
ICANN79 | CF – At-Large Leadership: Strategic Priorities and Metrics Work Session
Saturday, March 2, 2024 – 10:30 to 12:00 SJU

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Hello and welcome to the At-Large Leadership Strategic Priorities and Metrics Work Session. My name is Michelle DeSmyter and I am the Participation Manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand and zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. And also please speak at a reasonable pace. And with that, I will turn the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, Alac Chair.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Welcome, everyone. This is the start of a conversation, the restart of a conversation on the issue of metrics. Began as part of the implementation of the At-Large review, but now that we're moving in the direction of continuous improvement, there's a lot of areas for discussion around metrics coming up again. So this is sort of just a conversation to get us going, get people's feedback, and get some momentum again on this particular issue.

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.

Those of you who've known me for a while know that metrics is a particular passion of mine. In fact, a former CEO a couple of CEOs ago started calling me Metrics Man. And I think I also have the distinction of being the only one in the ICANN community to have a board resolution named after him because it involved metrics. That was in Cartagena, Colombia. Bruce Tonkin named it the Zuck resolution. I can imagine how there might be some problems calling it the Tonkin resolution. So I guess it's a good motivation there too.

But metrics are one of those things that's a balance. We need to find a way to measure things in order to get progress, to evaluate the things that we're doing so we can make course changes if what we're doing isn't working. And so it's always a balance. We don't want them to be in the way, but at the same time we need to get to a place where we can more easily kind of measure the work that we're doing and how that work is, the results being produced by that work. Next slide.

So metrics for performance and program evaluation. So if we think about it, metrics, there's often sort of two different kinds of metrics. One is efforts, and that's usually associated with people, evaluating how people are doing on an individual basis, and we need to do some of that as well. And that's often a measure of efforts.

The other is measuring results. In other words, trying to figure out what we're trying to accomplish. If it's outreach or recruitment, trying to figure out how many people show up to a meeting, how many people go to the next stage of signing on. Eduardo will have a good example at some point of results from NASIG because he's done enough of them

now that there's starting to be something resembling data associated with how those go.

So, often, results are measured for the activity itself rather than for people. Unless you're like a commissioned salesman or something like that, you don't usually do result-oriented metrics for individuals, but you do it for the program because if you're not achieving the results you want, you want to have the knowledge and capacity to do something different.

We should never be afraid of not reaching our objectives. As long as we're aware of it and are able to make motivations along the way. Too often in organizations, people just keep doing what they're doing and not even know whether it's succeeding or not. And often it's a small change that can make a difference. If we spread pennies on the sidewalk to get people to stop so we can talk to them about the At-Large and nobody's stopping, then maybe we change to nickels instead and see if that makes a difference. Often you can make a minor change that can make a big difference. Next slide.

One of the things that we're going to talk about is a little bit about metrics and in particular the At-Large review. We need to look at our objectives, what challenges we have associated with metrics. Some of those are geographic and others. And talk a little bit about where we left off. What I wanted to do is give Cheryl a chance to bring those of us that weren't deeply involved in the At-Large review and the metrics efforts surrounding that, bring us up to date on how that was going, where it got left off, partly because of the transition, I think was sort of what stalled it. So with that, I'll hand the microphone to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Jonathan. If I may, Michelle, can I get you to pull up probably the document that was put in to the OEC from the ARIWG regarding our implementation of the At-Large review recommendations? And while Michelle is doing that, what we're going to hone in on here is amongst the recommendations that we undertook as a result of the last ALAC and At-Large review, there were some 16 recommendations that we said we would manage to do something about.

And recommendation 16, this one that's on your screen now, thank you very much, Michelle, is the one that has very particular ramifications for metrics. And they are metrics that is not just on a project and success base, it's about metrics specific to us as individuals in At-Large. Now, historically, and I'm a bit of a partner in crime with Jonathan on the matter of metrics, we've had huge resistance from our own community, particularly the leaders of the communities, to do with measuring how we all perform. Do we turn up when we're supposed to turn up? And do we do what we are supposed to be there doing? It shouldn't be that complicated. However, it seems to be always something that causes a great deal of consternation in some people's minds. Well, that got taken away from us as a concern or an option or something that's been on the table for conversation since the early 2000s, with this recommendation 16, which simply says there has to be a mechanism by which the engagement and activity of the individual members of At-Large can be measured.

Now, obviously, how much, how little, there's still a lot of things that can go on in that space. A couple of things that happened after recommendation 16 was undertaken and to some degree partly implemented, and I'll come back to why it's not completed yet in a moment. But we also had, as a result of other recommendations in the At-Large review process, things that affected criteria and expectations on both our At-Large structures and our unaffiliated individual members. And so the huge amount of work that was done under Alan's guidance in the At-Large structure mobilization work and under Roberto's guidance for the unaffiliated individual members.

You as a community all agreed on sets of measures. So we are now in a position of saying we now need to measure those. So we've actually got over this hump that had been plaguing us in the past. We have now got criteria that are a baseline - it's not a ceiling, it's a floor, a baseline - of expectations clearly articulated for each and every one of us.

As a layer above that, many, if not all, of our regions, in response to the recommendations in those two mobilization studies, have looked at criteria, expectations and metrics and measures within their own rules of procedure and made sure that there is a fit. Certainly, you can do bespoke things in your own regions, no question about it. But the basic stuff still has to meet those mobilization recommendations. That's the good news. So we should be in a very good position to look at this is where we were and this is what we need to do.

But it's the how we measure. Measurement is often a very resource-heavy requirement. And that's where we now need to look and take the advantage of the continuous improvement programming that we have.

Michelle, if you could pull up the CIP CCG page, thank you. Apologies, Michelle is used to talking shorthand. For everyone else, that's the continuous improvement program cross-community group. On this page, and I would recommend all of you, each and every one of you, let alone those involved in continuous improvement programs going forward, this is our own wiki community page. Yes, there is a formal continuous improvement program space on the wikis, which is where the work going cross-community for all of the ACs and SOs and the RALOs and SGs and Cs. So everybody will work in that space as well.

But for our own At-Large community, Tommi and I took the bold step of putting up this wiki and it's housed under the operations, finance and budget space, so it comes under Claire's control. And here is where we would like to encourage not just the repository from the ALAC's activities in the continuous improvement program, but also encourage the activity reporting for the regional leads.

And if you scroll down now, Michelle, I'm going to play mean lady, you will see that APRALO, thank you very much, Justine and Amrita, have done very well. I have no idea what happened in AFRALO, apparently nothing. Continue on down and you will see, of course, APRALO had a lot to do. Keep scrolling, keep scrolling, keep scrolling. There we go, EURALO, Sébastien, no surprise there. Sébastien is also an integral part of the whole continuous improvement program aspects because, of course, it goes back to the accountability and transparency review team number three and our recommendations 3.6. So, you know, Sébastien and I and Vanda and Daniel lived and breathed his stuff. So, of course, he's certainly putting his region's activities in here. Apparently nothing

happened in LACRALO either. It's a bit of a shame. Maybe that could be fixed. And NARALO has done some reporting as well.

This is the sort of sharing space where we can look and see what are the regions doing that is similar. So where can we look for some degree of harmonization or guideline that we can say across our regions, this is a baseline of expectations. Then we will have a small chance—and if you scroll back up to the top now, Michelle, in the top of that section with the ALAC, and challenges, when we did the review implementation working group, so back many years ago now, after the second ALAC and At-Large review and all those recommendations were made, recommendation 16 was assumed to be being able to be made easier to manage because we were told a certain activity was going to happen within ICANN Org, and that was the particular provision of a particular tool, actually based on a Salesforce tool.

At one stage, At-Large was going to be the first cab off the rank. It was going to roll out to us first, then it was going to roll out to us some distant day, and now, of course, it's not even going to be used at all. It's moved on to something else. So we've actually lost the tool we were relying on to make this job easy. We cannot expect either volunteers or staff to do something cumbersome and unreasonable.

So we, as a community, have to do some very clever thinking about exactly how we record and report what. Still accountable, still transparent, still fair, considering various aspects of privacy. But the clever tool we thought we were going to have is not now possible. I might ask if someone at staff knows if there is another tool coming

down the pipeline. That would be great. But it is a challenge for us and we can't wait.

So as we now move into doing these measures, we need to keep them simple, we need to keep them clear, we need to make sure they are attainable, they do not have to be particularly onerous, and they need to be a start, because it will be the beginning of a continuous improvement program. So that's my spiel. Happy to take any questions. It's sort of a good news/bad news story. Hadia, yes.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Cheryl. This is Hadia for the record. Thank you, Cheryl, for this informative session. My ask is about the document that you just showed about the continuous improvement and the RALOs putting in their input as to what they are doing in that regard, where can we find the link to that document, and should the ones participating in the continuous improvement program be the ones updating this document? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Hadia, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Momentarily the magic will happen and the link will be in chat. And yes, it should be those who have been given the role. Tommi and I have been given the role for the ALAC. We're not going to wet-nurse the RALOs. The RALOs have their leads. We've got a space we would like to think you might benefit from sharing, but it's absolutely up to the regional leads in those processes to do whatever is necessary.

And as necessary at the moment is the first bit of homework, which was reporting what are the current activities, most of which are not actually continuous improvement activities. They're reactive actions to a spasmodic review process. But that's okay. Okay, any other questions? Back to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I wasn't trying to take the microphone back, unless you were in fact done. I was going to say that there is some evolution of tools that's taken place. So there's something called CES that the staff have begun to get some training on and things like that, and have begun to track certain things, like ALAC attendance on calls, for example. And so finding the balance there of how much is too much, we haven't figured out yet. But there is a tool now for doing that. There's another tool that we saw that's related to sort of project management and creates Gantt charts and things like that, that we saw a demo of at the SO/AC leaders meeting in Washington, D.C., recently. And so that's also coming to us, but it hasn't yet. But that's something that Berry worked on quite a bit for the GNSO, and they're coming up with kind of a simplified version for the other SOs and ACs, because the GNSO version of it is very dense, right? And we don't need that level of information that they're using there. But that tool is in process as well. And that's not based on Salesforce, as you say, but based on a product called Smartsheets, I think it's called, that is kind of a project management spreadsheet tool that a lot of folks are using and is becoming more and more used inside of ICANN.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Jonathan, if Berry's organized something, I have every confidence it will be a smart piece of equipment, a huge respect to what he can put together. But I think it's really important to recognize that there may be a benefit for allowing some self-reporting to take a load off how much data acquisition staff need to spend their time doing. But that as a nice thing to make things easier may not work with access to the tool. So we also have this friction point that we just need to consider. There are sometimes systems which we just can't access for all sorts of other good reasons. So it might end up with a slightly harder or more complex or more demanding set of resourcing than we may have wished to plan. But you can start now, regions in particular, and Marita's in her region and in Justine's activities with the rules of procedure review, just kept a spreadsheet. If you signed up to be part of that review process, then your name was put down one side of the spreadsheet and your attendance was, surprise, noted. And if you apologized, fine. And there was a simple algorithm applied and you either did or did not do well. And that was part of the reporting in the whole system. And you'd be surprised how many people went, "Ah! I hadn't meant for that to happen."

And the other thing I want to make sure is as well, attendance and effectiveness are not the same thing. Simply being in a Zoom room is not contributing to a process. And we need to be very careful about that as well. Now I'll stop. Until next time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We'll give that maniacal grin a break. But, yes, it's not always straightforward how to track these things, how to judge these things. That's for sure the case. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cheryl mentioned ALS mobilization. That's a process by which we try to decide how to make ALSes more effective. We went back to the original ICANN bylaws and said, "Why do we have ALSes?" And tried to figure that out. Those recommendations were approved by the RALOs and ALAC several years ago. It's taken us an awful long time to get to the point where we are ready to deploy them. We are almost ready. So you'll see that reasonably soon.

And one of the things you'll see out of it is a requirement that RALOs spend more of their time and energy focusing on ALSes. That an ALS is not a group that gets accredited at one point and then gets forgotten about for eternity. So you'll see some of that. Some of you will curse us for it because it will actually mean some work. On the other hand, it may actually make these groups more effective. And we'll continue more with that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. It's an interesting thing. That particular effort is to provide an option for direct access to ALSes. I don't even know that it's necessarily the preferred option. I think that it's to maximize flexibility. But we had a session that was sort of underattended at the AGM because we advertised it poorly. And so a lot of folks missed it. But Sally Newell-Cohen was here and presented at that session.

And it's interesting because Sally came out of software distribution. So there was a company called Ingram Micro that she used to work for. And back in the days of when you went to a store to buy software, which was a little while ago now, you had these retail stores that sold software. And if you made software, like Microsoft or something like that, and you wanted to enter, say, the French market, you wouldn't go out and contact French retailers. Instead, there would be a distributor that you would work with in France, who in turn had the relationships with all of the retailers. So Microsoft would engage the distributor. The distributor in turn would push product and do training and things like that with the retailers.

And if you think about it, it's a very analogous model to the one we have with RALOs and ALSes. And so in an ideal world, as Alan also mentioned, the know your customer part of this is in the hands of the RALOs. And that interaction is very knowing in that, oh, I know Bob over at ALS number three will really be interested in that. Let me get on the phone and get them engaged on this issue because it relates to security or something like that. And we're doing DNSSEC. And whereas ALS number seven could care less about that because they're just concerned about privacy or something. And so that level of intimacy with those retailers, if you will, I think is an important part of what we want to accomplish going forward. Did you have a follow-up, Alan? Okay, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I mentioned that we went back to the bylaws to look at why we have ALSes. The answer was very simple. We want ALSes because they

have people on the ground. People who might be interested in what we're doing. But we then proceeded to say we're never going to talk to those people. We, of course, don't know who the members of an ALS are and we're not allowed to ask for your membership list. And we proceeded to talk only to the representative and not to the members. So you will find in many, many cases that members of an ALS don't know what ICANN is. They've never heard about it. They don't know that their group is a member of ICANN. And they certainly don't know what ICANN does.

So the whole challenge is go back to roots. It says if we want ALSes because they have members, we need to be able to talk to them. At least occasionally. And that's the kind of thing you'll be seeing. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. Go ahead.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you, Jonathan. Good morning. I'm going to talk in Spanish. There's a few things I want to say. This is Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Let me tell you that in LACRALO, we are working with our metrics. We are having some difficulties to measure what is it that we need to measure. And we don't really want to be abusive when it comes to separating what's good from what's not good.

There are many ALSes in the regions that are inactive. And this is actually causing the expectations that the ALAC or ICANN may have to be different when we are actually 50 or 20 organizations working, or

whether we actually are more than 60, which is the number we are having right now.

So our first challenge is to be able to set some order to be able to go ahead to progress in terms of how we want to work. And this, of course, is related to mobilization. But it is also related to quality in our participation and engagement. It may not be the quality we're all expecting, but it is the quality we are having today.

It is in this context that Alan was asking why is it that we are having ALSes. This is like asking why is there a union. There are workers unions because when one worker interacts with the owners, well, it's not the same as if there is a collective of people working. There is a difference in the quality of strength in the symmetry of forces. And when you go there on your own, in this case when there is an individual user, the difference, the asymmetry with the rest is actually pretty big. That's why there is a need to have user organizations when we're active in the country so that we can have a discussion with the state, have a quality of service, and the definition of having stability with the Internet. This is what we need to be able to explain ALSes here.

And another thing, and this is a question, when Cheryl -- this doesn't really have to do with the discussions we are having. We are not discussing whether we are participating with ALAC or not in the metrics. I insist on this because this is essential for me. This doesn't really have to do with who is participating in ALAC. My understanding is the bottom-up process needs to work because my understanding is that regions do need to send whoever they think they need to send.

In regions where there are very few countries, such as North America, we need to send people with three or four countries with an associated taste, it is very easy to define who is coming, especially when they speak English, when they can participate outside the meetings established by the organization. But when there is cultural diversity and ethnic diversity, when you actually have historic diversity in the same continent, it is very difficult to have the expectation that others who are having a unity in their concept actually have. I don't want to refer to Asia Pacific, because they do have all the characteristics I'm mentioning. But in the case of Latin America, we are at the same level.

And let me wrap up, Jonathan. I am very concerned that we are talking about this. I am very worried that ALAC is defining who is coming and who is not coming to these meetings. I am very concerned by this. And I am very concerned, it's not only me, the whole region is very concerned about this. And this is something we need to discuss before we approve it. I think I would be ashamed of discussing this right now, and I am very concerned about it. That's all. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Thank you. Part of it has to be the way that we discuss it and make sure that we do it in a sensitive way. But we are in a position in a number of cases, whether it's slots for these meetings or slots for the ATLAS meeting when it comes up, where we have more people that are interested in going than will be able to go. We need a criteria for doing that. And I think that criteria has to be performance-based more so than it is title-based. Because ultimately travel is not an award. It's meant to be utilitarian. It's meant to allow us to do the work that we do. So if

there are folks that have a title but they never speak up, they don't need to be at the meeting. It's really that simple. And I'm not ashamed to say that, right? So people need to be active participants in order to be needed at a meeting. And we need to find a way to determine that and do it in an equitable way for sure. And I'm not trying to be glib about that. I'm not trying to say that it's easy. But ultimately, we're going to need to make some decisions about that because I think diversity is incredibly important. But if someone never says a word, we're not getting diversity from that person. It doesn't matter what the group photo looks like. It matters the ideas that are being presented at the meetings that we have. Did you want to follow up quickly before I go to the next person?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Okay. Thank you, Jonathan. I understand your point. I do understand it. What I don't understand is form. There's power to be able to define this. It has to be the power of a region. And it should not be the power of a committee or a chair. And it's actually the synthesis. I don't really want to use the word synthesis. It's actually the results that each region has sent people to have a discussion right here.

It is true that sometimes we do have representatives who do not participate as we would prefer them to participate or as we would like them to participate. But let me say that the power has to be in the regions and it should not be the power of anyone sitting right here. We are the result of our regions. We do not have power over the region. This is a bottom-up process. It goes from the bottom up. And when you're up, you cannot define what's happening at the bottom.

So, my understanding is that the ALAC can send reports. This is something they can do. And the region will define. But the ALAC should not make any definitions because actually this would not make any sense. We can have a government of the best and dissolve the regions. Maybe none of us should come here. These are all options. But I will definitely fight so that there will not be a person or a group of persons making a definition over the rest of the regions. And I think this is very important. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right, well, thank you. And we need to continue to discuss it. It is a bottom-up process. And the ALAC is in fact made up of representatives sent by the regions to address a myriad of issues. And so there's not necessarily a reason this isn't one of them. Because this is the work within the ICANN context, which is what the ALAC is meant to do. So we'll need to discuss it further. Because I think we're not completely aligned on this. But I really appreciate having the conversation. Amrita. Claire reminds me we're starting to do a two-minute timer too so that we don't run out of time. So we'll start paying attention to that. I'm not used to it yet. So unfortunately you're the first victim. Go ahead, Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you. A few points, and I will go back and forth. To answer Alan's query, yes, there may be ALSes out there. Few may be active, few may not. You may find innovative ways to get them engaged. For example, in APRALO, we have WhatsApp groups or mailing lists where ALS members, primary member who's not that active, but the other members are there and they're participating. So you can find unique

ways to get them engaged. That's one point. Depending upon your region, depending upon the dynamics, you can change things.

Second, what we also need to -- and what Sergio was speaking, etc., there are two different aspects in my mind, and please correct me. When we are talking about At-Large, it consists of regional At-Large organizations who work in the regions, and then you have nominees who go and form a council, like the GNSO Council, which is an ALAC, who go back and forth.

Now, if we look at At-Large, and this is something which yesterday during the training period we were speaking, and when we were trying to differentiate between NCSG, NCUC, and NPOC, I said that, and I firmly believe the difference with At-Large brings to ICANN is that while the others may be making policies only, At-Large gives advices to the various things.

However, ICANN policies are not made in a bubble. These have to go down globally to countries to be accepted. What ICANN wants to speak in the countries needs to be accepted, and this is what our ALSes do, makes things easily understandable. It could be UA, it could be IDN, it could be DNS abuse or DNSEC. So we have that power both in the policy but even in the place, which GSE team needs us for. That is why they are liaising with us, nothing else. It's a give and take.

So we have this power which we need to nurture—simultaneously, we need to nurture the policy, and both this has to go hand in hand. So you cannot have someone dictating something or someone trying to push. It has to be based upon need, and that's where we have to find a midway.

And I completely depend upon processes, but then the metrics, as I had said, has to be different. If someone is working on engagement outreach, helping even GSE to make liaisons within a government, because they have challenges there, that's also ICANN efforts. We have to recognize that.

Simultaneously, someone having power, not coming, not doing anything is bullshit. So that's where I come. So there has to be a middle way. If it's not done, it cannot be bottomed this way. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. I don't know when this went to zero, but I think you did pretty well. I wasn't paying attention to it. I'm not used to paying attention to it yet. But thank you. So we need to apply some rigor to what we're doing and making sure that it's comprehensive of that. What we want to do, though, I believe very strongly, is objectify the process. So it can't just be it's Bob's decision who gets to go and doesn't go. That can't be the answer, because that leads to a lot of friends going and cronyism and things, and it really should be linked to their performance, whether it's at the regional level or within the ICANN context. So I completely agree with you. I just want to clarify that I think objectivity has got to be a key component when we finally get to a final framework. Sébastien and then Aziz. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I only have two minutes. I've already lost 15 seconds telling you to put your headset on. Jonathan, I'm completely in disagreement with you. I disagree with you completely, and I'm not the only one. The problem is

to know how everyone will have the way to express themselves when it will be such a push from the room, from the president, or from others saying this is how we're going to do things. No, Jonathan, this is not how things will be done. You won't be able to know. You won't be able to know what one person does during one of the meetings at ICANN. There might be people in this room who never say anything, who do not express themselves one second during a meeting such as this one. For which reason? For what reason? Because the power is on the person who speaks the most. Once we make these people shut up, and then it will be simpler. I'm not part of these people, but there are a lot of people who actually do other things in other spaces, who discuss things, actions with other groups. You can't measure this yourself. You don't see it, but they do. They interact with the communities in their region. They meet other members of the community. It is very important. They talk to the staff about other subjects. That is important. So if you tell them, "Oh, your duty is to be here, to speak, to express yourself, to do what I expect you to do," that's not going to work. We are elected. I say "we," the leaders of the RALOs, the members of ALAC. We are elected to participate to the reflection, to the meeting, to the decisions. We can't be told, "Oh, you didn't do what I wanted you to do, so somebody else will take your place." No, this is not going to work in such an organization. It won't work at ICANN, so I hope you're not going to go into this direction, take this direction. And I hope that ALAC understands, the people in ALAC understand what they have to do when they're here. It cannot work that way.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right, thank you. It's a longer conversation. Aziz, go ahead.

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you. Yes, I would like to say something. ALAC was created first and foremost based on the ALSes. The ALSes were the ones who signed a memorandum of understanding with ICANN. Absolutely. I was there in 2003, and I remember. We were here together, and we discussed the creation of ALAC. We wanted it to be a community that represents all regions, and we wanted for organizations, for local associations, to work on a local level. And the basic principle of ALAC was to have representatives within ICANN who would come and tell us about the problems they have, the problems related to Internet governance at the local level.

And I also wish to say that we, within the AFRALO, of which I am a member, we tried to implement measures. And I remind you that [Cheryl] had started this discussion on measures several years ago, and so far we still don't have a system that allows for better measurements. So the measures we want to implement. Will they take into account the fact that someone is a member of ALAC, or are they members of their region's leadership? Will we mention the activities that this person is implementing on a local level?

Let's take ISOC, for example. They have chapters everywhere in the world, and they are implementing activities, and they are doing reporting to ISOC. So yes, it is included, but it's not really done as we do it within the ISOC. So we were in Chad recently, Sébastien, Tijani, and I. We talked a lot about ICANN. We talked a lot about the policies that are developed by ICANN. Will all of this be included in these measures, in

these metrics? Or will we just mention the fact that we come here for a week and we discuss a few topics?

And I wish to mention that some topics are less important for a region compared to another. We talk a lot about gTLDs, and we will mention this during the CPWG meeting this week. We've already achieved some results. Africa had submitted 17 new gTLDs for the new support program. Will this be taken into account? I'm not against metrics, you know. We want to use them within AFRALO, but we can't do it because we can't accredit ALSes that are not active. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you. Again, I didn't mean to represent any of this as simple. And I do agree completely that work outside of this meeting here, etc., needs to be a part of this system. You mentioned Tijani, for example, who's not here because he has a title, but because he was engaged on the applicant support program. That's why he's at this meeting, is because there's a utility to him being here at this meeting. There are people that work on drafting documents that lead conversations, that participate in work groups. So we need to find a way to bring those people into ICANN meetings as well. And I refuse to accept some unknown amorphous thing that I had a hallway conversation and that's enough to justify it. I think we do need to put some metrics in place and we need to objectify them. So that is the path that I'm pursuing. And you have the right to change the composition of the ALAC and kick me out of office if you want to. But that is the path that I'm pursuing, which is to try and objectify the practices that we have related to travel and participation and things in which seats are limited, such as ATLAS, for example. We

need the metrics and we need to reward the work that people are doing and recognize it and make sure that the people that are doing the work are in the best position to represent us when that work is being done. So Alan, I think, is next. Two minutes, my friend.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I do request that staff put a bell at the end of the two minutes. Having a timer run out that is ignored does not have any value whatsoever. Now to use my real time, I have a very simple statement. The ICANN bylaws put the ALAC in a position to take decisions on behalf of At-Large. The ALAC is the only body defined to make decisions on behalf of the organization. The ALAC is comprised of 10 people from the RALOs. So the RALOs have their voice on ALAC, but that doesn't alter the fact that the ALAC does have a responsibility to make decisions. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So thank you, Alan. Claire, go ahead. I'm sorry, I haven't been paying attention to the offline queue. So after Claire goes, I'll work my way through the Zoom queue. Apologies if you've been waiting.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Hi. Hello, everyone. Claire Craig for the record. I know that this is a very difficult topic, and it is one where we have not really done this before. And change can be very difficult for everyone. I am sitting here and I'm hearing objections to things that have not yet even been discussed or proposals have not been made. And I think that is why we are all here, to understand what we need to do to ensure that everything is

equitable and that it works for the community. It is not just about whether it is -- I heard Alan speak about, you know, the role of ALAC, which is important. And I'm hearing the RALOs talking about the role of their members and, you know, being able to sit at the table.

So let us sit together and determine what are the metrics that we would need to make that work. It is important for us to have some objectives that we can all rally around and implement and measure. Sitting here and trying to be very abstract and, you know, people don't like to hear this word, but emotional about the way things have always been done, will lead to more emotions and more disagreements among us. So if we can identify -- and, you know, they say smart objectives. So they must be -- what's smart again? We must be able to sit and determine things that we can measure, understand the objectives, give them timelines and ensure that they can be done. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Claire. Next in the queue I have Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:

Thank you very much. This is AK for the record. I want to first of all start by saying this is a good discussion we are having. And at the same time, there are a lot of things that have to be taken into consideration. Alan was talking about talking to ALSes. I believe that the role of ALSes is for the representative to be able to talk to the ALSes. I don't think At-Large needs to talk to members of the ALS directly. And the reason is because there is no provision for members of the ALSes.

We find out that a lot of people that come to the meetings might -- a lot of others might never have the opportunity of coming because there is no provision for them. You continue to have the same set of people, and it's extremely difficult for these people because at times it is totally different having online meetings and having physical meetings.

And at the same time, we also need to take into consideration that we need to go and talk to these ALSes. Not for the ALSes to come to the meetings. And I think it's going to work that way better. Just like what Aziz was talking about. Talking about not talking at meetings, I think at times we also need to understand why some people don't talk at meetings. And I think Sébastien mentioned one of the reasons. It's difficult for people, language barrier, even at times not talking at all. Just listening is also part of some of these things. You bring in some contribution—because when you're talking about metrics and talking about because someone is not talking at meetings, that person is not contributing, then you get to have people who just talk for the sake of talking, not because they have something good to say.

When we're looking at these metrics again, we need to consider the fact that some of us are working full-time. Some people are retired. It's easy for those that have retired to have enough time to participate compared to those who are working. So we need to take this into consideration. And most of the times it favors those that bring the policy or those that formulate the policy. And they see things from just their own angle and not looking at things from the angle of the others. When I have a daytime job and I have a work meeting and I have an ICANN meeting, of course I know which one to pick. So we need to understand that.

So when we are formulating these metrics, yes, there have to be metrics. But these metrics must not be metrics such that it's going to discourage a lot of people from participating and encourage a group of people, okay, a group of people to continue participating the way it is being done. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, AK. I think those are some good points. Part of it may come down to who we elect as our representatives, though, because it is a job. I mean, at the bottom line, we have to define what that job is, but it's a job. And if people's work prevents them from doing the job, then that might mean they shouldn't be on the ALAC, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, no, no, no, no, it's not a job.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is, in fact, a job. It is a volunteer job. Yes, there are expectations of the people that are members of the ALAC.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would say it is a responsibility someone has taken. It's not a job. It's a responsibility someone has taken.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We're splitting hairs. There's a set of expectations for what you are signing up to do, and just rubber stamping a vote and showing up to meetings is not enough to be a part of the ALAC. That's all. There's more

to it than that. And we need to define what that is. I'm not saying I know what that is. But to suggest that, you know, if I have this title that I have no other responsibilities, I think is a big mistake. And we've all seen the results of that. So we just need to find a middle ground here. That's all. So, yes, if people are too busy to be in the ALAC, then we should change who's in the ALAC. But it can't be that, well, I'm too busy to do anything, but I suddenly am free when it comes time to travel. That can't be the answer.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If we make it a job, we're going to exclude a group of people. In my country, you retire at 70. In some other countries, you retire at 50, 60. Okay? If you retire at 70, that means you need to wait for me to be 70 before I come onto the ALAC.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I don't want to personalize this. You are working and participating. But if you weren't, it wouldn't matter to me whether I needed to wait. Because having you in name only is not the same as having you actually be an active participant. And I don't mean you personally, right? Having one, right? So I understand. It's going to discourage people that don't have time to be on the ALAC. That might very well be the case. If you don't have time to do it, don't do it. But it doesn't mean that you should be on it even if you don't have time to do it. That doesn't make sense. Bill Jouris is next.

BILL JORUIS: Thank you. I'm as enthusiastic about metrics as anybody. And I think before we get too far into this, we ought to ask ourselves, what are we

going to do with these metrics if we have them? Are you going to say, gee, Bill, you don't speak up in meetings so why should we pay for you to come? We're cutting your travel. Go away. Or are we going to tell NARALO, "He doesn't do anything, so get yourself a new rep?" I don't know if there's even a process to do that.

But I think if we figure out what are we trying to do with it, it will make it a whole lot easier to decide what metrics do we need. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's a good point, Bill, and certainly something to figure out. I don't have that answer. My first feeling about that is that when planning for the travel for an event, the very first people we should choose are the people we need at the meeting, which may have nothing to do with titles. It may have to do with who's on the work groups that are going to be meeting at the meeting, the people that are going to be leading a discussion or a plenary that we're having at that particular meeting. That should be the first criteria for who goes. I understand you disagree. I'm giving my opinion, and I don't have the last word.

[SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:]

It's five times you give the same opinion.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And you've given your opinion the same number of times. I'm answering his question about what I think we should do. But let's continue on. Hadia is next.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Jonathan. This is Hadia for the record. I'm going to address two topics. First, the ALSes versus individual users, and the second is the measuring and metrics. So ALAC was created in order to provide a venue for end users to be part of the ICANN community and express their interests. But the means through which this could happen is actually having ALSes as members. So the main point here is the -- or the main individual here, member, are the Internet users and not the ALSes. ALSes were the means through which you could bring in Internet users to the ICANN community. And Internet users who are members of ALSes need to be able to directly communicate with ICANN, get involved with At-Large, get involved with the ALAC. It doesn't necessarily have to be through the representative. That's my first point.

And then my second point is in relation to measuring and metrics. And I think we all here agree that metrics are required, and we all need some kind of measuring system. But what we don't agree on is who will do those measurements, and how are those measurements going to be used.

And as for who will do the measurements, I do think that RALOs are -- and maybe Amrita also said something like that. There are some activities within the RALO that only the RALO can measure. So part of the metrics and measures lie in the hand of the RALO.

I would say also another part of this metrics or measurements also lies with the ALAC. So it's split between both, RALOs and the ALAC. And of course, and I think no RALO will disagree on that, that the RALO doesn't want an ALAC representative sitting in a meeting and—it's not about

speaking or not. It's about really representing the RALO or not. It's about doing the job or not, even if they don't speak up.

So is there a way for a RALO to, I would say, impeach an ALAC member who is sitting and doing nothing? Again, it's not about speaking up. And it's a voting because he was voted in, and according to the bylaws, it's a period of time that the member needs to be there for. However, does that entitle that member to remain for two, three whole years sitting in a place and traveling while not representing the RALO? And the RALO is not able to, like, get that person out of this position and put another one who would actually represent the RALO? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I don't know the answer to that question, so we'll have to look into it, and it may vary from RALO to RALO. Pari, I think, is next. Pari, go ahead.

PARI ESFANDIARI:

Thank you. Pari is speaking for the record. So first of all, in terms of metric, I don't think anybody has a problem with that. However, I think that metrics need to be qualitative rather than quantitative. So that's number one.

Number two, are you also introducing metric in terms of how ALAC is engaging its members? Because it's not just the member duty. It's also the management duty to engage. And if management is failing or shying people away, that's an issue that needs to be dealt with.

The other thing I'd like to mention is I can talk about myself, but I'm sure a lot of people here join this organization in defense of democratic

values and principles. Some of the language coming from the management has been troubling to me. Words such as "mandatory" in a bottom-up organization, which is voluntary work, is particularly troubling for me. So [inaudible] that language because some of the hostility that you may see is because of the language used that I don't think quite representative of an organization which is trying to produce certain values and principles. So it's not really matching with that, and that's causing problem.

The last point I'd like to make is in many of the meetings, it's not about speaking. In fact, I sit in many boards, and usually people, when first they join a board, are expected to be quiet, out of respect to better understand what's going on, before wasting the board's time and coming up with opinions and ideas. So members who repeat what is already said actually the ones that they should pick up and have a conversation with, because often in many of the meetings there are members who just repeat what already has been said, a statement of the obvious. So those are the areas that I think need, for the sake of efficiency, to be dealt with, rather than thinking who is sitting quiet and who is not quiet. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Pari. A lot of good points there, and I'm fully supportive of the democratic process and don't believe I can mandate anything. We have an ALAC that will be in a position to both discuss these things and ultimately vote on them, so it's not something that can come down from on high by any means.

PARI ESFANDIARI:

But the language has been there.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. I'm just saying that we are in a position where we need to form, for example, a travel policy. So the NCUC, for example, says if you get asked to travel, you have to write a report of the sessions that you listen to or something. So maybe that's a more indirect way. I think this idea of speaking at a meeting as an example is meant to be almost a metaphor for whether or not you are in fact an active participant in the work that we're doing. So I don't think we should keep harping on just whether or not you speak at a particular meeting, but are you an active participant in what we're doing is really the issue. And defining what that is is part of the exercise. And I don't pretend to have all the answers there. I think Greg Shatan is next.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. I think the term "participation" or "contribution" is one that needs to be broken down into pieces. And as you say, speaking at a meeting or not speaking at a meeting is only one aspect of that. Reporting back is another aspect. If you're on a board but being quiet during the board meetings, you should still be you'll be on committees and you'll be less quiet in the committees. Or you may be the one who volunteers to write up the work of the committee. One way or the other, you can't be a lump on a log. And if people are coming to meetings and going shopping and going to museums and the beach and not going to meetings -- I'm not saying anybody is -- but if that were to be the case, that would be fairly problematic.

So I think -- I'm a little concerned that -- I don't want the RALOs to seem like we're fighting for the opportunity to just hand out tickets to the ICANN meetings without any sense of the worth of the people going to what At-Large is trying to accomplish. I think that's where we need to go. We need to get the metrics or maybe we can call them key performance indicators, which are both a little more qualitative and also have a little bit of teeth to them. But the bottom line is we need to know what we are having people come to meetings to accomplish, and they should be accomplishing those things. Or people should be coming to the meetings who will do those things.

Again, there's more than one or even ten ways that participation or contribution occurs. And whatever we do needs to be nuanced enough to pick those things. And frankly, if we get this right, there shouldn't be some sort of power play between RALO leadership and ALAC leadership. It should be pretty obvious who is using themselves at the meeting properly and who is just abusing the privilege. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Greg. Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Jonathan. So I think it's been an interesting discussion. While we may disagree to some extent on what sort of metrics, what is the flexibility at the regional level to change those metrics, or whether we have a core set of metrics that are applying for everybody, but regions might have their own additional metrics, these are questions that are open. But I think what we can all agree that there's a requirement for

accountability of anyone who travels. And we also realize that it is not just the meetings that count, but also a lot of intersessional work that happens, which others may not see. So there's a need to capture this also and ensure that there is some amount of transparency, because we are actually a model for the rest of the community. So we have to be accountable and we have to show that we have been accountable. So anything that adds to that process will be useful for us and it will increase our sustainability also. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Sergio Salinas-Porto for the record. I heard many voices from different regions, and I am having a certain picture that what we are discussing today makes a lot more sense than in the past. Jonathan, ALAC cannot define who will and who will not travel. This has to be defined by the regions, and the regions will define this with elections. Every time there is an election, we decide who is the representative, the chair, the secretary, etc. The definition of who will and who will not travel cannot be in the hands of a group outside the regions. And I insist on this. It is important that the empowering lies on the region and not on a group. Otherwise, we are making a mistake. We need to make something separate. If this is what you want, then we need to dissolve the regions. But you cannot be doing this. That was your goal a long time ago. That was Cheryl's goal many years ago. So maybe that's the way to go.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's not my goal. It is my goal, however, to focus the regions on regional work. That's definitely my goal. And to make sure that the people that

we need most at the meetings are there. And how that is best done, I don't know the answer. But it can't just be a subjective decision on anyone's part. That's the only point that I'm making. So the regional leadership are part of the same committee with the ALAC leadership in terms of trying to define a policy initially around travel for this very reason. But I think it's important to remember the ALAC are in fact your representatives. And so you also have the ability to talk to them and give them guidance as to how you would like them to engage on this discussion. So they're not completely separate. They didn't land from the moon. You put them on the ALAC. So communicate with them as well. Definitely. No one is trying to usurp the regions. The regions are a key part of this discussion. No question.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just to be clear, the ALAC had the opportunity to effectively eliminate ALSes and disenfranchise RALOs very easily. We had an external report that recommended it. All we had to do was say yes. Instead, some of us, and I'm one of them, spent hundreds and hundreds of hours documenting and proving to the board or demonstrating to the board that we did not want to do that. And Cheryl was one of those. So accusing Cheryl of, you know, you wanted to get rid of RALOs, I don't think is appropriate. We decided not to get rid of them, but we have a responsibility to make sure that we are effectively using ICANN resources, period.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

We'll go to Natalia.

NATALIA FILINA:

Thank you. Nice to see all of you. And maybe I will not say nothing new, but I would say that it's nice and very hot discussion. When we discuss the participation and the activity and successful implementation of our mobilization recommendation, we must always remember that we are dealing with volunteers and we cannot act like in trade companies again. And the quality and frequency of participation, we know that directly depends on the regional specifics and ownership of participation resource. As people before me already said, we are talking about time, money, conditions of life, and it's very important. And we should understand that we have a very different starting position for each of us, for each ALS. And for example, for the establishment of the metrics, we should also be very sensitive and we should be targeted and set up these for different ALSes, group of members, and probably for different regions.

And another two points. There are members and participants we have who are regionally and locally very effective. But at the same time, we have members, representative of ALSes who are globally within our framework. It's a very important difference. And I think we are, like as RALO leaders, may be struggling in our imagination that we have an ideal internal business processes. But I think we are still not the ideal with our internal processes and maybe criticized, of course. And maybe we should work on inside processes and then look at how much we do for involved members, ALSs, and for giving these resources, ICANN resources, and provide the information and what we as leaders do for this. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks very much, Natalia. I think those, again, are very good points. Two points I want to raise that sometimes gets lost in this is we also have non-elected volunteers who are doing significant work on our behalf. And we want to make sure that we are putting them in the best position to do that work.

We also have instances in which we might want flexibility. So, for example, Hadia has requested that in Kigali we have an expansion of the number of participants in ALSes for some kind of a special program—I don't know all the details yet—to be involved in the ICANN meeting. And so that we are trying to free up more than the normal travel slots for African participants at that meeting. So to do that will require give and take and will require using some slots that would otherwise be used another way. And I think we want to preserve the flexibility to do things that are different. When the APRALO brought the students, they didn't need this help. But maybe they were doing something similar and might have needed travel funding to bring people in to do a youth program or something like that. So I think it's important to be in a position to accommodate these kinds of requests as part of the kind of travel policy that we develop. So it's both those things. It's not just elected people, but the people that are doing other kinds of work, which I completely agree and everyone has mentioned. We need to find a way to reward and facilitate the participation of all these folks at the meetings. Everybody is involved in this conversation. Nobody is doing anything top-down.

All right. So I think I had a couple more slides, but I'm worn out now. So what I may do is just adjourn this meeting early. I really appreciate everyone's participation and discussion on this. I don't pretend to have all the answers. I do not. We're just trying to reach to an objective policy. All other groups within ICANN are trying to do the same thing, which is figure out how to objectify the process of travel while maintaining the flexibility to get the people to the meetings that we need to have for work groups and other types of participation. So we're just one of many groups that are struggling with this very issue. So I appreciate all of your struggles and your input. Go ahead, Marita.

MARITA MOLL:

Oh, hi, Jonathan. I just wanted to thank you and everyone for persevering through what is a difficult conversation. But I think we all need to remember when we're having these conversations that we are all working to the same goal. We're here to support the multi-stakeholder system, how it works at ICANN. We have to show that it's working on our side. We are the only multi-stakeholder system that actually has an end users group. So although we may, you know, have disagreements like this, let's just make sure we're all coming from the right spot, that we all know that it's in our interest to make sure this group, this whole system works in our own group, and that we can solve these kind of problems. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Marita, for those words of wisdom.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I just wanted to point out something that, yes, I do not have a problem with what you mentioned, the fact that Africa will have more spaces at the next ICANN meeting. But the problem I have is the process. I don't think it is correct for you to just mention this casually. It is something that is supposed to be discussed, agreed, not just for us to hear it casually that it's going to happen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, it hasn't even been decided. I was just mentioning it as a potential that we would want to take into consideration. That's all. That's what we're trying to do, is come up with a process. All right. Thanks, everyone. I'm going to give you five minutes back to your lunch hour. Tough conversation, but I really appreciate you. Thank you. And thanks to the interpreters. They worked extra hard this meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]