
BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. This is Brenda speaking and I'd like to welcome you to the ATRT3 Plenary Call #45 on the 29th of January 2020 starting at 11:00 UTC today. Members joining include Cheryl, Liu, Jaap, Osvaldo, Pat, Sébastien, Jacques, Vanda, and Osvaldo. I said Osvaldo twice, sorry about that. We're having people join. Demi has just joined. I think I have everyone.

Observers joining us today include Sophie, Herb, Everton, and Avri. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. And Technical Writer Bernie is on the call. We do have apologies from Wolfgang and Daniel. Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking for the record and I'll turn the call over to our Co-Chairs, Pat and Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you hear me yet?

BRENDA BREWER: There we go. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. I'm having no luck getting audio out of the Zoom Room but never mind, we can do this in a varietal hybrid. Okay. Alright, so with that, while I take a little time to try and work out my normal connection in terms of audio to Zoom, welcome you all and ask if anybody has any statements of interest they'd like to make. Anybody have updates? Not seeing anybody raise their hand and I'm not seeing anything in chat.

Let's move on. And with that, while I battle with the sound and audio gremlins, I guess if we can look at the Agenda and note that it's again a relatively light Agenda with one particular, sorry about the echo, primary Agenda item. I'll move now onto asking if anyone has got an Action Item, sorry, let me start that again, any other business item they want to raise now?

And not seeing anybody there, then I'm going to suggest that Jennifer saves me desperately and goes to the Action Items Review, new and closed, and obviously we're going to focus on Pat's recent email of the Leadership Team Meeting on Monday regarding Brussels travel. Over to you, Jennifer. I'm hearing no audio. Jennifer are you still muted? Because I was hearing nothing, and I note others in the chat like Vanda are saying they've not heard you.

BRENDA BREWER:

I can see that Jennifer's microphone is not working. This is Brenda. While she gets that corrected, I can just let you know that Pat did send out an email, I believe it was yesterday's mail, asking for people to voluntarily share their travel information with me and you can send that to Brenda.brewer@icann.org. You don't have to send it to the whole list.

This will be sent to just the people traveling to Brussels and if you want to share rides to the hotel, you'll have access to the travelers arrival time. So, that should be completed by hopefully Monday.

So, I have received some of the travel details from the Review Team traveling. Others, this is a reminder to please send that information to

me. And that's what we have for the Brussels information. And if anyone's having, there should not be... Everyone should have their hotel accommodations by now. Anyone have any issues, please let us know as soon as possible. And, Jennifer, have you corrected your microphone?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I hope so. Thanks, Brenda. I joined via phone so hopefully you can hear me now?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes. We hear you now. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Thank you for covering that Action Item. That's all we have for Action Items Review. Thanks, Brenda.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Seamless teamwork. Excellent. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record again, and I think I actually have my audio gremlin sorted out so I'm now operating through the Zoom Room with the audio as well as hearing through that which will help me a great deal. Thank you.

I noticed a couple of us has sent it back to the whole list and that's alright as well but do please follow-up directly with Brenda with your details so we can sort out Brussels travel. Is there any questions or matters anyone who's traveling to Brussels wishes to raise? Not seeing anything.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may? Sébastien.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please. Yes, do go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Just a question. We have everything, I was just wondering if we have news about per diem or not. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Say again? News again about what?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Per diem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, per diem. Oh, okay. Sorry. Yeah, sorry, I didn't catch the term properly, per diem. Good question. Has anyone, or I certainly haven't, but has anyone received their per diem? I'm just so used to constituency travel being incredibly slow and rarely getting it anywhere on time.

Is there anybody who has received their per diem? Just put a green check or let us know in chat. No. Vanda hasn't, Jacques hasn't, Cheryl. My little system would've reminded me seeing as I only use the banking

account that I use for travel for ICANN things, it would've told me, "Good heavens, something has arrived.", in shock and horror.

So, it looks to me, then, Jennifer noting that Jacques is also doublechecking as we are talking here, that nobody has as yet got their per diem so we might just need to come back to that in the next day or two, noting how close we are to traveling. And we'll ask if perhaps it might be better if people can let the list know when their per diems arrive. Although, Jacques, perhaps you found something already. Jacques, over to you.

JACQUES BLANC:

Absolutely. Good morning everybody. Yeah, I have the per diem in the very first email which was sent by Travel Support. It is mentioned in the first email.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Mentioned, okay, that's fine, but have you received it in your bank? Because I believe Sébastien was asking about the receipt of it.

JACQUES BLANC:

Oh, okay. Sorry, my bad. No, I haven't but I usually receive it after I've been assisted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, that's fearlessly close. I usually get it while I'm traveling or often after I arrive which is bordering on useless these days. Okay, so let's... If

anyone receives their per diem, do let us know and when we get closer to the travel date, Jennifer, you and I might need to follow-up on that as well. Osvaldo's mentioning, he hasn't received anything yet. You might want to poke at the constituency travel just in case, Jennifer. Okay.

Well, with that, let's now look at the Brussels Agenda. And while I try and deal with another, not logistics issue in terms of the room, but in terms of the rottweiler that now desperately needs to go out apparently. Pat, would you like to take over while we go through the Brussels Agenda?

PAT KANE: Sure, Cheryl. Thank you very much. Jacques, your hand is raised. Is that an old hand, new hand?

JACQUES BLANC: It is an old hand, sorry.

PAT KANE: No worries. Thank you. Are we going to bring up the Brussels Agenda, please? Thank you very much. And, Jennifer, since you and Bernie have put this together, can you walk us through this, please?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure. Thank you. This is Jennifer. I will certainly start and, Bernie, please feel free to jump in or cover anything that I miss. So, you all should've

had a chance to take a look at the Agenda which is in a Google Doc. Hopefully, you've had a chance to take a look at it.

I will note, just on the first page, Brenda's helpfully scrolled to the Schedule which is great but do take the time offline just to have a look at the first page which covers the logistics, the office location. It does note that you need to remember to bring ID with you, a photograph ID, to the office as there will be security in the building there, so please remember to do that.

And then please also remember to eat breakfast if you're a breakfast person prior to coming to the office because the breakfast is not included in the room. We'll have snacks in the early morning but no breakfast items in the room itself. Pat, I see your hand raised.

PAT KANE:

Yeah. So, you mentioned a picture ID. So, does it have to be a government issued picture ID or any picture ID?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Good question. I would expect that it would be a government issued ID. So, thank you for that. Please bring with you a government issued ID just to be on the safe side. Otherwise we will have remote participation but if you're in Brussels we would like you to be in the office instead of outside the building.

The meeting itself starts at 9:00 a.m. local time in Brussels and runs through to 6:00 p.m. local time every day. The three days, it's the same

time which is 8:00 UTC to 17:00 UTC, and then there's time zone conversions on the Agenda as well.

As Cheryl notes in the chat, it's a simple Agenda focusing on the Review of the Public Comment Items and how the team intends to incorporate the public comments or otherwise into the Final Report, and then hopefully create a plan for developing the Final Report coming out of the meeting. So, that's the objective.

The first day, obviously, we'll just do the normal admin, welcome, review of the Agenda, and then feedback from Team Members from any presentations of the Draft Report that they have given over the past couple of weeks. I will note that all the Agenda Items, as it notes in red here on the screen, the Agenda Items and times are subject to change, obviously dependent on how many public comments we get and the progress throughout the three days.

So, the first day, really, is just the review of public comment and the public comment analysis tool which is simply a spreadsheet that we will populate with the public comments and it will hopefully allow the Review Team to track how it intends to reply or incorporate each of those comments into the Draft Report.

So, that will take us through to kind of late afternoon on the first day. And then we will... And Brenda, if you could just scroll down, I think there's another item on the first day. Yeah. So, we'll just take a look at the Agenda Items and structure...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jennifer, we're not hearing you if you're speaking. I note Jennifer has dropped audio. So, the audio gremlins are switching people. Go ahead, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I'll take over until we get Jennifer back. My delta tones will not be as enjoyable. The next day, Saturday, if we back up just a bit, we will see that we have a Team Dinner on Friday night, that's the first night after we complete our work and the details will be provided later.

Alright, our next day is Saturday, 8 February. Wash and repeat a little bit. Finish ATRT3 Response to Comments. And keep going. And so, our second day is about going through the comments and deciding how or if we're going to accept them in our report based on the tool we have provided so that we can... What that will allow us to do is look at all the comments on a given section together and then decide what we want to do with them.

At the end of that day, discussion on Agenda Items and structure for the next day. So, understanding what we're going to do because basically after each day, we want to make sure that we review our Agenda to make sure it's adapted. Next day, please, Brenda.

On the Sunday, again, 9 to 10:15, and now we should have completed our analysis, we should be familiar with all the comments, we should have completed our analysis of the comments, what we want to do. And so, our first item that is proposed is determine the structure of the Final Report and the work approach. So, how are we going to get across the finish line, keep talking about that. And then review of the schedule

and the methodology to Cancun, because let's remember we have a very tight timeline. By the time we get to Cancun, we need to be pretty much done.

And then our final block, look ahead to Cancun Meeting planning, messaging coming out of the face-to-face meeting, and update of the Work Plan. I'll be glad to take any questions if there are any. Not seeing any, back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie, and thank you, Jennifer. We're going to bring up today's Agenda again.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. Sébastien speaking.

PAT KANE: Go ahead, Sébastien. My apologies. Please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, no. It's mine because the time to raise my hand or to unmute was too long. Sorry for that. Just a question, I will say a logistical question. If for any reason we need to spend part of the night from Saturday to Sunday working, is it something feasible in the ICANN office or we are constrained with the time schedule of the meeting for the moment? It's not to say I am willing to or I wish to, or I dream to, but just to be sure

that if for any reason we need that time, how we can organize ourselves? Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. So, are you asking if there's access to time in the ICANN office space for off-hour meetings you might have?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No. If for any reason the team needs to stay working for part of the night from Saturday to Sunday, is it feasible in the room?

PAT KANE: Got it. So, can we work past normal hours? Jennifer, can you look into that, please?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I guess Jennifer's having audio issues. Yes, we'll be confirming that to the list one way or another. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Hi everyone. Sorry. Double unmuting takes a while. I just wanted to comment on the request that was just made about access to office hours. We will definitely look into it, but I can tell you based on the experience we've had in the past that the office staff and security teams

are pretty adamant about closing down the office as soon as the meeting is over because there are security locks and everything that get activated at certain times.

And I'm not sure that we as Staff have the right tools to disconnect them. So, I think the likelihood of anyone being able to work past the appointed hours of the Review Team, especially over the weekend, is going to be very, very limited. We will confirm regardless, though.

PAT KANE: Okay, thank you, Negar. I appreciate that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, Cheryl here. If indeed, and hopefully we'll be sufficiently well organized, collaborative, and cooperative that we won't need to go into the wee small hours, but I'm assuming if the news back from the office in Brussels is that the logistics are what the logistics are during the, inverted commas, office hours, we might perhaps then look at some room access at the hotel, which is what Vanda has said in chat.

PAT KANE: So, Negar, is that something that you or Jennifer can take a look at?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, Pat. We can definitely talk to the Meeting Team and see what they can help us arrange if there's a need for a room at the hotel.

PAT KANE: Great, thank you so much. Alright, so we've got no more questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, Cheryl.

PAT KANE: Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I just have one. Cheryl again. I just noted here in the chat that Leon said what hotel are we staying at? That would indicate he at least hasn't got a letter regarding the accommodation. I guess I just wanted to doublecheck that everyone else has got a letter regarding the accommodation. So, yeah.

There seems to be either everyone else has found working after hours in Belgium as a challenge or there is variability receiving letters regarding accommodation. So, Brenda, I guess you're keeper of keys on this. We might just want to confirm that all of our travelers do have all of the necessary information. That would be very useful. Negar, I've noticed your hand is still up. Do you have more information on that?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yeah, Cheryl. Just wanted to confirm for everyone who might not have received a letter that the Review Team Members are going to be staying at the Aloft Hotel, I believe, in Brussels, which is the closest to the

office. But, yes, we will take action to follow-up to ensure everyone gets their letter.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Okay, thanks so much. And yeah, Vanda, that's fine if Leon as a Board Member is accommodated elsewhere. It would be nice if he knew where he was accommodated elsewhere or otherwise.

Okay, so let's now move back to our main Agenda. Now, Pat, I'm assuming that we're going to do a very small review of where we were up to last week and then go on from 3 onwards on our Accountability Indicators text. Is that the case?

PAT KANE: That is correct. I think Bernie wants to cover a new introductory portion of this and then go to 3.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, we are going to back to intro. In which case, it sounds like you and I are handing over to Bernie. Over to you, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Hello. Yes, it's me again. Yes. So, I would like to thank Jaap for taking the time to do his usual detailed analysis on providing our first comment in the document. That is very useful. Thank you.

In going through the document, I mean I was unhappy with our introduction in trying to find a way to communicate to ICANN how to

make this better. I mean, I think from our conversation last week, people got the general take on all of these things and where we were going, and we'll finish those off today. But I think what's more important is how to wrap that up. So, I've taken a stab this and let's have a look at that.

So, the first paragraph is essentially as it was. And then we go into, "Prior to looking at each accountability indicator in detail, ATRT3 has the following summary observations. Defining Accountability Indicators. The introduction to the Accountability Indicators only states, 'In the spirit of accountability and transparency the indicators show the latest progress towards achieving ICANN Strategy', which is quite generic. The term progress is defined as a forward or onward movement as to an objective or to a goal and therefore the expectation by the average Community Member would be that an Accountability Indicator would indicate progress towards a goal. Using this definition, 24 of the 45 distinct Accountability Indicators do not have a goal or objective against which the information presented is to be assessed. Of those that do have objectives, not all of these provide information on how those objectives are established or reviewed."

"Usefulness of Accountability Indicators. Best practice for Accountability Indicators in many systems not only requires that they be well defined and quantifiable but that they be crucial to achieving the goal or objective. In assessing the 45 distinct Accountability Indicators, it is clear that a number of these failed to meet this requirement and as such limit their usefulness to the Community. See assessments below for details. Timeliness of information is critical. Providing information that is not up to date or that is not kept up to date significantly limits the usefulness

of these Accountability Indicators and brings into question the commitment to these by the corporation. See assessments below for detail.”

“It might be useful for ICANN to consider requiring in a fashion similar to the requirements for recommendations from the new Operating Procedures for Specific Reviews that when elaborating objectives in a strategic or operational plans that these include clearly identified measurable criteria for success for each of these. Including this information in the public consultations on the development of these would allow the Community to comment on these prior to their adoption and would ensure to meet the expectations of the Community with respect to Accountability Indicators.”

That’s all that has changed. I thought this sort of summed up where we were. I’ll be glad to take comments or suggestions. I have a thumbs up from Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Is there anyone wanting to... To me, all I can say is I think this is enhancement to the text and certainly fits well within my comfort zone on, personal opinion, not only Accountability Indicators and the advice we should be giving to ICANN, and obviously we will have another bite of the cherry as we go through to final editing but do please bring forward any clarifying questions or comments. If not now, in the text. The text is still open for suggestions, isn’t it Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Oh, yes, and it'll be open until after Brussels, but I thought it was important to try and limit and then we can redo our suggestions regarding these based on those because I'm hoping it wraps up our things that we think would really help getting those numbers up.

Because if we go back up to the top of the page, please Brenda, let's remember that only 50 percent of individuals and structures knew about Accountability Indicators when we did our survey and that of those structures that were aware of these, two thirds responded that the Accountability Indicators were somewhat ineffective. And I think that's concern we're trying to help ICANN with on this. Jacques, I see you have a hand.

JACQUES BLANC:

Yeah. What I was thinking is this question of having the rightfully tuned Accountability Indicators reminds me of the recommendations that have been modified with very precise criteria and deliverables and so on. So, I'm not saying that we should do the exact same thing.

What I think is maybe when we look again at these Accountability Indicators, we could look at what has been modified with the guidelines for making recommendations and see in what direction it has been moved, and maybe we'll find some efficiency tools there.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Alright, thank you, Jacques. Anybody else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I just note some compliment to the new text out of chat from Vanda. Now, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. It's just to say that we put the current document to comments, we may have some input specific on that therefore I will not spend too much time on this meeting here, but it could be a good idea to take it with the comments if any on that. If not, I have no problem with the current proposal. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you for that, Sébastien. And it's in the Google Doc so if you want to make comments or suggestions, we'll be looking forward to finding them there. Sébastien, your hand is still up. Alright, thank you. Anybody else? Alright, thank you very much for that.

Let's go back to looking at our details, and that would be Section 3. So, 3 dot something, Brenda. Alright. We're in a section where we have some pretty good Accountability Indicators, actually some very good ones, and they match up to what are defined in the literature as pretty standard Accountability Indicators. So, this one is a lot of fun because this one works out quite well.

So, this is under the theme of advanced organizational technological and operational excellence. For those that haven't caught on, maybe just a general comment, right? So, we understand that we've got the five major objectives in the Strategic Plan and then those five major objectives generated five major objectives in the Operational Plan, and

those five major objectives then get broken down into subobjectives, and these are all these elements that we see in the Accountability Indicators. So, each of these, 3.3.1, can all be found word for word in the Operational Plan for 2021, etcetera. So, just to make clear we have all that understanding.

So, Section 3, advance organizational, technological, and operational excellence, ensure ICANN's long-term financial accountability, stability, and sustainability. And our first thing is short term financial accountability, and what we have is funding, ICANN operations total versus the budget. So, we have clear numbers and we have clear targets, and if we go down just a bit, and this was actually the graphic from the previous Fiscal Year when I originally built this document. If you go to the Accountability Indicators, they have been updated.

So, let's go down to our assessment of this. By now, you will be familiar. So, the link between advance organizational, technological, and operational excellence and the subobjective ensure ICANN's long-term financial accountability, stability, and sustainability is relevant. The link between the subobjective and the short-term financial accountability is relevant.

And the value is an Accountability Indicator is excellent. Results are based on robust and transparent process to generate the data and the objective, budget, make this a very good Accountability Indicator. Additionally, the current version of this Accountability Indicator has been updated since the original slide was captured for this report. So, this is great because it checks all the boxes, if you will, as an Accountability Indicator and seems to work.

Alright, let's go to the next one. The financial accountability funds under management. Again, I'm not going to read through all of this. It's basically the same observation as the previous one. We've got some great data, we've got targets, and it's being kept up to date. So, 3.1.3 is next. And just put up your hand if you want to ask questions or want me to slow down.

Long-term financial accountability. Again, same thing. Very useful information, very well done, very clear what we're looking at. 3.1.4, financial year planning process. That one I'm a little iffier as an Accountability Indicator. It's a nice indicator. It shows people submitting comments, but there's no objective. So, useful information, not sure it's a great Accountability Indicator. And here we have some... Yes, if we go down, yes. We've got that split by another view.

So, if we go down to the analysis, please, Brenda. The assessment, the link is good. The link between the subobjective of ensure ICANN's long-term financial accountability and the number of Stakeholder Groups submitting comments is limited. Value as an Accountability Indicator, extremely poor given there's no target to measure against.

Alright, 3.1.5. Yes, my headset still dies once in a while. Apologies for that. Deadline for publishing the Annual Audited Financial Statement. Again, fairly clear data. Let's go down to the assessment. And the deadline is relevant. Value as an Accountability Indicator, good given it's relative to a clear objective. But, you know, if we go back... Don't move, Brenda, I'm just metaphorically... If we go back to that introduction, you know, the point is, is this critical to achieving an objective? I'm unsure that that would meet that test. And that, I think, is what we're trying to

communicate to ICANN in that summary section is some of these things are nice to have but are they critical to achieving an objective? Uncertain.

Percentage staff voluntary turnover trailing twelve month trend. And here, again, really nice. We've got some really hard data per quarter and we've got a defined target which is based on an industry standard. So, again, great data, great Accountability Indicator, works well.

3.1.7, please. Security Operations. That falls under the category of nice but unclear it's really useful as an Accountability Indicator. It's a good indicator. It's nice data to have. Let's go to the assessment. Seems relevant, the link between the objective. And Security Operations could be relevant but it's unclear what the Security Operations include. So, the value as an Accountability Indicator, extremely limited given there are no objectives against which to measure this, and we're really not sure what we're measuring also. So, sort of very limited.

3.1.8, Risk Management, roadmap to progress overall. So, the graphic is not particularly clear. Following on from the previous stuff, the black bar on top would seem to be the objective, that's what we think. We've got Overall RIM which is Risk Identify Management, ORP which is Resiliency Planning, and RRMP, Revised Risk Management Policy. So, let's go to the assessment. Unclear what is being reported on here and how it's a forest from the trees type of scenario. And so, stability and sustainability and risk management roadmap progress could be relevant but it's unclear what it includes or how its measured. And the value as an Accountability Indicator is extremely limited given it's unclear what is the target. Additionally, the graphic has four columns, but the

associated text fails to define what is CP. So, just a nit there but it doesn't match up to the text.

3.2. And so, we're switching gears here, so we're going to ensure structured coordination of ICANN's technical resources. So, ICANN's digital service ability. And so, we have a target and we have a measure. Contracted Parties digital services availability at the end of March which has been updated. Let's go to the assessment.

The link to advance organizational, technological, and operational excellence in the subobjective that it ensures structured coordination of ICANN's technical resources seems very weak for such a high level objective. Again, that notion of being critical to the objective. The link between the subobjective and ICANN's digital service's availability is unclear. And the value as an Accountability Indicator even there are objectives that are listed, it's extremely limited in it is unclear what and how, or how. So, you know, nice to have a target and nice to say you're meeting it, but it's also great to know what that involves and the text accompanying this doesn't allow you to drill down or understand it that much. So, that one could use some help.

Universal Acceptance Readiness. So, Universal Acceptance Readiness of Services Phase 1. And so, we've got some data there. So, we have an explanation of what we're trying to measure there. Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3. And our assessment. Let's go down just a bit, Brenda, we don't always reread the first one. The link between the subobjective and Universal Acceptance Readiness is unclear. The value as an Accountability Indicator even if there are objectives that are listed, it is of limited value given it's unclear what is being measured or how.

So, again, we've got that thing whereby we're providing information but for the average person, it's not clear what we're talking about and what the link is to the objective, or at least there wasn't to me. I'll be glad to take comments if I'm missing something and people see something different.

3.2.3, DNSSEC Adoption. DNSSES status of ICANN Domain Name Portfolio. Alright? So, this is interesting. The text accompanying the graphic through the Internet Engineering Taskforce Standards Process, a number of DNS Domains entered in the IANA Registries may not be signed with DNSSEC as per RFC 6303. ICANN Organization also operates 67 of these domains. Please visit for more information.

So, on Section 2, the assessment. Okay, it seems relevant. The value as an Accountability Indicator. Even if there are objectives that are listed, it is of an extremely limited value given the average user may have difficulty understanding what this is about. Explaining what the ICANN Domain Name Portfolio could help this, although it is important to know that domains in the ICANN Portfolio are signed, many would wonder about domains overall versus DNSSEC. Additionally, given this seems to be a steady state and one would assume that those domains would not get unsigned and that those which cannot be signed will remain so limits the interest of this. Jaap, come and save me. Thank you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Yes. Well, there's something else happening inside ICANN which probably is not clear to all [inaudible]. I mean, what you notice is that ICANN is actually having a lot of servers which are supported by third

parties. And maybe the domain name might be assigned but if you then look closely, the actual service partner of it is not used in DNSSEC at all. And so, it might [inaudible] even worse or at least more incomprehensible.

And it's actually something where SSAC has complained about a couple of times, or at least made remarks about. And I mean, why one of the... Why they don't look at the suppliers, whether they are using DNSSEC or not and but there's not... [inaudible] over. The same is actually, since now Bernie had the same is for IPv6 adoptions. I mean, if you were a consultant to ICANN you have to sign that you will do everything to get IPv6 or whatever. But if you look to the services ICANN is paying for, or I mean has a contract with, a lot of them don't go to IPv6 at all so God knows what it means. Anyway, that was my... I will actually look more closely into it later on, what exactly these numbers are, but this is more a generic comment.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Alright. Thank you very much for that, Jaap. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much for that, Jaap. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And as someone who, from a national perspective at least in Australia, has spent a great deal of time with other components of, for example, the Internet Society or Internet Australia as you now are, working with the government to ensure that things like procurement requirements do include things which therefore would be measurable when we're trying to make change towards things such as IPv6 adoption of DNSSEC.

This sounds like something that an appropriate piece of advisory text will be very valuable. So, Bernie, I'm wondering if we can work directly with Jaap proactively to wordsmith up something that might actually make a strong suggestion about what could be. And I'm not a big one of making specific details or detailed recommendation or suggestions on exactly what Accountability Indicators should be looking like, but whatever they do should be useful.

But in this case, it seems that there's a real value proposition at least to my naïve point of view about at least making mention of the value of procurement with service provision and third party providers here. Thank you. And that would make a reasonable measurable if indeed it mapped to an objective. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you very much for that. So, let's take advantage of the Brussels meeting. I will buy Jaap a beer and we can dig into this and see if we can come up with something along those lines. Jaap, your hand is still up.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Well, it's actually a new hand.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: New hand, okay.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

[inaudible]. And one of the ideas that might work is that doing... Here in Holland, the government actually has now a standard policy that they have at list of standards. Things need to be... Which can call in a requirement contract if appropriate, of course. But things like DNSSEC and IPv4, IPv6 are on there as well. The latest one is IPKI.

And it basically says, well, if you do procurement, you have to use this as a standard or explain why you don't. And I mean, instead of making it a must, this is actually more like a should. So, I mean, just making it a checkmark on a contract doesn't really help. You really... [inaudible] reasons why people don't [inaudible] to something but it should at least be explained in the contract. Germany's taking, and some other countries are now taking the same route as well.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Alright. Thank you for that, Jaap. All fascinating stuff, but as Cheryl has said, let's focus on Accountability Indicators. Also, I note Vanda's comment in the chat. Normally on security issues we need to measure the time to respond was a target to achieve and also the time to solve. Alright. So, we have beaten this one to death.

Let's go to IPv6 Adoption. Again, Anycast instances managed by Root Server. And if we go down, some other data. ICANN Org Services. The assessment. You're doing a great job, Brenda. Thank you, and I'm sorry I'm not giving you a lot of lead here. The link between the subobjective and IPv6 Adoption and Anycast instances of ICANN managed Root Server and IPv6 deployment status for Org services seems relevant.

The value as an Accountability Indicator on deployment status, extremely limited but it is unclear if the objective is to achieve 100 percent and the fact that the graphic shows a static situation. On IPv6 for Org services, there is a statement that the objective is 100 percent but it's unclear what is being measured and how.

Additionally, the following text is confusing. "All services are accessible over IPv4 and capable of being accessed over IPv6. Our target is to have all services accessible over IPv4 and IPv6." Anyways, it's, again, I think we could use some finetuning in such an Accountability Indicator.

3.2.5, Information Security. Alright, so overall CIS 20 Scores versus the target assessment level. So, we have data and we have target, and we're excited. Let's go down to the assessment. So, the link between the subobjective and the Information Security for CIS 20 Scores seems relevant. The value, good, clear objective and clear measurements, but no explanation of why the objective is not met.

So, it would be a lot of fun if you've got an objective, you've got a significant gap, that you talk about why you're not meeting it or as Jaap was saying earlier, do you want to meet it because sometimes some of these objectives are very high. But, at least this is an interesting set of data versus a specific goal.

3.3, alright. So, we're changing gears again. Develop a globally diverse culture of knowledge and expertise available to ICANN's Board, Organization, and Stakeholders. And the subobjective of that one is achievement of a globally diverse culture and knowledge levels, and we're talking about Stakeholders.

So, ICANN Public Meeting Participation. Well, we've brought up ICANN Public Meeting Participation prior in translation, which was a very first objective. So, that's a little repetitive but okay. And then participants by region. Alright, let's go down to the assessment. So, the link between advanced organizational, technological, and operational excellence and the subobjective of develop a globally diverse culture of knowledge and expertise available to ICANN's Board, etcetera. Seems it could be relevant. Let's be nice here.

The link between the subobjective and the achievement of globally diverse culture levels by measuring participation on ICANN Meetings seems limited. Value as in Accountability Indicators, very weak given there are no objectives to measure against. So, nothing much more to say on that one. We've gone through these kinds of things when you're just showing participation at ICANN Meetings. Alright.

So, Community. So, what have we got here? So, ICANN Learn. Alright. So, we've got a target and we've got quarterly data. Yes, I'm back. So, the assessment. We'll go to the second one since that should not change on the first one. The link between the subobjective and the data seems relevant, so ICANN Learn is definitely about giving more knowledge. Value as an Accountability Indicator, good given there are objectives and clear measurements versus these. However, it's unclear how objectives are set versus consistently and significantly surpassing these.

So, if we go back up a bit to the data, you'll notice that the objective has not changed across all those quarters which changes Fiscal Year, yet we're significantly surpassing them. So, that goes back to that first point

we were making in the introduction, is it's nice to have objectives, it's nicer to know how they're set and how they're reviewed to make these things really useful. Alright. Next point, please, Brenda.

BRENDA BREWER: Cheryl has her hand raised.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Oh, thank you. Please, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's alright. As this happens to be one where the blips, the bigger size of the blips are recognizable and obvious for those deeply entrenched in ICANN Learn such as Sébastien and Vanda and Daniel and myself, but perhaps not to the rest of the ICANN Community. And that is, of course, where we have several things coming together.

In some of these quarters, we had brand new modules coming out that were significant rewrites of the existing or previous ICANN Learn Modules. So, those of us who've been passionate supporters of ICANN Learn dived back in and, damn it all, redid it again because there was new modules. That's predictable, or that's an observable and that can be drawn out as a specific piece of data which hasn't happened.

Or one can reset the objective so that having revamped everything, one might hope that more rank and file membership of the ICANN Community will want to engage more anyway. So, maybe there should've been, as you were suggesting, a reassess or re-sitting of the

objectives. And of course, one can also note when, as the At-Large Advisory Committee made completion of a number of ICANN Learn Modules, a compulsory aspect for people who had been going to seek to be involved in their last year's ATLAS III activity. That's also a driver that's unique, not a bad thing, I think it's a good thing, but it is nevertheless an identifiable driver. And so, we might want to have the devil in the detail a little bit, how do I say this, more specifically identified in this sort of graphic representation. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you for that, Cheryl. And I think that goes to the points that we're making, but very useful information. Alright. Let's go to the next item please, Brenda. Alright. Achieving globally diverse culture of knowledge. The organization. So, we have years of service and overall and then years of by region. Okay. So, let's go down to the assessment.

So, the link between the subobjective and employee years of service could be relevant. Okay. Value as an Accountability Indicator, limited at best as there are no objective against which this is measured. And probably this goes back to the key point is it critical to achieving the goal, and I mean maybe if you're trying to set some objectives it would increase its value. Alright.

Next one, achievement of global knowledge programs, talent development courses offered. So, we have targets here. Talent development courses offered by quarter, breakdown by category, the type of course being offered. Assessment, please, Brenda.

So, the link between the subobjective and talent development courses offered is relevant. Value as an Accountability Indicator, limited. There are objectives to measure against but there is no information as to how these objectives are set and reviewed. Additionally, simply listing the number of courses offered is of limited interest without information on attendance and evaluation results. So, you know, really this goes back to our key observation, is this critical to reaching your objective? Just offering courses I don't think provides that kind of information. Alright.

Next one is the Board and so distribution of Board Members by region. Alright, let's go down to the assessment please. Value as an Accountability Indicator, limited. There are no rules for nominating SOs/ACs and the rules for the NomCom are set in the Bylaws. So, okay, yes, there are requirements for some diversity. It's nice that it's showing this. There are indirectly some objectives but uncertain we're generating a lot of value by this Accountability Indicator, but I do recognize that it's there so that's why it's limited.

Achievement of global knowledge on the Board, the next item. Training, so there are mandatory training for Board Members. We've got the targets there which are met to 100 percent and some other information there. So, if we go to the assessment, the link is relevant, the value is limited. We're glad that the Board is taking some training. Is it critical to achieving the objective? Unclear, so people can decide on that.

Nominating Committee composition by region. Again, useful information. Is it critical as an Accountability Indicator? Actually, I'm unfamiliar with the details of the Nominating Committee. Maybe Cheryl can pipe in here. Is there a requirement per region? I don't remember.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here for the record. No. In fact, the only appointing body to the Nominating Committee that has any regional requirements is the At-Large Advisory Committee because the At-Large Advisory Committee is required to appoint five, one-per each geographic region, representative to sit on any NomCom. So, it has a Bylaw mandate and the rest, basically, backfill with the advice and opportunities of resourcing that they have depending on what sort of membership base they may have from the SGs and Cs within the GNSO or availability from the other ACs/SOs.

And of course, when you're like the SSAC or the ccNSO and you're not sending five, or in the case of GNSO seven, members to sit on the Nominating Committee, if you're only sending one or two then geographic diversity or sub regional geographic diversity is limited, obviously. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright, thank you. That's what I seemed to remember. So, useful, under the category useful information as an indicator, really not sure it meets the test as an Accountability Indicator. And we've finished 3. Moving onto 4. ICANN's role in MultiStakeholder approach. Daniel, I think there is regional diversity in NomCom. Yes, it ends up showing that there is some. I agree with Daniel. But there are no objectives against which we're working and it's unclear how useful it is as an Accountability Indicator.

It's an interesting indicator and maybe that's another comment we can make. There are some things which are very useful or interesting to see. The Domain Name Abuse Report that is being produced by OCTO, very interesting data, not an Accountability Indicator. So, there are differences of things that are useful that are being produced with data. Are they Accountability Indicators? No. Are they very useful? Yes. As in the previous case, seeing the diversity on the NomCom is a useful thing but are there specific objectives as an Accountability Indicator? No.

Alright. So, our objective here is encourage engagement with the existing Internet Governance ecosystems at the national, regional, and global levels. Government and IGO Engagement and participation in ICANN. So, basically... And, you know, let's go through this is one in detail. So, let's go down to the assessment.

So, the link between the promote ICANN's role as a MultiStakeholder approach and the subobjective, encourage engagement with existing Internet Governance seems relevant. The link between the subobjective and government and IGO engagement and participation in ICANN is relevant. The value as an Accountability Indicator, limited at best given there are no objectives to measure against. Again, this is one of those things where it's interesting to see this kind of data. To me, it doesn't meet the test as an Accountability Indicator.

Clarify the role governments and ICANN and work with them to strengthen their commitment to supporting the global internet ecosystem and the Government Advisory Committee membership, total membership and participation in public meetings. Okay. So, we have

some data and we have total membership. And so, we need to clean that up first, that Section 4.2.1.2 should go away.

So, on 4.2.1.2.2, GAC Membership Meeting. So, telling us that there's GAC membership and the participation. Yeah, okay, it's limited value. And the value as an Accountability Indicator, again, limited. There are no objectives against which this is measuring. This is interesting and useful information but it's not an Accountability Indicator per our definition. Next one, please, Brenda.

Participate in the evolution of a global trusted inclusive MultiStakeholder Internet Governance ecosystem that addresses internet issues. Cumulative participation in IG ecosystem. So, we have a graphic some things here. Let's go to the assessment. And cumulative participation is good. A value as an Accountability Indicator, limited at best given there are no objectives to measure against. Also, no explanation as to what is being measured.

So, that one has got a few issues. I'm sure there's something that's being done but we're unclear on what it is. Number of regional and national IGF Initiatives. Number of regional IGF Initiatives and we see per Fiscal Year. And the assessment. Well, it's pretty much the same thing as the previous one. Promote the role. Too far, back up, please.

Promote role clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem rooted in the public interest. Percentage of contractual compliance service level targets that were met. Percentage versus target. So, we've got some good measurements here and we have a clear objective to measure against.

So, the link between the promote ICANN's role as a MultiStakeholder approach and the subobjective of promote role clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem rooted in public interest is clear. The link between the subobjective and percentage of contractual compliance service level targets that were met is relevant. And the value as an Accountability Indicator is very good, clear objectives and reporting unclear how objectives are set. And so, we're done 4, we're into 5, we're almost there. And I'll stop in about ten minutes to allow us to wrap up and make sure that we've got other things but we're almost there.

Develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by ICANN's mission. I found this one interesting. Act as a steward as the internet. So, public interest considerations from Board resolutions, progress against target. So, we consistently have 100 percent, which I guess is great.

The assessment, the link between develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by ICANN's mission and the subobjective of public interest considerations from Board resolutions is clear. The link between the subobjective and progress against targets seems like it should be relevant. The value as an Accountability Indicator is limited given there is no definition or link to a definition of what qualifies as public interest considerations. So, we're providing data in a vacuum here and unsure what the value is and unsure what the value is when you're always 100 percent. Anyways, it just wasn't clear.

Promote ethics, transparency, and accountability across the ICANN Community. Specific Reviews are important transparency and

accountability mechanisms. Yes, we're part of that. Complete Reviews and the details. Yes, sure. Okay. We are measuring those things and they are important as Reviews. So, let's go down to the assessment, Brenda, please.

So, the link is clear. The link between the subobjective and data, progress status is relevant. Value as an Accountability Indicator simply tracking the completion of Specific Reviews is of limited value in considering that there are no specific targets to measure against. So, similarly to the other things is...

Ethics, we measure compliance with mandatory ethics training for ICANN Board Members and the ICANN Organization and the submission by the ICANN Organization required conflict of interest disclosure documents. So, we're being told what's measuring and there's a target and we're always meeting it at 100 percent which is good news. The link between the subobjective and the training is relevant. The value as an indicator is good. I mean, we are doing the training. It's required by law, we're reporting on it. Okay, great.

Transparency of Board decision making materials, published versus redacted. So, Board decisions making materials, what's published versus what is redacted. And then we have Board decision making materials published by the deadline against the target, that's good. Let's go down to the assessment.

So, there's a clear link with the objectives. It's relevant to the subobjective. And value as an Accountability Indicator, redacted versus nonredacted is useful information but there is little values as an

Accountability Indicator. Publication dates for Board decisions is a good indicator but it's unclear how percentages are used in this measurement. So, some useful data there.

Documentary Information Disclosure Policy, DIDP. It's unfortunate Michael's not here, this is one of his favorite topics. So, basically a number of requests completed on time. Sorry, I disappeared there for a sec. Let's go down to the assessment please, Brenda.

So, the link is clear. The link between the subobjective and the data versus processed time is relevant. The value as an Accountability Indicator, limited value as there is no evaluation as to the type of response which was provided given that the response could be that the request was rejected. So, yes, we're talking about providing information in a set time and we're doing that. So, for that, that part of it is meeting the requirement for an Accountability Indicator. Is it critical to achieving the objective? That's where there's probably some finetuning which could be done.

Next one. 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 Acknowledgement by ICANN Organization of the Employee Hotline Policy. So, we've got this graphic which is very busy. Yes. Good point.

So, the assessment. Let's go down a bit more, Brenda, please. So, is clear. The link between the subobjective and the data would seem relevant. The value as an Accountability Indicator, limited as it is unclear

what is being measured against which objective. So, you know, yes, we're providing information, it may be useful but might need some more details on this one.

Next one. In and out of scope complaints. Number of complaints the Complaints Office handles. Complaints regarding ICANN Organization that do not fall into existing complaint mechanisms such as contractual compliance. Alright. So, we're provided some information and if you go digging, you'll find some information on this stuff and out of scope submissions.

And if we go down to the assessment. So, there's a clear link to the objective. The subobjective and the data would seem relevant. The value as an Accountability Indicator, limited as there are no objective against which this is measured. And it's not really also clear the details relative to these things. So, I'm certain it all matches up but missing a little details as far as we're going.

Empower the current new Stakeholders to fully participate in ICANN activities. We're shifting gears here into 5.3. Programs to support Community participation. Fellows, NextGen, number of participants versus targets. So, Fellowship Participants, participation versus target. NextGen, the same.

And assessment. So, the link between develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by ICANN's mission and the subobjective of empower current and new Stakeholders to fully participate in ICANN activities, for me, seem difficult to make. Not that the data's not useful, it's just versus the objective, it's unclear. The link

between the subobjective and the data, that matches. And the value as an Accountability Indicator, there's some value in this given the results are presented versus objectives.

However, it's unclear how the objectives are set and there's no explanation for the decrease over time. Note that ICANN65 data seems to be missing. So, yeah but unclear what this is helping to meet as information. Next one please, or are we done? And we're done. That's it. So, I will remind everyone, the document is up on the Google Drive and I am spot on time. Over to you, Pat and Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Pat, did you want to wrap this into the next section?

PAT KANE:

Certainly. This is Pat. So, if we could bring up again the Agenda for today. So, what we'll move to now is to any other business, and I don't think we had anything that came up in the beginning. Do we have any other business at this point in time? Cheryl, your hand is raised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. It's not actually a piece of business but more a piece of information for those of you who have served with one of our retired members of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team Number 3, and that is just to mention as a informational piece that Geoff Huston who did retire from our ranks earlier in our Work Plan has had the honor over the preceding weekend of being announced in the Australia Day Awards to have been entered into the ranks of a member of the

Order of Australia so he is now Mister Geoffrey Huston, A.M., and I think behooves us to note that for the record and to congratulate him that he received his reward as listed for services to science and through pioneering roles with the internet. And for that, I would personally like to congratulate him, and I suspect we all would do, as well. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. And [inaudible]. Fantastic. Alright. Anything else for any other business? Jennifer, if you will take us through any confirmed actions or decisions that we have reached today.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Let's try this again. Hopefully you can hear me now?

PAT KANE: Yes, we can.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Very good. Okay, great. So, a couple of Action Items that I captured regarding travel. So, Staff to follow-up with Travel Support, find out when the per diem will be delivered to the Review Team. And we're also going to follow-up to ensure that all Team Members have received their hotel confirmation for the closed meeting. We are going to confirm if afterhours office access is available in Brussels and/or where the team could work at the hotel if the office is not available after six p.m. local. With that, that's all I capture and please let me know if I missed anything. Thank you.

PAT KANE: I think you've got it all. Thank you very much. Cheryl, is that a new hand or is that an old hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, it is a new hand. Thanks, Pat. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Just one thing struck me as Jennifer was running through the AIs, and noting that for example Tola is yet to manage to finalize his Visa for the Brussels trip, and I believe KC is not planning on traveling but doing remote, do we have a dedicated time yet where we're going to be testing the remote participation?

It's something that I thought worked very well in the last meeting and I just wanted to raise that assuming our Staff will be doing what they can with the materials available, but it might just be worthwhile following up from an Action Item point of view if we do have a pretest for all of those gremlins to be shaken out of the system.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Cheryl. This is Jennifer. We don't at the moment have a time. We certainly will be happy to do that with any Review Team Members who will be joining remotely. We plan to use the same Zoom Room so all should be well in terms of just the standard process. But, again, do get in touch if you're planning to join remotely and we'll happily set up a test once we're on the ground in Brussels. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jennifer. So, if we have no more things to discuss or no more questions, I see nothing in the participant window and no additional

items in the group chat, let's go ahead and close out today's meeting.
Thank you everyone for joining and we'll see you next week.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. See you. Bye.

JACQUES BLANC: Thanks everybody. Bye.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]