

---

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you very much. Good day everyone, welcome to the ATRT3 Plenary #44 on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of January, 2020 at 2100 UTC. Members attending the call today include Cheryl, Demi, Jaap, Leon, Pat, Vanda and Sabastian. Observers joining today are Avri, Jim, Chantelle and Sophie.

Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar and Brenda, Technical Writer Bernie has joined. We do have apologies from Jacques. Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking and Cheryl and Pat, I'll turn the call over to you both. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Brenda. Welcome on behalf of Pat and I. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr and I'll note with Sophie here that Lou is perhaps unable to join us but she will be reporting back to him to ensure he's continued interaction with our work and if that's not the case, I'm sure she'll let us know. With that, I notice Osvaldo has just joined us as well. Welcome one and all. Is there anybody who needs to make an update to their Statements of Interest?

I noticed that Daniel hasn't joined us yet but he will have a Statement of Interest Update to report to us. We were pleased to hear and we congratulated him as the Leadership Team on Monday, when we met, that he has an advisory position with his national government for one of the particular areas of expertise he has.

---

*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.*

He will give us the details of that in chat and of course, update his SOI. That's a bi proxy update but obviously, when he joins us, we will be able to find out the gory details, unless Pat's memory is better than mine on that. Yes, it's excellent to news to hear Daniel going from strength to strength, including in his own area of employment.

With that, I think that's about it for Item 1. We have a relatively large agenda today but a lot to do in our time. Obviously, the primary activity we're going to be doing today after we review the Public Comments received so far and certainly, I am aware of several comments pending and being drafted by the Advisory Committee and support organization that I'm more deeply involved with. More will be coming. That's going to take us a little bit of time but the majority of our time will be spent on Accountability Indicators today.

I want to thank Bernie and Pat with the work we've been able to do with Bernie to get that into some form early drafting for your viewing and reviewing pleasure. Is there any other business that anyone wishes to let us know about now? Noting we will call for Any Other Business again at the end of our gathering.

Not seeing any hands going. With that, I'm going to hand over to I believe Jennifer, in terms of Item 2.4 Actions Item New and Closed, which will include the checking on the Brussels face to face meeting, etc. Over to you Jennifer.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. I'm actually going to hand quickly to Brenda, who will cover off the Brussels, she's been more in the loop than I have been. Brenda, please.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Jennifer. I was told by Joseph in ICANN Travel that the hotel letters went out yesterday. If you did not receive a hotel, your information letter regarding the hotel Brussels, that means you have not booked your travel yet or it's pending. Pat, you're an exception, you should -- I believe you did not get your hotel information yesterday, you will get it very soon, since I gave them the information you shared with me.

Otherwise, do we have anyone else; I believe there are two outstanding folks who have not confirmed their travel. One is Tola, who is working on his Visa still and another, let's see, I'm going to give you just a quick update. Remit let me know that he will not be able to join in person, that's the update I have regarding your Brussels meeting. Does anyone having to share? Yes, Jaap, I see your message and I've let travel know that you will be travelling by train.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He still needs a hotel confirmation.

BRENDA BREWER: Osvaldo has not received hotel; I will ask travel about that immediately.

---

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I just got five minutes ago, they got my receipt of train ride, so maybe they were waiting on that. I'll see what will happen.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Jaap.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, that sounds like Brenda has got her finger on the pulse of all this. As long as we don't find any predicted issues, it looks like we're on track. Just double checking that we will have more than adequate remote participation for Remy to attend and if Tola is unsuccessful with his Visa, for him to also be engaged?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I can answer that. Since we will be in the Brussels office, we will have all the standard equipment we expect and we're also going to have tech staff in the room with us for the three days. We don't anticipate any issues at all with remote participation. If you are participating remotely and you want to drop us a line as to the time you expect to online then that's always good to know, otherwise we'll be on standby as usual to expect that. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is good news. Thank you very much for that, Jennifer. Pat, anything we need to do more on the Brussels check in? Obviously, the agenda won't be terribly surprising, we'll be reviewing Public Comments and seeking to develop recommendations and suggestions towards a

---

final format. Is there anything else we need to discuss now in this action item?

PAT KANE:

On Brussels, no I don't believe so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Do you want to take Webinar Feedback? I had a good time. I thoroughly enjoyed all of the webinar. I have noted in fact that there have been additional webinars, including some done in specific languages for language communities such as Vanda did one for the LACRALO in Latin America and Caribbean Region. I know other of our Review Team Members have also given presentations to their committees and organizations. Pat, over to you.

PAT KANE:

Thanks, Cheryl. I'm not certain that I would say we had a good time but I think they were well received. The second one that we had was a little bit lighter anticipation but I guess that kind of expected because the first one was more in a timeslot where we had a lot more people that would have been able to dial in. I think from a feedback standpoint, what I've received so far has been positive on it. That we answered the questions.

I think the questions that have come out clearly are around the two primary items that we're addressing, which is the Prioritization as well as the Reviews. I think that Sebastien did a good job of describing the

---

Option #2 in terms of what the benefits are and how that laid out but I think those are the particular areas.

I'd be interested if anyone else received out of cycle or out of band commentary from the Community and for those had held more regionalized or specific structure reviews, if they had the same experience as we did in the broader available webinars? Vanda, your hand is raised.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

From our group we the normal questions about the recommendations and the how will this really work if it's considerations about the suggestions, etc., but also, we had questions about methodologies, to understand if we have accomplish the mission or if the suggestions was in a way to get out of our mission and some ideas about how to use the methodology to end up with suggestions and not the recommendations.

Some of those questions in our region on point but mostly people's comments were positive and they had some difficulties to understand how the prioritization entity to could work and some specifics on that. It's something that I asked for suggestions. If they have some specifics they want to add, to please join and comment on that. Most of it was about that. But in general, was very good feedback from my region.

PAT KANE:

Cheryl, your hand is raised.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, it is, thanks Pat. Vanda, if I can just drill down a little bit with your regional experience. Would I be correct in assuming that there was another level of complexity in terms of the understanding of the use of the term suggestion and what that meant?

We saw that even in the predominately English speaking pre-webinars we did with Consolidated Policy Working Group in the At-Large Community, we at least made some modifications to the slide deck for the main webinar to try and make clearer what the situation is with the new guidelines and it takes to make a Capital R Recommendation. Do you think it was a consequence of that and that transition of expectations of the community and what we can and can't do?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I don't believe. I believe that was mostly to understand. The question was done by Alejandro, being vice chair and the board, so it's someone that understands quite well those languages. Alejandro asked about the methodology, to make sure if our mission and the methodology we used was compatible with the newest standards and the recommendations and suggestions, was done under those -- not only standards but the methodology was not escape to do the right thing. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thanks for that Vanda. That's important for us to understand as review team. I would suggest -- without having any idea how successful you were at helping him understand and become assured but I would suggest that we should be having no issue at all when standing

---

behind our methodology as a robust one and one that is defensible as doing more than our best and in some cases, beyond expectations to meet our mission, under our current circumstances and the restraints we have in terms of time.

Thank you for that. We might want to make sure we discuss that further in our gathering at Brussels, when we look at overarching issues from webinar feedback and public comment. That's all the commentary I wanted to make. I'll put my hand back down. Back to you Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Anyone else want to weigh in on this topic. I know Sebastien, you led a regionalized or structure specific review of the deck, I was wondering if you had any comments that you'd like to add?

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET:

We had a presentation but in fact we were both Vanda, Danielle, Sharon, myself in this presentation to At-Large. In fact, we have done one prior to holidays and one after holiday break. Now they are starting to work on writing a comment.

My only concern, in fact when I look to the different webinars, when the people just listen to the presentation first and then if they just read the summary, it's I guess a little bit difficult for them to understand where we come from about the Option 1 and Option 2 and I have the impression that they are missing pieces that have because we have done the work and might be better explain.



---

I don't know if we can do that before but at least we will need to explain, what was the element of our thinking to get us to the Option 2. Example is, we try, I will write finally it's a little bit misleading because we try to stagger the different element of any type of review in Option 2, for decrease too much work, then we explain with a color but it's also a question of budget and time commitment from the Staff and from the Community.

We didn't explain so much why we consider that CCT will end that as a number 2, why we consider it's over and why we think that SSR is also something we need to be handled very differently. For example, SSR we have feedback and I guess we will discuss that in the next item of the current agenda. People from SSR seems to be very, very reluctant to change their mind about the need of SSR and even to have a big change, they accept a little change but not so much.

I think we need to have this thinking about why we consider that SSR would be -- we don't need any more or we did it differently because what have changed since the launch of the affirmation, the launch of those reviews, agreement between the US Government and ICANN. Sorry, I was a little bit too long. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Sebastien. If I can summarize, basically what people are looking for, at least the feedback that you've received, is a little bit more rationale as to what's behind the specific commentary on Option 2?

---

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm not sure that they are waiting for but it's my understanding of what are the question and the feedback we received on that after some explanations they understand better why we are there and they feel more comfortable because the first thing is to say, where is accountability on all the topic are gone. If we explain why and how, it's I guess they understood better.

PAT KANE: Okay, very good. That's very helpful, thank you. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Here I just wanted to follow on from what Sabastien was mentioning. One of the things I observed, Vanda, Daniel and myself and Sabastien, also attended as a resource, the Drafting Team Meeting today, the penholders of the comment that we will be expecting to get from the At-Large Advisory Committee and it really was a matter of, the devil was in the detail and it almost came down to trust.

They're concerned about, this isn't working now and we know it's not working now but how do we know the new thing is going to work any better? So, I think we left them in general terms, saying, "Say exactly that. Say the details of the implementation is essential. Say the support of the change makes sense but that there is concern that it's going to be wholesale support and engagement with the wider ICANN Community."

I think it's almost product of ICANN being what ICANN is and so I'm not going to lose any sleep over it, I think it's worthwhile sharing that we

---

certainly experienced that. In case of one of the drafters, a very experienced specific review team person. Thanks.

PAT KANE:

Thank you for that, Cheryl. The question I would have is, do you think that the comments about not certain that what we are proposing would work, from a context standpoint would that than apply to just about anything that we would have suggested or recommended? Because it seems to me that your point about trust, is that we can't really know with certainty whether any recommendation to change, what we're using today would work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for the question, Pat. To be honest, I think it's an almost -- we could be designing new widgets here in an industry. It's the whole change management thing is utterly common in these circumstances. How do we know the new thing will be better? There's ways of managing that. Look to standards. Look to agreements. Look to getting buy in before decisions are made. All that sort of stuff.

I think we need when we're making our recommendations and final suggestions, to be very aware that the community is still very much in need of that belts and braces approach and going into possibly very significant details or having some unclad guarantees, with that, I'm hoping that Leon has his ears very closely listening to all of this because how the Board manages our recommendations and suggestions is also going to be viewed with an even more jaded set of spectacles.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Sabastien, please.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat. If I try to put things together in this discussion, the reflection [inaudible] need to be taken into account quite closely, the reason is that he was the one who led ICANN 2.0 in 2002 as the vice chair of the Board and he was in charge, that's the first point.

The second is that, I am not sure that they knew that ccNSO will work, that the ISO will work and that when the PSO was disband that it will be okay, therefore we don't know but what we think and we are sure is that we do that and now our proposal is in good faith to announce at ICANN in the future. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sabastien, appreciate that. Any other webinar feedback or commentary in this particular section? Seeing no hands in the participant window or comments in the group chat, let's go ahead and move on to a preview of the Public Comments. Who did we decide on Monday was going to take us through this, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't know that we decided but I'm certainly suggesting that Bernie does.

---

PAT KANE: Okay.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Preview of the Public Comments, we only have one comment so far. I don't know if we can show it Brenda, do you have it lined up?

BRENDA BREWER: Yup, one second please.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: The comment is from the chair of SSR2, Russ Housley. Basically, only focusses on Options 1 and 2 for the reviews. I think that sort of fits in with what Sabastien was saying relative to SSR folks. At the end of it, I'm not going to read the whole thing, but at the end of it he is more supportive of Option 1 and that's all we have right now.

Given our deadline, it's not very surprising that we only have one comment so far. I guess we will get a lot of comments right up to the end of it and maybe a day or two past and we'll do our darndest to include everything, so we can look at in Brussels. That's all I have unless there are questions.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. I got as well, he was offering up maybe another process that would reduce time and focus some of the effort wrapped in conjunction with an ICANN meeting to do some of the significant work and it seems to me that what we had found is that there is enough

---

conflict between the reviews teams at ICANN meetings, that that being the significant or a significant portion of where work takes place, would be really tough.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I think we just have to look at activities like this review, ATRT, where we certainly can't fit that in during the week of meetings and it's been our experience on a whole bunch of other things. I absolutely agree with you, it's a good intention on certain practices proven this just could not work

PAT KANE: We'd almost have to end up having a three ITU type meeting.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, exactly. A plenty pot meeting for ICANN and I'm not sure the community would be very excited about that.

PAT KANE: Nope, I agree. Alright, while thank you. Let's move on to the next item, which is taking a look at the Accountability Indicators. Bernie, you're going to be up for this.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Oh, really? Okay. I'm surprised, alright. Let's have a look at this. A little background on this, we sort of had a look at this when we were in a Singapore. We sort of had a few comments on that first draft, took

---

those comments on and tried to restructure our comments and make them the most useful to ICANN. Let's remember that our beginning point was that, as it says on the screen, 50 percent of individuals and structures responded that they were aware of the accountability indicators, which means 50 percent were not.

Additionally, of those structures that were aware, 67 percent responded that accountability indicators were somewhat ineffective. Obviously, some issues. I think the best way was to actually go through these one by one and try to put in an intelligent comment on that.

I'm going to say we're going to start that long road; I doubt we can get through that today but by doing some of these, I'm hoping that the members will get a feeling for what I am proposing as a structure to see if it actually makes sense. That's my objective here. Before we get going, are there any questions? I'm not seeing anything. Brenda, let's go down to the first one please.

Alright, so they're divided into the accountability indicators are broken down into the five pillars of the Strategic Plan. For me anyways, if you're calling something an accountability indicator, there's the word accountability. If you're going to make something accountable, there has to be some sort of measure verses a target or something and that will be a theme that will repeat as we go through this. The first pillar is Evolve and Further Globalize ICANN.

The first part here is the interpretation, the sub objective is further globalizing and regionalize ICANN functions. If we go down just a bit, we see that what we're being presented with as an accountability

---

indicator is the number of sessions with simultaneous interpretation on ICANN meetings. We have live interpretation in that greenish color and the total number of sessions. There's text accompanying this. The ICANN language service defines proactive translation as the translation of a document into UN languages without the need of pre-translation evaluation. For more detailed information regarding ICANN's translation and language service policies and translation see community wiki.

Let's go down to the next point. The assessment, we're going to see the next graphic is related to the SO. We're looking at percentage of sessions with simultaneous interpretation at ICANN public meetings, which is another version of that previous graphic but on this one, we have a target which is pretty steady at somewhere around 27 percent.

Let's drop down. Here's our first assessment. You'll recognize this structure into the three blocks. The link between the primary objective, evolve and further globalize ICANN and the sub objective of further globalize and regionalize ICANN functions is clear and direct. That would make sense.

The link between the sub objective of further globalize and regionalize ICANN function and the data of interpretation of at ICANN conferences is limited given ICANN has always held these conferences with interpretation and as such it is unclear how simply showing the number of sessions that are interpreted further globalizes or regionalizes ICANN function. In that second, we're looking at, if you will, the applicability versus that sub objective.



---

On the third point, 11223, the value as an accountability indicator is limited as the objective is always significantly surpassed and there is no explanation as to how the objective was established and how it is reviewed. If we go back up just a bit to show folks the slide. You'll notice that there's a target there but it obviously has not changed in over 10 meetings. There is no explanation how it's set or how it could be reviewed. The relevance versus the objective is also unclear and that's what we're trying to bring forth in the assessment.

Let's bring up the full assessment again Brenda, please. I'll ask if there are -- now that we've done, I'll see if there are any questions before we go on. Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Bernie. When I was ready through Objective 1 and Objective 2, one of the things that I was keeping in mind was, how did the sub objective also relate to the objective and then when the assessment came in, for example, go 1.1, having to do with translation, how did that get to further evolve and further globalize? I guess 1.2 will end up being a better picture of that in terms of creating a balance and proactive post regional engagement.

I didn't just evaluate because I thought through it, the 1.1 and the graphic and what was actually being measured but also how that related to 1. Is that something that when you were going through and building out a little, did you look at that also? And I'd like to know if the team thinks that we should look at it as an isolation to where 1.1 is

---

being evaluated or all of 1, with its component parts, how to get to evolution and further globalization of ICANN?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, so two parts on that. That was my objective in the first part of the assessment, is looking at how the sub objective fit in with the top-level objective. You can only weigh the words that are there and you're trying to separate things out so that it makes sense. What I have not done and have not had time to do, is take a holistic view to all of Section 1 after it's done and that maybe an excellent comment, to say after we've gone through this and made these comments, maybe it would be useful to have a holistic evaluation or assessment of what's being offered for each major section, like Section 1.

PAT KANE: Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I'm thinking about reading the further globalizing, regionalize ICANN functions. I believe ICANN have done a lot of regionalize and globalize and not only related to language. Why they didn't pick up those lot of things that have been done and use as indicators or growing because some years ago, many years ago, they had a target to have for instance,

offices in each continent and they reached that. It's something that is well function.

Another is personal, that will be from around the world, how much distributed are people working for ICANN around the world. There is a lot of indicators that measure much better than the language and the interpretation. I see this index and this way to measure that very poor comparing with the opportunities ICANN has to show how globalized in many functions they are.

I would like to, if it's under our mission, to suggest many other information than ICANN to have this more clearly informed to the community about the globalization and regionalization of ICANN functions. That's just a point for me, amazing for this way to measure those or to use an indication for that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Vanda. Probably a couple of points I can make here. The first thing, I think they're trying to look forward with the strategic objectives is maybe one of the things and we have Leon, so maybe he can actually comment on that and Avri of course. I think maybe part of it was forward looking.

I think the second part of what you were talking about, is in my mind at least, related to what Pat was suggesting, is that maybe for each of the major sections we should have a comment after we finish making the detail assessments of each of the points. Those are things that we could welcome, people making suggestions in the Google Doc, if that makes sense.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, makes sense to me.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright and I see a thumbs up from Pat. Alright, I'll give Leon a chance to speak if he wants to but I don't want to put him on the --- I see Sabastien has a hand. Sabastien.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Bernie. Do we want to put proposal on what type of element or information we would like be gathered on those issues? Also, a question about what is shown here and what could be better shown in the future? Yes, I guess we and maybe we don't have enough time but the link between the strategy planning and now the five-year operating plan and what is shown here must be aligned. Is it what we are looking for, as we are talking about what we need accountability and transparency but maybe not the other points? Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I got some of them but I think that's a very good point, Sabastien. That's been something that's been -- that crept into my mind and before I'll carry on, I see Cheryl has her hand up, so I'll pass it over to Cheryl first.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I was happy to hear what was creeping into your mind Bernie, please, go ahead.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I can tell you; I'm aligned with a part of what Sabastien was saying here. I mean, if these are accountability indicators, do they really need to be structured according to the priorities of the strat plan? There are several examples in here of things where people are showing some data which is really good, it's unclear how it's linked to some of these objectives but they're very useful information and clear objective and seeing how we're doing. Definitely that was also something that was rummaging around in my mind when I was doing that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, and I'm glad I listen to you first of all, Bernie. In this case it helps me amplify a point I wanted to make. Let me start by going back slightly. Accountability indicators are not new, they are in many industries and sectors worldwide, commonly used and there are a set of traditional accountability indicators expectations wrapped around those sorts of things that people are very use to.

However, not all of those and I would argue even for the traditional industries, some of them, are really moving the targets of being measurable, very useful, some of them are -- let's look at annual report and annual financial reporting, a member organization with a million members and 0.001 percent of the people who receive a hard copy of that annual report ever even both to take it out of the envelope, I think one could argue, that there might be a smarter way of still working with

---

that indicator but not costing \$700,000 for the exercise. That's just an example and not an unreal one because I was once in an organization that had that problem.

That said, they are a very useful tool, one well designed and particularly, as you outlined in this document Bernie, the appropriate metrics are matched up to it. From my point of view however, it's sometimes very easy for an organization to put out data and metrics because they think it's an accountability indicator when what it is in fact is part of its transparency portfolio.

You can get some of that really interesting data which is useful, isn't meeting a particular accountability metric, especially if the metric isn't stated or the goal isn't stated but is still, if one puts the right aspiration of having a for frank fearless disclosure of all my document, whatever it is that doesn't matter.

It could be a word that puts together an objective that than allows that data to still be in a dashboard and accessible because it is good data but it's not actually doing anything as an accountability indicator, that's a very important thing in terms of organizational transparency and building trust and that in itself an achievable goal. Thank you. Did I confuse everybody?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

No, I think that's a very good point. You've actually taken up the second part of my thinking when I was going through this, in that there are several things in here which it would be very hard to set an objective for and we will see that when we get to some of the things OCTO is doing.

---

They're producing some really, really excellent reports on DNS Abuse, which is really, really useful information I think that everyone should look at and try and understand.

Now, it's really, really hard to set goals saying that you're going to reduce that, I think but, as Cheryl said. There's really three things we're talking about here and I think this is a very useful discussion, at least for me, for writing this. This first one is, do accountability indicators really have to be linked to those five pillars very directly?

Let's get some information that would be useful even as an accountability indicator, even if it doesn't fit that well against those strategic plans. Lastly, there are things which are not accountability indicators but are probably great to put out in some sort of a dashboard so people can follow the information. Jaap, I see you hand up.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

I've been struggling with this as well, same line as Cheryl. What we actually have here is an enormous bag of numbers on mixed quality but what are you trying to say and why they are collected is not clear at all. It might be very useful for some things, it's a mixed bag. It's very hard to make sense out of it why it is actually together anyway. That's the sort of. Also, underlying metrics for actually measured that, I guess that's similar like what you said, need to be holistic summary after detailed assessment.

---

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Jaap. I think all these comments are going in sort of the same direction. We went from the dashboard to accountability indicators that are structured by the priorities and I think everyone is struggling. Although I understand Jaap's point. I think the way to approach that is to talk about each one to try and explain it because if we remember in Singapore, that first version of the document, people asked us to be clearer as to why we didn't think these were working and I think that's what I've tried to do by putting in those comments.

I think also those meta points we've just made of, is this really what the community wants for transparency and accountability and are the things that are presented here really useful? I think it's about making those points in our report. Although Sabastien is right, we don't have a lot of time.

I think that this is important. If we are the ATRT, the Accountability and Transparency, this is the thing that is supposed to be continually produced, continually updated, that's a whole other point that we have issues with in here, which we can get to. Then that to me, seems it would be an important thing. Sabastien.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Bernie. Something we may wish also is to add something done by the community. I just want to take one example; I will put the link into the chat. The work done by Dev Anand Teelucksingh from Trinidad & Tobago is a tool to analyze the participation, the engagement, the number of people from each region, from different groups and when we are talking about globalization and regionalization,



---

you are here a lot of numbers, maybe too much, that's really very interesting to answer this part of the discussion about accountability element but is not done by ICANN Staff, it's done by one of the participants of At-Large. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Sabastien. Alright, excellent discussion. Any other points or questions? I think this has been very useful but I think it would be useful if we keep going through this, unless there is an objection. Not seeing any, let's do a few more.

As I said, as you've seen in the email, it's up as Google Doc and would really encourage people to go through it. I think once you get the sense of how this is put together, it's not as difficult as writing it and you probably can spend an hour or two going through it and you can put in comments and those would be very valuable. Also, some overarching comments would certainly be welcome as we have just discussed.

Let's go on to our next point. Bring ICANN to the World by Creating a Balanced and Proactive Approach through Regional Engagement with Stakeholder, a big, bold statement. We are getting as an indicator for that, ICANN events by stakeholder categories and regions. If you click on regions the graphics change and if you click on the type of category that will change, it won't change in my document but if you go in the actual accountability indicator.

Obviously, there was some usefulness. Also, I'll make a personal petty comment. This window in a window approach is a royal pain. I don't know who came up with this idea but it's not the best user interface,

---

just from a UI point of view. It's difficult to navigate. Having spent quite a few years in doing user interfaces, this is not one of the winning approaches, definitely.

Let's read the text. Regional outreach events are defined as speaking events participation in panels, workshops, bilateral outreach meetings with various stakeholders, as well as participation at various regional and international conferences across multiple sectors. The work relating to measurement of stakeholder participation and the effectiveness of the stakeholder experience at ICANN is currently under review and being re-planned.

A new timeline for the availability of this data and future plans for sharing the data will be published in the next edition of the accountability indicators. Let's go to our assessment. Linked between evolve and further globalized ICANN in the sub objective of bring ICANN to the world by creating a balanced and proactive approach to regional engagement with stakeholders seems relevant.

The link between the sub objective of bring ICANN to the world by creating a balanced and proactive approach to regional engagement of stakeholders and the data of the number of events, is relevant on its surface. Obviously, ICANN is out there talking to groups. The value as an accountability indicator is very limited, since there are no objective against which these are measured with respect to numbers. Again, this is what I was talking about before.

This is an accountability indicator, where's the accountability part? We're getting the indicator part, we're getting an idea of some data but

---

to my mind, it's not an accountability indicator if you're not measuring against anything. It's very limited since there are no objectives against which these are measure with respect to numbers and types of meetings, as well as any criteria for evaluating the success of these. It will be interesting to see how this evolves with the work that is promised to come forward. Again, nice transparency, nice numbers but what does it really give us? What does it really give us verses the objective is really not very strong, to me anyways?

Let's go down a bit. 1.3 We're changing gears here. Sorry, I'm not noticing the hand. Please, Sabastien.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Just to say that -- you talk about user interface, I will talk about the user usability. As chair of EURALO, I don't know where EURALO here or where the region that we as a participant, we use to work with. They have done that with their own view because staff organized like that but not us. I think we need to tell them that maybe they can work for us not just for them. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

And maybe that's a great comment, thank you, Sabastien. Now we're over in the policy department, which I think had trouble with accountability objectives, indicators. The sub objective is lofty, evolve policy development, governance processes, structures and meetings. Be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective and responsive. In English, motherhood and apple pie and everything but the kitchen sink. Very strong.

What we get for data is, formal membership totals across supporting organizations and advisory committees. Let's drop down and have a look at that graphic a bit better. You can select by groups, if we go down a bit, we see the graphic, that's the total we've got on the screen right now. If we go down to the next graphic, you can click and you can get the various SO and AC's, here's an example.

If we go down a bit to the text, has some details about how these things got calculated. Assessment, let's go down and bring up the assessment block. A link between evolve and further globalize ICANN and the sub objective or evolve policy development and governance processes, blah, blah, blah. Okay, seems relevant.

Link between sub objective of evolve policy development blah, blah, blah and the data of the number of members in ICANN and each SO and AC, is extremely limited verses the significant scope of the sub objective. I'm struggling with making it really positive link here. The value as an accountability indicator, missing that part of the sentence.

There is no real value as an accountability indicator, given there are no objectives against which this is measured and that the timeline of only a few years does not provide indication of any trends. What I'm going to do, is for this section 1.3, I'm not going to go through all of them because they're all pretty the same thing. They're numbers with no objectives. They're low level numbers in many cases. We'll just go through the graphics quickly and you'll get an idea.

The next one is, public forum, quantity and duration. If we can down a bit. We're getting a graphic about the number of public comment

---

---

forums per quarter I think and duration of these. I'm struggling very hard to see how this is going to be a valuable accountability indicator and the assessment reflects that.

Let's go down to 1.3. Another one, active working groups in other policy activities. Yet we don't define what a working group is and we don't define what the other policy activities are. We just have number of groups. Again, no objective set and you understand why. It would be very difficult and uncertain what it gives is.

Let's go to 1.34. You can read the assessment. SO/AC policy and advice development. Number of teleconferences and working hours. Again, no objectives and versus the objective we're talking about. If we go further down a bit, let's remember what the sub objective is. Evolve policy development and governance [inaudible] structures and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective and responsive and the number of durations of conference calls? I just don't see it, I'm sorry. Maybe it's just me. Sebastien.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. I wanted to talk about the question of the number of days for the comment. I guess it was useful when we set up a new policy for comment but I will not make the history total but to be sure that there more than 40 days. At that moment it could have been useful to follow. I guess today it's...

BERNIE BACHOLLET: That's ancient history, Sebastien.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, yes, they keep -- I have the impression that globalization, it's because of [inaudible] policy with the new office in different countries and so on and so forth and to follow that. Where we are today, I don't think that there are any changes on that. The same for a lot of things. I have the impression that we are on history and not what we need today. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you for that, Sabastian. Okay, 1.35 our next accountability indicator here, is total email exchanges on specific policy and advice issues. Again, going to back to our earlier discussion. I think it's really useful information that if we could break it down by groups in a drill down, providing information to the community, I think that's great. It could signal something but as an accountability indicator, telling total email exchange, I don't think it really brings anything to community.

Do we have a 1.36? Productivity, SO/AC council resolutions and advice statement completed. I think everyone understands, at least I'm struggling. If people find it good, excellent but as an accountability indicator there is no target against which this is being measured. It's mixing a lot of things in this case. SO/AC council resolutions and advice statement, it covers a lot of ground. Just mixing them all together into raw numbers, uncertain how that really helps accountability and transparency in this case.

1.37 or are we done with 1's? We're done with 1. 2, let's take a few minutes to do 2 because 2 as frustrating to a certain level as section 1

---

was, section 2 brings another view and it's another group that's doing some of these things. Our second pillar is support a healthy stable and resilient unique identifier ecosystem and the sub objective is foster and coordinate a healthy, secure, stable and resilient identifier ecosystem. Pretty much a match on that.

What we get is overall performance. Performance is a mixture of a number of things, including overall customer satisfaction. This is obviously produced by the global domains group and obviously, they give very clear references and pointers to how they calculate this, what their targets are, how they measure, how they update, etc. If we look at the assessment of this one, bring up the assessment block, the link between the objective and the sub objective is clear.

The link between the sub objective and the data on performance and customer satisfaction is clear. The values and accountability indicator is excellent as service level commitments are clearly defined and reported. That one really gives us the other view. We can have a discussion whether it matches the overall objective perfectly? I think it's pretty good. This thing gives a really good picture, that is probably very important for what ICANN does.

If we go 2.2, then we're changing gears again. Proactively plan for changes in the unique identifiers and develop technology roadmaps to help guide ICANN activities. As a sub objective, it's interesting and the data we're getting as an accountability indicator for this sub objective is, ICAAN interaction with the technical and public safety communities. Let's go down and get the full graphic. We have presentations, we have

---

publications and we have training. There is some explanation about these although it is light.

Let's look at the assessment. The link between the support a healthy stable and resilient unique identifier system and the sub objective of proactively plan for changes in the use of unique identifiers and develop technology roadmap to help guide ICANN seems relevant. It's a good idea to see where things are going.

The link between the sub objective and the data on ICANN interaction with technical and public safety communities, not sure how that's providing an accountability indicator working towards that objective, maybe a bit but to me it seems unclear. The value as an accountability indicator is limited at best, as there are no objectives against which the data can be evaluated.

The next one, 2.2.2, domain abuse activity reporting. Again, gives us another flavor. Now, the graphic is this little project plant. One of the things we have here is this is actually the slide as the accountability indicator, as it sits in the accountability indicator and I was looking at it this week as I was writing this up, it's still there. Now, look at the date. The last block on there is late February 2019. This thing was published in June 2019. Just part of the issues.

Let's go down to the evaluation block, the assessment block. The link between support a healthy and stable and proactively plan we said seems relevant. The link between the sub objective and the project plan on domain abuse activity is limited but the data that this system



---

produces could provide useful information to influence policy development.

Value as an accountability indicator, given this indicator was published in June 2019, there is little value in publishing a project timeline which ended -- it was over by the time it was published. This is where I have a note. The monthly domain abuse reports are referred in the text accompanying the slide are extremely well done and informative and up to date.

This being said, it's unclear how useful they could be as an accountability indicator but that goes back to our other discussion. Those numbers are really useful. It maybe not be useful as an accountability indicator but they're really useful as to the health of internet and what's going on. I think that's valuable information and it's done very well and that was being asked for by a lot of people.

Again, there's this, in my mind, a schism between what people are trying to shoehorn into this. They were told to -- I feel for Staff in many ways because I've been caught in that vice of people sending stuff over the fence and saying, "You have to produce accountability indicators."

And then people are scratching their heads and trying to do their best. This shows that as accountability indicators, I think they're failures but it's not that people are not producing stuff, not producing stuff that could be interesting but strictly speaking as an accountability indicator, I think there are issues.

We'll finish section 2 in a few minutes. I'll give the co-chairs a few minutes to wrap up the meeting. But the rest of 2.2 is very similar. We

have internet technology health indicators. Again, another project plan. Again, huge amount of data that is produced every month, that is providing great information, value as accountability indicator? Big question mark.

2.2.4 please. You can read it in the report. Sorry we're 2.3.3 which is the last one on section 2, where we go back to the global domain, support the evolution of domain name market place to robust, stable and trust. We have the domain name market place indicators. If we go down to assessment block, again it's a project plan, which I don't really like.

The link between support a healthy and stable and support the evolution of domain name market place to be robust, seems relevant. The link between the sub objective and the project plan on domain name market place is indirect but interesting. The value as an accountability indicator is limited, as this data has not been updated since it's publication in June 2019, that is that little project plan. I don't really see a project plan as a very useful accountability indicator.

Note, the domain name market place indicators referred to in the text accompanying the slide, should provide some very useful information. This being said, it's unclear how useful it would be as an accountability indicator. Again, that schism, I think people are trying really hard to fit things in as they've been asked to do and there is some very valuable information there, unclear how they can be accountability indicators.

Those are the first two out of the five. I'm really encouraging people to go through them. On our next one, next meeting, if the group feels it

---

---

useful, we can do three and four and five is very short. I will turn it back to you Cheryl and Pat. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Bernie for that. I'm glad you went through it because it's really difficult to tell how you feel about some of these metrics. I appreciate it. If we could go ahead and pull up the remainder of the agenda please. Any other business. I know that Daniel has joined us, so Daniel, I Daniel still on? I don't see Daniel. I was going to go back to Daniel and have him update us on his SOI but we'll take care of that next Wednesday, since it appears that he is gone. Do we have any other business?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Daniel did put into the chat the specific role he had [inaudible] at AfriNIC, so it's there for the record now so I think we can wrap that one.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much. I missed that; I didn't scroll back in the chat window. Again, any other business to cover at this time?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I think the idea of having us all, I mean you and I have already gone through it but getting everybody to now go through the document and use the suggestions and comments. I think you've got the general lye of the land and making sure that we can wrap up in next week's call before we all head off to then dive into public comment review. At least some

---

pretty good text and draft in potential for the piece on accountability indicators, that would be extremely useful.

With that, Jennifer we probably need to update the appropriate section of our work plan and the tracking activities to match. That's it for me. Thanks, Pat.

PAT KANE: No, I think you got it covered, very good. Since there were no hands on any other business in the chat. Let's go ahead and Jennifer if we can close up with confirmed actions or decisions reached please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. I'm basically just going to repeat what Cheryl said there for action items for team members to go in and take a look at the document, make any comments in the suggest mode on the accountability indicators ahead of the call next week. Then to update the work plan accordingly based on that. Unless I missed anything, let me know. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very, Jennifer. If you have anything for today, no hands raised, nothing in the chat. We'll declare today's meeting closed. Thank you, everybody.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**