

Room: US Virgin Islands

Scribe: Joke

Topic: cross-SO/AC and how to track

Round 1

Topic: (suggested by Sebastien). Can we improve the relation between ccTLDs and At Large structures in the same country?

- *How this could work in practice*

Closer collaboration in each country between the respective ccTLD and the corresponding at large structure. Room for improvement in some countries. ccTLDs can even help to have an At Large Structure. How can we improve? How can we work together at the level of the country? Could be useful for At Large, but also for ccNSO, to have a better relation with users in some countries. Perhaps the ccTLD is not contributing to the work of the ccNSO? In that case, the At Large structure could potentially be of help.

- *How does it relate to CIP for ccNSO?*

If this topic refers to the way things could happen in each individual country, how does it relate to the CIP for the ccNSO? No real answer to that question.

Round 2

Topic: (Suggested by Sebastien). How to enhance the working relations with other SO/ACs?

- *Methods for breaking down the silos: Liaisons*

Network of SO/ACs? Instead of silos that have difficulties in working together. Some work is already happening: liaisons appointed. Change of liaison with At Large. Perhaps also for other SO/ACs changes upcoming? At Large has liaisons with GAC, SSAC, GNSO, ccNSO. Is using liaisons a good way to enhance the relations? Is it working? If yes, can we have more? Liaisons might not have the same role: Some are embedded in the work of the other SO/AC, some are more of an observer. Organising meetings, discussing topics as an alternative.

- *Relevance to SOACs*

How does this relate to the CIP for ccNSO? This is a truly important question, which each SO/AC should address.

- *ccTLDs do this on a daily basis. Learn from how and what they do*

The utility/benefit/diversity of the ccnsO membership and cctld community. Very specific experience. E.g. business activities that would benefit from CIP and review processes. Wealth of valuable ideas and experience to share. Leading by example. Hopefully having strong

influence on harmonisation points to be developed. Reference point for other SO/ACs. Opportunity to come together in order to do that. Working in silos: is easy to understand why that happens. Awareness of what is happening across so/ac needs to increase.

- *Methods for breaking down the silos: Other*

Liaisons are a method. But occasional free form conversation is valuable too. Example: something like this session. Inviting non ccNSO people into ccNSO thinking. Not sure what, but something.

Plenary sessions on one single topic, all together. Difficult. Liaisons, a group of leaders Would be an improvement. Would be good to know for At Large how At Large is working, how ccnsso is working, and vice versa.

Optimising outcomes and learning from each other. Therefore you need communication. Opportunity at plenaries is good. If they are interactive, rather than informational. CIP is often about review analysis and workshops on improvement. Not necessarily a plenary format. Plenaries might be part of the program, but breakout sessions might be more appropriate.

- *In developing a CIP, community input is important. No top-down approach from ICANNorg*

CIP means to involve organisational improvement. Identify working groups within each structure, opportunity for leaders to meet. Communication is emphasized across the groups and that is helpful to all groups.

Harmonisation of CIPs. ICANN wide benefit form this. Disability sector: with and not without. Often external advisors coming in in the past, for organisational reviews. Not useful. Time for more gradual but solid improvement to occur. Design is not with the community. If not developed with the active parts of the community, it will not be valuable. Tempting by ICANNorg. Specific skills from the ccNSO community: they do this in the real world all the time. If they do not do so, they would not be successful.

Round 3

Topic: (Suggested by David). How to track Continuous Improvement steps from other SO/ACs to see if we want to replicate?

- *Learning from each other, have open communication channels*

In the previous rounds (Puerto Rico and American Samoa), this was discussed. Good idea. Regarding the CIP: it is important that each SO/AC has a relation with all others. We can learn from each other. Actively participate in committees: showcase what they do, for others to learn, and vice versa. Value of cross-pollination. Liaisons should pay attention to good working groups, to good thought methods.

Regarding how to track CI: ICANN org set up a "cross community" WG. exchange what is happening in each SO/AC.

- *Composition ccNSO Council, Nomcom appointees: something to review?*

When ccNSO was created, ccTLD managers wanted to be alone. Business constituency representatives who have different TLDs, who have good experience, and help with enhancement of the ccTLD. 3 NomCom appointees. Idea was to have people from the business world, to bring experience to ccNSO. Can we imagine tomorrow replacing the 3 NomCom appointees by liaisons?

Interesting idea. Despite having been actively involved in ccNSO work for years, not aware about the history regarding Nomcom appointees. some have been effective, some have not, from the perspective of someone that has not been a part of the ccnsso council. Do we want to talk about it? For GRC to consider.

Requirements for NomCom appointees reviewed on a regular basis by the ccNSO Council, Requirement to be not be associated with cctld, to avoid capture. Composition Council determined by the ICANN bylaws.

Potentially something for discussion in the holistic review.

