Round 1
(Continuously) Identifying Area of Needs and Improvement

The conversation began by stating that avoiding conflicts as much as possible is a continuous improvement. It is a timely opportunity in bringing the continuous improvement project, and an opportunity for ccNSO to lead and influence the important work that goes on at ICANN. We currently look at what Continuous Improvement activities are being undertaken within each of the SOs/ACs.

Have we identified new ways of continuously improving the ccNSO? ccNSO can lead in the next steps by working alongside other silos. Captured the date of what the other grops are doing would be useful and important information for next steps and it should include harmonization or best practices - building a better model across the various component parts of ICANN where there is a set of more unified expectations. A question that ccNSO should consider when doing next steps ought to be "and then what".

The word "continuously" should be used as the word is the key for a continuous improvement system to work. If something is identified as needing improvement, then it can be highlighted and handled immediately or as soon as possible rather than waiting for years until all the items are handled.

It's important to take care of issues as they are identified (the solution and way to improve may be very focused changes) as opposed to what happened with the reviews. The experts came up with a very long list of recommendations that it worked against the recommendations being implemented as the amount of work was overwhelming.

The extensive third-party reviews were quite astonishing that it led ALAC and At-large community to reject the reviews; none of the recommendations were taken as other than advisory on what ended up being a first step of an internal process. The ALAC and At-Large were going to do their own thing about the recommendations. They realized that they were able to do what they thought was best which is now described as the continuous improvement program.

Is "communication" the key. Is it "lead by example"? What is the methodology that we can possibly use?

There needs to be a way to make people aware that at any time they can point out issues that need addressing, that there is a mechanism, and that there is an open invitation for coming up with these issues. There needs to be results so that people will know that the efforts they put into pointing out is not wasted and that it will be acted upon. We need to make it

manageable. We in the ccNSO must recognize that there are people who are interested in how ccNSO works but are running businesses –- and some are small businesses without resources. We kind of relied others showing us a good way of doing things and hope others will take the best parts of that and see if they can deploy them themselves. That needs to be continued and strengthen but has led us to isolate ourselves in terms of that influence with the rest of ICANN and how ICANN operates. There is an exception -- the influence that ccNSO has had on how finance and budgeting is done. The years of being very active in being involved in those ICANN wide processes, being involved in committees -- hard working committees -- has paid off. It would be a shame for ICANN wide continuous improvement programs not to benefit from those real-world experiences and the diversity of those skill sets that ccNSO members bring.

The genetic diversity that ccNSO brings to ICANN is very important because without that ICANN does basically one thing: gTLDs. There is one way to do that with one set of rules; but if we look at ccNSO there are hundreds of different ways, and some may be done better than how it is currently being done. There could be a lot of good ideas to implement.

Round 2

Developing Metrics and Tools for Measuring Improvement

The things that need to be improved can measured numerically or qualitatively or a mix of both. The questions to think about: Where do we want to be? What do we want to measure? And how

If ccNSO wants to launch an awareness program, we need more volunteers; and we would probably measure the number of volunteers and not quality; while quality is important, it would be more difficult to measure. How can we know we are where we want to be?

Not only measure results but the process – such as tasks – is it timely? does it involve all kinds of communications? Regarding surveys, the results may not be what we are looking for, but the process is correct. At times when we go by measurements, we tend to focus on things that are easy to measure and may be overlooking more important things that are difficult to measure.

ccNSO is a place for ccTLDs to exchange information and help each other. How do we measure that? Do we measure the difference in how ccTLDS participate in various sessions? Measure the exposure of quality of our ideas of ccTLDS? How do we measure the ideas that come outside of the sessions among the ccNSO members? Conversations that happen among ccTLDS?

A measurement that ATRT3 reported was the satisfaction of members. We must measure their satisfaction by asking the right questions – such as, are you happy? Yes, happy. Not too happy, but still happy. The idea was to ask the questions annually – which might be too often for us, but still needs to be done. It's a tool that we can use.

How can we get more members to participate in the surveys. ccNSO surveys participants at every ICANN meeting to measure what the MPC put in place. The number of responses is between 15 and 20, compared to the number of participants. Is the process boring? How can we get more people to participate? Keep them in the room until they complete the survey? Or use newer techniques such as a digital service so that the participants can complete it at that moment. We can't force people to complete the survey; only encourage them to provide feedback.

Is it the size of the survey? If it's too long? The size depends on what ccNSO is surveying. Our goal might be to gather information, so it may have to be a little long.

How do we gather information from the attendees?
Do we survey the number of participants? That alone doesn't provide enough information.
Do we survey how involved are the participants?
Give gifts as a thank you for responding? A technique that marketers use.
Chocolates? Provide the gift after completing the survey?
Prizes can include a ticket to the ccNSO cocktail event; or a lottery ticket to enter a contest to get a slot to present at a ccNSO meeting.

How about getting help from AI – ChatGPT – using AI to summarize the survey; create pictures -- a funny picture. Make the survey activity enjoyable for people to want to complete the survey.

It can be as simple as those surveys at airport bathrooms – rating the cleanness of the bathroom; happy face – clean; upside down frown, dirty bathroom.

We can launch the survey at the end of the meeting, to be completed before they leave the room.

Launch the survey immediately after the council meeting; before people start to break. This is how it used to be; we can find a way to make it more animated/exciting. This is what ccNSO has been doing.

What do we want to measure?
Processes? Where do we want to be with the processes?
And how can we improve; who is our target audience?
The working groups? The full ccNSO?

We measure things that not everyone participates and are still in continuous improvement. We review our councilors, which helps the councilors know how they are being perceived by others and to have a 1:1 with the reviewer to learn where there is room for improvement. We have learned from that process and have received suggestions on how the council meetings could improve.

We may wish to evaluate how to improve working groups? Ask whether they have reached their maximum? Are they perfect? Those are the types of questions we need to ask: what do we measure and how.

We can't compare one group to another – as they are different, and we can't measure time; we can't measure number of documents created? The shorter the document, the better. Although it takes more time to prepare a concise account of the dealings.

We can ask working groups how are they doing. Are they happy to a part of the group? What's their dislike? What could be improved?

We had external examiners for the ccNSO reviews. What if we would have external examiners from other working groups review other groups? Do they need improvements? If already efficient, the working group might share their best practices with other groups.

What about sharing of ideas? We do well by sharing ideas. Is there a way to measure? Do we need to measure everything? No, we do not.

It would be wise to beef up the liaisons' relationship among the SOs/ACs. Beef up the job of a liaison. Find out which working groups are working well, get to know the liaison and invite them back. Like what the ccNSO chair is doing with organizing the registry stakeholder working group meeting with the ccNSO at ICANN79 – a good thing; we just need to beef up the liaisons.

Round 3

Community members did not attend round 3.