DEV ANAND-TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, this is Dev Anand-Teelucksingh. Let's start the recording and do the roll call, it's now five past the hour.

YESIM NAZLAR: Sure, thank you very much, Dev. Let's please first of all start the recording. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Social Media Working Group call taking place on Thursday, 21st of September 2017 at 14:00 UTC. On our call today we have Dev Anand-Teelucksingh, Agradip Dutta, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Daniel Nanghaka, Glenn McKnight, Susannnah Gray and Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, apologies Heidi did not join us yet but we're waiting for her to join. Joining us we have Ariel Liang, Evin Erodgdu and myself, Yesim Nazlar, and we have received an apology from Renata Riberiro. And finally before we start I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking for the transcription reasons, please. Back to you, Dev, thank you very much.

DEV ANAND-TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much. Welcome everyone to the At-Large Social Media Working Group call. Today we have a guest speaker, Agradip Dutta, I hope I pronounced the first name correctly. After our quest speaker, we'll be viewing some of our regular At-Large Social Media agenda items. Looking at our At-Large Social Media performance review of past action items and any other business.

So let's get right to it. So the guest speaker, Agradip Dutta, was a -- actually, Glenn McKnight knew this person and perhaps, Glenn, would you be so kind if you could introduce Agradip.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sure. Good morning everyone, just got back from the 25th anniversary of ISOC in LA, so good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Little bit of background; as you know, we've been discussing the whole issue of policy of organizations, and the significance of this issue galvanized with me when I had the opportunity to be one of the organizers at the IEEE International Humanitarian Technology Conference, and I had the good fortune of being at the session that Mr. Dutta was doing and he's based in Ottawa, and he gave an excellent presentation.

Bear in mind that his context of the social media policy stuff was in context to disaster mitigation, humanitarian activities which is our focus with the International Humanitarian Technology Conference, but apart from that, his core ideas are absolutely essential for us because it really drills down to core ideas that we need to think about for this committee. I do welcome him to the call and I really appreciate the opportunity to share his findings with all of us today. Back to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND-TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Glenn, and welcome again, Mr. Dutta, thank you so very much for attending the call. I believe the slide presentation is up on the Adobe Connect for everybody to see. Mr. Dutta, you can take the floor, thank you.

AGRADIP DUTTA: Hello, thank you for inviting me at this conference and I would like to once again extend my thanks to Glenn for organizing this conference. Is the audio clear?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, it is.

AGRADIP DUTTA: That's fine. So the presentation that I'll be doing for today's session as you can see is developing a public policy approach to social media monitoring during humanitarian crisis. This was actually a work that I conducted as part of my master's research paper while doing my masters at University of Ottawa.

So before I start I'll just give a little bit of background about my academic background and also the kind of work that I've done, previously. My academic back ground is in public policy and governance. My research interests and focus has mainly been on International Humanitarian policies, humanitarian system and more particularly looking at the roll of technology and how technology can [inaudible] present day to humanitarian response as well as helping adopt mitigations. Lately, I've been looking at a lot of issues that are particularly interesting in terms of digital government, open government data as well as using platforms related to crowd sourcing, particularly the role of social media.

I'll first start by giving a brief introduction about my presentation. In today's world it is not unknown that social media is being used my humanitarian organizations to [inaudible] their response mechanism at the on call of the crisis. For the field of governance, conflict management and [inaudible] of mitigation, this trend has presented an unprecedented opportunity. Real time information can be obtained and it also presents the scope to identify changing conditions as well as newer threats.

However, in many literatures it has been argued that the use of such technology should not come at the cost of accountability and transparency, and this leads into the main argument of my paper where I would highlight some of the ways to which organizations can install such accountability and transparency standards in their practices by applying a specific policy framework, which I'll be using for this paper called the Public Value Policy Framework.

Next slide. The main motivation for the research is that there is a perceived gap in the manner at which the social media monitoring where are being conducted by crisis response or organizations, particularly in terms of generating a public value outcome, especially having an accountability process where they're reporting to certain kinds of authorities or making sure that the process is more open to public or enhancement of participation. So these are areas that I believe that there is a gap and having an approach like a public value approach into execution would facilitate such initiative.

The presentation that I'll be doing today is divided again into three parts. In the first part I'll take about some of the opportunities that use

of social media bring to the humanitarian organizations. In the second part, I will apply the value based public policy framework as a method for organizations that are using social media platforms during the crisis situation. Lastly, I would conclude by giving some policy recommendations that could be looked forward for future researches as well as for organizations that are actually trying to set up some kind of parameters of monitoring as well as some kind of quality strategy for social media use during crisis response.

Next slide. The main argument of the paper, as I said, is that organizations can install better standards of accountability and democratic principles, both in their operational structure by applying the Public Value Policy Framework. This gives them scope to balance efficiency with the satisfaction of citizen needs. And this has been one of the main concerns for a lot of the use of new technology, where how does organizations balance the efficiency with the satisfaction of public value as well as understanding the needs of the citizen enhancing the participation, things like that.

I'll just talk very briefly about the kind of research methodologies that I used for this paper. Primarily I relied on two specific research methodologies; both were qualitative. Given the nature of the research I had to rely only on qualitative methods. One is the literature review where I did take a look on the different literatures that talked about how social media is getting used in crisis response situations.

In the second part I did a brief case study where I looked at specific platforms that are being used, particularly Ushahidi which is being used in a lot of crisis monitoring in response situations in Africa, in other crisis

around the world. Looked at Syria tracker and this programs where studied in order to know to what extent the technology is getting used and how well they're able to serve the actual needs of the people.

I'll now just give a brief outline of the different features that social media monitoring brings to the table. First it allows the crisis planners to get a better idea about the context. It gives a better [inaudible] base understanding. True monitoring of users activity, a better overview of the situation [inaudible] can be established. In this way it's possible to direct resources more appropriately so that damages or lose of lives can be reduces. Social media also gives opportunity to crisis managers to identify [inaudible] that have been discussed online and make decisions based on interpretation of real time information and as well as the situations.

It gives the scope to get a good overview of what the public wants, what the expectations of publics are, understand the public demands in other ways. The two way communication that is possible to social media allows publics to express their concerns, seeking actual input from the service recipients, improved overall efficiency of the program. It also gives organizations the scope to keep track as to how well their policy actions and processes are working or is responding to the actual situation.

Today many governments actually have developed a social media strategy for crisis management and response. We have seen this has been widely used. Also used in the recent natural disasters that occurred in the United States, they were used across the world in different situations. So different governments have their own polices

EN

and they set their own parameters of how they're implementing it, but in terms of the implementation there are still areas or gaps that need to be addressed.

The third feature that social media provides is that the platforms are designed in such a manner that it leads to an aggregation of data due to the use of a feature of mash up technology. It allows them to develop the content in a manner that is more beneficial for the audience or it could also give them the scope to gear the needs of the organization more strategically because different information from different sources can be pulled together and incorporated into one central platform to which it could be communicated to the people who are actually needing that information.

This aggregation also could be divided using like [inaudible] such as location, age group, gender, etc., which I think is very important because it gives them the scope to specifically target a specific audience rather than just applying it to a whole set of people.

These are some of the advantages and also the features that social media monitoring brings to the table for crisis response organizations, however this is not exclusive; there are also a lot of other areas and other features that social media brings, but due to the time constraint that I have for this presentation I just gave a brief overview of these features.

In the next slide I just give an example of a case study that I used for this paper by talking about the role of Ushahidi. Ushahidi is actually a crisis mapping platform. It first came into existence during the 2007 election

in Kenya. Ever since then it has been used in a number of crisis situations. For example during the flooding in Pakistan, earthquake in Haiti, during a lot of the humanitarian crisis that unfolded in the Middle East particularly the Libyan crisis as well the Egyptian crisis. The platform actually represents important conversions of new technology, particularly the SMS, Twitter, Facebook as well as smart phone applications.

Another example in 2011 during the Libyan crisis, the UN office for the coordination of humanitarian affairs launched a live social media map of Libya to project how effectively they were delivering their humanitarian aid to the people. Ushahidi has a feature that helps organizations set up their crowd-based crisis map based on their choice and demand, however it is the organization that actually determines what priority they will be setting. It actually contributed a lot in harnessing the power of social media.

Another example where the Ushahidi platforms were used is the example of HAZMAT. HAZMAT were used in Egypt and the main idea behind this crisis map was to project trends on women who were experiencing domestic violence and other human rights violations during the Egyptian crisis around 2011 and 2012, during the Arabic spring [inaudible].

That's basically an example that I've drawn and you can see the crisis map that I have put up in the slides here, you can see how organizations they can collect information and based on the information that they're collecting, they're [inaudible] in the map that which areas are mostly affected and where the service should be delivered.

Initially when Ushahidi was first used, they relied on [inaudible] technology in 2007, particularly during the electoral violence in Kenya, they relied on the SMS Code where people where sending messages via SMS, but later on they incorporated social media messaging and collecting social media messaging for the development of crisis maps. They're actually one of the newer features.

When talking about social media it is also very important for us to know the kind of lacking or the risks that it provides. So the lack of filtering capacity that is present often leads to various sources of disinformation and we've seen a number of cases where disinformation was an issue, particularly when it comes to using social media.

Privacy and security threats is something that always needs to be protected and there are specific concerns about that and still I think the policy needs to do better when it comes to protecting individual rights, their consent, things like that. Especially using them in a conflict situation, how effectively their information is getting protected, whether their information is being used by parties that are harming them. These are things that organizations need to very specifically keep in mind.

The last thing is the information overload that happens due to the immense amount of information that gets shared in the social media and managing the public expectation it's a major challenge. Organizations sometimes don't know what to prioritize and what not to prioritize, too much information comes in to them and becomes very difficult for them to decide using that information; and with the meta

data and the development of big data I think this is even going to be a bigger challenge in the near future.

Now I actually come to the actual point of my paper where I talk about the public value policy framework. This framework was actually developed by a professor at the Harvard Kennedy School. His name is Mark Moore and his model has been successfully used in strategic public management. In my paper what I did is I applied this model to the specific situations and showed how it could lead to enhancement of accountability, transparency and better due diligence both on the part of organizations and also it provides a scope for citizens to have a provision for their needs to be better replicated in the execution of policies.

Here what he talks about is that the crisis managers that are using this social media monitoring could rely on something like a public value policy framework. Such an approach considers the entire value chain of the process, where both input and the resources that are used to transform inputs into outputs are both taken into consideration. This actually contributes to the overall enhancement of the public management system. The framework in place allows managers to better steer the network of delegation and delivery and also maintain overall capacity in their service.

I'll just give you a brief explanation of the definition of what the public value model is. According to him, the public value model asks public officials to consider the benefits and the costs of public services not only in terms of dollars and cents, but also in terms of how governments affect important civic and democratic principles such as equality, liberty,

transparency, participation and citizenship. I think by this he actually touches one of the main concerns that a lot of literature raised particularly in terms of social media monitoring and using social media strategy as part of their policy, especially for organizations.

Next what I do on the next slide is I talk about Moore's policy framework. I'll just give a brief explanation. In his whole policy framework he develops his idea using a strategy triangle and this stagey triangle talks about three main categories. The first category is called determining the value outcome. The second is creating an authorizing environment and the third is having the operational capacity.

According to Moore, these three categories that have I specified work together and when they work together and there's a conversion between the three of the categories, then it leads to a situation, an optimal point, where actually a public value outcome is created. In order for that to happen, he says that all these three stages need to act together. If one of the steps is missing, then it's very difficult to achieve that optimal point.

I'll go over it more in detail. What I did for this presentation is that I used certain variables just for clarity that will give a better explanation of how the model could be replicated in real life. However when organizations are implementing or using this kind of strategy there are many factors that they need to consider and this is not included. When it comes to generating the public value outcome, the first thing I say is very important is setting the policy objectives.

So by this one it tries to do is first to understand the overall goal that an organization is looking to address from its program. The goal is set in a manner that it creates something valuable for the public. Say for example if an organization is planning to use social media for collecting information, then collection of information could be indicated as one of the goals, but the value that they could get from collecting of information could be enhancement in citizen engagement or increasing democratic participation. These are factors that I've taken into consideration when [inaudible] classified value.

So having this kind of an approach what it does is that it mitigates the possibility of social distress that arises from social media and it also allows organizations to have a better contingency plan. A careful consideration of goals also makes it easier for policy makers to better understand the problem that they will be solving.

The next factor that could be considered while determining what the value would be [inaudible] into consideration the unintended consequences. This is pretty basic, like for example if I'm trying to achieve a certain value, say the value is participation, so what could be the negative consequences that could arise in achieving that value? Say for example the threat that could arise from security threat, privacy threat are factors that organizations can look into in the initial setup, before determining what the goal would be. What this would do is, this would give organizations better capacity to identify what those threats are and then develop a specific approach of how to mitigate those threats in other words.

The other thing that they can consider while setting up the value and this has been used in a lot of the policy models but is most used in a different way than other policy models that have been applied in new public management and also in other bureaucratic policy processes that a lot of government organizations rely on, it's called taking into consideration the financial as well as the social cost that comes with implementing such policy decisions. What it does is that it gives them scope to outweigh the cost against benefits and also know how feasible the outcome of the process would be.

In doing so, it doesn't only consider the economic value, it takes into consideration other noneconomic value as well, factors like participation. I'll give you an example, having this kind of framework in setting up the value what it does it will give organizations capacity to base their decisions differently.

Like say for example if an organization is trying to use social media monitoring to save a number of people's lives, then that quantifiable variable would not be used as a primary indicator, they would consider the decision using an even broader parameter, like say for example knowledge mobilization that could arise by sharing information from social media. So this is something that I think it gives organizations better scope both in terms of their operation and also in terms of their ability to make the decision using a more [inaudible] approach.

The second category that I talk about, and also Moore uses in his triangle is creating some kind of an authorizing environment. This authorizing environment according to him is creating an environment where they seek the views of various stakeholders. Public officials in

EN

other words should operate under certain organizational settings and they should never look to determine the value by themselves; rather they should try to ensure that this value gets developed by having all these stakeholders involved in the process.

This is like many of the approaches to deliberation or concept that has been used in public policy frameworks, how an importance of having participation from the public are. What this would do here is that, when I talk about this is, is that I also lists other factors that they can consider, like taking into consideration the status of key legislative as well as the public policy proposals, not ignoring the legal boundaries that are there, taking into consideration the state laws pertaining to using social media. These are things that should always be part of the thinking when they're developing a strategy, nothing should be isolated because isolating these factors could lead to a problem in the future if the policy gets implemented.

This would also give them better scope to develop a procedure where they would be able to view the standing [inaudible], the organizations themselves, like for example taking initiatives to better protect organizational bylaws which would in other words would improve the overall governance mechanism. Say for example the specific legislative changes occurring, then those new changes should be identified and provisions should take into consideration such factors.

The second thing, what I think it is important for creating this authorizing environment is that it establishes an accountability process for the organization that is carrying out such activities. Accountability standards serve as a medium to get an overall idea of what is

happening, it does not leave the public clueless. In our case, it will let us know how democratic the organization process is and to what extent the organizations are actually serving the public as a whole.

The last thing that the authorizing environment creates is that it bases decisions based upon constants. What this does is that it creates a provision for feedback law. In network governance and also in new approach to public administration, a lot of legislation has been compared that talks about creating the feedback law as an essential [inaudible] of quality. So what the feedback law look does is that it creates provisions for the people who are at the receiving end of the services to have their views expressed to the authority that is responsible for delivering the services. We were also taking input from the public enhances the position of the organization as a whole and it also enhances their legitimacy.

The last thing that Moore talks about in his strategy triangle is creating an optimal situation for having an operational capacity. In this stage he looks at how organizations should adopt their operational footings to be more responsible to achieving the public value. He calls for developing specific performance measuring frameworks. For example relying on analytic techniques ensuring that organizations get a clear idea as to what extent they were responding to the needs of the public, how effective they were in reaching out to the audiences. If any new technologies are getting developed to compliment this process, they also should be considered in determining the overall capacity as a whole.

The performance measurement what it does is it also determines how well it has achieved what the public cares about and this is where I think this framework establishes a difference with the newer approaches to new public management theories where inputs and outputs are measured in a way that ensures economic effectiveness and responsiveness only to customers. This is wider than that. This is not just for customer economical effectiveness or just how well you are serving the clients, but this is measuring actually what is more important for then public more than anything else.

Last step is called the capacity building, it [inaudible] organizations to create an optimal situation for delivery of services, reflecting on the organization's external capacity as well as taking into consideration the resources that they need to produce the services, having a clear understanding of it so that organizations before determining what the public value is, they get a clear point about to what extent they can filter such needs. In other words, what this model does is that it incorporates an important role for community engagement in the process to enhancement and participation.

It also helps in sharing the process in a manner where not only citizen values are managed, but citizen values are managed in light to organizations' operational capacity as well in the authorizing environment under which it operates, so the citizen values that are determined using this framework are not just the values that are just set up; the values are actually developed taking into consideration to what extent actually an organization has the capacity and to what extent it is able to fulfill it by taking into consideration legal, technological approach, its organizations setup, etc, etc.

EN

This gives better scope for the organization to actually incorporate, have these values set up, at least in terms of its operating manual but still there are a lot of areas I think even if this model is used, but it in terms of implementation, yes, there are a lot of other factors that need to be considered but at least in principle this would give organizations a better scope to have a provision for these standards to be protected.

In the next slide what I talk about is how the policy process actually gets developed using an approach such as the public value approach. What the public value approach does is that it emulates both the bottom up as well the top down approach and this leads to efficiency in the public management. By bottom up approach what I mean is that the citizens have the capacity to provide their input, whereas the top down approach I mean that the decision or what the communication would be is actually set up by the organization.

Having a public value model in its inception allows organizations to combine both those approaches. When both approaches are combined, I think organizations are in a better capacity, both in terms of their functional ability as well as also in terms of having a principle based approach where these considerations could be better replicated.

Again, in terms of implementation and also seeing how effectively they can actually ensure that there's more acuity as well as more enhancement in participation, in terms to how well it is actually meeting the needs of the citizens or developing some kind of an operational value or measuring framework, I think that there is still a lot that needs to be done both in terms of organizations having the resources as well as the technologies that they're actually using. [AUDIO BREAK]

When both those approaches are combined it enhances the scope of the operation, social media monitoring policies actually balance the need of the efficiency with the actual satisfaction of the citizens; integrating the policy action, using this approach we ensure that an organization is able to install such standards both in its operation as well as in its structure. It'll also create room for them to have proper consideration for international guidelines that have been specified for social media monitoring set up by the OACG as well as other International bodies.

Next I talk about the policy recommendations. When it comes to the policy recommendations, here I actually just list some of the factors that need to be taken into consideration for future researches. First thing is that policies that are getting adopted should set some precedence for [inaudible] ethical guidelines. I think that having this public value model as a paradigm would ensure to a large extent that these ethical concerns are taken into consideration.

The second recommendation is organizations that are using this technology need to follow a more structured approach. This is something that needs to come from the organizations, even having the public value principle set up in the organizations' apparatus would give them acknowledgment towards these concerns in a principle-oriented way, but in terms of implementations organizations need to have the resources, the man power, the skills, the technology, etc. to get better results for that.

The third is the policy considerations that are being made, need to be made towards the communities that are not legally engaged. How do

you get those communities engaged in the process, people you know who are not using online mediums, so what do you do? If you rely on some medium that is purely relying on [inaudible] to social media then these people should be left out and here again having this public value framework would allow organizations to take into consideration such factors before setting their policies as in setting the public value outcome they take into consideration the unintended consequences. The unintended consequences would give organizations the capacity to have these provisions specified in the earlier processes.

This is basically my presentation, so what it does in an actual is that it uses the framework called the Public Value Framework as a way for organizations to install better standards, both in terms of accountability as well as in terms of governance initiative to have a provision through which they can better serve the citizens their actual needs. This is not a complete process however there are still a lot of areas where I think work needs to be done in order to have a more complete approach whoever is using social media for practice mitigation and disaster. Thank you.

If you have any questions or if any of you want to give me any feedback, I'm more than willing to answer that but take into consideration such factors. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Mr. Dutta, for the presentation. I do have a question. I'd just like to open the floor to the group here. Does anyone have any

thoughts or questions or comments? I see Glenn has raised a hand, Glenn, go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel here.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry, go ahead, Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel here for the record. Apologies that I'm not able to make it into the Adobe Connect, can you hear me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Perfect. I like the way the framework is being used. Are we looking at just a partial location of the different threats who call different modes of engagement with different members or participants being used or adopted? Because he mentioned that previously the tools have been -- previously it was SMS were the platform Ushahidi and now they are using Twitter, Facebook for engagement. Probably could it be possible for us to engage this framework in ICANN60 to measure the level of engagement? Thank you, back to you, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:	Okay, thank you, Daniel. It's Glenn. Thank you so much for the presentation and I really like the methodology that professor Moore was suggesting in terms of the analysis. I just want to share with you a quick story, when I was at the GHTC last year and you referred to the negative impacts of social media, when I first started getting into using social media and Twitter five, six years ago many of the tweets we saw good information getting on issues.

For example the fire that was in LA about five years ago, the information was fairly accurate and there was no vetting of the information but it was an example of the GHTC last year and Seatle, the guy who was a coordinator for the US Coast Guard gave an example which shows you how social media can actually get out of hand sometimes, they were having an oil spill on the coast in California and people got on to social media saying we need human hair to absorb the oil and so thousands and thousands of bags of human hair was being dropped off at the beach, with the idea that people felt good, they were contributing but it was all fake information.

It was a distraction, it was a waste issue, in some cases a toxic issue, maybe my question to you is, how does organizations be proactive because in the age of fake news, how does organizations actually grab the information back so that they are controlling the message and that social media doesn't allow things to get out of hand?

AGRADIP DUTTA:	Yeah, it's an excellent question and you are pretty head on when you talk about the negative factors, especially when it comes to terrorist

EN

attacks these days; when it happens, it literally increases our -- right at the onset of it they say no use of social media, they actually block any use of Twitter, Facebook, things like that. One of the main problems that it does, especially in terrorist attacks, is that terrorist organizations actually use information from that.

In 2012 when the Mumbai terrorist attack happened and the terrorist organization that was actually responsible for the attack, there's an article on that and I have read it, and they said how the terrorist organization were actually using that information and based on that information they were instructing the attackers who were executing the attacks to better target their strategy.

It's a big problem, but when it comes having a solution, this is where I think organizations need to have some kind of filtering capacity, where they can filter the most important information against the information that is not so important. There has been some tools but it's very at their inception, like collecting information using a keyword search maybe. Using a specific keyword and having that keyword in the messaging would constitute a viable information and not having that keyword would be unviable for communication.

Or say something like targeting to specific locations, but for this to be more effective, what organizations need to have is that they still need to have some understanding of what kind of crisis they are tackling and what the scale of the damages are. The kind of damages that could happen from it, so that they get some kind of idea that what information is important and what is not important. I think that could

be one of the ways, I'm not sure too sure about it. Glenn, do you have any feedback on that?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, thank you, thank you for that illustration of Mumbai, that's an excellent example. Perhaps I can turn it back to Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Glenn. I see Ariel has her hand up and I'll put my hand in the queue. Go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dev. This is Ariel, I'm in the support staff for this Social Media Working Group. Just for the guest speaker I'm wondering the theory and the framework that you presented, what is the application to ICANN the organization? For example, the public wouldn't face as many critical crisis like the national government or things like that, but we do have a process of enhancing accountability of ICANN, [inaudible] aware of that process. So, just out of curiosity, how does your framework apply to ICANN in the internet governance context? Thank you.

AGRADIP DUTTA: I think in terms of internet governance and one of the areas that ICANN is trying to address is mitigating the imbalance that is there in digital engagement. Making sure that there is some kind of paradigm in terms of having participation from all sectors of the society, so that digital

engagement does not stay limited to a certain segment of the population, it is a more enhanced process.

This kind of a framework, having a value based principle set up in the organizational apparatus would provide scope to properly take into consideration various motions of democratic participation, have a better accountability process set up in the initial stage so that organizations have a better reporting process; the public that is actually benefitting from that information would know what the process is or what they're expecting, they would not be left clueless.

This in turn what it does is that it contributes towards internet governance as a whole because the process would be more open, there would more transparency and as well there could be ways for enhancement in participations across sectors, which I think is one of the core fundamentals of ICANN. Was it okay? Has the explanation addressed your queries?

DANIEL NANHAKA: Daniel here, please. May I ask you something please again?

AGRADIP DUTTA: Sure, Daniel.

DANIEL NANHAKA: Daniel for the record. Probably my question did not come off so clearly. I'd just inquire how best can this framework be implemented for engagement in ICANN60? Because ICANN60 would be a very good

AGRADIP DUTTA: Before I get into this, can you elaborate a little bit more on ICANN60? So what exactly you're trying to look into when it comes to ICANN60?

DANIEL NANHAKA: One thing is that ICANN60it is a public forum. ICANN is so much about policy development processes and we as the social media working group, we aim to engage the public on awareness, what is transpiring in the different working groups, so through social media we tweet 3000 messages and the public is able to follow in different various locations.

When I get back to the question, the fact that we as the social media working group, we are engaging the general public in remote areas through social media, how best can this framework be implemented in ICANN60? Does that make the question clear?

AGRADIP DUTTA: Yeah, it does, and one of the ways I can say is if this framework gets implemented in ICANN60, so what it will do is that it would take into consideration those value based principles into ICANN's incorporation manual. What this would do is it will increase more the participation level of the actual people that you want to be involved in the process and this would also create room for various stakeholders to be involved in the process through authorizing environment which I talked about, is that there is provision for different stakeholders to get involved.

EN

This would not be only citizens; this could also be civil society groups, government organizations, we can bring these people together and then using that we can setup an approach that we can then execute on a wider scale.

On the other hand, this can also be used in operationalizing. Say for example if you use certain values and these are democratic values and then we start collecting data based on those values and then we operationalize it, they will give up a clear indication to what extent an organization is successful in fulfilling this value and if the organization has not fulfilled its value then this could be portrayed as an area where the organization needs to do better. Does that make sense?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think yeah, I think it makes some sense. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: One final question because we're also coming up towards the top of the hour. Are there any such documentation of public frameworks that you have seen that's been developed? Because we do have our own social media strategy, but perhaps it would be useful if there was any -- do you have any particular examples? Can you cite examples and provide any links to such frameworks that in your mind meet --

AGRADIP DUTTA: I can, definitely, and the one thing that I have in mind right now is BBC in 2004 when they were incorporating using digital media. They actually used this public value framework, and using this they created a public

value testing system, and based upon that they set up their parameters. I can share that article with all of you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That would be very helpful.   Thanks for that. It would be interesting to see how it's actually documented. Glenn, you have a hand raised.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I'm going to take the one step further, Dev, on your comment. Can you, it's early in the game in social media on the right and wrong way to do stuff but in your opinion, if an organization doesn't have a clear policy what do you think the impacts would be? And I'm following this dialog and like all of us, we're trying to figure out how to do it right and what are the mistakes that people are doing. So what are the key things that should be in a successful policy for an organization? Thank you.

AGRADIP DUTTA: Let me just put my thoughts here. It depends also to the context you are applying the policy, because in many cases having a policy that is not culturally sensitive or taking into consideration the actual scenario under which it is getting applied could not lead to desirable results and I think one of the main important things is that your approaches to public policy, what they are trying to address nowadays is that they're trying to have citizens be part of the process where they can provide some kind of an input to the policy makers and that input then can be used by the policy makers in making their decision.

For example having an online participation, a crowd based participation where you are seeking opinions from the public using case studies approach where social media was used as a crisis response and getting their opinion. This would give an organization a better understanding to what extent it's successful or whether it's not successful, to what extent they were participatory, to what extent they were not participatory, whether the organization trusts the agencies that are actually doing it, that's also very important because the public receiving the service, they also need to trust the organization.

I think according to me, the three most important policy considerations that need to be taken into consideration in setting up a social media monitoring strategy, one, is enhancement of participation, making sure that the participation is as open and as enhanced as possible; then having a trust both on the part of the people who will be providing you the information as well as on the part of the organization that is collecting the information; and the third is to what extent that information can lead to efficiency.

For example, does it actually lead to effectiveness in the delivery or is it the same thing that was there before, when social media were not getting used. So having these three things in the policy setting apparatus would give any organization the scope to set an example, I think.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great, thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Mr. Agradip Dutta, thanks for the presentation, it was very interesting, and do please send the links of actual documented public value frameworks. I think we're coming close to top of the hour, we started about four minutes late. I think we could probably just tackle the first two agenda items, which is social media accounts across ICANN and a quick analysis of social media performance. We could drop the review of action items because we won't have enough time. Ariel, I believe you have prepared a slide for the social media accounts across ICANN. I think this is one key action item that was fulfilled. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Dev. This is Ariel speaking. I just found it very interesting, it kind of applies to what our guest speaker has talked about in terms of a policy process, in terms of social media. Some are citizen lead social media use or organization lead social media use, that's kind of reflected down the slide where this item I'm sharing with you here is about all those ICANN social media accounts across all SO's and AC's.

So based on John Laprise's request, he wants to know what are the usage of social media across the whole community and then I did an initial analysis, a research with was my policy colleague, Carlos Reyes in DC over the summer, and we have found out all these different accounts like Twitter, Facebook, Youtube, Flickr, newsletters, websites and web pages and other platforms. When you look at this slide you can also blow it up, you can see there is a lot of them, staff lead accounts, so staff are accountable for managing a conference.

Of course there's community involvement [inaudible] contributing to a conference, but staff are mainly responsible for how these accounts grow. You can see that for Twitter mainly At-Large GNSO, ccNSO and some of the constituencies in the GNSO, they have staff lead accounts. For Facebook it's At-Large, ccNSO, GNSO and also [inaudible], and some of constituencies from the GNSO. For the others like YouTube and Flickr it's just by large that we have staff lead accounts.

Then the newsletters part, we know some of the GNSO working groups and the constituencies they have their newsletters, but staff are responsible for the content. For the website it's a lot of [inaudible] named websites, like At-Large, GNSO, GAC, ccNSO are staff lead websites, and then for the web pages you can see these items too.

For the community lead it's almost sort of like a 50/50 divide and for Twitter we have a lot more handles that are completely community responsible for their growth and managing the content. Mostly they're constituencies being the GNSO and then also for At-Large we have the African At-Large which is the AFRALO account that was created by community members in AFRALO.

For the Facebook it's a very similar situation too, there's a lot of constituencies, the GNSO have their own Facebook page, and for At-Large EURALO and AFRALO, they have their own too.

Of course when we look at the content the frequency of posting is much lower than the staff lead accounts because of the nature of the volunteer handled accounts, it depends on [inaudible] availability. For At-Large there is other unique items like Instagram, LinkedIn, eBook and

outreach calendar; only At-Large has that and it's the At-Large community lead initiated. For some other unique items like a blog, for example NCUC has it but they are community members responsible for the content of that.

For newsletters there is a lot more community lead newsletters, you can see on the slide, I included some CCWG and other PDP working groups in the GNSO, they have that. Even for the GAC, a working group in the GAC they have a newsletter but that's completely staff lead also. For the website it's mainly the constituency level; they have their own website and then they completely manage their own account side of community members.

That's just a quick report on these different social media accounts across ICANN, [inaudible] a more expanded view of social media by including newsletters and websites but that gives you an overview of the landscape. ICANN is a very diverse situation and each group they value their independence and staff involvement in managing their accounts in different ways, so that's how we see this kind of diverse landscape.

I just want to leave it here. I don't know where we're going from here, whether we need some kind of policy to make everything consistent but I don't know where this is going but at least we know the situation right now. I will stop here. Any questions or comments?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Ariel. Quite a lot of content being distributed online, both from the staff and from the community. I wasn't quite aware of some of

these community lead ones.   Any thoughts or quick comments or observations?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Based on the challenge that Ariel is speaking about, I think the challenge is consolidating these accounts based on how the different communities manage their accounts and also the ICANN staff. The fact that ICANN has a dedicated staff to handle social media, it's not the same like the community having a dedicated person to manage the social accounts.

Probably my suggestion is -- maybe let me pose a question, how can all these different social media accounts be consolidated? We are able to get feedback from all angles and harmonize them in one place, then there we are being able to at least to know the levels of engagement. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: A good question, Daniel. I'm not sure if I have an answer for you right at the top of my head. Does anyone wish to try to answer that question?

ARIEL LIANG: If I may, I'd like to answer the question with a question. Daniel, why do you think these accounts need to be consolidated? What would be the goal and the benefit of consolidating them?

DANIEL NANGHAKA:	What I mean by consolidation is the challenge is the community as you had mentioned have their own accounts, but the rate which they are managing the content or the activity that takes place on these other accounts is not at the same rate as the other one. I don't know how best that is going to be done, but that is like a paradox situation that we are currently in. Back to you, thank you.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Thanks, Daniel. I'm actually not aware of any way to easily aggregate all of this content but perhaps you could just take that after the call and consider ways if this could be done feasibly. My thinking is that it's not that easy, but it just goes to the huge diversity of the At-Large. Well, not just At-Large but the diversity of the ICANN community.

Ariel, thanks for this. I think there is probably some adjustments we need for the community lead one, for example there is a LACRALO Facebook group, a community lead Facebook group, so that is one to probably add to the list. I will share the link with you afterwards. Glenn? |
| GLENN MCKNIGHT: | This is a question for Ariel. In the past, Ariel, you had stats in terms of number of followers and number or tweets and some kind of indicator. I think some tools like mail chimp with its newsletters provides some very interesting analytics in terms of what pages people read and how many clicks and how often that newsletter gets passed on. I remember John asking awhile back when we did the newsletter for TTF on Copenhagen, the first thing he asked is the eyeballs, in terms of these |

metrics and actually which was lucid press, which was a very nice tool and all and we created and eBook with it as well but I think it failed to have the tools or the ability to do metrics. I'm just curious do we have any idea who's the leader or who's being real successful in this, whether staff or community lead, do you have any stats on this to share with us?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All that's coming up now 10 minutes past the hour, perhaps you could -- Ariel, unless you have a very quick answer and maybe that could lead into the next agenda item with the social media performance, and then see if you could answer the question that Glenn raised regarding, do we track newsletters and so forth.

ARIEL LIANG: I don't have an answer to your question because there are more than 40 different kind of products we're talking about here and they have different ownership. If it's a community lead account, staff don't have visibility to how it performs and how it's measured. I don't have an answer to your questions to all these accounts but at least I have an answer to how the At-Large Twitter handle performs which we actively track its performance. Maybe we can just jump to the next item.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, go ahead, please.

ARIEL LIANG:	Thanks, Dev and Glenn again for the questions. I think I have a little of a problem sharing my screen because of this Adobe Connect configuration, I cannot share my screen right now. If you can give me a moment, let me just extract a screenshot and I will share that screenshot on the -- let me just do that quickly. Just one second. Because we are running short on time I'm just going to give you a very quick overview of our performance.

In the past 281 days, because the last time we reported on our performance was December 15th, 2016.   We are tracking the performance, you can see how many tweets we did, the number or re-tweets clicked, and so you can see it's a drastic improvement compared to the previous 281 days, for the same length of period that we are comparing to. If you look at impressions, that means potentially how many people have seen our content, that's almost 200,000 people have seen that, so four times better performance than before.

Then we also gained more than 1,000 followers and it's not even within a one year period, it's like two thirds of the one year. We're definitely doing better than before and it's a shame that I couldn't share my screen with you. I was looking to what are the dates that we really performed really well. We had certain dates that had a huge spike of engagement, like people just re-tweeting or sharing or liking our tweets or measuring us. For example one time was when Leon was announced as the board director selected by At-Large; we had about 700 engagements that single day.

Also during ICANN59, we had a ton of engagement during that whole period and I think thanks that we have two other staff members, Mario

and Evin, are doing social media, so we're tweeting much more often than before. I think all these factors contributed to the growth of our accounts and also told all of you guys that over the weekend we passed the 5,000 followers milestone, that's remarkable.

Considering I just started working at ICANN with the social media working group in 2014, that time we only had about 1,000 followers. Just within the past three years and half we grew 4,000 something followers, that's pretty great. I think we're doing much better comparably speaking. I'm happy to share more details on that if folks have questions. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Ariel. Thanks for the precise reporting and data, and great milestone in terms of the number of followers. I know time is short so quick questions only, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah, very quickly as an action item if I may. It was something we brought up on GTS last week about proposals for the FBSC for next year, perhaps that's something we can suggest in terms of the budget for next year. Some kind of tracking tool or information. It would be very nice to see the results across the board. Who's doing better than others. I think it gets back this whole the ICANN evolution and accountability.

One of our obligations in MoU's is to reach out to the community and engage because of the multi stakeholder model. It's something I think

we need to start thinking about so perhaps as an action item we could suggest putting in a proposal and Heidi's very keen on us doing something on that. I just want to suggest that to the committee. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Glenn. I think obviously indeed we could probably look at what particular any further ideas for that requires budgeting for FY18 you should start considering it now so that we can develop the proposal in a timely manner rather than waiting to the last minute or missing that deadline. I believe we'll be meeting with the ICANN communications team, Duncan and so forth, during ICANN60 --

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Perhaps Ariel can join us on that meeting as well.

DEVANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. Okay, I want to just thank everyone. I do have one announcement to make and any other business, just a short announcement. I will be stepping down as the social media chair after ICANN60 due to personal reasons. John Laprise, I have talked to him, and even though he was unable to be on this call, he said he would be able to handle the chairing of this social media working group after the ICANN60 meeting. I just wanted to make that announcement and it's not to say I will be totally disappearing. I will be keeping track and following the discussions and of course making my contributions wherever I can.

EN

So I would like to thank everyone for attending this call and thanks to Mr. Dutta for the presentation, and again, if he's still on the call, looking forward to seeing some documented public value frameworks that he mentioned in his presentation. Thanks to everybody for attending this call. This is call is now adjourned. Have a wonderful morning, afternoon, evening.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]