The following is an excerpt from the ATRT1 Recommendations and Final Report:

**“Metrics**

The ATRT has not recommended specific metrics that ICANN should adopt to provide measurable results in its decision making and policy-making processes. The ATRT did not believe that it should select the specific metrics for ICANN as an organization to apply to its operations and processes. However, the ATRT discussed the importance of performance indicators and identified examples of widely accepted metrics that should be considered by ICANN and the community. For example:

“SMART Metrics” - Elements of Performance indicators that are defined as:

Specific

Measurable

Achievable

Relevant

Time-Bound

SMART metrics are one example of performance indicators that can be applied in both quantitative and qualitative contexts. In its initial exchange, the ATRT asked ICANN about the use of metrics by the organization and ICANN staff identified its “Dashboard” for performance indicators as an example of ICANN applying metrics to its operations and processes.

Commenters stated that the ATRT did not go far enough in recommending specific metric for ICANN to adopt as a critical component of improving ICANN’s accountability and transparency to all stakeholders. The Association for Competitive Technology (ACT) stated that ICANN will never “be truly accountable or transparent without established, public performance metric for its various initiatives and departments.”98 ACT’s comments went on to state that “while it makes sense that ICANN staff proposes actual target values for various metrics, it seems completely appropriate that the ATRT suggest a framework of measurable objectives. A good start might be the ATRT recommendations themselves. An initial metric might be a timeline for the implementation of recommendations.” 99

The ATRT included in a number of its recommendations, dates by which ICANN is expected to start and/or complete specific tasks under those recommendations. *At a minimum, the subsequent Accountability and Transparency Review Team, as called for by the AoC, will need to be able to measure ICANN’s progress and execution of the ATRT’s recommendations as part of its review and the dates should provide a form of measurement. The ATRT believes that quantitative and qualitative measurement is important to improving accountability and transparency in ICANN and encourages ICANN and the community to agree on operational and process metrics that will advance that goal.”* (emphasis added)

98 Association for Competitive Technology comments, December 4, 2010.

99 Association for Competitive Technology comments, December 4, 2010.

**ATRT2 and Metrics**

At the ATRT2 face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles on March 15, 2013, the issue of metrics came up in the course of ICANN Staff reporting on implementation of recommendations from prior Review Teams. As ATRT2 members noted the importance of being able to measure the impact of recommendation on ICANN’s accountability and transparency, ICANN CEO Fadi Chehade committed to have ICANN Staff develop a set of metrics for each of the prior recommendations. While Fadi’s commitment to develop metrics is well received, it also underscores that, to a large extent, such metrics have not been developed by ICANN to date. This is cause for concern given the excerpt from the ATRT1 Report above.

My personal view remains that a Review Team is not the best “author” of the metrics that ICANN should use as an organization. Nor do I believe that a Review Team should articulate metrics in a recommendation for ICANN to use to measure the implementation of that recommendation and its effect on accountability and transparency. However, given the ATRT2’s charter and responsibility, I do see a role for the ATRT2 to engage with an Independent Expert and ICANN to develop a metrics framework and, perhaps, specific metrics that will allow ICANN, the Community and future Review Teams to measure improvements in accountability and transparency as well as the effect of the Review Team process itself.