
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. I'd like to welcome you to the ATRT3 Plenary Meeting #51 on the 6th of March, 2020, at 20:00 UTC.

The members attending the call today include Cheryl, Demi, Pat, Sébastien, Vanda, and Wolfgang.

Observers joining us: Jim Prendergast and Everton Rodrigues.

Attending from ICANN org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical writer Bernie is on the call.

Apologies from Leon. He will be delayed.

Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking.

Cheryl and Pat, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Brenda. I'll grab it to start with because right now my voice and my breathing is good. So I'll take the opportunity while that lasts.

Welcome, everybody. Thank you very much, everyone who has made the additional effort to be joining this additional call today, especially our stalwart audience, Jim and Everton. Honestly, guys, we really appreciate the fact that you are here. It's not that we would behave or act any differently with you, but it does give us some hope that people outside our review team within the ICANN community are actually interested and supportive of what we're doing. So thank you very much.

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.

With that slightly extended welcome—the roll call has been done—let’s do the usual administrivia of asking for any statement of interest updates.

I’ll give you a moment. Not seeing anybody raise their hand or type in chat, we will assume that there is nothing substantive that anyone needs to let us know about.

With that, we’ll go to Jennifer, I believe, for any of the action items, new and closed. Just a note. You’ll note now that Brenda is highlighting the complete reviews. Pat and I have had a chat. To make better use of people’s time as they are available to join or not join in our time together today, we are going to shuffle the order of the agenda today, just so you know. Pat and I want to look at the accountability indicators first because Sébastien is here now and he has certainly been making some comments in that text that we want to go through. [inaudible]. Then we’ll move on to the draft sections, the final report, and then we’ll move back to reviews [inaudible] if [inaudible] permits. There’s also, under Any Other Business, the review of our call for the week of the 9th or March. That shouldn’t take as long.

If there’s anyone with any other Any Other Business that they’d like to let us know about, you can put it in the chat.

With that, that’s today’s slightly modified agenda. I’ll go back to you now, Jennifer, for any action items on the review, both new and closed. [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Cheryl. It's going to be very short and sweet because, actually, I have no action items, new and closed, to report on. So back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Didn't think it would take long. That's great. All right. So, with that, I guess the document to bring up, which—thank you very much—is also the link in the chat, is Accountability Indicators, Version 1.5. Those of you who will be following along in the Google Doc, please use that link as opposed to anything that you already have open. As soon as we get that on screen, we'll go over to Bernie.

Just noting that we do have some additional people joining. Brenda will be noting members and observers as they join throughout the call.

There we go. I filibustered long enough. Bernie, over to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Just coming off mute. Can you hear me [properly]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfectly.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Excellent. All right. Hello, everyone. We're going to dive into the accountability indicators. You'll remember I had proposed a modification to how we were going to analyze that. People had generally agreed that it was a good thing [inaudible] in line with what

was being asked of us when we met in Singapore. So we'll just refresh ourselves on what that was. [inaudible] [wishing] to assess the accountability indicators, the ATRT3s had to develop its own evaluation criteria, given ICANN did not provide any with respect to its accountability indicator. ATRT3 used the following to establish its evaluation criteria.

Next page, please, Brenda. [inaudible] go back up a bit so we can get the full comment from Sébastien. Usefulness of accountability indicators. Best practice for accountability in indicators in many systems not only require [inaudible] but quantifiable but that they be crucial to achieving the goal or objective. In assessing the accountability indicators, it's clear that a number of these failed to meet this requirement.

We have a comment from Sébastien. "[Some indicators] [inaudible] only to inform the community." I said we needed to have a discussion because that's a big change. In my understanding of accountability indicators, they're not informational. They're about [measuring] [inaudible] going to provide an indication of progress against the goal that is in the operational plan. So it doesn't mean that, in other areas, there cannot be things or in any other way. But I think my understanding at least—please correct me—is that an accountability indicator is not informational. That definition I think makes more sense for what we're trying to do here and what is trying to be achieved with the accountability indicators.

But let's have a chat about it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. [First] in the queue [inaudible]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, ma'am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda first. Go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I agree with you, Bernie, that we have information in many other points on the websites and anything. When you're talking about measuring the progress, we need to measure against some goals or something, or they mean nothing. As [for] information, we have in many, many other alternative points—meetings, calls, and information about each kind of ACs and SOs—[that] are providing information about always what's going on on .org or the community. So I don't think that accountability indicators are just for information. They exist to measure progress. So I agree totally with Bernie. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Nobody else is in the queue, but, Sébastien, can I call on you? Because this was your concern.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. If you read my comments I don't talk about accountability indicators. I just talk about indicators. Okay, I know that my language is not English, but sometimes words are important. I don't

think that the data are somewhere else on the ICANN website. Therefore, my question was, we can say that it's not an accountability indicator but it's still an indicator that would be useful for the community.

Therefore, we request that ICANN either put it there and say it's not accountability indicators or somewhere else. I don't care where it is. I just think that, sometimes when we say, "It's not an accountability indicator," it may disappear completely. That will be a pity.

I know that very few people are reading that, but, now that we will have done all this communication around it and ICANN will have done more [notice] about that, it will be still important to have some of those data that are not just accountability but just sometimes useful to be known by the community. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for that, Sébastien. I think it does help us understand. Might I suggest that the locked-in translation here is because most of us are reading this paragraph as coupled set of words: "accountability indicators"? What you've done is pointed out something that I believe we had discussed a number of times before, and that is that the other valuable information that is not as [inaudible] classifying accountability indicator still has value and needs to be somewhere. In fact, we even talked about that link when we were together in our last face-to-face meeting.

But, Bernie, I'm sure you're going to be far more articulate about that than I was. Over to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. I understand what Sébastien [said]. [inaudible] fits in the accountability indicators. I think what we can do is put in another note that says there is—oh. “You have been signed out. You must sign in again to save.” [inaudible]. We can add a note saying there are a number of indicators that could be very valuable and of interest to the community that are not [inaudible]. But I would really avoid mixing too many things here. The idea behind the accountability indicators is [inaudible] against the objectives in the operational plan.

Back to you, ma’am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks. I’m just typing. It seems to me that what we can do is make a note that we should point out [inaudible] bleedingly obvious to all readers: that we are not saying that there is a lack of value or validity in the useful data that is not an accountability indicator but an informal set of data that is of value to the ICANN community or even simply under an open data program is important, is valuable, and does need to be easily sourced and resourced in an accessible way. We can certainly put that paragraph together. Hopefully that will pick up Sébastien’s concern but not muddy the waters on the strict definitional term that we have established for accountability indicators.

Back to you, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I do remember that one problem that we saw in a big majority of the indicators on the website is the problem that they are not measuring anything. They are not measuring against anything. Whatever the indicator is, the indicator needs to be measured. That is something that you need to alert [with], whatever we put in some other paragraph. But they need to be an indicator against something. That's my concern here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. That is the issue. Just that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Vanda. Certainly your comment is in keeping with the current text. So I think what we need to do is pick up Sébastien's point. Certainly, that has been reflected in previous conversations in our last face-to-face, that we just pop a paragraph high in this section, Bernie, to make sure that that concern is picked up.

Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Noted. We'll get that inserted in there. All right. Basically, what are our [evaluations] [inaudible]. Is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the main objective in basic definitions everywhere? That is a key. [inaudible] very clear. If there is no goal or objective, the

accountability indicator cannot contribute to achieving the main objective. If you're not measuring anything, as Vanda has said, [inaudible] crucial to achieving then objective.

Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? Is there information on how the goal or objective was defined? Is [inaudible] clear? As we'll see in some things, it's really not. Is there information on where the data comes from? Sourcing the data is very important. [inaudible] several times, and I completely agree with him. Sometimes we get this information that gets pulled out, and we just have no idea where it comes from or where we can go check or try to understand more about it.

Is the [information] [inaudible]? That's one of the killers for me. It's very well and fine to do this once a year and put this up, but are people actually taking the time to update those? It's fine if it [inaudible] year, but, if it's something that says that you're providing quarterly updates and you're not doing it, I think it clearly shows that there is an issue with how [seriously] [inaudible].

I'll halt there and see if there are any other questions on the evaluation criteria because everything else rests on that. Anybody else have comments on questions on these? Please.

Sébastien?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I have no problem with [this list]. It's just a general comment. I think sometimes our inputs are a little bit too dry. In one sense, we consider that accountability indicators provide us [inaudible] useful, but [with] some, it's not enough information. I think we need us to try to put —I will not say as much information as we can but some more information than just saying yes/no. I think it will be better first to be understood by the readers and the one who will put that into application.

The second point is that sometimes I think we need also have a comment about the graph because either it's very difficult to understand or it's not clear. That's something we may need to add in our comments. As we are the ones doing the comments, it must be something useful for the rest of the community. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sébastien, let me see if I've heard you correctly because the term "too dry" had me thinking of a martini because it's the only time "too dry" is relevant, unless I'm thinking about my skin.

One of the things I think I heard you say then was you would like see more expanded text, more explanation, or perhaps even an example, rather than just a simple yes or no.

Is that correct?

Okay. Thank you for that. So what's the reaction to that? Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: [inaudible] understand Sébastien's point. In a few of the assessments, there are comments in there, and we can add further comments. But [inaudible] well what was said in Singapore by Martin when he was looking at our first version of these is that [inaudible] for them to receive it if it is very parameterized. I'm using a French word there. Sorry. But, if [there are] very clear parameters, then how [are] we evaluating it? So that's what I tried to do [inaudible] to adding to those as we go through. It's up as a Google Doc. Let's do that if people think that will make it useful.

Is that okay?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like a plan. Thanks for that. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you. So, keeping that in mind, let's go through [inaudible] [formatted] them as per Sébastien's note that it was a little difficult to grab. I had to agree with that. So, using these criteria on the [inaudible] indicators as of the 22nd of February. I just want to be clear. Sébastien made a few comments on things in March we may have to revisit. But, right now, what we're [inaudible] from the accountability indicators [site] on the 22nd of February. I just want to make that very clear. [At] a time we are ready to finish, we can tweak it with the latest updates.

All right. Is the accountability [inaudible] [an] objective? Again, let's remember that, if there is no objective measure—goals set in the

accountability indicator—it cannot be crucial. So we've got [inaudible] meet this requirement. That's 15%. Twelve AIs are not clear if they do. We'll see when we go through them that sometimes it's not really obvious. 28 were 60% of a [inaudible], and that would be crucial to achieving the main objective.

Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? 23, or 50%, of the AIs, do not have a goal or objective [inaudible] is to be assessed. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? Of the 24 AIs that do have objectives, nine, or 38% of those, do [inaudible] on how that objective was set. Is what is being measured clear? For five, or 11% of the 47 AIs, it was questionable if what was being measured [inaudible] or 6% of AIs, what was being measured was not clear.

Is what is being measured – hmm. That's repeated. That's odd. Okay, we'll fix that. [inaudible] on where the data comes from. 39 of the 47— that's 83% of the AIs—there was no information as to where the data was sourced from. [inaudible]% of the AIs were clear as to the source of the data they were presenting.

I'm at the bottom of the page, Brenda. I see [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I guess you see my hand up. A few things. The first one is that I trouble really to understand [inaudible]. I have asked Brenda to call me then, as soon as it's done. I will make the [call outside] for a few seconds or minutes.

But my comment was about why there is, two times, the same thing. Is that because I made a proposal to decrease the complexity of the reading and you have ... I don't think we need to repeat the title. "Is what is being measured clear? For five, it was questionable. For three, it was not clear." We don't need to add what was being measured two times.

Therefore, it's why, when you look at the document, I prefer to not choose this one, which is in pink in your screen, I guess, but to choose this one and try to do the same for all. That means that it will decrease [inaudible]. I really have a hard time reading and understanding what was [inaudible]. It was a little bit too much for me. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

All right. That's not a big issue. That's just a language issue. But I was trying to do a quick fix according to what you were asking. I obviously missed, but we'll give it a second try.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Bernie. So that'll be something that will be fixed up. Thanks. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Oh, Sébastien, your hand is still—oh. Thanks. There you go.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Is the information on where the data comes from? 83% did not have information on where it was sourced from. For 2%, it was questionable if we had the information on where the data was sourced.

Finally, if the information being kept up to date [inaudible] as we're being kept up to date. 40% of the AIs were not being kept up to date, and, for 9% of the AIs, it was unclear if they were or not. When we go through that, we'll have a look.

Let's go down a bit. Then we've got our note that is in the recommendation, so I'm not going to go through that last paragraph.

Finally, the ATRT3 notes that a window-in-a-window approach used to display the accountability indicators makes it difficult to navigate and visualize the information [inaudible] user-friendly interface.

Before we get into the details of the assessment, any questions or comments?

It doesn't look like it. Thank you, everyone. Let's have a look at them. [inaudible] [globalize] ICANN. These things—you'll notice up there that we say it's as of the 22nd of February ... That Section 1: Evolve and further globalize [inaudible] from the operational plan. The sub-goal on that is: further globalize and regionalize ICANN functions. The indicator we're presented with [inaudible] simultaneous interpretation at ICANN meeting. Okay. Number of sessions with simultaneous interpretation at ICANN [inaudible]. You see the number can be quite high. That is because they count, even it's one meaning as in the GAC all day .. It can

have five or six. So they count those as individual sessions when I asked the question.

Text accompanying the graphic. That was misplaced. That need to go in [inaudible], and the assessment will be done in the next one.

Let's go down a bit and have a look. Percentage of sessions with simultaneous interpretation [inaudible] at ICANN meetings. Here we've got a target. We have no idea where it comes from. We have no idea why it's so low and why it hasn't been [inaudible].

Let's go down a bit. There's that text. It was switched from the previous one. Here's the assessment. [inaudible] accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal or objective of evolve and further globalize ICANN not clear. I put in "not clear" for the following the reason. You'll see in the comments that [inaudible]. Sébastien is underlining that translation and interpretation are very important. They are, but the point of [inaudible] setting an objective is not necessarily measuring things that we do anyways and regularly. [inaudible]. That was my thinking when I put in "not clear." I fully understand. That's why I didn't want to put in that it was not. [inaudible], it's, I think, not very well-defined or explain. But I'm not going to die in the ditch on that one.

Let me finish going through the various criteria and then we can take some comments [inaudible] for the sessions? Is there information on how the goal or objective [inaudible]?

Sorry. I dropped off there. Is what is [inaudible] is being [inaudible]? Is there information where the data came from? No. There is a in the information that is provided for [inaudible] for the [translation] that is

significantly out of date, with the latest entry being from July 2016. So that's the information we're given. That goes along the lines to earlier [inaudible] we need to provide more information. I think that's part of an example of things where we actually talk to things.

Then [inaudible]. Is the information being kept up to date? No. As of February 2020, the last entry was ICANN65, which was held in June 2019. [inaudible] which was held in November 2019. A lot of the accountability indicators have been updated to include [inaudible] 2020 fiscal year.

So there we are. I'll be glad to take comments on this one.

Not seeing anything. All right. Sébastien, are we leaving the assessment of the [inaudible] crucial as not clear? Or do you want to change it to, "Yes, it's crucial"?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I put my comments in. You gave your point of view. I'm not the only one on this team. I think it's important. But the word "crucial" is so deep. No, it's not crucial. Is it important? Yes. That will be short [time].

But I'm sorry. I will jump to something more technical. It seems that I am not the only one, but it's very difficult to listen to you. You are breaking a lot. If we can't fix that, we will not go far in this meeting because, really, it's very difficult to get you sometimes. I know what you are talking about, but I don't know what we can do. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, I can dial in. I'm using the computer sound right now. I have a phone, so [inaudible]. Would it be possible for you to dial me? Then we should be doing much better.

[BRENDA BREWER]: Just private message your phone number, Bernie. Thanks.

Just an update. We are dialing out to Bernie, and I just got messaged that it's busy. Stand by, please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I've been given a number to call out to, [so] I'll try that and I will be back with you in a second.

All right. Is this better?

Can you hear me?

[BRENDA BREWER]: Hi, Bernie. Yes, I can hear you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. [inaudible]

[BRENDA BREWER]: You sound far away. Are you on the headset?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. [inaudible]

[BRENDA BREWER]: Well ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Are we better than this or the previous one?

[BRENDA BREWER]: I don't hear you cutting out at the moment, so I'd say we're better.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I didn't get that. sorry.

[BRENDA BREWER]: You're not cutting out, Bernie. So we're fine. We're better.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, great. Now let's get back to it. [inaudible], is that better for you?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Great. All right. So we had finished 1.2, and we had talked about the "not clear." Sébastien was saying, "Well, it depends." I agree. That's

why I left it as “not clear.” It could go either way, depending. We’re not trying to be particularly difficult in those evaluations.

Let’s go down to 1.2: Bring ICANN to the [world] by creating a balanced and [proactive approach] to regional engagement with stakeholders ... [ICANN events] like stakeholder categories and regions. We have three graphics—basically the [inaudible] regions, which [inaudible] note is the JSE and not the five ICANN regions. Two [inaudible] stakeholders. Well, this is what it is. We’re not changing them at this point. We’re just trying to evaluate what is being provided for us. So we have total number of events and events by stakeholder category.

Then, If we go down a bit ... please, Brenda. Thank you. There’s a text accompanying the graphic. Sébastien comments that [inaudible] relating to stakeholder registration and effectiveness of the stakeholder [inaudible] that ICANN is under review and being replanned. A new timeline for [inaudible] this data and future plans [inaudible] sharing the data will be published in the next edition of the accountability indicators, without saying when that would be.

So that’s his comment. This part of the text is for engagement and community metrics timeline. [inaudible]. So go for it, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. It’s supposed to be another graph. You have one graph for ICANN events by stakeholder categories, and then you have a line, and then you have engagement and community metrics and timeline, where there is no graphics and where you have [these specs]. Therefore, the

text in yellow is not part of this graphic. It's part of another graphic [that is not present].

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Ah, okay. Now I understand. Okay, I'll take a note on that and have a look at it. Thank you very much for that.

Under the assessment, we have, is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal or objective? No because there's no objectives. Is there a goal or an objective? No. Is what is being measured clear? [I don't] think so. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No because there's no goal. Is information being [kept up to date]? No, as of February 2020, the last entry was fiscal year '19-['24], which, as we know, ends in the summer. I think, as I wrote elsewhere in here, it's reasonable to [inaudible] after [inaudible] to update things. But, if [inaudible] fiscal year '19, '24] is quite a ways off. [inaudible].

If you're speaking, Sébastien, I'm not hearing you.

All right. We'll carry on and see if you can get your technical issues fixed [inaudible]. Thank you.

Let's move on to the next one: Evolve policy development and governance processes, structures, and [inaudible] to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective, and responsive. This is from David Olive's group in policy. That's quite a big objective. But, as you'll see, as we're going through everything ... I don't know. These accountability objectives ... Anyways, let's go through them.

Here's our first one. Representation. Formal membership totals across supporting organizations and advisory committees. The formal membership total number of members ... I didn't include all the graphics here, but you can click and you can get them by the [various] groups. I've given one example below for the GNSO.

If we could keep going down, Brenda, please. There we go. So you got them for all the SOs and the ACs in the same thing. So the text accompanying the graphic ... So that's a comment. "I don't know where the data are coming from." I just say I agree. We have a category [inaudible] in our assessment, which we evaluate as [inaudible] information provided.

The decline is due to [inaudible] GNSO recalibration to remove double-count members. Are the multiple memberships taken into account? Again, not really clear, given that we have limited access to the information. But we can put those in as comments and see if that helps.

Under our assessment, is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal? No, there's no objective. Is there a goal or an objective? No. Is there information on how that goal or objective is defined? No, there's no goal. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data came from? No, not really. Is there information being kept up to date? No. As of February 2020, the last monthly entry was from November 2019.

We'll halt there. Throw up your hand if you have questions and we'll [inaudible] necessarily since we've got quite a few of these to go through.

Our next one under that same objective is participation measure of community activity in policy development and engagement. [We would have thought public comment forums: quantity and duration]—so, basically, average duration and days of public comment forum and the number of forums. We're not really sure if these are forums related only to policy development or not because we don't have access to the data. It's not really clear if this makes a lot of sense as an accountability indicator.

Let's go to the assessment. Is the accountability indicator crucial for achieving the goal? No, there's no objective.

Can we go down a bit, Brenda, please? Is there a goal? No. Is there information on how the goal was defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes. As of February 2020, the last [inaudible] entry was from fiscal year '19.

Not seeing any hands. Let's go to the next one: Active working groups and other policy activities. So it's the number of groups and activities, whatever those means.

Now let's go down a bit. You'll see that those are provided on a monthly basis. That's a total. Right below it, you can click on the various groups and you will get the numbers of the various SOs and ACs.

Let's have a look at the assessment for this one? Is the accountability indicator crucial? No. Is there a goal or objective? No. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. Sort of. It may be a maybe. I may be not clear on

that one because I'm not sure how they measure various things since we don't have the data. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? No. As of February 2020, the last monthly entry was for November.

So there's that one there. I see you're there, Pat. Can you [inaudible] there just [inaudible] to reconsider is that is maybe not clear on 133-24.

Next one: SO/AC policy and advice development. Number of teleconferences and working hours.

Can we go down a bit, Brenda? Thank you – oops. [inaudible]. Let's see what's being measured. Sébastien said he had trouble understanding this graphic. Sometimes it can be difficult to understand these graphics that have a lot of the information. On the left vertical axis, we've got number of calls/total hours.

Sébastien, I see your hand.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sorry. Time to get out of my [inaudible]. I finally understood, but it's quite complicated because the axis ... In fact, you can just measure what is below, what is green, but not what's in blue because you have to do a subtraction to know what is the number from the blue. When you take an example of one and you try to divide and make out how many minutes it has taken, it seems to be wrong. It's difficult to understand, and I am not sure about the veracity or if it's really the right number. It's quite strange for me.

I will stop here, but if I can come back to the data for SO and AC members, I would like to make another comment. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. While we've got you speaking, let's back up to that SO and AC membership slide, please, Brenda. [inaudible] groups. That's the one—

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to let you know, we don't need to see it. But I was asking where those data are coming from. I guess those data from At-Large are coming from At-Large, but they are adding apples and oranges because they are adding, if I understood well and if I'm not mistaken, the At-Large Structure and the individual members. That means that, in one end, you have an organization with six dozen/hundred/thousands of members, and, at the other end, you have individual members. Definitely you can't add them. It's a wrong measure. It's a wrong way to show the situation. I am concerned that it may be not just for At-Large. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Well, what would be really helpful? If you can write [inaudible] what you just said. I'll turn it into a note to accompany that particular point. So just put it in as a comment and that'd be great. I'd be glad to add that in.

I see a hand from Jaap.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: It's similar with the membership of SSAC. They seem to add the caucus members to SSAC as well, or the description is wrong. I mailed that to you earlier, but [I] can do that again.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you, Jaap. Again, we're not sure, as you said. The evaluation criteria [inaudible]. We don't know where the data is coming from, so we can make a specific comment, whether it's right or it's wrong. Obviously, you're in the SSAC and you know it looks wrong, but the point is, we don't have the data. But we can certainly put in a note saying it looks like, for the ALAC and for the SSAC, that things are mixed up and [inaudible].

All right. Thank you for those. We'll get that fixed up. All right. We just finished with the [inaudible] graphics. Now let's go to the assessment of that one, 1342, Brenda. Thank you. Is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal? Well, there's no goal so there can't be. Is there a goal? No. Is there information about how the goal or objective was defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes, but confusing. Is there information on where the data is from? No. Is the information kept up to date? No, as of February 2020, the last monthly entry was from November.

Jaap, I see your hand. Is that an old hand?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

No problem. Thank you. All right. Our next accountability indicator: Total e-mail [exchanges] on specific policy and advice issues. Let's [inaudible] a bit. Total e-mail exchanges on specific policy and advice issues [inaudible] e-mails exchanged. This is broken down by SO and AC.

Let's go down a bit on that one, Brenda, please. [inaudible] examples. There we go. By month.

Our assessment. Is the accountability indicator to achieving the objective or goal? No. There's no objective. Is there a goal? No. Is there information of the goal that's defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes, although I will say, after thinking about it and looking at these things, maybe, if we had access to the data and we understood what they were measuring, it would be easier, but I'm [inaudible] this one to, "It's not clear," because I don't [inaudible] e-mail exchanges. Are you counting staff [announcements] in there? Are you mixing everything on a SO or an AC? So I really think that, at best, it's not clear and possibly what is being is not clear after thinking about it really. What are those things?

"What is the meaning [inaudible] e-mails?" Yes. Exactly, Vanda. That's my point.

So I'm going to suggest here that we change that 13524 to a no, unless there is some real argument for that. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? No. As of February 2020, the last monthly entry was from November. And we're talking February, so obviously it's not being kept up to date. Thank you for that.

Let's keep on going, Brenda, please. [inaudible] SO/AC [council] resolutions and advice statements completed. So it's the total number of council resolutions and advice activities. I'm not really sure [inaudible].

I'll take this opportunity to ask the questions. Does [inaudible] better? Yeah, I [inaudible]. Are those data used [inaudible] of some staff? My answer to that [inaudible] we don't have the data [inaudible]. I'm hoping that was more of a facetious question than a very serious one.

If we go down a bit, Brenda, you'll see that it's broken down by SOs and ACs by month. Where's our assessment? Here it is. Is it critical? No. There's no objectives. Is there an objective? No. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measure clear? That one I'm going to change to a no again. After thinking about, what is included in resolutions and advice activities? I don't know, unless it's clear for everyone else here. 13624. No, for the same reasons we discussed there. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes, it's relevant to [inaudible], Vanda. [inaudible]. Is it kept up to date? No. As of February 2020, the last monthly entry was for November 2019. So there we go.

Of course, you're not [inaudible] November 2019 on the graphic that we have on the screen because, as I explained later in the document, I copied those graphics from the accountability indicators in October. It's a really painful task to copy each of one of those over each of the documents. So I'm going to wait until we'll finished to have the really final ones.

Sébastien, I see your hand.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Two comments. The first one is that I really want us to talk about the title: Productivity. Are we as a community to be productive or be efficient? I think just the title is misleading because to be productive we need to have 5/7/10/hundreds of comments.

The second is I guess I understand what they are counting. They are counting the number of council resolution and advice activities. That means that, for example, when At-Large is putting a comment in a comment period, it's not counted. It's just when ALAC is giving an advice. Therefore, it's always a question of what GAC, ALAC, or the other ACs have to do if they have just to wait and give an advice at the end of what work or participate in the discussion. It's why all these graphics are quite misleading. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Again, if you can write a few words as a comment, Sébastien, I'd be really glad to include that as a note.

All right. What's our assessment of this one? We've just finished that.

All right. And we're done with policy. We're moving on to Section 2.

Sébastien, your hand is still up. Do you have another comment?

No? Okay, thank you. So our second major objective is to support a healthy, stable, and resilient unique identifier system. The sub-goal is the same thing on this one. So, overall performance. Here we go.

Overall performance: 100% all the time. Overall customer satisfaction: 100% all the time.

These tables can be further broken down into GDD operations, Global Support Centre, and new gTLDs.

So what's our assessment here? Is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal? It sounds like it is to me? Is there or goal or objective [inaudible]. Sébastien is questioning whether there's a goal. If we go back up the graphic for a second—please, Brenda—my interpretation of this is that you see there is a service-level commitment—that little black bar with the dot on it. If you're at 100% all the time, then obviously there's no point to put that in because you're at the maximum. So I'm not taking that as there is no goal if you're achieving 100% all the time. That's the way I'm looking at it.

Let's go back down to the assessment. Thank you. Yes, there is a goal as far. As I'm concerned, [inaudible] 100%. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? Yes. If you dive down on then information that is provided on that accountability indicator, they give you all the information that you want about how these things are measured and where the data comes from. Is that is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information where the data comes from? Is the information being kept up to date? Yes. As of February 2020, the last monthly entry was fiscal year 2021, which was, if you're in February, ['22] as not closed. So that's the latest information you can have.

Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I really don't understand what is being measured. Consumer satisfaction? If you add them, you will need to have a survey and then you have a happy customer or not. It's quite [inaudible] that even for this so good organization as ICANN we have always 100%. But overall preferments? What does it mean? Foster and coordinate a [inaudible], secure, stable, and resilient identifier ecosystem and overall preferments? What are you measuring? If you're happy the morning when the [boys] come to the job? Or what is this?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No. As I was saying, they do provide links that actually detail what they're measuring and how they're measuring. If you go through them, just [inaudible] perspective—they do provide you the information as to what they're measuring and how.

Now, are we satisfied with that? That's another question we're not evaluating. We're not at this point evaluating how good these things are. I think ICANN is going to have to work with the community to see what kind of indicators are actually useful and if what is being measured is useful. But just from a point of view a criteria, they do actually provide all the information and then, with that information, I think the community can decide if they think that this is a reasonable way to measure things. If that's the case, is it really a useful accountability indicator.

Does that make sense? I understand your concern.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but I would like to maybe a little bit to tweak the answers. No the graphic and yes if you go down to more information because what we are measuring –what we’re supposed to measure—is not that we have a link to other information. It’s, is it a graphic that’d help us understand what is the result of [inaudible]?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, okay. I see your point. All right. In ’21-’24, [fix]. Okay, I get your point. Thank you. [inaudible]

2.2. Plans for changes in the use of unique identifiers and develop technology roadmaps to help guide ICANN activities. Under that, we have ICANN interaction with the technical and public safety communities: presentations, publications, and training. That is by quarter. They seem to continuously be going down. There’s text that [conveys] that, which describes what they’re talking about here. This data represents the Office of the CTO interaction with the technical and public safety communities in regards to publications, presentations, keynotes, and research projects that [inaudible]. These activities highlight the number of request for activities that ICANN receives in relation to our technical and public safety communities.

Number of requests for activities that ICANN receives. Anyways, [inaudible] the text the way this thing goes. Are we measuring the actual things or the number of things that are received? If we go back up a bit, Brenda, to the header [inaudible] presentations, publications, and training. So one would have to hope that these are the things that are actually done, and we should put in a note.

I see Pat has his hand up, so maybe he can help us there.

PAT KANE:

I'm not sure I can help, Bernie, but I do have a question. This is the kind of example where I struggled with the ones coming out of then OCTO area specifically because, if we're saying that the high-level [inaudible] is [proactively] [inaudible] changes, I'm trying correlate that down to 221, which is the number of interactions that we have with the technical and public safety communities because I don't get an understanding in how they described this as: what are changes are we planning for? Is it for the DNS abuse topic that's currently going on within the community? Is it taking a look at the evolution of identifiers to include digital object architecture, block chain, alternate routes?

So the correlation that I'm missing is, if we're trying to plan for the changes, what are the changes and where are those documented? To me, that's the hard point when I jump into the lower level of each of these: they become more granular. How do they fuel the previous item? So there's so many here. We look at the assessment. It's ... I don't know. I can't tell. There's not enough data to say, does this actually achieve the objectives?

So, if everything gets tied back to the [inaudible] strategic plan from '21 to '25, does all this lead to a suggestion or a recommendation that is: scrap all of this and redo based up on the strategic plan?

I know we're just evaluating them right now, but I'm trying to see where do we get to that makes these things actually meaningful. Because this

feels like a, “Oh, yeah. Here’s something we can track,” not, “Here’s how we help make a better decision.”

So I guess this is just an example of what’s frustrating for me.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think that would make a, as I told Sébastien [inaudible]. If you just write a few lines as a little comment here, that would probably make a great additional note on the [inaudible] to provide more information to ICANN.

PAT KANE: Yeah. I will totally do that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you, Pat. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I thought here and understood is I don’t know if it was the issue being when to measure here, but there is a way you ask for someone from ICANN to come as we did to explain a specific problem for the tech community. They came and explained and made a presentation and helped people deal with that. So it has happened here, but I don’t know if it’s this kind of solicitation that they are [coming in] the direction they are talking about. But, if it is, it works very well. But I’m not sure if it is. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. I have to log off for just a minute and rest my throat [inaudible] if we're going to take ... We've been at it for [inaudible]. I'll give everyone a [three]-minute break—a bio break and everything else. Let's see. It's 14 after the hour. If that's okay—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We could take the whole five minutes.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, five minutes. Okay. Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, everybody. Hope you all made good use of your mini-break. We'll take another mini-break as we find the opportunity after we get towards our second of the three hours that we will be doing today in our virtual [inaudible].

With that, hopefully Bernie has rested his voice a little. Vanda, I'm going to assume that is an old hand, unless you park in the chat that it is a new hand. We'll get back to you now, Bernie. Over to you.

If you're speaking, Bernie, we're not hearing you.

Can anyone hear me?

BRENDA BREWER: Hi, Cheryl. Yes, we hear you, Cheryl. It looks like Bernie's phone connection has dropped. He's aware of this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. I almost was happy to just miss every 15th word. But anyway, let's get him back on. Hopefully the audio gremlins will go somewhere else to make someone else's life a misery.

BRENDA BREWER: Here we go. Bernie is back now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thank you for that, Brenda. Bernie, have we gotcha?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Ah, there we go. I'm unmuted. Sorry. A few technical issues, folks. There we go. [inaudible] useful. Let us keep going. 2.2.2: Domain abuse activity reporting. [inaudible] had a problem [inaudible]. This sort of generic [inaudible], so [inaudible] which goes with [inaudible]. It's that the domain abuse activity reporting is a system for [setting] and reporting on domain name registration and security threats and abuse behavior across top-level domain registries and registrars [inaudible] purpose of domain activity reporting is to report security threat activity to the ICANN community which can use the data to facilitate and form policy decisions.

Sébastien quite correctly puts in the link to the [inaudible] information. If we go down a bit, please, Brenda. All right. Now, the [DAAR] information is really well done if you followed the link. Providing the information may be really good. It may be one of those things that is

informational. [inaudible] the comments from here. Is the accountability indicator crucial to the goal or objective of supporting a healthy and stable, blah, blah? No. A project [planning] is not an accountability indicator. [That's] my fundamental stand on this. Is there a goal or objective? I guess technically. And the project is a goal. So yes. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. [inaudible] measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Unless it's in the project planning. Is the information being kept up to date. No. As of February 2020, the indicator had not changed since it's publication in June 2019. We're [setting] the completion date as February 2019 [inaudible] is not an indicator." Yeah, I know, but they're stating it is. So that one I'm referring to is still [inaudible]. Regardless of what we call this thing, it still hasn't changed since its publication. [inaudible].

2.2.3: Internet technology health indicators. Another project plan. [inaudible] technology health indicators metrics. They're there to help the Internet unique identifier system that ICANN helps coordinate. As soon as those metrics are defined, ICANN the organization will measure and track them for a substantive period of time to study the evolution of the state of the [inaudible] technology. It will include [inaudible] ICANN provides it. This is another one where OCTO is producing a lot of great informational data. It's very interesting. [inaudible] all done and explained how it's done. But the project plan by itself is not really useful, so let's go to the assessment.

Is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal or objective? No. Project planning is not an accountability indicator. Is there a goal or

objective? Again, [inaudible] because [inaudible] plan has a closing date. [I mean, really.] Is there information on how the goal [inaudible]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Have we lost Bernie?

BRENDA BREWER: I cannot hear him. Bernie, your audio is gone ... Oh, he just disconnected, so I'm sure he'll be dialing back. Bernie, do you want to try your VoIP again?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I found that last phone connection as bad as the original VoIP anyway. While Brenda and Bernie wrangle the gremlin, we will have a little hiatus obviously—

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: It will give us a [precursor] of what will happen next week.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sébastien, I was thinking the exact same thing, that this is a precursor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely, except it will be amplified on a much greater scale. We saw the challenges we had getting our bridges working with our last face-to-face meeting. Just multiple that. We shall see. Hmm. Things that make us go "Hmm."

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. Just again it's for ATRT3. The rest will work perfectly well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I hope that's not the case. I'd be very disappointed if I was singled out to that extent.

All right. Have we got Bernie back yet, Brenda?

BRENDA BREWER: We do not. I'm trying to communicate with him. I'll keep you up to date as I know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. It must be exciting in your job.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm back.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yay!

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm back on the computer. The Mexican telephone operator is telling me that I cannot dial out. We're going to have to stick with this for a little while, and then I'll try again a little later with the phone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Back to you then, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. So we had finished 2.23, and now we're in 2.3: Support the evolution of domain [inaudible] and trust it. Again, another project plan as an accountability indicator. I thought the text was interesting. "Published for public comment in July 2016 and updates with current data in June 2018. Report available here." [inaudible] assessment? No. Project plan is still not an accountability indicator. Is there a goal or objective? Yeah, but, you know. Is there information on [inaudible] and in the '20 version it has changed. Is what is being measured clear? Yes, if it's a project plan. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is [inaudible] As of January 2020, the ending date has been changed to May 2020.

We have a comment from Sébastien there that says [inaudible]. Yeah. Again, it's, I think, one of those things that we can add as a note in there, but against the criteria we're using to evaluate those [inaudible] information that we're providing.

All right. 3 we're changing. Now, these are more fun because the finance group—

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to the previous one, yes, it's up to date, but it's a little bit like if, at the end of this call, we decide to change the 5th of April for the 5th of October without saying that to anybody but just putting it somewhere on the website. Even putting everything with the 5th of April not visible, it's where I think it's a concern for us. They update but they didn't give the reason. But even they didn't show that they are updating. If you come today, you don't know that this was updated. It's because you took this information a few months ago that we know that they updated. Therefore, I am concerned with the way they're working. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We're not sure that they haven't gone [inaudible] changed those dates, but I think what we can add as a note on that one, if we back up a bit—I'll just take a note on 23136—is to note the concern. We can add a note to that along those lines, Sébastien. Will do.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. And you have still the [3.7] without any data after.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. All right. #3: Advance organizational, technological, and operational excellence. [inaudible] one. The first goal: ensure ICANN's long-term financial accountability, stability, and sustainability, short-

term financial accountability. And we [have] [inaudible] funding in millions of dollars by quarter. We have the budget which is the objective. We see that we're meeting those.

Further breakdown [inaudible] action fees, registrar fixed fees, registry transaction fees, and registry fixed fees and others. So the text accompanying the graphic: expenses are under budget due to lower personnel costs [inaudible] timing difference in administration projects. For more detailed information, please check the quarterly reports. And we have Sébastien who has provided a link, which I'll include in there.

The [assessment] [inaudible] crucial to our goal? Yes. It sounds like it should be? Is there a goal or objective against which the data can be assessed? Yes. Is there information on how the goal or objective [inaudible] through the budget process. Is what is measured being clear? Yes, I think so. Is there information on where the data comes from? Yes, through the financial tracking information. [inaudible] Yes. As of January 2020, the last monthly entry was for fiscal year '20 Q1.

We have a comment. "As of March, it's still the same. Must have been an update for fiscal year '20 Q2. [inaudible] Sébastien's hand up. Sébastien?"

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Yeah, I agree with your answer to my comments. Therefore, it must have been published in February because Q2 is October, November, and December, and we are now in the third of month of Q3. Therefore, I agree with you. It's why I am not sure that it's updated.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll double-check against the actual data, but the last time I checked, they were up to date. But I'll take that note and I'll make sure that ...

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I know that it's not up to date because we have just Q1 of fiscal year '20 in the document. I am following it. One thing who is quite difficult is that when you get graphic that you have on the paper, it's great. You have four quarter, you can compare one with the other, or you can see what is the trend.

Here, we have just the first quarter and the [inaudible] is just the part of Q1 and there's nothing else. Therefore, I don't know what it's used for. It's not useful for the first quarter. Therefore, I am questioning—in other part of the document, we have the possibility to go from one year to another year [inaudible] somewhere. I will see it later on. And I'm questioning if we can do the same here. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, thank you very much. And I know as you interfaced in one of the recent At-Large calls that you've been working harder than everyone else, actually, [inaudible] you indicated on all of this. But I also want to give the opportunity for other voices to be heard. So while we're now moving into the area of more traditional accountability indicators, if you'd like to make some comments, please do put your hand up. You do not have to have been the person who's been working so hard editing this document, as Sébastien obviously has been. But it is

important that we're not just listening to a dialog or monolog here today. You've all contributed an amount of your time, and even if it's an agreement or side comment, please put it in chat or raise your voice to be heard. You are a review team and I do want to make sure that Pat and I give all of the voices every opportunity to be heard.

Sébastien, I think what I heard from your comment there was that the concept of having very short block of data in a graphic in something that is looking at long-term financial accountability is falling short and that it would be a benefit to have some of this graphical information presented to the community as a multi-quarter or annual approach as well as this—or instead of—this quarterly. Is that correct?

Excellent. Okay, I think, Bernie, we can probably craft up something to fix that up as a comment. And again, team, let's hear from as many of you as possible. Right now, I know that both Vanda and Sébastien and Pat are awake, but really like to get some confirmation from some of the rest of you. Back to you, Pat. Oh, no, I won't say Pat. Obviously I should not be in charge of anything today. I'm day ten of being unwell. My apologies, people. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, ma'am. I thought I was getting away with things. Okay, long-term financial accountability 3.1.2. All right, expenses fiscal year 19 again, the slides from October. I will repeat it's a real pain to get these slides into this document, and so once we're finished I'll re-update with the latest.

I imagine this one will suffer from the same problem if there's only Q1 in there. Let's go down to the assessment, please, Brenda. These go through accountability indicator, crucial, yes, is there a goal or objective, yes, is the information on the goal or objective as defined, yes, is what is being measured clear, yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? Yes. And is the information [inaudible]? So yes, I'll double check that, Sébastien, and we'll update accordingly.

All right, next one, long-term financial accountability, funds under management, reserve fund, actual [inaudible]. That's rather clear. Not going to go through the text, let's go to the assessment.

Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes [inaudible]. The last annual entry was for fiscal year 19, so obviously that works. Fiscal year planning process, a little different on that one. Number of stakeholder groups submitting [comments] on the annual process, and percentage of groups participating by year. So there you've got participated, did not participate. One of these double [graphs.]

3.1.4.2, is the accountability indicator crucial? Number of participants, I don't think so, not versus our objective. Is there a goal or objective? No. Is there information on how the goal [inaudible]? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes, more than not. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is information being kept up to date? Yes, as of January 2020, the last annual [inaudible].

All right, so let's carry on. I'm not seeing any hands here. Deadline for publishing annual audited financial statements.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: May I, Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, Vanda. Please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I saw that the goal for what was asking in 3.1.4.2 is 100% of AC and SO. I don't see if it's needed to state that the goal is that, because if they are measuring how many comments for each one of those, I believe that the goal should be all those communities [have sent] comments on that, or not? So, are they paying attention or they understand that that is what could be measured on that if they get the 100% of AC and SO?

so I don't know if we should put some more comments on that, because it is not fundamental but it's quite important to see if what they are doing is following by AC and SOs, and the comments they receive is quite important to improve their performance.

So I don't know if we just say no, no, or yes, yes, or we should comment on something. It's just to comment on the way we are putting that to be relevant for the group that is doing that or not.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I understand the point, Vanda, but as Cheryl says in the chat, "But the goal [inaudible]." I guess we can put in a note saying it would be nice if your goal was to get 100% participation. But even if we did that, it wouldn't really fix [inaudible] accountability indicator, because the

fact that people comment is not critical to achieving the goal, I don't think. It's [inaudible]. If you're speaking, we're not hearing you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't know if you're talking to me because we are not hearing you, Bernie. When you finish your sentence, and if you give me the floor, I am happy.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, I am —

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. It's just to say that we have two graphics, and in fact my impression is we don't need two, we can just cite the total number of groups participating—I don't know what it is, it seems that it's 17, then you do 17 and then you do the blue on the first one and not percentage. But you need to make [inaudible]. But I agree with you with the fact that I'm not sure that it's so relevant. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you. Yes, I think that's the basic point. All right, 3.1.5, deadline for [inaudible] statements by fiscal year, and then we've got text, and let's go to the—all right, is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving—all right, I'll give it a yes. Is there a goal or objective? Yes. Is there information [inaudible] measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No, but that's a minor no

because I'm sure when the [inaudible]. But we don't have a formal definition of what they consider to be that date.

Is the information being kept up to date? As of January [inaudible]. I think we're going to have to look into that to see if they've actually met the fiscal year 19 requirements, but that's just to be checked [inaudible].

All right, percentage staff voluntary turnover. [inaudible] interesting comment about involuntary or involuntary turnover. No information provided. I'm not getting into that. However, there is an industry [inaudible] measured against, there is a target. This is good that we're under the target, and probably significantly under the target, so that's the information [we're presented.]

So we've got some text defining how they measure things. Sorry, Brenda, if I'm breaking up [inaudible]. Assessment, is the accountability indicator crucial? I gave it a yes, but I'm willing to take opposing viewpoints. Is there a goal or objective against [inaudible] information on how the goal or objective is defined? Yes, they do provide the relevant references. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data [inaudible]? Don't know. And is the information being kept up to date? Yes, as of January 2020, the last quarterly entry was fiscal year 20 Q1. And Sébastien notes that it's there [inaudible] if under our current dates that still makes sense for you. [1.6.3.6,] check the date.

Okay, security [inaudible]. Total events supported. Not sure how you support a security event, but anyways, by quarter. Then there are

[inaudible] which is defined as low, medium and high, and then there is support provided as informational, logistical and personnel. Text accompanying the [inaudible] on a case by case basis the specific support requirements for each event. The pie charts show generic weighting of each type of support [inaudible] although the exact proportions of the support type may vary from event to event.

Vanda writes, "Guaranteeing the event do not break the fundamentals." All right. Our assessment. Is it critical? No, there's no objective. Is there a goal or objective? No. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measured [inaudible]? We'll say yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information kept up to date? No. As of February 2020, the last quarterly update was fiscal year 19 Q4.

[inaudible] informational one, but not clear it's an accountability indicator. Next [inaudible]. All right, risk management, roadmap progress plus overall individual tracks. Now, I was a little [inaudible] what this was showing us. Let's go to our assessment. The title sounds like it should be critical, crucial [inaudible] it wasn't clear. Is there a goal or objective? Again, not clear. If we look at the graphic, we've got these black lines on top. We can imagine there [inaudible] goals, but it's not stated anywhere.

Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? No. Is there information on where the [inaudible]? Information being kept up to date, yes. As of February 2020, the last quarterly entry was for fiscal year 20 Q1. Note the graphic has four columns but the associated text fails to define what [inaudible].

Anyways, it is what it is. No questions? Okay. Ensure structured coordination of ICANN's technical resources. ICANN digital services [inaudible] digital services availability at the end of March 2019, so we have the last 90 days and the last year, and we have [inaudible] set at 100%.

Okay, additional charts available for tier one, tier two under the categories community, contracted parties, IANA and staff. We have a comment on the text accompanying the graphic, participate.icann.org Adobe Connect was taken down intentionally for security review and remediation in April. RADAR [was offline] for two weeks of maintenance to address a security issue. And Sébastien's comment is still 100%.

Available versus functioning, I guess it depends on what you're measuring. If you're measuring [inaudible] maybe it was just a drop in the bucket, and so again, it goes to having the data and being able to understand what is being measured so we can actually put in the [inaudible] an interesting comment or a useful comment.

So, is this crucial to achieving the objective? Not clear for me. Is there a goal or objective? Yes. [inaudible] objective is defined. If it's 100%, you're meeting 100%, then I'll say yes. Is what is being measured clear? No. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? [inaudible] the last 90-day entry was for March 2019. So [iffy] how useful this is going to be. Next one, please.

[inaudible]. All right, so we have universal acceptance readiness of services phase one completed, in progress and in queue. Text accompanying that, phase one enhances all of ICANN services to

support long TLDs, TLDs with names longer than three characters such as museum or .plumber are considered long TLDs.

ICANN services to support Unicode and IDN e-mail addresses. An IDN TLD is an internationalized domain name, top-level domain. This refers [inaudible] no more [winning] comments for me as I was not able to go further. Well, I'm sure you'll finish it, Sébastien. We'll be looking forward to those.

Latin alphabet [inaudible] IDN TLDs has permitted people to make use of names in many more languages than could be achieved in the legacy TLDs. All right, our assessment. Crucial to achieving a goal? [inaudible] Objective? no. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? No. I see a hand from Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah, I do believe that universal acceptance is something crucial for the environment and users of Internet around the world. So if your ISPs, providers, do not recognize those TLDs as something that is valid, you can lose a lot of your connection or people that are assigned under those are not able to connect with the others. So the meaning of a global internet is breaking.

So I believe that is quite important. I say that to have a clear indication, I don't know if this is a clear indication, but have a clear indication [on] it is in your country the websites around—the ISPs are able to deal with these new names and new TLDs. It's quite relevant. So I don't know how we're going to put this one, but I believe that just say that is crucial to

us [inaudible] is important or not, it's something that is quite difficult [to define,] because in my view, this is quite relevant for the users and even for the business groups. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Vanda. And so I understand your point, but I think what is being [inaudible] is ICANN's internal preparedness, at least from what I could read. So we're not talking about getting the world ready to actually deal with these things [inaudible] and that is way beyond ICANN. But we're talking about ICANN getting itself ready in its systems. But I'll take a note of that and we are [inaudible].

All right. Vanda, you [inaudible]. Yes, it's something that would be [achieve and measure,] and maybe like the domain abuse report, it's informational. But I don't think ICANN can dictate or be responsible for ensuring that ISPs carry out things, and universal acceptance is important. Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah, no. Of course, it's not responsible, but to have information that was measured from ICANN to the community is quite important for the multi-stakeholder groups anyway. So it, in my point, could be an accountability of they are doing once you deliver the new gTLDs and you have an agreement with them and disagreements. You are not demanding that they guarantee to keep universal acceptance within their [distributed groups] or something like that. It's something that they need to pay attention to be accountable to the community.

So it's quite complex because it's not by themselves just themselves that they can do something, but they can do a lot of work to improve the universal acceptance by for instance adding some points on the agreement for instance and see if they are respecting these things, or those kinds of things that could be very good indicators.

But I agree that this one is not important, because they should be—they start the issue, so they should be ready to really have universal acceptance. But even that, I don't know if they are fully. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yeah, I'm not sure either, and I think Pat makes a great [inaudible]. Thanks for that. The metric should be about a number of something that becomes universal acceptance. Number of browsers, number of e-mail clients, number of registrar websites, etc. Universal acceptance is about advocacy, as you point out, not ICANN's readiness. That is certainly an ICANN community metric as opposed to an ICANN Org metric.

Yeah. Listen, folks, [inaudible] trying to—and you'll remember that in our recommendation, we're saying that once ICANN goes through our comments we're making with the accountability [inaudible] going to fix them, and that they go to public comment on this stuff so that the community can have input on useful indicators and we can have a community discussion on those.

Now, each of the goals, a separate page, if you will, in the accountability indicators [inaudible] on that goal. And that doesn't get published anywhere. I asked for it and I could not get it. And there is also no

report on what is done with that [inaudible] the accountability indicators are not. Vanda, I see your hand.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry, my hand is not intend to going down for some reason. So I don't know if it is raises or not. Sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No problem. All right. okay, very useful discussion, I'm taking a lot of notes on that, and let's move on [inaudible]. 3.2.3, DNSSEC status, ICANN domain name portfolio. Now, I was very intrigued by this [inaudible] portfolio. It's interesting to read up on this and I would invite everyone to do that. [inaudible] how helpful that is versus the stated objective, but lets go to our assessment, please, 3.2.3.3.

[inaudible] goal? No. No objective. Is there a goal or objective? No. Is there information on how the goal or objective's defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yeah, they actually defined it. [inaudible] where the data comes from? Yeah, they do that too. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes, as of February 2020, the last quarter entry was fiscal year 20 Q1, and as [inaudible] comment from Séb, this will have to be rechecked as now we are in March. Jaap, you always have interesting comments on this stuff, so let's hear from you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes. I would like—what they're measuring is actually important here. They might have a lot of domains under their own management, and a lot of them are signed, but what really happens if you look slightly closer

is that a lot of [services are actually] outsourced to other people. And so [the empty point is assigned to mean that] they get redirected to something which is not signed at all. So it's really important what we really mean with this. [inaudible] it's kind of [inaudible] problem in the background.

The same can be said about IPv6. [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

That's our next graphic. But can I ask you, Jaap, since you're very knowledgeable in this area, if you could write just [inaudible] graph that we can use as a note on this one? I think that would be most helpful if you could do that.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Yeah. I should go back to my old knowledge. It has been discussed in SSAC as well for a little bit.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

That'd be great. Thank you. All right, IPv6, 3.2.4. IPv6 deployment status, [inaudible] managed root servers. And we have IPv4 plus IPv6-enabled servers and then IPv4 only. So we've got that [inaudible]. We've got it by ICANN Org services as opposed to servers, and then we have some text. These are [inaudible] ICANN Organization and community but managed by ICANN Org. All services are accessible over IPv4 and capable of being accessed over IPv6. Our target [inaudible] over both IPv4 and IPv6.

I'm a little confused about that because the previous line says that all services are accessible via [inaudible] being accessed over IPv6, and then it says the target is to have all services accessible over both. Anyways, a little confusing but maybe Jaap can help me with that one. [inaudible] unclear. I don't know if there's a goal given what is stated. Is there a goal? Yes. Is there information on how the goal objective is defined? [inaudible] what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. And is it kept up to date? Yes. So, is it really critical for attaining the objective? [inaudible] clear, so we'll leave that one as a question mark.

All right, information security, 3.2.5. Overall, CIS20 scores—they go to zero because they decided to change the system. So text accompanying the graphic, ICANN has used the Center for Internet Security controls CIS20 as a framework for cybersecurity between fiscal year [inaudible] latest applicable version of the CIS20 framework was used for scoring in June of each reporting year. ICANN is transitioning from CIS to the NIST CSF to information security. A CIS20 score was not produced during the transition period. This chart will be updated to use the NIST CSF in fiscal year 21. That seems like a long ways away, but that's just a personal comment here.

Is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal? I would think so. [inaudible] There was. Is there information on how the goal or objective's defined? Yes. is what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept [inaudible]? No. As of February 2020, the last entry was for fiscal year 2018 with a note that it's transitioning. So the usefulness right now is unknown. [inaudible].

All right, we are out of the technical stuff and into a new segment here, “develop a globally diverse culture of knowledge [inaudible] board, organization and stakeholders.” So our first goal under that is achievement of a globally diverse culture and knowledge levels for stakeholders. [inaudible] our first graphic is proposed is ICANN public meetings participation by ICANN meeting, and further [inaudible] for ICANN65, which was the last one.

Regional statistics are based on attendees identifying the region that they currently live in during the registration process. [inaudible] ICANN public meeting statistics and technical data can be found here, and there's a link to something.

So, assessment. Is it crucial? No, there's no objective. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes. [inaudible] entry was for ICANN66.

[inaudible] the next meeting, additional ICANN public meeting statistics and technical data can be found here. Does not link to [inaudible]. I went looking at the link and it actually dead ends. So that's a useful note hopefully for those that are managing that.

3.3.2, culture and knowledge levels, community. Graphic. ICANN Learn, new users. So we have it by quarter and the number of learners, and we have a nice [inaudible]. This chart reports the number of new users signed up to ICANN Learn within the time periods shown above. All right, and the assessment. Is it crucial? I've got a question mark,

meaning I don't know. Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? Yes. [inaudible]. No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information [inaudible]? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes, as of February 2020, the last quarterly entry was for fiscal year 20 Q1.

All right, moving on. Achievement of [inaudible] organization. Years of service, global and regional. So basically, staff years of service [inaudible] of knowledge level, I would guess. So we see zero to three years, three to five, five to ten, ten to 15, plus 15, and then regions, but here is the summary by quarter. So further broken down by Americas, APAC and EMEA.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Not so clear for me.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

To our assessment, there is no objective, so no, it's not crucial. Is there a goal? No. Is there [inaudible] being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes. As of February, the last quarterly entry was fiscal year 20 Q1. Yes, we will review [inaudible]. All right, next one.

Achievement of global knowledge development programs, organization, talent development courses offered. So this is just about [inaudible] and we have targets and we have broken down by category of leadership skills, team and organizational with [inaudible]. Yes. Cheryl points out we should note a desire to see harmonization of regions used in these,

because yes, the ICANN official regions and then we use the global stakeholder engagement regions which are not the same. Yes, it's one of those things.

All right, [our assessment.] [inaudible] No, the number of courses offered is not a useful indicator versus the objective. So I'm taking a position here just saying how many courses you offer—I mean, [inaudible] to the extreme. You could offer courses which no one goes to and then you're still meeting your objectives. I just don't see how measuring the number of courses offered is very helpful. Was there a goal? Yes. [inaudible] defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes, the number of courses. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes, as of February 2020, the last quarterly entry [inaudible].

“No sense for me in this indicator” says Vanda in the chat. Yeah, join the group. All right, 3.3.5, achievement of globally diverse culture [inaudible]. So, what we get is distribution of board members by the ICANN regions, and then you can click on the various regions and get some breakdown for that region of the individual members. [inaudible].

All right, is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal? No, there's no objective. Is there a goal or objective [inaudible]? No. Is there information on how the goal is defined? No. Is what's being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? It's [inaudible].

3.36, achievement of global knowledge development programs, board. Board training by fiscal year, board [inaudible] versus new, board

training sessions fiscal year numbers. So basically, we have board training by fiscal year, percent training completed versus [the] target, we have 100% [inaudible]. Number of training sessions, onboarding, individual sessions and full board sessions. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: For the previous one, is it keep up to date? The answer is no as the information is fiscal year 19 and we are already fiscal year 20 since—and it's difficult to measure that with fiscal year because change of the board is at the end of the AGM, not fiscal year.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, exactly.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But even so, it must be fiscal year 20. As of end of November, we have new board members. Therefore, it's not up to date.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, I'm taking a note. Up to date. [inaudible] questioning whether it was or wasn't. But anyways, let's go to the assessment of 3.3.6.3. Thank you for that, Sébastien.

Is the accountability [inaudible]? I have a question mark. Training board members, is it crucial to the objective? I don't know. Is there a goal or objective? Yes. Is there information on how the goal is defined? Yes. Is what's being measured clear? I've got a bit of a problem with that one.

You're talking about courses taken. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? No. As of February 2020, the last quarterly entry was for fiscal year 19 Q4.

All right. [inaudible] by region, 3.3.7. Again, very similar graphic, and we have a lot of [inaudible]. Let's go down to the assessment, please. All right, is the accountability indicator crucial? No, there's no objective. Is there a goal? No. Is there information on [inaudible] Is what's being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No, not really. We're just told it is. Is the information being kept up to date? Not really clear. [inaudible] if you go through the information, it's not really clear if it's up to date or not.

And that completes section three, and now we are going [inaudible] in the multi-stakeholder approach. And I'm going to ask my chair if I can take 90-second bio break, which [we can of course do with everyone also.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can certainly do that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Back in 90 seconds.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think 90 seconds is underdoing it. Let's round it up to a couple of minutes, shall we?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we'll take another five-minute break at the end of accountability indicators anyway. Time is against us in today's session. We've got about 40 minutes left in today's call. We've got at least another 10-15 on accountability indicators, but at the end of this, it will be sufficient notes and information for Bernie, we believe, to be putting final text together on the accountability indicators at least, which is going to be very—draft final text, obviously—useful to us.

With the rest of the agenda, we will go then to the residual of today's call, we'll be focused on looking at our document, and the last five minutes or so will be looking at what our next steps and cadence of work is going to be.

Now, I don't think I've taken up a whole two minutes yet. Might have got close. Pat? Have I missed anything? Okay. Vanda, just in response to your question in chat regarding the training, of course, that particular reportable is a mandatory piece of California law that boards have to go through a skills gap analysis and undertake a minimum, I believe, of two training sessions. So the reportability of that is rather more on the requirement of the California law, I believe, than anything else. And Bernie's back. Over to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you very much. [inaudible]. Here we go, whole new section. There's only five of them, and the fifth one's—anyways ... Promote ICANN's role and multi-stakeholder approach, encourage engagement with the existing Internet governance ecosystem at national and regional levels. Government and IGO engagement and participation in ICANN, number of governments and orgs.

We've got is overview, engagement and participation in ICANN for fiscal year 18 and 19. So we've got [inaudible]. Developing intermediate and regular and stable. So [inaudible]. We're getting a level as to the number of comments and organizations.

So, what's our assessment here? No, there's no objective. [inaudible]? No. Is there information on the goal? No. Is what's being measured clear? Given I didn't see a definition of what's a government or an organization, I left that as a question mark. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes. As of February 2020, the last quarterly update was fiscal year 20 Q1. Yes, Sébastien, we will double check.

4.2, clarify the role of governments in ICANN and work with them to strengthen their commitment to supporting the global internet ecosystem. [inaudible] and meeting participation. So basically, the black line is not an objective, it's a measure of total GAC membership [inaudible] participation in the various public meetings. So we've got all the ICANNs in there and it gives you [inaudible] a bit.

We get governmental advisory membership participation and then we have it broken down by GSE regions [inaudible] or just all registered as GAC. I believe it's all registered as GAC, Vanda.

So our assessment. is the accountability indicator? No, there's no objective. No, we don't know how it's defined. Is what's being measured clear? Yes, it's numbers. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? [inaudible] February 2020, the last ICANN meeting listed is ICANN 65.

All right, 4.3. Participate in the evolution of a global, trusted, inclusive multi-stakeholder Internet governance [inaudible] Internet issues. Cumulative participation in IG ecosystems, Internet governance, I guess. [inaudible] Internet governance ecosystem fiscal year 18-19, participation in WSIS events, participation IGF events, and presentations regarding multi-stakeholder model.

Okay. Assessment. Crucial? There's no objective, so no. [inaudible]. Is what's being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes. As of February 2020, the last quarterly update was for fiscal year 20 Q [inaudible]. [IGF and WSIS are UN entities.] I'll let someone else answer that.

[inaudible] IGF initiatives. So if we look at that, it's the number of IGF initiatives by fiscal year, and [inaudible] assessment here. It's not crucial because there's no objective. Is there an objective? No. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? [inaudible] because what's an initiative? Is there

information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes, as of February 2020, the last annual update was [inaudible].

All right. Next, [inaudible] promote role clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem rooted in [inaudible]. All right. Percentage of Contractual Compliance service level targets that were met, percentage versus target, Contractual Compliance. So the blue bar is the score and the black line is the target.

So the assessment, is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal? [inaudible]. Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? Yes. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. [inaudible] on where the data comes from? Yes, you can actually go digging and find all of that. It's referenced. And is the information being kept up to date? Yes, as of February [inaudible] Q1. All right, next one.

We've finished four, now into five. All right, folks, we are [inaudible]. Develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by ICANN's mission. All right, last section.

[inaudible] considerations from board resolutions. Progress against target. Now, you don't see it, but there's a little bit of [inaudible] and the green is compliant. But we don't define what is a public interest consideration, so that's a bit disappointing. [inaudible] target, but I don't know what it is unless—if we back up a bit, I guess one has to assume the target is 100%, but it's just not stated as in all the other graphs where we have [inaudible]. So I'm saying no, there's no

objective. We don't know what is public interest. Yeah, I have to agree with you. That is [inaudible].

Next, is there a goal or objective against which can be assessed? No. Is there information on how it's defined? No. Is what is being measured [inaudible]? Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes. Okay.

Promote ethics, transparency and accountability across the ICANN community. [inaudible] accountability mechanism, the number of recommendations, ATRT1, ATRT2, SSR, WHOIS, CCT. And then we have the review status percentage. As I say, these graphs were taken a little while ago, so let's not go by those. Let's keep going down, Brenda.

[inaudible] what they're measuring here, and the assessment [inaudible]. Is it crucial? No, there's no objective. Is there a goal? No. Is it defined? [inaudible] clear? Yeah, I think measuring the number of recommendations and percentage of how they're complete, yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? Yes. Is the information being kept up to date? That's unclear. [inaudible] February.

All right, next one, 5.2.2, ethics. We measure compliance with the mandatory ethics—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]. You've got Cheryl and Pat.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And Sébastien. Oh, wow. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Slow down there. We cannot let this last one, 5.2.1, go by without perhaps suggesting that not only does data when it's put up need to be up to date, it'd be nice if it was accurate, because this goes back to the who says what is completed or not and by what measures are they completed or not. And I realize that going forward, there are mechanisms both agreed to and in our recommendations that should make sure that there is greater accuracy. But this current set of accountability indicators are basically BS, to put not too fine a point on it.

So I'm not saying any of our assessments are wrong, I'm just saying we also need to suggest that, yes, accuracy and accuracy that is clearly understood and agreed upon by the ICANN community on this at the very least would be a wise place to reiterate it. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Cheryl. Pat.

PAT KANE: Thanks, Bernie, and I think that Cheryl covered it from what I wanted to put in, but I think that given that review teams are identifying that the recommendations are not being complete, I think we need to evaluate this a little bit differently, probably. And the other item is I can't tell what a good number of recommendations [are,] what are the [inaudible] actual graphs is number of recommendations. Should we think of fewer recommendations as good, or a greater number of

recommendations is good? Because it seems to me if you're more accountable, you'd have fewer. That's just the way I would look at that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, I'm not going to get into that discussion. All right, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I totally agree with Cheryl, but one thing, it struck me that there is a green box for "in progress" and nothing is in progress, everything is already done. And that's the first thing. The second is that this completed review compared with the one currently going on, it's completely the reverse. It's done and it's very difficult to understand why they are mixed here in one single place. And yes, definitely for this, completed reviews, we need to be sure that we'll say that we disagree with the data who are here. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. I think I picked that up fairly well. A bit of a lightning rod on that one, took a much of notes. All right, 5.2.2., ethics. [inaudible] 100%. All right. Board members and the ICANN Organization and the submission by ICANN Organization of the required [inaudible].

Assessment. Is it crucial to achieving the goal or objective? I left that one as a question mark. I'm unclear if doing your [inaudible] statement is critical to achieving the objectives that we're talking about here. Is there a goal or objective? Yes. Is there information how the goal or objective is defined? Yes, 100%. Is what is being measured clear? Yes.

[inaudible] where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes, as of February 20, we have fiscal year 20 Q1.

All right. [inaudible] making materials published versus redacted. So we have documents published, documents redacted. That's interesting, and then we've got some links you can click, and it gives you pages redacted, pages published [inaudible] that, we have board decision making materials published by deadline. So, is stuff published by the deadline? Board decision making materials. I'm not really sure what that covers [inaudible] 100%, at least they've done that well.

And again, we've got the details below that, the number of meetings, the agenda posted on time, resolution posted on time, and there's the information. All right, let's go down to the assessment on that one.

Is the accountability indicator crucial? I'm not sure. Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? Yes. How the goal is defined, yes, 100%. Is what is being measured [inaudible] where the data comes from? No. is the information being kept up to date? Yes, as of February 20.

All right, 5.2.4, documentary information disclosure policy, and it's really too bad [inaudible] in the world. The DIDP, and what we've got here is number of requests received versus completed is the green bars by quarter, and number [of met] response time requirements, so did we respond in time?

Text accompanying the graphic, I'm not going to read. Before we get to the assessment [inaudible] Michael for a minute knowing he's not here.

The fact that you respond to a DIDP request and say you cannot give any information [inaudible]. So this is a little tricky as far as being useful.

All right, let's go to the assessment. Is the accountability indicator achieving critical or crucial? Answering a DIDP request on time, I'm not really sure. Is there a goal or objective? Yes, 100%, obviously. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Yes, as of February 2020, we have fiscal year 20 Q1.

All right, 5.2.5, accountability. We measure the timelines 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 anonymous employee hotline policy.

Interesting that you mix all of that together under accountability, so green is independent review process, blue is anonymous employee hotline, and orange is timely posting of reconsideration requests, and we have a target of [inaudible].

[inaudible]. Sorry, faded there for a sec. So [inaudible], is that crucial to achieving the goal? Saying you responded in time to those things. Sébastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Just one comment is that, great, ICANN is very accountable. Everything under accountability has gotten 100%. That's nice. But the title is completely misleading here. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, and I'll be looking forward to your short paragraphs I included as a note, Sébastien. All right. Is there a goal or objective? Yes. Is it defined? Yes. Is what is being measured clear? I'm not sure. Is there information on where the data comes from? Again, I'm not sure, even [inaudible] information being kept up to date? No, as of February 2020, the last quarterly update was fiscal year 19 Q4.

All right, 5.2.6. We're almost there, folks. [inaudible] complaints, number of complaints the complaint office handles, complaints regarding ICANN Organization that do not fall into existing complaint mechanisms such as contractual compliance.

So by a quarter, we have the number of complaints and then we have a nice pie chart that says in scope complaints, response provided, evaluate and consider and response drafting, and then in scope complaints by department. We see that finance gets 25% and [inaudible] and red is somewhere else in there. Then we have out-of-scope submissions and out-of-scope submissions by type. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: What is out of scope? If you are complaining of something, that's because this really bothers you for some reason. What is out of the scope? Because [at least it's] regarding to contract. If it's not, there is no, in my view, out of scope. Any complaint has its own scope and could be okay or not okay, could be responded or not responded. It is not agree, it was not clear, but out of scope is something that for me do not fit into the possibilities of the complaints.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. I think the issue here, Vanda, is that the complaints department is [inaudible] very specific range of things, and if someone complains to the complaints office about things that are not within that scope, [inaudible] of scope, and it is the problem. But I understand what you're saying. Let's go down to the assessment, Brenda, please.

Is the accountability crucial [inaudible]? Is there a goal or objective? no. Is there information on how the goal is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? [inaudible] February 2020, the last quarterly update was fiscal year 19 Q4.

All right, 5.3, empower the current and new—we're really almost done—stakeholder to fully participate in ICANN activities. Programs to support community participation, fellows and NextGen number of participants versus target.

We have the standard regions at this time, and fellowship participants, global, the fellows versus the targets, and the NextGen participants by ICANN meeting. Let's go down a bit, please, Brenda.

The assessment, is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal or objective [inaudible] And more than willing to take other input on that. Is there a goal or objective against which the data can be assessed? Yes. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. [inaudible] the goal varying a lot, we don't have any explanation. Is what is being measured clear? Yes, the number of fellows and participants. Is there information on where the data comes

from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? We had the ICANN meeting listed as ICANN 66.

All right, next one, please, Brenda. Is that it? We're done. Thank you to everyone for putting up with me for that time, and back to the chairs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much for that, Bernie. However, I have a question, and I guess it's a question that we all now need to discuss and consider. First of all, this is a huge amount of work done and it's a pivotal piece of our work which, because of its degree of difficulty, we had delayed until we had to do it, and it's good to see it's done this much now.

There are, however, Bernie, a number of question marks still in this document, but it seems to me that we almost need to deal with these question marks in several different ways. Some of them, the question mark needs to be turned into this is unsure, the statement. [inaudible] no way we can be sure about that type of stuff.

But there are others where we may need to make a comment or even raise a clarifying question, and I want to know how we want to deal with that, because we did not deal with the question marks on our way through in general. So to me, that's a little bit of a missing bit. I want to hear back from you first, Bernie, as to how you want to approach that. There might be a bunch that we can simply apply the simple sticker of, "It was unclear."

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, that was my fault. When I was reviewing it [inaudible] question marks, but all the question marks were supposed to be not clear, and now that the document is up in a Google Drive, I would certainly do as Sébastien did and go for it and put in some comments, and we can finalize this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. So can we have a time binding on that now, Bernie? Because we need to move this into the next step.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I would—yeah. One week, would that be reasonable? So by Friday next week, all the comments have to be in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy with that. People have got plenty of spare time in this coming week. After all, it's not like there's a virtual ICANN meeting on. Seriously, it's something that is important and we do need to keep up. After all, we're not running our plenaries next week. But let's make it by the usual 23:59 UTC on Friday, whatever date it is next week, for comment from each and every one of us on the accountability indicators document. That would be appreciated. And please consider this is the virtual last hurrah on this text.

Sébastien's asking about after the weekend. Well, okay, everybody's weekend is different. Mine's already halfway through for example, and I assume most of you are still on your Friday. So Bernie, what's going to

work with your time? Because from now on, it gets to be very much how you can pack things in.

Bernie is saying Sunday 15h of March 23:59. Okay, we will take the document at that stage into its ultimate if not penultimate form. Terrific. Thank you very much to everyone on all of that.

Now, we do not have time for the rest of our agenda, but if we can go back to our agenda very briefly. Yes, UTC. I never speak in anything other than UTC, Sébastien. You should know me best by now.

So we managed to get our accountability indicators done, you've got it open until the 23:59 UTC on the 15th for final comments. Please make sure you take the time, make the time and do that. It is very important that you do do. Next time we formally convene, we will formally kick off with the review of the updated draft sections of the final report and then go into the reviews recommendation so we can spend a good block of time on both of those.

The schedule of calls for the week of the 9th of March, at the moment we do still have a leadership and plenary currently scheduled. Pat, I personally think that we'd be asking an awful lot of our volunteers to do both, but I'm happy to be told that I'm just tired and exhausted and still recovering and my vision is not quite clear. What do you think?

PAT KANE:

I think you're tired and exhausted and your vision is not quite clear.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so we're going to run both the leadership and the plenary.

PAT KANE: Oh, no, I didn't say you were wrong, I just—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So Pat, you're making an observation. Well done.

PAT KANE: So basically, if we take a look at the schedule and what competes with the ICANN meetings itself, our leadership meeting would be competitive to other ICANN sessions. And while I think that we have a window for the currently scheduled plenary, which starts before the day begins for the Wednesday events, that makes for an extra long day for anybody who wants to participate no matter where they are in the world. So I'm with you in terms of not having any meetings [inaudible] regularly scheduled meetings next week, but since we're not traveling home from ICANN, I would like to offer up maybe the same time slot next Friday to get through something so that we don't lose a week, take a three-hour window on Friday. And maybe it's a Doodle poll effort that we have to go through, but I would suggest that we don't lose some work during the week and set a time that's not competitive with other ICANN sessions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm perfectly happy with that, Pat. And whether or not we need to do the full Doodle poll or whether we simply say that this many people are

able to make the time this week—let’s assume seeing as they would normally have been traveling back from an ICANN meeting next week that we pop this in as the proposed time and see if we get many complaints.

PAT KANE: I like it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Well, Jennifer, where are we? What have we done?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you very much, Cheryl and Pat. Bernie, as usual, took the most of the action items to make adjustments to the document based on the comments from the review team members on the call today. We also had an action item for review team members to share comments on the document—which is the accountability indicators—by 23:59 UTC on Sunday the 15th of March.

Brenda is going to send a calendar invitation for a plenary call next Friday the 13th of March, the same time as this one which was 23:00 UTC, and we’re going to cancel the leadership and Wednesday 18th of March plenary call.

I hope I captured everything. As usual, do let me know if I missed something. And back to you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Jennifer, although I suspect Pat and I should be full of trepidation if we're having our three-hour meeting on the ides of March. I'm pretty sure it is the ides of March. But there you go.

Without too many [et tu brutes] hopefully we will meet again next week. Thank you all very much for the heroic efforts you've all made. I just want to hear a bit more from more of you when we do gather next week. I do hope you enjoy the thrill-packed and exciting adventure that will be a fully virtual ICANN67. And I'm not actually being too flippant there, you are all going to be working under, in many cases, unusual circumstances unless you are used to seven, eight or nine hours in the virtual world. Some of us are, but certainly not the majority of us.

Remember to be kind to each other because tempers may indeed fray, and the standards of behavior will be strictly accounted to and enforced. So let's make sure we don't fall into any of those traps. Thank you one and all. Pat, any final words from you?

PAT KANE: No, just thank you, and have a good week next week.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Bye. Enjoy the meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can stop the recording. Thanks, Brenda.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]