

JESSICA PUCCIO: Okay. Hello, everyone, and welcome to the Continuous Improvement Program meeting. Today is Wednesday, the 18th of September. The time is 14:00 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 the call. Today, we do have apologies from Irina Danelia, Manju Chen, and Sean Copeland. We would like to remind everyone that this call is being recorded, and please state your name clearly for the record before speaking. And now I'll hand things over to you, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Jessica. Great to be here. Thank you all for being here today. Today, as you see on the screen, we'll start with a continuation of phase four of the Community Coordination Group's work plan, which entails preparations for the public comment proceeding on the framework. We'll then have time for general updates from you all on further progress of your work with your groups on the framework, including further important updates from Chris Disspain and the other GNSO representatives here on their initiative to align within the GNSO on continuous improvement. Finally, we'll have an item to update on plans for ICANN 81 and how the Community Coordination Group can socialize the draft framework. And to that end, we'll revisit the four specific asks for the Community Coordination Group to complete to be ready for public comment and to move into next steps for implementation of the Continuous Improvement Program. As always, we look forward to a great discussion and your input, and the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

group has had consistent engagement throughout this calendar year and done extensive work with your groups outside of these meetings to advance this work. So thank you all again for your efforts to evolve organizational reviews into something that makes sense and is helpful for the ICANN community. All right, and we still have a few people joining, so welcome everyone. Let's get into our first item. Could we display the second slide, Jessica? I think it's like, yeah, just to emphasize phase four.

So from the last meeting, there was a related action item that was completed for the volunteers, Cheryl and Bukola from the ALAC, Sean from the ccNSO Council, and Glen from the IPC to support ICANN Org in the development of introductory language for the five principles in the draft Continuous Improvement Framework, as discussed by the CCG during your last meeting and on the list. The ask we'll have of you is to provide your input, if any, on these documents related to the public comment proceeding during today's meeting, and we'll follow up afterwards as needed. If we could go ahead and display the document, Jessica, the continuous, yeah, thank you. Awesome. Okay, that's a little small. Thank you. Maybe let me also share this in the chat for everyone. This is in the external Google Drive for the Community Coordination Group, but there's a link in the chat. So the red line of the five principles with IPC feedback was circulated on the list, and the draft Continuous Improvement Program Framework, as reviewed by the small team, was also circulated on the list. We received some comments in the document from other representatives and alternates in advance of today's meeting. If we could scroll down to page seven, I think we're already there, right? Thank you.

So after describing the concept of principles, criteria and indicators, there's a section on developing the principles. This was revised by the small team. The five principles are listed here. So this is why we would like to have general consensus that this is suitable to post for public comment. Otherwise, the main area of input we wish to draw your attention to in this document is the overall execution of the Continuous Improvement Program that would apply to the Continuous Improvement Program Framework. You'll see this starting on the bottom of page nine, and I've highlighted this section. And before we turn over to general discussion from the group, and Amrita, thank you, I see your hand. I'd like to ask if Bukola, Cheryl, or Glen would like to note the nature of their revisions and approach to their edits as a small team working on this document. Or maybe we can have Amrita go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Evin. So I had a question. When I read the section, the second paragraph, which is highlighted from the part, at the same time, the CIP CCG concluded that to begin with the structures should apply the CIP framework at the organizational level, SO, AC, NomCom. As they continue working on how the overarching principles apply to each SO, AC, NomCom, and their respective substructures, any necessary adjustments and fine tuning to these overarching principles can evolve over time. I'm asking from the RALO perspective that how does it reflect for a RALO? You know, from the essence, which we are getting from this is ALAC would be driving it based upon ALAC, only RALO would then look at implementing, whereas the structures of the RALOs and ALAC is a bit different. So some clarity on this would help.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Amrita. That's a great question and segue perhaps to the small team explaining the preamble, this introductory language, and then we can follow up for discussion because like GNSO and other groups, the ALAC has substructures, but not all groups have substructures. Cheryl, please go ahead. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, and that's a perfect segue to what I was going to say. I think this text is very much in line with the thinking that we discussed during our call and also, of course, what we recognized, last call I should say, and what we recognized is what we need to push for this public comment is the most applicable across the widest proportion of ICANN set of principles. And so focusing at the AC, SO, NomCom level is the big ask. Now, there will be a different degree of preparedness for the substructures if and where they exist, but the autonomy, the ability for those substructures to get on with a job of continuous improvement in a way that fits their modelling where and where it exists and hopefully in close identification with the modelling that this public comment framework is putting out is pretty much up to them. But the ask, the require, is going to be left at that higher level. And I think we'll also hear a lot more about the rationale for that when we hear from the GNSO later in the call. So, Amrita, in response to your question in the actual notes where you said, does this mean, what does it mean for the RALO? It means they, from a RALO perspective, they can get on with it the way they need to or want to. But we're not going to have to fiddle with finding words that will meet so many layers when those layers don't

necessarily even apply to some of the overarching structures. So, sticking just to the AC, SOs at this stage is probably the safest way forward. Otherwise, we're just going to end up in rabbit holes of wordsmithing. Thanks.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Yes, Cheryl, thank you for explaining it, but clarifying it in the text would make sense. Else what the small team thought and what the text reflects, there would be a gap and that would be concerning. So, something if we go back to the RALO and kind of share this, they would say a 15 member ALAC trying would be dictating things for RALOs. Yes, we work in coordination with that. And it has happened with other SOs and ACs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's exactly what we're trying to avoid, this business of who begot who and it's all that sort of nonsense. It's ALAC looking at ALAC first time around.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Yes, a request to the small team to clarify it because it doesn't reflect that. That is the suggestion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Amrita. And just noted in the chat as well that ICANN Org can take an action item to draft language with the small team to clarify. So, thank you for pointing this out. And Alan, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. What Cheryl describes makes complete sense from the context of why this original program was originated, instigated, perhaps, by the ATRT, and it makes complete sense as a replacement for the reviews that it is supposed to be replacing. It does put into question, the work that we've been doing for the last six or eight months within the subgroups. And I would have a hard time rationalizing to the small group I was working with, that if this is what we're supposed to be doing, and I'm pointing to this document, then why did we put all that effort into focusing on the RALO and doing our navel gazing, if that's not really the intent of this thing. So, although the document stands on its own from a zero point level, in the context of what we've been doing, it doesn't make a lot of sense. And as someone who's aware of what we've been doing may question why we've been putting all this effort into it at the regional level. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Alan. If I may respond to just to provide some context as well from the org perspective in terms of the formation of the community coordination group and the terms of reference. When the group was formed and when the task of implementing this ATRT recommendation came into existence, we wanted the broadest

representation of the ICANN community involved in this work as it does touch every corner of the community at some point when you have an organization review, either conducted by an independent examiner, or this now evolution into a continuous improvement program led by the community, it would impact the substructures at some level. And every substructure also has their ongoing activities and purpose. So, this has been a very useful mapping exercise for each of the groups to apply this framework. And hopefully as the ATRT recommendation specified, aggregate to their overall organizational structure and I see some hands up. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Evan, Cheryl for the record. And I just wanted to reassure everybody and I was involved in some of this regional work as well. None of that work is wasted. Far from it. It just means that where you've got more advanced planning, which is clearly in line and reflects well these principles, that you'll be amongst the first in the cycle to have the data points to go into not a holistic review running as a pilot, but a holistic review running post pilot. And that is exactly the design that you've heard, Sebastian, I think quite well in the past where it was supposed to be the thinking. And there was even very, you know, nice diagrams that we used in ATRT work that ATRT 3 didn't expect everybody had the exact same starting point and cadence, but in fact have overlapping different start and finish points be at different points of continuous improvement and that they were checking in on those improvement statuses every three years. But what happens in those cycles isn't just a circle. It's actually a number of small circles overlapping. So certainly no work should be considered wasted. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Cheryl. And Alan, I think that's a follow up. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'll just comment. I wasn't implying it was wasted, but in an extremely constrained resource constrained environment, simply doing it because everyone, you know, org thinks everyone should have been participating at this phase seems to have been an ill-advised decision. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Well, I hope it was not seen as a waste of time. We wanted everyone's input into this process and thought that your voice lending into this process would also help inform a really strong framework. And Larisa, I see your hand is up if you'd like to chime in as well.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much. Alan, thank you for your comments and Cheryl as well. Also just wanted to observe that throughout this process, there have been some really robust discussions about what continuous improvement really means to the organizations. And I don't want to speak on behalf of ATRT3 because they're well represented here, but our understanding was that part of the intent of the recommendation would be to solidify and expand on the culture of continuous improvement at all levels, while also maintaining the integrity of the recommendation to see if the organizational reviews could be replaced with something more flexible, more consistently applied. But at the

same time, there's also this idea that continuous improvement would continue at whatever level so it's useful and appropriate and relevant to a particular structure. And I really celebrate Cheryl's word autonomy. I think that that kind of speaks to the process and the environment that we were striving to facilitate with the work of this group and the really exceptional participation that we received from all of you to take part in it. So thank you very much for that. And hopefully, as everyone indicated, the effort produced useful inputs into the culture of continuous improvement. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Larisa. I see some further comments in the chat. So we have some comments in the document. I'm not sure if, before we go into the comments, if Glen or Bukola would like to provide any comments about the revisions made to the draft document, overall comments.

BUKOLA ORONTI:

Yes, with the comment that I put in the document, I was thinking, I was trying to avoid spelling out the RALOS in the suggestion because I believe they've been captured on that the ACs and because there are substructures under most SOs and ACs. So that was why I suggested that the structures, in quotes now, the structures, including the substructures under them to apply the CIP framework, because each RALO is also an organization within At-Large, so that they should apply this at the organizational level. But like you put this in the action item, I think the small thing we can still meet and see how we can actually spell this out in such a way that it will not look like ALAC is deciding for the

RALOS. So I'm just trying to avoid repeating or necessarily mention it. That was why I said that the framework should be applied by each structure and then adjustment can be done over time as it goes. So that's just it.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you for summarizing your comments in the draft framework. And we've also highlighted these sections. And I think Sean unfortunately was an apology today but he did some edits as well throughout this section and also earlier some, some, even including formatting so he did a really thorough pass here and I really appreciate that too. Glen before we move on I don't know if you would like to share any updates or perspectives from your editing.

GLEN DE SAINT GERY:

Thank you very much, Evin. Well, thank you very much for taking into consideration the IPC comments that were made. And for the rest I think we don't have anything to say. I do realize that it's very difficult with all the different groups to come up to some wording that fits everybody. I think what you have done is good, and the IPC is pleased that you have taken into consideration their comments. Thank you, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Glen. I appreciate it. And Owen, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Thanks, Evin. I didn't put this into the document, but one of the concerns or I guess questions I had was with regards to the change to principle four about being accountable to externally, previously had been to the internet ICANN community and now it's to the global internet. And I just was just kind of curious why it was made that broad and where the rationale is that a thing that's allowed through the bylaws. I must confess I'm coming from my own constituency perspective and the registrar stakeholder group isn't really accountable to the wider, the global internet. It's something more of either our members or other registrars or registrants, but an online gamer is not somebody or somebody who's doing a chat or an app developer. I think that's a little bit more expansive out there. I know that the GNSO council might be a little bit more broader in who they represent or say, the IPC might be representative to intellectual property holders who may not be participating directly in there. But I think it's kind of a little bit difficult with that requirement on these groups and structures who might not have any contact at all with those types of global internet people. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Owen, for your intervention and articulating that. If I may, I'll just read off the comment from the August feedback from the IPC about this adjustment. So it's also placed in the document, but from the feedback relayed by Lori and Glen, the IPC had suggested replacing to the wider ICANN community to the global internet community. They stated that accountability is not limited to inside ICANN. In our view, that is a perpetuation of the concept of the ICANN bubble, which is not helpful to evolving ICANN's role in a broader governance model. ICANN

is not an island. It is important that the SOs', ACs', or NomCom's accountability be as broad as possible and not to perpetuate an impression of isolation or industry capture. ICANN's commitment to the public requires this. This was the feedback from the IPC, but I take your point, and I'm sure we have others that would like to weigh in on this, and Tijani, I see your hand up, and then Chris, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. This process is an ICANN process, isn't it? SOs, ACs, and NomCom are part of the ICANN community, aren't they? So I don't understand how we try to make Principle 4 out of ICANN. It doesn't concern ICANN. It concerns only the internet community. This is not our work, the internet community. Our work is the ICANN community. This is an ICANN process. We are working for ICANN, not for the global internet community. And second, for Principle 5, this is more important, because it seems that we don't want to, how to say, to further the mission, not the mission, and the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder models, the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. I don't know why. What is wrong with that? This is part of our work, in my point of view. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Tijani. And just going down the queue, Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Couple of points. Just speaking to what Owen said and Glen, I think that given the clarity that we are now talking about these principles applying to the SO, or AC, or the NomCom, specifically, the issue of whether or not the Registrar Stakeholder Group or the Registry Stakeholder Group, whether the principle applies to them at this stage, has moved, and probably doesn't matter. That said, whilst I understand the suggested change and the motivation, I don't know that I necessarily think that the term global internet community is one that we can use as an expression of a group to whom we are accountable. Because what does that actually mean? It means that we have to have mechanisms in place to take into account their views. And we don't have any mechanisms in place to take into account their views. We have mechanisms in place to take into account the ICANN community's views. Some people would argue that we spend our whole lives taking into account the ICANN's community views. But I wonder whether we do, in fact, have the ability to be accountable to the global internet community, absent any form of communication with the global internet community. Whatever the global internet community actually means. And I suspect there are many different definitions of what that might mean. So I'm concerned that that is too wide an expression, and it makes it almost impossible to be accountable. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you very much, Chris. And I see many plus ones in the chat. Glen, were you going to say something?

GLEN DE SAINT GERY: Yes. I think what is meant there is that the internet itself doesn't only belong to ICANN. It belongs to a much broader, broader section, and that is the global community. Everybody that uses the internet. And I think it is in that sense that it was meant, that the internet is there for everyone.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you. And I wonder too, maybe similar to the discussions about the relationship between the organizational structures and the substructures, if perhaps the IPC's point can be expressed in a different way, not in the principle itself. But I see a couple other hands up. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Listening to this discussion, I think the real problem is the word accountable. There is no question in my mind that the ICANN, the ACs, the SOs, and even the substructures have to be going on with their work in cognizance of the fact that we are supporting a major function of the internet, period. So, yes, the registrar's constituent, the stakeholder group or the registry is not there to be accountable to the other parts, the wider global community, but surely they're supposed to be thinking about the impact of our decisions on those groups. And perhaps even altruistically make a decision at some point to do something that isn't in their personal best interest, but is in the interest of the internet. And in fact, even I can think of cases where they have done that in the past. So they're not accountable to those groups, to the wider group, but they certainly should be going about their business

thinking about the impact to those groups and to the larger, wider internet. So the real problem is using the word accountable, which implies some communication and a method of getting retribution if they don't do it, whereas that's not the process that we have. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. Damon, I see your hand up next. Please go ahead.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure, thank you so much. I'm not really here on behalf of the IPC. I'm really here on behalf of council. Just to kind of support what Glen was saying, I'm in the IPC and I think the spirit of this edit was ICANN works for the internet, basically the internet is part of ICANN for the overall global public interest. And so I don't think you can be accountable to ICANN without being accountable to the public interest. I mean, after all, what is ICANN? Under California law, it is a quote, public benefit corporation. So if you're accountable to ICANN, you are in part accountable to the public. So I don't see an issue with this edit. I think it's just sort of a, I think it's frankly kind of inherent that that's sort of what this is. So thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Damon. And I see agreement from Chris in the chat. Tijani, I see your hand is up next. Please go.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. I think there is a difference between the registry stakeholder group and the registry at large. The registry stakeholder group is part of the ICANN community. And these principles are for ICANN. They are not for the registries at large. When a registry speaks in the spirit of registries at large, yes, this is something. But now we are in ICANN. This is a process to replace the reviews. And the reviews was done in ICANN. We never spoke about outside ICANN. That's right. We are, of course, a contributor to several things, [inaudible] also. But here we are speaking about ICANN, the structure of ICANN and the community of ICANN. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Tijani. And Larisa, please go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Evin. I wonder if perhaps it might be helpful to keep the principal wording before the red line adjustment, but also to add a short paragraph that can expand on this idea that is being articulated by several of you as to the intent of the word, not in its specific definition of accountability, because for that, I think we do have to make sure that we're in keeping with the ICANN bylaws, but to expand on this idea of doing things for the interest of the global Internet community. So it could be relevant to this principle, maybe even some of the other principles now that I'm thinking about it might be helpful to have a short explanatory paragraph that kind of defines the spirit of what that principle is all about. I hope that's helpful. And of course, reflecting also on the word accountability, I was trying to pull up the bylaws. It seems

like the page is down at the moment, and we'll follow up on this, but if my recollection is correct, the accountability principle was added to the bylaws for the organizational reviews, I believe, at the time that the bylaws were amended during the transition, so that concept had quite a lot of significance from the bylaws perspective. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you very much, Lisa. And yes, we'll follow up regarding the bylaws to specify that language. Damon, I see your hand is up. Thank you.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure. And kind of listening to the conversation here, and we have a lot of different points, and I see a lot of different concerns about specific words and different interpretations. And quite frankly, I think we might be making this a little bit more difficult than we need to be. You know, this is framework. You know, we're not drafting a statute. We're not drafting bylaws. You know, the reality is, I don't know how many people we have on the call. Just eyeball it at 25 or 30. We probably have 25 or 30 different plausible interpretations for different words, and that's okay. So, I would encourage the group, let's not get so wound up around the axle on individual interpretations of individual words. They're all relevant here, but I would recommend that we kind of recognize this is framework, and it's meant to be goalposts as we move forward. We don't have to agree on every single term. That's all.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Damon. I appreciate that. So, we'll take, unless there are further comments, I think we'll take an action item to refine this language, and it's clear that adding some context for the principles and reflecting these discussions will be important for the framework. So, thank you so much for this input. Chokri I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: Yeah. Yes, I probably agree with Damon's suggestion, proposal, that we are not dealing with a law of legislation that we have in those words, where the specific words have their specific balance, and we have to be accurate in using some words and others. The most important thing in my humble opinion is to see the dynamic that we have to create in order to implement those structures and operational review. As you probably viewed, or if you have an idea of the proposal that SOAC have given in their response, you will see that it will be very hard for us to find this dynamic, how to transform some structural proposal in operational law. This is the most important thing that we have to think about, more to attract or to focus in some specific word and their balance in those differences. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Chokri, for your comments and also supporting Damon's intervention. I see Justine's hand is up, and I just want to note, too, we are running at time for this item, but it is a very important and really interesting discussion that we're having. So, before we move on, we'll just maybe conclude with Justine's comment. Please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Evin. I understand where Damon and Glen are coming from, from the IPC view, but honestly speaking, I don't know how to be accountable to the global Internet community. By what means do we do that? And I think Chris alluded to this. So, what I've done is I've suggested some text. If folks want to have a look at it to see if the text captures what the IPC is trying to say. Right. And basically, it says accountable internally to stakeholders and substructures where applicable. Same words. Right. And externally to the wider—basically, adding on to the benefit of the global Internet community or population at the end of it. So, don't tie the global Internet community to the accountability element. Tie it to the purpose of why we're doing all these things. Let me fix that on the Google Doc. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you very much, Justine. And before we move on to our next item too, I know that there's another comment from you in the latter half of this document, which is also another important section for community coordination group feedback. If we could scroll to page nine, Jessica, I just wanted to display Justine's comments there. Here, it's just language, but important to note the ICANN community. Justine flagged that maybe we want to be more specific in terms of referencing the SO, AC and NomCom and substructures. So, we'll just make that change. But it's clear from this conversation, ICANN Org and the small team will take another pass at this document and incorporate these suggestions, and we can distribute on the list, these updates for further feedback.

So, since we just have a few more minutes, I'd like to move to updates from other representatives of the group on continuing work. And actually, if we could display slide four, Jessica, in the slide deck, I think it's it. So, just to reaffirm, these are the goals for the community coordination group ahead of public comment. We are settling on consensus, slowly but surely, on the five principles as they're also explained in the draft Continuous Improvement Program framework. We'd like to conclude or finalize this document within the next meeting or two, ideally. And then we would like to harness attention and engagement on the horizon for ICANN 81. We have socialization items that we'll do for the public comment itself, but also an informal meeting with the pilot holistic review team. We'll have a hybrid meeting on the ground there, and also can plan to have a webinar that would be hosted by community coordination group volunteers after the AGM to focus the community's attention on the public comment. And we will also develop and share a draft satisfaction survey for each organizational structure for input for the next phase of implementation of the first continuous improvement program assessment. So these are four very significant asks and I think we're making great progress on the first two and hopefully we can arrive at some consensus in the coming couple of weeks. So if we could go to the first agenda slide, Jessica. Thank you. Just to show, yeah, thank you.

So I'd like to give a few minutes to updates on community progress, updates on the framework. And I know that Chris and the GNSO representatives continue to have really insightful discussions on aligning within the GNSO on how they'll approach continuous improvement. So

if I could turn it over to Chris and I know also Jeff from the SSAC and Alan from NARALO have had progress with their groups too. So Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Evin. This is Chris. I'll be very brief. We had a call, the reps of the various different subgroups of the GNSO had a call yesterday. I think pretty much everybody was represented. Having got clear that these principles are to cover the SO, AC and NomCom, our job, our time constrained job is to get back to this group and confirm that the GNSO in its various constituent parts can buy into those principles as drafted in whatever form they end up in respect to the continuous improvement of the SOs and ACs. The secondary issue is how will the GNSO as a group, the council and the GNSO in its constituent parts work on the criteria and indicators. And what we've agreed is that we suspect that the CCOICI, which is the continuous improvement working group of the GNSO, which has been sort of bolstered and is entering a new phase of its life, is probably the place for that to happen. It seems a bit daft to duplicate effort by having this small group of people decide what the criteria and indicators are rather than the actual working group that's gonna deal with continuous improvement. Although we acknowledge that there'll need to be probably at least initially some liaison. So, Damon and I will be talking to Manju Chen as soon as we can to get her on board to agree that we think it is the CCOICI or whatever the acronym is. And then presumably there will just need to be a tick from the council to say that that is the right way forward. And then we can deal with that and tick that box in this group. Yes, thanks, Berry. The CCOICI is becoming, or whatever it is, is becoming a permanent standing committee.

So, as soon as this group settles on the final draft principles, we will get the GNSO as a whole group to confirm buy-in on those, but we will be discussing the current drafts. In the meantime, I'll be sending an email out tomorrow to the group to say, look, here's the current drafts. What do we think? Do we have buy-in? And so on. And that's it. Thanks, Evin. Happy to answer anyone's question.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Wonderful. Thank you very much, Chris, for that update. And we'll look forward to hearing the feedback from the GNSO on this and the progress. I see Berry's also sharing information about that group within the GNSO in the chat. And Tracy Hackshaw, I see your hand is up for an update from the GAC. Please go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Hi, how are you? Very small update. As you know, the GAC is currently embroiled in a bylaws consultation with the board on several pieces of advice. So, a lot of other issues currently underway. But I did have a bit of feedback on the last share made of the framework. And there's a suggestion, although not confirmed, that it be discussed in the full GAC committee, committee of the whole, as we'll call it. So, that's my update. So, there's a possibility this will bubble up at that level. A GAC member may bring it to the fore in an upcoming agenda-setting call or with leadership. So, just an update that it may surface on the GAC agenda in Istanbul, but we are not yet confirmed on that. Thanks very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you very much, Tracy. Appreciate your update on behalf of the GAC. It's exciting to hear of that potential development. And we also note the ongoing GAC continuous improvement efforts as reflected in the existing database of continuous improvement efforts that the CCG developed earlier this year. So, it's a good touch point for that coordination. So glad to hear. Thank you. Alan, I think you provided an update earlier on NARALO as well as Bill. But Jeff, I'm not sure if you'd like to provide an update on SSAC activity. And I see Alan's hand is up. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just to confirm, I sent the email, but the NARALO has completed its review of the criteria and indicators. The utility of that, given the discussion in the first half of this meeting, the short-term utility is rather questionable, but we've gone through the process and completed. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Alan. I appreciate this very much. And Jeff, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

JEFF BEDSER: Thanks, Evin. Jeff Bedser for the record. SSAC's leadership is meeting early next week, followed by our annual workshop with the full membership. I think we believe that we have the majority of the internal review and answering to how our accountability works structured. We're gonna go through the finalized process of leadership

and then basically hopefully get the consensus to move forward from SSAC. As most of you are probably aware, SSAC is a relatively small organization within the structure. We're usually sub 40 people. And if everyone has to be approved by the board, the process to get new members in is a bit lengthy. But in that regard, many of the issues surrounding the diversity and the accountability to whom versus our charter, where our charter is pretty clear that our accountability is to the board as we're a board appointed organization, the broader accountability based on the cross community efforts and those modifications to our operating procedure and mission are where we're trying to build in the improvements where it's not just, for example, measuring our effectiveness to the community by the number of documents we put out, but also how far and why the message in those documents is spread. How has it been taken into other works by other parts of the community and how well has it been accepted is something that is going to be a new processes to SSAC, but bluntly very much needed to basically show the effectiveness or hopefully not lack thereof of the effectiveness of our work product. So hope to have a big step forward by the end of next week.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Jeff. That's a really exciting update from the SSAC. And thank you for also sharing the context of the SSAC's culture. I think as you noted, many here are aware, but it's good to emphasize how different each of the organizations are and what a significant effort this is to have consistent framework for the community. So thank you. Are there any other updates others would like to share? Otherwise, I think we'll just, we already kind of briefly touched upon it, but we'll just

emphasize the engagement for ICANN 81. If we could go to slide three, I think it is for the work plan. Thank you, Jessica. Sorry, there's a lot of shuffling around today. Thank you. So this is just a reiteration of the work plan and roadmap for the CCG this year and how we're nearing the tail end of this. So we have reflected the period for socialization of the framework ahead of the public comment from now until the annual general meeting. We know that you've been consistently engaging with your groups throughout this calendar year. And we would like to suggest to the group after we have finalization of the public comment document, and as we go through the AGM and socialize the framework, that there be a community coordination group informational webinar for the community to draw attention to the public comment proceeding, which is currently slated to open just after the annual general meeting on the 21st of November. And of course, if work concludes before then, the public comment can open before the meeting, but we think perhaps in terms of engagement and socialization, it's a great opportunity to leverage the annual general meeting with your groups. Thank you.

So then maybe we could just go back to slide four, Jessica, just to kind of recap the goals for the group. We will take an action item for Org to work with the small team on the draft continuous improvement program framework, particularly pages seven and nine reflecting the feedback and the great discussions we had today. And we'll circulate this on the list, and hopefully complete some work intersessionally to align on this language as well as general consensus on the five principles with further explanation of their context, and then head towards finalization at the next meeting. And then we'll just focus on gearing up

for public comment, ICANN 81 and the survey for implementation, we would like to have your feedback on that aspect as well. So there's still several months of work ahead for the CCG, but a lot of information to come together. And we appreciate your efforts, your diligent participation and liaising with your groups outside of these meetings as well. So thank you very much. And I think we might be actually ending on time or early today, unless anyone has any further feedback. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you very much. I don't know if the modification of principle four and principle five have been adopted. If they are adopted, please note the disagreement of the NomCom about this change, because the NomCom is appointing ICANN leaders, and NomCom cannot be accountable to people outside ICANN. We are appointing ICANN leaders, so we are accountable to the community of ICANN. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you very much. And if I may summarize from discussions today, I believe that several were in agreement that this is perhaps a bit broad to apply to all the groups, but we can reflect this in the language surrounding the principles to explain it a little further. But this is an action item we'll take with the small team to resolve the feedback from the community coordination group today. And thank you again for emphasizing the NomCom's perspective. Thank you all. All right. Well, then, I guess we'll give five minutes back to everyone today. And thank

you very much, as always. And we'll see you in a couple weeks, and in between on the list. Stay tuned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]