GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. On today's At Large Metrics Working Group call on Wednesday the 24th of September at 14:00 UTC, I have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Glenn McKnight, Alan Greenberg, Murray McKercher, Dev Anand Teelucksingh will be joining us shortly.

Apologies noted from Tijani Ben Jemaa. From staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Small group, but let's see how we go, and obviously we've got apologies from a couple of people including Maureen, which is a [tragedy?] because a number of the action items and agenda items today are directly involve her and her sub-committee.

We will do our best. Moving into that, let's go first of all to action items from the last meeting. I'm also struggling with technical issues, so I'm hoping that what is showing in the agenda is in fact all of the action items, because I'm having difficulty opening up the separate page with the computer I've got here at the moment.

So, at this stage, from the agenda, the only action item is the review from the PowerPoint, etc. of Maureen and [inaudible] comment for discussion on today's call. And to that end, we will then come back to

EN

that when we get to it being the rest of the agenda. Is there any other action items, Silvia, that isn't listed in the agenda?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello, this is Silvia. Those are the action items of the last meeting this group had.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, good. Yes, please, if you want to read them out and double check.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. So first one, all working group members to review Maureen's PowerPoint and to [inaudible] comments for last discussion in Singapore. This was to refer to Singapore. Then for Tijani Ben Jemaa to work on the report and send it to Maureen and the working group.

Gisella Gruber to obtain attendance records of ALAC meeting, face to face. And Maureen to add one additional slide to the PowerPoint.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks very much now. Obviously, with the exception of the attendance record section, and that was all in preparation for our presentation at the last face to face meeting in London. So I believe we can kick off all of those things, with the exception of the attendance records of ALAC, at meetings for face to face.

EN

I think Gisella and I have some attendance records to look at from return on investment to metrics for the London meeting, but I'm pretty sure we, once we have access to the previous ones, we haven't got that data just together yet. Is that the case Gisella? I think we probably lost Gisella as well.

GISELLA GRUBER: No, sorry Cheryl. Gisella here. I'm here. Just with regards to the attendance, I'll get back to you because I'm not 100% clear on what was actually recovered from the scanners and what we can actually do with that data to give us accurate attendance for the meetings.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I do know that's [inaudible]. You do have a few other priorities in your life at the moment in terms of getting this little meeting ready for Los Angeles. So let's leave that one open and tick off the other two. So rather than make a new action item, obviously, that's just a continuing one, so we'll carry that one over.

Okay. Any discussion on any of those action items? What I would like Silvia, if possible, is if we could also, on this meeting page, link to the report including the PowerPoint and any other materials that we've presented in the London meeting. So we've got that in one relatively neat pile. It's often a challenge to get materials out of face to face meetings, so if we can do that easily, that would be greatly appreciated.

I don't really mind where it goes. It doesn't necessarily need to be in the action item section. It certainly needs to be somewhere, even if it's

a matter of linking to our master meeting's record. You know how we have each of our meetings, and make sure that we've got the links to face to face meetings as well as the teleconferences, and of course the same should go in our preparation for our Los Angeles meeting, which we have a home for the meeting that we'll be running, can't really remember if it's in the middle of the afternoon or the middle of the morning.

But anyway, we've got one in Los Angeles so the same treatment should go there. Good. All right then. As I flick between screens, let me just check to see if anyone has got their hand up, no they haven't. Okay. All good. And welcome to Darlene. And let's move on now into our next agenda item. Agenda item two, and this is the primary effort for today's call, is looking at the discussion and review of what Maureen has been doing with the regional secretariat, which is one of the reasons I'm glad to see Darlene on the call, because I expect she's been keeping a bit of an eye here on that.

And one of the key features here is as the regional secretariat, and of course the RALOs, discussing and interacting with the ALAC metrics, and the work that the metric subcommittee has done for this newly adopted, or recently adopted rules of procedure. We're looking for mechanism to get some highlighting, I don't know where I get highlighting from, I apologize, to get some harmonization with what can be happening with the regional rules of procedure, and of course, including on performance metrics and standards for the ALSs as well.

This is also going to be the primary activity, but in a slightly different format of what we do in our face to face meeting in Los Angeles. The

reason being, is that of course, at the face to face meeting, one can only hope that we will have the opportunity to have, [inaudible] of course but, perhaps more interaction with both At Large structure members, but also [inaudible] representatives as well.

We are a bit scant on the ground here, particularly at today's meeting. But let's go through the final comments are that have come back from the regional secretariat. And I believe it's all shared on your screen. And in Maureen's absence, let's see if we can go through all of this and then have a discussion on them. And as we know, it's quite often far easier for a small group like us in this working group call, to agree on things and see good things, and have great intentions of no impediments.

But when we come to try and convince the wider At Large community and regional leadership, that they should be adopted. We may have a slightly tougher time though, if any of you are in any position between now and Los Angeles, but certainly at Los Angeles, to talk up why it's a very good idea to have a high degree of harmonization between the regional At Large organizations on things like their leadership forms of metrics and the expectations of what we all have on At Large structures.

And please do so, but not actually an action item, but I think it [inaudible] overwhelming homework for us all. I know that Olivier is also very keen to see this happening in the very near future. So, the final comments, and this is on behalf on what Maureen has gathered, for our discussion here today as follows. And I will read into the record, just that we checked to see if there is any hands, no there isn't.

So let me read these for the record then. During the ICANN meetings in Singapore and London, the ALAC metrics subcommittee, proposed and sought feedback upon, some measure by which performance of ALAC members could be assessed in accordance with section nine [insert the] various numbers, of rules of procedure, section which is performance metrics and remediation.

And we have listed there rules 9.1, 9.2, all the subsections of 9.2, which is 9.2.1, 9.2.2, and 9.2.3. Rule 9.3 and 9.4 is referenced. I'm not going to read those, they're on the note and on the screen in front of you. It then goes on to say, consultation with the secretariat group and… Let me try that statement again. Consultation with the secretariat group and subsequently with the RALO ALSs themselves, indicated different views on the types of performance measures that should be expected of the elected ALAC members.

Taking these variances into account, the subcommittee proposes the following metrics. And this is very much what we will be work-shopping in greater detail in the Los Angeles meeting. Number one, a record of meeting attendance of each ALAC member, of all face to face and online ALAC related meetings, and metrics.

Second one, a record of ALAC member participation in the formal ALAC voting process. A subsection here, subsection A, the names of any working groups or committees, in which the ALAC member has actively participated during the annual period. And B, a statement describing the ALAC member's role and any significant contributions made to the outcomes of the working group.

And we've probably got a fair amount to talk about there, including of course, mechanisms in technical ways. We can do that, and presentation in what type of dashboard or system can be there as well, remembering the offer that what we do for ALAC members is very likely to be also a trickledown effect to regional At Large leadership as well. Four, these records will be opened to view by the At Large community. A critical point.

Five, the ALAC chair is empowered to enforce rule 9.4. Rule 9.4 says the ALAC is empowered to set a threshold which the chair or RALOs to use to monitor performance. Okay. If the chair decides that ALAC's performance requires more structured monitoring, and that's a discussion where not only the past chairs but obviously the incoming chair, undoubtedly have a few things to talk about with us as well. And then [inaudible] six, which is the last point from the [inaudible], any additional metric expectations determined by the RALOs of their elected ALAC member, must be clearly stated within the RALO rules of procedure.

And Silvia will tell us and take us through briefly in a moment, some of the review points that are happening in the various rules of procedure. Just before we open for discussion, and I see Alan already in the queue, Silvia, if you don't mind, we've got listed and noted in this agenda, and it has also been duplicated for the agenda in Los Angeles, that both AFRALO and LACRALO reviewing their own procedures at the moment, and you've got links to those, so I expect you to take us through those in a moment after we have some general discussion.

We also, of course, have recently have had the APRALO rules of procedure reviewed, and there is reference to metrics, performance metrics and criteria in that document. If you would be so kind Silvia, to also link whatever material is available in the also recently, but not quite as recently as APRALO, renewed rules, reviewed rules of procedure for NARALO. If that could be added to this please, and also to the agenda for the Los Angeles meeting.

And the same for anything that, let me try and get the words out properly, that EURALO has. It just seems that we kind of left out those two RALOs. If they could come into the fold, that would be good. So that's a little minor action item on you. Okay, before we go into too much gory detail, let's go to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I have a question, I have a statement that I would like to make, but first a question. The lead in to the six points, seems to read as if some RALOs disagreed with what is in the rules of procedure. Yet as I read the points, they seem to map almost perfectly. Am I misreading something? Is there something that they have, the RALOs did not disagree with and was left out of those points?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, in the absence of Maureen being here, I'm going to have to take that question on notice. And we will have to follow up with her specifically. But yes, I agree with you, that is how it reads. But you're right, it seems you have picked up on everything. But Darlene, I don't know whether, and Glenn, have you been present at any of these

meetings at all? Both having served in different capacities during these sorts of discussions. Can you give us any feedback?

Either of you may be muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Darlene is not on the bridge…

[CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: …memory, okay. Thanks for that Darlene. So Alan, we're going to have to take that on notice with Maureen. But yes, it does seem to indicate that is the case. I wouldn't be surprised if there was a spirited and big discussion of course, that we've all seen before. And it maybe that begrudgingly, everything has been agreed to that. But that's another reason why I think having a workshop style in Los Angeles, and we'll get to that when we get to that when we get to that part of the agenda, is important.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Clearly, everyone doesn't have to agree. If the RALO, if the ALAC makes rules, those rules stand even if some people don't like them. But I think it's really important to understand what it is people don't like and why this is, you know, there is the… The ALAC might want to change its mind as what's in the rules, if indeed there is substantive

EN

disagreement and a rationale which is accepted by a significant part of the community.

So I think that's something that almost has to be remanded to the ALAC, if indeed there are significant departures that the ALAC should be looking at in those rules. The overall statement, I think, is one of context. And this process, I'm talking about metrics in ALAC, has been going on for a very long time. And I would say something in the order of six plus years, maybe a little bit longer, I could check dates, but it almost doesn't matter. It's a long time.

The discussion… There is very little discussion of metrics in virtually any other part, performance metrics for workers, in virtually any other part of the organization of ICANN, other than many groups do maintain attendance, but don't talk about penalizing people if they're not attending. Although the GNSO seems to have now introduced, at least in some working groups, a concept of active members and observers and differentiates between the two.

But in general, there is not, what are we going to do when we find someone slacking off? Which essentially was the tone within ALAC when we started this discussion. We are still having some problems, but the ALAC meeting yesterday barely made quorum. And that's a serious issue I think we need to look at with some depth. There may well be reasons that every individual couldn't make that particular meeting, but if ALAC meetings can't come close to full attendance on a regular basis, we have a significant problem.

That being said, we probably have the best more active ALAC that we've ever had. Now maybe this is the rose colored glasses that come with the chair position, and I'm mandated to be optimistic, but at this point, things are pretty good compared to some of the things that we've seen in the past. Any of the people who have been around for a number of years, could in private, talk about some of the problems.

And they're not necessarily problems of people being maliciously inactive. It's just circumstances vary, and sometimes we have ended up with people who simply didn't do anything with all of the best of intentions, but nevertheless, it's a reality. So, I think the world has changed, and we maybe don't need to be as focused on enforcement, a word we don't use but it's implied, as we go forward now. Just a few thoughts, and a little bit of history. Thank you Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. It's Cheryl again. That gives great context, but I think it's important to make sure that what we're starting to enshrine with rules of procedure, allows enough flexibility that as the dynamic in different groups may change from time to time, and circumstance may change from time to time. We can minimize these variations on a theme. And yes, we've all seen where getting quorum can be a challenge.

One of the things in particular that I would like to think will happen as a product of the work we're all doing in this subcommittee, is a greater awareness of these expectations, and ideally of course, before a RALO appoints people to the ALAC, they should be able to ensure that the person they're either appointing or reappointing is absolutely aware of

the expectations, and indeed aware of and able to give an undertaking that they will, to the best of their ability, be able to meet those. And I still think that that part of the equation is missing.

Olivier, over to you and then Darlene.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you. So a part from the fact that there should be a special rule for slacking Canadians, which clearly not yet allowed on this call, hopefully by the number of Canadians… I might be overruled. I would say, however, being back to serious, is that I think we should not be influenced by the current success of the ALAC, and the current involvement of the ALAC.

We really are looking at putting together metrics that will stand in time, and regardless of whether the ALAC as a whole is very active, or is not active, I really think we should be not thinking, well everything is fine, so we can be complacent. And that's why I would say we have to come up with the metrics, and push for those as if the ALAC was not behaving, and as if people were not pulling their weight, so as to make sure that this doesn't happen in the future. That's all. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very wise words Olivier, and I think that is something that we will agree with. Over to you Darlene.

Ah, see my writing about… Okay. If you're not able to join the audio. The writing about from Darlene, is as follows: "I agree a lot with Alan. However, many outside of the ALAC question the amount of travel support given to the ALAC. I hope the world has changed, but as people go in and out of the ALAC, things can regress.

Ergo, I think it's very, and the emphasis there is very important, to have this enshrined so that we can point to it and show that we monitor our people." Well said Darlene, and of course, it's not just within our RALOs and our At Large communities, but of course that's something, as I suspect Alan is also going to take up now, and I give him the microphone, that those beyond ALAC and At Large in ICANN also keenly watching. Alan and then Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a comment. I don't think anyone would argue with, Darlene, certainly not I, as one of the more active people in the group, in your group Cheryl, that created the rules of procedure and the person who ended up drafting many of the words with approval of everyone else, of course, I can't disagree. That's why we did put them into the rules, and in fact, not only put them into the rules, but gave the ALAC the permission and the ability to make more rules, whether draconian or not, as it sees fit in the future to meet the world as it changes. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Alan. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. I was going to add that with ICANN now going through a full process of accountability, of measuring its accountability and cross-community working group that will be looking at this, the whole NTIA stewardship transition, having this accountability fold into it. I certainly feel that in order to be absolutely fair on all levels, not only should we look at the accountability of ICANN, the organization, the accountability of the Board, the accountability of staff, but obviously the accountability of all of its component communities.

And as one of the communities that has been often point with the finger as not being accountable, which actually I would refute totally, and I think that our community has done great work as accountable as it can be, but one of the communities, it would be a good thing for us to show the way and say that we are ready to be held accountable for what we do. And we expect everyone else, and that includes the Board, the organization staff, to do the same. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. I think that's very much the motivation, but of course, even if we do have beautifully enshrined performance criteria, within our own rules of procedure. We will, I'm afraid, probably still have to all jointly and separately fight the good fight, and keep up that opinion, having accountability based in metrics and the reporting of

performance, still needs to be advertised. Because the fact that we do it, wouldn't be obvious to anyone unless we tell people we do it.

So there is a certain outreach and PR value that needs to be looked at. And I would like to think perhaps in some utopian future, things that the tweeting and social media might be picking up on is some of the metrics, rather more as bylines, we're just seeing as advertising points. So not necessarily just dashboards that are used for, hopefully not too draconian measures. I think we're very careful to use words like remediation rather than draconian measures.

You know, I think we also need to put this a bit on its head and in the not too distant future and try and become very positive, the people feel the number of [inaudible] put in two meetings in the face to face meetings, but also inter-session-ally [sic] is somehow recorded and advertised. Now, we will, ladies and gentlemen, sadly I'm afraid, at least from my point of view, always have negative views and naysayers.

And I certainly have recently been brought up to see the day, with an email explaining to me from at least one serving member and long standing member of the current ALAC, to why these types of measures and return on investment, are not desirable tools to somehow, in this person's view, see that these types of measures, number of hours done and number of meetings attended, etc.

Whilst I don't think they were suggesting, my reading of their principles is correct, that the actual, what we're doing in terms of collecting this same sort of data is wrong, there was a philosophical point that the use of that to justify the effectiveness of At Large and the ALAC within

ICANN, was in their view, philosophically speaking, an error. And indeed, I think words like travesty were used. So we will continually have to recognize that there will be great diversity of view, even to those sitting, and in some cases long standing members of the ALAC and the community.

But it is what it is. And we can start to do our best. Just wanted to read also that Darlene has pointed out in the chat, just in case she's unable to have her audio recorded, that during, I think what Olivier and Alan were saying, she also said that in her opinion, the ALAC and At Large, I'm assuming, should lead the way in accountability, and I'm sure all will give a yeah team on that.

I think it was Murray's hand that went up before Alan, but anyway. I'm going to use my chair's discretion and give the floor to Murray anyway. Over to you Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you. It's Murray McKercher speaking for the record. I just wanted to make a quick comment. Maybe it's the term, return on investment, or ROI, which is used a lot in my corporate world, but it's probably used less in [inaudible] world that might be throwing various people off. So not that we should change the name, but just be aware of the context perhaps, maybe that's why there are some objections. Anyway, just wanted to add that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Murray. Cheryl again. That's an extremely valid point, but the people to whom we do, and it is, we do have to go cap in hand. And I often meant that literally as well as metaphorically. And if not, the leadership, then the staff to say, "Please, ICANN, we would like able to get a piece of your funding pie, to be better enable what we as the ALAC and At Large can do." And that goes back to, I think, a valid point about people concerned about the amount of travel support that we're given.

That's a terminology that would be using. And so we just kind of have to, you know, deal with the fact that if we all call potatoes, potatoes, we can all then understand that we're talking about potatoes. And so if those part, the giving part of the equation, use terms like ROI, and I've been fairly careful to avoid it in the metrics context, but we have used it in the ATLAS 2 context, then I think it would serve us well to continue to like it or lump it.

See that what sort of bang for the [inaudible] and it is [inaudible], the we would be getting. And of course, it isn't up just to ICANN as an administrator of sums back out to the community for various services, but it also, as we've seen in the past, and then I'll go to Alan and then Darlene, comes from other parts of the ICANN community. We've certainly seen times when industry. So of course many of us, myself included, see the domain name industry as rather more tax collectors, and everything, with the exception of upfront payments for TLDs, and things like sums from options, etc.

Most other things that come into the pockets of ICANN are, of course, in some way shape or form, directly from the registrant anyway. But sometimes it's difficult. To Alan and then Darlene. Over to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. For the record, hands are ordered by Adobe in the order that it sees them go up. However, Murray said basically, Murray followed by you said basically what I was going to say. I'm not privy to the letter that you received, but the comments I have heard, from more than one person actually, is not so much that we shouldn't be looking to analyze the benefits from essentially, what might be an investment, but certainly an expenditure that ICANN makes.

It's a very much a nomenclature issue. The term return on investment, talking about people, tends to offend some people. Whereas other words, such as benefits from whatever, are far softer. And to the extent that that is a general, you know, if it's only one or two people, then so be it. Not everyone is going to be happy all of the time.

If indeed, that's a comment that has more support in the community, then part of what we need to do is try and convince, you know, the people in ICANN that maybe it's the wrong term to use. The concept is definitely going to be there, but maybe that's the wrong term. But it's very much a nomenclature and a sensitivity issue, not whether we should be trying to understand whether something is worth money on or not.

That is something which we can't afford not to do. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed. Thanks for that Alan. Cheryl for the record. Again, I guess the other that we should probably adhere is, that the reactions with this

EN

terminology, and to some extent, the reactions we've had over the years to try and put in hard coded performance metrics criteria and expectations, is also that we are dealing with volunteers. And of course, one ought to be able to value, in some way, shape, or form, and indeed, measure, some proof of value concept.

The, as we all know, because you all do it, extraordinary amount of committed time of something very valuable, people's free time, that is contributed by At Large, the RALOs, and the ALAC in sort of that order, in their work for ICANN. I mean, in the majority of cases, there is little, if any, direct connection with the day to day making of a living employment or benefit to the individuals from our community with what they do. It's not as if you could say, "Well, we're getting X, Y, Z, company, employ them, and their activities in ICANN and At Large is somehow able to be seen by X, Y, Z company as an investment it is making."

In giving precious time, we have people who literally take leave and lose income to participate in things, and that's part of the equation that I think we need to be pretty careful to somehow capture and make more obvious. We spent a lot of time on things like conflict of interest, where there may be some particular bias or capture ability from what people do. But I suspect that we spend as much time noting where there is a huge amount of altruism and selflessness, but we might be well-served as well. Darlene, you had your hand up earlier, did you want to speak? Have you got your audio together now?

Not hearing you Darlene. Okay just, chime in if you can get your audio. If not, I'll just note that you just said, "Sorry, the comment was

pertinent at the time." I suspect that means, okay, she's got no audio. Please anything you type in, I'll try and make sure I capture and read to the record, so I'll act as your voice.

While I'm reading to the record, this is Cheryl again, I just wanted to point out that Olivier has put in a link, and if I can ask staff to capture that link from the chat and make sure it goes in as a little reference piece please, to today's meeting notes. And that is volunteer value with an URL that is called Independent Sector dot org forward slash volunteer underscore time.

And I'm a little bit confused now, Murray. What do you mean you're moving to Boston, Massachusetts for $27…. All right Murray. Okay. Now rather than me read what is a little confusing, I suspect, into the record, can you explain? Even if it's a piece of amusing anecdote. I suspect you're probably reading something at the same time. Over to you Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, thanks. I think I'm unmuted at the moment. Look, I was only looking at the list, amusing anecdote. There is a list of values, of volunteers, by state in the United States. And my quick eyes tell me that Massachusetts is the best place to be considered a volunteer, and be paid the highest amount of money.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, there you go. That's actually extremely useful that someone has put dollar and cent value on it. That might be an interesting exercise for

some of us to look at in our spare time in the not too distant future. I know that, for example, here in Australia, there are some statute values that, for example, we have a fairly vigorous volunteer in the emergency responders.

So most rural communities at least, but also in suburbs have emergency services personal who are otherwise employed under normal circumstances, but can be called in to assist in disasters or for accidents. And there is a numerical value put on at a per hour rate for all of that as well. So if you were a volunteer firefighter, or a civil defense person, you'll have, you were called out 100 hours duty. The government would, in fact, compensate you at X amount per hour after you performed that duty.

That's of course taxable, etc. etc. as any of your income is. So there might be some other values that we could put. That of course, is different as Alan has just pointed out, between value and what's being paid. I would suggest the value, event at $27 an hour out of Massachusetts, that specifically ICANN is getting, considering some just the legal talent that volunteers at various parts of ICANN, but certainly within our own community, billable hour rate versus what deemed values are with the vastly different…

I know that Alan went through an exercise some time ago to look at what, from a business perspective, he would be worth in terms of the huge amount of hours he put in, not just for ALAC, but of course, for [inaudible] the GNSO. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Since you mentioned my name, I will make a comment. I gone through two exercises in the past, and the actual numbers would vary from time to time and year to year. One is, what is my time valued at my regular billable rate, and even a low ball billable rate. And the other is, what am I'm actually giving up by forsaking contracts to enable me to volunteer.

And the two are substantively different numbers, but are both impressive. So when we're looking at value, I think that's the kind of thing that we need to look at. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. And I think that as we come out the other side of this exercise, and we get our community to be more aware of all of this, it's probably going to do a good job of just reminding people, throughout the ICANN community, but perhaps even beyond those who are not, I would say, used to volunteering. Because I would suspect that we are probably the highest amount of volunteers, in the ICANN community coming out of ALAC and At Large.

But even so, it should be a use for those whose activities in ICANN still have some relationship to their, either their employment or their day to day life, would probably some heartening to go through that exercise as well. And yes, it is a fear I have, and have had in a number of volunteer context, that what, without good recognition, and good valuing, and I mean that in all senses of the word, not just some numerical value in a spreadsheet somewhere, of volunteers.

And people who commit to activities, such as we all do, and we ask people in the ALAC in the leadership roles to do, because that's above the call of duty in many cases, without a good valuation of that, we will get less talented and less capable individuals attracted to take up that role. So that's a real fear, and we can't all be retried or independently wealthy, as well as motivated to do the hugely important work that's being done, and even just in the world of Internet governance and ICANN specifically.

So, if we are going to chew the fat on all of that now, and look at, and I'm going to ask Silvia here, to take us through, because again, without Maureen being here, just some of the high points and issues that have been raised out of the recently reviewed and currently under reviewed rules of procedure, that would be good.

But just before that Silvia, you sent me a couple of private messages. I'm unable to count right now, how many hours ago Gisella asked me to do exactly what you have just asked me to give you today, which is the agendas for the LA meeting. She asked me shortly after the close of the ALAC meeting in my yesterday. I would say I would do it, and I have in fact, given quite lengthy and detailed agendas many, many hours ago.

So if you haven't seen them, don't take it up with me, take it up with her.

Right. So just basically, that's done. Now, can we get from you Silvia some ideas of what might be happening out of the AFRALO and LACRALO current review. I suspect that, of course, in the AFRALO rules, we may have also got back to some of the criteria for activity in At Large

structures, etc. as well. Because that's the material that Tijani and Fatimata have already introduced to this subcommittee, but it may very well be modified, and regardless, it's probably worthwhile refreshing our memory. Over to you Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, thank you very much. Yes, for now, we have two RALOs actively participating, and modifying the rules, the Internet procedures. And one of the main is metrics, performance metrics. AFRALO has just beginning, started his work. And Tijani is running this process, and they are just beginning, based on the ideas of what is minimum participation requirements.

So at this point, we don't have any specific proposals, just some brainstorming ideas from different members. It is a subject that is raising some controversy. Many people are not in agreement with setting minimum performance requirements, but we'll see. So AFRALO, we don't have any specific metrics yet.

LACRALO, however, through Alberto Soto, the new chair, has presented a new document called proposed metrics for active participation in LACRALO. So I'm going to read out to you the main items. They want to define what is active participation, and they say that a representative participation in at least 60% of the meetings, 60% of [inaudible] any kind. We support in this from 50% of those present, of those who cannot attend, and at least two in a calendar year would be a minimum participation requirement.

And there is a document that I can share with you drafted by Alberto Soto, and that's being discussed at the moment. And needless to say, there are some members from ALSs which are completely disagree with this, and would like to have just a status quo on change these minimum requirements.

But some other members are supporting this proposal. So this is still being discussed. Another interesting benchmark would be the following, when an ALS does not vote in three consecutive elections or contributes to LACRALO to comment in ICANN policy statements through collaborative discussion in 12 consecutive months, automatically they lose their voting right and active status within LACRALO.

And the ALS must be notified about the change of the status, and could regain their voting rights and their active status within the next 12 months, if they become active. Otherwise, the chair will send a request to the ALAC to discredit this, yes, the ALS. I'm translating as I'm…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure.

SILVIA VIVANCO: …sending a representative to face to face meetings organized by ICANN, and sponsor [inaudible] ICANN, we [remiss] the status, the active participation status within the last year prior to the event date. Okay, so this is, I'm translating again. I think the idea is that they will meet,

the opportunity to participate in a face to face meeting, if they do not comply with what I just mentioned.

So they are a number of very strict punishments, if I want call it something, measures that are integrated at the moment. And as I said, there are actually very strong opinions about those. So those are the documents that are being discussed at the moment. And on Friday, this Friday, we have another meeting with the AFRALO leaders and the AFRALO working group, rules of procedure. So I expect to see more movement regarding metrics.

And of course, APRALO, as you know, has also metrics, and maybe you can explain that. Another, I believe, also has metrics that they haven't updated their procedures regarding metrics yet. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Silvia. Cheryl for the record. Just to answer Glenn McKnight's question in the cat, we're probably coming towards the close of discussion on item three, specifically with relationship to the RALO reviews and comments on metrics and measures. It's interesting what you say Silvia, and then I'll go to Alan, because whilst what you've outlined is the hotly discussed item out of LACRALO at the moment, they're still in general keeping with what we've heard from out of AFRALO.

And certainly in keeping with what I'm aware of is currently in measuring in NARALO and the new rules of APRALO. And I wouldn't been overly concerned. NARALO's review of their rules of procedure happened, I believe, Alan and everyone else, correct me if I'm wrong

when I give the floor to you Alan, that I don't think that's much more than 12 to 18 months ago, that was reviewed.

But if you can be clear on that, that would be helpful for our record. Whilst the percentages and the exact measures, the how many measures constitute activity or not satisfactory activity, the messages seem to be the same. That they is a desire within the regions, regarding At Large structures at least, to have some measure of engagement, being linked to a right to influence voting outcomes.

And I think we can probably work with some sort of paired down principles there. I know AFRALO's earlier work had a quite specific set of totally engaged, moderately engaged, and currently not engaged sufficiently to engage in voting, etc. And there is probably going to be a little bit of betting down to get some similarities between the regions. But the sub-scene seems to be the same, total lack of satisfactory engagement should result in you not contributing specifically until you are more engaged in quorum and the associated ability to vote and influence. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Several things. In terms of NARALO reviewing its rules of procedure, we haven't. We have updated them periodically. We've been recognized that we have a problem, so to some extent we have quote reviewed them. But really we've been problem fixing, and filling gaps as opposed to a real review. That's perhaps something we need to do.

When we started this whole business of metrics, we did put percentages assigned, as the LACRALO statement suggests. And the problem we had there is, when you put percentages, the next tendency is to change the color of your name in the spreadsheet or something like that. And when people got red, they reacted very negatively sometimes.

And in some cases, there was good reason for them to react negatively. We had a rule, for instance, saying that if you do not vote in more than, I don't remember, two thirds of the ALS votes, in a specific period, then you turn red and are clearly not performing. And then we had a period when we only had one ALS vote, and therefore missing the one vote for perhaps valid reasons, would turn you into red.

Also, people on occasion miss things because of illness or something or other, and that, the metrics review team, at that point, we're not necessarily cognoscente of that. So that was the reason we ended up dropping it in the current incarnation, basically say it's the chair's call, although obviously this group is discussing whether we should go back and put some sort of numbers on it to make the chair's job easier. On losing voting rights, I should note that NARALO has had a rule since we started, essentially saying that if you don't vote for two years, or you don't participate for two years, and voting is one of those participations, you lose voting rights.

And you don't become a full member again until you fixed the problem. And we realized that we were setting up an impossible situation. That is, you lose voting rights, but you're not reinstated until you start voting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That's a Catch-22.

ALAN GREENBERG: As RALOs write rules like that, they've got to be really careful that they're not setting up an impossible situation. We have, and I believe, still have in our rules. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Alan. Cheryl for the record. That makes me smile. That is, I think, the classic Catch-22. Darlene, you've got your hand up, if you've got audio go ahead. If not, I will read from the chat.

Darlene?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll read it. She says, "Fixing that problem only means positing on the list." I believe, in our case, we actually, the wording did need to vote, and I believe Darlene was the one who caught that problem. So that's just a warning, as one writes rules just to make sure you don't setup ones like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh indeed. I'm just going to read for the record and the transcript, that Silvia has put into chat, "NARALO metrics," so this is a direct quote of the current state of play when it is specific to ALSs, this is still important

part of our discussion, because it sets a precedence, of course, to what we can expect of leadership as well.

When an ALS does not vote in three consecutive NARALO elections, or does not contribute a comment to ICANN policy through collaboration on the NARALO discussion list, in 12 consecutive months, that's one calendar year, it automatically loses its voting rights, and active status within NARALO.

The ALS may regain its voting rights, and active status, if within the next year, it votes or participates to online discussions, otherwise the chair will submit to ALAC a request for the decertification of that ALS. And we obviously note the potential for ambiguities, but that's the current state of plan. I think I'm right in saying that is very much in keeping with what we're hearing in the other regional discussions and recently reviewed rules.

And Darlene, it is my pleasure to act as your voice. Okay, now, ladies and gentlemen, I'm very much aware that we've only got 25 minutes left on the call. I'm also aware that some of us would like some of our life back. So, let's move on in the agenda, but let's recognize that what we're going to do in Los Angeles, is with flipcharts, and paper, and pretty colored sticky notes, probably try and workshop….

I'm going to do this… I thought about this, Gisella if you would take a note, when I requested flipcharts and colored pieces of paper for the work-shopping the accessibility taskforce. I think it's probably worthwhile with us doing some more workshop or breakout session in our metrics meeting as well. So, I will request that at least the sticky

bits of paper, or colored bits of paper are used again in this meeting, which will be on the Monday for metrics.

And let's just see whether or not we can start narrowing down some of the key parts from these regional inputs, and see whether we can end up with a few distilled points that can then be picked up and discussed in greater detail. Not only by the ALAC, and of course the rule 9.4, which of course could be the chair of the ALAC itself, with the chair acting on behalf of the ALAC deciding on particularly more structured monitoring, but also to make sure that there is clarity and understanding.

In fact, what we really want is things that are highly predictable between the expectations and what goes on in the region. And types of measures, and here we're talking about activity and performance, somehow relating to the right to engage in things like voting, or for staying in an accredited ALS that's coming out of the region.

So we'll workshop this in greater detail. We won't have a lot of time, it's only a 60 minute call, sorry, meeting in Los Angeles, but if we do, I think there are some more practical things. I think we can get some outcomes out of that will be a good thing indeed, because I'm assuming that we may have people outside of our work group able to join that call.

Alan, you just put into the chat that, you just said, "Yes, that's correct," to what Darlene has put into the chat and I've read out. And say, it's wrong in that there is no Catch-22 in the NARALO rules, but there is an illogical condition that says you can regain voting rights by voting.

EN

Luckily, in the wisdom of those who have drafted it, and he was not involved he's mentioning, in parentheses, it does not include a second way of regaining active status.

But yes, you're right. We need to be very, very careful about what we draft here. Olivier, as the current chair of the ALAC, at least until the end of our Los Angeles meeting, can I hear from you, is where we are now starting to be where you would like to see us a subcommittee be? Because I know that you had particular desires for the output of our subcommittee. Are you able to use audio?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I certainly am. It's Olivier speaking. Thank you for this question Cheryl. I think that we are getting there. I had concerns that we wouldn't be, at least, coasting along by the time we met in Los Angeles. And I can see that we are now starting to get moving at all levels. The problem really is that a coordination of everything. Coordination of having the overall metrics for ALAC members, the metrics for the chair, for the ALT, for the RALOs, and for the ALSs.

And I just have a concern that if we don't address all of them simultaneously, then there will be push back from one part, saying, "Well, why are we subjected to metrics why they are not subjected to metrics?" Etc. And hence the reason why I was a big concerned, but seeing that you are moving forwarded. This working group is well represented and certainly has the input from RALOs that's really helpful.

I think that, if we can, put things down as a proposal for the ALAC, either in Los Angeles or by Marrakesh afterwards, depending on where your discussions go, then we're clearly set out for the right direction.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Olivier. This is Cheryl for the record. That's very good to hear back from you. And I think that I see no impediment to us tracking perfectly along this timeline. I think one of the reasons during this call were, of course, giving out the colored pieces of paper, a few big pieces of butcher paper, or [inaudible] or three, would be so we can start ordering and coordinating what was keyed out of community discussion to date, so that we do have the stripes, the parallel lines of activity and proposals coming out of Los Angeles.

Clearly there will be more discussion needing to happen out in the community, and clearly Maureen is the one who has been particularly leading that. So not having heard here on today's call is a disadvantage to us, which she will be with us, obviously, in Los Angeles. But we also need to recognize that much of what we are discussing has come out of the works of the sub-team that Tijani was heading up.

Tijani is also not with us here today, and I'm sure he will have some very particular input from what his metrics sub-team has been doing to date. And of course, that has a [inaudible] with a lot of what is happening in the regions with the types of measurements, and metrics, and performance criteria that's being discussing across all of, or our already existing rules, of some where there is some form of measure that says an At Large structure is active or not.

I suspect, Olivier, the greatest amount of work will end up being that what expectations are put on the regional leadership. Of course we recognize that the regional leadership is a bit like the filling of a sandwich, is absolutely critical to the successful outcome of in many cases, coordinating and facilitating and I'm going to use the word coagulating, which sounds a little bit yucky, but the bringing together of a nice, big thick paste of input from all of the ALSs, as it gets plugged into our early ALAC directly, or up into ICANN from the regions.

And so those who take the leadership responsibility there, and who do, let me use the dreaded return on investment language here, who do benefit, in inverted commas, by significant travel support, etc. etc. from time to time. And one assumes are off hand more likely to be successful in applying for various other things such as CROPP funding, etc. in the future. That those leaders should also be subject to some minimum performance criteria as well.

And that's probably going to be the largest amount of kerfuffle in the future, a bit like when we go back to the dim, dark, distant days of what we had in the ALAC that Alan referred to you earlier. Back to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl, it's Olivier speaking. And so, in anticipation of the meeting in Los Angeles, I was also going to suggest that it should be understood, we actually touched on this that the regions are a pivotal part of this whole process, and yet, when you look at the regional, sorry the RALO leaderships duties and activities that are expected of them, so

expectations of them, they're not as clearly listed out as expectations of an ALAC member, expectations of a chair, etc. etc.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Or an ALS.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I guess that this has to be recognized, and perhaps this is one of the pieces of work that will have to be done. And for the time being, I'm not going to dwell into, to delve into who this should be allocated to, but certainly setting down, or providing sets of documents to RALO leaderships as to what is expected of them, and maybe helping them out in how to run the region, how to run a RALO, etc. is something that will certainly be of help for the RALO leaders in order for them to be able to settle into their positions.

I have certainly heard for at least two secretaries, that when they took on the job, they had no idea whatsoever of what was expected of them, and therefore their performance was, and I'll use a Cheryl, sorry, an Australian term, piss poor, and they admitted it at the beginning of their tenure. And in fact, for some of them, it took quite a while for them to settle into the job.

And so this obviously has to be understood. If we are going to subject the RALO leaders to metrics, we're also, we're not there to hit and push people down. This whole exercise is one to pull people up, to pull everyone up. Honestly, I would not be happy having, if I had such

metrics and having to tell someone in our community that they're not doing well, it's never a happy thing.

I'd be much rather happy to look at metrics and say, "Wow, we're doing great. And we're doing so much better than we were, and we're improving." And I think that's the way we should market this. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hear, hear Olivier. Cheryl for the record, and I couldn't agree with you more, and I see nothing but agreement coming out of the AC room as well. This should be very much an exercise in enabling the in service training in facilitating, and I'd love to see one of the outcomes of what we do is inspire, perhaps, some handbooks and guidelines come out. And there is absolutely no reason why ALAC can't convene a cross-regional leadership ad hoc group, to do that type of thing.

So it's not as if these things should be handed down on high, but ALAC, just as it's in the business of setting the standard and maintaining the standards for its At Large structures. The regions were brought into play because it was seen at the time, that there would be a benefit of this middle layer, a coordination point, an administration and coordination point being brought into play.

Because we have ALSs and ALAC, and ALAC and ALSs long before we had ever had regional At Large organizations. So let's perhaps… Around the Marrakesh time might be a good desirable point to start focusing on that as well, or particularly focusing on getting some outcomes out of that as well.

We're creeping through this additional time. So if there is no more particular discussion on these existing and being reviewed rules, I think what we'll do, and this of course leads to the next agenda item anyway, is take a fairly focused workshop approach in our 60 minutes together in Los Angeles. If Silvia or Gisella could just remind us of the exact time on the Monday that we're meeting? Is it 10:30? Can someone confirm?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry Cheryl, Gisella here. We're meeting from three to four on Monday afternoon.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. 15:00 to 16:00 hours, local Los Angeles time. UTC minus seven at the moment. Is it UTC minus eight when we get there?

GISELLA GRUBER: Cheryl, Gisella here, UTC minus seven. I will tell you that is 15:00 Los Angeles time, it's 22:00 UTC. And a meeting invitation will be sent to the working group for those not in LA to allow them to participate remotely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And what we would like to do with that remote participation, because we will be work-shopping, is I'd like to make sure that we have a… Glenn, you might be in a position to assist us here, that we have some form of video feed going out into the Adobe Connect room, from the room, which is not just look at all of these bodies sitting around the

table, but actually looking at sticky pieces of paper, or colored pieces of paper as we work with charts and sift and sort some of these things.

So if we can… Glenn, if you could have a little think about that perhaps for us, about how we might best and more actively engage any remote participants by the Adobe room, that would be good. Darlene is just noticing if the IT gods will smile upon us, she'll be able to talk next time. That would be a very good thing indeed. And it is all up to bandwidth and who knows what.

I have put a meeting, a fairly brief meeting agenda together. Gisella, I don't think we need to change the agenda as such for Los Angeles, although I will have another look at it tomorrow, which is still well in advance of your cut off time for translation, and just see whether we need to add a word or two there to show that it is going to be a workshop style now.

And obviously, we will need for the metrics subcommittee now, that meeting will also need the flipchart materials. And bits of paper, bits and bobs, that I've already asked to be available for the accessibility meeting as well. In terms of number of flip charts, I'm not all that desperately concerned, if we could only get one, we'll work with one. If we can get two, we'll work with two. If we can get three, it will be ideal.

Three would be ideal, simply because that would give us a puddle to put ALS stuff, RALO stuff, and ALAC stuff, and then we could live with those pieces of paper. But if we only get one flipchart, we'll just tear off the butcher's paper and make three landing spaces. So we will manage with whatever materials we can get hold of.

It's just this type of thing probably needs a bit more live interaction that we might as well take the opportunity at the face to face meeting to do that. What I'd also like to do at the Los Angeles meeting is have the agreement of those in the room, and remotely that we go back to pre-determined, regular meeting. I'm happy to have those meetings rotate around the most popularly selected time. And I'm going to suggest perhaps that if not before, certainly in preparation for our meeting in Los Angeles, that we are doing a Doodle, or doing a Doodle, you know, on the day or immediately after the day of the Los Angeles meeting, not before, to allocate a set of times.

And I think a set of times is probably fairer than just one time. I don't always want to be up at midnight talking to you all, nor do I think you all need to be up late at night when I'm conveniently getting up at my 5 or 6 AM. So let's share the pain, rotate the pain if we can. And so we'll have a high degree of predictability between now and the Marrakesh meeting as well.

I think it has already been said there will be a reasonable amount of work to be done at the Marrakesh, or for the Marrakesh meeting. And it would be good to get ahead of the curve on that. Now, you do need to think, do you want to have a once a month, or do you want to have a fortnightly?

I would suggest if we start setting out a Doodle time once a month, and we take the opportunity to perhaps have the space in a month, so if we can perhaps have a meeting that's predictably either the second or the third week of the month, that will also mean that reporting to the ALAC is easier for our full metrics subcommittee. Then that we can use the

alternate week, in other words the second or the third, week of the month for what I suspect will be some sub-teams to work.

So we may very well find that there will be a specific focus on some of the regional work for example. And it would be good to not have you all spread too thinly, but to allow to that other week to be utilized. We'll sort that out more, we just need to get this preparation done so we can sort it out in Los Angeles. So that's another AI to be prepared to do that Doodle.

And that, of course, means that staff need to have a look at the calendar and see what's available. Because the most appropriate timeslots are already booked up. So we may not have as much flexibility as we'd like, but if you can come to be prepared to say, "I cannot possibly make it on the third Tuesday of the month, or the first Monday of the month," or whatever, that would be greatly appreciated.

As we come to a close, I wanted to ask if there was any other business. Is there any other business? Not hearing anyone. Not seeing anybody wave at me in the room. Okay. In that case, don't forget we do have a list. I am who will admit, first of all and foremost, I get far more done either immediately preparing, getting ready to come into a teleconference meeting, or during a teleconference than I ever do on the list. But we do have lists, and so we can use them. And we probably need to make sure that we, perhaps that we capture everything that we do in our Los Angeles meeting pages.

So we'll just probably come back as an AI for staff as well, just to make sure that we capture in our metrics wiki pages, what we do in the Los

Angeles meeting. Because when we are meeting, during these face to face meetings, because what's happened in Singapore, it's very easy for them to sort of disappear into those main face to face meeting archives, and we find it more difficult to get them collected back out into our wiki spaces.

So even if it means just a page that links to the formal face to face record. I don't care how it's done, I just care that it's done, since we have a couple of items in the past which are very difficult to track down. Okay. Coming towards the end of the hour. You're right Murray, AI is action item, not artificial intelligence, although one never knows. We could have an auto bot doing some of these things at one point.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for the time you've spent with us today. And thank you particularly for those of you who will be able to join us face to face in Los Angeles, but if you can't join us face to face in Los Angeles, we will have remote participation. And Glenn will have come up with some very clever method to make sure that if you are participating, you're able to do as fully and interestingly engaged via the Adobe Connect room as possible.

Bye for now, thank you one and all, and this meeting comes to an end.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]