

JESSICA PUCCIO: Okay. So, hello, welcome to the Continuous Improvement Program meeting. Today is Wednesday, the 3rd of April. The time is 14:00 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 this call. Today, we have apologies from Tracy Hackshaw and Natalia Filina. 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'll hand things over to your project manager, Evin. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you so much, Jessica. And hello, everyone. Welcome. Evin Erdoğan speaking. So I'll briefly provide an overview of our agenda for today's meeting. It's officially April, which means it's officially the second quarter of the calendar year 2024. Time is flying by. So as a reminder from the last meeting, ICANN Org created individual workspaces for each community group in the CIPCCG Google Drive. Please reach out to Jessica or myself in case you do not have access to this collaborative drive. We've tagged you each in your community group's respective workspace. And today, ICANN Org will present a draft slide deck for the representatives of the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group to take to your groups to update them on the community coordination group meetings from January to March of this year and to gather your group's feedback for the draft framework in progress.

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've previously requested that each of you regularly engage with your community leadership through the calendar year 2024. If you've not done so already, 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 this month.

So we'll walk you through the slide deck today, which ICANN Org prepared as a resource to support the community coordination group in delivering a consistent message to the ICANN community on the work accomplished by the group so far. We also distributed a blog on the mailing list highlighting the hybrid meeting held during the ICANN 79 Community Forum and the progress made on the draft framework. You're all encouraged to please share this blog with your community groups to inform them of the progress and the significance of this work. And I'll share a link in the chat now. Oh, and I see your request, Irina, as well for the link to the Google Drive. I will share it with you momentarily, if you just give me a minute.

And there were also several social media posts shared on the ICANN social media platforms, including Facebook, LinkedIn, and X, formerly known as Twitter, about the work of the group during ICANN 79. I'll also share those in the chat. And so please circulate these in your groups.

In addition to the presentation, we've also prepared talking points for you each for each slide in the deck, and after today's meeting, we will incorporate any feedback from the group today and distribute both documents on the list as a resource for your presentations to your community groups. After the presentation of the deck, we will revisit

the work plan for the remainder of the year and then have any other business. So unless there are any questions or if anyone would like to raise AOB, we'll move into the presentation. Great. Okay. Thank you so much.

Okay, so this slide deck, again, is what we will distribute on the list that you would take to your groups. So I will speak to what you can share with your groups for each slide. And also, Sherwood will present a portion of this deck as well.

So you would introduce yourself as the representative or alternate to the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group and share why you're presenting to your group to provide them with an update on the work of the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group and the progress made thus far towards the development of a draft Continuous Improvement Program framework for the community. Noting that the Community Coordination Group has met six times already in 2024, including one hybrid meeting during the ICAN79 Community Forum. You can share your relevant experience in and outside of ICAN related to continuous improvement and motivation to contribute to the continuous improvement of your community structure. Also very important. Oh, I see. Erum's hand is up. Go ahead.

ERUM WELLING:

I'm so sorry. I never want to interrupt people, but are you still on the first slide? Because that's what I'm seeing. You were saying so much. I

thought maybe this is like written somewhere in one of the next slides. Sorry about that.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Oh, sorry. Yes. I think so. Yeah, this is the title. Oh, yeah. Good call. Actually, this will be written somewhere though. That's a great point, Erum, because we'll distribute talking points. So basically what I'm saying, you can also share with your groups as well. So that's a good point. Thanks. And I see Bill Jouris has a question. Do the slides include notes? If you'd like, we could put some notes related to each slide for the talking points in the deck, but it's also up to you. So yeah.

So very importantly, please welcome the questions and input from the perspective of your community structure or group as a part of this presentation. You can note that you would be regularly engaging with your group throughout 2024 on the development of the draft framework. So there'll be many opportunities for their input. And generally speaking, the presentation would provide a high level overview of the recommendation to establish the continuous improvement program for the ICANN community, and then the progress made on the development of the draft framework by the community coordination group. And I see your comment as well, Cheryl, for speaking up. So thanks. I appreciate it. We'll incorporate those into the slide deck. Okay, so now we can go to the next slide. Thanks. Thank you, Jessica.

Okay, so this first slide provides overview that the third accountability and transparency review or ATRT3 recommendation 3.6 calls for the

evolution of organizational reviews conducted by an independent examiner into a continuous improvement program led by the ICANN community. There are community perceived shortcomings of organizational reviews, which led to ATRT 3 recommendation 3.6. The perceived shortcomings include the ability of the independent examiners that have conducted organizational reviews to understand the complexities of the ICANN structures and produce useful recommendations. The quality of the independent examiner recommendations has been debated by the community and the volume of recommendations has led to a current backlog to implement a number of recommendations. One of the goals for the continuous improvement program is to accomplish the objectives of organizational reviews without undertaking the volume of work required in the past. The board deferred upcoming organizational reviews until 2025 so that this recommendation and others from ATRT 3 could be implemented. The ICANN community demonstrated great interest in contributing to the evolution of organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program with 21 out of 22 of the groups across the ICANN community represented in this continuous improvement program community coordination group, which convened in January 2024.

The community coordination group is tasked with developing a framework for the continuous improvement program, which will be published for public comment prior to adoption by each supporting organization advisory committee and the NomCom. The continuous improvement program will include an annual satisfaction survey of members and participants and a regular assessment once the continuous improvement program framework is developed. The board

will consider the progress made toward evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program, including the framework for adoption by June 2025. And if we could go to the next slide, please. And thank you Yvette for sharing the link to the external Google Drive. I appreciate it.

Okay, so this slide you'll see the overall roadmap for the continuous improvement program, which is very useful to show to your groups as well to give them an idea of where we are in the process. This is also previously been shared in prep week webinars too. The recommendation states that ICANN Org shall work with each supporting organization advisory committee and the nominating committee to establish a continuous improvement program that shares a common base between all organizational structures, but will also allow for customization so as to best meet the needs of each structure. So this draft framework currently being developed by the continuous improvement program community coordination group will be published for ICANN public comment in 2024 before adoption and the first CIP assessment period would take place afterwards. It's estimated to last three years, including a survey of each organizational structure and their stakeholders that utilizes the continuous improvement program framework. The results of those assessments will inform the holistic review. And you can note that as your community group's representative or alternate to the community coordination group that you've already shared the existing and ongoing continuous improvement activities of your community structure or group, which is informing the draft continuous improvement program framework and

progress and will be taken into consideration during each continuous improvement program assessment phase.

In June 2025, as noted, the ICANN board will evaluate the progress made thus far towards evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program pilot. The related bylaws amendment to formalize the evolution of organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program would occur thereafter, including public comment proceedings as required.

So the work of the community coordination group to produce a framework for the continuous improvement program will be done by then, but the overall implementation of ATRT3 recommendation 3.6 will continue under the first continuous improvement program assessment. All right, next slide, please. Thank you. Great.

So this is a great photo of the community coordination group volunteers during the ICANN 79 community forum. As noted, the volunteers have shared the extensive work already underway within all the structures towards continuous improvement and are collaborating on community-wide implementation of ARTR3 recommendation 3.6. In work to date, the group has considered a range of methodologies for effective continuous improvement programs, utilizing a principles criteria indicators framework fit for ICANN purpose.

The community coordination group volunteers are drafting the framework to be used by each structure while relaying information back to your groups to inform the process. And you'll provide more information on this framework later in the presentation and can share

the recent blog published on the progress and work of the community coordination group. Next slide, please. Thank you.

So as noted, you can describe how during the ICANN 79 community forum in Puerto Rico, the volunteers had their first hybrid working meeting. And during this meeting, the group made substantial progress toward developing common principles for the ICANN continuous improvement program. These principles stem from Article 4.4 of the ICANN bylaws, which describe the objectives for organizational reviews and will provide a common base for the assessment of the different ICANN community structures.

The group's next steps will be to use the principles to build out the draft framework for public comment later this year. And now I'll just take a little break and hand it over to Sherwood for the next few slides. Sherwood, over to you.

SHERWOOD MOORE:

Thanks, Evin. So for slide six, I'm just going to provide more detail on the framework just as a quick reminder of principles, criteria, and indicators. So principles describe the objectives of the continuous improvement program. They define what the CIP is fundamentally trying to do. And they come from the current ICANN bylaws pertaining to organizational review objectives. The criteria are the conditions that need to be met in order to comply with a principle. So criteria define how a principle will be achieved without themselves being a measure of performance.

Indicators define what the CIP will measure to assess whether or not criteria are being met. So indicators can include metrics, they can be

assessments, or just new processes that have been put into place to meet a criteria. But overall, the principles provide kind of a common base for community assessment. And then criteria and indicators provide flexibility because each structure is able to emphasize which criteria they're going to focus on at any point in time and develop their own custom indicators. I'm going to slide seven.

And so why this is so important, again, this common base with the flexibility is that recommendation 3.6 states that ICANN Org shall work with each structure to establish a continuous improvement program that shares a common base between all the structures, but also allows for customization and flexibility so as to meet the needs of each individual SOAC and outcome. So that's just a quick reminder of the flexibility and the common base that this approach provides.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

I'm sorry to interrupt, but I see Erum's hand is up, if we could just-- Yes, please.

ERUM WELLING:

Thank you. Appreciate it. Could we go back to the previous slide for just a second? I didn't want you to go too far before I had to request to go to the previous slide. I could probably ask it without even having it up. You had principles, criteria, and indicators. I noticed when I went to-- for example, I'm involved with the RSSAC area. And when I went there, there's the principle, there's the criteria, and then there's some additional text under the criteria. So that's some of the text that we added from the spreadsheet initially, for example. Are those to be

considered indicators? And what I want to know is, do we need to add indicators under every criteria? Is that something that is work that we need to do, is to make sure? Because there's a lot of indicators. I want to know-- excuse me, a lot of criteria. And I want to know, do we need to add basically text as part of our homework to add text under every criteria to add indicators?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

That's a great question, Erum. Thank you so much. We're about to discuss that a little further, so it's the perfect segue. You positioned it perfectly. And we'll also do it in several phases of the community coordination group. And I'll show this in the work plan as well for the remainder of the calendar year. So thank you so much, Erum. Appreciate it.

SHERWOOD MOORE:

We can move on to the next slide unless Evin has something else she'd like to add. So, again, the reason we're showing this is because Article 4.4 of the bylaws essentially describes what the focus of organizational reviews are. This exercise is evolving organizational reviews into the continuous improvement program. And so the objectives provided by Article 4.4 of the bylaws provide us with the foundation for the shared principles for the community under the new CIP. So moving to slide 9. This will look familiar. These are the draft principles discussed and developed by the CIP CCG. Again, we're reviewing this for you, but again, to reframe this for everybody, the purpose of this is really to kind of share with your different community members how these were

developed, where everything comes from, so everybody has a kind of shared understanding as we develop this framework together.

So here are the five draft principles. Historically, ICANN Org have asked whether the supporting organizations, ACs, and the NomCom have a continuing purpose within the ICANN community rather than articulating this as a single principle. It's an overarching consideration that is addressed through five separate principles that would guide the successful execution of this continuous improvement program. So the first principle being the SOAC or NomCom is fulfilling its purpose. The second, the structures are effective. That operations -- third principle, the operations are efficient. The fourth principle is that the structures are accountable internally to their stakeholders and externally to the wider ICANN community. The fifth principle being that ICANN community collaborates together to further the mission of ICANN and the effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder model. And it's worth noting that the origin of accountable in principle four is from the related work stream two recommendations to increase SO and AC accountability. And I have a link that I can post to the chat related. One moment, just in case anybody is interested. Very good. So I'll go on to the next slide, please.

Mapping existing continuous improvement work to the Jamboard content. This will look familiar to many of you. As mentioned, the CIP CCG volunteers have mapped the existing continuous improvement activities of the different structures onto these draft principles, criteria, and indicators for drafting the framework itself. And please, if somebody raises their hand, please flag me because I don't always see it if anybody has any questions.

The included content is shared via a collaborative JAN board from the hybrid meeting. That's where this information was captured. And the group determined to use the SMART approach for indicators. And just as a quick review, this is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. Moving on to slide 11.

Great. So I'd like to now explain the relationship between the common principles and customizable criteria through an example. So taking principle three as an example, this is that the operations of SOAC or NomCom are efficient. For that, what criteria would apply to this principle? So you can see on the screen here, we have some suggested criteria. We also have the opportunity as the different structures to use existing continuous improvement activities to inform these criteria. The CIP CCG also has a Google Drive workspace dedicated specifically to your different structures where it's possible to input and draft specific criteria. In the coming weeks, and again, this is what we suggest, that each of you will organize working sessions to develop the criteria and the indicators for your groups relaying output, input that you receive into the CIP CCG, into this group. I'll pause there. I don't see any questions. Okay. Great. So just going on to the next slide.

So here's an example of how principles and criteria. Yes, Irina, please.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you. Here you speak, you say principles, the operations are efficient, but it seemed that earlier on slide probably nine, it was the structure is efficient, which one is correct? I assume the one on slide we currently see.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Irina. Probably that's a typo. I apologize. It probably is the one on slide nine, actually, because that's the latest that we have for the principles after the hybrid meeting and what's in the individual workspaces and subfolders for each of the community groups. So thanks for catching that typo. We'll update it to the structure rather than operations. I appreciate it.

IRINA DANELIA: Because for me, this makes more sense because in five principles, we see the structure is efficient and the structure is effective. And honestly, for me, it's hard to distinguish what is the difference between these two principles.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Oh, good point. Okay, so that's a great point. I know also English is not everyone's first language and we want to avoid being over jargony as well, but there is kind of a difference in potential overlap between efficiency and effectiveness. So efficiency is generally all about reducing the costs and the resources required to execute on tactics and operations and effectiveness is about achieving the strategic goals that align with the vision of the organization and drive its mission. So often increasing effectiveness naturally leads to an increase in efficiency. So we included those as two distinct principles, but there is a relationship there. So that's a good point to make.

SHERWOOD MOORE: Very good. So for principles to criteria to indicators example. Yes. So next we have this example of how principles and criteria relate to an indicator. So using the example of the criteria of having a process for planning and setting priorities, an indicator would ask whether this currently exists. And if not, it would suggest that a process be developed that is specific measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound, the smart principles. So we have this example, kind of helps clarify how criteria and indicators can work together. It's just one example. There are many more. Yeah, with that, I'll pass it back over to Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Sherwood. All right, so we'll go to the next slide, please. And Erum, I see you have a hand up. Go ahead.

ERUM WELLING: I'm sorry. I feel like I'm asking too many questions. So could we go back to the previous slide for just a second, please? So my question is where it states yes, period, right? Is that enough for us to do or do we have to provide more details about the process? That's my question.

EVIN ERDOGDU: For this framework development process, this isn't the assessment yet. Sherwood, I don't know if you want to provide a comment, but essentially the indicator is something that you can measure. So if there is a criteria or criterion for a principle, if there's something sufficient there, you can report on it, as you did with the current continuous

improvement activities. If not, that could be an opportunity to develop an indicator. So this is something to discuss with your groups as well, and it's part of the continuous improvement process.

ERUM WELLING: So we need to provide as many details as we can in answering whether an indicator—

SHERWOOD MOORE: I think it would be helpful to provide a little bit of context. Obviously a yes is not the greatest answer, but also at the same time, as a reminder, the indicators are really where each structure has quite a lot of control over what the indicator is and how you're answering it. Now, I'm assuming that a lot of this information will be published, so it's really helpful, I think, for other structures to be able to have context. If you do have a process in place for planning and setting priorities, a link or a description I think would be a good general best practice to provide context. Like, yes, it's not extremely helpful. But again, the indicators are where you get the flexibility you need to customize a CIP to fit your needs. So that would really be a question that's up to you and your structure.

ERUM WELLING: So the criteria, it's almost like you could put a question mark at the end of them, right? Does each structure have a process for planning their priorities?

SHERWOOD MOORE: So the criteria should be uniform across the continuous improvement program. Where the flexibility comes in is each structure will be able to identify for this next year or however long the continuous improvement program runs. And you're going to go through iterations where you're getting feedback from your structure and focusing on what you're going to improve. Select the criteria and then -- okay.

EVIN ERDOGDU: And Sherwood, I see Cheryl's hand is up and also Chris Disspain after Cheryl.

SHERWOOD MOORE: Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sherwood and Evin. I think just to gild the lily here, it's really important that an answer yes is also given with greater detail about the status of why you think yes is the correct answer. You know, a process for planning and setting priorities could be yes, I write it in my private diary and lock it in my drop drawer. That's fine for the chair of the group who does that to have that. But anyone else needs to be able to know how efficient or otherwise that actually is. How well that does or does not achieve the goal. So it not only provides a platform for improvement, but also a ratification for an external viewer. And a lot of this is all about being assessed to find out whether or not the average person would believe it is also a suitable measure that you have with

each of these indicators. And I'm sure Chris will follow on and give you more context to that. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Cheryl. Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Hi, everyone. This is Chris. Actually, I think my point is a different one, Cheryl, although I agree with what you just said. I apologize for throwing this in this stage. But it's the top of the slide that has triggered me to try. I've been trying to figure out why it is that I'm sort of in a state of constant state of confusion. And I think it's partly to do with the fact that it is illustrated by the example of principle three. The operations of SOAC or NomCom are efficient. That's actually not what you're asking, if I understand it correctly, in respect specifically to the GNSO. Because if you're asking the Registry Stakeholder Group, are you asking the Registry Stakeholder Group to comment on its own efficiencies, on the efficiencies of the GNSO, on both? There's no provision in the bylaws to review the constituent parts of the GNSO, only the GNSO itself. And so I think it does stand differently from all the other organizations simply because of its constituent parts. There are no -- I suppose you could argue that At-Large has constituent parts as well. But my point is the reason why I'm lost is because I'm not sure what we're actually supposed to be doing. If you want me to comment on the GNSO, that would be one set of comments. And I suspect most people would know what they might be. And if you want me to comment on the Registry Stakeholder Group, that would be a completely different set of

comments because it is an entirely different set of people running an entirely different organization. So I'm totally confused.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks, Chris, for your question and clarifying question. Before I comment, I see Larissa's hand is up. So Larissa, please go ahead.

LARISSA GURNICK:

Hi, Chris. Thanks so much for the question. And I guess I wanted to respond with maybe a question. If the idea here is continuous improvement and creating a process and a means of a particular structure, let's just say the GNSO, which is comprised of its constituent parts, to evolve and improve and be able to measure how that's progressing, what would the GNSO and its constituent parts find to be most useful? In our minds, this is the power, so to speak, of going through this process and ideally not dictating how this should be done as maybe would have been done if an independent examiner came in and kind of organized its work however it was done. But the real question is what would be most useful? How would you like to see it? And when I say you, Chris, I don't mean just you, but you and everybody. Right? Like what would make sense? I think the overarching point of this exercise is to do something that's meaningful and impactful, not just a checklist of things, although it may sound like a checklist, but what's behind it is the idea of making things better, addressing certain problems. I hope that that helps. Sorry if I'm not giving you a clear answer.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

may I respond to that before you go to Alan, if that's okay? It sort of does, but I think it also draws the circle around the issue. The review mechanism, the old -- well, it's still existing, to be replaced review mechanism, in this particular context, reviews the GNSO. Obviously an independent reviewer is going to look at constituent parts of the GNSO, but the review itself is of the operations of the GNSO. So let's take a simple example.

Is the question, does the registry Stakeholder Group Have a structure -- sorry, have a process for planning and setting priorities? Or is the question, does the Registry Stakeholder Group think that the GNSO has a process of planning and setting priorities? I'm not suggesting that that particular example is a good one, because there would be differing answers, but there could be differing answers. And so I think we need real clarity around what it is that we're actually answering for. If I'm answering on behalf of the Registry Stakeholder Group, which is why I'm here, and I'm answering for the Registry Stakeholder Group in respect to what they do, their planning and setting priorities, that's fine. But I don't understand how that contributes to the question whether the SO is efficient. Because the mere fact that the Registry Stakeholder Group self-assesses itself as efficient, and in fact all the constituent parts of the GNSO may self-assess themselves as efficient, that does not mean even remotely that the GNSO as a whole is in fact efficient. So that's where the confusion lies, I think. I hope I'm clear. I know what I mean. But others may be confused.

LARISSA GURNICK:

No, Chris, this is Larissa again. Thank you. I think you're being very clear. And this conundrum, if I may call it that, the question that you pose, I think is one that probably deserves a lot further discussion. I know when we prepared kind of an approach to be discussed with all of you and to think about how to facilitate this process, this question keeps coming up. And, for example, even in the sense of a survey, right, because we're imagining, as ARTR3 imagined, that once there is some sort of a framework to assess it, there would be maybe, you know, tactics, tools to gather information. So a survey, but a survey of whom? In your example, survey of the different volunteers that comprise all of the GNSO, survey of its constituent parts, who is serving whom and for what purpose, which is essentially the same question that I think you're posing. I don't believe we have an answer. I guess it would be a great topic to further discuss and kind of come up with something that has meaning. And I see that Alan's hand is up and Alan, Cheryl, and others that are very experienced in this, too, I would be very grateful to hear your input. This is an area where there is not a clear-cut answer, but what I think needs to happen is, however it's approached, it should be prioritized for what's most important.

So in your example, Chris, if there is a sense that's what's most important is to look at how the constituent parts of the GNSO fit together and whether together they work efficiently and effectively, if that is the biggest priority, then that should probably be the focus. However, if there is also a sense that no, the way the constituent parts are organized and what they do and how accountable they are, and I'm just kind of saying things just as an illustration, if it's the component parts and how they fit together, that there is a sense that that really

needs to be examined further because somehow it could contribute to the overall effectiveness of the GNSO, then maybe that should be a priority. I hope that helps. Sorry, Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, and I think my comments follow on to what you were just saying, Larissa. Chris mentioned ALAC and saying this doesn't seem to fit the GNSO, but it does fit the ALAC. I'll give you a bit of history. Maybe Chris, maybe that isn't what you said, but I'm going to continue anyway. The ICANN bylaws say the ALAC should be reviewed, the committee. We have, in the implementation, taken that very flexibly, let us say, in that the first At-Large review, the rest of the At-Large RALOs had just been created, and we basically said forget them. We will look just at the ALAC, but it is an At-Large review, and we cunningly changed the title from an ALAC review to an At-Large review. This last time around, it was all of At-Large.

The reviewers in each case essentially cherry-picked the things that they thought were going to be important at that time, and that's where I think we are going in a different direction from how the reviews did it. We are looking at five principles, some unknown large number of criteria, and a much larger number of indicators. That fans out to be a huge number of things, and if we had been doing a review instead of this, again, there would be much more cherry-picking, much more focus. And I think in the continuous improvement program, we need that flexibility to decide which of the items are we going to look at and where are we going to put our focus. If we try to do everything at the bottom of the tree, we are creating a huge paperwork or electronic

paperwork effort and not necessarily going to really attack the problems. Nowhere are we asking, what do we need to fix? What's broken? And ultimately, that's what our continuous improvement program should be targeting at. So I think by articulating this detailed structure, we end up creating, I guess, a morass that's going to make it very hard to focus on the issues that will really help us. Thank you.

LARISSA GURNICK:

Alan, thanks for that comment. And just to kind of make sure that I, that we're all hearing you, I think that the task is to prioritize what's important, right? So maybe what we need to make a bit more clear is that not everything has to be examined and not everything has to be developed to the degree that this proposed framework is laying it out. And I think Sherwood has mentioned it today. If not today, I know we tried to incorporate this in prior presentation. The choice should be up to the structure of what areas are prioritized. So it's not a matter of doing everything because clearly not everything is important. But it does kind of focus the question for each of the SOs and ACs and the NomCom to really determine where the areas of greatest opportunities are and how to address the overarching principles and the criteria so that using Alan's word cherry picking, cherry picking may come across as you only pick the things that, you know, for whatever reason are selected for some reason. Maybe a better way to think about it is where to focus your limited attention so that not everything is examined and worked on. Because the question of what should be worked on first, a matter of priority, should definitely be a matter of priority and focus. So the fact that there's all these principles and criteria doesn't mean that you have to work on all of them, assess all of them, improve all of them.

That's the point that it's up to you, not the independent examiner, to determine where the greatest impact will come from. I hope that that helps.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

And just wanted to note we do have a few more slides to get through, about 15 minutes left. So Seb, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. Two points. The first one is in part of the recommendation from ATRT3 and particularly, I guess it's about the satisfaction survey, It's clearly written that SOs and ACs that are composed of substructures should apply to their individual substructure and the result of all substructure shall be aggregated to generate a result for the given SO or AC.

And I guess the idea was really to go into detail. Just to take one example, and I know it's difficult to rewrite the history and to do it again. But just Chris, consider that if we were in 2002 and having in front of us the DNSO, how we can create the GNSO and the ccNSO? And it's, I guess, some points could be to discuss how we can evolve the substructure to something different if needed. And then the continuous improvement program, it's also for each of the substructure.

And my last point, I would like very much to discuss once again the overall calendar of all that. It seems that we, at least I have expressed some concern about how it's set up and I would like very much to have time to discuss that in depth. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Sébastien. We will indeed go over the work plan momentarily. Chris,

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, I'll be very quick, because I think what Sébastien has just said and in fact Owen's response to my question in the chat kind of focuses the point. I appreciate Sébastien's point about what the individual parts of the structure should have to say. But I think where I'm heading is that the individual parts of the structure should have a say in respect to the structure. So I think where I'm heading is what we're looking to continuously improve in this process is the GNSO. And that the individual parts of the GNSO's input into a continuous improvement process is in respect to the GNSO, not necessarily in respect to what they do as a small group within the GNSO. The Registry Stakeholder Group is perfect. It has its own continuous improvement methods, doesn't need to do anything else. That input isn't helpful or useful. What's useful is, in respect to the GNSO, is what we think we should be doing. But I think I understand that that's what we're talking about, and I'm happy to work on that basis.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Chris. Indeed, the previous organizational reviews of the structures did review the overall structure and their component parts, similar to the GNSO. So as the representative to the Registry Stakeholder Group to the CIP community coordination group, you would be discussing with that group this process and this approach. And

this would be how the group fits into the overall GNSO. So thank you for the clarifying question. And we do have to move on, but Sébastien, if you want to make a quick comment.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, quick comment is that we, if we have no problem with what Chris just said, but for the other part, and for At-Large, it must be At-Large and not ALAC or the RALOs. What we are all working on, it's to evolve At-Large. I know it's not written anywhere where it's At-Large, but it's something we need to take into account. Yes, that's my point of view. It's why I am here. It's to express my point of view. And definitely the 15 people from At-Large, it's not equal to the GNSO, but it's equal to the GNSO. It's At-Large. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Seb. And we'll move into the next slide of this presentation, please. Thank you. So this may be helpful putting this further into context. This discussion has been really helpful to have some clarifying questions for the group. So this is a snapshot also of the work plan for the next steps for the community coordination group and our development of the framework.

As you see on the screen here, the phases of the work plan so that your community groups have an understanding of what the group is progressing steadily towards and when they can expect to hear from you. So phase one has already occurred from January to March of this year to champion the work of evolving organizational reviews. The Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group was

launched in January 2024. The group has made substantial progress toward developing principles for the ICANN Continuous Improvement Program, which will provide a common base for the assessment of the different ICANN community structures. The principles stem from Article 4.4 of the ICANN bylaws that describe the objectives for organizational reviews.

Phase two in April, which is the presentation today, the community representatives are going to your groups to inform them of the progress of the community coordination group and your work to date, including the work on the principles criteria indicators approach for the draft framework, how the framework will be utilized in the first assessment phase. You can note that there are ongoing community coordination group meetings every two weeks and you'll be providing regular updates to your group through 2024.

Then phase three in May and June, once the community representatives have informed your structures on the group's progress on the principles criteria and indicators approach and how the process of the Continuous Improvement Program will work, you'll then organize a working session with your community structure or group and to gather their feedback on the criteria and indicators for the framework.

Please note that in June, there will be an ICANN 80 Policy Forum, which may provide opportunities for the community volunteers to engage on the work on the draft Continuous Improvement Program framework and for the ICANN Org reviews team to engage with your groups on the progress and facilitation of this work. And the community coordination

group meetings will refine the input from all the community groups during your meetings in May and June.

And phase four in July and August, the group would reach consensus on criteria and indicators applicable to your organizational structure. And the draft framework will eventually be published for public comments estimated later this fall at 2024. And if this work can advance faster, we will certainly bump up the timeline for the public comment. Yes, and I see your comment in the chat, Chris. We will be sharing the slide deck with the list soon after this call. And then next slide, please.

So this is the final slide for the presentation. So finally, before opening the floor to your comments and questions for your group, please share these resources with them on the Continuous Improvement Program and the important work of the coordination group. And thank everyone for their time and attention. And I'd also like to display, Jessica, I'm not sure if you have it, the talking points document. Oh, and Irina, I see your hand up.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you, Irina, for the record. I have a question with regard to five principles. Do we consider them like fixed and approved already or there is still place for adjustment of the principles itself? I don't recall like we all signed on that these five principles is what exactly we want.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Irina. Great question. So, as the volunteers, the representatives for the community coordination group, you have

discussed these and are representing your community structure. This is an integral part of the terms of reference for the group as well, is that you're relaying the discussions and the developments of the community coordination group to your community group or structure. And so the work thus far has been focused on these five principles. And so this is a great point in time to discuss them with your community group. And if they have significant feedback, we can take that into account. So this is a good point for you to get the input of the group. But these are the five principles as has been discussed and developed by the community coordination group so far.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you. And is there any deadline to finalize at least and to fix at least these five principles?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

We would request that April is a great time for all the representatives to discuss with your community. So after this meeting, we'll be incorporating some of the feedback and the questions that we've received into the slide deck and talking points. And we'll distribute on the list the resources and request that all of the representatives talk to their groups in April to collect this feedback. And then we'll convene in May on this information. So, sorry, I hate to be rushed, but I'll certainly follow up after this meeting. Thank you.

So you'll see on the screen here, this is the related talking points document, which has everything we just shared verbally with you for reference in your presentations. It also includes areas where you can

insert your community group affiliation and name and links you can share in the chat. And please note that we also have a frequently asked questions section prepared for you, which assembled questions that are frequently asked about the continuous improvement program and the ICANN community. That's on page eight of this document, I think. And you're encouraged to gather your community group's questions and feedback on the work thus far, including the principles.

So if we could go back to the work plan slide in the document, thank you, or the slide deck that we were just showing. Thank you. Yeah, actually, slide 13 would be great. The previous slide. Thank you. So, we would like to revisit the overall work plan for the community coordination group and have a pulse check on the progress thus far. We recognize you're all juggling a lot of work in your day-to-day roles in your community group. So please note that in order to give time for each of you to engage with your groups, we are planning to skip the next community coordination group meeting scheduled on the 17th of April. This will give more time for you to gather input and schedule time with your community groups to present on the work thus far and gather their input and questions.

The next meeting would then be on the 1st of May, and we would extend that session time to 90 minutes. As we can see here today, there's a robust discussion. We want to make sure we get enough time in, and we can utilize Jamboards to gather input and inform the next phase of the work plan.

So for any other business, just a reminder to please bookmark the workspace to evolve organizational reviews into a continuous

improvement program, linking to all the community coordination group meetings and resources. And should you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to the review support and accountability team. And after today's meeting, we'll incorporate this feedback as noted from the group on the presentation today and distribute both the slide deck and the talking points with the frequently asked questions on the list, serving as a resource for your presentations to your community groups in the coming weeks in April. So we look forward to hearing from your groups on this important work of the community coordination group in May. And with that, I'll turn it over to Larissa, if there's anything else you'd like to say, or we can close.

LARISSA GURNICK:

Thanks, Evin. Yeah, I just wanted to kind of remind everybody that I see that we're out of time, but I do know that Sébastien wanted to discuss next steps or a calendar. So perhaps this could be shared on the list or I'm not quite sure, but just flagging that Sébastien had a point. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you. Yeah, sorry for that. Great point. As we've discussed here, these are the next phases, but after the community discussions in April, on our next agenda in May, we'll revisit the work plan for the group and the timing and cadence of the meetings and what the rest of the calendar year looks like. We can have that on the agenda. Thank you.

Well, it is the top of the hour, so thank you all again for this really robust discussion and great questions and we will incorporate the feedback

into this presentation and distribute it on the list. And we really appreciate your time and work on behalf of your community group. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]