

---

JESSICA PUCCIO: Hello and welcome to the continuous improvement program meeting. Today is Wednesday, the 24th of July. 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 Christelle Vaval, Manju Chen, 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 our project manager, Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Jessica. Evin Erdoğdu speaking. Hello, everyone. Thank you all for being here today for our, this is I think our 12th meeting at the end of July already. During the last meeting, we heard from many of you about your engagements with your groups on the current work of the community coordination group on phase three of the criteria and indicators as well as additional big picture thinking with regards to the five principles and some adjustments to the language. The meeting report from the last meeting is updated to reflect those discussions on the principles and the red line is open for additional comments where needed. We didn't see any further comments on the red line, though.

An action item from the last meeting was to devote most of today's agenda to updates from your groups on the work related to criteria and indicators. We were just chatting before the meeting as well. A few of you have submitted your completed work already, which is wonderful. We acknowledge that the groups are kind of working at different paces

---

*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.*

and many of you are finalizing this work with your community groups. So we will also offer an opportunity to discuss any challenges or ways that ICANN org can support your work further. If we can attend meetings or help facilitate any discussions, we're here to support you where needed.

We'll then have an item for you to provide an update on the continuous improvement program survey. We had shared some suggested questions for your consideration on the survey during the last meeting on which stakeholders your group wish to target, as well as the ICANN Org development of the survey in progress. So if you have feedback there, we welcome it as well. And under AOB, we can include any other business you would like to raise as usual. So before we begin with our agenda, I'd also like to just take a brief moment to introduce our new community coordination group alternate to the IPC. She's a familiar face to many of you, Glen de Saint Gery. If you'd like to say a few remarks to the group and introduce yourself, that would be wonderful. Thank you.

GLEN DE SAINT GERY:

Thank you very much, Evin. Thank you very much, Jessica. Yes, I'm Glen de Saint Gery. I think that I know quite a few of you on the call. Lori Schulman has asked me to be the alternate for the IPC on this group. And I am very happy to be that. Lori unfortunately has a conflict today, so she will not be attending the meeting. And she has also told me that the IPC still owes feedback on the replies that were supposed to be handed in. And we will get together after the meeting and work on that. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Wonderful, Glen. Thank you so much and wonderful to have you here. Thank you for joining us. Without further ado, I believe we'll just go into agenda item one. We've given the most time for this item today. We've heard ongoing updates from the progress with many of your groups. And of course, as noted, even though the initial deadline is for a draft by the end of this month, we are flexible with this timeline, acknowledging that the groups have a different cadence to their work. So we're hoping to get kind of most everyone's drafts in by August. So there's flexibility here. But as a reminder to the community coordination group settled on having at least three to five criteria minimum for the different groups. The workspace has Google Docs, a template presentation to go to your groups and a database of the existing continuous improvement activities that the group worked on earlier this year.

So with that, I would like to turn it over to the group for further updates on this work. And also, I think all of you have heard from us from last week as well. We just checked in with you one on one to see how things are going and if we can support further. So we heard a lot of updates one to one on the great progress that's going on. But we'd love for you all to share with the group as well. So with that, I'll turn it over to the group, or just go down the list. But if anyone would like to share the status of their work, please feel free to go ahead. Amrita, I see your hand up. Please go ahead. Thank you.

---

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

I mentioned that both Justine and I represent APRALO out here. And we did, the small team actually worked on it and presented it, the work to the entire APRALO community in our APRALO monthly call. Then the entire document was shared to the community for comments. And finally, we submitted it. So, and everyone can look at it. And Justine, please correct me if anywhere I missed something. We worked on the five principles. We identified 20 criteria work for us. We have merged a few, deleted some from some places, but merged it. And we worked up with about 61 indicators at this point of time. And the document is there for all to see. So, just in case, you know, anyone wants to see it or comment on it, in case you want to share it, you could do so, and we could take comments. But Justine, do you want to add anything to it? And we've given the rationale also with all of the criteria, as well as the indicators, which we plan to adopt.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Wonderful. Thank you so much, Amrita. That's great. 61 indicators, that's quite robust. So, really appreciate that. And also acknowledge that some groups are further ahead than others. And this is really a wonderful accomplishment. And you have also, I think, volunteered to serve as an example. We'll kind of touch upon this later, but we'll definitely be sharing the work that APRALO has done as an example of next steps and how this fits into the public comment proceeding later.

---

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks. Just to clarify, this is draft. We may also keep on tweaking it because, after all, it's a continuous improvement, and we may also think of kind of making it a bit sharper.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you for clarifying. Not sure. I think it was... Okay. And Justine's [inaudible] everything. Great. Thank you. I think there's some background noise from someone, but Damon, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead. Thanks.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Always hard to follow Amrita. But with respect to council, we're actually presenting the criteria next week to a meeting with council representatives on that. So we're not as far as long, but that is our update. And just wanted to let everybody know, and thank you so much. But I'll stop there. So that's all I have.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Damon. That's great to hear. Thanks very much. And Cheryl, I see your hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I hardly had time. Damon was so quick, I was still mulling things over, and he finished. Gee whiz mate. Give a girl a break. Bukola and I presented the current state, the snapshot, which is well-baked but not fully cooked version of the 52-page long with some 27 criterion. And we haven't tallied up the indicators yet. That's yet to happen, but

there's certainly no shortage of that the ALAC small team put together. We've taken a slightly different approach to what you may see in some of the other example documents, but we've designed our form to be more interrogatory. In other words, it poses a set of questions to ensure that future readers amongst the At-Large advisory committee, the 15-person ALAC can read it, understand it, get the backgrounds done and be able to prepare and continue to prepare future indicators for the continuous part of continuous improvement. So like APRALO, you will see there is what we are doing now alongside a space for aspirational or what was planned to be done, doing next. That's a methodology. We've adopted and we've shamelessly and without any apology stolen the design of one of the tables that APRALO has in their presentations, if not final documentation, where there is a tabular approach. Sorry, perhaps tabular isn't the best word term. It's an interactive mesh where the principles are listed, the criterion are listed, and it's a live link to the document. So you can get to each table to see what is being done and what is planned to be done. So the ALAC has got that document currently, I think about 12 hours into a 48 hour consensus call. And the plan is that the ALAC small team will also continue to work on the aspirational stuff going forward. Then we're also happy to be used as an example, obviously. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Wonderful, Cheryl. Thank you so much. I was just about to ask if you'd like to serve as an example. So that's fantastic. I guess we'll wait until the consensus call is completed, but this would be great to demonstrate to the rest of the group. And we also, I mean, this part of this item as well is feedback on your efforts to engage with your groups on the

---

---

work. If there's, you know, any best practices you can share about things that were successful in your facilitation to get this information, to get some consensus, or the opposite. If, you know, if there are some challenges or if there are dynamics that you find challenging, so please feel free to share positive and negative. So I don't see any further hands up, but would anyone else like to share updates on their work so far? Benjamin, I see your hand is up.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE:

Hello, good afternoon, everyone. Apologies for joining late. I'm in a conference. So I've been able to engage some of my group members. And one of the things I hope to get out of this meeting is to try and see, to know if we're on the right path. So we've created a couple of criteria, unfortunately, criteria and indicators. So I don't know at this moment if it's suitable, but I'm hoping that before this meeting ends, some of our community members, if I've missed that, I could go back to watch the recording to see what their own criteria on each principle is, and what the indicators look like. But we've tried our best extracting from our bylaws and operating guidelines to give us some ideas. And that's what we have done so far. And also because one of the things, I think deadlines work magic. So we're able to do some things, at least we have more than three criteria that we have done. So that's what I hope to get from here. If there's a time later, I don't want to take anybody's time. I'll share what we have so far. We'll call it draft. And yeah, that's what we have thus far.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Benjamin. That's great to hear. You're welcome to share it now if you would like, if you feel comfortable sharing today. I don't know the status, but if you do want feedback from the group, we can work on displaying it in Zoom, and we're happy to share. Would you want to do that today or just another time?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: I don't mind sharing, but I want to be respectful of everyone's time. So if there's room, we could pull it up and show if it would give me a good feedback to either post-correct or yeah, if that's okay with everyone.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. So you would like to be maybe a co-host to share your screen. Jessica, I'm not sure if we can do that, or if you could share with Jessica the document. Okay. So wait one moment. Would anyone else like to provide an update while we get this set up in the background?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: So let me send me a personal message on Zoom and I'll just send the link to you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: So maybe while we work this out, I see a couple of hands up. So we could let Bram go ahead. Please share some updates. Thank you.



---

BRAM FUDZULANI:

Thank you, Bram, for the record. So I think from AFRALO perspective, we have also started to fine tune our documents. We had the meeting with AFRALO leadership just to go the whole draft document. And we were fortunate enough for the AFRALO leaders to also give us another window to work with rules of procedure working group in terms of clearing the documents and we're planning to circulate the whole document to the community by next week so that we are also within the timelines that have been provided. So that's an update from AFRALO perspective. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Wonderful. Thank you, Bram. I saw a lot of activity from you and Chokri and Hadia as well in between. So that's wonderful to hear. Thank you. And I see Harold's hand is up. Harold, please go ahead.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you. And well, regarding the good CIP practice, and we have an open document in the [inaudible] where the entire region has access to make the comments and contributions. Since we started the principle of execution, it is a consultation in constant progress. And we are 11 members in our LACCAP small team within our regional monthly meetings and monthly meeting of the LACRALO board. We have a fixed space for the CIP topic to update and request their feedback. And for the LACRALO board of directors, we create a small team and have worked to consolidate the contribution of the region. Plus they analyze for the LACRALO small team in the document that we will present

today. And to resume, we create 36 criteria for our five principles. And the next Monday, we will start the bill and discuss our indicators.

And the most common challenge was the discussion about the classic topics of the At-Large community, which constituency is part or outside ICANN community, like LACNIC and others. And the classic discussion also was a challenge about the 4.4 principle, the concept, and we discussed here. Well, that [inaudible] summarized. Thank you, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Harold, and for pointing out maybe the more challenging conversations with different stakeholders, such as LACNIC and how things tie into, I think, Article 4.4 of the ICANN bylaws. That's wonderful to hear of the progress and note that it seems like a best practice that many of the groups have created subgroups to work on this work specifically. I believe EURALO was also one of them. I see Sébastien is on the call. I don't know, Sébastien, if I can call on you to provide an update on this work as well on behalf of EURALO.

HAROLD ARCOS:

No, within the EURALO, we don't have these members, but it is the perception is about the principles with talking about the relationship that RALO with the regional organization with others, space, institutions. Some members think that LACNIC and others, LACTLD are part of the ICANN ecosystem. Obviously, it's not. And we have a two time today with the discussion with another members requesting consultation outside. So what's [inaudible] real practice relationship, the real organization with the ICANN constituency, taking account the

---

---

letters in the principle have details in the principle, not the wider concepts in the other institution that ICANN have relationship. That was the point of view.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Harold, for that really thorough update about the conversations. That's very insightful for the LACRALO community within ICANN. Yeah. Thank you. And I don't know if Natalia or Sébastien, I think, Sébastien, your hand is up if you'd like to provide an update on your own, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you very much. I guess we are behind all of the others, but we set up the EURALO CIP working group and we decided to have people from outside of the usual suspect, at least for some of them. And it's one of them who is running the show for this working group. Therefore, we need some time to get all at the same level. And that we start to work. We set up the working group last week and we start to work this week. I hope that something will go out, but it will take obviously more time to deliver something today. I guess summer for the Northern Hemisphere will be useful. I can't promise that we will do that in one or two weeks, but we are working. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Sébastien.

---

NATALIA FILINA:

I would love to add that we RALO feel it is a table on our wiki space and I'm sure maybe you will be interested to see with which kind of progress we enter this CIP working group, because EURALO usually looks a little bit beyond the regional level. And I think in the near future, we will have a different kind of recommendations with which intermediate final feedback we may come to this working group from At-Large level and ALAC level. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Natalia. I appreciate that feedback and the coordination between the different groups within the At-Large community. That's great to hear the progress. And we have quite a few other representatives and alternates on the call that we hope we can share more updates, but we do have Benjamin's document up. I think, Jessica, if we'd like to share that and Benjamin, if you'd like to speak to this work and ask for any feedback, please take the floor. Thanks.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE:

Yeah, thank you. This was the template. So we start from here. So this is what we have thus far. So I'm just sharing this so that if it makes sense or if others, if it looks like that. So some of the criteria we said for the first one is [inaudible]. So perception of NCUC in this case by members. What do the members feel about our alignment to our mission, basically, is for us to bring representation of non commercials to the ICANN community and to policy development. Also participation in policy drafting comment. How many of our members are participating actively because that's when the GNSO, I mean as a constituency on the

noncommercial stakeholder group. And attendance both virtual and in person meetings. The number of noncommercial related concerns that we champion. So those are some of the things.

So now the struggle is in indicators. How do we measure some of these things we've spelt out. So say, do members feel included? We need to look for how to measure other indicators will play out, how many policy draftings have we contributed to public comment. How to measure. So we know that ICANN has [inaudible]. Do we use it to further our goals? So that's one of the things. As I said, this is all draft. The general members haven't seen it yet.

And then we went to the second one as well. Is our structure effective? So the elections and tenure, how it is conducted, diversity and inclusion, membership approvals. More importantly, this would probably, how do we contribute to the whole multi stakeholder is effective? Do we really reach our members that we say we want to reach and all of that and all the things? So is the election tenure timely and correctly effective, and leadership? So we also have a small group. So it's not the entire constituency that's participating. There was a public call for people who are interested. And I will say in this case that most of the people volunteering here and new. So I'm hoping that the drafts we get out of this will [inaudible] the broader community to have them critique and all of that. So please bear with some of the input.

So the next one is operations is the efficient and the use of time, financial resources. If we have, and then the indicators [inaudible]. So what is NCUC meeting regularly. How do they get their view, their finances? What terms and activities do we support with the funds? So

---

those are the things these members want to see. And then finally, notice the fourth one, is, are we accountable internally to our stakeholders or to our members, is NCUC maintaining skills and technical expertise through capacity building? So that's the only indicator we found so far. But I also think it will have things like we report, we communicate activities to our members and our members are aware of what we do. So increased participation. So the indicators we have there is increased participation in activities.

Then the final one is, do we collaborate with other constituencies? These are the criteria that came up. Awareness of ICANN initiatives, participation in members meetings as well. Meeting with other constituencies and the indicators we showed were these ones. The level of awareness of ICANN initiatives, is it currently sufficient? How much participation of members are there in the meetings?

So this is everything we have. So if there's anybody who wants to give us, even if it's outside of this meeting [inaudible] as a chair, I'm doing that. And that's a very vulnerable position. So, please, just know that is a small group of people drafting this, and we really want to contribute to this work so that our constituency can improve our continuous improvement. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Benjamin, we really appreciate you sharing this with the group for feedback and walking us through the document. It's organized well. It's a great first draft. I'm not sure if would like to comment on any of the work that he's done with the NCUC. I would like

---

to share too, I did notice for instance, as a reminder, of course, the principles are consistent across the community structures, the criteria, you can choose to focus on criteria more relevant to your groups and the minimum is three to five. And then the indicators are generally something that we can look at as approach as a SMART goals, which are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound. So on some of the indicators, maybe some feedback would be that there are either specific numbers included or dates. For instance, I think I saw somewhere about the members feel like they're engaged, maybe if there's a way to show how you could measure that, that would be some feedback there from the group's discussions on what the different principles, criteria and indicators are striving to achieve. Thank you. I see your thumbs up. That's great. Anyone like to react to what Benjamin has shared with the group? Really appreciate this. Again, thank you.

I believe there was a representative, a month or so ago that may have been from one of our technical groups but who raised how through this process of engaging with groups, a new recommendation or process was discussed by the group to implement. So this is a principle of continuous improvement. And this approach is meant to kind of foster that dialogue and stimulate recommendations so this hopefully is a very meaningful and insightful exercise with your groups. All right. Well thank you very much again Benjamin for sharing that. Irina, I see you're on the meeting. I know Sean is not here today, but I was wondering if you'd like to share the latest progress from the ccNSO if there are any updates.

---

---

IRINA DANELIA:

Hello everyone. Yeah, I'm happy to. By the way, somehow I had not a calendar invite in my calendar for this meeting. So that's probably the reason why Sean is not here, he might have missed it as well. And with regard to the ccNSO activities, latest ccNSO activities, we identified two most relevant groups of people to discuss this topic. One is the guidelines review committee, which is tasked, in addition to its regular activities, also to run continuous improvement efforts for ccNSO, and you are aware that we had a session during the last ICANN on the topic, etc. And the ccNSO council, definitely.

Last week, the presentation with criteria with principles and criteria, where I demonstrated both at GRC meeting, and at the council meeting, and it also has been distributed through the mailing list. We agreed on the preliminary time deadline as August 1 to get some feedback from the council members on how comfortable they feel with the suggested principles and criteria. And then the next step will be to look in the indicators. So that's our status as of today. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Wonderful, Irina, really appreciate this progress from the ccNSO, it's exciting to hear the different meetings and the presentation, and it's nearing some consensus on the finalization. Thank you.

IRINA DANELIA:

In addition, we are also discussing the opportunity to inform broader community about this, about what's happening in this group, and not insisting but suggesting, letting them opportunity to join the discussion, if there is somebody interested.



EVIN ERDOGDU: Wonderful, wonderful. And we're happy to share any relevant information on the list if you'd like to distribute that too.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you for your support. It's very valuable.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Irina. That's great. And I see Justine's comment as well in the chat and we'll troubleshoot the invites and hope everyone is all set there. Thank you. Naved, I'm not sure if you have, if you would like to provide an update on the RSSAC's progress so far.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: we have been meeting with the group on a weekly basis, inviting all RSSAC members to contribute, and we are going principle by principle. So far, the group has covered four principles along with the criteria and possible indicators, and we hope to finish that in a couple of weeks, the first draft at least. So, things are moving. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Wonderful, Naveed. Thanks. That's great to hear. The RSSAC's progress. And I'm just looking down the list as well if there's anyone I've missed. Nenad, would you like to relay an update for our progress so far?

---

NENAD ORLIC:

I don't have much to update from, basically, because I missed some meetings here and I have missed some meetings in my group because of personal business obligations and some accidents. And what I plan to engage now, and as I said in the beginning, we are a smaller group with less diverse members, so I think I can get through it with my constituents very quickly. I must say that hearing how others are doing their jobs and how they're putting this into perspective to their groups really does help. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Nenad. I appreciate it. The audio was a little choppy, but we heard that you are discussing with your groups and it's on the horizon to kind of get the draft there, so thank you for that. Santanu, I see you're also here. Would you like to comment on progress? Or any challenges or best practices? I'm not sure if Santanu is connected. I also see Tijani. Tijani, are there further updates on behalf of NomCom? I know that NomCom can serve as an example for this work, too, so some good progress has been made there.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you very much, Evin. As for the NomCom, after several iterations of discussion with the NomCom leadership, we have now set of criteria for each principle, which is almost final, and we didn't work on the indicators yet. We are doing that now, and I would like to say that NomCom is not like the other constituencies. It is difficult to speak about the NomCom community members. Who are they? This is one of

---

the questions that we are working on now, and I don't have a consensus yet on it, and I will provide you with that when I will have it.

So NomCom, for your information, is not similar to the other constituencies because it is different. We have a set of delegates each year. We have leadership turning and changing each year. So, frankly speaking, it is not like the other constituencies. It is different, and that's why we are trying to make the work as it must be done to give something which is realistic. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Tijani, for the update and for pointing out the uniqueness of NomCom with relation to the other organizational structures within ICANN. I appreciate this update. And Cheryl, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm happy to follow Tijani in terms of the uniqueness of the NomCom. There will be a requirement for, I think, some slight differences to be recognized, even in the specificity of the wording for the principles, where we have a different approach from an AC to an SO and certainly to their component parts. And the NomCom is just the ultimate example of uniqueness. But from the at-large advisory committee perspective, so that's specifically an AC and one like the SSAC that has a very particular role in terms of advice to the board, and it doesn't actually have subunits or constituencies itself. You know, all of that sort of thing, although it is obviously in the service of At-Large more broadly. We have in fact rewritten, but it is still a solid twin, Principle 4. So the

---

exact language of Principle 4 didn't really work for us, but what you'll see in our current Principle 4, just for the ALAC, is something that is a little bit different to stakeholders and constituencies, etc. It's something that the ALAC itself is comfortable with, but it still is talking about the accountability and indeed also transparency and where those ties lie. And I think we need to allow some of that flexibility with the different parts of the wider ICANN model. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Cheryl, for sharing that, the nuances with the ALAC's approach on this work. That's really insightful. And we're actually nearing the top of the allotted time for this agenda item. There are a couple of people who haven't spoken, so I just want to give a minute or two to those if you would like to share more. Alan, would you like to provide an update—or Bill on behalf of NARALO?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I can provide an update. As with EURALO, we are unfortunately way behind. We're starting the process and we hope to have something well before the end of August, hopefully towards the middle of August.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you. And I believe our next meeting is on the 7th of August and we'll be touching base with you all in between to see how we can help facilitate as well and support more. So thank you all for this great feedback and this work in progress. Most of the representatives and alternates have a draft going with their groups, so that's very significant

progress. We will begin to collect the feedback and start moving into the next phase over the coming month or so. This is great progress. Thank you all for your work and your dedication because it's not an easy thing to do with all the current work going on in the community. And Org is here to make this as lightweight and helpful as possible. So always feel free to reach out to us as well to help with your groups and facilitate.

So I guess we will move into our next item. So this is a follow up from last meeting as well. Larisa will share a few words about the survey and development and next steps for this framework. But I also wanted to remind the group that there was this action item that we gave from the last meeting with relation to the survey specifically. As we are developing the survey for the first continuous improvement program assessment, we would love to have your feedback about which stakeholders, members you would like to reach out to for this survey because the different groups have different membership and stakeholders. We also would like to pose the question if you would like to reach out to people who have lapsed membership or are not as engaged.

So these are pretty important questions for the survey. We created a database to capture this information similar to the continuous improvement program activities database made in January this year. So just a reminder to please engage with your groups and try to obtain this information as well as it will inform the development of the survey.

And in general, we heard here today from everyone that's participating in the call that we have had great responses so far from the groups that

---

---

work is in progress, drafts are all in progress. We do have a couple volunteers who have emerged who would like to volunteer their work as an example for next steps because it helps illustrate how does this all come together in the public comment that we're preparing for at the end of November and how do we engage on this and help this framework inform the survey and assessment. So the goal is to make this all easier for you and help make this be an illustrative example for how to communicate all your work this year. So please keep top in mind the survey input. If you have updates related to this, please share. And I would like to now hand it over to Larisa if you would like to share further updates or on the side.

LARISA GURNICK:

Sure. Hello, everybody. Great, great meeting. And it's really interesting to see, good to see how the different parts are coming together. And Benjamin, I really appreciate you, you know, kind of bringing your questions to the group, as well as everybody speaking to the nuanced and detailed work that the groups are doing. So from my perspective, I think about what brought us here, right, and where we came from, meaning organizational reviews, how they were conducted, what were some of the issues with those reviews, the things that worked, the things that didn't work, and kind of the goal, which was to replace that process with something lighter, easier, and more giving control to the groups themselves to make continuous improvement work the way that it needs to work at that level, right?

And I think that if the fact that there are questions, and also the fact that there are observations about the differences, I think this is exactly

---

where we need to be right now, because that is what the goal was, to make something that's easier, that actually allows for continuous improvement at the right level, that people can feel good about, and actually demonstrate progress. And importantly, also to tap into the work that you're already doing. Continuous improvement program may have been branded as an initiative that started as part of this implementation effort, but continuous improvement work has been going on, as we heard from so many of you back in January, and the database really speaks to it.

So my observations at this point is to make sure that we kind of keep all these things in mind, as you're all developing very, in some cases, very robust frameworks. And I'm wondering if, and also imagining where this is all going to go, right? So all of this will come together somehow into a framework that we need to share with the communities through public comment, and get kind of agreement that this is a reasonable way forward for everybody. Not an easy task, we already started thinking about what would that public comment process look like, and what would be shared, and how would we collect input.

But to the extent that everybody has to kind of weigh in on the framework and agree that this makes sense, I'm wondering if the group would like to critique or provide constructive criticism to each other on your work so far. This is kind of inspired by Benjamin's question, would it be of use, but especially when we pick a couple of illustrations, for those of you that were willing to use your work as examples, to kind of look at that as an opportunity to comment from other groups to really question and try to understand the work of other groups, but also to kind of make takeaways from that to inform what everybody else is

doing. So we're hoping that we can move that work into something more concrete and illustrative and specific so that it's more tangible and less theoretical. I see Tijani's hand is up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. Permit me to disagree with you. This is absolutely contrary to the principle of the continuous improvement. The continuous improvement is the self-improvement, it is self-evaluation, self-assessment. So if you ask the other constituencies to criticize or to try to change or to intervene in the work of each other, it will not be self-evaluation and self-improvement. Of course, we can discuss, we can give an opinion, but we cannot intervene in criticizing or in giving strong opinion that may oblige the constituency to change something in their work. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Good point, Tijani. I agree with you. I didn't mean it in the sense of directing or driving the outcome but more in terms of offering kind of a helpful hand based on some of the groups being maybe further ahead and having thought through certain components of principles, criteria and indicators and fudge that may be of use to others. Does anybody else have any reaction on where we are, and is there anything else that you all can think of that would be useful as we're beginning to contemplate formulation of this framework and preparation for public comment? Because that's kind of the next phase. Cheryl, please.



---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

We're at that point where we have to define where the little boundaries are on the internal work that's being done by the component parts and the wider cross-community work, where what we're also trying to do is establish a set of norms and activities, those overarching principles, etc. And we are to some extent, building the plane while we're flying it which doesn't actually make it terribly easy.

So from my point of view, and I'm not speaking as an ALAC representative in this process but just from my very personal point of view, an end game here would be to have an ICANN community-wide, recognized, notice I'm not saying agreed, but recognized set of norms. So that's the style guide to the principles, the agreed terminology and intention of each of those principles. In other words, the principles are not set in concrete but they're pretty much all of the same design. Then the few key criteria with the flexibility for add, removal, edit, etc. that we're doing as a process as an almost off the shelf how to manual.

So for example, if I want to bring in a client when I had them through a stage implementation of ISO 9002, there's a guideline, I can send them the material. I'd like ICANN to have the material available for every set of new leaders and managers and key personnel involved in any of the ACs, SOs or component parts to be able to sort of pick it up off the shelf virtually and go, ah, this is what we need to do. I now see what this document means and what we need to do in the near future. So that's more of an aim than it is a methodology of getting there, but felt the need to share. Thanks.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you. Thank you, Cheryl. Very useful and we'll continue to bring this topic up, especially as we get ready for the next phase, which will be the public comment to make sure that that that is clear to everybody and that there's agreement. Amrita, please.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you so much. I just had a question. For example, what we have been doing so far is working with our communities and coming up with a particular set of criteria or indicators which we feel could be used. And obviously, what I understand is that's going to be summarized. And obviously, each of the SOACs may have their separate criteria, but certain things would be similar. And obviously, it would be going in for public comments.

So if the entire thing is going to go in for public comments, could you please explain why we are also having a survey in between, for example, you could also have focus group discussions to kind of flesh out things and put it into perspective. So what is the rationale of having a survey in between and then going in for public comments?

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you. Great question. So everything that you described as the process toward public comment, that's spot on. Survey is meant to happen later, right? Survey was something that was envisioned and incorporated into the recommendation by ATRT 3 as a means of actually doing the assessment. So the survey itself would come later. So if you can imagine that the framework, everybody's work is completed. It's summarized, it goes out for public comment. We get feedback from

---

people on this framework or as Cheryl suggested, style guide, maybe whatever we call this thing. And then, so at that point, we have an agreement across ICANN on how to formalize maybe or carry out this continuous improvement program that is to replace organizational reviews. And then the starting point of that is the assessment that each group would do their own assessment as Tijani pointed out, what's working, what's not working. And that would be done via or through a survey. So survey would be a means of collecting information to be used as a baseline for future evaluations. I hope that that makes sense. And Naved.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah, so just want a clarification on the timeline of the public comments, because we have almost 23 groups participating. Are we going to open the public comments for all of them? In that case, we don't expect to get very useful input on all of them simultaneously because we are limiting the approach and readability that it will get from the community. So are we thinking of doing it stepwise, like community-wise, maybe a few more, a few at a time? Or I don't know if we have thought on that.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you for the question. I see Sébastien's hand is up. Seb, why don't you go ahead. And I also see that we're almost out of time. So I'm suggesting that maybe we make this a topic of discussion for the next meeting, how to approach public comment and how to address some of these questions. But in the meantime, please, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. And sorry to be late to take the floor. I don't remember. I am not in front of my computer. But I think the survey is a two-way survey. That means that, yes, it's what we need, where we are. And where we are, it's what we have done before and what we would like to do after. Therefore, it may not be at the beginning. Once again, I don't remember what we write in the ATRT3. But my point of view is that at least this survey needs to be done. I don't know if it's every year or every three years. But if it's every three years, we will not do that. All the SOAC subgroups at the same time. We need to have three groups each year. Therefore, we have to take into account that it could be both ways, backward and forward.

And regarding the comment, I feel that what we need to ask as a comment period, it's the framework, the overall idea, but not the detail we are putting right now in the in-depth work like ALAC has already done. I would say we can provide a discussion with them, but it's their own work and it will be the same for the other groups. We don't need to have that as a public place and to be discussed by everybody. The framework, the bigger picture, yes, not a very detailed one. At least it's my personal point of view. Thank you very much.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Sébastien. And with that, over to you, Evin, to wrap us up. Thank you.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Larisa and everyone who contributed. This is a great conversation and we'll certainly continue it next time. We're two minutes over, so just wanted to conclude the call this week. Thank you all for the significant progress and work on the framework. We will come back with some concrete information about next steps for public comment and continue this discussion as well on the survey. Kind reminder to please provide input on your ideal target for the survey for your different groups. And thank you all for being here. We'll see you, I believe, on August the seventh. So, thanks. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**