

JESSICA PUCCIO:

So hello, and welcome to the Continuous Improvement Program meeting. Today is Wednesday, 21st of February. The time is 20 UTC. My name is Jessica Puccio. Yvette and myself will be your Zoom coordinators for this meeting. Attendance for this meeting will be taken by Zoom and posted on the Wiki shortly after the call. Today, we have apologies from Chris Disspain, Justine Chew, Manju Chen, Naveed Bin Rais, Sean Copeland and Irina Danelia. But we do have Alejandra, and I do believe Segun's trying to join the call as well.

We would like to remind everyone that this call is being recorded and to please state your name clearly for the record before speaking. And now I'm ready to hand things over to our project manager, Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Jessica. Great pronunciations. So, thank you all. Hello, everyone. Evin Erdogdu speaking. Today, we have the following agenda as you see on the screen. We'll complete the presentations on existing continuous improvement activities of each organizational structure and their stakeholder groups. Then Sherwood and I from the reviews team will present five draft principles for the group's consideration. And we'll go over logistics and the agenda for our upcoming meeting during ICANN79, providing time for any updates or AOB at the end.

So, without further ado, I'd like to ask the representatives to present up to two minutes on your group's existing activities, continuing where we left off last time. We'll aim for cutoff this time at about 25 minutes in as

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.

we need to get to the other items on our agenda, but we can continue sharing these activities on the list after the meeting as needed. So, with that, I'll turn it over to I believe it's Alan Greenberg from NARALO. And it may be a short one, but please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It is indeed a short one. The only activity we have and it's just starting, is a review of our rules of procedure. The rules of procedure have been updated relatively recently, but they need a little cleanup. Every once in a while, you find a problem you have to fix. We also have a number of other documents which go under various different names, like rules for meetings, that haven't been touched since 2007. And those, clearly, need to be cleaned up or perhaps just discarded. So, we're working on that. That's the only formal activity.

The informal ones that we're starting to talk about is what can we do to communicate better with our communities. The RALOs as you know are groups of other organizations and of people, and it's always problematic to actually have this entity work as single group as opposed to various disjoint entities. And that's something we're going to be talking about going forward. But not a lot on the books right now. We had completed everything that was in the accountability requirements.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

All right. Thank you for that update, Alan. Sounds good for NARALO. Then we'll move on to the GNSO, not for profit operational concerns constituency. Please, I think, Caleb, if you're on the call.

JESSICA PUCCIO: We don't have Caleb or Wisdom on the call at the moment.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Oh, shoot. Okay. In that case, maybe I can just quickly read off on their behalf that they do have some membership engagement and improvement to their online presence and contributing to the various public comments, including NomCom representation. And they have recently amended their process to amend their charter to change their name, reflect their current practices, align with their operating procedures, and accommodate their evolving needs. And they consider their best practices also under GNSO Operating Procedures as well as Work Stream 2, Recommendation 6. And they've linked to their charter and noted the revisions and the current roles in their stakeholder group. Okay. So, then I guess we could move to the Business Constituency if Nenad is on the call.

SANTANU ACHARYA: Excuse me. I think, I'm here in this call, and next item is mine.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Oh, okay. Do proceed. Sure.

SANTANU ACHARYA: I'm sorry. Thank you. Evin, can I give a little introduction of myself? Because it was pending and you had sent a mail to me also.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Sure. Please go ahead, Santanu.

SANTANU ACHARYA: Thank you. My name is Santanu, and I work for .IN ccTLD, which is also known as NIXI. I'm the head of finance, compliance, and taxation. I'm a CA by profession. I'm also qualified law here, and I have also completed my MBA from UCLA, California. And for 2024, I'm also a NomCom applicant team. So, I belong to ISPCP. So, I'll give you a little brief about what ISPCP is doing.

The ISPCP operate Internet backbone networks and provide access to Internet and related services to end users. And the ISPCP provides constituency forms and integral part of the generic name supporting organization. It takes an active part in many supporting organization advisory committees and working groups within the ICANN diverse structure. And we have a meeting monthly, but we also have a small, dedicated team which has been formed for meeting very frequently. And among the other numerous top topics, we are now working on universal acceptance of new gTLDs, and we are also working on new gTLDs and their impact on the network. And IANA transition is also there.

We are also working on the WSIS policies. And recently, we have discussed a lot of structure on the Internet fragmentation. And in the last meeting, we had worked on the WSIS questionnaire. This has been hosted on the WSIS website also. So, this is a brief description of what ISPCP is doing. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Many thanks, Santanu, for the description and also for the introduction. Welcome. Erum, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

ERUM WELLING: Thank you. Would Shantanu please put his email contact information in the chat? I have some questions about some specific things that are being referenced in this text. But I can do that separately if you don't mind. That'd be very helpful. Thank you.

SANTANU ACHARYA: Yeah. Sure. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you both. Then we'll hand it over to Nenad. Please, go ahead.

NENAD ORLIC: Hello, everybody. Well, I'm sorry I didn't fill out the table, but I will in a little time. And I would just like to say that basically Business Constituency is smaller than some other groups in ICANN and much more compact in size and type of membership. And therefore, maybe our job is some way easier. And basically, we meet on a schedule every two weeks. And we do not have any formal improvement program, but we're constantly trying to improve trends and basically, we are aware that there are some former rules that we would like to revisit and maybe put it into a charter to be more transparent about that.

Basically, we publish a brochure regularly with the activities and information from the group. And also, what we did identified as a point of improvement is membership for improving the diversity and the number of members, and we're working on it. So, basically, that's it.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Great. Thank you for the overview, Nenad. I appreciate it. Next is the GNSO gTLD Registry Stakeholder Group, and Chris Disspain had shared his apologies over the list just before this meeting, but he noted that he provided information in the spreadsheet. So, I'll just read it off on his behalf that the group continuously reviews its charter, its membership rules, administration processes, and policy inputs. And as a stakeholder group of the GNSO, it has never been the subject of a specific independent review, but it participates fully in all continuous improvement activities of the GNSO Council. All right. And then we could go next to the Intellectual Property Constituency with Lori.

LORI SCHULMAN:

Hello. Good afternoon, good day, wherever you are. I'm just going to start my video. I've been keeping my video off unless I'm speaking. We have substantive programs going on in the IPC for continuous improvement. As with many, we're all volunteers, and it takes some time, but we have had, I think, pretty good success. We're toward the end of a bylaws review where we will actually be changing our structure, our corporate structure. We'll be organizing, believe it or not, as an unorganized nonprofit corporation in California. There is the

thing. We're providing this so that we could have some legal structure, some insurance, and protection for our officers.

We're making fiduciary decisions which we have not had in the past. We felt that was important. We'll be able to even purchase some insurance for those officers. We do have a treasury. We charge dues, and we take the financial responsibilities of the dues very seriously. This adds another level of protection and accountability for the dues. We're also removing a level of decision making. Currently, the IPC has something called the-- What is it called? The intellectual property council, a coordinating Council, IPCC. I don't even know if people know it exists, but it is supposed to be the organizations, only IP organizations like INTA who make certain executive level decisions, and then other decisions go directly to the membership who can be individuals or organizations.

We're completely removing that bureaucratic layer, so it'll be more direct with the constituencies voting without the layer. We've hired a professional bookkeeper and do financials at the end of every year. We do a budget. We're transforming ourselves into a much more functional organization rather than a loose group of colleagues who trust each other, which is great. But as time goes on, we have about 100 members, and we do have a treasury. And because of that, we do take the fiduciary responsibilities quite seriously.

We are also always relooking at our participation coordination. Again, we're also small compared to some of the constituencies, and we have a small but mighty group of talented people who help us form our policy positions. The officers serve as our policy council. We don't have a

separate policy council, but we do have a participation coordinator who makes sure that the people who have the strongest interests and desires to participate in certain forum are able to do so.

We're also looking at with our partners at NCSG, we're part of the commercial stakeholder group, looking at more efficient ways to choose shared seats on the Board. Many of you may have heard there was a lot of back and forth about how to choose Board seat 14, and we're working toward improving that process so that there are less opportunities for stalemate and for not coming to a good consensus conclusion. And we've also changed our welcome procedures. We used to send out very lengthy legalistic letters, which you might understand since we're mostly a group of lawyers, although they're non-lawyers in our group as well, and make them more one on one, a little friendlier, and promoting a little more social interaction as a constituency at ICANN.

So, again, I think many people have said it. We're always looking at ways to make the membership experience easier to improve our own accountability. As I said, since we are mostly a group of lawyers, all of us are bound by an ethical code of conduct that I think over in past years really made people think, well, maybe we need less formal structures because we're mostly licensed, and we're accountable nonetheless. But we're going to add that other layer to this accountability based on recommendations from the Work Stream 2 and our own understanding that we've become more sophisticated as a stakeholder group.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Lori. That's a significant amount of activities for the IPC and a lot of exciting changes happening and on the horizon. So, thanks. Next, we have the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. I don't know if Jeff is on the call today. I don't see him, so I will just read off the input he provided, that the suggestions for improvement in their procedures arise on a regular basis from both SSAC leadership and the membership. Their ideas and proposals are discussed, and if consensus exists, are adopted and incorporated into the operational procedures.

Recent improvements that have already been implemented and reflected in their operational procedures includes significant changes to the way in which SSAC consensus is defined and achieved, improvements in the process for developing SSAC documents in the work parties. And their procedures tend to be updated on an annual basis, but can be updated more frequently. Improvements in the process for sharing information about an SSAC document following publication, including a questionnaire.

And they have a list of 2024 plans, including opening some SSAC meetings at ICANN meetings to attendance by any interested person. And until ICANN78, all SSAC meetings had been closed with the exception of the public meeting. And they're also exploring opportunities to engage more actively with ICANN Fellows and NextGen.

That's a lot of updates there. And next, we have the Country Code Name Supporting Organization. And I know that Sean is not here today, but we have Alejandra with us. So, Alejandra, if you would like to

perhaps provide an overview of the current continuous improvement activities in the ccNSO.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Thank you. Hi, everyone. Good to be here. Also, here is Segun Akano that is also covering for both Sean and Irina.

SEGUN AKANO: Thank you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi. So, I just briefly had a run through what is in the document, and I would like to give a more wider view of the things that we do at the ccNSO for continuous improvement. Many of the committees or working groups work on their own improvement. For example, the MPC that is in charge of the meetings program. They always have a survey, and they are always looking for new ways of having sessions and interactions and tools and all these things. So, that's one of the things that they do particularly.

We have in the council, the triage committee. That's the one that is in charge of getting all the input that we receive from outside of the ccNSO and see how to literally triage it as into should it be going to the council directly, should we take an action, should it be not discarded, but shall we pass on some things because of the workload. And soon, they will do an analysis on workload itself as in who is volunteering where because, again, we in all of our groups, we have these people who are very dedicated and have a lot of energy, and they are in many

groups, which is great. But at the same time, once these people decide to retire, we need to know who will come after. Right? So, that's one of the things that they will look into.

Also, we recently adopted the 360-review for councilors. This is something that we are doing to improve a councilor participation. So, the three-year term, after one year, they will be reviewed. And before, at least 6 months before their term ends, they will be reviewed again. So, we give them the chance to grow and evolve and improve if necessary. But in any case, it's a tool that we use to not only improve the participation and quality of our councilors, but of the dynamics of the council itself because it provides that forum to have a discussion on what's working, what's not working, and how can we do things better.

Additionally, well, the GRC, that's our guidelines review committee, it's the one that it's now spearheading all things related to continuous improvement. That's why Sean, he's the chair, is being appointed to this group. And I would like first to let Segun say of the activities that the GRC is doing. And if anything else, I will add to that. So, Segun, would you like to speak up?

SEGUN AKANO:

Okay. Thank you, Alejandra. And good afternoon, good evening, and good morning to everyone. I'm representing Sean. I'm the vice-chair of the GRC. The GRC committee is so passionate about continuous improvement to assist NSO. And we continuously look at how to do things much better. And Evin will be a witness to this. She's been part of us in all our deliberations. The last time in Hamburg, we had an OST

review, open space technology seminar, whereby we invited all the ASO into our deliberations. And we came up with different topics that were of interest to individuals and of common interest to ccNSO growth.

So, we have recently been able to work on project like statement of interest, conflict of interest, good faith recommendation, Board recall, and even 14 principles for our councilors. So, it's been very interesting trying to see how efficient we can do things continuously. And I want to say kudos to Alejandra. She's always been part of us. Even though whatever we agree, as you said, the GRC is the engine room that reviews all the policies, and then we pass on to the triage committee who will now also relate with the council, and they approve in most cases all the things that we come up with. That's the truth. So, we are in tune and in sync with the ICANN Org. For instance, the Work Stream 2 are not the recommendations. So, thank you, Evin. Don't let me take much of your time.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Segun, and Alejandra as well. And we also have really enjoyed, on behalf of the ICANN reviews team, and I think many of the representatives here participating in the open space sessions that the ccNSO has facilitated, and we recognize the great thought leadership that the ccNSO is providing on continuous improvement. So, thank you so much. Thank you. Thank you again. We have just maybe about five more minutes left for this item. So, we'll go to the NCUC next. Is Benjamin on the call? Benjamin or Leo Blue? Oh, Benjamin is here. Okay.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yes, I'm here. Well, my camera is not in the best of shape, so I'm just going to speak. Good evening. This is Benjamin, and I represent the NCUC for this group. Since this came up, I've tried to go around asking veterans in the group if we do have a formal continuous improvement process. But as you know, NCUC is part of NCSG. So, it's kind of umbrella procedure that come from top to bottom. But I'll just quickly tell you what the NCUC has, and I think I'm going to paste it in the Excel sheet thereafter.

So NCUC has not established its formal continuous improvement procedures. However, the organization is agile enough to always make adjustments to enhance our processes. So, we have multiple guardrails, especially as they align with our parent stakeholder group. That is Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, NCSG. So, we are guided by our robust NCUC bylaws and as well as the NCSG bylaws. There's some interfacing in both.

So, additionally, we have the NCUC operating procedures that is publicly available. I'm going to paste it on the group as well. And our bylaws, if it is of any importance, was a 2018 reviewed, and it was approved even by ICANN Org and then is in operation. So, we're also hoping that there'll be a reason for anybody to call for a review and have it improved. The NCUC executive committee is responsible to look at this and either activate a process towards this. But we're also working with what NCSG is doing in this direction, especially as it comes from the GNSO Council.

So, what we have is our operating positions is online, and I'll share it to you in this group. That's something that guides how we work and how we can improve things. And that document is as flexible, it gives condition to when you can ask for an amendment. So recently, we redesigned and launched our website just to showcase our activities and every other thing.

And then recently, we've been having an additional session at ICANN that we organized. We call it NCUC issue forums just to try and improve our engagement and activities. And we always use our mailing list as our center of conversation and interaction. And as you know, we're a small body. I mean, we're small, so all depending on volunteers and all of that. So, that's what we have in NCUC for now. Thank you. In terms of continuous improvement.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Great. Thank you so much, Benjamin, for sharing all those activities. And last but not least, we have the GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group. Owen, if you're on the call, please go ahead.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Yeah. Thanks, Evin. This is Owen Smigelski, and I'll try and crunch this in as quick as possible. So, I put in there about how there's no formal continuous improvement process for the Registrar Stakeholder Group, but we did participate in the broader GNSO Council's review as part of the implementation of Work Stream 2. And I put a link to that spreadsheet in there so we can see how the registrars did.

And also, the Registrar Stakeholder Group did a significant revision of its charter in 2018, and identified a number of issues and concerns that there were with the way that the Registrar Stakeholder Group was operating to make it a little bit more responsive to the members, as well as to ensure some continuity and leadership such as having an executive committee that had a balance so that not everybody was terming out at the same time, things like that.

I realized as I was listening to this call that I also left out another large improvement that the stakeholder group had. We're actually incorporated, in I think it was 2020. The Registrar Stakeholder Group is now a German-based association. And with that comes some certain formalities that needs to be some directors that are separate from the executive committee. We need to utilize the services of an attorney who then also serves as a cash accountant to verify stuff. We have to have an annual association meeting, which goes through and checks to see kind of like an annual report of what the stakeholder group has done or the association has done, and things like that.

And along with this, that has allowed us to officially have a paid secretariat and do some other things as well too to kind of formalize things to ensure some ongoing and continued continuity because, goodness, we do not want to lose the services of Zoe. We've also been expanding the number of groups that we have within the stakeholder group. Some other programs that we've come up with, we've been doing some communications and outreach things to try and engage other groups better. We've set up an ambassador program where people are selected to be free to speak on behalf of the Registrar

Stakeholder Group in public and ICANN meetings if people want to know anything.

And then we've also, in the Hamburg meeting, we launched what we call our registrar program. And that is a mentorship program where people who've been around a little bit more in the stakeholder group take mentees who either have not been as much as participating, are new, or are continual lurkers who now want to get more involved. So, well, that was the first time we did that, and we've actually seen some results where we've been getting some of these mentees more involved in some of policy and other work within the stakeholder group. So, I will stop there. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Wonderful. Thank you, Owen. I like the registrar, and great that you still have Zoe with you as well. So, we are right on time, which is great. We're able to make it through everyone today. So, we'll transition over to our next item. So, these existing continuous improvement activities ongoing in each structure will help inform the draft Continuous Improvement Program framework that this group is tasked with developing. And today, as everyone's aware, the ICANN community faces competing priorities and a significant workload.

So, one of the goals for the Continuous Improvement Program is to accomplish the objectives of the organizational reviews without undertaking the volume of work required in the past. And ICANN Org reviews team is supporting this work to make it as lightweight as possible for the Community Coordination Group here.

As a next step, we want to tie these existing activities into the bigger picture of developing the Continuous Improvement Program framework this year, including highlighting the frameworks previously discussed and circulated on the list. And as you'll recall during the inaugural Community Coordination Group meeting on 17th of January, we presented some preliminary research on continuous improvement frameworks, including an analysis of a principles, criteria, and indicators-based approach for an ICANN Continuous Improvement Program.

So, Sherwood will share now how this aligns with these existing continuous improvement activities in the ICANN community. And I'll then share a preview of draft principles for the group's consideration and next discussion, which are from the organizational review objectives in the ICANN bylaws. So, with that, I'll turn it over to Sherwood, please.

SHERWOOD MOORE:

Thank you, Evin. Hello, everyone. So, to kick things off, I just want to set the stage a little bit by looking at Recommendation 3.6, and the language specifically that directs that ICANN Org shall work with each structure to establish a Continuous Improvement Program that shares a common base between all structures, but also allows for customization as well as to meet the needs for each individual structure. So, this is really our challenge to develop a Continuous Improvement Program that provides both that uniformity to give structures a shared approach and also that flexibility so that they can customize the program to fit their own unique specific needs.

So, if we can go to slide 3, I'll speak about the principles and criteria framework. I'm going to want to review this again. So, it provides a way to accomplish this, and it's actually been used successfully in the sustainability field by very similar diversity. There's a diverse group of stakeholders working towards a shared definition of principles. And so, looking at the principles and criteria framework, I'm going to review it and then I'm going to-- I want to speak a little bit about how it can be applied within ICANN using some real examples to provide some real context so we can kind of start getting our arms around it.

So, the principles and criteria framework, it consists of principles, criteria, and indicators. Principles describe the objectives of the Continuous Improvement Program. Essentially, they define what it is trying to do. Criteria are the conditions that need to be met in order to comply with the principle. And criteria, they define how it's achieved without themselves being the actual measure of performance. And indicators, they define what is measured to understand whether a criteria is being met. And indicators can be quite flexible. These can be metrics, these can be assessments, or they can even be a new process that's going to be put in place to meet the criteria.

So, why we feel that this fits so well to suit your needs is that it provides us uniformity. The uniformity is provided by having the shared principles, and also, criteria. But there's also this level of flexibility and ability to customize because each stakeholder group decides which criteria they want to prioritize. And also, each structure develops custom design indicators to meet criteria. And so, I do see a hand raised there. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. May I suggest that we use different words than uniformity? We need communality. I don't know if it's an English word, but something we have in common and the thing we have not in common. But we don't want uniformity. We want something to share. Whatever the word you find in better English than mine, it's something around communality, I will say. Yes. It's maybe a bad translation from French, but. Thank you.

SHERWOOD MOORE: Yes. Thank you. Yes. That makes sense, and we will get if we can do that. Lori?

LORI SCHULMAN: Yeah. I was going to respond to Sebastien. I agree exactly because the communities operate somewhat differently at times. And maybe it's consistency or consistency with the principal rather than a uniform adoption, consistent with a spectrum rather than something lockstep, I think, would be important to convey.

SHERWOOD MOORE: Okay. So, it sounds like there are definitely concerns about the word uniformity, and yeah, we can definitely look at addressing that. So, thank you both. So, I will go now to slide 5, Evin, and start looking at a real-world example to unpack this a little bit. So, starting with principles. And for guidance on this, we have Recommendation 3.6, which states that ATRT3 shall evolve the content of organizational

reviews into a Continuous Improvement Programs in each structure. So, the content of organizational reviews is provided in article bylaws 4.4, which define the scope of organizational reviews in 1, 2, and 3.

So, developing principles can be as simple as reframing this as the CIP principles, and this will be something that you decide. So, during our last call, I shared an example related to accountability. And for this call, I'm going to focus on a different example, article 4.4 on whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to prove its effectiveness. So, slide 5, Evin.

So, reframing this as an active statement, we might have the following principle. The operations of SO/AC or NomCom are efficient. So, let's explore potential criteria which can be used to define whether this principle is being met. Potential criteria might be each structure has a process for planning and setting priorities. Each structure efficiently assesses inputs related to their scope of responsibility. Each structure efficiently develops and recommends outputs relevant to their purpose. And this can be policy development. This can be supporting policies. This could be leadership placement. So quite broad. And also, each structure outputs are implemented efficiently, and implementation of outputs is monitored.

Now I know I shared a lot there. Just keep in mind, ultimately, the criteria for the principles will be for you and your structures to agree on together. But the criteria that I have here were actually pulled from different final reports, from different organizational reviews. So, we went through and reviewed them, and we actually have compiled a list

of different criteria that could be used as tools for your view groups to use as a starting point if that's something that's helpful.

But the criteria, again, provide this commonality because they're the same for all the different structures. And this is something that can be agreed upon. But they also, again, provide this level of flexibility and customization because in executing the Continuous Improvement Program, each structure can identify the criteria that they want to focus on and prioritize.

And so, moving on to slide 6, Evin. So once criteria have been agreed upon, each structure will then be able to customize their own indicators. And so, for this example, let's focus on this one criteria where we say each structure has a process for planning and setting priorities. So, indicators can be different for each structure. One structure to meet this, they may use a survey tool. And their indicator could be that a certain percentage of their group agree that they have a good process that is functioning well.

Another structure may identify that they do not have a process in place at all for prioritization. And so, their indicator might be that they will develop a process by a certain date. But in this way, you can see that criteria and indicators provide a way for your structures to customize the Continuous Improvement Program to fit your needs while meeting these shared principles that really kind of come from the scope of the organizational reviews that article 4. 4 describes. So, with that, I know I covered a lot. So, I'll pause and see if there are any questions, any comments. Okay.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

All right. Well, thanks so much, Sherwood. We've taken note of the comments from Lori and Seb as well. Thanks so much for that. So as Sherwood described, historically, ICANN organizational reviews have asked whether the supporting organizations, advisory committees, and the nominating committee have a continuing purpose within the ICANN community. ATRT3 Recommendation 3.6, which calls for organizational reviews to be evolved into a Continuous Improvement Program, and the ICANN bylaws provide a foundation for the Continuous Improvement Program framework. The objectives of organizational reviews can be addressed to the five separate principles that would guide the successful execution of a Continuous Improvement Program.

If we could go to the next slide, please. Great. So, you'll see on the screen here five draft principles, including the one example Sherwood provided, taken from the objectives for organizational reviews for the group's discussion. These principles can be considered in the development of a Continuous Improvement Program framework. These five principles would provide the consistency needed for the framework. As Sherwood noted, the next level of criteria and indicators would be customizable, providing flexibility for each structure's unique purpose, and priorities.

ICANN Org is supporting the Community Coordination Group to keep this work as lightweight as possible. So, in advance of our next meeting, we will share some suggested criteria for each group organized under these five principles. These five principles can be discussed and further developed during the next meeting as a next step in developing the

framework. Are there any questions or comments on these before we move on to the next slide? Alejandra, please go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you. Just a quick comment, and I know that in the next meeting, you will go thoroughly through this. But what caught my attention, it's on the first one that it says that the SO/AC or NomCom is efficiently fulfilling its purpose. And then number 3 is if the operations are efficient. Okay. I'm not sure we need to have the double efficiency there. As in maybe the first one could be just "is fulfilling its purpose" because you are evaluating efficiency later. Just a comment.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Alejandra. Appreciate that. And as you noted, we'll definitely do a deeper dive, and we want the group to discuss this thoroughly, and that's a really useful observation. We can also the group can add a principle as needed. But we thought we wanted to kind of parse out the existing objectives, break them down to make them more manageable for each group to address. But that's great feedback, and we can consider how to incorporate that next time. Thank you. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you. I think we need to be sure that we understand the same thing with SO/AC and NomCom because-- And this group is referring to the stakeholder group, constituency level, and RALON level. Therefore, we may say someone once that when we are talking about

SO and AC, we're in fact not talking about the full organization. Or we are talking about the full organization, but also of the body of this organization. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Sebastien. And Natalia, please go ahead.

NATALIA FILINA: Oh, thank you very much, Evin. Natalia Filina speaking. Maybe my question is following Sebastien question or comment. So, we as advisory committee, maybe is a must complete case here because we are represented by five RALOs here. And so, I would ask about maybe a special approach to At-Large, ALAC.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Natalia. Great feedback and segueing off of Sebastien's comments as well. Oh, before I respond, Cheryl, go ahead. I don't know if it's related to what they've been sharing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, it's related. Fear not, it is related. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I understand that the RALOs and the constituencies in the GNSO model, all need to-- And it is in fact the foundation. It's the bedrock of the success of the specific AC or SO that they belong to. They certainly need to be brought along on a CIP journey, but we cannot not focus on the SOs and ACs, because the mechanism by which ICANN is structured,

there's certain responsibilities and accountabilities that are associated at the various level, should I say constructs points, construction points.

So, let's not think this is an either or. I think the modeling that we put together of a CIP needs to be broadly applicable at whatever layer we are looking at, but all layers will benefit from a great deal of shared principle effectiveness, and then the differences come in with the customization opportunities that Sherwood has already beautifully outlined for us. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Cheryl. And yeah, if I may pipe on to just to note, it may have been related to Seb's original comment, but in terms of filling its purpose as well, just an FYI, maybe some of the representatives don't know, but each structure does have a purpose articulated in the ICANN bylaws. So, that's a useful anchor for this principle as well.

Great. So, if there aren't any further comments or questions, we can move to the next slide, please. Thank you so much. So now we're looking ahead to our next meeting, and this is great initial response and feedback, and we want to provide an opportunity for the group, the representatives to thoroughly discuss this and add to it. So, looking ahead to our next meeting, it will fall on a Wednesday, the 6th of March during ICANN79. So, this provides us a great opportunity to have a meeting with volunteers on the ground in San Juan with virtual participation available as always.

The March 6th meeting will take place at 14:30 UTC or 10:30 AM local time after the locally scheduled coffee break. Participants not in

attendance, of course, will be able to participate through Zoom as usual, and the planned agenda will feature collaborative Jamboards. I think most everyone here has some experience with those at some point, but we'll send some instructions over the list about how to use those, and populate them in advance as well, to discuss each of these principles for the framework, and suggested criteria as well for the groups to consider overall and for your specific structure.

So, with the discussion and the eventual agreement on the principles, the Community Coordination Group can then work on the next layer, which would be the criteria and indicators to take back to your respective groups for input after ICANN79 during the Q2 of 2024. So, that's kind of the broad planning snapshot. And after today's meeting, as mentioned, we'll send some homework over the list to prepare for the meeting on March 6th and a discussion of these five principles. And will also include draft criteria for each SO, AC, and the NomCom in our collaborative Google Drive, and organize the Community Coordination Group volunteers into five groups for discussion of these five draft principles.

So, before we move to the next agenda item for today, I would like to also show you the overall road map for the Continuous Improvement Program which many of you are already familiar with, but it's a good reminder of where we are in the process. Actually, Jessica, if we could go back to the slide deck, I think. Thanks so much. Should be the next slide, I think. Thank you. There we go. Perfect. Thank you.

So, the role of the Community Coordination Group is to conduct an inventory of these existing continuous improvement activities, consider

the methodologies and frameworks for effective continuous improvement, and formulate a Continuous Improvement Program framework to be used by each ICANN structure. This framework for the Continuous Improvement Program will provide the common base of principles between the different structures but will also allow for customization of the criteria so as to best meet the needs of each individual structure. And to remind everyone, the Continuous Improvement Program is an opportunity for the community to remove the independent examiner from organizational reviews and to have more control and responsibility over the evolution of your structure.

For context, ICANN Org previously received broad support from all of the community to defer the next scheduled organizational reviews, considering the need to plan for implementation of this Continuous Improvement Program. And accordingly, the ICANN Board took action to defer the next cycle of organizational reviews, and the Board will consider the progress made toward evolving organizational reviews in June 2025. So, our goal is to demonstrate progress on this work by then.

And as you'll see on the screen here, the Continuous Improvement Program Framework will eventually be published for ICANN public comment by the Community Coordination Group before adoption. The group would address input received and revise the framework where relevant. And upon adoption of the framework, the first Continuous Improvement Program assessment period would begin. And all these results of the assessments will inform the holistic review as well. All right. So, I'll pause here for any questions before we move on to our next item. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Evin. Just read this road map. I think it's useful for us to also see where the opportunities are for us to gather back in and find some opportunity for more of this digging in and face-to-face things, particularly as we look towards the commonality aspects. I think the customization ones, they're always the easiest part. It's getting that layer above customization that I think is going to be more requiring of detailed conversation.

I don't particularly care whether it happens associated with some form of meeting, ICANN meeting in this schedule, or whether we take some bigger blocks of time where we've had perhaps a longer meeting with a single purpose, but I think we do need to think about popping in a few of those activity-based ones. The example immediately comes to mind is the amount of time it takes for a successful piece of sharing such as the ccNSO was done. You don't do that in 60 minutes as a part of another agenda. So just as you're thinking about all this, I'd encourage you to do that.

To that end, I also want to share with you, Tommi and I should say, want to share with you that the—All sorts of words end up in letters, and I'll do it long form—Operational Financial Budget Working Group of the At-Large Advisory Committee—Yes, there is an acronym, but I'm not going to share it—has an interest in this as you can imagine. And part of its face-to-face activities in ICANN79 will be spending all too little time, but a little time, looking at how we can develop some of the commonalities and where we can recognize some of the shared principles. So, just to flag that at least the ALAC and its RALOs, the At-Large layer down, will

also be starting to dig into that. So, that might be something we can feed back on.

But I also want to ask-- I was going to do this under any other business, but I won't now. I'll just get it out. What are we doing with the really interesting data capture you've done on that spreadsheet that we started with? Because there are some clear commonalities of activity, if not purpose, that might also feed into this work. So, I just want to make sure that that very useful data capture exercise was made so we got some output out of it or some use out of it. Thank you. That's me. I'll shush up now or try to.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Cheryl. Yeah. That's a great segue because we will be using the data on this spreadsheet to inform the development of the principles and criteria. So, this data will extract, and again, ICANN Org is trying to facilitate and make it as lightweight as possible for the group. So, we'll go ahead and start to populate. We'll share this in our collaborative drive and get this up and running for our session.

And I definitely hear you in terms of maybe having longer dedicated sessions for our meetings. During ICANN79, we actually have the full block set aside of 90 minutes. Even though I think most of our remote participants are expecting a 60-minute meeting, we could look into extending that for any time that we have a collaborative brainstorm session. So, this makes a lot of sense. Thank you.

All right. So, with that, I think we have just a few more minutes, but we'd like to have some other AOB. Jessica, if we could go to the agenda

slide maybe. That's there. Awesome. Thank you so much. So, last time, we didn't get time to discuss this, but there was a note sent over the list whether or not a repertoire would be needed of this group if the group would like to appoint someone. We didn't hear anyone come to volunteer for this, so we can adjust the terms of references needed if there aren't any objections. And I think Sebastien actually noted at the beginning of the meeting that he did have some comment for AOB. If you still have that, Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you very much. I don't know if in two minutes, I will be able to go through the term of reference, but just some issue about the-- If you can find it and put it on the screen will be easier for the others. But I just want to be sure and to underline that when it's written at the second paragraph, the result of the CIP assessment will inform the policy pilot holistic review. It's really, when we take your time frame, it will be in 2027 and 2030 and not for our group and within this one year of work. We discuss about the-- Somebody else want to talk?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

I think it was just someone's line.

JESSICA PUCCIO:

No. That was me. I apologize. Sorry.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I just want to be sure. We already discussed about commonality or uniformity or whatever the CIP framework. My other concern, it's in composition. It's written each SO/AC, GNSO stakeholder group, and RALOs. I guess, the reality, it's the GNSO stakeholder group and the constituency. And I don't know about the 22 representatives, but I don't remember why I was underlining that. But the fact that there is no just stakeholder group, but also the constituency from the GNSO it's great. That's some of my comments. Thank you very much. I don't want to take more of your time. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Sebastien. Appreciate the feedback, and we'll address the wording to be more accurate as you noted. And just to note as well, just to emphasize, the Community Coordination Group is working on developing a framework. That's the work of the group, but then afterwards, the assessments would be done by the structures themselves. So, this group is expected to work over the next 12 months, 12 to 15 months or so. Thank you.

Great. So, then, I know we're at the top of the hour, but I just wanted to remind everyone to please also bookmark the workspace for the Continuous Improvement Program. We'll be posting resources there. And we also, as a reminder, just ask each of you to please regularly engage with your community leadership throughout this year to identify a potentially relevant working group or recurring community meeting where you can update your community and solicit feedback on the group's work. That's a really important connection to make there for communication. So should you have any questions, please feel free to

reach out to us. And we look forward to seeing many of you at the ICANN79 community forum. So very excited to continue this work. And thank you all so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]