BUENOS AIRES – ICANN Accountability & Transparency Metrics & Benchmarks
Wednesday, November 20, 2013 – 10:30 to 11:30
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

Good morning. We're going to get started in just a minute. Sorry for the delay.

Very good. Christina Laybourn is finally on the line. Sorry for the delay.

LARISA GURNICK: Good morning, My name is Larisa Gurnick. I'm part of ICANN staff, the strategic initiatives department. And this is the presentation on the accountability and transparency benchmarks and metrics.

The One World Trust had been engaged to help with this effort. And on the line with us we have Christina Laybourn from One World Trust who is going to provide an update of the work that she and her team have been conducting. And I just wanted to clarify that this is project specifically focused on accountability and transparency metrics. In parallel with this effort, there's other work going on at ICANN on performance measurements and metrics. And we're coordinating this effort with that other work. But this is specifically focused on accountability and transparency.

Good morning, Christina.

CHRISTINA LAYBOURN: Good morning, everybody.

LARISA GURNICK: Good morning. Go ahead and start.

CHRISTINA LAYBOURN: Great. Thank you. Thank you, Larisa. Good morning. Apologies I'm not able to join you in Buenos Aires. I know it must be difficult to try to listen to a presentation when I'm remote. So thank you for your patience.

The presentation today, just to give you a quick overview of what I'll be talking about, I'll start with a brief introduction to The One World Trust. And then I'll talk about the parameters of this consultancy project and the design of our research. I'll go on to give you a brief overview of some of our key research findings.

And then I'll introduce some of our current ideas about what these metrics and benchmarks might look like in terms of what they will do, what they will measure, and how they will work.

And then Larisa will have some time to talk through what the next steps will be for ICANN.

Next slide, please.

So The One World Trust is an independent research organization that focuses on the accountability and governance of international organizations. We conduct a mixture of search and consultancy work for IGOs, INGOs, and their associated umbrella bodies. Our clients have included the IMF, World Bank, International Federation of the Red Cross, and the European Parliament. We specialize in conducting accountability assessments, developing tools and training, and also developing organizational specific accountability frameworks.

In particular, our global accountability framework has assessed the accountability policies and practices of more than 100 international organizations, including ICANN in 2007.

Next slide, please. Great.

The One World Trust was engaged by ICANN to conduct this work because of its importance in telling the story of how ICANN meets its accountability and transparency obligations and also in response to the first ATRT recommendation that there should be a system of metrics introduced to evaluate and report on ICANN's accountability performance. We've been tasked with developing a draft set of accountability metrics to measure and track ICANN's improvements over time and accompanying benchmarks to compare ICANN's accountability with other international organizations. As Larisa said, it should be clarified that our accountability metrics will be separate but complementary to the

wider to the organizational metrics currently being identified by ICANN staff. A final report will be delivered to ICANN on the 20th of December. So we're very much still in the development process. But, hopefully, this presentation will give you an overview of the work we've done so far and a taste of what is to come.

Next slide, please.

So, right from the outset, we knew this would not be an easy task. So we set ourselves three questions to be answered to provide us with a base to develop the metrics and benchmarks.

Firstly, what are the expectations of ICANN's accountability performance, both from stakeholders and peer organizations? Secondly, how is ICANN currently performing against these expectations in terms of accountability? Where are its strengths and challenges? And then, finally, how are other international multistakeholder organizations reaching their accountability challenges and what learning can they share with ICANN?

Next slide, please.

So, in order to answer these questions, we divided our research into a three-pronged approach. Firstly, we reviewed four internationally respected frameworks of nonprofit accountability to establish how they defined accountability and what standards they regard as key to being accountable.

We also analyzed ICANN's policies and practices through desk research and interviews with key staff and stakeholders to provide us with an insight to ICANN's current accountability strengths and challenges as well as gathering ideas about how the metrics and benchmarks might work.

This is then accompanied by three case studies of the accountability policies and practices of other multistakeholder international nonprofit organizations.

We looked at the World Fair Trade Organization; the International Organization for Standardization, ISO; and Forestry Stewardship Council.

Next slide, please. From our analysis of the four accountability frameworks, we saw that they take a stakeholder approach to accountability. They look at how an organization allows itself to be held to account by the different people affected by its work.

And we know from experience that this is the approach taken by most nonprofit organizations who aren't driven by the binary client vendor relationship with commercial transactions.

So under this approach, for example, ICANN should be accountable to multiple stakeholder groups, including staff, governments, civil society, and businesses. I should add that this includes ICANN's formal stakeholders, such as those engaged in supporting organizations and advisory committees, but also

informal stakeholders who are not necessarily engaged in these mechanisms.

Next slide, please.

From our analysis of the four accountability frameworks, we also established that they all in different ways focus on the six key areas of transparency, participation, board governance, evaluation and learning, and complaints and response.

All but one also looks at the overarching principle of accountability strategy, how an organization makes an explicit commitment to accountability and strategically plans to meet these metrics. As I will describe later, these six principles will form the basis of our accountability metrics and benchmarks. I think it's interesting to note how closely these accountability standards align with the broad categories of draft recommendations from ATRT2.

Next slide, please.

From our perspective, having worked with other international organizations on accountability issues, we actually find that ICANN performed pretty well. The real commitment to accountability from staff and stakeholders on a number of developments in the past year have manifested this commitment in practice, although ICANN is somewhat lacking in clear accountability policies to support and guide the practice.

We also find that ICANN exceeds standards of information sharing and participation. As I'll discuss next, ICANN's particular accountability demands mean there is still room for improvement.

There were, however, some areas where ICANN does not meet good practice standards of accountability. As I said, there's a lack of accountability policies which detail how to practically meet the high-level obligations in the Affirmation of Commitments.

We also find that there's room for improvement in how ICANN evaluates its work and learns from its evaluations. And, finally, although ICANN does have three complaints mechanisms for stakeholders and one for staff, which meets several of our good practice standards, stakeholders reported concerns to us with how they operate in practice.

Next slide, please.

Because of ICANN's unique mandate and unusual structure, we also identified several areas where we believe there are specific accountability challenges that should be addressed. In terms of sharing information effectively, ICANN has established a principle of near full disclosure on its Web site. But I'm sure, as anyone who has used the Web site will agree, the information up there is not always easy to find or easy to digest.

With regards to defining parameters for consultation and balancing interactions with different stakeholders, while in

comparison with other organizations, ICANN creates a lot of opportunities for its stakeholders to engage in its decisions. However, there are well-recognized problems with when stakeholders are consulted, whose recommendations are actioned, and how recommendations are responded to.

Then, in terms of ensuring board accountability, because the board has ultimate responsibility for decision making within ICANN, it is particularly important that the board is accountable to their stakeholders. There have been some real improvements in this area in the past year. But the people I've spoke to reported that this is still an area of concern for them, suggesting that what is now key is demonstrating board accountability.

Following on from that, one of the things that The One World Trust has established over the years is that regular reporting on accountability performance is key in improving standards. The ATRT reports are a good step. But internal yearly reports would provide more regular guidance on how ICANN is doing and where it needs to improve. And the metrics will, hopefully, play a key role in this.

Next slide, please.

So my colleague Manija, who is unfortunately unable to join us today due to illness, conducted three case studies of the World Fair Trade Organization, the Forestry Stewardship Council, and ISO. These three organizations were all selected because they are

nonprofits and they work on a multistakeholder model. And Manija looked in depth at how they meet their own accountability commitments to their stakeholders with a key question "What can ICANN take from this comparative analysis?" Just to give you a sense of Manija's findings, I'll discuss some good practice examples from the studies in relation to governance structure, accountability strategy, participation, and evaluation and learning.

Next slide, please.

So we find that the Forestry Stewardship Council delivers a good practice example of how to address the challenges of multistakeholder governance. FSC's organizational structure incorporates a whole array of different multistakeholder arenas at the national, international, and regional levels, which are specifically designed to assure that powerful corporate interests within the forestry and wood products industry cannot dominate over less powerful social and environmental interests.

FSC governing bodies are required to conform to a tripartite structure. Every governing body is composed of three chambers representing, firstly, industry and also environmental NGOs and, finally, social groups such as labor and forest communities.

This tripartite structure ensures that social and environmental representatives form two-thirds of each multistakeholder venue giving them a strong majority in relation to the one-third of representatives from industries. Within the general assembly

within the governing board, the organization's bylaws have also served to assure careful balance of representatives from the global north and the global south. Next slide, please.

So, actually, similarly to ICANN, the WFTO, FSC, and ISO also don't have a clear definition of accountability to their stakeholders. But these three organizations do identify clearly and precisely who their internal and external stakeholders are. And I'll talk about ISO as an example in just a minute. All three organizations also prioritize between their stakeholder groups.

However, our comparative analysis actually finds out that only WFTO prioritizes on the basis of which stakeholder group is most affected by its activities. FSC and the ISO are not explicit and transparent about why they prioritize, which is not necessarily good practice.

Next slide, please.

As I said, ISO provides some interesting learning around encouraging participation. For decades developing countries played a passive role in ISO, even though they supplied the majority of its members. A survey in 2001 of ISO's developing country members reveal that half of the 84 respondents did not participate in the work of any ISO technical committee. However, by 2012, the number of ISO technical bodies which were led by developing countries rose to historic high of 9%. And they managed to achieve this by a purpose of twinning in which

member bodies from developed and developing countries hold leadership positions jointly. So the ISO working group on social responsibility, for example, had a Brazilian chair, a Swedish vice chair, a Swedish secretary, and a Brazilian cosecretary.

Next slide, please.

Finally, the WFTO provides a good practice example of how it creates opportunities for evaluation, self-reflection, and learning.

It uses a WFTO guarantee system, which is a monitoring tool that aims to identify which member organizations have met internally agreed accountability standards of fair trade practice.

The WFTO guarantee system is based on a three-tier process. Self-assessment is the first step of this monitoring process. WFTO members assess themselves against nine standards using the self-assessment guidelines and regionally developed indicators. The self-assessment report, which is largely narrative-based, outlines the degree of compliance with these standards and is sent to the WFTO every two years.

The second step of the WFTO guarantee system is mutual review, a kind of internal verification. So the WFTO members send their self-assessment reports to their trading partners allowing for comments and feedback in a process that encourages accountability and transparency in line with practices such as a 360-degree assessment.

The external verification is then the last component of the WFTO guarantee system -- monitoring system. Sorry.

Registration is given to organizations that have successfully completed their self-assessments and met the demands of the WFTO monitoring system. The external verification identifies them as fair trading organizations.

Next slide, please.

Can I have the next -- there. Thank you.

So now you've heard what our key findings were.

This has led us to the current stage of our work, which is developing the metrics and benchmarks themselves, drawing on our findings. We're still in the early stages of developing the metrics and benchmarks, but I wanted to give you an overview of what we're thinking and give you an opportunity to contribute your thoughts to the direction we're taking. And I should add that what we're currently developing are draft metrics and benchmarks.

Larisa will talk about the next steps toward the end. And I'd like to reiterate that The One World Trust and ICANN staff really welcome your thoughts and ideas. And there will be time at the end of this presentation for questions and discussions.

Next slide, please.

So our development of the metrics and benchmarks is shaped by our ideas as to what we want them to do. The benchmarks will establish how ICANN performs in comparison to its peers. They'll produce qualitative learning about accountability good practice amongst other multistakeholder organizations. And they'll provide strategic guidance about how ICANN's accountability can be improved.

Next slide, please.

The metrics will measure key indicators of accountability practice which are specific to ICANN, including stakeholder perceptions. They'll clearly communicate how effectively ICANN is being accountable to its stakeholders. They'll identify specific areas where resources can be strategically invested to improve accountability practice. And they'll align the tracking over time to improvements to ICANN's accountability.

Next slide, please.

So what might they look like?

Well, we propose that the benchmarks will consist of the six identified principles of accountability good practice with each containing three to four standards. The idea is that these standards will provide a kind of accountability checklist.

The checklist will guide annual comparisons with other selected international organizations. Now, in order for this to be

productive, it will need to be done on a friendly, mutually supported basis. And it can't be about competing. But, instead, it should be about sharing learning, about how the organizations meet the accountability benchmarks in different ways.

This will then produce qualitative learning and recommendations as to how ICANN performed in relation to its peers and where there are areas for improvement.

Next slide, please.

We envisage that the ICANN-specific accountability metrics will fit within the accountability benchmarks, although our current thinking is that accountability strategy cannot be metricized.

So the metrics will follow the five other benchmark principles. Each principle will feature two or three metrics which will measure specific practical implementations of that accountability principle. The aim is to keep them concise and easily communicable. At this stage we're not aiming to measure everything concerning accountability or even all aspects of accountability. Just to provide the highlights.

I should say that this graph on the right is probably misleading. Firstly, because no organization I've come across would be able to improve as quickly as over four years; but also because we're not planning on creating a system whereby one final accountability score can be calculated. At the most we might have summary

scores for each accountability dimension. But I think that needs to be worked out in the piloting.

However, we are proposing to identify metrics which will increase or decrease, rather than just looking at distributions, for example. And a visual heat or dashboard representation of this from red to amber to green might be a good way of quickly conveying how ICANN is performing. Of course, staff would have to set what the levels of red, amber, and green would be for each metric, and this could be part of the planning process to establish what achievement we want to reach in 2, 4, and 6 years, for example. Next slide, please.

These metrics will bring together measurements from three sources. Firstly, there will be metrics for which the ICANN staff are already gathering data. In many cases the practicalities of accountability are actually already being measured for other purposes, such as the (indiscernible) dashboard on the Web site.

Secondly, we think we'll have to develop some new metrics where we believe there's an important aspect of accountability to consider but there's no existing available metric that measures how this is being practically achieved within ICANN.

And then thirdly, we're proposing to initiate an annual survey of ICANN stakeholders perceptions and drop all these results in the metrics. As a focus of ICANN's accountability effort, stakeholders are obviously key, and this will also allow us to measure factors

which are not directly within ICANN's control, thus lessening the problem of ICANN teaching to the test or rather working to the metric. Next slide, please.

So as I said, we're just at the stage of beginning to think about what the metrics might measure. But here are three possible metrics for the principle of accountability to formal stakeholders such as members of Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees.

From the stakeholder perception survey, we might report the percentage of stakeholders that state that they feel actively involved in ICANN's decision-making process. From the existing dashboard metrics, we might report the number of ICANN fellowship participants who are supported to attend ICANN meetings. And then we might propose a new metric measuring the percentage of participants in Supporting Organizations or advisory community working groups who are from a targeted region, so one that is underrepresented or is recognized of being in need of strategic support. Next slide, please.

The final output for this consultancy is a series of recommendations about how the metrics should be implemented. Here are some of our key thoughts at the moment. Firstly, there needs to be a solid process of consultation with staff and stakeholders about the draft metrics with benchmarks accompanied by piloting and redrafting. Once the metrics have

been finalized, there should be a strong communication strategy developed to launch the metrics in the community so that stakeholders are aware that the metrics are out there and also of what they're measuring. We'd also recommend that the metrics and benchmarks are accompanied by an annual report to provide a qualitative analysis of the year's accountability measurements and any recommendations for improvement. We believe that the metrics need to be sustained over several years to allow tracking before there's any redrafting. However, once the metrics are embedded, there will be the potential to expand them to cover other accountability practices at ICANN.

So I'm now going to hand it over to Larisa so she can talk you through what the next steps will be within ICANN. Thank you very much.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Christina. During the process of the work of One World Trust the team has gotten quite a bit of feedback through consultations with staff, board, and the community and in particular the ATRT2 who provided great insights as to things that would be helpful to this effort. So with all that information and additional feedback from this group and for the rest of the ICANN meeting we'll be collecting the feedback, looking forward to the One World Trust report, and also working with staff to make sure

that the metrics and the methods proposed for collecting and communicating these metrics can be implemented in short order.

In December we will start the planning process for the pilot that Christina referenced, and in the time frame of January through March we'll be work on implementation plans as well as communication plans to make sure that the metrics that are being piloted can be communicated clearly, can be understood by the community, as well as are on target in terms of measuring the kinds of values that are important to accountability and transparency. The pilot -- the metrics will be available by the Singapore meeting and after the feedback and targeted consultations that we plan to hold in that time frame we will also be doing workshops, demonstrations, and other ways of making sure that the metrics are hitting the targets for what the community is looking for from our accountability and transparency framework.

At this point I would like to take some questions and open the floor up for discussion.

>> Chairman.

BECKY BURR: Hi. My name is Becky Burr. I've spoken with Christina so if you're still on the line, hello. And what I'm going to say --

CHRISTINA LAYBOURN: Hi there, Becky.

BECKY BURR: It's not going to be a surprise. When you were talking, Christina, about this you said one thing that was important about ICANN was that it is not driven by contracts and by contractual obligations and then -- and I think as you know, that's not quite right. ICANN derives a lot of its legitimacy from contracts with registries and registrars and that's an important part of the functionality and accountability that needs to be taken into account. It does, obviously, have other stakeholders that it needs to be accountable to, but it would be a big mistake, I think, to neglect to think about the accountability to contracted parties.

The other thing that I want to point out is that ICANN really doesn't have a peer, and if your benchmarks are not adjusted to reflect that, you will miss the -- the product won't be workable for us. So let me just -- you talked about the Forest Stewardship Council, the World Fair Trade Organization, and ISO, those are very interesting and wonderful organizations but they're not comparable to ICANN. They're 100% voluntary. They don't control access to a public resource. If you don't deal with ICANN and you want to be in the gTLD space, you can't have a domain name, you can't be a registry, you can't be a registrar. ICANN does regulate participants. It regulates through its contracts. It

regulates through its Policy Development -- mandatory Policy Development Process. The fact that the peers -- I'm not suggesting that there are peers out there that you've missed because I don't think there are peers, but if the benchmarks -- in your benchmarking, if you don't take into account the fact that ICANN lives in a very different space, what comes out of this will not be useful to us. And unfortunately that is an experience that this community has had in the past where, you know, people want to find a peer and people want to compare it, but you got to take into account the differences. And that's a lovingly supportive comment. Sorry.

LARISA GURNICK: Christina, would you like to respond to that?

CHRISTINA LAYBOURN: Yes, please. Thank you, Becky. I just want to clarify, I did not say that ICANN wasn't driven by contracts. What I said, that it wasn't only driven by commercial interests. I would struggle to find any international nonprofit organization that doesn't have its eye on the money from some source, whether it's from donors or whether it's from an alternative source such as contracts.

As far as ICANN not having a peer is concerned, I absolutely agree with you. And we are taking this into consideration. Perhaps one of the areas where the One World Trust has expertise with

regards to this is that our global accountability framework is specifically designed to be able to compare organizations from very different backgrounds and to find commonalities in terms of accountability standards, and we're drawing directly on that when we're developing the benchmark. So we're taking our experience with very -- assessing very different organizations against each other into consideration.

I would also say this is one of the particular reasons why we're not proposing that the benchmarks will be generating a score or a rank of ICANN against other organizations. Precisely because it is just not productive to start comparing them because they come from such different contexts. But what I will say is that just because they're different doesn't mean that there isn't any interest in learning to be had. And it can be good to hear how other people approach sometimes very different problems but it can spark ideas within your organization about how you might reach another problem using a similar methodology. So thank you very much, Becky.

BECKY BURR: Thanks.

>>   May I be heard?

BECKY BURR: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK: Becky respond and then you --

BECKY BURR: Thank you, Christina. I just want to respond. I was not saying that it's not interesting to have this information and I'm totally supportive of it. It's just in establishing the benchmarks those can become expectations. So we need to take into account that it's -- it's not -- it's not -- let me rephrase this. It would be a huge disservice if the report allowed ICANN to think of itself as the Forestry Conservation Group or ISO or -- so it's actually more about how -- how it's presented and making sure the ways in which ICANN is unique and not comparable come through.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Becky.

CHRISTINA LAYBOURN: Great. Thank you, Becky. That's a such a good clarification. I'll bear that in mind.

LARISA GURNICK: Go ahead, sir.

CEASAR SOTO: [Speaking in non-English language.]

Okay. I'll speak in English. My name is Ceasar, like the salad, Soto. I have a problem with this discussion. I think that the ICANN process is an opium for the masses. It is intended not to resolve anything at all. You need to have a final determination in everything. Not a discussion. Not a report. Not a framework or a suggestion. At the end of the day you need to have a final determination. And this may be an opinion that I have because I'm a lawyer, and normally you have a judgment.

The problem that I see with ICANN and its way of going about things is that the bottom-up approach, the frameworks, the discussions, are intended precisely not to resolve anything but to keep the status quo. And that is something that is, in my opinion, incorrect. You have to determine a process of adjudication. A process where conflicting parties can have a resolution on their disputes. Otherwise, we end up with meetings and discussions which are entertaining but hopeless and not helpful. I understand the ICANN process of the bottom-up approach and I understand the process of the meetings and discussions and panels, but I don't understand when at the end of the day we end up with just the discussion. We need to have resolution to our problems, delegations, pre-delegations, the problems that are real to the ICANN community but are not dealt with by ICANN. And, you

know, I love to come to Buenos Aires, but I want to have a resolution from ICANN. And what I believe is that ICANN should have a adjudicating committee to deal with the disputes between -- conflicts between people in the community of ICANN. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you for your comment.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi, my name is Stephanie Perrin and I'm a volunteer with the Expert Working Group and the WHOIS replacement. I'm most familiar with developing metrics within the framework of a maturity model and it does strike me that given the current preparations for the Brazil meeting and the strategy groups and all the rest of that it would be useful to figure out what the maturity model -- where ICANN sits in a maturity model and then figure out what metrics need to be mapped to that maturity model. Particularly it would mesh the two activities that come out of the strategic materials. So I just offer that as a proposal.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Stephanie. Brian.

BRIAN CUTE: Yes. Hi, Larisa, and hi, Christina. This is Brian Cute. Thank you very much for the presentation.

CHRISTINA LAYBOURN: Hi, Brian.

BRIAN CUTE: How are you. You had the opportunity to speak with ATRT2 and that was much appreciated so you probably heard some of these things already, but I wanted to react to your presentation.

To be clear, it sounds good and appropriate and helpful. Just to be clear from my perspective, and I think the ATRT2s perspective, it is a broader approach than what the ATRT2 is focused on in its work and the work of review teams under the Affirmation of Commitment. So just for clarity from our perspective, looking forward to a report and deliverables and a framework and tool kit of metrics that can be applied directly to recommendations coming out of review teams under the AoC is critical. To the extent that the report is providing a framework for metrics that get to other aspects of ICANN's operations or its accountability to the community in other ways, certainly welcome and helpful. But from the ATRTs perspective-and that goes back to ATRT1 -- what is really critical is providing ICANN with a metrics tool kit, if you will, so that meaningful benchmarks and metrics can be applied to the implementation of recommendations arising out of those

review teams, and I would add one other point for thought which is ATRT2 is about to issue its final report and recommendations at the end of December and certainly your inputs to the ICANN staff process is timely with the timeline that Larisa put forward of working toward June next year, which is when the board of ICANN will take the recommendations from ATRT2 and if accepting them begin to implement, but importantly, the organization is still in the process of.

But, importantly, the organization is still in the process of implementations from ATRT1, from the WHOIS review team, and the security and stability and resiliency review team. So an important input from you would be metrics that could be applied, to the extent that they haven't been, to that ongoing work. The review team process under the AoC is a cyclical process. There will be future review teams that need to measure how well ICANN has implemented all of those recommendations. So not just future metrics to be used in the future to ATRT2 recommendations, but for ongoing work from other review teams. Just wanted to underscore the distinction of that piece of the work here. And thank you very much for your inputs.

CHRISTINA LAYBOURN: Thank you, Brian.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi, this is Jonathan Zuck from the Association for Competitive Technology, known to some as "Metrics Man." This is a topic near and dear to my heart. I guess I want to echo Brian's comments. There may be a strategic side to this and a tactical side to it. A year from now there's going to be another review team. And I think part of the genesis of this is that the review team realized, gosh, wouldn't it have been nice if we'd have been measuring some things over the previous year in order to make a somewhat more quantitative analysis about the impact of the recommendations we've previously made. So I think, at some very fundamental level, it's got to boil down to a set of objectives and then attempts to address those objectives so that the success of those recommendations could be measured against objectives.

I think transparency is too often used as a proxy for accountability. And it's really only the first stage. The real issue is about whether or not there are goals that were set and whether or not they were met. And I think that's the other part that has to come from ICANN is a willingness to set operational goals within -- especially within the confines of the ATRT review and then measure itself against those objectives.   And I think, in the absence of objectives, metrics just become data. They're not particularly interesting from a management standpoint.

So, again, I want to echo Brian's remarks. Let's try to get it really narrowly focused and make sure that that part of it gets done.

Because, otherwise, what we're doing is creating another monolithic kind of effort within ICANN that goes on for a very long time but doesn't get to some of the transactional side to this. And so I would really like to see that.

And, again, I think that, you know, true accountability comes from telling people what you're trying to do and then being held accountable on whether you accomplished it. And without that first step, without that first step of saying, "Here's what we're trying to do. We are trying to get the percentage of Latin American participants or working groups to this number by this time," then metrics are meaningless. So there has to be an objectives-based approach to this as well.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you. Good feedback. Christina, would you like to respond to that? There's no other questions.

CHRISTINA LAYBOURN: Yeah. In particular, to Jonathan's comment, I absolutely agree with you that you need to have a set of objectives. I guess in the accountability world we call them accountability standards. And that's precisely what benchmarks will be doing. And then metrics will be finding specific things within ICANN that can measure that.

And also, I'm in agreement with you about needing to kind of plan and look to the future and think about what we want to achieve.

Part of our recommendation is very much that the metrics are used as a planning tool for ICANN and integral to the ATRT report in future years. Thank you very much.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you. This will be our last question, unfortunately. Our time apparently is up in this room.

PAUL FOODY: Hello. Paul Foody. It's an observation more than a question. But I'm looking at your stakeholder guide to accountability, the slide, I think it's number 7, where you've got the circle with ICANN at the center and the various stakeholders around it.

I think that that model is misleading. Because, obviously, you know, you've got the staff looking the same size as the Internet users. You don't have domain registrants anywhere on it.

But, really, you should be focusing on the Internet users. Everything else is secondary to that. The accountability -- you're running the Internet. You're running it for the global population. So, if you could focus on that.

And the fact that we've got this 1net thing becoming quite popular -- and ICANN is promoting that -- that's a sign that ICANN has failed in trying to deliver to the Internet user group.

Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much. Thank you for coming and for your feedback. And, if you have any additional thoughts and ideas, please feel free to email them to myself or Christina. And I apologize that we don't have that information up on the slide, but I'll make sure that it will be available on this meeting information. Thank you so much.

Thank you for coming, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]