This report comments on the usefulness of each of the accountability indicators vs accountability.

Accountability indicators can be found at: https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators

Please note that these Accountability Indicators are bundled into the categories used in the current Strategic Plan, are not specific to any other review recommendations such as ATRT2 nor do these align with standard organisational accountability Indicators but rather reflect the unique nature of ICANN.

It is useful to note that the ATRT3 asked two questions regarding the accountability indicators in its survey. The results from these questions included that only 50% of individuals and Structures (SOACs and their component parts) responded that they were aware of the accountability indicators. Additionally, of those Structures that were aware of these 67% responded that the accountability indicators were Somewhat Ineffective which provides clear indication that the accountability indicators are significantly below expectations.

The comments made on each of the accountability indicators are meant as a constructive criticism of these and often include suggestions for improvements. Each of these has been rated on a scale of 0 to 4 for effectiveness vs accountability where 0 is Not Effective and 4 Very Effective.

A comment made by a respondent to the ATRT3 survey best sums up the global assessment of these accountability indicators:

> One should not confuse transparency and accountability. Transparency is but one requirement for accountability.

Assessment of Accountability Indicators

1. **1 Evolve and further globalize ICANN**
   1.1. Further globalize and regionalize ICANN functions
       1.1.1. Number of Sessions with Simultaneous Interpretation at ICANN Public Meetings
           1.1.1.1.   Good to have the numbers from ICANN public meetings but surely there is more than just language services to Further globalize and regionalize ICANN functions? No reporting on the plans and objectives of Regional Offices and Engagement Centres? Assessment 1.
       1.1.2. Percentage of Sessions with Simultaneous Interpretation at ICANN Public Meetings
           1.1.2.1.   See previous comments.

1.2. Bring ICANN to the world by creating a balanced and proactive approach to regional engagement with stakeholders

    1.2.1.   ICANN Events by Stakeholder Categories and regions

        1.2.1.1.   The #'s are interesting from a transparency POV but there is no objective against which they are measured – how many sessions were planned for each region, how many were organized by ICANN vs how many were we invited to and what types were these, what was the participation at these events, is there any kind of satisfaction survey of the participants to those events, what is the media coverage of these, were these recorded? Assessment 1.

1.3. Evolve policy development and governance processes, structures, and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective, and responsive

    1.3.1.   Representation - Formal Membership totals across Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

        1.3.1.1.   Interesting numbers from a transparency POV but given the relative constancy of the numbers there is limited value in this from an accountability POV. Would this not be the ideal place to show the progress being made in implementing WS2 recommendations, the results of the various Specific Reviews and other activities such as evolving the MSM? Assessment 1.

    1.3.2.   Participation - Measure of Community Activity in Policy Development and Engagement

        1.3.2.1.   Uncertain how participation in public comments is a gauge of community activity in policy development and engagement given PCs are about more than PDPs (only about 20% of PCs in 2018 were PDP related). If we only had PC's that were about PDPs it would be a start but what would be useful to know from an accountability POV is how many comments for each PDP and more importantly if the comments were taken on or not. Perhaps presenting an analysis of attendance to PDP meetings sorted by affiliation would be a beginning of something more useful? Assessment 0.

    1.3.3.   Active Working Groups and Other Policy Activities.

        1.3.3.1.   Numbers are interesting from a transparency POV and from a resourcing POV by presenting how many working groups have to be supported. However, this falls short of expectations one could have for accountability. One thing that would be interesting in this area would be tracking the number of members of these groups vs the participation at each meeting and then aggregate this up to look at the difference between the groups in an SOAC and then the difference in participation between various SOACs? Assessment 1.

    1.3.4.   SO/AC Policy and Advice Development - Number of Teleconferences and Working Hours

1.3.4.1.   Numbers are interesting from a transparency POV and from a resourcing POV by presenting how many meetings have to be supported. However, this falls short of expectations one could have for accountability. This could be merged with the previous point showing by WG attendance etc. Assessment 1.

1.3.5.   Total: Email Exchanges on Specific Policy and Advice Issues

1.3.5.1.   Numbers are interesting from a transparency POV however fall short of expectations one could have for accountability. For this to be useful one should be able to see emails per working group per quarter and also identify how many different senders there are after removing staff emails (which can account for large numbers with meeting announcements, reminders etc). Assessment 1.

1.3.6.   Productivity - SO/AC Council Resolutions and Advice Statements Completed

1.3.6.1.   Numbers but this time it is about official acts, council resolutions and the like, so this is of some interest. It would be more useful to categorize these by items that are intended to be internal to the SOAC and those that are external as to the Org or the Board. Assessment 2.

2. **Support a healthy, stable, and resilient unique identifier ecosystem**

   2.1. Foster and coordinate a healthy, secure, stable, and resilient identifier ecosystem

      2.1.1.   Overall Performance

         2.1.1.1.   Results based on a robust and transparent process to generate this make it a very good accountability indicator. Assessment 4.

      2.1.2.   New gTLD: Customer Satisfaction

         2.1.2.1.   Results based on a robust and transparent process to generate this make it a very good accountability indicator. Assessment 4.

   2.2. Proactively plan for changes in the use of unique identifiers, and develop technology roadmaps to help guide ICANN activities

      2.2.1.   ICANN Interaction with the Technical and Public Safety Communities (presentations, publications, training)

         2.2.1.1.   Similar comment to 1.2.1 for meetings and training. Assessment 1.

      2.2.2.   Domain Abuse Activity Reporting

         2.2.2.1.   Essentially high-level project tracking which had the project ending in February 2019. We are now in late August 2019 so out of date. Assessment 0.

      2.2.3.   Internet Technology Health Indicators

         2.2.3.1.   Essentially high-level project tracking which had the project ending in June 2019. We are now in October 2019 so out of date. Assessment 0.

   2.3. Support the evolution of domain name marketplace to be robust, stable, and trusted

      2.3.1.   Domain Name Marketplace Indicators (Robust Competition, gTLD Marketplace Stability, Trust)

        2.3.1.1.   Essentially a high-level project tracking which had the project ending in September 2019. Assessment 1.

3. **Advance organizational, technological, and operational excellence**
   3.1. Ensure ICANN's long-term financial accountability, stability, and sustainability
       3.1.1.   Short Term Financial Accountability
           3.1.1.1.   Results based on a robust and transparent process to generate this make this a good accountability indicator. Providing a longer period for comparison purposes would be a useful addition. Assessment 3.
       3.1.2.   Long-Term Financial Accountability (Funds Under Management: Reserve Fund)
           3.1.2.1.   Results based on a robust and transparent process to generate this make this a very good accountability indicator. Assessment 4.
       3.1.3.   Percentage Staff Voluntary Turnover Trailing-Twelve-Month Trend
           3.1.3.1.   Results based on a robust and transparent process to generate this make this a very good accountability indicator. Assessment 4.
       3.1.4.   Security Operations
           3.1.4.1.   Results based on a process to generate the data points make this a good accountability indicator, but transparency is lacking which is understandable in this area but limits the usefulness of this indicator. Assessment 3.
       3.1.5.   On-Time Delivery and Quality Index of the ICANN Planning Process
           3.1.5.1.   From a Timing standpoint results based on a process to generate the data points make this a very good accountability indicator. Evaluating the quality of documents vs Spelling & Grammar, Style and Terminology is probably of limited value to most users. Adding the community participation component will be a very good addition if done properly. Assessment 3.
       3.1.6.   Risk Management
           3.1.6.1.   Unclear what is being reported on here and how (forest from the trees issue?). Assessment 0.
   3.2. 3.2 Ensure structured coordination of ICANN's technical resources
       3.2.1.   ICANN Digital Services Availability
           3.2.1.1.   Unclear what Digital Services include, some sort of general description should be included. Additionally, there is no mention about how the data is obtained and the only update is from March 2019 while we are currently in October 2019 - to be of value these indicators have to clear and current. Assessment 1.
       3.2.2.   Universal Acceptance Readiness
           3.2.2.1.   Unclear what is being measured here and how as well as what the targets are. Assessment 0.
       3.2.3.   DNSSEC Adoption
           3.2.3.1.   The average user may have difficulty understanding what this is about - explaining what the ICANN Domain Name Portfolio is could help this.

Although it is important to know that domains in the ICANN portfolio are signed many would wonder about domains overall vs DNSSEC. Limited value especially as it tends to a steady state. Assessment 2.

3.2.4. IPv6 Adoption

3.2.4.1. This includes two graphics - IPv6 Deployment status: Anycast instances of the ICANN Managed Root Server (IMRS) and IPv6 Deployment Status: ICANN Org Services. Now both of these have no information on how the data is obtained or what the targets are beyond a statement saying "All services are accessible over IPv4 and capable of being accessed over IPv6. Our target is to have all services accessible over both IPv4 and IPv6." without providing any dates. Additionally, both these graphics have been static for the last year without any explanation. Assessment 1.

3.2.5. Information Security

3.2.5.1. Results based on a robust process to generate the data make this a very good accountability indicator. It would be good to specify what systems are covered by this metric and why the target is consistently missed and what is being done to address this - if relevant. Assessment 3.

3.3. Develop a globally diverse culture of knowledge and expertise available to ICANN's Board, organization, and stakeholders

3.3.1. Achievement of Globally Diverse Culture and Knowledge Levels – Stakeholders

3.3.1.1. Useful representation of core data to provide some sense of how well ICANN is of interest to the various communities of the world via its use of rotating its meetings over the 5 regions. Aggregating this data over all the meetings would help provide a longer-term view of this. Assessment 2.

3.3.2. Achievement of Globally Diverse Culture and Knowledge Levels – Community

3.3.2.1. ICANN Learn is an impressive collection of material some of which is available in other languages. Simply measuring the number of users in the three categories of New, Active and Super learners is of some value but seems to fall short of providing information to judge how well ICANN is doing vs this objective. No explanation is provided on how the targets are set, no information is provided on which regions the learners are from and what their mother tongue is. What is the usage of the non-English resources, is there a set of objectives to provide additional multilingual versions of courses? Is there any kind of satisfaction survey of users to rate these services? Assessment 2.

3.3.3. Achievement of Globally Diverse Culture and Knowledge Levels – Organization (Years of Service: Global-FY19-Q3, Region: Global | Years of Service: All)

3.3.3.1. Factual and somewhat useful at a macro level. Years of experience could be a rough indicator of retained knowledge in the company. Simply listing the number of employees per area is factual but a comparison over time of the

number of employees in each region would seem more useful for the objective of a globally diverse culture. Assessment 2.

    3.3.4. Achievement of Global Knowledge Development Programs – Organization (Talent Development Courses Offered (courses offered))

        3.3.4.1. Showing the number of courses offered in each quarter in each of the six categories is of limited value. Who attended these courses, how many people attended the courses, what are the targets based on, is there any evaluation of user satisfaction of these courses? Assessment 1.

    3.3.5. Achievement of Globally Diverse Culture and Knowledge Levels – Board

        3.3.5.1. Simply listing the region of the directors is factual but of limited value. Also, the pie chart graphic only includes voting Board members and is not clickable while the map, which is clickable, includes both voting members and liaisons which is slightly confusing. Accountability in this area would provide some sort of analysis of this distribution over time and separating voting members from liaisons. This could be augmented by doing this individually for each SO or AC that nominates directors as well as the NomCom to understand if these units are working towards the stated objective. Assessment 1.

    3.3.6. Achievement of Global Knowledge Development Programs – Board (Board Training by Fiscal Year, Board Composition: FY19(returning vs new), Board Training Sessions: FY19 (#s))

        3.3.6.1. Factual but of limited value. ATRT2's recommendation 1 states "The Board should develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN Board members and the success of Board improvement efforts, and analyze those findings over time." and staff have pointed to this as the implementation of this recommendation which at best represents only partial implementation. In addition to this ATRT2 recommendation 2 states "The Board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts, and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement.". Again, staff have pointed to this element as showing the implementation of this recommendation, yet this does not address metrics for improvement and the materials used for training do not seem to be published. Assessment 1.

    3.3.7. Nominating Committee Composition (by region)

        3.3.7.1. Similar comment to 3.3.5.

4. Promote ICANN's role and multistakeholder approach

   4.1. Encourage engagement with the existing Internet governance ecosystem at national, regional, and global levels

      4.1.1. Government and IGO Engagement and Participation in ICANN (# of govts and orgs)

4.1.1.1.   This is somewhat confusing and probably of little value to most users. Understanding that dealing with governments are often delicate undertakings there is certainly better reporting which includes some sort of targets which can be provided. Assessment 0.

4.2. Clarify the role of governments in ICANN and work with them to strengthen their commitment to supporting the global Internet ecosystem

    4.2.1.   Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) Membership and Meeting Participation (Total Membership and Participation in Public Meetings)

        4.2.1.1.   Firstly, repeating the same graphic twice, for all intents and purposes, does not really add value. In addition to this simply using these raw numbers does not really provide much added value beyond stating basic facts. One might expect, as a minimum, that this participation data would be broken down by region. A key component, without getting into which governments attend how many meetings, could be repeat attendance, training etc. It is also slightly confusing that this segment uses a different set of regions vs all other reporting in ICANN. Assessment 1.

4.3. Participate in the evolution of a global, trusted, inclusive multistakeholder Internet governance ecosystem that addresses Internet issues

    4.3.1.   Cumulative Participation in IG Ecosystem

        4.3.1.1.   There seems to be very little value in this segment apart for saying ICANN participated in those events. It is also frustrating that the timeline between this point and the following one do not match up. Assessment 0.

    4.3.2.   Number of Regional and National IGF Initiatives (#'s)

        4.3.2.1.   Obviously, there is some interest in tracking the number of national and regional IGF initiatives. However, this adds little value as it simply presents raw numbers over time. It could be useful to understand which regions these initiatives are being held in, comparing this over time, if these are regional or national, what was ICANN attendance at these, what was the overall attendance, what presentations did ICANN make did ICANN offer any sponsorships etc. Assessment 1.

4.4. Promote role clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem rooted in the public interest

    4.4.1.   Percentage of Contractual Compliance Service Level Targets That Were Met (% vs target).

        4.4.1.1.   Results based on a robust and transparent process to generate this make this a very good accountability indicator. Assessment 4.

5. **Develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by ICANN's mission**

5.1. Public Interest Considerations from Board Resolution (Public Interest Considerations from Board Resolutions: Progress Against Target)

5.1.1.   Firstly, the title says "progress against target" but there is no target provided? Next there is no definition or link to a definition of what qualifies as a Public Interest Consideration. Unclear what the value of this is beyond saying we pass public interest resolutions. Assessment 1.

5.2. Promote ethics, transparency, and accountability across the ICANN community

5.2.1.   Specific Reviews Are an Important Transparency and Accountability Mechanism (# of recommendations)

5.2.1.1.   Useful information for ongoing reviews. Assessment 2.

5.2.2.   Ethics (We measure compliance with the mandatory ethics training for ICANN Board members and the ICANN organization, and the submission by the ICANN organization of required conflict-of-interest disclosure statements.)

5.2.2.1.   Not much added value beyond saying we meet all the requirements, which are important. Assessment 2.

5.2.3.   Transparency (Board Decision-Making Materials Published / Redacted)

5.2.3.1.   Useful presentation of facts. Number of pages and % of pages are one measure however it could be more valuable to see redactions vs specific recommendations on a quarterly basis (eg 36 resolutions passed, 6 included redacted elements). Assessment 2.

5.2.4.   Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (only measure # of requests completed and if on time).

5.2.4.1.   Useful data to see the trend as to the number of requests. However as was noted in WS2 transparency recommendations simply saying a request has been responded to, which could mean it is rejected, is not very useful. What would be useful is categorizing the responses. Assessment 2.

5.2.5.   Deadline for Publishing Annual Audited Financial Statement (days vs deadline)

5.2.5.1.   Useful statement of facts but not much added value. Assessment 1.

5.2.6.   Annual Operating Plan and Budget (# of comments made vs responses provided – always 100%)

5.2.6.1.   Useful statement of facts but what is most important for accountability is understanding what the response was and if the comments that were made were taken on or not instead of noting they were responded to. Assessment 1.

5.2.7.   Accountability (We measure the timeliness of posting of Independent Review Process materials and reconsideration requests on icann.org. Additionally, we measure the degree of compliance with the annual acknowledgment by the ICANN organization of the anonymous employee hotline policy.)

5.2.7.1.   Timely posting of materials is good to know but there is little added value in this. Classifying the results of all these requests using some simple scheme such as accepted or rejected as well as the time to process such requests would provide useful information. Assessment 1.

5.2.8. In and out of-Scope Complaints (# of complaints, The Complaints Office handles complaints regarding ICANN organization that do not fall into an existing complaints mechanism, such as Contractual Compliance)

    5.2.8.1. Useful information with some added value. On "In-Scope Complaints" raw numbers are useful over time. On "In-Scope Complaints by Status: FY18-Q3" it is unclear how the time to close a complaint is tracked if it goes beyond the quarter? On "In-Scope Complaints by Department: FY18-Q3" there are too many categories to effectively use a pie chart - either aggregate using the top 4 or 5 or go to a list. Overall for in-scope it would be useful to understand average time to resolution statistics as well as some sort of statistics on the success rate of complaints. On the out-of-scope complaints - it is unclear what Type category the majority of the Q3 outliers are in? Assessment 2.

5.3. Empower current and new stakeholders to fully participate in ICANN activities

  5.3.1. Programs to Support Community Participation (Fellows and Next Gen, # of participants vs target?)

    5.3.1.1. Useful raw information. How are targets decided? Assessment 2.