EN

JESSICA PUCCIO:

Hello, and welcome to the Continuous Improvement Program meeting. Today is Wednesday, the 10th of July. The time is 20:00 UTC. My name is Jessica Puccio. Yvette and myself will be your Zoom coordinators for this meeting.

Attendance will be taken by Zoom and posted on the wiki shortly after this call. Today we have apologies from Carlos Aguirre, Christelle Vaval, Manju Chen, Santanu Acharya, and Tracy Hackshaw. 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 the project manager, Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thanks so much, Jessica, and hello, everyone. Thank you all for being here today. I think this is now our 11th meeting, and we're officially over halfway through the calendar year. During the last meeting, we heard from many of you about your engagements with your groups on the five draft principles and work of the Community Coordination Group thus far. The redline of the five draft principles was updated to reflect the Community Coordination Group discussions in June.

An action item from the last meeting was to summarize thoughts on Principle 4 and finalize through the mailing list. One comment was provided by Chokri and resolved in the document. I see your comment, Alan, as well. We'll speak to those principles. We're devoting most of today's agenda to updates from your groups on the work related to criteria and indicators, what has been developed so far, as well as any

---

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.

challenges or ways ICANN Org can support your work further. We also have an update from Owen on feedback from the GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group. Since he's only able to stay on for the first part of the meeting today I think we'll allow him to speak first for that discussion item with the group. And then we'll have an update on the Continuous Improvement Program survey development and the ICANN Org development of that survey, including some questions for your consideration. Under AOB, we can include any other business you would like to raise, of course.

So we can get started. But I see Tijani, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Evin. Before starting, I would like to read ATRT3 Report page 73 saying for SOs and ACs that are composed of substructures, this should apply to their individual substructures. And the result of all substructures shall be aggregated to generate a result for the given SO or AC. You can notice that here, there is no mention of stakeholder. As you can see, no RALOs, no ALS. All are considered as substructures. That's why I proposed for Principle 4 to remove stakeholder and keep only substructures. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Tijani, for this note. Jessica, would it be possible to pull up to the redline of the five principles, since we're already kind of discussing that? And then we can move into the first agenda item. But to answer Alan's question, we've updated the redline. We've corrected Principle 2

EN

and, I believe, Tijani, Principal 4. Substructures is there. I open the floor to the group for any comment or response to Tijani.

The action item, I believe, from the last meeting was to finalize the principles over the list in advance of this meeting. But I want to reiterate of course that especially as this work is progressing to this calendar year and you're continuing to engage with your groups, this will all be revisited being the principles, criteria, and indicators ahead of publishing the draft framework for public comment. So this won't be the last time we discuss the principles, but we do want to start the group's focus on criteria and indicators. So if there are any other comments about the principles? If not, then I think we can then just move into our first item which is a continuation of Phase 3 discussions. Chokri, I see your hand is up.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: Yes, for the last part. I think the mentioning here of the ICANN bottom-up multistakeholder model, the ICANN have from what they know only one multistakeholder model, so adding the superlative specification that bottom-up is [inaudible] in my opinion. I mean by adding bottom-up will not add any added value for the expression of the Principle 5 since ICANN have only one multistakeholder model. Evin, can you hear me?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you. Thank you so much, Chokri. Yes. I had to turn off my camera because my Internet is not so great right now. But I'm seeing some responses to your comment in the chat from both Justine and Cheryl. And Amrita as well, if you would like to speak and respond to Chokri's

EN

comment. Both some agreement and disagreement, but we have other hands in the queue as well. Okay. Also, if this is related to the principles, I'd like to ask Sébastien to make a comment. But we would then like to move into the first items so that Owen can present on the Registrar group's feedback. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. It's about the discussion raised by Tijani. Of course, in the ATRT3 Report, the question was raised about the different organizations who have substructure. But for the other, they have to be accountable to somebody, and somebody we can't say members, as ICANN is not a member organization. I guess the title of stakeholder is a good word we keep on this document. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Sébastien. I see some comments. Maybe we could put the comments into the redline. And just for sake of timing today, since we're about 10 minutes into the meeting, we can go ahead and switch over to the first agenda item. I see Owen's hand is up. Owen?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, Evin. Apologies for missing a couple meetings, my travel schedule didn't permit. I'm actually on vacation this week. So I wanted to do this and get offline because I've had three rambunctious boys in the house who might go a little stir crazy. So apologies.

I was finally able to coordinate with getting the Registrar Stakeholder Group's feedback together. We have just two general feedback items,

EN

and both of them are with regards to Principle 4. The first one has to do with being externally accountable to the wider ICANN community. And there's some concern in the Registrar Stakeholder Group regarding the Statement of Interest, the SOI concern, where not everyone is disclosing who they ultimately represent. I know that's something that's been discussed before the Board as well as the GNSO Council, and there are certain groups who feel that they don't have to fully reveal who they represent. The Registrar Stakeholder Group believes that we should all be transparent with this, even if lobbyists are before the United States government or the EU or the UN. We believe that the full transparency is required so that we can be actually externally accountable to other ICANN community members.

The second has to do with kind of, I guess, Principle 4. It has to do more with general of doing self-evaluations or self-review, as opposed to having an external review process. This is not disagreeing that we don't think this should go forward. We believe that this is a much more cost effective, efficient manner of proceeding with this. But the concern we have is that, quite often, self-review tends to be a little bit biased. People are more generally likely to report good things as opposed to bad things and not be as self-critical. And there are some research articles that do show that self-evaluation generally tends to miss certain items or gloss over them or just assume that things that are wrong, they assume that they are correct. So I'm not sure necessarily what the solution is there. But we may want to provide the perhaps some guidance or some understanding in there, where that is something that is just a little more guidance to make sure that there is that critical look that all of the SOs/AC's and NomCom are taking a critical look and

EN

saying the ugly things that perhaps people may not want to hear along those lines, just to make sure that these self-reviews are a full replacement for having the independent reviews. Those are the two things of feedback from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you so much, Owen. That's very helpful feedback to hear. We've taken note of that officially into the record. I see. Sébastien's hand is up as well. Please, Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Owen, for your comments. May I suggest that it's why we have ATRT and possibly one day Holistic Review to do what you are talking about external and not to be only the self-evaluation will be too kindly. It's really not just one piece of the whole architecture of the reviews we have to take into account. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Sébastien. That is hide as well. The feedback is related to the survey. That would be part of the assessment. And the assessment is to also inform separate recommendation for the Holistic Review.

LARISA GURNICK: Evin, I see Lori is waving her hand. It looks like she would like to say something.

EN

LORI SCHULMAN:	Yes. It's not to the ethical requirements of disclosure. I'm not going to say anymore because we know it's been an ongoing discussion. But I am going to say about whether being accountable to the ICANN community versus the global community. We have a public interest remit. And I'm wondering if our accountability is in fact too limited in how we project ourselves and how we strive for continuous improvement. That would be my sense of it. Why are we only accountable to the ICANN community? We're not. It's a broader remit.

I'm so glad Owen thinks this point is interesting. It would be nice because I think having some alignment on who we're accountable to is critical. I will say one thing. Even to the point of lobbying requirements that are required by a national law versus a nonprofit organization policy, there are different levels of governance, different levels of accountability. If you're going to lobby under government regulation, then everybody knows what the rules are. And I think with ICANN, because there is a lack of clarity, we are having these back and forth, which I don't want to rehash here, but I want to just use that as a reference point for thinking about who we are accountable to. And I agree, Owen. I don't know if this is the solution. But I'm wondering if leaving the word out might be a solution. That's it for me.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:	Thank you, Lori. And yes, we've got the principles on the screen. Cheryl, please go ahead.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, thanks, Evin. Just to your point, Lori, as ICANN and the entity and the writ large, absolutely, and that's an aspect that shouldn't be lost. But when we are talking about a Continuous Improvement Program, at this stage it is now, it is in fact trying to ensure that the organizational review process is managed in a different way. And that is not a holistic organizational review process, rather the component parts of ICANN that are currently under the Bylaw organizational review processes, then we can probably be comfortable by having our focus more to ourselves and exactly who we are currently declaring rather than our place or as the entity as a whole, or if any of us have, be it the GAC or your group, or even one would argue, the At-Large community and the ALAC therefore, may have a public interest aspect. That's not to undersell it, it's just whether it needs to be focused on now is the question. Thanks. Chris will disagree with me now.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You shouldn't assume that, Cheryl. Shall I carry on, Evin?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Yes, please. Go ahead, Chris. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. Thank you. This is very complicated, challenging environment to deal with. I think it varies, and that's part of the challenge. So the ccTLD community, for example, you will not get a ccTLD to agree that they're accountable to anybody other than the people that they represent, which in the case of almost all ccTLDs is the citizens of their territory.

EN

In the context of the ccNSO, you will probably get the ccTLDs to agree that they're accountable to the processes of the ccNSO in the sense that if they choose to be a member, then they agree to those processes. But they can of course choose not to be a member. And in which case, they're not accountable at all.

The Registry Stakeholder Group is another example. Registries can choose to be a member of Registry Stakeholder Group or choose not to be a member of the Registry Stakeholder Group. It's a matter for them. And if they are a member, then they agree to certain things. But if they're not, then they don't. What all gTLD registries are accountable to is the contract that they have with ICANN, but that doesn't make them accountable to the ICANN community, nor does it make them accountable to each other. It just makes them bound by the terms of their contract. They are accountable to the community voluntarily. Members of the Business Constituency aren't accountable to anybody other than themselves and their own shareholders, if they have shareholders.

So, to be honest, talking about accountability to the wider ICANN community is a fine goal but needs to be clarified in more detail. Because what do we mean? How am I accountable to the wider ICANN community? If I choose to be a part of the ICANN community—and let's be clear, I don't have to be a part of the ICANN community to run a registry, to be a registrar, to be an At-Large person, etc., to be a government. If I choose to be that I'm accountable to the ICANN community to a degree, to what extent I don't know. It depends entirely what my role is. So I think broad brush, if I could be so bold as to suggest motherhood and apple pie statements, such as accountable to

EN

the wider ICANN community, are not particularly useful or helpful because they're meaningless, or perhaps better put, they are meaningful in many different ways to many different members and parts of the ICANN community. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Chris, for that intervention. Tijani, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Chris, I hear you. And you're right. Not any registrar or any registry or any party of any Internet community member is not necessarily a member of the ICANN community. This work is only for the ICANN community. It means for the people who are a member of SO, AC, or NomCom only. So when we say they need to be accountable to the wider ICANN community, it is about member of SOs, member of ACs, and member of the NomCom. That's all. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I just respond briefly to that, Evin, before you go to Alan, if I may, because I'm going to need to drop off shortly anyway. Is that okay?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Of course.

EN

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I agree with you, Tijani. But that doesn't diminish the challenge. Let me be very specific about ccTLDs. They choose to be a member of the ccNSO, but I think if you polled the ccTLD community, you would find that if you were suggesting that because they're a member of the ccNSO, they are in some way accountable to the rest of the ICANN community. So for example, they would have to account for their policies to the ICANN community, or account for the way that they run their ccTLD to the ICANN community, their response to that would be no, they're not. And I'm not suggesting that it is what it means. But what I'm saying is that if that is what it means, that I suspect is the response that you would get.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Chris. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I want to elaborate a little bit more than that, because even within the very narrow group of members of SOs, there are, for instance, NomCom appointees, who are members of SOs, who are not accountable to anyone other than themselves in their own conscience because they're nominated there to represent whatever they believe in. And certainly members within stakeholder groups and stuff, as Chris pointed out, are not necessarily accountable to anyone. So we may all want to think that everyone has a good heart and wants to please everyone and support everyone. But the reality is that's not how it works. So some people are accountable because they are nominated by

EN

someone and have to answer to them, others are not. And it's going to vary based on the positions. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Alan. I see a comment from Sean in the chat as well. I just wanted to share, just a reminder for the group, I posted this in the chat as well, that the five principles that you see on the screen here are stemming from the current ICANN Bylaws pertaining to organizational reviews, the objectives, as well as recommendations from prior organizational reviews that were conducted by independent examiners. A big part of that is to ensure that ICANN multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable. And Principle 4, as it's articulated, referring to accountability is also referencing the Work Stream 2 recommendations to increase SO/AC accountability. So just a reminder of how we arrived at these principles. There's a lot of discussion in the chat. So thank you for that. I'm not sure if anyone would like to further. Alan, I see your hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, the principle says the SOs, ACs, and NomComs, not their constituent members. So the group may be accountable, but that doesn't mean each member is necessarily accountable to a specific organization, stakeholder, or entity.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Alan. Noted. I see some hands are coming up. Justine, please go ahead.

EN

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Evin. I'm a little bit confused. Are we kind of converging on maybe adding where applicable in brackets after ICANN community?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Justine. That's a suggestion that could be put in the redline. I see a comment from Chris and I also see Tijani's hand is up. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Evin. I know that that you want to go to item one of the agenda, so I will not discuss here. I will send my comment on the e-mail list because I am hearing very confusing comments. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you to, Tijani. Yes, we did indeed have agenda item one devoted more to focus on the criteria and indicators, the work thus far, any updates that you have from talking to your groups on this Phase 3 work. We did hear from a few of the members on the last meeting at the end of June. So we would like to use the rest of this first item's time to present any other updates or feedback from your groups on those work there. So if we could transition that conversation, although this has been very productive and helpful, I'd like to turn it over to anyone else for updates from their group so far.

Phase 3, of course, as a reminder, is aiming to extend until the end of July, which entails another engagement with your groups on the substantive work on criterion indicators. So there's some flexibility on this deadline, given that the work with your groups is more significant and specific. So we realize that you have a different cadence to your schedules. As a reminder, the Community Coordination Group settled on three to five criteria being a minimum for the different groups. Anyone like to present any further updates? Are there any challenges maybe to getting onto your group's agenda or any ways that Org can help facilitate? Tijani, I see your hand is up. Please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Evin. Why are we limiting or trying to limit the number of criteria for each principle? I don't understand why. Because sometimes you are led to have much more criteria for one principle than the other. So we don't have to make any limit or any regulation of the number of criteria for the principle. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Tijani. Sorry. Just to clarify, it was actually a minimum for the criteria. The group just wanted an idea for each principle how many criteria would be useful to strive for, and it was discussed during a previous meeting, as detailed in the meeting report, that five would be a good minimum, but certainly the groups can have more, especially if their work is more relevant in that area. I hope that helps clarify. It seems to be a bit quiet today. Amrita, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

EN

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Evin. Just to update from the APRALO part, we have been working on the principles, criteria, and indicators. Obviously, as Justine had informed in the last call that we may be suggesting some strike downs in terms of criteria. But the small team has worked on a particular piece, and we are sharing it with the leadership and community for comments. So our attempt is to try to have something by 21ˢᵗ July. It may be slightly difficult getting the community's input. So once we have that, we should be able to share at least the first cut of what the community feels on the principles and criteria. The small team found that some criteria would be merged or could be struck down because less is better at times. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Amrita, for this update. I see it's kind of a quieter group today. Tijani, I see your hand is up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. As for the NomCom, we discussed with the NomCom leadership the series of criteria we put for the principles. And now we have almost a final list of criteria for each principle. They are on the dive. But for the indicators, we don't have yet a lot of indicators, but we will try to find some if it is necessary. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Tijani. Good to hear the work progressing. And yes, it is middle of July and hot in many parts of the world, to your point, Lori. There were a great number of updates provided during the last meeting

EN

and we have been seeing a lot of updates in the Word documents, the separate workspaces for each group. So we thank you. We know that the work is ongoing and it's more substantive. So this will take a little more time to finalize. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Evin. Since it's a bit quiet, this meeting, let me introduce some pedantic notes. In the document that the RSA has shared with us, you mentioned criteria when you put for each number, so you have Criteria 1, Criteria 2, Criteria 3, and so forth, for each principle. I think it's correct to be criterion rater than criteria because "criteria" is plural. So this is just a semantic thing. When I was doing our work for APRALO, I suddenly realized that it's criteria everywhere when maybe some of it should be criterion. It's just something to note. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Justine. Yes, accuracy and language, criteria being plural, criterion being singular. I'll take a look at that.

Jessica, I'm not sure if maybe we could actually display the PowerPoint and go to that section that shows the suggested criteria under Principle 1, I think it's a little later in the slide deck. Thank you. Maybe like 13 or onwards perhaps. Or no, after. Maybe 16 or onwards. Yeah. Maybe 17. Thank you. Yes. That's correct. Thank you, Justine. We can change the format there. But this is hopefully helpful for your discussions that these draft criteria were proposed for the principles for discussion with your groups. A minimum for three to five is the goal for the Community Coordination Group members back by the end of the month. And as

EN

always, the ICANN Org Reviews Team is here to help facilitate or provide any guidance on your presentations. And just know if there are any challenges, we're happy to help get this moving. I know that a lot is going on and we're trying to make this as lightweight as possible and easy on you all.

Okay. Thanks, Jessica. So we did give about 40 minutes for this item, which we've discussed the principles as well, but unless there are any further comments, this is actually a great segue some of the points that had been made about accountability, membership to your stakeholders versus the wider community versus even the greater public interest. It's a great segue to our second agenda item for today, which is an update, the position we want to have with you on the survey for the Continuous Improvement Program. And for this item, I'd like to hand it over to Larisa Gurnick from Org.

LARISA GURNICK: Thanks, Evin. Hi, everybody. Thank you for being here. I'm hoping that this information will be timely and useful as we started looking into the development of survey so that we're ready eventually when the framework, the principles, criteria, indicators, and all that is ready in some shape or form to test, to pilot out, if you will, or test out, sending out some surveys, asking questions, beginning to collect information that could inform the next steps in the process.

Thank you, Evin, for the slide. What's on here? I believe this is right out of the ATRT3 Final Report. There was information included by ATRT3 to provide some guidelines as to what the survey would look like and what

EN

it should aim to achieve. It's detailed out as annual satisfaction survey of membership, members/participants, and then I get into a little bit more detail about each SO, AC, and NomCom shall perform a comprehensive annual satisfaction survey or equivalent mechanism of its members and participants. And the focus of the survey should be on member and constituent satisfaction versus their respective SO, AC, NomCom, but can also include satisfaction with Org services such as staff support, travel services, translation services, etc.

Then further clarification from ATRT3, for SOs and ACs that are composed of structures, as we've been discussing already earlier, this should apply to their individual substructures and the results of the old substructure shall be aggregated to generate a result for the given SO or AC. I believe this may have been the same. That's what Tijani was reading earlier. The results of these surveys would be public and used to support the Continuous Improvement Program as well as input to the Holistic Review. If the survey results notice significant issue, this shall be the trigger to initiate appropriate measures to deal with any such issues. I think that's an important backdrop to what it is that the survey will aim to do and how we could do that. So with that, next slide, please.

How do we go about developing the surveys and how do we go about developing questions that are flexible enough and reflect the framework itself? And the fact that maybe different questions need to be asked of different groups, but there has to be some sort of continuity across all the structures, hence, principles, criteria, and indicators. So we started doing some work with our internal colleagues. We have a research team as part of the GDS group that some of you may be familiar with, people that have expertise in conducting research. So our

first step was to consult with our internal colleagues and share with them all this information, what the recommendations are all about, what the work is that this group is doing, and how we're going about this process, so that they could begin to think about how to structure this, what should be the questions, and also impart on some of their professional expertise about things to do or not do to make sure that people actually engage with the survey and are able to provide meaningful information. And that work continues.

In the process of beginning these conversations, we uncovered something that I think could be actually very timely and helpful because the question that the research folks asked us is who would be asked to respond to the survey? Who are the members or the participants, as it was indicated on the prior slides? And do the groups have an idea of how many individuals? These are just basic questions that they're asking in order to try and understand sort of what the survey is all about.

So we thought that we would pass this question to you all and I think it might be informative in light of the discussion that we just had about who is accountable to whom. But the fundamental question with the survey is—let's just imagine that the survey is developed and it's ready to go—who will get the survey? Who would each of these groups consider to be their number? Because we're generally talking about a survey that would most likely be done through an e-mail, are we able to contact the members through e-mail or through some other means? I just wanted to put that out there. Certainly we have a bit of time. I think, Evin, if you agree to have a conversation about it here and discuss this. But ultimately, it would be really helpful for us as we do the work behind the scenes to start preparing some possible means for doing the

EN

survey and also beginning to think through the questions, how to set that up and how big or not big this survey reach would be.

So I'll pause there, and then I'm happy to talk about the last bullet point too. Anybody have any thoughts or ideas on this? Tijani, please. Tijani, please go ahead. And then after Tijani, I see Alan and Amrita and Cheryl. Very good. Lots of opinions on this. Very good. So starting with Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. You're asking very interesting questions. Since I am here for the NomCom, who are the members of the NomCom? Are they the delegates of the current year? Is it representative? It doesn't give a sense. Is there any sense to have these members, these delegates as member of the NomCom only, 15 persons? It is an important question. I think that we have to think about perhaps the last 10 years delegates, it will be around 100 persons, and this will be, in my point of view, more representative and more important to have opinion of other people than the delegates of the current year. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Tijani. Amrita, please.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you. For us at APRALO, our members would be the people, the ALSes who have been registered, especially the primary person who is there and the individual members who are registered. So they would be our members to whom it would be sent out. Regarding the active and

inactive, I think it should be sent to the member base, at least for APRALO rather than looking at the active/inactive. But obviously, we are having our new rules and procedures hopefully coming in by the end of the month. So we may also be having some cleaning up of our membership base, etc., then after that, but that's what I think it is for us.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Amrita, very helpful. And I see Cheryl and Alan's hand is back up. Sorry, we missed you, Alan. We'll come back to you after Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan could go first because he had his hand up earlier.

LARISA GURNICK: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It seems Zoom lowers your hand if you have your microphone unmuted and don't speak. It's trying to be helpful, thinking I'd finished speaking.

LARISA GURNICK: Sorry, Alan. I didn't mean to drop you. My apologies.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: No, you didn't do it. Zoom has a mind of its own. My short answer is it's going to be as varied as the groups. I think you're going to get very different answers from each of the groups and you're going to have to be flexible. I would caution, Tijani said go back in years. Groups like the NomCom have changed an awful lot in 10 years, and asking someone from 10 years ago what they think of the NomCom will get you answers which are not going to be helpful at this point. Other groups perhaps are more stable over time. And NomCom, if you look at the users of the NomCom, well, that's confidential. We can't tell you who the users are other than the entire ICANN community at large may have some opinions, but I don't know how you send e-mail to all of them asking them about the NomCom. So I think the answers are going to be very much tailored to the individual groups. Some will have a handful of surveys, some will have literally hundreds. That may not be a convenient answer, but I think that's the answer.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Alan. Yeah, we weren't necessarily looking for convenient answer. I think this information is really also intended to be thought-provoking, right, so that we can begin to understand who and how. So I appreciate that. And certainly we look forward to kind of pushing this information or these questions out and actually beginning to collect some ideas so that we're able to work with our internal folks to think about a survey design that useful. Cheryl, please.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Larisa. To some extent, I'm just reinforcing what Amrita and Alan had said that, in fact, if we ask each of the ACs, SOs, and their component parts where they exist, how large extent their survey needs to go for, in other words, who will they be distributing each to, then we will get an answer. In the case of the ALAC, it'll say 15 members. In the case of the RALOs, you will get those registered At-Large Structures, accredited At-Large Structures via the already established communication methodology through an appointed representative and all of the unaffiliated individual members. And again, if they ever need to do a vote, they actually go through an individual who is appointed. So they could even end up being instead of 40, 50, 60, or 2000 unaffiliated individual members within—

LARISA GURNICK: It seems like we lost Cheryl. Cheryl, I know you're hardly ever speechless, but it seems like you became speechless for a moment there. Sorry about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can assure you that will be my Internet, not me. But the issue is we need to ask the entities, we need to get that answer back if it affects the development of the survey. But it will be different, as they have said, for each group. And if the answer is one or none, then I'd only be worried if it said none. I wouldn't be worried if it said one. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Cheryl. Benjamin, please.

EN

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you. My question would be what type of survey do you want to take? If it's a quantitative survey, you could go as many as you want. But if it's a qualitative survey, if you want people's opinion, most times, about 15 saturation you don't want. So my take will be the type of answers do you want to get also would generally guide the number you might want to put out there. Because if you say, "Okay, we want 15 members from each stakeholder group," then… But if you want quantitative, so that's what I will say would also help shape the kind of information you need from the community, that would form—and I think that's why the research group was asking you, would you want this to go through. If we know the kind of questions you want to ask us, then it's now left for the SOs, ACs to determine, "Okay, where can we get these numbers?" So that's what I think would help. Because if you put qualitative questions to a thousand people, after a while you start getting the same answers, even if all of them have different opinion but the conclusion will almost be the same after a particular threshold. So that's just what I wanted to share. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much. And yes, indeed, excellent input. And of course, the kinds of questions that we anticipate discussing with you all and kind of getting that process started is in large measure informed by the information on the prior page. So we were given some inputs from ATRT3 as to what this is supposed to be, kind of a satisfaction survey. And we're going to combine this information with the kinds of framework that is being developed to see if there's a way to merge the

EN

satisfaction type questions with the questions that would help inform the kind of the self-assessment and serve as a benchmark to areas that might be in need of further consideration, further improvement.

Benjamin, I think your hand is still up. I just wanted to make sure if you want to add something No? Okay. Thank you. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a very quick additional comment. What kind of answers you get depends to a large extent on who you ask. That's well understood phenomenon surveys. Damon in the chat suggested for the NomCom, you could ask those who were selected by the NomCom. That's public knowledge. Clearly, their satisfaction with the NomCom will be very different than those who were rejected by the NomCom. We may not be able to ask them, but we know their answers will likely be very different. So I think we have to be very careful. The convenient people to ask may not be the ones who will get you the right answers. And of course, when we're dealing with a survey, in many, many such cases, those who are dissatisfied are the ones who will bother answering it. Those who are satisfied will very often not have time to do it and just ignore it. So, again, I think we're going to be very, very careful doing this to make sure that we don't end up going off on wild goose chases that are not going to be effective and help us creating surveys, and then evaluating them and then acting on them is a very time-consuming activity.

LARISA GURNICK: Indeed. Thank you, Alan. Sébastien, please.

EN

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. We are in situation a little bit maybe different from the other RALOs, maybe not all, but for the moment, I guess we are the only one where we have all the individual member gather in one single At-Large Structure made for that. And therefore, I think it's important to survey those members. But if we start to do that for this ALS, why not do that for all the ALSes? I have no answer. You asked a question here, and I just want to bring some of my thinking about that. I don't know what will be best. But it's important for me that there is no good or bad answer. It's where we want to go. It's to have feedback from some more grassroots people than us to participate to the survey. If we're able to do for some group a large survey with all our members—and remember our members will be great. If not, we will end up like, say, for APRALO to the leaders of each At-Large Structure will answer, there will be one or two or three. And already it will be difficult to get the answer of all of them. Yes, there's a number of people we want to survey. For me, it's an open discussion for today. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: I agree. We knew that that would be the case. So I'm glad that we started the conversation. Also being mindful of time, I just wanted to real quickly touch on the third bullet, which I think someone in the chat kind of made a reference to it. The question about active versus inactive members just came to mind, thinking generally, not specifically to each entity, which is quite different. But I guess the opportunity to contact inactive members would be maybe a little bit different, and it would be

EN

to find out what is the reason for their inactive status and if someone moved on and just no longer is in the space and this is no longer relevant. That's one thing. If they have some other input as to why they are choosing to be not active, they might have some insights into what made them join and then what made them inactive. So that's just another dimension and another consideration.

So, Evin, I'm going to hand this back to you to wrap things up. But I think that what I'm hearing was really, really thoughtful and very useful answers and commentary from all of you is that this is probably a question that bears some further discussion for each of you as members to take to your groups to really give some thought as to what would be meaningful for the given group, which is the beauty doing it at that level, right? We don't want to do something across all groups just to make it easier if it doesn't make any sense. I know someone else asked the question of can we use—I think it's a particular survey provider. We're certainly looking at possibilities of using whatever might be helpful once we understand what the scale of the survey will be roughly, and that will help us inform how to get the survey out to people. So I hope that that makes sense. Over to you, Evin. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you so much, Larisa, and everyone for your really helpful comments. This will, as Larisa noted, definitely be part of a future Community Coordination Group meeting agenda for substantive discussion and it'll inform the survey development. So you are key partners in influencing this process.

For today's meeting, too, since we are in the middle of three, we'll be following up our meetings to reach out to each of you and see how it's progressing with your groups, if we can help further put on the agenda, help facilitate if the resources are helpful. We hope to hear more feedback during the next meeting and also help finalize, head towards finalization of this phase and putting shape to the framework.

So we have maybe just a minute for any other business, but we are at the end of our call. We'll be circulating the meeting report as usual and action items. We look forward to seeing you all at the next meeting which will be on the 24th of July, in two weeks' time. Thank you very much. It's been great meeting as always. I appreciate your time and your work. Thank you all.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]