

LOS ANGELES – At-Large Metrics Working Group
Monday, October 13, 2014 – 15:00 to 16:00
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's October 13, 2014, on a Monday at 15:00. This is the Olympic conference room with the At-Large Metrics Working Group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We will be holding for just a moment or two while we get some equipment in the room. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. This is the At-Large Advisory Committee Metrics Working Group meeting. We are scheduled to start now at the top of the hour, but if you would indulge us for five minutes, we'll have some flip charts, which are kind of necessary for later in our agenda. So talk amongst yourselves, and anyone in the AC room, you might want to start organizing your questions. Thank you.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Five minutes' delay has turned into three minutes' delay, and I have a hissy fit if things run late, so let's get this show on the road. The rules of engagement for today: we will be having some interactive workshop-style going on, depending on how many of us turn up at the time. There may be others coming in from lunch, I mean. We will separate ourselves up into small groups, or we might do something else creative, see how the urge takes us partway through today's meeting.

What that does mean, of course, is that if you're in the Adobe Connect room only and not here in the room in whatever place we're in — oh,

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.

yes, Los Angeles — there may be some limitation on what you’re seeing and how you can interact. Excuse me one moment. Dear me. My apologies from that. Back on deck again.

What we will do, and I will apologize to the people looking at the recording in the Adobe Connect room — I’m going again. It’s the chili I had in my tortilla soup. Can I just confess? I did put extra chili in the tortilla soup over lunch, and it’s paying me back. Maureen may be taking over in a moment.

We’ll do our best to include and perhaps scribe and capture into the Adobe Connect room chat what we’re doing. It’s not set up for the ideal remote participation, but we will do our best. So, onto the fun and games of today.

We have, when I can get to the agenda, a fairly standard agenda, but we thought we’d take the advantage of having all of us face-to-face in the room to hopefully fast track and agree on some of the harmonization and requirements, for now, the next layer down.

As you know, we have put forward, and it has been accepted— please come in, you are more than welcome. Come on, don’t be frightened! I only look scary. I look like a zebra, so I guess that’s a bit worrying. There is a reason for that, fear not.

Now, with recommendation 43, if memory serves, at the ATLAS gathering, the expectation is that the rules, which is the 9.1 series that the At-Large advisory committee has now accepted as metrics — these are baseline performance requirements — some of the regions have already started putting performance requirements which are measured,

so they are genuinely metrics, into their rules at the regional level for their leadership, and it's a very good thing.

As leaders, we are accountable to the community, and so we do have to prove our worth in some way, shape, or form. And part of today will be looking at how we try and harmonize, and how we try and take these expectations even all the way out to the [inaudible] community, because I know the incoming chair of the ALAC is very keen to have the expectations on the At-Large structures clearly delineated, and metrics, and I throw to Alan when we get to that part.

So let's start with our rather more traditional agenda and have a look at the action items, which will almost be complete when the magic happens from the [star] facilities here.

The first one is Gisella to investigate attendance records. Not only is that done, we will show you on screen in a little while what's been captured so far, and you can help discuss where we go from now, and Dev, I think you'll be pretty pleased because this might be easy to mine. We'll take that. That one's ticked off now. Whoever does the magic by ticking the box in the record, please do so.

The next one was [our star] Silvia Vivanco to add the PowerPoint in any other meetings, Singapore and London, in preparation for the space. Again, I believe that's being done.

Third point, again to Silvia, was to add the NARALO relevant links to the agenda. Now, I think that's any existing metrics, and I'm unsure that that one has been done, so leave that open, work out exactly what it was that we wanted. But I suspect because we have other regions who

have recently redone their rules of procedure, even though NARALO hasn't redone rules of procedure, we still should link — I think this is what it is, Silvia, so I think I've got it now — we still should have a link to the existing NARALO rules of procedure, so that will be tidied up.

We're doing a workshop with flipping charts and sticky notes. We've got the sticky notes, but the flipping charts aren't here yet, so that's Gisella was doing and what our delay was on, but apparently the elves are bringing the sticky charts from wherever they hide for the winter, and we'll have them shortly.

The most important thing, which I'm almost tempted to do now, which is pre-determine the regular meetings, because we've been naughty little people between London and here, and we've only managed to put one — I know it's not a long time between London and LA; it was very short — but we did actually only manage one formal metrics meeting. It was such a rare event that, other than myself, none of the leadership bothered to turn up, so having put that to the public record and permanently on their records, we're just going to now sit on agree regular every however many times you want — once a month, once a fortnight, whatever — at suitable time zones.

Now, that means we can cancel one, but if it's in your calendars, in your diaries, it stays front of mind, and we'll manage to do that. Thank you. And the flip charts are coming in as we speak.

Then number six is staff to capture our wiki pages what happens in the face-to-face meeting. Not only is it not a sentence, I'm unconvinced I

can remember exactly what it was about, it was so long ago. So let's work on that one, and we'll come back to it.

Okay, we'll assume that all our action items are done, and not only are they done, Ariel is so quick off the mark, she's already edited, and I have to reload. Things are already happening.

Moving back to our agenda then, I'd like you to think very seriously about how frequently you want to meet. Let's poll it now. Do you want to meet monthly? If you want to meet fortnightly or monthly, then we'll make this decision now. Do you want to meet every fortnight? If you want to eat every fort— Eat? Let me try that once more: Meet every fortnight, then do this with your card. I don't see many people doing that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

A fortnight is every two weeks for those who don't live in certain places.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Oh, I'm sorry! Antipodeans measure things differently. I do apologize. We were right. We knew exactly what we [inaudible]. Every two weeks, every 14 days or so? Nobody's putting their [hand] up? [inaudible]? Alan is, yes. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I was putting my tent card up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, right. Okay, we have one vote from Alan. I don't see any overwhelming majority. Let's talk about three weeks. Three weeks is on the table. Every three weeks...three weeks... Look at the scowling faces. I am not going beyond a month, ladies and gentlemen. It sounds to me like you've all agreed by not agreeing to every other derivation that we'll be meeting monthly now, Gisella, and Gisella will find a slot – a couple of slots now – and there will be a Doodle sent out to you all. So that's that done, so we'll mark number five already. No? Okay, Alan has – you haven't got your tent card. I can't recognize you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have a tent card. Actually, I do have a GSO tent card in my bag somewhere. I never got an ALAC tent card. I guess I'm not important.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You'll have a gilt-edged one next meeting, but anyway, go on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'd like to presume that if the group is only meeting once a month, that there will be significant work done between the meetings, not just by Noreen and— Noreen. Maureen and Dev.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Answer is not required.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed, and in fact, depending on the workload, it may be at the end of any one of these regular monthly meetings that someone decides we need to meet in another two weeks, just for the purpose of wrapping something up. We will be flexible. We will have in our calendars a monthly meeting. All right, let's get on to the exciting stuff. Attendance, etc., etc.

This is a metrics meeting, so if you're in here, you need to be measured. No, you don't. You need to be shown as part of the attendance. Staff will ascertain who you are if we don't know who you are. And if you're not a member, feel free to join us. This is open, and we are certainly looking for more input.

This is going to then take us to Maureen's slides, if they're ready to go up, because we're now going to have a look at some of the review of outreach and discussion Maureen's been conducting already over the last many months, actually. It's been probably close to nine months. I think we could have had a baby by this time. Maureen's been gestating with the regional leaders, and over to you, Maureen, to bring everyone up to speed.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. And I think that, with several new people on the block, it's timely to introduce this and provide some context to what it is that we've been doing for the last nine months or so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Gestating.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Gestating. Next slide, please. We'll be going through a little bit of a historic context, and then going into the ALAC rules of procedure, which will explain why it is that I'm actually going down this particular track, and looking at some initial recommendations that we made and which we provided to the RALOs for consultation, and some feedback which resulted in an end review and another draft, and a look at some tools.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's not a nice way to refer to Dev!

MAUREEN HILYARD: Next, please. I just picked up a couple of metrics that were done in the past, and this was— yes, well before my time. And this was a measure that was being used for ALAC members in looking at attendance mainly. It seemed to be quite time-intensive in relation to staff input, but everyone in the ALAC team was actually – every time they attended a meeting or voted, it was actually measured. Next.

I've also [inaudible] found that in relation to ALS participation — again, because the metrics group is supposed to be looking at ALAC, RALO, and ALS metrics, these are just a couple that I actually found from olden days — but the AFRALO ALS participation was actually a little bit more specific.

For example, minimum participation in teleconferences. The minimum attendance expectation was 50%, so six out of the twelve teleconferences, they were meant to attend, that they had to participate in a post at least once a month, and similarly on Wiki once a month, and of course attend the general assembly. I noticed, too, around that time other RALOs didn't have anything as specific. Again, it's sort of like looking at the ways in which metrics have been used in the past. Next. Please, if you've got any questions...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He's got his tent there now. He's totally legal.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And ALAC as well. Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: On the previous chart — can we go back?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I notice you don't have voting there to the extent that you do any votes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [inaudible]. Those were the only participation measures that were given by AFRALO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I can help, from memory, because these were ALS participation requirements, and like APRALO, AFRALO don't actually conduct formal votes. They work by consensus. The participate in the AFRALO general assembly would be a way of ensuring participation in vote. That is my memory of that, anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: The reason I ask is because for the regions that do have voting as a criteria, and at least two of them do, one tends to notice that people vote, but they don't do anything else, so I like the idea of not having that as a criteria, and I was just wondering. Could we go back to the previous one, by the way? Is it possible to blow this up any so it's a little bit more legible?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I'd have thought you wanted to blow this up totally.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I do, and you can even focus on my name if you wish. Okay, that's probably enough. Notice the red. It says, "Not acceptable on a red background."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: “Not achieved.”

MAUREEN HILYARD: “Not achieved.”

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, “not achieved.” The negative comment in red was what caused the entire blow-up over metrics the first go-around. If we had done it in yellow or some other— well, not yellow, in some other color other than blatant red, we probably would not have had the angst that was expressed by many people, so as you’re going forward, think about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We’ll be very careful with our color choice, and we’ll take professional consultants on board to make sure we’re cross-regionally sensitive to it all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Also, “not achieved” as opposed to “look at in-depth” or something like that. In other words, it’s a warning, not a judgment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can we just flick forward? Yes, this one. In 2012, when I sort of came on the scene and got collared into a working group already, this is when we

were actually starting to look at metrics over the whole system, but at the same time we were also looking at ALAC rules of procedure.

There was a review of the rules of procedure, and so I know that, from my perspective, that was the others. ALSs and RALOs were put on hold while we did the rules of procedure and therefore looked at the metrics that would be required to look at ALAC members specifically. There was a sub— it was actually changed from a working group to a subcommittee, which specifically looked at ALAC. That’s when things started to change a bit, and the focus became on ALAC. Next.

And so the purpose of the subcommittee was, as I mentioned, looking at metrics and measures of performance expectations of the members of the ALAC, and we were to provide some specifics of measurements and metrics as well as tools for metrics and performance measurements, and at the same time, because we knew it was going to be difficult, we wanted to be able to do it within an environment of trust, of consensus and understanding with the ALAC members themselves in relation to RALOs and ALSs, who actually elect ALAC members. Next. And of course—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is one you’ve got to commit to mind.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, this is the one we all have to commit to memory, really. The reasons why the metrics are important is because they’re actually within our rules of procedure, and they actually state in 9.1 that ALAC

members must make regular and significant contributions to the ALAC At-Large and ICANN.

And 9.2, that we would provide a variety of metrics to measure quantifiably the performance of ALAC members, and that this would be of meeting attendance, which had been attempted before, participation in decisions and votes. Votes, again, measurable. And participation in decision-making, that sort of thing, and participation and roles played in Working Groups.

Now, when you're actually just measuring attendance and participation, that seems to be quite easy to do, but one of the things that came up in later discussion, of course, was how do you measure actual participation and the roles that people play, and their actual contribution to the decisions that are actually made within those bodies. I think that that was what really created a lot of the discussions that we had in the feedback that resulted. Next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Alan.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a small note that I discovered quite by accident this week, that at least one other group within ICANN has had participation rules on the books for ages — never did anything about it — has recently started.

That’s the Intellectual Property Constituency, and I’ll be getting a copy of what they have and passing it on.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Of course, when we’re actually looking at the expectations requirements for the metrics [situation], we’re looking at meetings, contributions, and votes. The metrics are supposed to actually define whether an ALAC member is actually active, less active, or standby. These were three definitions that were actually created in the discussions within the metrics organization itself — our metrics committee. Next. Can you just go to the next one, please?

And of course the whole thing – what is actually in the rules of procedure? The expectations of ALAC members in the 9.1 to 9.4, and then you’ve got your remediation things, like what happens when people don’t meet those expectations, and what happens as a result? What isn’t there, of course, is how you measure, and this is what our role was, and this is actually what will become like an appendix to the rules of procedure, because it could change.

When you’ve got remediation, the ALAC chair is the person who has overall responsibility, and it can also include the RALO chair, and could also include a third party, most probably the ombudsman if there was any remediation required. Looking at other types of remediation to try to encourage the [miscreant] member, there are other ways and means in which that person could possibly be persuaded to perform. But, of course, it does actually state in the rules that resignation is preferred rather than taking any formal action by the ALAC itself.

Although we haven't concentrated too much on this aspect of it, what we want to do is actually look at ways and means of offering a metric that is acceptable and manageable without being too—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, and [fair].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll go for fair.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We'll go for fear as well. Next. The consultation process has been going for, as we mentioned, quite a while, and it did involve teleconferences with the secretariats of each of the RALOs, actual face-to-face meetings with the RALOs themselves to put our case forward and to get some feedback.

There were several responses on the wiki, and these all came back to the metrics team, and we created a proposal that, first of all, went to Singapore, and another one that has gone since to the RALOs, and we're waiting on some final feedback. Next.

This is the draft proposal, and there is, first of all, a record of meeting attendance, and although I haven't seen it in its final form, I know that staff, and I guess Dev has had something to do with it, is putting

together some sort of attendance record, which, again, we'll be taking a note of those comments that you made, Alan. Similarly, an attendance type record of participation.

But when it comes to how much people actually contribute to a working group or some other activity in which they're involved, I think that the feedback that I got was that ALAC members who did respond weren't interested how other people felt they were contributing, that they felt that that could perhaps be a little bit unfair.

What we are proposing is that the ALAC member themselves writes an annual report and offers what they feel has been their contribution to the decisions of the working groups or other activities in which they have been involved.

And this report will go to the ALAC chair, who will have 14 reports to read, but this report is for the ALAC chair, and one of the things that I was actually thinking was that they might — because two of those members are of course members that are elected by the RALO chair could sign it off before it goes to the ALAC chair to say that it has been accepted by the RALO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Report it, too.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, true. These are some things that we'd like some feedback on from the RALOs, from other members, from ALAC members, from anybody to

help us with this proposal. Right. Here we go. Oh, and I think Alan Greenberg has something to say.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless I'm misreading – and the color of that slide is not very good, by the way, for those of us with failing eyesight.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll have disability and accessibility [inaudible] sort that out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I appreciate that. Have you looked at not work group participation, but work group membership?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The short answer to that is yes, and the exciting thing is we can actually project and show some of that now. So if Gisella can make that magic happen, that will be not only a good answer to you, it'll be the segue into what we want to do next.

Now, we defer to Dev in many things, but we defer to Dev in how on earth this raw data, which is what you're going to be shown now, will eventually be harvested, preferably with as little human input as possible, and displayed in whatever way, shape, or form. Not just Dev, but obviously the Technology Taskforce that he leads.

What we want to do today – and this is where we're not far off getting to sticky labels – is really look at with this data, how do we meet these

proposed or draft proposals? More importantly, now — today — is the time to make any additions or edits to these draft proposals.

And I just wanted to be quite clear — I don't think Maureen articulated this particularly, so I want it to the record — that the proposal on these metrics says under point four that these records will be open to view by the At-Large community. So, again, you now today are going to be work-shopping maybe some ideas of what that might look like. We want to come out from today pretty well close to a fully-baked proposal to go to the ALAC.

The other thing is whatever we do here, whilst this is specifically for ALAC members and members of At-Large — ALAC included — who are actively participating in working groups, working parties, subcommittees, or task forces — there's a bunch of them — that that is recognized as well, because there is an expectation, of course, that ALAC members will be engaged in at least one or more of those activities. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. How are you mapping names and/or e-mail addresses to ALSes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

That is yet to come, but whatever the framework is, the expectation is under recommendation 43 from ATLAS, as you well know, that all the layers will start to comply. Just while we're about to have a nice, close look at this, let me read again exactly what recommendation 43 says:

“RALOs should encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.” That’s separate to any regional rules. There’s a little bit more work to do and some socializing to do on there, but that was a community outcome of ATLAS. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would encourage you to take the words with a grain of salt, because it may not be the formal representative that is the active one in the ALS.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Point well taken, and what we will do now as we move on, because that will be the next step after today’s work and our next meeting’s work, if we make a point, an action item, to dissect and analyze recommendation 43 and ensure that we, as our work group, has a clear and unambiguous understanding of not only what it was meant to be, how it can be relayed effectively, because it might be meant to be one thing, but it’s not going to be effectively able to be done, so we will have to sort that. That will be an action item on the whole work group. Thank you, Silvia.

Just now, I know this is very difficult, if you’re in the room — I’m not in the room — can I ask if you’re in the Adobe Connect room, are you able to see those figures any clearer? Is it being projected into the Adobe Connect room? If you’re having trouble, as my old eyes certainly are, looking at what’s on screen, I’d encourage to log into the Adobe Connect room for this meeting and have an [up-close list].

At this point, I'm going to have another sip of water, and ask Gisella to take us through some of this. Over to you, G.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Cheryl. Basically, what we've captured in this table — and we've done this for every working group 2013, 2014 and possibly even 2012 data, like up here on the screen — is the working group members, the day of the meeting. One is in attendance; A is an apology; blank is no attendance, no apology.

What we have the last column is you have the total calls attended by each member. For instance, for this working group, we have had 16 calls. We're only recording 15 calls because at this stage we don't have the data for the Prague meeting, and there you can see the number of calls attended by the various work group members.

And at the bottom of the column, we have the number of participants per call, second-last line from the bottom. So this is the raw data we have for all the working groups, and it is then just an understanding how we're going to use this data, and analyze it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Gisella, and I hope that all of you who have ever tried to collect this sort of quantitative material from qualitative notes held on archives and wiki can appreciate how much data mining had to go on to get this together. I just want a small vote of thanks to the staff that manage this so effectively for [inaudible].

And that's enough niceness. Let's stop this niceness. What I think we might do now— I do apologize. Ali, please. You waved at me. Go ahead.

[ALI DRISSA BADIEL]: Just an inquiry. Is this the updated list for the [inaudible]? And I don't see [Raf] part of the APRALO.

GISELLA GRUBER: Ali, if I may, I will just need to double-check the members. Another member of staff helped with all this data, so she did take the list of working group members that was on the wiki. For now, this will be just about accurate. It's not 100% yet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just so we're clear, there is a question of some names that appear to be missing off what is on screen. Ali, I can assure you this does need a sanity check, because my name is missing off the Finance and Budget subcommittee, and I've only been on that since 2008, so I'm probably listed somewhere. Yes, this has got to go through a sanity check, but it's an example of the type of material we have that we can use today.

If we can get a microphone near Dev, perhaps you can switch that one across. I'm going to ask Dev, I know you have told us before about some of the ways this could be collected into some more palatable forms, but just as a gut reaction — you haven't seen this until now — is this some material that we may be able to make good use of, for example? Over to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I would say, looking at the data, yes, but I think obviously the next step would be to graph it, to highlight more clearly what persons were contributing and, I guess, those that were more absent. Looking at that raw spreadsheet as is, even looking at numbers probably doesn't help. What would be more helpful is actually just the infographic or graph to show the participation in that working group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Dev. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just looking at it, it dawns on me I saw my name there and not particularly great attendance. Pardon me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Alan, let me just double-check that, because I think you are among the five people who have attended.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps I was in attendance. The point I'm making is I'm not actually a member of that group. I understand, but there are people who periodically audit things, and we don't want to inadvertently mark them as poor performers because they only show up occasionally when that was the intent.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: One of the other things that Gisella's got is something that's also color-coded for one particular work group, and that might be worthwhile showing as well. Over to you, G.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Alan. Again, the staff person who helped with this took the data off the wiki page At-Large Metrics Subcommittee, and I'm scrolling down and, in NARALO, see Alan Greenberg listed as an ALAC member. So we have you on that, and that is the data that we took. And Ali, I'm just trying to find you on Skype to just check the two names that we're missing, but from what I can see, we took the list that is currently on the wiki page, which then may not be accurate.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, I wasn't saying anyone made a mistake. I'm saying as we go through these kinds of things, the person taking notes may not realize someone is not a member. It's just one of the things, as we develop the metrics, we need to look at

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is something that is identified on the master wiki page, and so it's also something that's going to be able to identified on this data set, and Gisella had showed me at least one data set where the leadership team and the RALO people were a different color, and indeed the ALAC. So even with the differentiation, yes, we need to do that.

Over to you, Dev. Oh, I suppose, over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Madame Chair. Oh, I sound different here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Get used to it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just for the sake of understanding what we're doing here, this is just an example, isn't it, this table? Because I just wonder why we're discussing individual attendance and so on when we should really be moving forward.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Point well taken, and I think it was just people noted they were or were not on the record. That's all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: For the record, I did attend a couple of calls. I'm not on that either.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We will put it through [inaudible], I promise.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just one observation based on Alan's intervention earlier, and I guess this is probably the danger, that if there's a person who's joined a working group, say, in 2013, 2014, you're going to see immediately gaps

on 2012, 2013, so you've got to also have some sort of field to suggest that wasn't there, didn't join until then, so it wouldn't affect the metrics when it's charted. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. Enough of this frivolity. I see you've all had a lovely time noting that, like any very virgin data mining piece of work, little errors have occurred, but I am looking on Gisella's screen at things that show everyone — Olivier, even you — who have ever attended. It's another page. Just because you're not a working group member doesn't mean your metric is not collected, and if you are an ALAC member, you metrics people may indeed end up making a proposal that says those external visitations to other work groups and activities might be worthy of reporting, for example. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

So, all of these tables are inter-coordinated together automatically?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Olivier, if I may, what we've got for now is the raw data. We then need to understand what needs to be done with it. And just as an aside, all the people who did attend the calls who are not working group members are listed a little further below. Their attendance is still recorded, but we need to understand what needs to be done with this, and how we need to merge it, etc. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's very much where we're going to head to now. Just briefly, and I do mean briefly, before we spend the last 15 minutes getting to our sticky labels and basically deciding what we do with these metrics. [inaudible] it published? This is published. We're talking publication now.

At a high level, Silvia, could you just briefly give the high days and holidays about the metrics that are being done, particularly with the reviews that have happened on the RALOs? Just very briefly. Thanks.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, I can give a brief update on the progress that each RALO has made with regards to metrics. APRALO recently approved the new rules of procedure, and they have a section — section B, article 11 — on performance metrics and remediation, and that's posted in the APRALO wiki page. That was approved in March 2014, so this is the newest set of rules regarding metrics.

Then we have LACRALO, which at the moment is working on a metrics proposal. It's a proposal, it's not approved yet, and they're the LACRALO Metrics Working Group. And they have some ideas with regards to participation of individual members, active participation of ALSes, and they have some benchmarks such as 60% of attendance of monthly meetings, 60% of attendance in general assemblies, 50% of other meetings. They have a set of rules, but as I said, they are under discussion, and there are some views perhaps not in total agreement with this, but they are going to have at some point some sort of metrics.

Then we have AFRALO also has started a new review of the 2006 operating principles, and the data that Maureen showed with regards to 2010 has been discussed. Those numbers will probably change as well. At the moment, the rules in AFRALO — they don't have metrics, so there are not specific metrics in AFRALO at the moment, but as I said, the discussion is ongoing, so very soon we will see some metrics.

EURALO – in 2002, they had a procedure on how to deal with inactive ALSes, and they do have it in their website, and that's all they have with regard to metrics.

Finally, NARALO has an article – Article 16 – with regards to metrics, and it says when an ALS representative does not participate in three consecutive NARALO lectures, or does not contribute or comment to a policy in 12 consecutive months, then it automatically loses its voting right, and a little bit more detail.

So that's what we have at the moment, picture of what's going on. Two RALOs, LACRALO and AFRALO, are currently discussing metrics internally, and we will see in the next few months something.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Silvia. Despite the obstruction, staff have assisted me to see that Alberto would like to say something. Over to you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

I'll speak in Spanish. I would like to give you some updates on LACRALO. I have some more information. LACRALO metrics were going to be shown later on when the procedures were changed. Because of a

leadership issue at LACRALO, I'm going to communicate them earlier. [inaudible] what you said. There is a saying in Spanish that goes, "We just obey when there are strict rules and when we are punished," so when they learned that I was calling the roll at this, who checks [inaudible], and how it is shown — I didn't say anything, and I started checking attendance since I was the chairman of LACRALO.

[inaudible] this, we have moved forward faster, and with the metrics right now, just like all of our procedures are dealt with in the working group, which starts with a schedule and a deadline and a scope, all the groups have this.

When the deadline is reached, if there's a subgroup, there are seven days in which the whole group deals with governance after the public comment period is open for 30 days. After that, if there are comments, the working group deals with them, and after the document is finally drafted, we vote [inaudible] directly for seven days.

Right now, the summary is we are within those seven days. It is being dealt with by the governance group. We will have it ready after that. There were two different points [inaudible]. One, taking into account participation and ALS structure and members at participation. Right now we are considering just one participation, ALSes, and something was going to be said about the members. But apparently when the 30-day summary, it's going to ask for us to go to the previous scenario, because we want to be more stringent, more stringent requirements for ALSes in participation both in monthly meetings, working groups, internal groups, within LACRALO external groups.

That is, participation on ALAC, on ICANN, on webinars, and that while there are two representatives for each ALS – each ALS, if they don't have a representative, somebody else may take their position and participate on behalf of the ALS.

However, on an individual basis, it's harder, and we are all working on a volunteer basis, so maybe the number we are going to set for individual attendance will be lower than the number of mandatory attendance for ALSes.

We also have this issue of de-certification that is for a given time of LAC activity. We are going to ask for organizations to be de-certified, and an ALS won't be able to vote if it hasn't actively participated, and members of an ALS may not apply for [any] role in the RALO or ALAC or ICANN if it hasn't actively participated as stated by the rules. And I think that's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

From what I heard – and thank you, team, I'm pretty sure I heard it all accurately – what the RALO is coming up with is in very close keeping with what is either already in existence in AFRALO. So I would correct slightly that AFRALO may be reviewing, but currently the default they have is those existing percentages that Maureen put up earlier. Now, they may have forgotten they've got those metrics, but they do have those metrics.

To that end, I believe that at least three now of the five RALOs have a percentage of some description which is an expectation for the At-Large Structures to attend in at least three categories. They have the category of normal meetings, they have the category of workshop or working

group or policy activities, and they may have the category of voting or presence at general assembly, and we've heard our incoming chair of the ALAC prefer this presence at a general assembly, and not too specific on voting, so we'll talk about that. So we have some unifying points.

What we need to do now — and if we can put some of the little sticky yellow labels, some form of paper that will stick on the flip chart — hopefully we've got the flip chart in a situation where the remote participants are able to see it, and we're going to do a bit of work-shopping now and going to drive the camera operators crazy, I know, but never mind.

From your point of view, and I want you at least give an honest opinion based on your actual appointment. So, if you're an ALAC member, think from an ALAC perspective; if you're a regional leader, think of it first from a regional leadership perspective, and if you're just an At-Large structure person, or indeed, Mary Jane, doesn't matter who you are — just an interesting At-Large person who doesn't even necessarily belong to any of the sub-units — I'd still be interested in your perspective.

The first thing we're going to do is answer the question on how much of percentage of all the meetings one would expect. What is, in your view, an appropriate percentage of all the meetings? It does not matter whether there are three meetings or 33 meetings. It's the percentage of all the meetings.

If you're coming from a regional leadership perspective, and you already have a percentage in your rules of procedure, you may choose that, but

you may also not if you feel something else, because what we're going to do is see if we can actually come up with a percentage that works from everybody. So, from the perspective of the role you have, you need to answer on three different pieces of paper.

One piece of paper, you need to label ALAC. That means ALAC members. That's the expectation of ALAC members. Second piece of paper, you need to label RALO, and that would be the expectation upon the RALO leadership. And the third piece of paper you get to label ALSes, and that's the At-Large Structure. So, the percentage minimum requirement for those three categories on different pieces of paper. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just a thought. Different RALOs have different quorum rules. Some RALOs have no quorum rule; some, it's set at 50% and some at 30, I believe. Assuming that number was picked for a rational reason, it might influence how many you expect at each meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Absolutely, indeed. This is something that we're going to have to look at when we look at harmonization, and that's another step down the road, but right now let's look at percentages. And then, when the urge takes you, come and stick your percentage in the nicest possible way up on the flip chart, and I'm going to put the flip chart probably into four. So I'll have between zero and 25, between 25 and 50, between 50 and 75, and between 75 and 100. If you wrote 60, you know which quadrant to put it in.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ALAC, RALO leadership, because some of the RALOs already have expectations of their leadership. I'll do it for you, because I'm feeling kind. I need a Sharpie. Pardon me, that was for the record.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record, tripping.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That was exciting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you looking for one piece of paper from each of those, depending on what category we're in?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: One for ALS, one for RALO, [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Of attendance. Oh, my God. What is the percentage of attendance?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, ALAC members, what percentage of attendance. ALAC members on ALAC – yeah. Meetings, yes. RALOs, RALO meetings and anything related to RALOs. ALS, RALO and working groups. Well, ALS participation. We were assessing ALS participation. Participation on what? [inaudible] RALO activities and working groups.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is one of those “vote early and vote often,” right? That’s the exercise, which I would like to have been able to spend a lot more time doing, and then we move on to the next thing, and we move on to the next thing. We will not probably have another face-to-face on this. We will have another meeting, but what we be doing then is polling this, using the polling tool in the Adobe Connect rooms. We’ll be polling percentages and amounts and votes and things in the thing.

Alan, do you have a very brief thing, because we’ve got other people who— okay, sorry, that was Alan, just confusing the system.

It appears to me, looking at this, that there’s not much support for 33%. Not many people think that something as low as one-third is appropriate. Some think 50 — 30 — but not many. We have a fairly close mix between those that want more than 75% and up to 75%, or 50 to 75% for pretty much all of it.

What I’m seeing here, and I’m sorry you can’t see it, but maybe if you look in the Adobe Connect room instead of at my bottom, you’d be able to see that there is great consistency between what you’re all saying an

ALAC member needs to do in percentages, a regional lead needs to do in percentages, and the ALSes. The natural tendency for you all is to actually have harmonized and having the same expectations on all levels of leadership or structures.

We're going to stop now, because we have to clear the room, but we're going to capture this. We're then going to set up some polling. We might even use big polls. We'll think about it. The girls and I will sort that out. We will poll now a whole bunch of questions, and I do expect you all to respond, and in that question you will be indicating what your comfort zone is for each: ALAC, regional leadership, At-Large structure. For each question, you'll be doing that.

That will go into a draft proposal, which you'll get to edit, but the intention is for the November ALAC meeting — we're having a November ALAC meeting, are we, Mr. Chairman? By the November ALAC meeting, we should have at least a draft proposal for the ALAC to start considering. This is short-term but vitally important work, but we're looking at all levels.

Apart from my very bad language in public — I do apologize for anyone that was offended, but I nearly tripped over, and that was not fun for me — I want to thank you for your participation. I'm hoping that you all feel that where we are now is stepping off and being able to get everything done. We do need to clear the room. If you have any questions, you've got Dev, you've got Maureen, you've got me, you've got Olivier, and we will help you through all of this.

Thank you one and all, and the recordings can now end. Thank you, guys. [applause]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ladies and gentlemen, could I please make a quick announcement? Whilst there is the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group meeting here, there is also a session on ICANN accountability and governance. Unfortunately, because I'm part of the Capacity Building Working Group, I shall remain here, but anybody else interested in going there would be highly encouraged to do so. There was also a question on whether we could have anybody who wishes to speak on the stage, so if there's anybody that is interested in taking part, it looks like it might be a bit interactive and things.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]