

JESSICA PUCCIO: Hello and welcome to the continuous improvement program meeting today. It's Wednesday the 15th of May. The time is 20:00 UTC. My name is Jessica Puccio, and Yvette and myself will be your Zoom coordinators for this meeting. Attendance for this meeting will be taken by zoom and posted on the weekly shortly after the call. Today we do have some apologies. We have Alan Greenberg, Chris Disspain, Damon Ashcraft, Justine Chi Chew, Lori Schumann, Manju Chen, Santanu Acharya, and Wisdom Donkor. We would like to remind everyone 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 Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks so much, Jessica. Appreciate it. And just noting in terms of the attendance, as always, we'll be distributing the Zoom recording after each meeting and the meeting report. So hopefully everyone can catch up ahead of the next meeting. And thanks all so much for being here today.

So during the last meeting on the 1st, we heard from many of you about your engagements with your groups in April on the five draft principles and work of the community coordination group thus far using the prepared slide deck and resources. We have a longer agenda today to continue those discussions, including sharing whether there are any challenges and opportunities to obtaining input and any best practices to share with the group here today. And continuing with best practices, the representative to the ccNSO, Sean Copeland, has graciously accepted an invitation from us to present to the CCG today on the

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.

ccNSO's engagement and thought leadership on continuous improvement. We hope that this will be an insightful discussion on best practices for working with your groups on continuous improvement, particularly as we begin the next phase of the project for input on draft criteria and indicators for the draft framework and progress.

And lastly, we also have some time for discussion of the community coordination group's overall timeline for work this year, including key dates for milestones and related deliverables. We circulated the timeline in advance of this meeting, and we look forward to hearing all of your input on feasibility and how ICANN Org team can support you in getting things done.

So before we go into the first item, I also just wanted to let you know that we received the translations of the slide decks and talking points of the April presentations for the principles as requested. And those, the slide deck and the talking points have been translated into all five UN languages, and we've placed those in the collaborative Google Drive for your use. So we hope these will be helpful to you in engaging with your groups now and even going into the ICANN 80 policy forum.

So with that, I just welcome everybody and unless there's any AOB for the agenda, I think we can move into our first item, which was just giving some extra time on community feedback thus far. So I don't know if there was anyone who wasn't on the last call who'd like to share any insight from their groups on the work or any questions, challenges. Please feel free to go ahead. Tijani, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Evin and hello everyone. First of all, I apologize for last time I had a health problem. As for the NomCom, I had continuous feedback from the NomCom leadership. I made the presentation for them that you provided and I customized it to the NomCom specific piece. We worked on the principles and we have a single point for principle number four, speaking about internal stakeholders or internal constituencies.

You know that the NomCom doesn't have internal constituencies. So we propose to change constituencies by structures. This may fit with all SOACs and the NomCom. I don't see, for example, for the RSSAC that there is internal constituencies in the RSSAC. I think it is the same for them also.

I do agree with the proposal to modify principle number four as was proposed last time. We also worked on the criteria. We started working on the criteria for all the principles and we have already a first draft. When we reach the stage where we have to share that, I will give you our funding. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Wonderful, Tijani. Thank you so much for this input. I'm really glad to hear the engagement with NomCom leadership and great progress there thus far. Indeed, there are several groups that do not have subgroups and this is important feedback. The NomCom is also distinct from some of the other organizations in terms of their role, in terms of them not having a role in policy advice or development. Thank you for this really important feedback. Very appreciated.

We have the draft principles on the screen. I'm showing principle four. We could perhaps remove NomCom from this principle wording and share this update over the list. Of course, this can be adjusted relative to each organizational structure that does or does not have subgroups. Cheryl, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't support removing it from the principle at all. I would support changing the principle to not necessarily be so specific internally to its stakeholders. NomCom is absolutely accountable externally to the wider ICANN community. It absolutely fits with part of principle four. We may have to wordsmith principle four to be more encompassing in language that allows the internal accountability to be enshrined for the ACs and SOs. But I definitely don't want to see them not to principle four. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Great point. Thank you so much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with that.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Tajani, thank you. We'll make note to do some suggested revisions for the group's determination. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Thank you. NARALO, we did finally have a time to discuss it. We've formed a small group which will be looking at the various aspects starting with the principles. We are not anywhere near finished our work. Hopefully, we will be in a week and a half or so before your end of May deadline. I do want to note, however, that two thirds of the groups represented in this organization are not here representing SOs, ACs or NomCom.

Accordingly, I could easily say that none of principles one to five apply to us. Or we could change principles one to five to actually apply two thirds of the groups that are here. So I think the intent is that all the principles talk about ACs, SOs, NomCom or the constituent units that are here. And they should actually say that. But we'll come up with a formal recommendation before we finish. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Alan, for this input. I'm glad to hear NARALO is engaging on this topic. And we look forward to more input as you finalize with the group.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will point out that at some level I prefer to leave the principles alone and we have no work to do. That was said tongue in cheek.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Alan. Thank you for that. I see a couple of hands up. Caleb, please go ahead.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yes, so I have a question for Alan. Are you proposing that the structures, which take, for example, I am aware that NCSG and NPOC within NCSG is clamoring to have a little bit of representation on the NomCom and stuff like that because they are not currently supported by the current bylaws. Are you suggesting that that should not be the case? I'm trying to have a clear understanding of what you're saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: Having spent eight years sitting as the liaison to the GNSO, I have lots of opinions of what should be done for the GNSO, but I wouldn't dare to comment in this forum. All I'm saying is that if the RALOs or the seven constituent parts of the GNSO that are part of this group, the CIPCCG, if we're supposed to be working on it, then we should be mentioned in the principles and not ignored. That's all I was suggesting. If you want to talk privately about whether NPOC should be represented on the NomCom, I would be glad to have that conversation.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Well, given the fact that I'm representing NPOC, it's just a case. I will continuously make that we would like to have a representation on that on NomCom. So just put in for the record. Thank you. Over to you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Caleb and Alan. I think Erum's hand was up before Cheryl.

ERUM WELLING:

Yeah, okay. Sorry, Cheryl. You can go first if you like. But so just to, now that I'm looking at the principles, sorry I missed the last meeting. But looking at principle four, especially with its focus on stakeholders, I just wanted to mention that towards the end of April, there were six sessions of the RSS, the root server system governance working group, which is all about continuous improvement. There were six sessions here in the ICANN location here in D.C., particularly focused on identifying stakeholders.

So again, the GWG governance working group's primary focus is to make the root server system more transparent, the activities related to it. And as part of that governance revamp, we're looking at who are the stakeholders, who are the primary. So you've heard of the RACI charts, right? So we're truly defining stakeholders and then doing basically almost like a RACI chart against them to see to what level they need to absolutely be part of the process.

So I just wanted to mention that since it just happened to be six sessions and it happens to relate directly to principle four, I thought I just mentioned that real quick. Thank you so much.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sure. Thank you so much, Erum. That's a great update to share with the group and exciting to hear the use of the RACI chart as well. That's very handy. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. I popped into chat while Alan was speaking, and it was literally a flip off the top of my head, some language which may have met his issue that he was representing on behalf of one of the RALOs. And so instead of internally to their stakeholders, the suggestion from me was the structures of, in brackets, where applicable of the SOAC or NomCom.

But listening to Erum, it would appear that I would prefer to modify my proposed language to be internally to its stakeholders or structures where applicable in brackets of the SOAC or NomCom. It picks up the constituent parts, which Alan mentioned, and it makes quite clear, as Erin has represented, that the terminology stakeholder has meaning and good meaning going forward in many of the areas, not just our work in ICANN, but in similar spaces in the Internet ecosystem. So I think we can, again, we can wordsmith that to work. And of course, that language, stakeholders and structures, or just and structures where applicable, can be knitted into each one of those principles to relieve the risk that the constituent, not constituencies, the constituent parts of the various SOs and ACs are feeling they are either going to get away without doing the work or having these principles not apply to them. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Cheryl. We'll make note of your wordsmithing and we'll share this as a consideration for the group's input. And I see Naveed's hand up. Naveed, please go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah, thank you, Evin. And hello, everyone. Yeah, I remember this discussion from ICANN 79 as well that we tried to define why there is an SO AC and NomCom in the principles per se. And I had the understanding that these are not literally meaning SOs and ACs here, but a general way of talking about all the structures within ICANN. And I got a feeling as an answer to my question on the same issue that as the representation of the CIP is suggesting that all groups and structures are represented, so it would mean that all these constituents or constituencies or structures, whatever we say, are part of that. But I still support having some kind of terminology, some kind of wording that we have that should be applicable to all of them. Right.

So apart from that, I just wanted to update from the RSSAC perspective because I attended the last meeting and what I promised is that we are going to have a session with the RSSAC meeting. And we had that. So I just wanted to report on that, where I presented on their meeting in 7th May. So I had a detailed session with them around 35 to 40 minutes. The presentation went to the RSSAC group. It was an internal meeting to the RSSAC members only. And I presented to them all the principles, the meaning of criteria, the need for having indicators and all of that.

So their general questions were around the timeline of this continuous improvement program and when this is going to be applicable, specifically the indicators, like the indicators that we don't have at the moment. Once we create them, when we are going to apply them, are we going to just talk about creating them right now, developing them and not applying them so they will be applied during the improvement program that is supposed to be kicking off next year? So these are the general concerns or the questions from the group.

So what we agreed upon is to create some working sessions with the RSSAC members themselves, a number of sessions. So for first of them, we already started a poll having the availability and the voluntary participation of the group members so that we could work on defining specific criteria as well as the indicators. So that's the update. I am seeing at least a couple of working sessions, at least one of them before ICANN 80 and then we will see how it moves forward. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Naveed. That's wonderful to hear these updates on the engagement and so glad to hear there are working sessions already being scheduled by the RSSAC. That's great and good timing in terms of the questions for the timeline. I'm sure you were able to provide some feedback to them, but today we'll also go into greater detail on the timeline and how this fits into the next step. So thank you so much. And Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you, Alan Greenberg. Just to be clear, SOAC and NomCom are in those titles because those were the groups in the bylaws that organizational reviews applied to. Even in the bylaws, it was wrong because ALAC should have been At-Large, which is the superstructure around it, just like the GNSO is the whole structure and not just the council.

But nevertheless, and yes, as Naveed said, we could say that those three words will be interpreted to mean the larger group, but since this is

going to be for a larger group of people to work on, let's be clear and let's say what we actually mean and not have a secret code. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Alan, for clarifying comments. And Marco, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

MARCO MARTINELLI: Thank you. I just wanted to give you a quick update with regards to the IPC. We finally got the chance to go through the material. The topic was presented to the group. And we also will have a separate session, and I believe we will collect the input in written form from the other members in the upcoming weeks, hopefully before the June deadline. That's that. [inaudible].

EVIN ERDOGDU: Wonderful. Thank you so much, Marco, and I also appreciate Lori's note to the list as well on those updates. Great. It's wonderful feedback. Was there anyone else who recently engaged with their groups and obtained input or maybe had further feedback follow up from their April or May presentations? Hopefully we didn't miss anyone. If not, thanks so much. I think we'll then move into our next item on the agenda, which is Sean Copeland has graciously accepted to walk us through some exciting continuous improvement activities that the ccNSO has been undertaking. So, oh, and I see Benjamin's hand is up. Actually, we could just get Benjamin, please go ahead before we move forward. Thank you.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Apologies for reacting very late. I represent NCUC, Noncommercial User Constituency, and I took the opportunity to engage the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group, which is the parent body of. Manju also represents that group in this meeting, but she's not ... So the bottom line is after sharing some of the principles and everything in brief, Caleb also supports my presentation, my short presentation.

So the team, the community requested for maybe we should organize a webinar to make them really get the gist of the working group to know. So I'm just saying if there's a webinar train moving around, there's a request for it, but it's on us to present to them in more detail for us. I mean, me, Caleb, and the rest of us, but it could be faster if there's a train going around that can stop by and just present for my team. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Benjamin. That's great to hear it. Just to clarify, is it they were interested in having the CCG provider webinar or was it just certain representatives within your stakeholder groups?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Well, they wanted the knowledge to understand so that they can engage and contribute and give us feedback every time we asked. Who should present it or what wasn't of importance to them, is kind of get clearer understanding. Yes, we've shared mails, we've shared content, I've done presentations, but I mean, people still ask for these things like, oh, give us the capacity, let's understand it more. So I'm just giving back

the feedback that I got from the most recent engagement with the community. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much. Appreciate that feedback. And I see a note in the chat from Amrita as well. And actually, Bram's hand is up. Please go ahead.

BRAM FUDZULANI:

No, thank you so much. I think I just wanted to echo what Benjamin was saying. So we also had from AFRALO, we did a presentation to the community, but I think there's a lot of maybe unlike other constituencies, there's a lot of you'd call it knowledge gap, which of course, the representatives that are in the working group need to obviously work with the leadership and try and raise the awareness. But I think there's a lot of if you really want to get the input, as Benjamin is putting it and the members to engage is to try and build more capacity.

We've also tried to do what Amrita is saying, to request the leadership from AFRALO to give us more slots so that we can engage with members and really walk through the principles so that they understand. Recently, we were just doing the elections and I think some of the candidates that were meeting the community were asked the question of whether they understand the continuous improvement program and what is their view, for example. And I think the response from the potential candidates indicated that I think there's a gap. So perhaps I just wanted to support the idea of the webinar, but I think we could assess how many constituencies or how many of us or within the

communities would actually want to have it. And then maybe we can combine so from AFRALO, NCUC and just have a combined sort of a webinar and then engage the committees to those kind of webinars. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Bram. That's wonderful and actually is a great segue I think to Sean's presentation as well as hearing that you're looking to collaborate more on how to obtain input and discuss continuous improvement within your groups. So thank you so much for this. And yeah, without further ado, I think I will hand it over to Sean then.

SEAN COPELAND:

Thank you so much, Evin. Thanks you guys for [inaudible] up the clock because if you know me you know I hate to speak. And thank you Yvette for the comment on the slide cover. Just for background, what I did for that, it was done with AI, I will admit that. I took photographs that I had taken from the room in Hamburg, put it in, laid out all of the descriptors that I wanted. Somehow or other, that is what AI decided the background or backdrop of Hamburg looked like.

So anyways, what I want to talk to you about today is our experiences within the ccNSO in terms of open space technology and the World Cafe. We have been using these now since Hamburg, but we started working on these, oh gosh, I'm going to say six months before we did Hamburg, we started to get really intense on the planning process. And there was a combination of people in the staff and people within the

community that were working on these. So talk a little bit about that. If you want to flip over to the slide, I guess. Sorry, I'm not used to the slideshows. Anyway, so yeah, so we'll walk through a little bit about open space and World Cafe. And hopefully you guys will learn a little bit about these methods. And we'll go through it, kind of do a bit of interactive QA, because as I said, I don't like to speak. I'd like to hear everybody else speaking. So we'll see how that goes. Next slide.

So for me, I'm putting open space technology first just because this was the one that I was very much involved in the setup and process, the planning. And this was an intense type of session. It was very, very different than what we had done previously within the ccNSO. And the intent of this, as well as the World Cafe, was to find a way to engage membership, to get people involved, thinking about subjects, thinking about topics and bringing it to the table. And we had no idea how effective or ineffective it was going to be. And I'm happy to say that the results of it were really good for us.

So what it is, is it's a method for hosting meetings where participants create the agenda. This is very different than what we normally do, where we sit around in a work group or we sit around a council, we sit around with the staff and we define an agenda. And then we practice everything based on that agenda. And it's kind of there's a show and a flow and everything kind of works because everybody kind of knows what they got to do, when they got to do it. And it gets information out. But the flip side of it is it tends to be, to be honest, a little bit boring. And you watch people checking their emails and everything else like that when you are, up at the top of the panel, we'll say.

So what this means in terms of creating the agenda is that this creates a meeting that is self-organizing. This is very different than, again, how we normally do things. And to make that work, you got to find a central theme or idea that is going to be galvanizing for your community. And then of course, you have to encourage people to want to participate. So these become different points of concern versus a typical meeting setup.

So when you're thinking about that, think about some of the traditional meeting formats that you have done in the past and what challenges you see in them. Or alternatively, do you see no challenges because you've gotten used to doing things in a certain way? So you're thinking totally within the box. What these are about are thinking outside of the box and how that will engage membership. Next slide.

So with the open space technology, and I will tell you being in technology, many times I want to say open source. It's one of those things. There are four principles and the principles are pretty simple, but it defines how this is going to function. The four principles are whoever comes are the right people. Whatever happens is the only thing that could have. Whenever it starts is the right time. And when it's over, it's over, which is kind of very different, right? You think about it, like even today, we have a schedule, there's a time block. We're going to do this, then we're going to do this, and we're going to do this. That's how we normally structure a meeting. We understand that it's linear. This is entirely different.

So what ends up happening here is that you get people coming together into creating a marketplace, if you will. They put up ideas that are

related to a theme. And then there's sort of a bid and an ask between people to organize the subjects that are going to be talked about. So think about going into a market in Istanbul, for example, and you're haggling. It's the same sort of process. And you might wonder, well, why would that be a good idea, right? Because we want to get this done.

Well, it turns out that your membership, they actually want to be involved, and this gives them an opportunity to be involved in a way that is actually humanizing, if you will. It's how we communicate. And it has the unusual effect of getting those of us that don't like to speak actually to be involved. And that's a beautiful thing, because what ends up happening is you get more diverse opinion, and you learn a lot about your membership, and you're able to get new points of view, and that's really valuable.

So the open question to you is, how do you think these types of principles would affect your current meeting? Like, how do you do it? Like, would it be strange to you? Would it be something that you would be excited to try? Think about that. And then, next slide.

The last part of the OST is something called the law of two feet, which is you are free to move around whenever you want. So you don't have to stay stuck in a single topic. You can move around. You can go outside. You can come back. You can do what you want. And strangely, what happens there is, again, because people have that freedom, they actually are more willing to participate. And it was really interesting to watch this in Hamburg, because you saw, like, there was a couple topics that a few people went to, and then they dispersed. And then there was a couple topics that were pretty involved. And one of them actually

went over the two blocks that we were given for doing this, which was amazing to watch. So when you see that again, you are seeing your organization the members of the organization actually wanting to be involved.

Now, a little bit about this in terms of the virtual sessions. It's a little bit different, because naturally, as we're doing now, it's harder to do logistics and to figure out how to make this work effectively. So about another two months of planning went in to make it work online with the use of breakout rooms and having people have the mobility to experience as close as we could what was happening in person online.

So there's some knowledge there that I don't know how to disperse it to you quickly in terms of this session, but we do have some knowledge between the people that were involved in planning and the staff, that if you guys ever look to do something like this, more than happy to answer questions that you may have. So next slide.

So for the OST process, you start out with an opening circle, and that's kind of where you set the stage and explain the process. As Irina and Cheryl will know, this was my first time ever doing something like this. So it was a learning experience for me. But the whole entire intent of it is you want to surprise people, if you will, like you don't want them to come in and have, this is what's going to happen, this is how it's going to be. You want it to be as blank slate as you possibly can whilst connecting with your audience. So you find a connection that works for you, that hopefully also works for the people that are there to bring it all together, and then you give them an explanation of what's going to happen.

So the first part of that is, after you've explained what the theme is, and you personalize it in some form or another, is you go through the process of creating the agenda. This is done with the marketplace. So people, as I said, they bring up their ideas, they put them on pieces of paper, sticky boards is what we did. And then you allow the people to negotiate the process in terms of the marketplace.

When they do all that, they end up actually now having an agenda that they have created with the topics that they want. There's no time limits in terms of OST. In terms of ICANN space, there is. And then what happens is people break out into their sessions and they go off and they do their work, if you will. And it's happening in real time. So there's a recording of what's going on. And in terms of ICANN land, this meant that there were staff there to actually be taking notes, just so that the people that were within the community could participate easier.

And then at the end of it, you kind of go into a process where you're getting people's feedback and how they felt and so on and so forth. And when you do that, because you're asking people how they felt, what their emotional connection was to this process, it changed how people were feeling about the session and what was going on with themselves internally and with the topics that they've been talking about.

So there was a general positive energy, positive vibe coming out of a two-block session, which was pretty incredible because usually coming out of a one-block session, we're kind of all tired. That's what happens. So curious if any of you guys find any of that intriguing or interesting, maybe, maybe not. Think about that though.

So then this brings us to the World Cafe. Next slide, sorry. So the World Cafe is the other format that we have done. And we've done two of these now, or sorry, we've done one offline and online, and we are doing another one of these in Kigali. So this is a little bit more structured than the open space technology format. And I would argue to you that ICANN would probably like this format versus the OST. However, I see you're nodding your head, Cheryl. I love the OST. I, it's all good.

So with the World Cafe, because it's a little bit more structured, there is a semi-defined agenda. So you have a theme, but then you have some feeder topics to get people into a more specific mindset. And you break it up into smaller spaces. You will have facilitators within the space, within the tables. And they will ask questions to the people at the table. For us, what we did is we had partial people who had very scripted questions and carry forward questions. And we had other people who are more able to talk off the cuff, if you will, to create a different dynamic and to also be able to have more facilitators, just because the volunteer situation is such that only so many people do, right? And so you have to accommodate those people.

Then what happens is every 20 minutes, 30 minutes or so, people rotate around the tables to deal with different questions related to the same topic that other people have already dealt with. And you kind of put it together. The facilitator builds off of what the previous people had done. So you end up with a different result than OST, but again, you end up with a more refined result and a more interesting result than what you get purely with just doing a work group scenario. So as I said in the last item, the harvesting of the collective knowledge, because that's really what it is. It's here's a topic and here's everybody's opinions and

ideas and getting people that are not usually being involved, involved. So of course the question then, and you can, I think Cheryl will say yes to this one and Irina will, have you guys ever participated in a World Cafe before? Oh yes, says Cheryl.

Anyways, so the key principles, next slide. And the questions on the bottom of the slides are just kind of for you guys to think about where we're going along. And then when we get to Q&A, you can pummel me, it'll be good. Key principles of the World Cafe is, as I said, it's kind of more defined. So there's this, you set the context, you create a hospitable place. So you create a place where people literally feel like you are at a coffee shop, having coffee, talking with your friends about a topic. That's the environment you're wanting to create, which again is very different than what we normally do in ICANN land.

The exploring the questions that matter, that's the feeding of the questions and defining them a little bit. But at the same time, because people that are coming up with the questions, you guys know the material, your ability to do that is there, is possible. Obviously you want to encourage everyone's participation. That goes without saying, that's the whole purpose for doing a continuous improvement type tool such as this. You want to get people engaged.

So then to talk about cross-pollination and connecting diverse perspectives, think about a little bee flying around, during the conversations and things like that. And again, it's just to get people with different ideas in the room talking. And it works. We saw that work incredibly well in Hamburg and we're hoping that it will work well for us in Kigali as well. And then you're looking for patterns and insights and

you actually get these in the results as they're being produced, which is also an incredibly interesting thing to see because in a sense, you're taking, in the ccNSO, I would say two or three, four months of work group sessions and you're shrinking it all the way down to the session. And getting the same work product, it's incredible. And of course, once everything is all done, you share what you've learned.

So the World Cafe process, next slide. As I said, in some setting the stage, which is the introduction context of what you're doing, the small groups that you're going to do, six to eight people per table in our community, the cross-pollination, so people again can move around, which is good. And then at the end, they call it harvesting. So in OST, it's a sharing circle and in World Cafe, it's harvesting. It's the same idea that was sharing your ideas, how you're feeling, summarization of insights. Again, very different than typical ways of doing meetings. So next slide.

So the similarities are both of them are participant-driven. Both of them are to encourage open dialogue and both of them are focusing on outcomes, emergent outcomes. The differences is the OST is less structured. That does make it a little bit more difficult than ICANN world, but also much more exciting to pull off. And the World Cafe has a rotating discussion format, which means, as I said, people move from table to table, building up on a subject, whereas with OST, here's a subject, here's the people that are interested in it. They go through it, they exhaust it, they're done, they move on, two entirely different methodologies. But you get really good results from both. So next slide.

So as I said, we did this in Hamburg and the OST, funny enough, was on continuous improvement. And the World Cafe was basically on the next

20 years of the ccNSO. So we did it obviously in person in Hamburg and then we followed up with a virtual session because to be able to do these in the ICANN world, we have to be able to do it online as well. We just haven't figured out how to do an online and in-person at the same time. So there's going to be a lot of logistics to figure that out just because of the nature of the beast.

Yeah, what I want you guys to take away from it is planning, planning, planning, think [inaudible]. It takes a lot and it takes a lot of dedication to get this right, in my opinion. As I said, we started about six months earlier and we it's not just, here's the hour a week call that we're doing on it. There was background reading, background talking with people, background research, just a lot. As Cheryl knows.

So in the planning, of course, you can you're defining the theme that works. That makes sense. The support mechanism logistics, kind of both—support in this, I'm talking about ICANN staff because you kind of have buy-in from staff and you have to have buy-in obviously from the membership that are involved.

Logistics is a wide variety of things. Getting a room set up for either of these sessions is difficult. You're setting up a room in a way that is not typically done within the ICANN environment. So that's going to take a little bit of training, if you will, and compromise, but it can be done. We pulled it off. Yes, lots of real estate. We took up a pretty large room and I know in Kigali, we're taking up, I think the tent that's outside, which will be interesting. And then of course, invitations for both. That's how you get your membership and people such as yourselves excited to come to a session that you might not otherwise go to. So there's a bit of

a hook to it. And then dry run. We did a couple of dry runs on this. You know, so as I said, planning, planning, planning. Just to answer the question, it was the morning block. So it was from 9:00 to noon with a 30-minute break is as I remember it. So two and a half hours, about. And I wanted more, just so you know. So next slide.

So the benefits and challenges. So the benefits are greater engagement by your membership. That was decidedly apparent. A richer discussion. Holy cow. It was, if you watch people that have never spoken, never raised their voice, basically wallflower people, being fully engaged and being animated and alive. And wow it's just, it's incredible to see. And innovative solutions, different ideas. And seeing that and being able to say, okay, let's test that. Let's play with that. It's an entirely different sense. And funny enough, for the people that have been quiet now they want to be more involved. And for those of us that are the doers, it's always nice to have a little bit of breathing room given. Volunteer fatigue is a real thing.

So your challenges. Requires skilled facilitation. For some reason, I was given a mic on this one, so I don't know why. I would say there are courses that are out there. You know, I seriously looked at trying to get a course for Kim, one of our staff who's moving out of the ccNSO. And I had to take a course just because she's very good. For me, she's a good staff support person in terms of continuous improvement and playing with these things. And I had talked with Bart and got permission for her to be able to attend training, but then getting it near her house is very difficult. So anyways, I will say outside of this, and Evin, this is for you. We do the leadership training. If continuous improvement is something that we really stick to, it'd be really, really nice if I can look at bringing in

people to teach people within the community, the facilitation process, so that we have skillset, not just within the community, but also with staff. Just putting it out there.

And of course, the format may be unfamiliar to the participants. So you've got to kind of play with it and be open to whatever type of comments and criticisms that you're going to get because people are just wanting to feel comfortable with what they're doing and want this to work. And that's the thing that I really like about it. So anyways, next slide. Anybody have any questions? Feel free to slaughter me. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

First of all, a question. Later on, I might come back with a comment. As you know, I'm a fan of all of these sorts of things at any form of workshopping, any form of communication, but I also like a well-structured effective agenda when that's fit for purpose. So there is a fitness for purpose test that comes in here. How did you find your audience, your membership, the ccNSO members, were able to understand why this approach was going to work for this activity? Some people don't like change, as you noted. Some people like things the way they are because that's where their power structure is. But how did you flip those, or didn't you flip those, into trying this model out? Because as you also noted, you have to actually want to be in these activities. You're not made to be in these activities. And is that a risk for later buy-in? There you go.

SEAN COPELAND:

Okay, multiple parts to that. Let's see if I can do this. Okay, so within the ccNSO, what we did is we broke it out so that the GRC itself was doing it, so that it wouldn't be the entire ccNSO, but we invited everyone within the ccNSO to participate. So that was kind of the risk that we were taking, that nobody except for the GRC would come to the session, then it would basically be a GRC session. And we also have people that were invited outside the community as well. And we were happily surprised that people within the ccNSO community, but also externally came, right? And participated and that.

So for the first go-around, Cheryl, it was entirely, let's try this thing, let's see what happens, because you can't go wrong with trying, right? You know, as I said, our fallback was, well, it'll just be another GRC session. So then what was your follow-up to that one? I missed it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It was about the risk of when you get the outputs, the buy-in for those who were not involved. It's great to have this wonderful output, but you've got to sell it somewhere. It's got to be uptake.

SEAN COPELAND:

True enough. Well, that's where the invitation came in, right? The pre-selling. The invitation is really, really critical. And we spent four weeks on the invitation for the one in Hamburg, and Evin got to participate, and Larissa, as we were working out the logistics for the invitation for the one in Kigali. It's a lot of work. And you got to get it as right as possible. There's no question. It's, you're advertising, right? So that's very different than we're having a GRC block. It's from nine to 10.30. If

you're interested in rules and procedures that's very exciting to people, I know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maybe to you and me, my friend, but not to most.

SEAN COPELAND: I know. But on the other hand, tell them that we're talking about voting, and the reason we're talking about voting, of course, has got to do with membership engagement, and because we want to improve the membership engagement, and getting that all [inaudible] into a way that makes people excited. Well we're getting there, and it's our hope that we will, besides the regular people that I know will be there, that are always there, we're hoping that we will get a higher turnout from the general ccNSO community, especially people in Africa that aren't normally attending, and that will be, for us, very exciting. Benjamin, go ahead.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you, Sean. And I'm not far away from Cheryl's question, but I'm just going to put a little twist to it to say, have you had an opportunity to evaluate the outcome, and to see maybe what you got now, beyond the fact that additional voices came in, it's more valuable, more qualitative than what you used to get. That's one. And then also, maybe I didn't get this clearly from Cheryl's question and your answer, that I saw a picture that is shared nowadays, [it's more clean.] Now, some persons might just [delve] in their own conversation, and maybe output

that comes back does not align with, I mean, we always have a predetermined, an idea of what we want the outcome to be in a way. How do you now match all of that? So my first question is quality. My second one is, how do you stay in line, or on focus with this kind of—because some group can just go on joking, or laughing, and then come up with something. I'm just saying, I'm not saying that's—but how do you ensure that people stay in line, and stay focused on the topic of conversation? Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND:

Sure, thank you, Benjamin. Okay, so for the output that, because it's happening immediately so it's transcribed immediately, you are able to review it, go through it really, really quickly. And in terms of the GRC, and what we've taken away from it, we've already been able to act on some of the recommendations from the community as a whole, if you will. And we've been able to fit other things into our working pattern. And we've also been able to be mindful of some of the concerns or issues that people have brought up that are touching some of the subjects that we are looking at. And ultimately, I would like to see, and Irina can throw something at me if she wants at this point, I would love to see this type of situation evolving throughout the ccNSO. How it will happen in Irina's group, in terms of the SOPC, I'm not sure, because about the only thing that's dry as policy and procedure is accounting. It's one of those things. But if there's anyone that could pull it off within the ccNSO, it's Irina.

In terms of keeping focus, that's actually a really good question, because you think that people will go off and start talking about a soccer game

or football game, hockey game here in Canada, I suppose. That's not what happens. People actually stick loyally to the theme, and then within that loyalty to the theme, will deal with a subject matter that they are actually interested in, and they'll move around to go to where it is that they are actually interested in. So they actually police themselves, which is really, really different, but really effective for the work output and getting really good results. So I hope that answers.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you, that did. So you didn't need to do any buy-in because they already almost got sold on the ideas, right?

SEAN COPELAND: Yeah, I would say that the invitation is really, really key. And as Cheryl says, the people that want to be there, they're there, they police themselves. And if they don't want to be there, they leave. And that's not a bad thing, right? Because if you're not interested in a subject, you're not going to have a lot to contribute just because you're not interested in it. You know, I hate to say it that way, but it's true. Any other questions? Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not so much a question of the process about it, but a question more for you because you're someone who's trying to improve the way, the modeling choices, the way communication is done, and the way that it's done. And I'm just wondering if you could talk a little bit the way the modeling choices, the way communications can happen, at least within

your part of the ccNSO. Do you see this as a one tool in a toolkit or a solution to all our problems at either end of the spectrum? Do you see it universally applicable at all levels? Would you like to see it universally applicable at all levels? I mean, I think you know where I'm coming from on the answers to all of those questions, but I'd like to know your, because you and I are very, very different characters, let's face it, okay? Put you on a stage and you'll manage because it's your job and you'll get through it. Mention that a stage might be built and I'll be on it, right? So we are at the other end of the spectrums, right? Yeah. You don't like talking, you can't stop me under wet concrete, but how we approach things is not that much different. So I just want to know from your very personal perspective, where you see this fitting into the bigger ICANN scheme of things. Thanks.

SEAN COPELAND:

Sure, okay. So personal perspective, this all goes at the end of the day to volunteer and volunteer burnout. For those of you who do not know, about 20 years ago, I was involved in a group here that kept our hospital running and operating. And it was a non-partisan group, it was the largest one in the Commonwealth to ever do something politically non-political. And somehow or other I was, I don't know, I was on the council, the board of that, so on and so forth. And unlike in ICANN land, we were doing eight hours a day of meetings as volunteer over a two-and-a-half-year period. So volunteer fatigue, it was real, absolutely real.

And when I look at continuous improvement in terms of this, I look at each of these as different tools in a tool belt and that different situations will require different mechanisms. Saying that, in terms of a

grassroots organization, a Postellian worldview, these two tools happen to be really effective for supporting that concept of grassroots. Will it work for all issues? Probably not. Would I like to see more of these used though? Yes, absolutely. Ever since we did the OST for the half morning block, I've been really wanting to have us do the OST for the entire ccNSO, like the two-day ccNSO session on a theme and kind of change how we interact with our working groups and kind of do it as, here's our different things from each working group but then do it from such a way as to market, if you will, those working groups for people that are not actually involved necessarily to get an exposure to it and bring them into that. Because the volunteer rate within the ccNSO is running probably about five percentage points lower than what you would say a normal volunteer organization would. So in our community, burnout is a real possibility and I don't want that.

In terms of the wider ICANN community, it would be interesting to see a session like this done across all of the groups. It would take an immense amount of planning. But it would be an incredibly interesting experiment if we found that one issue, if you will. And I'm sure that that one issue does exist. There are a couple existential things that come up every once in a while in terms of ICANN and funny enough, those would be beautiful for this. That's my personal opinions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I can just respond very briefly, yes, you need a good threat to get that whole thing happening. Invasion from Mars is a great way to get solidarity type stuff, okay. I love these more inclusive methodologies. I am a great supporter of pretty much all of the non-profit organizations

that are doing this. I am a great supporter of pretty much any form of workshopping, as long as it's fit for purpose. And there are some really good purposes and some really right times. And time is the operative word here because you've mentioned how much planning it takes. And I've also popped into chat, ideally how much time should be committed to these blocks. And you're already working on the smallest end of the success likelihood spectrum. So if one is going to choose to do more of this, then we need to do it well, not just give lip service to it because it sounds good from a bottom up, multi-stakeholder model ticker flip box thing, right. It is something that can be very, very effective. And there's a whole lot of variations on the same. Some of you who've used [inaudible] pick a proprietorial name of online, or heavens above whiteboards, butcher paper, and the tools you use in these things. They bring a lot of the benefits of these models, but it's more useful for some situations than it is for others. But it doesn't mean there's aspects of this, these two tools in particular, that you can't always try and build in even to a highly formalized agenda, you can build in more inclusivity. So it's a great set of learnings that can happen from experiencing these things. So I'd really encourage anyone who wants to work on improving in their continuous improvement program for the component part of ICANN they live and work in, to consider these kindly and to learn from the experiences of the ccNSO. It has my absolute support and I love to play anyway. But by the same token, when you try and pull off the same thing with a group of CEOs and members of boards, it's not the same game. But you can apply by the same rules with a different setup, right? Different hooks, different comfort builds, but the same actual mechanisms coming into play. And I can tell you about some of those some other year, buy me a drink and I'll tell you the story.

But I also want to remind you that you can get a huge difference between what happens in these really inclusive, really dynamic, really productive mechanisms and then making it happen at an implementation and approvals level. And I just want to share a very brief story of me working through interpreters. So I'm in English, everyone else is in Vietnamese with two levels of training for the Ho Chi Minh Postal and Telecommunications Authority. It's just a business. But there was the managers, middle managers and above given a whole training course, brought out to Australia, a lot of work done, lots of this dynamic stuff, brilliant outcomes. Then we brought their bosses out for a shorter course. So for very good reasons, they could understand each other so that the bosses understood what the middle management were being encouraged to utilize as tools of their trade when they went back to their workplace. The difference in honesty and response of what you get when the bosses were on site versus when they were not on site was instructive is all I can say.

SEAN COPELAND:

It's a feature, Cheryl. Going back to my hospital days, I remember when we were doing a campaign and I went down to work with the people that were stuffing envelopes because I would. And one of the ladies, she looked at me after about 15 minutes and she goes, "Mohammed came off the mountain," no offence to anyone. But that was what her comment was because there I was sitting on the board up there, but you can't expect people to do without doing. And maybe that's part of having been trained at McDonald's many years ago when that was the job that you did at school. You do everything and that's it. That's sort of my background. So any other questions or comments?

Just one little thing. So in terms of these tools, because there are logistics that are interesting in terms of pulling these off, I'm hoping that as each group comes along in the continuous improvement process, that collectively we can create, if you will, a unified lobby group on the logistics for some of these events to be run more effectively when we're in live sessions. Just a small ask over time. So think about that.

Yeah, my last thing was just a couple of tips for people. If you wanted it, these are different things. You guys have used Mentimeter, they work really well when you're doing the virtual sessions, the breakout rooms, coordinating that, practicing that, practice. If you guys are going to do this and you're going to do it online, really practice with your staff support the use of the breakout rooms, because that'll make it or break it in terms of the virtual space.

Infographics, real-time examples, stories, what have you, anything that's going to interest people, pull it in, make it as personal as you can. Within the ccNSO and Cheryl and [inaudible] will know this, to kind of tie it all together, because I was quite nervous doing it. I used an example of an encounter with a bear, right? Just for me, that kind of pulled it together. It's a strange example, but it worked.

And then again, between open space and World Cafe, with open space, you hold space as a facilitator. You're there as a touchstone for people to feel, oh, I'm safe, but you let them do the work. You are silently there. And then in terms of World Cafe, and also really OpenSpace, be prepared. And of course, that goes back to what I said, start the middle and throughout, planning, planning, planning. It takes time. For every outsider reading and all the lots of, I would say I spent about 50, 60

hours in preparation easily for the open space. And for the World Cafe in Kigali, I'm sitting at about 25 hours now, just on the planning along with the staff. Like, it's a lot, but it's worth it. So that is the end of my comments. Evin, I will give it back to you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sean, thank you so much. This has been such an informative and helpful presentation. And I can share, just from the staff perspective as well, we're happy to coordinate and share resources with the team. And from being there on the ground, as you mentioned in Hamburg with Larissa and Jason, I personally observed that the energy shifted in the room significantly and ideas were shared or heard from others that hadn't participated before. It can sometimes be hard to measure and maybe it causes some ripple effects in terms of culture change for continuous improvement. So this is really helpful. So thank you so much. And also took a note about your suggestion for a third party to bring in someone to help the community with leadership skills and facilitation. So we'll be looking-

SEAN COPELAND:

In tandem, like don't get rid of the current program, like in tandem. Just saying.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Got it, thank you. Yeah, we can maybe share the slide deck on the list as well and follow up with additional resources. And thank you again so much.

SEAN COPELAND: You're welcome. Thanks you guys for putting up with me for the last hour or so.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Great, well, so we do have about maybe 15 minutes left in the meeting today, and we wanted to go over the work plan and timeline for the group, which includes milestones for this calendar year. This was a request from the last meeting. So on this slide, thank you, Jessica, you'll see the overall roadmap for the continuous improvement program. We've shared this with you previously, and it's also been in prep week webinars for the reviews program. The 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 CIP framework in progress. And the results of these CIP assessments will inform the eventual holistic review.

In June, 2025, the ICANN board will evaluate the progress made thus far towards evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program pilot. So we want to demonstrate significant progress by then, and the public comment will help to that end. And the work of the community coordination group is to produce a framework for this program and the overall implementation of ATRT3 recommendation 3.6 will continue under the first CIP assessment. And as noted during the

last meeting, ICANN org is now engaging a third party, third parties to help develop the survey for this assessment utilizing the framework. So if we could go to the next slide, please. And this next slide is new. Thank you so much.

Okay, and hopefully you can see the calendar dates and time. So this is specific to the work of this community coordination group within the overall continuous improvement program roadmap. And as you'll see, we have the proposed timeline with key dates for deliverables, the milestones that need to be achieved in advance of public comment this year. So kind of where we have been right now, and just last month from the 3rd of April until the 29th of May, we are obtaining, requesting that the CCG volunteers receive input on the principles. On the 5th of June, our next scheduled meeting, we're hoping that we can finalize these principles with the group's feedback.

And from the 5th of June until the end of July, around the 24th of July, the community coordination group volunteers can be organizing a working session with their community groups if you have not already—some of you have already started—to gather feedback on the criteria and indicators for their group. And of course, Sean's presentation was very helpful in terms of a format for maybe a really good collaborative approach with your groups.

The 7th of August, we would hope that the community coordination group can finalize criteria and indicators, and ICANN org would be engaging with the survey developer during this time. And from the org side as well, we can provide another slide deck or jam boards to support your working sessions with the groups. This can be done in time for the

5th of June meeting. So we'll prepare resources as done before. And we can also attend your meetings as needed and support as appropriate, however would be most helpful.

And the 21st of August, ICANN org would be beginning preparation for public comment proceeding, including a template and materials for the CIP framework. And the community coordination group can begin more actively socializing beginning in September. And so we're looking at then the 4th of September through the 16th of October, the engagement ahead of the continuous improvement program framework, public comment and ICANN 81 annual general meeting, including an ICANN 81 prep week webinar. We would finalize the survey and do some beta testing with third party developer where needed. Some groups are kind of ready to try this out.

And the 30th of October, it's not yet confirmed, but we're anticipating that'll be the ICANN 81 prep week. We can finalize the public comment proceeding ahead of the AGM, continue engagement and socialization through ICANN 81 and through November. ICANN org again will prepare supporting materials. And then we're hoping soon after ICANN 81, by Thursday, the 21st of November or so, we can open the public comment proceeding and it has to be open about 40 days. And in light of holidays and closures, the staff summary report is anticipated the end of January or early February. And so we're thinking then that by the 8th of January, early 2025, the community coordination group can convene to address any input on the framework as needed. But we're of course all hoping that this would be supported generally by the community, especially with the advanced engagements and socialization.

So I hope that this is a helpful snapshot. And if we could go maybe to the next slide, please, Jessica. So this was a previous slide that we've circulated. It just articulates the different, the four different phases for the calendar year. This should all be in your prepared materials already. Next slide, please. And then these are the key dates, just basically what I shared verbally right now. So that this can be a helpful reference for your work and communicating to your groups as well, what the expectations are and if this is feasible and how we can help you get this done. So I think that concludes this overall timeline and we're really eager to hear any input or reactions to this. We did circulate. Oh, thank you, Jessica. There's actually one more slide. Thank you.

So this is also the schedule of meetings. And of course you all have placeholders on your calendars. The highlighted dates are 14:00 UTC, but we've just also highlighted the relevant CCG meetings for when we would anticipate these milestones to be achieved. So hope that this is a useful resource. And with that, I guess I would like to leave the rest of the time for any questions or discussion, reactions from the group. So please feel free to comment. And maybe we could go back to the main, the second slide with the, yes, this one. Thank you. Sébastien, please go ahead. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. There are no change taking into account our discussion during the last meeting. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks very much. We received the feedback to share more information about key dates and deliverables. And given the ongoing work for the representatives and volunteers to engage with their groups, given that April through end of May has been the first iteration of the principles and then the subsequent would be criteria and indicators and the engagements that have to happen, we are hoping that this is a reasonable timeframe. And we know many of you are attending meetings in Kigali and elsewhere. So I hope that this is a reasonable timeframe. Amrita, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Evin. As in the new timelines do help us to understand more and work. So thank you for this. It gives us more clarity. I just had a question. And I think Cheryl also mentioned in the chat as in broadly, if I'm talking from APRALO perspective, the principles look fine, the broad principles look fine, but would the changes which are being discussed in the wordings by when do you expect it to be made if fifth is the deadline for us accepting it? Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Amrita, for your question. A great question. So just given the feedback today during the meeting, we have some suggested wording from Cheryl and others specifically for principle four. We can circulate this on the list intersessionally between our meetings. And we still have a couple more weeks and hoping that we can have some agreement by the 5th of June. But we can circulate this information on the list. We don't have to wait for the next meeting to make those

updates. Wonderful, thanks. Are there any questions or reactions from anyone else? It's a busy timeline. Oh, and I see Tracy made a comment as well in the chat. I'm not sure, Tracy, if you'd like to share this comment or... And oh, and I see Sébastien's hand is up in the meantime.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Which one is that one? Which comment is that? Sorry.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Oh, sorry. It was the one I think just shared a couple, maybe five minutes ago about logistical challenges, language barriers, remote participation. But I think it was in response to maybe the last item. So sorry about that. Maybe it wasn't related to this item. All right, Sébastien, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, sorry to insist and to come back to the same thing. You didn't move the CIP assessment period one. I will stop to discuss anything about the planning if you don't want to have any change, but it seems that during the discussion last time, we may wish to change something. And at least it's the At-Large perspective that we need to start as soon as possible the first assessment period. But if you have the key and you decide by yourselves, that's okay. And I will shut up. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Larissa, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

LARISSA GURNICK:

Thank you, Sébastien. This is Larissa Gurnick for the record. So we did take into consideration the discussion that was there last time, where I believe you made the suggestion that the assessment period can get started immediately effective July 1st. And there were some other viewpoints shared at that time from other members of the group as to whether that would be feasible and the value of continuing the process of developing the framework. So it was a good, robust discussion. In terms of staff, our reflection of this timeline actually did incorporate something that came out of that discussion, which we articulated last time around, which was in order to test out some of the ideas for the survey and things like that, we're planning to pilot and kind of test things out with those groups, such as the At-Large or others that may feel ready to test out the framework and the questionnaires sooner before the public comment proceeds. But the general sense that we gleaned from the discussion was that there was value for the groups to continue with the work that they've been engaged in to see the framework all the way through and put it out for public comment before the assessment begins. This is not a decision that the org is making by any stretch of imagination. This is really a question for this group to discuss further to see if there should be modifications to this timeline. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Larissa.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, it will be the last time, but we just need two groups to start the 1st of July. We don't need anybody else. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you. Oh, Cheryl, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I'm all, as you may have noted in chat, as I was last week, I am still supportive of working with a survey, third-party survey developer, and that some of our entities might be in a better position to act in beta test and get started earlier. And I think that's a fine, fair and reasonable thing. But having at least the job of bringing the perspective of the ALAC specifically into this particular fora and working now for a couple of weeks in weekly calls, so these are intensive pieces of work, with representatives of the current ALAC, I'm unsure that a July 1 kickoff, even for that entity, which I would proffer as one of the more ready to run in a CIP model than others I am aware of, is actually going to be attainable. I would think a September slash October might be more likely, but that's just my feeling. They may have a rush of blood to their heads and I might be astonished in next Monday's call. So I guess what I'm saying is let's not get ourselves too tied up in the specificity of the beginning or end of a particular quarter, but rather say that the opportunity is there for an earlier kickoff for at least one or two, and the suggestion is two from Sébastien, of the entities, if at all possible. And that certainly has my personal support and I have not floated that with the ALAC small team. It's just an off the cuff comment.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Cheryl, for that feedback and Sébastien as well. And I see Larissa has a comment in the chat actually directed to Sean. Sean, I'm not sure if you would like to comment on the timeline in light of the work that the ccNSO has been doing.

SEAN COPELAND: Thanks. I mean, can I come back on that? I mean, there's what we're doing in terms of this, but then there's some other things that we're also doing that are kind of coming up to this. And then we have a real habit of taking summertime off and we kind of get a better, I'll have a better idea of what we're looking at after tomorrow, after we have our council call tomorrow. So I don't want to say one thing and then find out tomorrow that it's entirely impossible for us for whatever reason.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Sean. And Larissa, please go ahead.

LARISSA GURNICK: Thank you, Sean. I didn't mean to put you on the spot. Just considering how thoughtful and advanced we know some of your work has been, I just thought that you might be in a position where we'll take feedback from you and anybody else as this progresses, perhaps at the next meeting. So I think just to summarize, and we're probably over time, if I'm not mistaken. So just to summarize real quickly, we understand that there is a good reason and good support to move this forward as quickly as possible. And yet to do that in a way that respects the process, the

intent of ATRT3 recommendations and all the work that's currently underway.

So this roadmap is just that, it's a roadmap. It's a way to think about what could happen, what needs to happen in time for the public comment proceeding to open so that we can garner support for the whole community for the framework. I certainly welcome input from everybody in connection with Sébastien's proposal and idea, and we'll continue to work on the third-party provider to help with the survey, beta testing, as Cheryl commented, and anything else we can do in terms of staff support and facilitation to make this happen easier and more effectively for all of you, we're happy to do, but ultimately the roadmap has to be something that works for the community as a whole. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND:

If I could come back to you, Larissa, just for consideration, so, or to understand the thinking process and why I'm holding back. So because we're doing the session in Kigali and we want to do a follow-up, well, we have to do a follow-up. We're obligated to do a follow-up that's virtual. We actually are not looking to doing the virtual into September, maybe even early October, just because of what happens within our community over the summer months. So that's the logistics. It doesn't mean that we can't be involved and Irina and myself are not going to be available. It's just getting it all timed right, the logistics for us, that's all.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Sean. And Larissa, I appreciate your feedback and consideration of those logistics. And thank you for input on the timeline. I know we're a few minutes over actually. So just wanted to thank you all again for being here, participating in today's meeting and we'll be circulating these resources presented over the list. And also just wanted to plug, since our next meeting is on Wednesday, the 5th of June at 14:00 UTC, there will be a reviews program webinar during prep week. So we encourage you to please all attend and see the latest updates for reviews and the community's work. So thank you so much. We'll share more soon and see you soon. Thanks. Bye everyone. Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]