First of all, when we're talking about thresholds, I think we need to be really careful.

One of the pitfalls we fell into last time was – I may have it wrong, but I think I have it correct – we said that you must vote in two-thirds of ALS votes in every given period or you are deemed to be in violation. There

were periods where we only had one or two ALS votes, which means missing a single vote means you are in violation.

The rule was well-conceived if we had thirty, but it didn't make a lot of sense when there was only one or two, for instance. I think we need to be careful of that.

Number two, in terms of counting participation, it's almost the inverse of meeting attendance. If you don't participate, if you don't contribute at all, there is a message. It may be a message backed by cultural issues, as Cheryl has regularly pointed, but it's a message. Large amounts of participation may just be that you have your computer to set plus-one to everyone's message automatically.

The same can be true for wiki. I tend to be a rather paranoid person regarding computers, and I save regularly when I update a wiki because I'm afraid someone will come in and do another change or my computer will crash or whatever. As a result, if I've made changes to a page, you'll probably find I've made 20 changes to that page, although it's only one and I just happened to be saving as I went along.

We need to be really careful with a lot of these things. Most of them, I don't think we need to be collecting and displaying. We need a mechanism for quickly assimilating or pulling information together when the Chair or when someone identifies a problem, where there is a potential problem and we may want to be able to verify it. I really don't think we should be putting an awful lot of energy into collecting these kinds of statistics on an ongoing basis. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I don't think that I spoke about threshold now. I didn't speak about that at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, Tijani, that was before you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you.

Second point, you are absolutely right about the participation on wiki and on the mailing list. But, Alan, it is at least a temperature. We know if you are participating or not if you are at least sending mails, if you are updating pages. That's what I mean. It will not be something—because we were trying to find a way of active participation because people said attending is not an active participation. Those are elements of participation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani, one of the things I was hoping to get from you is a willingness or otherwise, without going into the details of what measures will make up a criteria, as to how you felt to incorporate into our record for reporting in Singapore a high-level version of your go/no-go range of participation levels, which takes us to remediation.

That's what I understood you were hoping to make sure we did. Have I got that right?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, you are right. What I am doing now is trying to be in line with what Maureen is doing and what Dev is doing. I am trying to...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, my dear. What I'd like to ask, before we go further into that is with the group's permission – this is administration now – can we extend this call by 10 to 15 minutes? If possible, I would very much like to do it. Anyone can't stay for that extra time, I understand.

I'm not seeing anyone yell or scream at me, so let's assume that's fine. Okay, good. Thank you, Gisella, that you're okay to stay with us today.

So, Tijani, back to you, but what I'm going to ask you is focus down now onto what one slide, what you can get Maureen to put on one slide that says whatever the criteria we have, whatever qualitative and quantitative measures we make, here is a plan on what happens in terms of level of engagement and consequences or remedial action or whatever. I think, in your case, your model is more consequences than remedial.

Okay, so if I could get you to focus on that and just spend two or three minutes on it, thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, Cheryl. First of all, I'd like to apologize because I didn't send the report earlier. I worked on it from the beginning, from the last meeting, but it was discontinued because I have a lot of other things very important and we know what they are.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not a problem Of course, no problem.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I don't have the final format. I will do it. I will send it to you, to all the list. I hope that Maureen will try to incorporate it in her presentation.

Yes, all what I am doing now is trying to make my work more or less in line with what is done by the others so that we'll have something more or less harmonized. Okay?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, are you there?

Okay, thank you very much Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If you want me.... Continue, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Tijani, how much more time in today's call do you need?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: As you want. If you want me to continue, I will continue briefly. If you want, I can send the report and you read it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Please send the report, but if you've got a few points to make from the report now, please do so.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: One word about the voting. We have the recording of everything about the voting, so this is one thing that we can have an objective recording on it and it is easily used.

For the reporting, now we have a page for all the reports. It is also something that we can do automatically, I think, because we have it on a precise place so it is easy to do.

This is all I want to say except the details of my proposal that you know, but I will try to make it adapted to what I said now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Tijani. In your adaption, if you could leave it to high principles and not get too specific on the exact nature of the measures, rather the consequences of the measures not being met. Because when Dev is doing his work presentation, he will go into greater detail on the quantitative aspects of all of this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much.

Okay, Dev. I bet you thought I was never going to get to you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. I think what I have to do is going to share my screen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Let's see, share my screen...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: While he's doing this, I hope you all appreciate that I'm giving over all this control to my fellow workers here. This is big for Cheryl. There you go, Dev, you're all sorted.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you very much, Cheryl.

I've shared my screen. What you should be seeing is the spreadsheet that I've been working on.

In terms of meeting attendance, what I'm looking at is the attendance for meeting for ALAC members from 2011 to 2012. I was able to successfully automate a lot of the data collecting for capturing the meeting attendance. I was able to capture all the meeting dates within that time period. Then by looking at the actual meeting pages, gather the information regarding whether the person was present, absent, or sent apologies.

I have the table here. It's a long table, going scrolling all across. We have no statistics for the Beijing, Durban, and Buenos Aires meetings, so that's why you're seeing blanks there.

The end result was a graph illustrating, in terms of persons attendance, whether that person is present, absent, or sent apologies.

I think this is a good visual indicator as whether a person is present during meetings or if there's a concern regarding number of absence or apologies becoming more than the sum total of meetings.

One question, actually, I wanted to ask, actually, and this I shall. If I'm presenting this during the Singapore meeting, should I be using actual persons' names for this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

My guess is we should probably get permission for the use of those names. Let me suggest that you can presume permission from Alan, from yourself, from Olivier, from Tijani, and from Maureen. But you probably should not go beyond that unless you have explicit permission.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. What I can do, I could, of course, obscure the persons' names completely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like a perfect solution to me.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, I could actually replace the names with placeholder names, but the statistics will still be accurate for reporting purposes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go on, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I'm sorry, I'm not at my computer. I had to come down and get some food as well.

I might have misunderstood this. There are no statistics of attendance for Beijing?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is regarding meeting attendance. We're talking about the meeting attendance during...

We have for meeting pages, for conference calls, they have the meeting attendance taken at the beginning of the meeting and that is recorded as part of the meeting summary.

For the actual face-to-face meetings, we don't have attendance sheets as such. That's what I was referring to when I say we don't have attendance for Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, we should do. I've asked for them, so staff should have connected those. We should have those. If we don't, then the record of that is lost or something.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I was told there has to be recordings and attendance records of all the face-to-face meetings. Maybe they are not available, they are not on the wiki for whatever reason, but I'm sure we can get them. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: If you can get that information, I can of course update the spreadsheet and expand the number of meetings and so forth.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we make that an action item? Sorry, Olivier. Silvia, we need to make that an action item. I don't care whether they're published on the wiki. I care that Dev has them.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, I will note. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I get in for a moment?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I see you in the queue, but I heard Olivier and he's not on his computer and it's a follow-on. Go on, Olivier, and then Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Just to explain to you, there has not been – well, in some of them, I think the first meeting of the week, the Sunday meeting – there had been a roll call, as in people introducing themselves around the table.

In all of the other meetings, I have asked staff to make a note of the attendance of ALAC members where their participation is mandatory. I know that Gisella has done that in the past. I think Silvia has done that in Buenos Aires. I'm not quite sure who did it, but I've certainly asked for that, so we must have it somewhere on our records.

I have not asked for these to be made public, that's the only thing. You wouldn't find them on the wiki. Why? Because there is no, at the moment, there hasn't been an authoritative metric for this. The only thing I've done so far is for my own personal records. I guess for the record, if needed, they're the records of staff. If someone basically is not attending calls or not attending meetings, etc.

I hope that this working group will be able to get hold of those. That's all, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, rather than the working group as such, I've just asked that to be an action item that Dev gets that post haste, okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect, fantastic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Alan, I still see your hand up. Alan, is that an old hand or a new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it's the hand that wants to speak now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a continuing hand!

ALAN GREENBERG: When we were working on the rules, it became obvious from if nothing else my looking for records that, although we are moderately well organized in how we make available the minutes or the summaries of conference calls, those associated with the face-to-face meetings tend to be kept in completely different ways. They're linked off of the conference agenda, not off of our regular pages, or they're linked off of

a different set of pages on our pages. They don't tend to have the same level of detail.

Moreover, as Olivier mentioned, it became obvious that although we record attendance at the meetings by who got on a plane to get there, we did not at that time record attendance at each of the individual day-by-day sessions.

The Rules of Procedures explicitly said we must do that in the future. We must have records for those face-to-face meetings on a session-by-session basis. They should be just as public as the teleconference ones are.

I don't know whether it's being done or not right now, but it's part of our rules. It was explicitly put there after a significant amount of debate, so I hope it will get done. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Remember, for the purposes of our Singapore reporting, what Dev will be presenting is a snapshot example. But yes, all of that needs to be done. Thank you. Back to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you.

I've done this counts for the attendance records. Like I said, I was able to produce a graph illustrating present, absent, and apologies for the various persons. I think it's a good visual indicator. Just by looking at it, you can see some indicator of some persons have not attended the

majority of meetings. That will raise a red flag or a concern, something to look at.

What I started then looking at was look at, “Okay, so you’ve attended the meeting.” How do you count participation in the meeting? Somebody could have attended the meeting and gone for coffee, fell asleep, whatever.

My thinking was looking at the transcript, and therefore counting the number of intervention in the transcript. I’ve come up with a semi-automated way of doing this. What I do is count the number of times the word appears in the transcript, which is in a standard format for the conference call where the name of the person who speaks is in capital letters and there’s a colon. By searching for each of the ALAC names and for that particular name followed by a colon, I can generate a statistic in terms of the number of interventions happening.

I’ve started to do so. It’s a bit of a challenge, and it’s not 100% complete. Again, it comes back to the slight differences in how the transcripts are recorded. Maybe I should bring up the sheet that shows it all, sheet number two. Okay, sheet number two, it is [inaudible] material here. I apologize.

If I look at the transcript, the names for these transcripts change, and there’s slight variance between each of them. In the end, what I had to do was to basically go to each of the meeting pages and then copy the link and pasted it into the spreadsheet after a while. There was simply no good, reliable way of doing it.

I did the same thing also for the AC chats as well, the Adobe Connect chats. In the end, I had to just go in there and just for each of those pages copy that URL and paste in there for processing.

Going back to the interventions, I started going through them. I haven't finished all of those things. I do note several things, though. The transcripts for meetings that happened that during the face-to-face meetings is done in a different style, where it's not so consistent with our conference calls, so that's a challenge. In fact, the counting intervention method would not work there. That's one concern.

Another concern is also regarding the Adobe Connect chat, because we don't really are consistently in terms of the names that we use to log in to the Adobe Connect. Somebody might use just their first name, for example, or they use their full name. There's a little bit a problem of matching the actual names in the Adobe Connect chat. That's another challenge there.

I've done some of the interventions for about seven of those sessions. It's essentially running a batch file – I don't know if everybody's seeing this. I just run a batch file and I get a text file, and from that text file, I just paste it in. Let me just, ah yes. Okay, here's the results from one of the meetings where I count the number of interventions.

Other challenges? Sometimes, the transcripts may have misspellings. For example, Olivier's name sometimes is misspelled. On one call, Evan Leibovitch was Evan Lubovitch, for example. That was just something to look at. When you want to just double-check, sometimes you're just

going to have to go to the actual transcript and do an actual visual search and thus verify that these numbers match up.

That's what I've done so far. I've been listening to the conversation. I understand some of the things regarding the indicators. Let me see if I... These are some of the indicators that we're looking at from the metrics point of view.

The meeting attendance, right? The interventions in meetings, the interventions in chat. In terms of the e-mails to the mailing list, there's a script that is part of the mailman engine that runs the list that can generate statistics on a weekly or monthly basis that generates statistics. I think you may well be aware of I believe it was Thomas's script that runs on the At-Large mailing list that measures those interventions – sorry, that counts the number of e-mails to those lists.

In terms of the wiki updates, theoretically, that could also be monitored in an indirect way. For example, what I have done, I have set up watches for all of the pages involved. I'm just switching over to my e-mail client and, again, it's very dense.

The point is that – and I think I have about 9,000 wiki updates happening to the pages there. You can certainly measure that as well. I'm not sure whether it will be very useful though.

Of course, in terms of the voting, that's also going to be a challenge. I hope the [inaudible] system will be able to actually generate those statistics. Otherwise, it'll be another challenge to get those numbers plugged into a spreadsheet.

I think I'll stop there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Dev. As ever, you never cease to amaze us. I think from what I've heard in your report today, providing we can either obscure the names for the detailed reporting unless you have permission – and it looks like you got some from some of the work group members – there's probably so much information on the other pages that you're going to display that providing we don't include them in any permanent record, that won't be a problem.

What I would want you to do, Dev, is make sure that you're set up and able to do a live demonstration. What we'll do is depart at the slide that Maureen will be showing that has the quantitative on the left and the qualitative on the right, and then you can do a live demonstration. I think that will be the safest from a privacy point of view. Do you agree with that, Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. What I can also do is I could, of course—maybe what I can do is I could do certain extracts, showing that probably people don't really need to see the entire spreadsheet. I could provide a link to the spreadsheet with obscured names. I just take the first five meetings and put that on a slide. How would that sound?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep. I think that'll work perfect.

Dev, the other thing is I would like you to give them a tasting plate, which I think you're indicating you will. I don't want you to take them into the entrails of any of the problems. I'd like you to say things like, "With some simple agreement on conformity of data capture protocols." Do a bit of gobbledygook, you know what I mean. What we're saying is that we need to make it that everything is easily capture-able and therefore some standardization will have to come into the system.

You highlighted problems to us, but I don't want to highlight problems to the group in reporting. I just want you to say, "With a little bit of tweaking and making sure we can actually get access to the data where we expect the data to be and that the data are in some standardized form, we should minimize areas," etc.

However, I see Tijani and then Maureen. Tijani? You might be muted, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, Cheryl. I would like to say that what Dev is doing is fantastic. The way that will make our work perhaps implemented afterwards because it will not depend on persons, it will be automatic. I have heard questions about who will manage that. We have to make the human intervention as small as possible.

To be [inaudible] with what Dev did, we need it to be agreed on by ICANN and adopted by the ICANN IT so that it will be any change in the ICANN work must be replicated on this applications so that we have always the information. We will not have the information today and

tomorrow they will change something in their system, we will not have anything.

This is my general remark about this. It will be fantastic, but we need it to be adopted by the ICANN. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely, Tijani. Could not agree with you more. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi, everyone. I was basically going to say the same as Tijani. We had had lots of people asking for specifics. I think Dev is actually trying to address those things that people have been asking for.

I think it's important that they do get to see from Dev just how complex it is getting that information and also, as we mentioned before, just who's going to be responsible for it. If we can get as much of it automated, that's fine. But having to tweak things when the names are spelled incorrectly and some of the points that Dev mentioned, those sorts of issues can skew those results quite a bit.

I'm going along with what everyone else is saying too about this. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maureen, and thank you, work group. I do note we've trickled over our appointed 15-minutes extension, but I would like to

spend another couple of minutes just doing a bit of a wrap-up and instructions on where we'll take it next.

We'll be taking it to sharing any modifications and final material on that wiki page that was reproduced by Maureen after staff put it together. It's reproduced in today's meeting chat.

The good news and the bad news we've got way, way, way too much information for the time we have to report back. What I'm going to ask you to do – and I've already seen in the chat, Maureen, you said you can cut yours to five minutes.

What I'd like you to do, however, is not so much cut it to five minutes but rather with the culls and modifications we've made today and putting in an additional slide which will encompass the high-level points that Tijani's sub-team has worked on and from his report, that slide itself I guess will take about two minutes to talk to.

Tijani, you believe you can talk to it in two minutes, once it's done? Just put up a green tick if that's the case, and I'll move on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. What I think we'll do is make it into a sort of continuity piece or PowerPoint presentation. Thank you, Tijani, I note your tick.

If we were to – and just do it in your minds, don't worry about putting it up on screen, staff. You've gone above and beyond the call of duty already in today's call. I'll probably do a bit of an intro and flip through the first couple of intro-y type slides.

Once we get into the meat of the feedback and obviously, particularly the proposals, the recommendations, I want Maureen to be running it then.

You need to decide, Maureen, Dev, and Tijani, whether Tijani's piece goes in before those feedback and recommendations or after. My inclination is in fact put it in before, but we can talk about that online.

That will mean then, we've got somewhere between four to six minutes to go through and have at least some interaction with the recommendations. That will include taking another four minutes at least for Dev to do a live demonstration because that will happen as an offshoot in the—I think it'll be about slide seven by then by the times things are adjusted, Maureen. Does that make sense to you all?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes [inaudible].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: [inaudible] sounds great, sounds good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What I'm talking about is we'll take 15 minutes. It'll be a tag-team exercise. I'm going to play intro and coach. What we need to do between now and the end of next week when we all get on aero planes is make sure we have a slide deck and timings with the slide deck that we're happy with.

Dev, you need to make sure before we get to getting on planes that you're happy with being able to do a live presentation.

Staff, you've got at least one action item, which of course is to make sure Dev has got the data that he needs for one of the data capture points of meetings to include face-to-face meetings.

The other piece of action item which will be on staff but in Singapore is we need to make sure that Maureen and me and Tijani and Dev have had a test run in the room, that this presentation will go off like clockwork to the timing, and that we will have no technical difficulties with the live presentation. That live presentation needs to be able to be recorded some way, shape, or form, for the Adobe Connect viewers.

Have I missed anything?

Glenn, you've been on the call. Did you want to type or say anything? I know you've contributed both to Maureen and Dev's work? Type away if you're still muted.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, I'm unmuted now. Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go for it!

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great meeting. Thank you so much for allowing me to attend. As I've said to Maureen, please send me these slide shows. I'll give some comment. And I've been giving my feedback through Dev. Dev is doing a super job. Thank you so much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Glenn. In fact, the whole team is something to be extremely proud of. I look forward to continuing to work with you all.

Maureen and Dev, are you happy with our plan? Tijani, I gather you're pretty comfortable with what's going to happen? You've just got to do a little tweaking on the report and then send it through so Maureen can just get one slide out of it.

The only thing I will remind you of, on the wiki page, please let's make sure we don't link to any resources which have identifiable characteristics for any ALAC member, past or present, without their express permission.

Other than that, team, let's take this offline, or more to the point, online, but in a different format. Shall we agree to have a final draft agreed upon no later than Thursday of next week?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Mm-hmm.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yep.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Agreed.

MAUREEN HILYARD: It's fine by me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, okay! Thank you, one and all. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]