

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the Continuous Improvement Program inaugural meeting happening on Wednesday, January 17 at 18:00 UTC. My name is Yvette Guigneaux, and Jessica Puccio and myself will be your Zoom coordinators for this meeting. Attendance for this meeting will be taken by the Zoom room and it'll be posted on the wiki shortly after the call. We do have one apology from Manju Chen. We also would like to remind everyone that this call is being recorded so we ask that you please state your name clearly before speaking so we have you on the record. Okay, I think that about does it for me and so now I will turn things over to our project manager, Evin.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you, Yvette. Thank you so much and thank you all for being here on behalf of your organization and stakeholder group to contribute to this important work for ICANN. I'm Evin Erdogan for those of you who don't know me, and I'm the project manager for implementation of this ATRT3 recommendation 3.6 to evolve organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program. I've been a part of ICANN for seven years now. I can't believe it's gone by that quickly, including five years on the policy team primarily in support of ALAC and the At-Large community so I'm well aware how unique each supporting organization and advisory committee is as well as the NomCom and the whole ICANN community in general. I've been on the reviews team with Larisa Gurnick the past two years which has provided facilitation and support of the organizational and specific reviews at ICANN and I used to be based in Istanbul, Turkey but now after the COVID-19 pandemic I'm

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

based in the US in Houston, Texas to be specific. So I'm in the central time zone. I look forward to collaborating with all of you around the world in this truly global effort. And before we jump into our introductions for the group, I wanted to quickly highlight our agenda for today which you see on the screen. I'll provide some background information and direct the group to useful resources about our work for 2024. Sherwood Moore who is on the reviews team and has conducted preliminary research into continuous improvement models for the group's consideration will provide a high-level overview of that research and how to consider it in the context of evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program. I'll then walk us through our terms of reference, draft work plan including draft agendas for upcoming meetings and timeline for 2024. And as we go through our agenda today, feel free of course to ask a question or make a comment at any time. We'll provide some time checks in case we start to run out of time. And after the meeting, we'll be sharing the Zoom recording and relevant resources for next steps for our work. So we ask each representative and alternate to please introduce yourselves for up to two minutes each, a total of 40 minutes for this agenda item for all introductions. It'd be helpful if you could share your community affiliation, relevant experience in and outside of ICANN and motivation to contribute to the continuous improvement of your community structure. So with that, how about we just go down the list of participants as they appear in the Zoom room and we'll try to get through everyone today. So I see Alan Greenberg is the first on the list, if you would please get started.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks for giving me plenty of time to prepare. My name's Alan Greenberg, I'm here as the primary representative for the North American region of At-Large. My background is I've been involved in ICANN for a lot of years now, 17 or so. I was heavily involved in both At-Large reviews that have taken place. I was on ATRT2, and I was on the Accountability CCWG, which also talked about improvement and responsibilities of various organizations in regard to improvement of various sorts. And that's it.

EVIN ERGODGU: Thanks so much, Alan. And you're based in Canada. And next, I see on the list Amrita Choudhuri, if you would please introduce yourself.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Hi, Evin, and hi, everyone. My name is Amrita, and I'm based in New Delhi, India. I represent APRALO out here, and happy to be here to work on this process of, you know, on improvement in ICANN At-Large, and especially At-Large. Thank you, Evin.

EVIN ERGODGU: Thank you, Amrita. I see Benjamin Akinmoyeje. If you'd please feel free to introduce yourself and your community affiliation and motivation for joining this community coordination group. That'd be great.

BENJAMIN AKONMOYEJE: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Benjamin Akinmoyeje, and I'm the chair of Non-Commercial User Constituency. And I'm also... Okay, so

the reason why I'm interested is, first of all, to represent my community, right? When the call came out, so I need to represent the community. I also think there's someone here, I'll try to figure out who has joined to be part of this group. So I'm just ensuring that we have a representation, and I'm interested in also the topic, and I hope to participate actively. Yeah, thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Awesome. Thank you so much, Benjamin. And Bill Jouris. I see you next on the list.

BILL JOURIS:

Hello, my name is Bill Jouris. I'm the alternate for North America, for NARALO. I'm based in California, about six hours north of ICANN headquarters, not next door. But I spent my career in the IT industry doing performance analysis and tuning, which I think has some synergies with continuous improvement. As far as ICANN is concerned, I got involved initially about 10 years ago in the IDN project, and then more recently got dragged in to NARALO and then ALAC. And I suppose my major motivation is having been involved with the IDN project, which it would probably be unkind but accurate to say seems to be in desperate need of some improvements. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you, Bill. Great to hear that background. You're so close to ICANN. Next, I see Bram Fudzulani.

BRAM FURZULANI: Yes. Thank you so much. Hi, everyone. This is Bram, and I am also connecting from Malawi in Africa. I'm representing the AFRALO, which is the African At-Large Organization. I also am interested, obviously, to represent as a primary contact my community, and I think my day-to-day job, just like Bill, I'm also in the IT space and deal with one of the methodologies of the continuous improvement, which is agile methodology. So I'm excited to learn from expertise that is on the table, but also see what our contribution will be from our community. Thank you so much.

EVIN ERGODGU: Thank you, Bram. And I see Caleb Ogundele next on the list.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you very much. Thank you very much. So my name is Caleb Ogundele, and I currently serve under the NPOC leadership as the membership chair. In my everyday life, I am a project and a product manager, and basically some of the things that we do more around that area is issues around continuous improvements, on how we continuously improve technical systems and a couple of other things. And I have served on a couple of not-for-profit boards that require lots of continuous improvements, and I currently serve on the board of trustee of Internet Society. And that wraps it up.

EVIN ERGODGU: Thank you very much, Caleb. And Carlos Aguirre.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Hi. Good afternoon for me here at 3:00 PM. I'm in Argentina, South America. I represent the LAC region. I'm a lawyer. I'm academic. I'm focused in my work in law and economics and cyber law. I was three times ALAC member, one time GNSO Council by NonCom. I'm honored to be here. It's a big challenge for all of us. I think I wish a great job for all. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU: Thank you, Carlos. And we're honored to have you as well and everyone here. Next I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hello. I have served on a whole bunch of stuff in ICANN. I have all sorts of affiliations. I would suggest if you're passionate or interested in knowing more about those, the ICANN-y ones are on that link I've just put in the chat, or you can google me. I'm Australian. I'm coming to this call, of course, then at UTC plus 11, which means it's bright and early in the morning for me. But it doesn't seem to matter to ICANN calls because they seem to run 24 by 7 and usually at times which are heavily inconvenient for those of us residing in Asia-Pacific.

My rationale for being here, and I'm here as one of the two representatives from the At-Large Advisory Committee, so you'll see ALAC rep now next to my name, is because, of course, with having served with ATRT3, which came up with this terribly good idea in the first place, I certainly have a vested interest in making sure that it works and operates and also keeps in keeping with what ATRT3 envisaged, which is very, very important.

But possibly more relevant, when I worked, and I'm a retired old lady with little to do, I did run a company that was in the top 20 nationally in quality systems, quality systems management, critical control point management process design, [inaudible] accredited laboratories, and kind of know a little bit about continuous improvement. And if you really want to get into 9000s in the ISO series, I've got a few credentials there. So all of that's in dark, distant past, but it means I do have that understanding of the general principles. And I also recognize that most of them are designed for things that are definitely not ICANN. And so our work is going to be needing to be very bespoke, very modulated to meet the individual and unique needs of all of our own parts that we need to work with. And I think we need to make sure that whatever we come up with, it's a very appropriate to ICANN use model. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Awesome. Thank you, Cheryl. Great to hear of your extensive experience in and outside of ICANN and for ATRT3 and continuous improvement. Next, I see Chokri Ben Romdhane.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE:

Thank you, Evin. I'm really happy to have you again and to be in touch with you after following you at ALAC activity. I'm not easy to speak after Cheryl, but I'm Chokri Ben Romdhane. I'm representing Africa as an alternate. I'm mainly an IT senior analyst. I'm working for the Ministry of Education in Tunisia, based in Tunisia. I followed the activity of ATRT3 as an observer with Sébastien, Cheryl and all the members of ATRT3. I think that [inaudible] actively in the activity of this working group

[inaudible] can help somehow the African community to be more active within this working group and within all working groups. Thank you very much, Evin.

EVIN ERGODGU: Thank you, Chokri. We're delighted to have you here. Thank you for sharing. Christelle Vaval, I see you next on the list.

CHRISTELLE VAVAL: [inaudible] I'm Christelle Vaval from Haiti. I'm here as the alternate for LACRALO. I started with ICANN in 2014 in Argentina. Then I was a councilor on the ccNSO. Now, after I took repose with COVID, then created the ISOC chapters for Haiti. And also, we are now an ALS, so in LACRALO as the representative of our ALS. And I'm motivated to join this group because with my legal background, and I guess that I will be a valuable member of the work of the working group. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU: No doubt you will, Christelle. Thank you so much. And next, I see Erum Welling.

ERUM WELLING: Thank you. Erum Welling, the alternate for RSSAC. I've been working with ICANN, I'd say about 10 years, maybe a little over. I was part of the IANA transition effort that went on in what I think was around 2014, I think. So, I was part of that. I'm part of RSSAC GWG, the governance working group. Throughout my career, I brought in emerging

technologies to many organizations, especially in the US government. And as you know, you can't just throw technology into an environment. You have to do a lot of reengineering of the processes. So I'm very comfortable with coming into an unknown environment and looking at efficiency issues before introducing the technology that may be needed. So I'm very comfortable in this environment. I look forward to work. And I also enjoy working with a very diverse group. And that's what this is about. I'm very much looking forward to it. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Excellent. Thank you so much, Erum. Great to have you here with that perspective. Next, I see Irina Danelia.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you. My name is Irina. And I'm here as an alternate member on behalf of the ccNSO, Country Code Names Supporting Organization. I was not a part of the IANA transition or ATRT3. However, I'm with ICANN from 2010. And I'm at the end of my term at the ccNSO Council as a European representative. I'm also a member of guidelines review committee of the ccNSO which leads the continuous improvement work effort here. And I'm based in Moscow, Russia. And I work for the .ru country code registry. And happy to be here with you all. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you so much, Irina. It's good to see you again, too, after participating in the ccNSO's open space session as well. So really excited to have your perspective. Next, I see Lori Schulman.

LORI SCHULMAN:

My name's Lori Schulman. I've been involved with ICANN as an NCSG and as a CSG member for over 20 years. I think I started in 2000 or 2001 and I served on the executive committees and as officers in both of those constituencies. I'm currently the president of the IPC and I'm senior director for Internet Policy for the International Trademark Association. So my involvement in ICANN policy matters and Internet Governance Policy matters has been long and sustained, and it will be that way at least for the next three to five years, I'm hoping.

I joined this group because I do have a long term experience with ICANN, and I think having that experience could be very helpful to the community. Having, again, like many on this call, particularly Cheryl and Alan and others who've worn many hats. I was a rapporteur during the IANA transition discussions. And I have worked on RPM working groups and many other working groups within ICANN. So I agree that there is a lot of room for improvement. I also agree that we tend to throw technology out first and not think about the efficiencies, notably the RDRS. This is something we have an interest in specifically in terms of improvements because the technology is here, but in terms of how it was engineered for usefulness could definitely use some improvement. I know we're not here to talk about one system, but I think it would be helpful to illustrate systems we're aware of where perhaps rethinking or reevaluation could be super helpful, particularly in view of how ICANN is evolving vis-a-vis the world right now. I've worked with a lot of you over the years. I'm excited to work again. I will also share that the IPC is looking for an alternative person. Right now, I'm the only person on this

group, so my attendance may be a little spotty simply because of my travel schedule, but we'll do the best we can to get full coverage.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you so much, Lori. It's great to see you. And it's great to hear of your extensive experience with ICANN as it's evolved over the years. Certainly, we're all about evolving here. So thank you again. Next on the list, I see Naveed Bin Rais.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah, hello, everyone. So my name is Naveed. I've been associated with ICANN over a decade now. So I'm an academic by profession living in Dubai and currently serving on NomCom as well. So I'm representing RSSAC and looking forward to working on this important task. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you so much, Naveed. Great to have you here. And next, I see Nenad Orlic.

NENAD ORLIC:

My name is Nenad Orlich, and I'm a representative of the Business Constituency. I have more than almost now 40 years of experience with the communications internet. And I've been involved with ICANN for now 15 years. And I have also many affiliations. And through all this time, I have seen many good things in ICANN and many things that could be improved. And there is my motivation for involvement here.

EVIN ERGODGU: Fantastic. Thank you very much. Great to have your background and interest here. Next, I see Owen Smigelski.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Hello, everybody. My name is Owen Smigelski. I am with the registrar Namecheap. I've been involved with ICANN actively since about 2009 when I was in the IPC and joined a working group there. I then later spent seven years with ICANN Contractual Compliance, where I interfaced with several of the review groups, provided some feedback and stuff like that. And then for the last five years, I've been head of ICANN Compliance and Relations with the Registrar Namecheap. I, for most of that time, have also been vice chair for the Registrar Stakeholder Group for Policy, so I've been involved in ICANN for quite a bit and a number of facets. I've also, as part of my work, have taken a look at a bunch of the reviews and recommendations, things that have come out of these different cross-community groups and seen a number that either have not been implemented or could be implemented or could be improved. And so while I have not specifically worked on any of those, I have a good knowledge and experience with them and would certainly like to contribute more to improve ICANN. Thanks. Oh, forgot to mention, I'm also located in the LA area, a 14-minute drive from ICANN headquarters, so I think I may win for a closest non-ICANN staff member to the ICANN headquarters. Thanks.

EVIN ERGODGU: Nice. Close competition with Bill there. Welcome, Owen. It's good to hear of your review experience and interest as well. Next, I see Ricardo Holmquist, please.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Good night. I am Ricardo Holmquist. I will be the alternate for EURALO. I hope you can hear me because I'm probably in a train in the middle of Spain and sometimes I lose the signal. Yeah, I have been involved in ICANN since 2015 and maybe from 2019 I chair or co-chair the Operations Finance and Budget Working Group. That's the group inside At-Large that handles most of the reviews and budgets and this kind of stuff, so I've been involved with all of this since maybe four years ago. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERGODGU: Wonderful to see you again, Ricardo, and I hope you have a good train ride. Next, I see Sean Copeland, please.

SEAN COPELAND: Hi, my name is Sean Copeland. I'm from Vancouver, Canada. I'm part of the ccNSO. I'm the other representative along with Irina. I chair the GRC and we are the group within the ccNSO that is charged with and has within our purvey continuous improvement. It's an area of interest to me going back. I have not-for-profit and for-profit board experience and continuous improvement tends to be a heavy theme and I'm very intrigued to see how this will roll out community wide. And it's great to have other communities within ICANN doing it because it will be

different than the for-profit world for sure, so I'm looking very forward to it.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you so much, Sean, and thank you as well. It's been great to engage with you and the ccNSO and GRC on the thought leadership displayed on continuous improvement during the open space session as well during ICANN 78. Great to have you here. And next, I see Sébastien Bachollet. Welcome.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Sébastien Bachollet. I am based in Burgundy in France and I started to participate to ICANN in 2001, a long time ago. I was a member of ATRT3 and Work Stream 2 and I think that both are important work done to be here with this group to discuss the continuous improvement. As Cheryl, I think it's important that we take into account what was at the aim of our proposal to the board and it's why it's important to have Cheryl who was the chair of the ATRT3 and myself in this group.

I had experience in different parts of ICANN, but mainly I was an ALAC member. I was an ICANN board member for four years, selected by At-Large. I was for one year, NomCom, and I am currently EURALO Chair. When I started with ICANN, I was involved in what was called ICANN 2.0. It was the first evolution of ICANN and maybe one day we will have the holistic review who will be the next global review of ICANN, but now we are in the continuous improvement program.

I have some experience with this type of thing. I am, for example, chairing a non-for-profit in my little village taking care of family, youth and older people, organizing activities and so on and so forth, and we need to evolve and it's why I'm trying as chair of this organization to do. And as the other thing, completely outside of all that, I am also a beekeeper. Thank you very much and thank you for joining this group. I hope that we will be able to do a good job together. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you so much, Seb. Good to hear from you and have your experience as well with ATRT3 on this project and the bees as well. Great to see you here. Next is Thomas Barrett, or Tom, please.

TOM BARRETT:

Hey everybody, Tom Barrett here. I'm the alternate for the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I've been involved in ICANN its entire existence. Probably back in the green paper days, I founded two ICANN registrars, Encirca and Nameshare back in 2001. I'm also a member of the IPC and the ccNSO on behalf of the Palau country code TLD. Very interested in this, even as an alternate. In a prior life, I did business process re-engineering with Accenture and participated in countless working groups and PDPs at ICANN. More recently, I was the chair of the NomCom review. I'm currently serving on the NomCom and also active in some other working groups as well. So very excited to be here.

EVIN ERGODGU: Fantastic. Great to see you again, Tom, and indeed it's been great working with you on the NomCom review as well. So great to have your extensive experience with us. Next I see Tommi Karttaavi.

TOMMI KARTTAAVI: Well, hello and greetings from the sunny and warm southern Finland. Well, not so sunny at the moment because it's evening, but I'm pretty sure I saw the sun at some point this week. It's a cozy minus eight centigrade outside now. So not that bad. So my name is Tommi Karttaavi and I'm the alternate for the At-Large Advisory Committee. My involvement with ICANN goes back some 20 years when I was the chair of Internet Society Finland chapter, which was one of the first At-Large structure organizations that were accredited back in the early 2000 something, 2003 probably. And currently I'm serving as a NomCom appointed At-Large Advisory Committee member and I'm an alternate member for this group for that. And in my day job, I'm the Chief Digital Officer for Social Healthcare and Rescue Services District in Finland. Yeah, that's about it. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU: Wonderful. Thank you. Great to have you, Tommi, all the way from Finland. And next there's Wisdom Donkor I see on the list.

WISDOM DONKOR: Yes, thank you very much. I'm connecting from Ghana. And then my name is Wisdom Donkor and I'm affiliated to noncommercial and

currently GNSO Council member. And then I'm happy to be here to learn and also contribute to the process. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Wonderful. Thank you, Wisdom. Great to have you here. And was there anyone that I have missed from the list in Zoom? It's possible some people joined. Tijani, I see your hand up, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

So my name is Tijani Ben Jemaa. I am from Tunisia. My primary and forever community affiliation is At-Large and AFRALO. And I am there since 2009. I am also, I used to be a member of the NomCom for two years and I am here to represent NomCom. Experiencing ICANN, I was Vice-Chair of AFRALO, Vice-Chair of ALAC for several years, and I was on several cross-community working groups. The most important of them was the JAS Working Group, I think. The meeting strategy working group and CCWG accountability, where I was co-chair. Experience outside ICANN, if you want. Yes, I made the whole World Summit on Employment Society from the first prep come to the closure of the second phase. I used to be a member of the WSIS Civil Society Bureau, representing the family of science and technology. For the record, this was the first application of the multi-stakeholder model at the UN level, the World Summit on Employment Society, and that's why the Civil Society organized themselves, creating two bodies. One is the Bureau, the Civil Society Bureau, where I was a member, and the other is the content and theme to prepare the contribution, the content contribution that the Civil Society made to the summit. I made almost

all the UN IGFs, except the four, I think, and when I go there, I am either a speaker, moderator, organizer of workshop, otherwise I don't go. I am a member of the MAG of the Africa IGF. I just finished my term as the chair of the North African IGF. I made two of the West African IGFs as a contributor, as a speaker, and also train the trainers on internet governance for the Francophone community for several years. I also contributed in the Tunisian IGF.

As for my motivation, having seen how the At-Large review was conducted and what kind of results it gave, I understood that the community periodic reviews, as they were done, couldn't lead to the required improvement, so that's why I am here. Thank you.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you so much, Tijani. Great to have you here and see your extensive experience in various fora, and indeed we have the WSIS+20 coming up as well, so it's great to have all your rich experience. Thank you. Is there anyone else? Hopefully I didn't miss anyone. If not, we'll also be following up with a couple of representatives who were unable to join today and they'll introduce themselves over the list. But with that, I guess we can just move into our next agenda item.

I'll walk us through some brief background, including resources on the context for this recommendation to evolve organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program and the overall purpose of this community coordination group. So if we could please display our project workspace, that would be great. If that, I think we have the Wiki

workspace. Thank you so much, and I'll share it in the chat too for everyone. Thank you.

So please bookmark this Wiki workspace if you have not already, as it provides a high-level overview and all resources for our work. The resources related to community coordination group meetings will also be shared here, including the meeting recordings and transcripts. For context, organizational reviews are mandated by the ICANN bylaws and assess the effectiveness of ICANN supporting organizations, advisory committees, and the nominating committee. They are conducted by independent examiners to assess the organization's continuing purpose and any change in structure or operations to improve its effectiveness and its accountability to its constituencies and other stakeholders. As many of you are aware, the community has experienced two cycles of organizational reviews so far.

So the third accountability and transparency review team has issued two recommendations to address issues related to the function of reviews. For context, the accountability and transparency review is another type of review mandated by the ICANN bylaws. This review is different from organizational reviews in that it is conducted by community volunteers who examine how well ICANN fulfills our commitments in the specific areas of accountability and transparency. And the issue observed by many community members over the years is that organizational reviews are time-consuming and costly, and on the most part, do not produce useful recommendations and outcomes. So the third accountability and transparency review team published these recommendations to address these community concerns.

This recommendation 3.6 calls for ICANN Org to work with the ICANN community to establish this continuous improvement program, and the outputs from the continuous improvement work conducted by ICANN structures will inform the eventual holistic review as outlined in ATRT3 recommendation 3.5. The ICANN board approved these two recommendations and the community assigned each high priority status. The third cycle of all organizational reviews have been deferred with support from all of the community to allow time for the implementation work to proceed. There's a very important checkpoint that we all need to keep in mind. The board will consider the progress toward evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program in June 2025 to determine whether the deferred organizational reviews with independent examiners should be resumed. So our goal here would be to demonstrate significant progress on the related continuous improvement program implementation by then, and that's about 15 months from now. Which seems a little far, but it can go quickly in ICANN time. And the ATRT3 final report provides information for both recommendations. ATRT3 recommendation 3.6 is detailed starting on pages 71 to 72 of the report, which I'll share in the chat for your reference this fall.

The ICANN community has clearly demonstrated strong interest in contributing to the evolution of organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program with nearly the entire ICANN community. 21 out of 22 of the groups across the community represented today in this community coordination group. So this is a great achievement and we're excited to support you all in this effort. We ask that each of you, each of the community coordination group

representatives here today to please regularly engage with your community leadership throughout the calendar year 2024. Please identify a potentially relevant working group or recurring community meeting where you can update your community and solicit feedback on this important work of the community coordination group.

The letter sent to SOAC leadership and the related ICANN Org announcement about the formation of the community coordination group are also on our wiki workspace for your reference. They're useful to share within your community groups as well, and I'll link them here in the chat too. Most of you have probably seen it, but it's good to promote this within your stakeholder groups.

And our next agenda item will present some preliminary ICANN Org research on continuous improvement models that are useful to consider in the context of evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program for the community. So we will dig deeper in subsequent meetings as you'll all help our community to develop the draft framework for continuous improvement. And later in this meeting, we'll go over our community coordination group terms of reference, draft work plan, and timeline for your input. So unless there are any questions on this recommendation and context for our work, I will turn it over to Sherwood Moore from our team for the next item.

SHERWOOD MOORE:

Thank you. Hello. Okay, you should be able to see my screen. Well, thank you, everybody. As Evin mentioned, I'm going to be walking through some of the preliminary research that we did in preparation for

this crucial work. So I'll be walking through very briefly a proposed definition of continuous improvement, sharing some of the considerations that we took into account when doing this research. I'm going to speak a little bit about the objectives of recommendation 3.6 and bylaws Article 4.4 and how they kind of influence the research. I'm going to speak to the solutions that we assessed, our initial findings, and then also speak to principles criteria framework that we'd like to introduce. And an example of that with some work from ICANN for specific examples. So I'll hop right into it. And as Evin shared, I think there's going to be further opportunity for discussion. This is a very kind of initial introduction, but just to kind of get the conversation moving forward. So I will go to the next slide if it allows me to.

So I think that we can all agree that in order to develop a continuous improvement program, it's important for us to begin with a shared definition. Here's one option that I'd like to share with you just to kind of get the discussion started. Continuous improvement is an ongoing process of identifying, analyzing, and making incremental improvements to systems, processes, products, or services. Its purpose is to drive efficiency, improve quality, and value delivery while minimizing waste, variation and defects. The continual improvement process is driven by ongoing feedback, collaboration, and data.

So with that, I also wanted to share some of the research considerations and quickly highlight language from recommendation 3.6 and its influence on the considerations that we took into account and conducted this research. So the language that I really want to flag is 3.6 directs to evolve the content of organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program in each SOAC and NomCom. It also states that

ICANN Org shall work with each structure to establish a continuous improvement program that shares a common base between all structures, but will also allow for customization. So it's best to meet the needs of each individual structure. And so we really took this into account as we conducted the research.

And so this is kind of the considerations that we took into account at a high level. We were looking for frameworks that provide that flexibility for individualized fit for each structure. Also that uniformity for assessing the health of various structures following the content, as the language describes in recommendation 3.6, the content of the organizational review scope, which is shared with us in Article 4.4, the focus of organizational reviews. Also efficiency. We were looking for solutions, continuous improvement program approaches, frameworks that are both effective and efficient to avoid overburdening the community resources. We also want to identify and build upon existing work to avoid duplication of efforts. And last, we think it's important to understand what is working well, as well as identifying opportunities for improvement.

So moving on to this idea of the objectives of recommendation 3.6 and the bylaws of Article 4.4. What we came to understand is that while the process may change, and, you know, since we're evolving, we're here together to evolve organizational reviews conducted by one independent examiner into a continuous improvement program conducted by the community structures themselves. While this process may change, the mandate is the same. It's the organizational reviews anchored in Article 4.4 that provides these very clear areas of focus for the review to accomplish.

So with these things in mind, I wanted to share some of the different research tools, continuous improvement program tools that we looked at. Obviously, what we discovered through our research is that there's a broad range of continuous improvement tools. And I think this reflects the fact, and this is alluded to by several of you in the introductions and in your broad variety of experience in continuous improvement, that, you know, there are a broad range of tools because there's a broad range of organization types and use cases. And even the definition that I led with, where it speaks to the incremental improvement of systems and processes and products or services, I think it alludes to the fact that there are a lot of different tools for a lot of different uses, and we have very specific uses. And I think I really like the way Cheryl flagged in the beginning, you know, that ICANN is unique and we need a bespoke and modular solution to fit our needs. And so this very much was kind of in our thinking as we approached and looked at these different tools.

So at a high level, and these are our initial findings, and I am nervous about sharing them because we obviously have so much expertise on this call. But at a high level, these are some of the tools that we looked at. Plan-do-check-act, Lean and Kaizen, Six Sigma, Total Quality Management, ISO 9000 and others. And this is kind of our initial findings. Plan-do-check act—And by the way, we can share resources on these tools and obviously kind of dig in and provide a bit more information so that everybody can understand the different tools. We can't cover them all today, but I was going to provide a high level understanding of these initial findings. And so that is the Plan-do-check act and Lean Approach and the Kaizen model. These are all different

solutions that are really excellent tools for improving individual processes and tools for groups to work together to get that done. But an area where they seem to be potentially lacking a little bit in our particular need is that layer of uniformity that Recommendation 3.6 asks for. So there are tools that we could potentially use, but we kind of feel like we might need something additive, something additional.

Six Sigma, this is an excellent CIP tool for optimizing manufacturing processes. It's used to decrease the number of defects over time to a minuscule amount. Maybe not the best use case for what we're trying to accomplish. Total quality management, ISO 9000, EFQM, Baldrige models. These are all really good examples of very robust CIP frameworks. The robustness provides a level of complexity and perhaps inflexibility that we're concerned could make it difficult to, one, customize to help really focus on the Article 4.4, the scope of organizational reviews that we've been provided, and potentially also create a lot of additional work for community structures. And just to provide, you know, an example, the Baldrige model, for example. It's a structured approach, very effective, but it focuses on leadership, strategy, customers, measurement, analysis, and knowledge. Management, workforce, operations, results. So not exactly what the organizational reviews are asking for and a little bit more complexity. So again, something that we've looked at, we consider, but might not be totally in alignment with the key areas of focus of the organizational reviews.

The last framework that I want to share is this principles and criteria framework. And it's an approach that we would actually like to spend a little bit of time introducing because it seems to have the flexibility and

the uniformity that Recommendation 3.6 is asking for and that ICANN specified that it needs. So this framework, just to give a little bit of context, it's been used by multi-stakeholder groups, generally in the sustainability field, where you have a diverse group of stakeholders in the same field, but with different needs, working towards a shared definition of principles of sustainability. So we thought that use case worked quite well. And what we did is we looked at it. We applied the model to some final reports to see how it works. And so I'd like to kind of walk you through the model and then share kind of our initial findings. Just to provide a real kind of world example using ICANN, which we're all familiar with, to help kind of communicate it a little bit better.

So the principles and the criteria framework, it consists of three components. There are three components. There are principles, there are criteria, and there are indicators. Principles, they describe the objective of the continuous improvement program. They define what the CIP is fundamentally trying to do. Criteria are the conditions that need to be met in order to comply with the principle. So a criterion is an element or a set of conditions or processes through which a system characteristic is judged, through which the principles are met. So the criteria define how a principle will be achieved without themselves being a measure of performance. And the last component is indicators. This is defined simply what the CIP will measure. They allow for the measurement of whether or not the associated criteria are being met. They are flexible, and they can include metrics, assessments, or even just new processes that are put in place to make sure this criteria had been met.

And so speaking to this idea of uniformity and flexibility, the uniformity in this model is provided by the fact that the principles are shared. There's uniformity there. But the flexibility is provided because each stakeholder group is able to then go in and prioritize which criteria they really want to focus on, what's their specific needs. And then also develop custom indicators to indicate whether they have met this criteria.

And so I'll share kind of applying this to ICANN. This is kind of what we looked at. And so this idea of uniformity and principles in this example of organizational reviews, we're essentially given what the principles are. And whether the organization, council, or committee is a continuing purpose in ICANN structure, that's a principle. If so, whether any change in structure or operation is desirable to improve its effectiveness, this is also kind of guidance for one principle.

And the last one is around accountability, whether the organization is accountable to its constituents or the council or committee is accountable to its constituencies. This is the example of a principle that I want to use for this example that I'm going to be sharing. So again, applying it and through our kind of first pass, looking at ICANN and essentially what we did is we looked at some different final reports to kind of pull out different examples of criteria and also different indicators that were used by, you know, through different organizational reviews. We're able to kind of pull out some of this material and see where it fit and how it fit.

And in this example, again, just a matter of kind of reorganizing the scope of organizational reviews to provide that principle. In this case,

it's that the organization, council, or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations, and other stakeholders.

So in this case, there's a lot of different ways that you can develop criteria around how that accountability is measured. And especially for people who are involved with accountability and transparency reviews, some of this will definitely ring a bell or any of the organizational reviews, obviously.

One criteria that we use for this example is that the SOAC and NomCom maintain sufficient levels of transparency of information. This is one criteria for defining whether this principle has been met. And so how do we develop, how would you and your different stakeholder groups develop indicators to ascertain whether this criteria of transparency of information has been met?

Well, there are a variety of different ways. There are a variety of different ways, and so you might be able to envision your conversations with your stakeholder group, identify one or multiple of these different indicators. And some of them could be, one, there is a clarity of information across channels, that information is accessible, that the information is delivered in a timely manner, or that there is sufficient transparency in maintaining, is maintained to facilitate relationships and interconnectedness across structures. And this could then be ascertained, whether you met these indicators, whether you put, if you put a process in place, whether this is a way you can develop indicators that are metric driven or potentially get consensus or feedback through qualitative surveys with your community.

So at a high level, this is one approach that we thought would be a good potential fit. And I will pass back over to Evin to kind of talk about next steps and how we move forward.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Awesome. Thank you so much, Sherwood, for that overview. And I also, I wonder if I saw someone join, I believe it's Chris Disspain, if you wouldn't mind introducing yourself. We did do the round of introductions to start off, but since you're here, I thought to give you a minute and then we could jump back into the agenda, if you wouldn't mind.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Evin. Hi, everyone. Chris Disspain. I don't know what level of introduction you guys have done. I'm on the ccNSO Council. I consult with Identity Digital. I used to be on the ICANN board. And right now I'm here as a representative of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Thanks.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Awesome. Thank you so much, Chris. Welcome. Great. So then we'll move on to the next agenda item, which is the terms of reference, work plan and timeline. If we could please display the community coordination group terms of reference, which I'll also place into the chat here. Should be, I think it's a second tab. Yeah, there we go. Perfect. Thank you so much.

So as mentioned earlier, we shared a request for appointment of representatives to the community coordination group through the SOAC

leadership in October 2023. We also requested feedback on the draft terms of reference for the group circulated at that time. These terms of reference explain the reason this group has been organized and what it is expected to contribute. The ccNSO provided very helpful input, which we incorporated and we'd like to share with the group here today. And afterwards, we'll also be putting the terms of reference into the community coordination group's Google Drive for your reference and further feedback, if any.

It's worth noting that the continuous improvement program community coordination group and its terms of reference are modeled from the Work Stream 2 community coordination group. And several of you are involved in that group. And we welcome your thoughts on replicating its successes as this group progresses its work on the CIP framework.

In addition to the formulation of the framework, this group is intended to serve as a forum to exchange best practices, lessons learned, as well as for sharing information and progress related to already existing community continuous improvement activities.

The representatives in this group will collaborate on community-wide implementation of the recommendation while relaying information back to your constituencies to inform the process. And to that end, I would like to emphasize the bottom of the second page, if we could scroll down there. Thank you so much. Yeah, right there. Decision making and transparency of discussions. So to note, this is not a decision making body, but a coordination group. So the members of the group will therefore be expected to report back to your communities on relevant and useful points discussed in the coordination group and to

voice your community's views and decisions into the community coordination group. So it's an exchange.

And at the top of the third page, if we could just scroll down a little bit more. Thank you. If you scroll down below challenge, so this at the top of the third page here, as noted, the community coordination group will discuss and develop the recommendations of the community coordination group. And include the appropriate community structures and the SOAC leadership for any required decision making. And the eventual goal and output for this group will be the draft continuous improvement program framework for public comment. The framework will be published for public comment by the community coordination group before adoption and the first continuous improvement program assessment. The group here will also address input received from the public comment and revise the framework where relevant.

And we'd also like to give the community coordination group an opportunity to appoint a rapporteur. This is something that was part of the Work Stream 2 community coordination group who can assist in documenting the group's discussions or presenting them in different fora. If someone would like to volunteer for this role, I'm happy to take any volunteers today, or it could be on the list after the meeting.

ICANN Org is otherwise supporting and facilitating these meetings and will prepare and distribute resources and agendas with input from this group. And we want to evolve with the group as we receive your input and accomplish our goals in the most efficient and lightweight manner. Jessica and Yvette from our team shared a doodle poll in December to determine the best timing and cadence of meetings for the group going

forward. The doodle poll showed 60-minute meetings every two weeks as the most desirable cadence with rotating times of 20:00 UTC and 14:00 UTC to be as friendly as possible to all time zones represented by this global group, so we'll proceed to schedule the next meetings accordingly. So I'll pause here, but we can move then to the work plan if we could get that up on the screen. Awesome. Thank you so much. Now we're here.

So this is the suggested work plan, and it's going to be a living document and agendas will be updating as we get input from the group as our work progresses. For the overall timeline, this information is also on the wiki workspace and in different resources that have been distributed. But as a reminder, the initial development phase, the CIP framework development is estimated to take up to 12 months with the goal of concluding with a draft framework for public comment by December this year. The first continuous improvement program assessment period is estimated to begin after the adoption of the framework at the earliest at the end of 2024, but likely in early 2025. And the first assessment period would conclude at the end of 2027, a period of three years estimated. The second assessment period is estimated to begin in early 2028 and would conclude at the end of 2030, another three years. So each assessment period is approximately three years as per the recommendation, and these assessments would inform the eventual holistic review.

For our near-term agendas in the first quarter of 2024, we have the following suggested agendas for upcoming months. After today's inaugural meeting, we would like to give the representatives time to gather information and liaise with their groups to provide an update on

their existing continuous improvement activities of each organizational structure. And this would be an item for the February agenda. And we would also plan to introduce a draft ICANN Org CIP framework as a straw man, so to speak, for the community coordination group to react to and develop further to ensure that this work is as lightweight as possible for the community, because we know each of you have a lot on your plate.

For those of you who are planning to attend ICANN 79, the community forum in Puerto Rico, in person, the community coordination group will have an opportunity to have a meeting in person there, and the usual remote participation will be provided for other community group volunteers who do not plan to join in person.

In the second quarter of 2024, we'll continue to have the community representatives engage with your groups and develop principles and criteria relevant to your organizational structure and gather feedback to develop the framework and related survey.

In the third and fourth quarters of 2024, we'll plan to finalize the framework and socialize and engage on the framework before the public comment proceeding. And we're always open to your feedback to develop these agendas and the work plan further. And for budget, by the way, just a brief note on budget, the plan for this coordination group is to do its work virtually, so whenever possible, we would meet face to face, we'll do our best to make that happen, such as during ICANN 79, where we hope to have a hybrid meeting to bring together those attending in person and those participating remotely. So, unless there are any questions on those, maybe if we could have the agenda

back up on the screen, thanks. And we're doing pretty good on timing, but I could then just go into next steps.

So, for next steps, ICANN Org will schedule the next CIP Community Coordination Group meetings for the upcoming months based on the rotating times for the doodle poll. We'll share information and useful resources from this call over the list. And we know that many of you are already doing work towards continuous improvement, and we want to get a sense of what that work looks like so that we can help tap into what you are already doing and not reinvent the wheel where necessary. So, we ask that you prepare information related to your group's continuous improvement activities for the next meeting. And we'll follow up via email on the list with some further information for you to bring back to this group to inform us all on what the different groups already have in the works.

And we also have a Google Drive that the Community Coordination Group can use to collaborate on documents and resources intersessionally. We'll place related documents from this meeting there as well, and if any of you are new to this, we have several people that can give you a tutorial on the workspace and how to find things. Just let Jessica from our team know. And yeah, so thank you all very much for representing your stakeholder group and your organization and for being here today. Larisa, I see your hand up, please go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you. This is Larisa Gurnick, and welcome everybody. I thought I'd give Evin a chance to take a breath. As you can see, we have a lot of

information to cover, and I know it sounds like there wasn't much time for discussion. And we do actually have 15 minutes before we close out, I believe if I'm correct. So I just wanted to welcome and encourage comments, questions, reactions. We wanted to have a chance to kind of provide you all with what hopefully is useful information, but we also understand that there may be all kinds of questions, all kinds of clarification needed and such. So please do let us know what you think.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Lori, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

LORI SCHULMAN:

I have a question just to make sure I understand our remit. Have we signed up for eight years on this working group? I'm not really clear about where things start and stop based on these timelines in terms of expectations of working group commitments.

EVIN ERGODGU:

That's a great question. Thank you, Lori. Don't worry, you're not trapped here. So the community coordination group is specifically working on exchanging best practices for continuous improvement across the structures and developing the framework that would then be adopted and utilized in the assessment for the continuous improvement program. So this timeline and this group is anticipated to have its work run between 12 to—exactly as Larisa is saying, about 12 months. Given that we will have a public comment before the adoption of the framework, the group may convene to address community input. And

then, of course, we kind of have our looming deadline where the board will evaluate progress related to this recommendation, as well as the holistic review work in June 2025. So I think the timeline for this group, generally speaking, is 12 to 15 months, but we're hoping that it can be done within 12.

LORI SCHULMAN:

If you permit me a follow up then, Evin. So that would be okay, 12 to 18 months, maybe two years because it's ICANN. So let's acknowledge that. But with that being said, so what I think I'm missing is so this is continuous improvement from the community only, as opposed to recommendations for continuous improvement for the Org as well. I mean, that's where I'm getting—Because it seems to me that we have one piece of a CIP puzzle here, but I would imagine the Org is also a CIP goal. And is that part of what we're looking at or not?

EVIN ERGODGU:

That's a great question. So, Larisa, I see your hand up.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Lori. And I'm only going to just say a few words and then maybe ask Cheryl and Sébastien to respond. Of course, and this maybe has to do with the definition of continuous improvement, I think every one of us in every group or department or structure or entity that we are involved in, strives to continuously improve. I think that everybody would agree with that, right? So everybody is doing continuous improvement. In the context of the recommendation that was issued by

ATRT3 that we're implementing and working, facilitating the work, it's bounded, it's anchored in the bylaws and the sections that Sherwood has gone through. The bylaws give us the formulation or the boundaries, so to speak. So it is directed to the SOs, ACs and the NomCom. And those are the parameters that we're applying for the purposes of this group. That does not at all suggest that continuous improvement for the board or Org or anybody else is not important or shouldn't be looked at. It's just not part of this particular effort. Cheryl, over to you to see if I got that straight.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You certainly did get that straight. Well done, you. Yes, here we are, of course, looking at what ATRT3 thought was well connected and nicely coupled recommendations that have been being disconnected through a whole lot of matters that were well out of our control. Remember that this is one of several recommendations made by ATRT3 and things like a holistic review, not a pilot holistic review, but a holistic review were also part of that suite of recommendations. So this is very much bound within the considerations made in both Work Stream 2 for accountability and transparency of the ACs, SOs, and of course the aim of 3.6, which is to help evolve from what we see as a now beyond its usefulness model of external consultants conducting organizational reviews for the component parts to something that is fitting in that CIP model as admirably reviewed in today's call. So I don't think you missed a thing, Larisa. All good.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you, Cheryl. And I see Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, may I add one point? I guess, no, I am sure that the answer is no, the Org continuous improvement program in Org and in the [inaudible] I will say, but as we have to evolve our structure, one part of the work is done with staff and therefore we may need to discuss and see how our, let's say, relationship or working relationship with staff in each group could be improved, but it's not to change the Org itself or the Org as a general body, but more the link between our own structure and the people who are working from Org with us.

And I wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for your summary of the proposal and I really feel that it was very good and well done. I have the impression that it's what we suggest in the AT&T 3, therefore well done. There are things I hope that we will be able to discuss, for example, the definition of the continuous improvement program, because it seems to me that it's a little bit too much oriented on, or yeah, I have the impression that it's too much oriented on the production of product and we are just producing, let's say, ideas or work processes and maybe we need to think about definition for us. As Cheryl said, we are a unique organization. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERGODGU:

Thank you, Seb, for the input. Certainly we're all collaborating to ensure success of this project. Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It just struck me that not everybody, I know, astonishing as it may be to some of us, has spent some time living and breathing continuous improvement programs and the like, you know, may not have been deeply entrenched in Six Sigma worlds, etc. So I'm wondering, Sherwood, if it's possible for you to share with the group, to the list, suitably simple introductory material that you may have come in contact with during what obviously has been a well-thought-out piece of research, because it's, I think, easy for people to assume they know what is meant looking at a title of a methodology, but if some of us have the time, the energy and the inclination and we don't feel suitably qualified, it might be handy for us to actually have a third-party resource to look at. So if you could share that, I think that might be useful. And that way, when somebody says, oh, well, that won't work because of, insert, whatever, there'll be a greater understanding and perhaps less likelihood for people to either just go along with things because I think it sounds good from an orator that can sell something and much more likely to have done their own assessment on the worth of some of these aspects we'll be talking about. Thanks.

SHERWOOD MOORE: Yes, absolutely happy to. And this is something I think we discussed and I think we were talking about sharing some resources on the Wiki. Absolutely.

EVIN ERGODGU: Thank you, Cheryl, for the suggestion and Sherwood for the follow-up, too. Great. Yeah, and thank you, too. I see Larisa's comments in the chat

as well about how some of us were participating in last week's SOAC roundtable discussions and the relationship between community and Org continues to be an important and fruitful topic and area of work. So thank you again, Cheryl and Sébastien and everyone here. This has been a really wonderful inaugural meeting. And thank you again. We'll be sending out the invites and the resources and we look forward to discussing continuous improvement during our next meeting. Thank you all. Stay warm, wherever you are, too.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]