KATHY SCHNITT:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the At-Large Metrics Working Group meeting on Thursday, the 13th of November, 2014, at 17:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Chery Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Oksana Pryhodko, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Siranush Vardanyan. We have no apologies at this time.
	We also have from staff Silvia Vivanco, Heidi Ullrich, Gisella Gruber, and myself, Kathy Schnitt. In the meantime, I do see Olivier Crepin-Leblond has also joined.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Cheryl, back over to you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you, Kathy. I appreciate that. Okay, well, it's good to get back into regular metrics work. I've know you've all been [furloughed] by having big breaks between London and our last meeting in L.A., but that is no more. Nose back to the grindstone now. We'll be spending a fairly more regular monthly program. Thanks to Gisella for sorting that out to us.
	I do hope that I can assume that you have all taken the time and had the opportunity to do our standing Agenda Item 0, which is to review the recordings and transcripts and action items from the last call, which was in L.A. on the Monday between 3:00-4:00. There are links in your agenda if you want to scramble to look to them now.

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.

Is there anything anyone wants to raise in general terms about the Los Angeles meeting, or make any suggestions about any agenda changes you might want to dare make before we get ourselves started? [inaudible]. Not seeing anybody waving at me, and not hearing anything. Let's assume we're all good to go then. Terrific.

Okay. Moving right into then into our action items, sadly this is one of the situations when we don't have as many boxes ticked as we should. It is a best laid plans of mice and men situation, I'm afraid, and a number of things, which we had with all very good intention, agreed which we would get straight onto after Los Angeles we didn't get onto. Staff has been more than busy, however, as has just about everyone else on this call, particularly those of you who are associated with anything to do with IANA transition work. You've barely had time to scratch yourselves. So we'll give ourselves the forgiveness, but that means we do have a lot to catch up on today.

We do have the coordination [inaudible] the monthly telephone conferences, so that's all sorted. Apparently Silvia did follow up with at least three RALOs to have some measure of attendance. I'm going to ask you to talk to that, Silvia, in just one moment, but we do have three things that we did not do, and they are now at least in one case becoming quite time-critical.

We did say that we would continue on with our analysis of Recommendation 43. Of course, we haven't. We're going to have to get back to that and begin today. We did say we would run a poll conducted to see whether or not we could get more information on not just RALO attendance percentages, but to expand what we did in Los Angeles

about attendance metrics, and also to other metrics measures. And we haven't, and we must.

But most importantly, we said we'd be able to put a draft proposal together on at least metrics for the November 25th ALAC meeting, and that gives us about ten days to do it. So hang on to your seats. We're going to have a busy ride. We'll do our very best to tick all those boxes.

Any questions on any of that before I ask Silvia to just talk to us very briefly about measurements of attendance? Not seeing anybody waving at me, and not hearing anything.

Over to you, Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello, everyone. Can you hear me well?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can, indeed. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, great. Okay, so I sent yesterday a table that shows the current state of the metrics in the five RALOs and I have reviewed the regulations that are currently in place, and what we have is basically APRALO has some measures of attendance.. NARALO also has an article that speaks about attendance. However, reviewing our past calls, they are not currently enforced, so I think that the problem is that we need

to go one step further and start taking this measured attendance [inaudible].

So we have APRALO, the latest review in March. We have a new document and perhaps Gisella can put it there – the table I sent– yes, it's there.

Okay, you can see then Article [11.3-1] says the meeting attendance, which includes sending prior notice if attendance is not possible is basically what we have for attendance. We don't have anything specific as percentages or number of meetings attended in APRALO. However, we have some benchmark.

Then EURALO has some guidance. However, it's not a measure of attendance. AFRALO [inaudible] is working on it. Still, they haven't decided on specific percentages. Then we have LACRALO, which goes down below. I'm moving this. I don't know if you can see it. LACRALO is currently discussing and they are proposing some percentages. For example, 60% of participation in the monthly meetings, 60% of [inaudible] of any kind, and 50% of those were the person could not attend, and at least two [inaudible] in a calendar year. So they have some very good aggressive, perhaps, measure of attendance. However, this is still being discussed. It's not approved.

And then NARLO has an Article 16 that says if an ALS does not participate in three consecutive NARALO elections or does not contribute or comment to an ICANN policy to collaboration in twelve consecutive months, then it loses its voting rights.

So that's what we have currently. As I said, they are so far only on paper. I haven't seen since I joined any measure where this has been enforced. So that's what we have for now.

Over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Thank you very much, Silvia. Perhaps I'll just ask Alan – I think he's only longstanding member of NARALO on the call – yes he is – whether or not he remembers any of the . . . because there have been I believe a couple of At-Large Structures discussed if not actually decertified, or I'm assuming, however, Alan, if you could confirm that this was probably the basis for any such discussion and either remedial action or decertification?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. In fact, it was. The rule when you look at it is not as good as it should be. We went for a long period of time with never having an election, so the first phrase is somewhat moot. We have had a number of elections recently, and we certainly have not monitored policy contributions. So I think that's something that NARALO needs to focus on.

The fact that, as you're telling me, there are no other NARALO people other than me participating in this group is somewhat problematic. That's something we need to look at.

I will say, however, though, that the ALAC will be looking at overall criteria for participation or criteria for ALSes that we have not done in a

very long time. The last time was 2007. So although this group is looking at metrics as such, the ALAC I think needs to review overall "what do we expect of ALSes?" We have a lot of ALSes right now that are coming on at a relatively quick rate, and I think we need to set some expectations of what we consider an active ALS.

We'll be discussing that in the forthcoming ALAC meeting, and I presume a lot of the people on this call will be there. We'll be kicking it off at that point, but there will be a concerted effort to look at a number of things related to the ALS process or the certification process, the decertification process, and criteria and expectations. So more work should be going on here.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Maureen did say that Glenn, of course, has contributed greatly to discussion relating to metrics for ALAC and ALSes. Silvia also has suggested coming up with common benchmarks it an important first step.

I wasn't suggesting that nobody ever contributes to the metrics discussions from NARALO, merely that [inaudible] only one on this call today, Alan. So fear not. There are one or two other voices, but certainly not the full list of people who are supposedly members of this working group. That's still a problem that needs to be looked at.

Tijani, over to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very, very much, Cheryl. Thank you, Alan, for your comment. I think that if ALAC had to make those high-level expectations for the ALSes, I think we should do it before, prior, to the RALOs establishing their metrics for participation because those metrics should take into account the expectation that ALAC will put. The expectation should be the bottom of the metrics they have to define.

So perhaps we need to go swifter, quicker, and provide the RALOs with the expectation they need to define their own metrics. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Tijani. You got a green tick from me because I think that is probably a very essential first step. I just wondered if I could just draw a line under this part of the conversation now. We will definitely be coming back to it in today's call and in the future, and move briefly onto Item #3 because it does I think move on from your point, Tijani, and indeed the aspirational outline that Alan has given us that the ALAC wants to pursue in this coming year.

Looking at point three for our agenda, it is in fact a little bit more conversation about Recommendation 43 from the ATLAS II, which of course is a good opportunity to say this is how the community wants to [see] things – because of course the ATLAS II recommendations were very much a grassroots-developed exercise. We can I think on our laurels and say, "Dear At-Large Structures, this is what you've asked for."

I've criticized a number of the recommendations out of ATLAS II in a number of for a for having wishy-washy or non-specific language, and

here I'm about to put my hands together and bow my head slightly in thanks for exactly the same thing because – and I'll read it to the record – Recommendation 43 states the following: RALOs should encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.

I'm not the best [inaudible] on this call, but at least to my interpretation of that fairly general language, we could use Recommendation 43 as leverage to start and effectively continue at a fairly fast pace what Alan has been referring to as looking at the standards that are expected for ALSes, assuming that the representatives of the ALSes will be a key measurement or fulcrum point for how the entities are acting in compliance with what both ICANN and specifically ALAC might be setting as performance expectations.

But most importantly, it does already say – it's implied there that the ALAC's job is to set and standardize these minimum participation requirements. It delightfully doesn't say, "As is only written in the current Rules and Procedure." It's implied, of course, with our new Rules and Procedures that they will be amongst the standards and requirements, and therefore the measures from them. But it certainly does not preclude our group and our group working with the appropriate subgroup from the ALAC coming with measures and metrics that will meet the regional needs, and indeed the ALAC ones as well.

Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a quick comment that it is conceivable but not clear that changing some of the criteria and/or expectations may require Board ratification. The bylaws are…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For the ALSes?

ALAN GREENBERG: For the ALSes, yes. The bylaws are somewhat unclear about exactly how much discretion ALAC has, and at what point the board must ratify. Just something to keep in mind. It's unlikely the Board would refuse to go along with anything we propose, but there may be that step in the process as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. That is a very important point. Indeed, even the last generation of changes which were made – the certification process and the requirements and expectations for At-Large Structures went through very close scrutiny from ICANN Legal, and I believe you've had Board ratification. A significant change will have to go hand in glove with a very close eye from ICANN Legal as well.

Maureen, over to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. [inaudible] an ALS application form, and I'm not quite sure if there are any expectations that are actually listed in there

as part of the explanation of what ALSes are expecting or [the requirements] of ALSes [inaudible] actually do become members.

Also, I was sort of interested in the MoUs that used to be. I'm not quite sure. I really haven't used ever used an MoU [before] in ALS as such, although they are all there. I just wanted to know, are we going to continue to incorporate the MOUs into our [inaudible] on them?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for those questions, Maureen. I'll take the second part first. The MOUs are with the regional At-Large organizations and ICANN. The RALOs came into existence formally with the signing of those MOUs. ALSes and the requirements for ALSes predated the existing RALO MOUs, and to my knowledge we have never run an MOU-based system with ALSes. The ALAC itself, of course, is a construct by ICANN and operates under bylaw. So hopefully that's kind of clear to some of your question, your inquiry.

I'll see if I can copy and paste it, which I may or may not be able to, but there is of course the published minimum requirements for At-Large Structures, which of course talks about its commitment, which is reflected in the MOUs to a greater or lesser extent as well, and that of course is to support individuals that use as [informal] participation by distributing to those people – constituencies, members, etc. – relevant ICANN information and relevant ICANN activities and issues, and offering Internet-based mechanisms the enable discussion on one or more of these issues, etc.

So that's where the current minimum requirements from an ICANN and official ALAC point of view comes from. I'm hopefully going to be able to paste that into chat. If not, I'll ask staff to do that if you don't mind. Now I've got to find my way back to the Adobe Room. I've lost myself. Oh dear. Where's the Adobe Room? Oh, there I am.

So there's your requirements. Maureen, does that answer your questions? I think Alan is specifically keen to see something a little more meaty, perhaps, and measurable than what we have those in those current expectations, though. Is that the case, Alan?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, thank you very much for that explanation, and Alan, too. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just before Alan comes back, of course we should not have this conversation without thinking about the bylaws as well. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is yes. Something perhaps significantly more meaty than that. Of course, that's not going to be my call. We're going to have to have a significant discussion on it. But we have enough evidence I think right now, although we have a lot of ALSes which are very active and very large. We have a large number of ALSes that we suspect are far from that. We will have to have a very meaningful discussion on that.

There has been pushback in some RALOs that we should not be taking any action like that, so it's going to be an interesting discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I was going to make that point. I think we also need to recognize that the point Tijani made about having these more global issues sorted before particularly the regions that are current reviewing, and that is the LACRALO and AFRALO. Setting concrete changes to their own Rules of Procedure is probably very important.

It appears to me that the most recently reviewed one, APRALO, won't have too much of a problem because our language is generic enough that we could simply annex or appendix whatever criteria comes out of ALAC or is trans-regionally harmonized without actually having to go back and change our own Rules of Procedure too radically at all.

LACRALO, for example – and I suspect AFRALO having conversations of similar intensities now – have become very, very specific, albeit not very clear to me and Maureen anyway, talking very much about the 60% and the numbers of apologies, 50%, etc.

Of course, some of those percentages, when you go to the bottom of what Silvia has passed on and look at LACRALO section, it then says, having talked about 60% in the beginning, now then talks about 50% of monthly meetings, etc., with apologies for not attending the other 50%, etc.

So there's similarities coming out of these rules as they're being discussed. The apologies story, for example, is one that resonates with

the existing APRALO rules. The percentages, interestingly enough, in the LACRALO, are slightly lower than what we had at our meeting in Los Angeles, which is interesting, but I think it's, as Tijani pointed out – and I'm coming to you now, Tijani – pretty darn important that we get at least a draft out for discussion with relatively high level, if not specific, suggestions, out as soon as possible so that these conversations don't get set in concrete at the regional level.

To you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Thanks to the table of Silvia, I've noted that several RALOs are now going to more or less by proposals about the criteria, about the metrics.

You remember very well, Cheryl and Alan, when we discussed those proposals that there was very strong pushback from some members of the community, and they are always arguing that we are volunteers, so we don't have to oblige me to attend how many meetings or to go vote how many times, etc.

Now I am seeing that some RALOs have already demanded some very specific metrics, and they are so happy for that. This is the way we have to go. We don't have to be afraid of these kinds of metrics. This is the way to measure. There is no other way, and we need it. We need it [inaudible].

As I said on an earlier call, some ALSes refuse any change, any kind of evolution. And I understand very well, because they are afraid they may

be evaluated as non-performers. But we need to do that because people are not participating. It is a shame because they come to NomCom. Everyone comes to NomCom. They are very happy to come, but they don't participate, and this is a very important point that we have to address.

I am really happy with this table of Silvia, and I hope that we will continue at the same place, and that we won't be afraid of the reaction of some people. Thank you.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Thank you, Tijani. I'm sure most of us are thick enough skinned these days to not be overly concerned about some people's reactions. But we do in fact have enough of a groundswell now to say that it is the desire and indeed the requirement out of Recommendation 43 that ALS representative participation requirements are clarified and acted upon.

We have enough activity in each of the RALOs, which have either reviewed their rules, or are reviewing their rules, or are going to review their rules, and are talking the same language, similar language. It's not exactly the same language as you've just outlined. And of course, we have the impending review of the ALAC and At-Large, and of course, it will be the purpose of the RALOs and the continuing purpose of – should I say the RALOs and indeed probably that the ALSes that one might predict is going to be the focus of this next review [inaudible] ALAC itself was the focus of the first review.

However, what I'd like to do now is say thanks to Recommendation 43 and thanks to the existing activities. A clear call for harmonization has

gone on for many, many, many months now, and also I think, Tijani, some of the RALOs are coming around to look at some of what AFRALO has put forward earlier on as well, where you have levels of consequence for minimal or non-performance.

I think that's something that is also very helpful because it is a vast cry between a decertification process and a reduction in voting ability. There are all those remedial opportunities, or simply for some ALSes, they may choose to use the language that we're developing now in our cross-community working more [mere] participant and less active fully-fledged member. That may be okay. We've yet to come across those discussions yet, but it is possible that some ALSes might be very happy just acting in the informational level and not taking part in both, or taking advantage of travel opportunities, etc. So that's all ahead of us.

Let's start now from the discussion on Item 3. I just wanted to look at what Silvia has just put into the chat, which is talking about if your organization is accredited, does it or will a degree to adhere the provisions – thank you for moving that at the same time – that the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding made between the other ALSes in your geographic region and ICANN as if it were an original signing of . . . yeah, that's a very important addition to what we were discussing before. Thanks for bringing that up, Maureen.

What it does mean is that as ALSes are included into the fold of any particular RALO, the expectation has been continued that they will be working under the same expectations and requirements as were outlined in the Memorandums of Understanding with [inaudible] when

the RALOs were formed. That all said, they're all useful tools, and we might have to remind our ALSes about it.

The other thing that happened in the chat while we were talking that I wanted to put to the record was that there was a very brief discussion about when you have a possibility of previously or retroactively requiring At-Large Structures to comply with these newer sets of rules, guidelines, expectations and measures, would that be a problem?

I think, again, our timing is good because there would be a good argument I would think to suggest that either as part of or preparation for the upcoming ALAC and At-Large review that a reaffirmation or recommitment exercise with all of the ALSes, regardless of when they joined, whether they're brand-spanking new or not, or like my own At-Large Structures go back to the early 2000s. There would be no downside in going through that exercise, and that may pick up some of the problems of the difference between what people want to find up to and what we might be putting forward in the not-too-distant future.

Just before we move onto Item 4 on our agenda, in the not-too-distant future, Alan, can I respectfully request I think on behalf of the Metrics Subcommittee that when you're populating whatever structure or target group that is going to be looking at the ALS requirements and expectations issue that there's a good sprinkling and cross-pollination of active participants from the Metrics Group, beyond metrics discussions as well? I think that could be very important that we have close coordination and crossover there.

Okay, anybody want to raise any – yes, go ahead, Alan. Okay, I thought we'd move on, but…

ALAN GREENBERG: I have not fully thought this through, nor have we had the discussion in the ALAC, but I would not expect this to be a closed group, and if people from this Metrics Group want to carry over their work that's associated with what we'll be doing, of which there is significant overlap, I don't think we'd have a problem. But I'm not going to guarantee what the outcome of the discussion we haven't had yet is. But it's certainly a reasonable thing to think about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. I would like to think that as a strong, effective leader, however, you will bring whatever influence to bear for an intelligent and effective and efficient outcome.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was on mute, but I did laugh when you said that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Otherwise, I think Olivier and I will have to take you aside and have a quiet chat. Okay. So it's good that we're having the discussion on the triple layer approach as well in the chat on what guidance is out there and what the expectation is for people to put an At-Large Structure forward, what the expectations are. We probably need to remind everyone about not just the bylaw expectations, but the MoU

expectations, and of course remind them about what an At-Large Structure currently to date has signed up for.

I would hasten to add the one that signed up in the dim, dark, distant days, such as my own, some of the language in our existing expectations is actually from those very early days as well. The At-Large Structures were always meant to be a home for edge community discussion, and their mechanism [on ICANN] and a mechanism to bring the results of that discussion back into ICANN. So we probably don't have anybody who would say that it's definitely not what they signed up for, even if you go back to the early 2000s. So we need to keep an eye on that three-layer approach.

If I can, I'd like to move you on for pretty much the remainder of the call to looking at what is under Item 4, which is now a matter of considerable urgency, and that is the preparation of a draft proposal for us to send to the ALAC, which should be based, I think we can all agree, on the harmonization or points of harmonization where we can find them, and probably a few suggestions as well, based on not only Maureen's work, but our various face-to-face meetings with community, as it [inaudible] a while. And of course, our own various papers and recommendations that hopefully we'll be able to get to the ALAC for at least provisional consideration for their November meeting.

I've written out in the agenda a fairly specifically hierarchical set of what's called key points at the moment, which are a bunch of bullet points which need definitely expanding. If I had been smart, I would have asked Kathy or staff to get a copy of that and put it up as a PDF,

but unfortunately I didn't, so we'll just have to ask you to follow the agenda page, and it's all written.

I have tried to put it together in a little bit of an order so that by filling in these dot points, we will have a skeleton of a paper for ALAC's consideration.

I'd like to also suggest that what we think about when we're doing our discussion on all of these points is assume that we should probably have some formal poll on many, if not all, of the points or the decision nodes that we come up with for each of these sections.

So at that moment, I've got starting with sort of high-level stuff and ending with Section C under Point 4, which is subcommittees. I just want to take you to there for a moment – Section B, actually, in Section C – where the words "staged implementation" are. I'm suggesting, and we'll discuss this further once you think about it now, that we do consider the benefits of staged implementation, both because it allows us to propose some higher level and start points to the ALAC for earlier consideration and we hope adoption, and then follow that by perhaps more granular or more detailed metrics as a next stage, which gives of course our committee the luxury of time to get it right, but it also gives the community the luxury of making sure as many At-Large Structures are up to speed with the big picture, and perhaps a more argument before we get too much into the weeds about how many apologies are accepted and how many votes or whatever are required.

The voting ones are worn in now. Of course, we won't actually find [inaudible] parity between the all the regions because certainly some

regions are more focused on a voting form of decision-making compared to other regions who choose in selected leadership by consensus. So we're going to have to walk through very fine lines in this paper.

With the Section C subcommittees I put in drafting and administrative the Drafting Subcommittee suggestion, which I want you to think about – and we'll talk about it towards the end of our call. I would suggest that we need to commit a few people into a drafting subcommittee for the paper we need to put to the ALAC, and then that bullet point will probably disappear.

But the administrative subcommittees we probably should also consider, even if it's at a later stage of implementation of metrics and measures, putting into our performance requirements and measures proposal because it's all very good talking about just the regional meetings or, in the case of the ALAC members they talk about the ALAC meetings, but they also talk about taking an active role in policy development, and so we might have to talk about how we measure that policy component [as] ALSes and individual members.

We also would need to talk about the possibility of having entity [would be] a committee in their own right. I've sent for review an [audit appeal] and some other things.

Having whet your appetite, let me take you to the top, and let's discuss. If you don't mind, I'll just briefly let you know that we're going to be looking at key points which are obviously role-specific, and some leadership expectations. We are going to look at the thing that we're all

very [inaudible]: the attendance at meetings and activities, and recognize of course that attendance is only one part of it. The effectiveness, as we discussed before, even though you're attending, is another measure altogether.

We need to look at a few other matters to do with meetings, and they include the different types of classes that we'll see across the regions of what is or isn't a meeting and what meetings are important or not, the matters of quorum, parity in the role, how to deal with apologies and leaves of absence, and of course the most important expectations rules and requests. I'm hoping you'll come up with at least three more.

We also need to look at how our contributions to policy and ICANN-specific activities, including outreach, might be measured. This is where I think such masses may in fact go to a Stage 2 of implementation if there's any measures, or even a Stage 3, going on to then RALO-specific activity and requirements, which I would like to think would be cross-RALO-specific activity and requirements, and consequences of what happens when one isn't performing.

That's the overarching plan. Now we need to put flesh on those bones. We'll start at the top, but let's first go to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm sorry, I was away from my computer for a little bit, and I really put my hand up in relation to your introduction, where you were talking about involvement with policy. I'd be careful and use a more generalized term than policy. Activities is probably a good one because not everyone is going to be a policy person, and

there's a lot of other things that we need done. So when we're looking at participation, we should not segregate policy into a separate section from overall participation in stuff we do. Just a semantics term.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Alan. No, important terms. I'm heartened by the fact that the bullet point I'm referring to there is already called "Contributions to policy and ICANN-specific activities, including outreach," and we probably need to expand that considerably as well to make sure it's well-recognized as we discussed before that they are a bunch of ways to contribute. [Being] a policy often is only one of them. But we do expect the RALOs themselves to be making some contributions to things like public comments, which contribute to perhaps a regional or ALAC input into policy. So there's that sort of nuancing we need to work with as well.

Yes, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I have a new phone. I'm trying to remember how to take it off mute.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're unmuted.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know I am. I know I am now, but not when I first started talking. Just a very short comment that Olivier, Heidi and I had a discussion with Fadi in Los Angeles, talking about just the kind of thing we're talking about now. How do we get people involved who are not the policy honchos? It's clear that not everyone in the world is going to get imbedded in that, and we have a difficult walk between keeping within the scope of ICANN and recognizing that to get involvement from – forgive the expression – the masses, we have to widen it somewhat.

So we had his support. Now we just have to figure out how to actually do that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Magic has to happen. Okay. I noticed Janvier is having problems staying in the room. I wanted to [inaudible] just see what the problem might be in a private chat, whether or not it's just a bandwidth problem. If that's the only way he is in the room, I would suggest that we might need to do a dial-out so he can at least have all the audio if he's just relying on the AC room, and [if it's flaking out on him] it would be very frustrating, so if staff could have a bit of a look at that, that would be terrific.

Okay, let's take it from the top and look first of all at is this skeletal structure of a set of recommendations – remember, we're talking metrics here, and we obviously have the baselines that are outlined in both the ALAC Rules of Procedure to draw on as a gold standard, perhaps, or at least a standard, and of course the matrix that Silvia has put together for what's actually happening or being discussed to work with.

Is this type of approach going to meet the starting needs for us handing to ALAC for consideration something that they can then get on with, discuss, hopefully ratify, and then we can help the region or organizations and ALSes enact?

Firstly, Alan, can I ask you for a knee-jerk action? And then I'm going to ask Olivier because he's been very much involved in all of this and quite passionate about this in all his spare time while he was chairing. Is this type of approach and bulleting of information going to be the type of thing you think ALAC might be finding useful?

First you, Alan; and then Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so. Certainly we don't want to throw away the work that this group has done in that direction, and once the ALAC comes up with a short list – when I say "ALAC" I mean ALAC and gets them approved – it goes back to the Metrics Group to actually put measurements together to actually put measurements together and things like that. So I think it's a reasonable pathway to follow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. I think I'll echo what Alan has said. It certainly is a good number of steps forward. It will be interesting to see how the ALAC responds to it. I think that the environment today, especially after

the At-Large Summit, is such that these recommendations – I guess you can call them recommendations – will be received in a much more positive way than they might have had in the past.

So it's a good way forward. It's a good first step, I think. There's a lot more that we can do. Certainly, you might have seen something I've also shared with the working group a few days ago – or was it yesterday – with regards to the actual participation during calls, etc., with automated [inaudible].

It's interesting because the very fact that this type of tool would be provided by Adobe means that it's not just a single problem that we're faced with in our organization, but it's something that is faced by many others. Maybe we can also learn from the work that's already been done elsewhere on this. But certainly [inaudible] keep this moving forward.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier. Is there anything obvious you think we have missed on this very first step with getting something to the ALAC?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The thing is we shouldn't look at having covered absolutely all angles as a first step forward. Once we have a first set of metrics and get people used to having those metrics in place, I see this as an ongoing improvement for us where we can – only by actually implementing these can we start seeing their shortfalls and their advantages and

things that we might wish to dig into a little bit further, and to refine those so as to make them more useful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thank you. I've put to the chat, although none of the words seem to be actually the English language. I was hoping they'd be. Sorry about my spelling. It's actually my typing, not my spelling, that's the problem. I do think the stage implementation and continuous improvement process is the way forward.

Alan, are you agreeing with my lack of typing skills or my bad spelling or what [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was agreeing with what Olivier said. I just have a [inaudible]. I would not dare comment on your typing or spelling skills in public.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Mr. Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record and I want it to the record that you have been continuously commenting on my writing and my spelling since the mid-2000s.

ALAN GREENBERG: I said in public.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Doesn't tell people that you're not going to continue to be my virtual [inaudible], greatly appreciated. All right, enough of this frivolity.

That gives me some hope. I'm pleased to hear that you're both using language like implemented in stages and continuous improvement, because I think that's going to be a much easier and more successful sell to the regions as well as the At-Large Structures.

Go ahead on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I find it very annoying that someone keeps putting my hand down.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's not me. I never do.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know. The problem is when you put a hand up, Adobe flashes a message on hosts saying it's accepted, and if you accept the hand, it disappears. Please don't touch. Don't do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just remind staff, actually, if any of the staff are doing it – because I can't imagine who else – just control yourselves. If I can keep my sticky fingers off the accept button, so can you. Go on, Alan.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: The problem is it's not obvious from the message that's what's happening. People are trying to help.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Stop.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just one comment. The fact that some of this – and again, we're working in unknown territory. Some of this may need to go before the Board and be ratified. I'm hoping it will be a minimum amount of that, or maybe none, but to the extent that we do end up having to get Board approval, the stage approach has a downside, that is it's an onerous enough thing that we don't want to do it on a regular basis.

So that's one of the things – how staged we can do it will depend on how much we can do on our own [without having] to get formal approval . I'm certainly going to be pushing for less approval rather than more, but it's something to keep in mind as we go forward.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Before I go to Maureen, thanks for that, Alan, but I think we may have some tools to our advantage there because of how at least some of the MoUs were written, and I believe Silvia did put in some of the language that gave the regions at their [AGMs] the opportunity to look at things, and I think part of what we established by precedent, and it may even be baked into some of the bylaw language, is a greater power for the ALAC to pick up and do the continuous stuff rather than continually go back. When we changed after the first ALAC review, some bylaws, I

EN

think some of the language might be in our favor there. All of that needs to be explored.

If staff can make a note there that we do need to have a conversation with someone, I'm suspecting perhaps Amy, but whoever is appropriate out of ICANN Legal for early intervention, that's probably best to be a small group of us rather than a committee as a whole to begin with. But we do need to get onto that fairly quickly, say in the next week to ten days.

Maureen, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Before Maureen talks, I'll note that I asked Heidi 20 minutes ago to make sure that we follow that path and ask the right questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Well done. Maureen, all yours.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, chair. I'm [inaudible] referring to a couple of conversations back when Olivier mentioned about the discussions that we've been having with the RALOs. I just think that the regional dialogue that was initiated with this [inaudible] metrics, [inaudible] regular dialogue with the RALOs and the ALSes despite push-back that we had originally has really helped to [inaudible] a greater acceptance across the RALOs now about the idea of [inaudible].

I think that once we move towards specifying what these measurements are going to be as a proposal, I think there's going to be a lot more approval. I'm just looking at, for example, LACRALO which was probably one of the most anti towards the whole metrics issue. The fact that they're actually – there's obviously a lot of thought been going into their discussions, and although I don't think they've quite made their final decision, I think that's been something that's been a really positive move. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Point well made. Thank you, Maureen. You'll hear me continually referring to that outreach work that you've done over these last, it must be 18 months now I guess. I think that's going to need to continue. Unless you run and hide, I think the fact that you've established yourself as this liaison point [capital hell] in my view, but it's probably lower-case [inaudible] in the rules, with the regions and At-Large Structures, we may need to prevail upon you perhaps with some assistance to continue in that role [inaudible] indeed.

Olivier, over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. I suspect one of the reasons for the push-back is actually one of our own mistakes in conveying the concept of metrics and mixing it with the concept of retribution or consequences to non-performance.

This is one thing which I think we should be quite aware about. The pushing for the metrics is not a case of saying, "Well, we want to point out who is not performing." Pushing for the metrics is really to find out how well we are performing and see it in a much more positive light.

Having those metrics, we have no idea on how well we're doing, and if we have no idea on how well we're doing, we stand a chance of actually accusing ALSes or ALAC members or community members that are actually doing a lot of work of not doing any work because we have no way to track how much work we're doing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent point. I'll just [inaudible] to the record that not only do I agree with you but I've actually spoken [inaudible] successfully in my region [inaudible] de-certification of ALSes based on any form of apparent non-[conformance] non-compliance or low level of engagement. By that recognizing that we can do better. I'm all for helping people be better engaged, but I'm not a fan of de-certification at all.

That said, I do recognize we have to tidy up some deadwood and I'm okay with that, but you've got to be very careful how you take this particular argument to the community.

Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Cheryl. I do agree with Olivier that, as a first step, we have to make clear that the metrics doesn't mean that there will be remediation after that, but we need remediation with the first step, and

as we said from the beginning, it is an ongoing work, so we have to go step by step. I think that, after defining the metrics, we have to think about remediation. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Tijani. We've got about 20 more minutes that we can spend on this agenda item. I need another five or ten minutes at the end to do a bit of administrivia, but I wondered, because we're having such a good high-level conversation whether we can continue with this a little bit longer because I think what it will be doing is – I don't need longer than 20 minutes, I mean now before we get into specifics, because I think it will be acting to inform the small drafting sub-committee very, very effectively.

So with that, over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just with regard to what Tijani said, I'll point out that we do not – I don't think we have much on the records with regard to ALS performance, but with regard to people performance, our current Rules of Procedure and the other associated documents make it very clear that, should it be necessary, we can take action. I'm not saying we do that randomly, but we do have provision for ensuring individual performance with regards to ALAC members and RALO leaders and things like liaison and things like that.

The question is how do we go about doing that if and when we need it for ALSes? And that's what the current discussion is all about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Wanting to also pick up on something that Olivier mentioned and then shared certainly with the Metric sub-committee, and Dev is on the call, and recognizing not everyone will have had the opportunity to read the white paper PDF on the abilities now for Adobe Connect, the now considered I think fairly universal tool used for collaboration meetings in ICANN.

I'm wondering if we can take five of our valuable minutes and ask Dev to give us the high points and holiday aspects of the assessment of engagement tool that I think is going to be kind of exciting.

Just to Olivier's point, it is interesting. It's, in fact, probably not so much from an engagement measurement motivated by organizations like ours wanting to somehow see where the performance is to a particular expectation, but very much from the marketing world a number of the webinar, marketing webinar things that I treat myself to as lunchtime recreation. Yes, I do have lunchtime recreation – is frequently talking about new and clever ways to ensure that while you're pushing your message out in this sort of face-to-screen forum, that you can find out whether or not the punter is engaged. Because there's money to be made of this, I'm sure they'll continue to develop these engagement tools.

Dev, you put the link into the chat. Thank you very much. We will make sure, please staff, that link also gets copied to records page for this meeting. I'm going to ask you, Dev, to give us a little bit of a whirlwind tour.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Chery. I found this PDF yesterday when trying to find some things regarding Adobe Connect for another conference call. It's a very interesting tool as part of Adobe Connect. It is what you call [an index].

First of all, there's an engagement dashboard which [inaudible] can see. When this is enabled before meetings, it can measure the engagement of the participants on the Adobe Connect room during a call.

How it works, [inaudible]. It's very interesting what it does. It assigns calculations to audit engagement index to decide whether a person is very engaged, which is 60-100% which is green. Yellow is between 20 and 60%, and then there's red which is 0-20%.

How it works is it assigns points to various activities within that takes place during the call. So if you are chatting, a chat activity you get 100 points. If you're responding to a poll, downloading a file from the Adobe Connect room, typing in the notes part, if you've been giving status updates. Even if you stepped away, it is measured as you are engaged – at least you're letting know. [inaudible] things like scrolling a notes part, for example, which I thought was quite surprising. So if you're scrolling a notes part, it indicates that you perhaps are reading whatever is in that notes part.

What it also does is the host can then look at that during the conference call, and also after the conference call it can be charted to see whether people were engaged or not.

I think this is possibly going to be very useful for the actual chairs of [voting] groups to see whether, well, when they look back on the chart to see what parts worked in a conference call and what didn't work and so forth.

So I think there's an opportunity for us improving the quality of our conference calls. So it does show – it also shows for each of the persons under the participants whether a person is highly engaged, average engagement or low engagement. And you can see that.

So you can [inaudible] a person who's consistently low engagement, then perhaps that is – after the call, after reviewing it, the idea can be [inaudible] a person engaged [inaudible] more directly next time on the next call and so forth.

I think I've covered it. It was a two-page document and it was quite interesting, I must say. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Yes, I think it's a very good thing for us to also make sure our community knows that's the type of mechanism and method that can be used. I am convinced of course at least one person will ask us does it mean we're going to be turning on their web cameras and seeing what they're doing without them knowing? We need to also [inaudible] any fears that this is some Machiavellian mechanism invading people's privacy.

Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can say we're not only going to turn on people's webcams. We're going to turn on their microphones and see if they're having other conversations during the meeting. We're going to check everything. That was all in humor, for those are listening.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For the transcript, that was a joke.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the transcript record, that was very tongue in cheek. It strikes me as I look at this that if we end up – right now, we have a big window in the middle, which I can scroll. In fact, if we're talking about it, I ned to scroll it. On the other hand, if we were to say that in this particular case the speaker should have control and the speaker will take us through the slides or through the discussions, we could end up with [inaudible] people fascinatingly watching what's going on and listening and having zero engagement scores because we haven't really given them anything to do other than perhaps to put comments in the chat.

It's interesting to see how this will unfold, and to what extent it will match what we sometimes know from the reality of the feedback we get, how close it maps to real engagement of just the things we can artificially boost it by forcing people to do their own scrolling, whereas that might not be the most productive way to actually run the meeting in any given case. So it's a fascinating tool and we'll have to see how it unrolls. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Of course just as we're having timestamps put in things nowadays so we can work smarter with our piecing together what goes on in the call more effectively, if one was having the webinar-style guided experience, that's something we may have to make sure or note at the beginning, so that when one is looking at the performance in any particular call, one would know whether or not it was a more guided experience, and indeed whether or not it was one of those experiences where we're not even letting people have effective use of chat boxes or anything until the very end. There's also funny mechanisms.

We do have to watch very carefully, as you say, how we use these tools. As long as I suppose that it's done in a very clear and transparent as well as a very effective way, we hopefully will stay ahead of the game.

Ladies and gentlemen, I wanted to thank you for spending that little bit of time on that sidebar which was not actually part of the agenda, but I do think it's good to know that one of the challenges which we know is ahead of us, even with our staged implementation and continuous improvement program in our not-too-distant future, that mechanism of how do we measure engagement? We're one step closer on having at least something that might be a nice thing to have in our toolkit. It may not be the only tool that needs to be there.

But thank you, Alan. Yes, I'm sure someone can write macros. I'd actually like to suggest that we probably need to – Alan was talking about finding a way to wiggle his mouse so he gets more than a maximum interaction score [inaudible]. We also probably need to note difference – I'm running two screens. Actually, I'm running three screens at the moment, a static agenda one in one screen, my two

Adobe rooms are open because when I'm chairing a meeting, some of the tools that can only happen when I'm not based on the Android mobile platform, and I'm wondering if all the measurements are the same, because even the ability to scroll in the Android mobile platform, one has to select the shared document and then click through page by page, rather than having scrolling. We probably need to make sure that all operating systems will allow equitable measurements as well.

But that's all for another day. Thank you for the sidebar. I do think it's very, very exciting that these tools are starting to become more accessible and sensible for us to use.

If you look to what is on your shared screen, scroll because you'll get more points if you do, to page two. Page two will be where we've got the beginning of our points. I am aware that we really only have a short amount of time now to talk about this.

Silvia is asking me about administrivia, which Silvia, we said we would talk about at the end. But that's okay; I can be flexible. I believe Gisella has already set the dates for several months now, and if memory serves correctly, Gisella, I think it's the 10th of December is our next call. You're muted Gisella. Well, she has no voice anyway. But yes, as far as I know, based on the Doodle polling, we have our next call out until – well, February or wherever. I think I certainly set my calendar based on it being this time of day this day of the month – sorry, this day of the week in the month for the next 15 months thinking we'd probably still be working with it on that. G's got that all sorted, Silvia. I'll make sure that there's an AI between you two to share that information, or better still, put it on the big calendar. Right. Getting back – that's fine, Silvia.

Getting back to looking at page two on our shared document then, what I'd like you to do now is just give your soon-to-be-organized drafting team a head start at least on how you would like the proposal structured.

First of all, and you can use your green ticks if you agree with this, I believe it's good practice to start this type of proposed paper with a little preamble. A preamble that probably runs no more than a third to a half a page, which picks up a number of the affirmative on why the measurements are useful and important and [have our focus] as we go forward to our next ALAC review, etc.

Is it the will of this sub-committee that we start with that sort of preamble preliminary text, yes or no? Maureen's a yes. Testing whether you're all going to be interactive. Alan, the irreverent, is yes. I do love it, Alan. He's already showing signs of a stir crazy. Dev is a happy yes. Tijani, yes. I'm going to assume that Olivier has a good sense to be yes as well. All right. So it looks to me like that's the way we're going to go. Terrific. All right, then. That gives our drafting team something to work with.

Do you then want us to – notice "us" because I figured I might be part of the drafting team. Do you want us to then get straight into people metrics? In other words, leadership positions and ALAC representatives and role-specific things such as a member of a sub-committee and appointment of whatever? Do you want us to get straight into that? Or if you don't want us to get straight into that, then I'm going to ask for you to tell me where you would like to go next.

If you agree that the next part of our document would be looking at the people stuff before we get to the ALS stuff or do you want something else? Do you want us to start with the people and role-specific stuff first? If you put up a red X, I'm going to ask you want instead. If you put up a green tick, I'm going to assume that you're vaguely happy with this general layout as we've got it, to the beginning at least. Please let me know.

Maureen is happy. That's good to see. Tijani agrees. Olivier is undecided and wants me to go faster. Okay. No one is saying no. All right. Olivier, [inaudible] that joyous revelry. Is there something you would like to say? Oh no, he's switching to a yes. He's switching to a green. Okay. So let's deal with the people, and then we will deal with the meetings associated with those people or do you want to go to At-Large Structures? So we can deal with people and then ALSes, or people and then meetings. The question will be a green tick if you want us to go as it is on the screen – that is, people and then meetings. Go ahead, Alan, the irreverent.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. When I put my hand up, you hadn't given me the tick option. Yes, definitely meetings before ALSes. ALSes at this point are going to be influx for a little while, so I think it makes sense to deal with the things that we have a better grasp on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. That also then saved me asking another couple of check questions as well. We would then have, following that polling point –

and this is where we will probably need to get into the options, the percentages. And there may be different percentages of course and different things. That's another thing we'll have to discuss.

We also need to look at a little bit of information back from the ALAC, the RALOs, and the ALSes in terms of what they see as essential meetings and all those other things.

Alan, you mentioned at the face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles matters of quorum or quorum issues, I believe is how the transcript refers to it. I'm not 100% clear that affects other than At-Large Structures and meetings where elections are required. Could you expand on why? I put quorum there, just because I want [inaudible] on that point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, you're presuming I remember why I said something. If I had to wing it right now and say why is quorum important, I think in general that at least some RALOs have not paid any attention whatsoever to quorum, and have on occasion made decisions, whether they're by vote or by consensus at meetings which were way under quorum. I think that's something that we need to fix.

I think that will get fixed automatically if we start eventually putting in rules that you must attend some number of meetings if you want to maintain your status. But right now I think it's been something that, to a large extent, it has been ignored and I suspect if you ask at least some RALO leaders, "What is quorum in your RALO?" they won't know the answer. In fact, some RALOs do not have a quorum role. It's a confusing issue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood. In fact, that may mean that we need, in some of these points, in quorum would be one of those, some discussion in the paper as well as we probably won't be putting in any sort of solutions or suggestions in the early stage implementation on that. Rather, we recognize the points you made, and indeed probably some others, and we will take that as a stage two exploratory exercise.

Okay. If we treat the other matters that you'll see on your screen there, including apologies and leaves of absence and exception rules and requests along similar lines, we give them more of a discussion and get the juices going on it, as well as perhaps make some provisional proposals, if they only be at high level. In other words, that a mechanism for the acceptances of apologies and leave of absence, which are two different things I'll hasten to add, need to be established type language; that will be good.

I'm now going to stop conversation on this agenda item and ask that we create a small sub-committee now to get on with this and work over the next ten days fairly diligently. But I would like to suggest still publicly on the list. In other words, we do use perhaps – is it a Wiki or both the Wiki and Google Doc approach? But we will need to have at least fairly early drafting done, which will mean those of you who are [inaudible] heading off to Frankfurt will probably not have a lot of time to contribute.

But who would like to put their hand up to join me in the small drafting team to put the paper together, expecting that both Alan and Olivier

will take a great interest in it, but may not be able to contribute as much as they normally would because of their commitments with IANA transition activities for the next while. Don't all rush forward at once . . . Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, I'm having a little laugh here. I'll put my hand down. I'll help you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maureen. We do do good drafting together. Well, you write it and I fiddle with it. Wonderful. It's a great way to [inaudible]. Who else would like to join us? Come on, we need at least one other. Dev, how busy are you at the moment, my dear?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It's going to be getting quite busy, especially with LACRALO's strategic plan also kicking off. I'm not so sure within the next ten days what I can devote for time to that; I'm sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, if you'd like, Maureen and I, just to get started on this and bring it back to the group. But please, we'll just start off. You're all more than welcome to get in and make comments and suggestions, but we certainly would like both Olivier and Alan, when they have time, to be pretty serious and brutal about their suggestions and their edits because it is going to have to meet the criteria of course that is going to get through ALAC and we don't have to rely on our outgoing chair and

vice chair, Olivier [inaudible] our new chair, Alan, to help clear those waters. So they need to be [inaudible] comfortable with it.

So at the moment, it's Maureen and CLO. We'll see how we go with that. Yes, you can note Alan and Olivier subject to time. I think they're probably [inaudible] regardless, but if subject to time, that would be good.

It will be our aim then to have something for the Metrics Working Group ruminations sometime in the next week, so perhaps by this time next week. I don't mean this hour of the day, but this day of the week. That will give us a little bit of time to fiddle more in.

And then what we would be asking the rest of you to do, those of you who do not reside in the Pacific, to spend perhaps your Friday of next week and perhaps your Saturday/Sunday having a good look at what we've put together and that we will be then able to get your edits incorporated early on.

So that's that settled. Is there any other administrivia we need to do? I believe we've captured a few action items we need. That really takes us into our next steps. There's no any other business that was mentioned early on. Does anyone want to bring any other business to us at this stage?

If not, we have just a couple of small action items, the main one being on the development of the draft documentation and the expectation of all of you to spend your Friday, and perhaps part of your day Sunday next week, looking at the draft document that Maureen and I will do our very best to get out, and we'll at least have something for the

ALAC's consideration. We will then be making on I think December 11th and I believe it is going to be in the calendars anyway.

So if any of you need to get to staff and request dial-outs, please do so early so that we've got our dial-out done at the top of the hour when we begin, because it will be a busy meeting next time.

Thank you, one and all. I'm a whole minute over. I do apologize for that. I'd like to thank staff. I'd like to thank all of you. I'd especially like to thank my very willing volunteers. I appreciate it. Bye for now! That's it for the recording. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]