

JESSICA PUCCIO: Hello, and welcome to the Continuous Improvement Program meeting. Today is Wednesday, the 26th of June. 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 do have apologies from Chris Disspain, Christelle Vaval, Damon Ashcraft, Natalia Felina, Nenad Orlić, and no longer, Tracy Hackshaw. We would like to remind everyone that this call is being recorded, so please state your name clearly for the record before speaking. And now I'll hand things over to the project manager, Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thanks so much, Jessica. And hello, everyone. Evin Erdoğdu speaking. Thank you all for being here today at the end of June and just after the ICANN80 Policy Forum has been completed recently. I hope for those of you who traveled to ICANN80 in person, that it was a productive and engaging meeting in Kigali, Rwanda.

During the last meeting earlier this month, we heard from many of you about your engagements with your groups on the five draft principles and the work of the Community Coordination Group thus far. We set aside some time today to discuss the principles to finalize them as many groups already began on the next phase of work on the criteria and indicators. As a reminder, we'll be able to revisit the entire draft framework, including these principles, criteria, and indicators in

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.

advance of the Public Comment proceeding later this year on the framework.

Aside from the discussion on principles, we'll devote most of today's agenda to updates for your groups on the work related to criteria and indicators for Phase 3, what has been developed thus far, as well as any challenges or ways that ICANN Org can support your work further. Under AOB, we can include any other business you'd like to raise, as usual. And we also have a brief update on the survey developer for the first Continuous Improvement Program assessment. Let's begin with our agenda. Jessica, would you please display the five draft principles? Thanks so much.

The redline of the five draft principles, which you see on the screen, was updated to reflect the 5th of June Community Coordination Group discussion. And in light of the continued discussion on the list and ICANN80, the due date for this action item to finalize the proposed language and the five principles was extended to today, the 26th of June. Owen Smigelski, I believe, if he's on the call, I'm not sure if he's here today. He's not here today. Okay. Well, he did have an update related to the discussions he's had with his groups on the five draft principles. We'll follow up with him to perhaps provide that update on the list. But otherwise, I see Tijani recently placed a comment in the document. So I would invite Tijani, if you'd like to speak to this update or any others on these principles, and we can otherwise then move forward to resolving them. Would anyone like to comment on these principles or have any other feedback on them?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, if you want. Principle 4, we wrote the SO/AC or NomCom is accountable internally to its stakeholder and substructures. The stakeholders are substructures already. So why mention stakeholders since they are specific to one of the SO/ACs? Stakeholders are also substructures so I propose that we remove stakeholders and keep only the substructures. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Tijani. That adjustment was made in redline. So if the group is okay with this adjustment, the Principle 4 would read as “The SO/AC or NomCom is accountable internally to its substructures where applicable and externally to the wider ICANN community.” Is there any feedback on this change? Justine, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks. In principle, I don't have a problem with just using substructures. But I would like to actually post a question to GNSO, really. Because in my opinion, the word “stakeholders” actually applies to the structure for GNSO. To me, it doesn't apply to the structure for At-Large because we use substructures rather than stakeholders. So I don't consider RALOs stakeholders of ALAC or At-Large. If GNSO is comfortable with not having a reference to stakeholders in Principle 4, then that's fine. I'm just worried that they might want to keep it there because it is unique to GNSO per se, which is why I said that it's probably should be internal to stakeholders or substructures where applicable. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you very much, Justine. I know a few of the representatives from the GNSO and their groups are on this call. I see Manju, I believe. Erum, I see your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

ERUM WELLING: Okay. Thank you. It's interesting. Stakeholders, a lot of times, it's a way to capture the concept of a broader community that's outside of yourself, but you're accountable to. I understand that there's substructures internally within a group, which is very formal, for example. But stakeholder is a broader, more like a conceptual level of who cares about me, who cares about the work that I'm doing and how it may impact them. It's doesn't even have to be a formal stakeholder. The public is a stakeholder. They may never have gone to an ICANN meeting, but they're very much a stakeholder. And if they choose at some point to show up at an ICANN meeting, then they certainly can't, right? They can register as just a citizen and participate. It's not like ITU or perhaps you have to be a sector member or government or something like that. I like the work stakeholders because it shows that we are accountable, really, to the world. Regardless of which AC or SO you are, you are accountable to the world. You may not realize it, but you actually are. I've always liked the work stakeholder because I always thought it's at a more conceptual level inclusive of a group that may not even be organized or we can think of at the point in time that we're thinking about these things. It allows for this freedom of other people to be incorporated into the mix if it's needed in the future. That's just my two cents. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you for your feedback, Erum. I see several hands are up so I'll just go in order I see them. Irina, please go ahead.

IRINA FELINA: Thank you, Evin. Hello everyone. This is Irina for the record. As I'm here on the behalf of ccNSO, my interpretation of Principle 4 and stakeholders is that ccNSO is definitely accountable, at least, to its member and broader ccTLD managers. If we remove it and replace by substructures, ccNSO does not have any substructures, so actually, we are accountable. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Irina, for the feedback from the ccNSO perspective. It makes sense. I see Justine's hand is up next, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: I appreciate what the previous speaker mentioned. I take the fact that the interpretation of stakeholders is, at the English level, a very generic way of interpreting stakeholders. I also want to point out the fact that the ATRT3 report does say substructures. I think why substructures is included is to be consistent with the ATRT report. As I said, I'm not going to die in the ditch, whether it's stakeholders or substructures. My preference is that the word substructures remain, because that is applicable to At-Large. I am only concerned that if you remove stakeholders, whether GNSO people will be comfortable with that. And I do not take the word stakeholders in its English interpretation that way. I'm looking at it from a very ICANN-specific interpretation. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Justine, for that point of clarification. I see Tijani's hand is up. Please go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Evin, and all the others. The idea is that the ICANN community is composed of structures, SOs, ACs, NomCom. All these are structures of the community. And each structure has other components, part of it. Those are the substructures. What they call stakeholders, they are part of the GNSO. That's why we call them substructures. I didn't understand the intervention of the ccNSO representative because ccNSO doesn't have stakeholders. The ccNSO has members and has Council members. That's all. Anyway, it is only to make it lighter and more clear for everyone. It is not because one component of the community has specific substructure that we have to mention the name of these specific structures as their names and this structure. For me, it is not a problem. It is only to make it clearer and lighter. That's all. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Tijani, for the clarifying comment. Irina, I see your hand is up. I don't know if that's an old hand or if you'd like to comment again. Seems it may be—

IRINA FILINA: Apologies. It's an old one.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Okay, no worries. I do see some comments in the chat. I'm not sure if anyone would like to state them, but I know that Naveed from RSSAC has noted that stakeholders could be at an equal level in hierarchy while the substructures are necessarily further down in the hierarchy. There's a suggestion to keep where applicable. Also, Manju has noted a suggestion about perhaps just saying members or substructure and members. But I'm not sure if anyone else would like to comment. Sebastien, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I don't want to intervene in this discussion, but really be careful. ICANN is not a member organization. Therefore, we have to be careful with the word we use in such a document. I don't think that we can add member as it is, that it will create more trouble. In the other hand, it's not because one substructure of the GNSO is using one specific word as a stakeholder, as when the staff decided that the word organization is for them and not for the whole organization. So with ICANN, we need to withdraw this word. If I take one example, when we have participants from At-Large in some of the RALOs are not in a substructure. They are in the RALO, therefore, directly. One way to talk about them is stakeholder because it's more linked with multistakeholder we use in ICANN and the Internet governance. Once again, I don't think it's a good idea to use member. That's why stakeholder, it's a good word to be keeping it. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. It seems there is some support to keep this raising as it is and continued comments. We did, I think, a lot, maybe 15 minutes or so to this item and I see we're about 17 minutes right now. Since there are a few comments going on and since Owen did note he had some feedback as well, I would suggest perhaps we can resolve this on the list in between now and the next meeting. We can note the comments and feedback in the meeting report as well to reflect on. I'll note that as an AI. Then if there are no further comments, we'll just move into the next item.

This is the next phase of work that, of course, everyone is aware we've moved into. We distributed an ICANN Org prepared slide deck and resources for the initiation of Phase 3 on the work plan for the Community Coordination Group. Phase 3, which is aiming to extend from this month until the end of July, in just a few more weeks, entails another engagement with your groups on the substantive work on criteria and indicators for the Continuous Improvement Program framework.

As a reminder during the last meeting, the Community Coordination Group settled on three to five criteria minimum for the groups. We know that many of you have busy schedules and workloads in addition to your work with the Community Coordination Group. So you were able to promote your work in the Community Coordination Group during ICANN80 and in the month of June so far. It's been a busy month. As presented during the 5th of June meeting, ICANN Org developed those resources to support your presentations to your groups for Phase 3. We translated the prepared resources, including the slide deck, frequently asked questions and talking points into the five UN

languages, and we distributed those as well on the list and in the collaborative Google Drive. Please use those supporting materials and outreach to your groups, however you think is most helpful and relevant to your groups.

As a reminder, there's also the dedicated workspace that many of you have already been updating and revising with your groups in the Google Drive for this work. You can use that workspace or other preferred collaborative tools such as Jamboards. Sean Copeland from the ccNSO presented on a couple interactive formats that he's used with the ccNSO on the open space session and World Café formats. There is, of course, the database that the Community Coordination Group assembled earlier this year on the ICANN community's existing continuous improvement activities. Using the objective of the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Program is to leverage work that is already underway by the community, already being progressed as continuous improvement to inform the development of this framework.

I'd like to now turn it over to the group for any update so far on this Phase 3 of work with your groups on criteria and indicators. It can be also any challenges or issues you've been facing, anything that occurred during ICANN80. I just open it to the floor. Justine, I see your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Evin. Not directly to your question. Please note that Jamboards are being taken off by Google, and I think that's effective in October. I

have received reminders to save any Jamboard resources that I have now onto another platform because if you don't do that then after October, it won't be available anymore. So far, I know that this group has been using Jamboards, so it suggests that you find a way to preserve those resources on another platform. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you so much, Justine. We've taken that from the ICANN Org side of things. We have already saved the information that this group has previously done on Jamboards. Thank you for that reminder to the group, too, because individually the different groups may be using it and not aware of that. I note that Jessica has shared in the chat as well that we're looking at various options to use instead of Jamboards so we'll share those as we are closer to that time. But we will grab those resources. Thank you for plugging that. Great.

Harold Arcos, if I may call on you. I think you had an update from LACRALO regarding the work.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Yes. Thank you, Evin. Can you hear me? It does sound good?

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Yes, I hear you.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you. As you know about the good practice, the best practice, we have the Google Docs where we are receiving the feedback from the LACRALO. Today, still we are receiving comments that we should mean that it's a good tool for feedback in our case. The good news is from the last LACRALO Board meeting, we opened a new small team focusing on CIP, obviously, our small team. According to the group recommendations on the CIP global, we have the new small team CIP. Recently, we received some proposals about that. Some members want to elevate to arise the proposals requesting accept within our CIP process, within our listed review process, accept an older person outside from AC/SO constituency. Why? They press that it's a good practice within the review process organization, on corporates, and another kind of organization. So it's an interesting proposal we arise in LACRALO. We hope the support or new comments or a new point of view within our Google Doc. That is the last update about that. Two proposals. Thank you, Evin.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Wonderful. Thank you, Harold. Good to hear of the activity in LACRALO, including the formation of the subteam to address this work. I'm curious too if anyone has used the translated resources in any other languages with your groups. We hope that's useful. That's always an option. Justine, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you. We haven't had to use any of the translations because there isn't a need to really in our APRALO anyway. Just to report back that

we've had a small team set up for APRALO to do the work on this topic, and that's been ongoing for a few months now. The progress made is reasonably good. I had an extra comment and also a question, which is that as we progress through Principles 1 to 4, and especially in regards to Principle 3 and 4, if I remember correctly, we are finding that the indicative criteria that was given to us in our own Google Doc, we're finding them to have a lot of overlap and duplication. So we are now looking at working through whether we can delete some of those or merge some of those together. In that respect, we're going to have quite a bit of changes to our list of criteria, which brings me to the question. I noted that in the CIP-CCG roadmap for 2024, there is a 24th July deadline for something. I'm just not too sure what the deliverable is expected for 24th of July. My question then is, are we expected to deliver our criteria by 24th of July?

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you for that update, Justine. Also, it's great to hear about the progress you've made so far with your group on analyzing the criteria relevant to each principle. Thank you, Jessica, for pulling up the roadmap. Indeed, it is until the end of July that we're hoping most of your groups, you can engage with them on the criteria and indicators that are relevant to each principle and each group. This began earlier in June in light of ICANN80 giving about a couple months. We're hoping then that with all the feedback from your different groups, the Community Coordination Group can then later this summer be finalizing the criteria and indicators. This is a much more substantive, intense effort with your groups because it's more specific to your groups. Thank you for flagging that. We would like to have all the representatives

provide feedback from their groups by the 24th of July, which is in about one month from now. It would be great to hear from others if they have already spoken to their groups about this or done work on this, if they've gathered input. If not, if something has been scheduled with your groups, ICANN Org is also eager to support you in any way to help get this work advancing with your groups. So please feel free to share. Cheryl, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks. Just from the At-Large Advisory Committee perspective, ALAC has also been running with a small team. It's appointed to the small team and ALAC member from each of its geographic regions. It also has the leadership team as observers. So you've got five plus three. I'm acting as facilitator and coordinator. I'm sorry. I've got another thing starting in my other ear. Apologies for that. I must say I'm also working with Justine and Amrita in APRALO. I do see what they're saying that there's a desire to be more bespoke. I see the difference between what ALAC is able to do going through. We've done some work on all principles at this stage, but I wouldn't say we're completed. Hopefully, fingers crossed, we will be by the 24th. But there is definitely a difference when you're looking at that from a perspective of an AC. I suspect that the same could be said for an SO or their component parts. I think it's when we get to how the component parts need to manage these things, we might need to have more flexibility in terms of how much they do or don't leave into their list. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Cheryl, for the update from ALAC and noting that flexibility with the work on criteria. I see Justine's hand is up again, and then Naveed afterwards. Please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Evin. As I said, according to this roadmap, we're supposed to deliver by the 24th of July our list of criteria and indicators, if that's what I'm reading correctly. I can probably say that 24th of July is too tight a timeline. I'm not quite sure what we can do about it because it affects the rest of the other tasks subsequently, right? Plus, I also don't know when you say receive input on the criteria indicators, whether the list that we are supposed to provide is the final list or not. Looking at 24th of July, there won't be enough time for us to actually consult the RALO. We've been working in a small team. And as I said, work is progressing. But at some point in time, we need to bring the work back to the RALO so that we have buy-in from the entire RALO itself. Judging from our work speed and progress, I don't think we're going to meet 24th of July. I'm not quite sure what's going to happen in that respect. I would appreciate some thoughts on that. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you so much, Justine. I'll open it to the group as well. But just to comment on that, of course, we are hoping to advance this work as expeditiously as possible. This year's roadmap is fairly aggressive to start with. We outlined these dates as guide for the groups. We know that you interact with your groups at different paces and you have different standing meetings. Some of you have substructures, others do

not. There is a different pace for you all. With that in mind, though, we are flexible, of course. The goal is to receive feedback from all of your groups on the criteria, the indicators relevant to your groups so that this can inform the CIP framework for public comment later this year. There's flexibility but—this is a guiderails for the timeline, so we hope that most of you will have completed engagements with your groups and can provide input. Then also after that time later this summer, we will be finalizing those criteria and indicators as a group in advance of the Public Comment proceeding. We just want to note too that realistically, many in the community may have a slower pace of activity in August. But we want to use all the time available to us to advance this work. Thank you for flagging that, Justine. And of course, we will allow some more time. But we hope that everyone can begin the core of this work within the next few weeks. I see other hands are up. Naveed, please go ahead and then we'll go down the list. Thank you.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Thanks, Evin. A couple of things. First is that at ICANN80, we were able to present the Phase 3 timelines and all to the group. We presented what is expected and all with the RSSAC group. We had a 30-minute presentation face-to-face with the whole group. They now understand what is expected and all. We also agreed on continuing in the small working party. We had already one session on that prior to finalizing the principles. And the second one is expected tomorrow, where I expect a few members to chip in and contribute to our drafted workspace of indicators and criteria.

One thing I would like to see clarification is that if we go for indicators that do not currently exist and that may need some mechanism to be created, now what is the expected timeline or date that we see that those processes, those new indicators should be put in place before we can initiate the CIP process going forward? Maybe we create one, we go for one. But exactly at the same time, it is not ready to be measurable. So it requires some time to do that. Just a clarification on that aspect.

Regarding the timeline, I also think it's a bit tight, especially I see from our group perspective, it's a small group and it's hard to catch up with people. Especially during this the summer, most people are either off or on vacation or something. So this 21st July is little tight for us. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you very much, Naveed, for that informative update. So glad to hear you've begun such engagements and you have more plans. To your question on indicators and the timing for implementation of your group, of course, that would be up to the RSSAC to determine implementation of indicators they find relevant to their structure. But of course, this is all part of the Continuous Improvement Program process as well that is envisioned by the HRTP recommendation. That it's an ongoing process, that this framework, as you're developing it, would be a useful guide to developing your continuous improvement within your structure, and then would also be reported out. This is something that could not only be implemented by the RSSAC but also reported out in a survey and the assessment once it takes place. Early next year, hopefully, is when it would begin. I hope that is helpful. Thank you also for the feedback

about the timeline of the work. We'll be flexible there and hope that most groups can get a lot of work done before the later this summer.

Tijani, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead. If you're speaking, Tijani, I think you're on mute. Just give it a minute. I see Amrita's hand is also up. Maybe Amrita could go while we wait for Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you hear me now?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Yes, we can hear you now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. If you go to page 15 of the most recent slide deck you presented on 5 June, we can read this for July, August. Community reps work with groups to reach consensus on criteria and indicators applicable to their organizational structure. This will occur after several iteration of etc. Here it is said that we will reach consensus until August and you give the deadline of July. This is a little bit confusing. Especially because as someone said, in this period of summer, people are not always available. This is the first remark.

Second, I worked with our NomCom leadership. And you know that we worked already on the criteria, but we updated them and sent them the last version. We are planning to meet in the upcoming weeks according to the availability of everyone. That's all. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you very much, Tijani. I appreciate the update. I'm glad to hear of the work so far with the NomCom, that you've already been working on the criteria. That's wonderful news.

To your point about the dates, just to clarify, we are hoping that the Community Coordination Group representatives and alternates can engage with their groups by the 24th of July. But the Community Coordination Group itself would then focus in July and August on then finalizing this input and sharing this input and developing the framework. So I hope that helps clarify. Sorry for any confusion there. Thanks. Amrita, I see your hand is up.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Evin. In our part of the world, we are not going in for summer holidays, but still, July 24 seems very difficult, even though we've been meeting every Monday to discuss this, the small team.

The other challenge, which we see... It's not a challenge. Because if you look at how At-Large is structured, we have different RALOs. So what we had discussed amongst the different RALOs is that we need to have some amount of similarity also in what we are implementing. Yes, there will be differences. Similarly, we would also have to have some similarity with At-Large, while there may be some diversity. So my question was—obviously, when the entire SO/ACs are working, they will come up with different things, but there will be some unifying structure. So how is the work going to happen? Because even within I think the RALOs, we will have to have some amount of uniformity. Obviously,

diversity will be there in terms of criteria which we adopt or the indicators, because as Justine said, we are looking at some and we think they could possibly be merged or not to be there. So how do we bring uniformity across structures also while ensuring there is differences based upon each structure?

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you so much, Amrita. It's a great observation and I'm glad to hear of the work so far taking place. As, of course, described in the presentation, the principles serve as a foundation that's uniform across the different structures and their groups. And the criteria, even though each of your groups have been given a list of criteria to start with that are the same, this is where the flexibility comes in for each group to determine which one is more relevant to their structure and ways to measure that progress. So we're hoping that that question that you have as well, it can be raised either within your group during your engagements or with this group as well as we move into assembling all the input and then drafting that out for the framework. So I hope that helps clarify your question. And the survey itself will also utilize information from all of the substructures if each structure has them. I hope that's helpful.

Would anyone else like to share any updates or engagements, either during ICANN80 or aside from this with your groups that have occurred in the month of June? Or if you have planned anything in July? Naveed, please go ahead. Thank you.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS:

I have a question or confusion around the principles that we have. I remember that initially, once we drafted these principles, two and three, one of them were slightly different and it says structures of the SO/AC or NomCom are efficient or effective. And now both of these principles say operations, one is operation is effective, one is operations are efficient. So this might lead to some overlapping between the criteria and the indicators. I don't remember a discussion that we have on changing this from structures to operations, one of them, if somebody remember and could help me understand that.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Naveed. We can pull up maybe some more specific points of discussion from the meeting reports and on the list. But these principles, as you're aware, came from the organizational review objectives and the current ICANN Bylaws, as well as some Work Stream 2 accountability suggestions. So these were a discussed previously, and there's documentation in the meeting reports and on the list, and then the call recordings. But if you have kind of a specific question about certain language being used, I'm happy to look that up. I see Cheryl's comment about the differentiation between effectiveness and efficiency. I'm not sure if you would like to comment—

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Sorry to intervene. What I mean is that I attended almost all the meetings, I don't remember missing any of them so far from CIP. I just don't recall whether the group thought that structures because, first, it was structures mentioned as word. One, the group felt that there is a

difference between operations and structures or something like that. So that is I'm not sure.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

I'd like to open it up to the group if anyone would like to comment. Maybe I can circle back to you on that, Naveed. Tijani, I see your hands up. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. I also don't remember that we discussed anything about that. I was also surprised to see that structure was placed by operations. In fact, it shouldn't be structure because the problem in all this work is that we are losing structure for several meanings. We are still using several words for several meanings. So here, it shouldn't be structure, it should be substructures, because the structure is SO/AC or NomCom. So you check it. And operation I don't know when and where and why, but I accepted it. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Tijani. If it's helpful too regarding the question about the potential overlap between the term efficiency and effectiveness, efficiency is generally all about reducing costs and resources required to execute on tactics, whereas effectiveness is about achieving strategic goals that align with the vision of the organization and drive its mission. So often, increasing effectiveness of a structure naturally leads to an increase in efficiency. So there can be some overlap there. But I hope

that term helps in terms of the terminology. Thank you, Cheryl. We'll take a note to go back.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just so you know, based on the text sent to us as individual component parts for us to work on, the ones that were the original setup, Principle 2 unedited does in fact say the structure of the AC/SO or whatever is effective. And Principle 3 states the operations of the SO/AC, NomCom is efficient. So there does appear to be some form of editorial slippage that has occurred at some point. But if you go back through your redline versions, the material that we're all sent to work on as the baseline, yes, in many cases has been modified that I've gone back to the original. And it definitely said Principle 2 was the structure and Principle 3 was operations. So that is probably worthy of looking at and noting. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Cheryl. We'll look at that and correct it. Thanks for noting that. I'm not sure how that happened, but I appreciate that. We'll take that as an action item. Thank you.

Okay. I'm not sure if there are any other updates from anyone regarding their engagements thus far, or any challenges. I'll just give it a minute. Otherwise, we are nearing the top of the hour and we could move into Any Other Business.

So for today, we'd like to also update the group on the work in progress related to the survey and development for the first Continuous Improvement Program assessment that will utilize the draft Continuous

Improvement Program framework. Previously, ICANN Org shared that we would begin to recruit a third party for this work. But, however, as most of you have heard or seen by now, there is now a broader effort to evaluate costs and activities for ICANN focusing on resource management, ensuring operational efficiency and achieving financial sustainability. A blog was published at the end of May detailing these changes, which I'll share in the chat now with you as well, in case you haven't seen this. So, as such, we wanted to let you know that we're pivoting from hiring a third party to utilizing existing ICANN Org resources for this effort. We'll have an update on this work and the survey and progress at a subsequent Community Coordination Group meeting. And I just want to thank you for your support and understanding on this front, as well as your continued collaboration to fulfill the ICANN mission with the same quality high standards and volume of work we have in front of us. So I just wanted to provide that update. We're already actively working on this and we'll have an update for the group at the next meeting or thereafter. Thanks. Thank you, Cheryl. I see your comment.

Otherwise, we ask, of course, that each of you, as the Community Coordination Group representatives, regularly engage with your groups on this work and your community leadership. We're just now at the end of June and we have a month ahead of us. So I hope that many of you can, if you have not already, identify a potentially relevant working group or recurring community meeting where you can work on this, the criteria, the indicators with their groups, and solicit feedback on this important work. We note that many of you think that this is a pretty aggressive, tight timeline. So, of course, we'll remain flexible. But I hope

that we'll be getting a lot of feedback over the next few weeks. And please also let us know as Org how we can help deliver, facilitate this work if there are any challenges. We're happy to support as needed to make this as lightweight as possible.

Thank you all for your questions, they're really insightful, and comments. So we've taken several action items regarding the redline, and also the work so far on the criteria and indicators. So thank you all. Unless there is any other business from anyone or any other comments, we may conclude this call a bit early today. All right. Thank you all. Thank you all. Good to see many of you virtually. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]