HYDERABAD – Strategic Goal 5.2 and Measuring Progress
Friday, November 04, 2016 – 11:00 to 12:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: I think we'll wait a few more minutes to see if we get a few more participants.

So I guess we'll go ahead and get started. My name is Charla Shambley, I work at ICANN in the multistakeholder strategy and strategic initiatives department, it's a mouthful. And this is my colleague, Larisa Gurnick. So, I'm going to hand over the microphone to her for a few minutes.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you for joining us this morning. I know it's a very small crowd, but the topic is actually quite an important one, so we're thrilled that a few of you have decided to join us, and hopefully more people will join as we go. ICANN had developed a strategic plan, a five year strategic plan, with input from the community and we've been operating under this plan for a couple of years now.

And every year, when we go through a public comment process on the operating plan and budget, we typically get a lot of

comments from the community saying, well, these are big goals and big ideas, but what does it really mean? What are the components? How do you measure results?

How do we know where things are going? How does this work? So the purpose of this session is to illustrate for you what we've done for the one goal that our team is responsible for, it's goal 5.2, and the intent is to promote ethics, transparency, and accountability across ICANN. Obviously, it's a tremendous goal. It involves contribution from everybody in the ICANN ecosystem, not just our team. Our job is to come up with a framework and a means of beginning to frame up what are all of the activities that are tied to this, and how do we measure if progress is being made.

So, that's what this session is about, and I'm going to turn it over to Charla to walk you through more details.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Okay. So, on this slide, that you can barely read, the screen is very far away.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Yes, you can join the Adobe Connect room. So, on this slide, you can see that there are five strategic goals that Larisa mentioned, and our strategic plan. And I'm not going to read all five of those

strategic goals, because we're just focused on 5.2, and this screen, you can actually find on our dashboard, under quick links, under our main ICANN dot org page.

So, that's how you would navigate to this page here. So, the fifth objective there states that ICANN should develop and implement a global public interest framework, bonded by ICANN's mission. So under this objective, there are three components that support this objective. The red arrow you can see points to the goal 5.2, and it states that ICANN shall promote ethics, transparency, and accountability across the ICANN community.

So that's really the focus of this session.

So the next slide shows kind of a pyramid of ethics, transparency, and accountability, and those are the elements of goal 5.2. These were developed with the community who help guide the strategic plan a couple of years ago. Thank you.

In order to measure progress towards these building blocks, we had to determine… First, we had to come up with a framework for these KPIs, and as the community worked within these, within work stream two continues, will recognize that some of these elements may change, and impact this. So, we're aware of that.

EN

Next slide. So, what are the building blocks? What are the… What can KPIs deliver? So KPIs can deliver trust, efficiency and effectiveness, and legitimacy. By building trust, you're getting factual information that builds trust within the community, the Board and staff, it inspires faith that systems are in place to hold everyone accountable. And any fact based decision demonstrates that actions and decisions are being made fairly.

Efficiency and effectiveness is demonstrated by areas that may help us determine that we need to improve in certain areas, without having that internal look at ourselves, there is no way to make improvements. And so it ensures also that resources are used efficiently and effectively. And then legitimacy, KPIs demonstrate to the rest of the world that ICANN is effectively meeting its commitments, and it inspires faith that ICANN is a disciplined, mature organization ready to meet those future challenges.

So, if any of you have visited our dashboard over the past year or so, these are some of the metrics that you would, actually all of the metrics that you would find under goal 5.2. We felt that in the multistakeholder strategy and strategic initiatives team, that these weren't delivering any value to anyone that actually went down and did a drill down to that goal.

So we started to take a look at these several months ago, and tried to reevaluate what's important to the community, and what's important to staff. So with that in mind, we wanted to take a different approach to KPIs that historically have been reported on the dashboard. The KPIs that support ethics, transparency, and accountability are cross-departmental.

So, on the next several slides, you'll see the information that we've been collecting from various departments within ICANN. KPIs drive continuous improvement through the ICANN organization. They focus our attention on KPIs that support ethics, transparency, and accountability. And will help ICANN achieve its strategic goals, objectives.

It gives ICANN the opportunity to share with the community how we're doing in relation to those objectives and targets, and it also provides a way for us to measure our work. Not yet. Sorry. I'm just trying to scroll down.

So we typically think about ICANN being held accountable, but we want to expand our thinking about KPIs. For example, we're implementing a fact sheet for the competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review.   And we're going to be implementing that across all specific reviews in the future. So we've got SSR2 coming up, we've got RDS and ATRT 3. So we

would like to incorporate that fact sheet with those reviews as well.

So it's not just about ICANN the organization and the Board, but it's also about the community and how we're all collaborating together to achieve our shared objectives.

So, you saw our historical charts that we've been showing on goal 5.2. We've taken a new approach, I'm calling this version 2.0. So this is what, if you actually go to our dashboard now, what you'll see, one of the charts that you'll see for promoting ethics. So, we've done a drill down, and you can see that we are saying here that there are two components that make up ethics. One is mandatory training for staff and for Board, those are ethics classes that we have to take annually, or is it biannually?

And we do get 100% participation on that, it's required. And then the other component to ethics is signing and submitting a conflict of interest form. So those are the two components that we felt showed that ICANN is being ethical in everything that we do.

So transparency is a little bit more detailed. We have seven components on this slide. This tool is for the community to understand how ICANN makes organizational and policy decisions and the rationale behind them. Transparency means having processes in place to publish materials. And by being

transparent, we build that trust, that systems are in place for effective decision making by all parties.

So in this example, I have… The seven components are requests under DIDP, ICANN publication practices, materials posted for Board decisions, the annual audited financial statements, annual operating plan and budget, translations for documents and sessions, and quarterly stakeholder calls.

So, since some of these targets, again, it's really hard to read on the screen, but hopefully you're in the Adobe Connect Room. You can see that some of the targets, weights, and scores are still under development, because we are trying to determine those numbers, so those are indicated by a TBD. So those should be determined by the end of the calendar year.

So then finally, we have accountability. And as mentioned in a previous slide, work is done across ICANN by the community, the Board, and ICANN organization. And that's why it's important that we are able to demonstrate how accountability is woven into this work.

So accountability at the KPI level is measured by posting materials from the independent review process, also known as IRP, the anonymous employee hotline, and the timely posting of reconsideration requests.

So, as we go into version 3.0, and we're looking about a year from now to implement this, right now we're limited to some technology hiccups, I guess. So, these are just some examples of some drilled down capabilities that we would like to incorporate once you see that dashboard for each of the ethics accountability and transparency scorecards.

So, you can see that there is more data behind each of those weights that we've determined and scores.

So, actually we'd really like to get some feedback. This session is really a workshop to determine, you know, are we on the right track? Do these components look good? So I've actually come up with a couple of questions that we want to maybe get some conversation going here.

So, one of the questions is, does this approach make sense? Do you like what you see? Is it better than what we had on the dashboard? Do you like the vision that we're going with this? As we expand our data collection capabilities, what other information will be useful in these scorecards?

We plan to add a narrative component to provide some context to these? So would that be valuable and useful? And then also, how do you see outcomes of the current work stream two accountability we're connecting with goal 5.2? So, if you guys want to all come to the table, that would be great.

We could get some feedback from everyone. Hi Denise. Go ahead. This is an interactive workshop.

DENISE MICHELLE: Thank you. This is Denise Michelle with Facebook. Thank you so much for this great presentation, really important work and so glad that you're really giving a lot of time and attention to it. One of my questions was how you're interacting with work stream two? I'd be particularly interested in, and would encourage you to actually take time to give this specific and much more in-depth presentation to both the transparency and accountability sub-teams, and also, of course, to take a look at what these sub-teams are focused on.

There is a little bit of overlap, but I don't see ICANN tracking and reporting on several of the topics that the work stream two is actually looking at for transparency and accountability. And then, beyond that, I think you know, as a first effort, I think these are going in the right direction, but I think way too many of the components are quite superficial, and don't actually get to the essence of accountability and transparency.

So, where you see so many of these measures simply tracking action, rather than substance, those really are not nearly as useful as they could be. So an example is, simply measuring the amount of, how many DIDPs were responding to in 30 days, is

not nearly as useful, I think, as actually asking the respondents, the people who actually submitted the DIDP requests, if their requests have been fulfilled.

If they felt that it was responsive to the requests that they made, and if not, why not? I think we'd like to see a much more substantive measures that get to the public's feelings and opinions about whether ICANN is accountable and transparent. Way too many of these measures seem to be written to enable staff to check a box and say 100%, rather than getting at the really heart of why so many in this community feel that ICANN isn't, or hold the opinion that ICANN isn't accountable or transparent.

And then finally, I'll stop talking. I think this would be incomplete in the accountability and transparency arena, if you did not, on an annual basis, do an in-depth survey of your community, and their opinions of ICANN's accountability and transparency. Thanks.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: I like that idea.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm participant in the work stream one world as well as all of the topics in work stream two, rapporteur of the accountability one. But our focus in accountability work stream two, is very much on the advisory committee and support organization accountability.

So I'm going to refer, particularly, to some of the transparency aspects that Denise currently raised, and I hear everything you say, by the way, Denise. And this will remember very well, for I'm back to ATRT one. How concerned the community has been, and this is across the board, from ASO to ALAC, about some of the aspects of transparency.

And in fact, a measure of how many DIDPs have been dealt with in whatever way, whether or not people are happy or not, is a fine metric, but in fact, in a most transparent organization, the requests for them should be extremely low. So if indeed, we have a system which the community has been on bended knee asking for thoughts many years now, where the default is open, where retractions are minimal, where there is a timely publication of records, reports, meetings, notes, and a far more transparent set of who influences who in a process.

So out of transparency work stream two, you're going to see, I would predict, some recommendations about more transparency on some consultancies and that sort of thing. Now

if that was upfront from the organization, we should, in fact, have the reverse of the reporting models. So rather than say, how many potential problems and claims have we dealt with?

We should be saying, look, we're still looking at almost to zero, under 0.5% of people thinking they don't have enough. I would caution, however, and this is where I do like the way things are starting to be set out, and I think that this generation of dashboard is a vast improvement, and I like the concept of drilling down, because what we need to do is allow the community to get sufficient information to satisfy whatever it is, now this might be a brief look, or it might be to the nth degree of detail.

I've seen it in particularly the local government world, where the concept of transparency is one of, drown the community under so much information, that it is impossible, other than with a full time staff, to find your way through this mess. And that's not transparent either, and it's certainly not accountable. So, if we can find the right balance, and I think your tools are certainly a good way forward, and I'm expecting that they will be, choose your language and be able to have them in at least the UN languages, that that, that's an aspiration, but it certainly one that from an accessibility point of view, should be dealt with.

I would also, get my hat on from the accessibility point of view, as you're designing your reporting models, just try and remember, as things change, as people are using more mobile technologies, there is a benefit with the universal designs coming into some of the applications we have, you know, there is an app for that.

Where we used to have even hearing impaired communities, for example, or vision impaired communities, having had really expensive pieces of equipment, they use their mobiles now. Now that same feature can assist everyone, because of the aspects of universal design on that.

So, design from the beginning to have that little one pixel at the top of the page, that offers, do you want to go off to those facilitation tools, and mobile applications, or do you want to stay in the full blown web base. And another, and this is because of my irritated mood about the current schedule system, because I'm an Android user, unless you're going to provide us with the Apple software, equipment, you know, please remember that there is more than one choice including open source.

But I like where it's heading, so that's all positive, but I would love to see it, that we actually move from reporting on complaints, and issues, and how they're resolved, to making

that such an unlikely thing because we are transparent, by default, and reporting in a timely manner. Thank you.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Thank you Cheryl.

Did you want to…? Theresa, did you want to say a few things?

THERESA: This is actually a really good conversation, also in relation to the use of some of the different platforms we have to the points that Cheryl is making, and the different tools that we make available to the community, and working on those internally with the IT team and others.

And I know Chris Gift and others have been doing a lot of thinking around this. And how to ensure that that information is getting out there, and we can process that fairly quickly. So I really like that suggestion in taking that back. And then also, in the context of work stream two, we're looking forward to getting their recommendations coming out of that as well. Obviously, these slides and everything will be made available to that group, but also hearing the recommendations coming out of the work stream two in particular, how that ties in.

As you know, this is one of the areas under the current strategic planning process, that is an area of focus. And so as we look into the next cycle of strategic planning process, we'll look forward to how the community wants to put that forward. But this is a really, really helpful conversation on how we can take some of the inter-dependencies and move them together. This is great.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Dear, I do have one look at [inaudible], one of the few voices coming forward.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Now switching from focus on transparency for work stream two topic, and looking at the ombudsman's office, that's another part of the portfolio that I think at the moment is still far… It's very much constructed as it should be independently, but it shouldn't be reported so separately, that if one was just looking without knowledge of where to look for ombudsman's reports.

So even if it's a simple linkage out from your primary source material to the other independent work, and the IRPs and everything else, I think we still need to be able to bring those

clusters in, so what you offer is more of a fully accessible one stop shot, when you want to know how the organization is in terms of its accountability and transparency of 5.2.

LARISA GURNICK: This is Larisa Gurnick. So, appreciate the feedback, and wanted to raise another area for discussion. Obviously, the ICANN dashboard is structured around methodology that allows us to set a target, and then score how we're doing relative to that target, and that's very helpful, and that's the framework that you've seen. But as we look at the information and dig into the details, and to Denise's point, look for what's beneath that, and what's really meaningful, and what's substantive, in some areas, as it turns out, not every meaningful observation is scorable, if you will.

So, some of the ideas that we are exploring is to keep the scoring mechanism, because that is something that's very quickly provides a snapshot of where things are, and you can do trendlines and compare, but also to use the other, the drill down capabilities, as well as narrative components to help complete the picture.

So, at least that seems to be the current thinking, that that would be helpful to the community, but certainly feedback or

other ideas of whether that helps, or whether we should be looking at other directions, would be really helpful.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi, [inaudible] from [inaudible]. What are the two recommendations that are outstanding from ATRT 2 that are yet to be implemented?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: So, recommendation nine, I think it's 9.4, which is the accountability and transparency annual report…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Very relevant topic, actually, to this discussion.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: And then, recommendation 10. And I believe both of these recommendations will be finalized while we're here in India.

LARISA GURNICK: Charla, do you want to talk about information that we have posted online, where you can get a lot more information about the…?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: ATRT 2?

So, on our website, on the Wiki, let me pull that up. You can get detailed implementation report. Okay.

The executive, we have executive summaries that we post quarterly. And we've been posting them since, I believe, 2014. So they're all posted for your review. They do go into some detail about some things ICANN has done with the community and the Board. And lots of links that you can click through to see resolutions and final reports, and it's a source of robust information.

So, if you want any detailed information on any of those recommendations, it's on the community Wiki, and it will be posted here in the chat momentarily.

And that's true also for SSR one and for WHOIS one, we have executive summaries as well.

Any other feedback? Chris? Come to the table.

CHRIS GIFT: This is Chris Gift. So, I think Cheryl's points are well taken about transparency. It's important to be able to find the data and not have it opaque, and there are a number of programs or projects

that are looking at that, trying to revisit how we organize our content on ICANN dot org, and all of the subsequent websites.

And also, you know, about Denise's point, Denise Michell's point about how do we get to KPIs that are perhaps meaningful to the organization and about certain key activities that they are interested in? To all of that, I would encourage the community to continuously ask the organization about open data initiatives.

I think it's very important for us, as the organization and staff, to put data forward, and to have our interpretation of that data, but of course, it's best if we just have the raw data itself. Again, we continuously look at it, we want to do that as an organization, but it is a question of priorities, and so if the community would come to us with prioritization around that, I think we would welcome that.

THERESA: There is also… Sorry to interrupt. May I?

There is also a lot of data around, not just what we're doing in the sense of receipt of, you know, complaints as we get the complaints officer put into place, or in receipt of certain requests of the ombudsman and various other things, but there is also a lot of community activities that exist, where compilation of some of that data might also help with some of

the SO and AC accountability related discussions on how many participants are in certain areas, or whatever it might be.

So, just to add on to Chris's point. If there is areas that the community itself sees as possible to undertake in compiling certain information that then shows transparency around different community activities, that might be a nice compliment to figure out how to support that in different kinds of ways.

So, not committing Chris or anybody else at this point, but I think that there is opportunities for showing… I'm just reflecting on, you know, there is the discussion around, in work stream two, around diversity, and then around the SO AC accountability, and a lot of that data, the community itself has, and we can find ways to help the community itself compile that in different ways to show that there has been diversity in that working group, or in that dialogue, or in that community dialogue, or these are the members of this constituency.

Various information like that, that is not really from an ICANN organizational standpoint, but more from a community standpoint.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Cheryl Langdon-Orr again. That's a really important point, Theresa, because I'm painfully aware, I'm here amongst

friends and none of this recorded, of course. Painfully aware that there is great diversity of view within the ACs and SOs as to how we should even be reflecting our independent and individual accountability.

But that's something that because of the diversity of that view, I believe, we need to find other ways of making those steps of more sharing of best practices and models that could be useful to other parts of our community. And this is something that I think is perhaps part of your toolkit in the future that you could do, which allows you to ensure that the community isn't doing what they're clearly doing now, sitting in their own rooms doing their own naval gazing, or their important naval gazing I'm sure.

But, you know, there are five members from the At-Large advisory committee, one per region, for work stream one and work stream two. I am the only person here, because everyone else is doing something else. So, we need to make this activity more important, and that we can win-win by bringing some of the mutual sharing, notice I'm not using certain words out of work stream two, mutual sharing of how we are accountable within our communities as well.

There are real good dashboard opportunities for some of that, but it is also going to start improving, or floating all of the boats. The fear that any one component part of ICANN will be seen as

less worthy in output, because some of these measures, is something we have to manage very carefully, and I recognize that. But if the organization is being incredibly open and honest and transparent in saying, help us be better for you, it's going to make it easier for us help us be better for ourselves as well.

LARISA GURNICK: Great, great feedback, Cheryl, thank you. So a couple of points. When we look at the goal, it says promote ethics, transparency, and accountability across ICANN. So, our interpretation of that is it includes everybody, really, and one of the slides that you saw in Charla's presentation is, that the first step, the starting point, is with us, ICANN organization and the Board, but community is very much a very significant component of that.

So division is that we could eventually get contributions from community about efforts and activities that help us round out the complete picture of all of the components. And what you see on the screen right now, I apologize because it's really, this is not completely friendly to this sort of presentation, but this information will be available and posted publicly in short order, but this is just an illustration of where we're moving some of our reporting tools as part of the transparency and accountability effort.

In this case, it's on one review in particular, the one that happens to be very active, and consuming of a great deal of community efforts and time. So, this sort of scorecard, if you will, or a fact sheet is what we call it, attempts to provide some insights to people that may not be familiar with the details of the work, a one page glimpse at the timeline, how long this process is taking, where they are in terms of those activities, the men and women hours and efforts that are going into this.

And that's the people section, in section one. Off to the right is a section on the dollars and cents, the financial resources that have been committed to the effort, and probably most significantly, is the section down below on milestones. And this information comes from the review team's project plan and their workplan, and it reflects work that they've done, so it helps provide a view of how will these different components, the time, the people, the dollars, and the accomplishments all come together to provide a complete picture.

It's not a perfect reporting mechanism as of yet, it's just a starting point. We don't have data on many areas. We don't really know how much time people spent, or community members spent, other than the time that we know in calls. So, we already know that there are some gaps and some opportunities to fill this out a little bit better. We have different

ways to account for our time, the ICANN organization and staff time, but obviously volunteers are different.

So, some assumptions have been made and this was just a starting point. Similarly, not all milestones are created equal. And it kind of looks a little flat here, meaning that every activity is weighted the same way, and clearly it's not. To analyze the enormous amount of data that the team is going through right now, is quite an effort, and that's quite different than posting something for public comment, which takes several clicks to post on the website.

So, we are aware of all of these limitations, and this is version 1.001, maybe. So, we'd love some feedback on this and how useful it is. We hope that these views and evolution of this kind of information will help us get to a more informed place in terms of transparency and accountability.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Does anyone else have any feedback on where we're heading? Suggestions? Improvements? You like what you see?

LARISA GURNICK:	Certainly, we understand that this is a very busy meeting, and we would love to have more people participate in this conversation, so this isn't the end all. This is just the starting point, and we'll continue to have these workshops and opportunities to meet up with different groups, perhaps work stream two would be the next logical one, as well as any other group that's interested in looking at this more in-depth.
	And we'll continue to expand the way we are reporting this out as we get better data, as we get better information, as we give a little more thought to make this more useful and informed, some of the ideas that Denise raised. This will continue to evolve, and get better, and hopefully provide people with more insights. Yes, please.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	[Inaudible] from [inaudible] again. How often would you keep this sort of up to date?
CHARLA SHAMBLEY:	So, because this is pulling information from our financial reports, we anticipate that we'll be doing this on a quarterly basis.

LARISA GURNICK: In the dashboard data itself, in most cases, gets updated. Some pieces of information get updated monthly, and some get updated quarterly, just depends on the nature of activities as a whole for the ICANN dashboard. Most of our reporting is done on a quarterly basis.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible], it took me some time to get to the document. Just one general question, because I saw the metrics and all [inaudible], is there something like a code of conduct for this multistakeholder engagement? Is there some document available which is translated to this forum? What is it? How is it that you came to these two parameters?

Promote ethics.

LARISA GURNICK: Yeah, under ethics, so there is two components. We should probably switch back to that slide so that people can see the areas that we're talking about. So, at this point, the ethical components are really focused on ICANN staff and Board. So, when we asked ourselves the question of, what are the things that we can measure? Because ethics is a huge topic, and we could probably have some really robust discussions about, you know, what ethical behavior really means.

And again, here, our challenge is to come up. So, I don't want to give the impression that this is all that the organization is doing to be ethical, but we're looking for measures, things that we can score and report out on a regular basis in terms of how can we demonstrate ethical behavior.

So I would say that this is probably, again, the beginning of this kind of information. So mandatory training, there is actually data behind that, about classes that we take that are required, as Charla suggested, to make sure that we understand what it means to operate in an ethical way.

So, the first component has to do with mandatory training for all personnel at ICANN, and the Board as well, right. And then the second component, this conflict of interest, we do have an internal policy where, once a year, I believe, we have to review the conflict of interest policy, and identify whether there is any conflicts, and sign the statement, so it's a very specific process that we go through, to make sure that we think about conflicts of interest and report them out, and are reminded of appropriate or inappropriate behavior in terms of conflicts of interest.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr again. Just on that, I'm aware, and I'm sure you are too, but I think it's the appropriate time to introduce it

because, as you said, it's not just the organization, it's across. Efforts in terms of some of these measurable, are going on and have done for some time, in at least the GNSO as a support organization, primarily undertaking in its PDP processes.

It is unlikely if not impossible, for a member or participant to be involved in a GNSO PDP process without having filed their statements of interest. And the rule there is one of continuous disclosure, so it is a standing item on agendas for update of your statements of interest. Excuse me.

Hopefully I'll survive, well, at least through this conversation. The same is said for the ALAC and At-Large members who are put into any work group anywhere. So, whether it's an internal work group activity, or whether it is you operate either independently or on behalf of ALAC and At-Large in a ccNSO or GNSO work group PDP or non-PDP, you have to have your statement of interest, which is similar but not identical to the GNSO one.

So, in my case, on my space, on the Wiki, the link is to both, and I have to continuously update both. That's actually a really good thing to report on, and by doing that reporting, perhaps in a more centralized way, and I'm just thinking there might be some low-hanging fruit here to bring community reporting into some of your work as well, that would be an interesting, I think,

system to try and encourage the ccNSO, which currently doesn't operate under that same sort of principle.

Yeah, slightly different because most of the work group participants in a ccNSO world are clearly identified if they are ccTLD managers, everyone knows what they do, they know what their work is, etc. It's not the same gray space as you get into these other areas, but that seems to be a possibility here. The other thing is, with the mandatory training, which clearly has a cost as well as a benefit, there may be an opportunity for perhaps a form of passing on some of this information to community leaders.

So it might be that you're SO AC leadership, or in my utopia, even the chairs of work groups, could have a little in service training and up-skilling on a number of issues, not the least of which is the ethical management of an activity within ICANN.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you Cheryl, and I think both of those are really good examples of the value of kind of putting up a framework that's certainly just a starting point, and definitely not perfect, but it opens up conversation about these kinds of things. So while our focus here is to look for things that can be measured, we get a lot of really meaningful and valuable feedback on, not every activity is valuable only because it can be measured, and the

things that you describe may not be measurable initially, could be down the line, but nevertheless, really important components of this view, and we take that onboard.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just following on from that. It has been practiced now for a number of meetings slash years, for the, at this time of year, for the incoming council in the GNSO, and the incoming At-Large advisory committee, to have an in-service training day, and they do that. There is an opportunity to input into those agendas, and you can get your participation rate measured.

And I think it would be certainly welcomed to have those additional activities brought in as part of those packages. So perhaps talking to the key staff as well to see… Sure, we have to cycle through things and we're doing, you know, how to manage better meetings and how to be an effective leader and all of that sort of nonsense, and I'm saying nonsense because I'm running it. I'm allowed to say nonsense, it's my program, for the ALAC.

And I'm actually turning up to the GNSO when I find out what's going on there. But, year in, year out, they have to change. And so, it might even be, you know, every second year, or every so often, if people are there for two years, at least if they get it once in one of these two sessions, it would be worthwhile.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Fiona, I know you came in late, but do you have any…? I know you have to have some feedback. [LAUGHTER]

FIONA: Charla, clearly, you seem to know me very well.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: You were on ATRT 2.

FIONA: Yes, and sorry I came in late, but I've gone through the slides, and I'm just thinking of how we could be able to measure ethics, not just to the [inaudible] stuff, but I think it's also important that within the community, their ethical parameters of the community has to adhere to. And even in an interaction, as a community, and with staff and with the Board, having ethical standards that are measurable and would be very important.

And I like Cheryl is sharing the idea of having the segments of interest, because there are supporting organizations within ICANN that do not, do not have any statements of interest, and you are not expected to present anything. So even when there is an issue, and there is challenges in terms of accountability and conflict of interest, there is no easy way of resolving them.

And so I think that is something that would be, I would want to see across the board, and not just with the ALAC and the GNSO, because for me, the interaction with the GNSO is very good to put out a statement of interest prior to that. [Inaudible] the community, so what happens when the community that decides on policy, end up manipulating policy in a manner that favors some entities and they have no ethical obligations to declare what their interest really is?

THERESA: You raised a really important point, and I think it was probably part of the conversation, maybe, before you came in. Is the community having discussions around that amongst each other? Because that's all, there is sort of a role for the organization in the context of reviews, but in various other aspects. But is the community itself having that kind of conversation amongst each other as part of the SO AC accountability? Or how different constituencies are working? I don't know the answer, I'm asking, yeah.

FIONA: From what I get in the community, there are those things that the community sort of, we don't want ICANN to do this, and ICANN to do this, and ICANN to do this, and we forget we are also part of that ICANN. And that is why, for me, getting the

community and staff to see that we are all one ICANN, is a good starting point, because then we stop pointing a finger at staff, and telling staff, ICANN is to do this.

We're also ICANN. But if that emphasis on [inaudible] part of ICANN as a community, is not, if there is not emphasis on that, then we're going to lose it. We're going to be an obstruction where, the community feels there should be ethical measures and transparency accountability within staff, and then we'll see about SOs and ACs. But we don't want to touch on the nitty-gritty, where the rubber hits the road.

And we, as members of the community, for me as an individual and a member of this community, what are my obligations and responsibilities in as far as accountability, transparency and ethics is concerned? We have a lot of issues that sort of get pushed under the carpet, and that is [inaudible] personal interaction with members, and I would like to put names on the table, yes.

But, you notice there is some tense things that happen that are a bit off ethically, nobody wants to talk about it. No one wants to look in that direction, and if you try to park, you're told no. Let us let it be, I think we can look the other side of this one. How many times do we look the other side on issues we should stand

up for strongly, that inference, the ethical standards that we want, ICANN the corporation, to standby?

So long as we feel that staff have to be ethical, they have to do this and that and the other, and community is outside of that, then we will lose the link on what community does and how that has an impact on what staff has to do, because we are, we are a multistakeholder bottom up process organization. So if our bottom up processes are having issues, in the way that we are coming to the conclusions on our bottom up, as we move up the ladder, so that means we are carrying some unethical silent issues over to staff.

But even when staff look at it, they say okay, it sounds okay. It was passed by the community, we should honor, because that is what we as staff are expected to do, but there could be some things actually staff should be able to just say, yeah, this doesn't sit right. Or this is [inaudible] different constituents within ICANN, and we probably need to get feedback from them, and be able to do it confidently knowing that it's not just because they are, they have to do the implementation, and they're finding a challenge, but also because they have seen an underlying issue that has not been addressed and would like clearance on that before they proceed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Cheryl Langdon-Orr again for the record. Just to specifically answer Theresa's question in terms of the community conversation, at least in the construct of the work stream two accountability for SO and ACs, which I think is our opportunity to further that conversation, two things. Feels like having given birth to an elephant very slowly, but we have finally managed to get consensus approval for us to put out a very simple questionnaire to the AC SO leaders.

And what should happen as a consequence of that self-reporting on accountability, will be the opportunity for us to start doing some interactions. But, we don't want to miss that opportunity. So I think that it's really important that we try and capture and facilitate that, perhaps in Copenhagen, perhaps later, but it certainly needs to happen.

To your point about ethics and my ethics and your ethics might be miles apart, depending on our cultural basis and expectations. And I think we need to recognize that in a global organization as well. And so, I think we need the awareness training and the agreed sets of values of what is ethical in ICANN and for ICANN community, before we can start going, my ethics are appalling and Fiona's are outstanding, as an example.

Because if my culture is one that certain things, bribery for example, are perfectly reasonable, then my understanding of

what should be going in a statement of interest and why it's important, needs to be brought into a mutually agreed set of understandings, and that's where awareness training and everyone getting to be…

We cannot assume, and it's going to get more complicated, not less complicated. You know, the more of the global south we bring in, the more variety we're going to get. We're going to bring in very indirect communicators. And we're going to have to retrain our work team leaders to know how to work with indirect communicators, otherwise we are going to offend, and we will be fairly criticized of cutting them out of input.

That's bad for accountability, team. So, you know, there is some really interesting, from my point of view, but some really serious work that could be addressed in the middle term to near term. We're going to identify the opportunities.

My ethics aren't that bad, Fiona, I'll hasten to add.

THERESEA: Fiona, you raised a really good point, this question of, where actually should the responsibility for that lie in a way? And I think the work stream two, I think you're spot on, is really the opportunity. The… And maybe work stream two comes out with recommendations that, you know, I don't know.

Maybe part of the dialogue is, you know, helping facilitate the conversation for how different community accountability mechanisms might take place. But I do, and this is just my personal view. In a way, it's really up to the community how they want to establish its own checks and balances and accountability amongst the respective stakeholders.

What kind of statement of interest forms does the community want to have amongst each other? We obviously have certain ones for the organizational standpoint and participating in those for that, but I think the discussion around both your point, and then what Cheryl had raised on insuring that the diverse views and voices can be heard in the right way, that, I think it's going to be a conversation the community needs to determine amongst each other.

You know, how do I know you are representing? How do I verify that? How do I know who you're representing and verify that? Who are you accountable to? Are you representing that voice, or are you representing your personal view? And that, I think, is a conversation amongst the community to set up the best practices and the framework for that.

And work stream two, I think, is a great opportunity to benchmark where the different stakeholder groups are. Yes, it's a great opportunity. It doesn't mean that the work has to

conclude there, it could set out recommendations to the community itself to say, we really want to, within X time period among each SO and AC, determine what the framework is so we can compare and have something that's transparent, or whatever it might be.

But I think it's a very important theme, especially in the context of now an empowered community. An empowered community that were to exercise any of its powers, also needs to show how it was accountable to itself in exercising those powers. No differently than the Board or the organization itself.

So it's a very interesting time. It's an important conversation though.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Any other comments from the floor?

It's a really good discussion, and I think it reinforces the conversations that we've been having internally to move this forward, and make it more robust. So I appreciate the feedback.

LARISA GURNICK: Same here. I just wanted to add, Cheryl, you've seen the presentation, we're thrilled that you were here, and Fiona, so

any of this that would be of value to work stream two, in your efforts, I think you know where to find us.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: All right. I think with that, we'll close the session. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would like to formally suggest you consider it to be put forward as a high interest topic in Copenhagen.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]