
ICANN81 | AGM – Continuous Improvement Program CCG Meeting
Wednesday, November 13, 2024 – 16:30 to 17:30 TRT

JESSICA PUCCIO: Hello and welcome to the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group meeting. Today is Wednesday, 13 November, and it's 13:30 UTC.

My name is Jessica Puccio and I, along with Yvette, will be acting as remote managers for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior and the ICANN community antiharassment policy.

While this session is open to observers, question and comments will be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod and originate from the CIP-CCG volunteers.

If CIP-CCG members wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom and when a session facilitator calls upon your name you may take the floor.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that the transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the transcription, click on the closed captioning button in your Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name.

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.

You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I'll hand the floor over to the project manager Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Jessica. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Evin Erdogdu speaking. For everyone connecting from around the world and to those of you in Istanbul, [inaudible]. Welcome to the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group meeting during the ICANN81 Annual General Meeting.

There may be some observers in the room today, so first just wanted to welcome you all and thank you for observing but wish to highlight that this is a regular working session of this community group so only the representatives and alternates will be engaging in the discussion.

From ICANN Org in addition to myself, Jessica, and Yvette, we also have Larisa Gurnick and Jean-Baptiste joining remotely. And in the room today with you we have Jason Kean as well as Theresa Swinehart and Giovanni Seppia.

Just a quick overview of the agenda which you see on your screen here. We wanted to note a few adjustments in light of ICANN81. We'll first do the final review of the public comment proceeding and related documents and then discuss the related engagement efforts. And at the end, we added a little more time under AOB for any input and observations from the representatives that you'd like to share from

your meetings during ICANN81 so far, including comments from your groups on the continuous improvement program.

Unless there are any hands raised or questions from the group, we can go ahead and go into the first item. Sorry, Jessica. If we could actually display the Continuous Improvement Program draft framework document, the Google Doc. Awesome. Thank you so much.

Thank you all for your input on the list in advance of ICANN81 with the majority of the Community Coordination Group expressing support to the adjustment of Principle 4. Given the majority of the Community Coordination Group members expressing support for this adjustment to Principle 4, it was reflected accordingly as a next step with modification to the principle and emphasis in the draft framework.

We can allow time for further comments and observations of course today as suggested from IPC and others, if any, and offer to note for the record anyone who does not support, but we will plan to progress forward with the majority expressing support for these adjustments and finalization of the principles.

The Community Coordination Group meeting today is devoted to next steps for the public comment and the related webinar after ICANN81, which is tentatively planned on Thursday, 4 December.

The related resources for your review were shared on the list in advance of this meeting, and over the past few months a small team of coordination group representatives—namely Sean Copeland from the ccNSO, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Bukola Oronti from the ALAC, and Glen de Saint Gery from the IPC—have drafted language in this framework

with additional feedback of course from the Community Coordination Group overall incorporated into this document.

Before we take time for comments and discussion from the group, I'd just like to provide you all with a high-level overview of the public comment proceeding documents and how they relate to one another. First, if we could go to the bottom of Page 7, Jessica. Thank you so much.

These are the five principles finalized by the Community Coordination Group. We'll try to do some formatting and fit them all on one page so that they're not separated, but I encourage everyone to please read the narrative of this section if you have not already about the development of these principles which provide important context.

Notably, the Community Coordination Group concluded that the Continuous Improvement Program framework should apply at the organizational level at the SO, AC, or NomCom level to begin with. And as the community continues working on how the overarching principles apply to each organizational structure and their respective substructures, any necessary adjustments and finetuning to these overarching principles can evolve over time.

These five principles are to be used by each organizational structure to further the criteria and indicators relevant to your groups. To that end, if we could go to the bottom of Page 9. Thank you, Jessica. Actually, the top of Page 9. Sorry. Yeah, that section there. Thank you.

I just wanted to highlight a new section if there are no objections. This is highlighting the illustrative examples of the frameworks provided by

several representatives to the Community Coordination Group, including the NomCom, ALAC, APRALO, AFRALO, and the RSSAC. We noted that input is not specifically requested on the community group's work, but it serves as a useful example of how the Continuous Improvement Program framework is utilized by the organizational structures. If we could now go to the public comment proceeding template document, please. Thank you so much. All right, perfect.

I wish to highlight here at the bottom of Page 2 is the input that's requested on the Continuous Improvement Program framework as a part of this public comment proceeding. I'll just read off these questions and then, Sebastien, I see your hand is up in the Zoom room. But I'll read this off first.

We're generally asking whether the Continuous Improvement Program framework is fit for purpose to evolve organizational reviews led by independent examiners into a Continuous Improvement Program led by the ICANN community to inform the eventual holistic review.

We generally ask there: "Do you support the framework utilizing the principles-criteria-indicator approach?" And then we highlight which section of the framework that is on, on Pages 6 and 8. And then we ask: "Do you agree with the five principles to apply across the organizational structures?" referencing Page 7. And we also ask that: "If you do not agree, please provide your rationale and related suggestions for improvement." If we could scroll just a little bit further down, please, Jessica.

Then the second overall input that we're asking for is the community's agreement for the framework to be adopted by each organizational structure, including agreement with the plan for the next steps to carry out the Continuous Improvement Program out in two three-year assessment periods as described on Pages 9 and 10 of the framework. And again, we ask for any input and constructive suggestions if responders do not agree or support these aspects.

I'll pause here because I see Sebastien's hand is up in Zoom. Please go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Evin. You are going too fast for me. After five days of meetings with other topics to tell my brain to the topic it's already difficult.

If we can go back to the previous document, I would like to ask two questions. The first one, is it what is written now for the five principles that it's the last version? That's my first point.

And my second, in somewhere in the document it's written the word "whole." And I don't remember—and I am sorry—if "whole" is referring to each organization, the whole SO, the whole GNSO, the whole ICANN.

I ask this question because I don't think it is the same meaning, and it will end up at the same place. That's my two questions for the moment. Thank you very much. And if it's not clear, just ask me to repeat and to say it in another way as—I am maybe the only one—but I am really tired. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

All right, Sebastien, thank you very much. I'll just respond, and then I see we have a queue, but also welcome input from the group as well. And I hear you. There's a lot going on during ICANN81 and a lot to digest here as well. But your questions are insightful because this document really them, and it has been shared with the Community Coordination Group before.

But just to confirm your first question, those principles in advance of ICANN81 the majority of the Community Coordination Group has expressed support to those five principles as they are currently articulated there. So that's been reflected accordingly, and we plan to progress forward with these principles with the majority expressing support.

But to that end in the spirit of continuous improvement, this is a pilot and we're also putting this out for public comment. So further adjustments may take place, but these five principles have more or less been supported by the Community Coordination Group at this time.

And I think for your other question about the organizational level as well, this information is described in the framework. I wish to draw your attention to that preamble there under developing principles section. It's highlighted as well. Just noting how the Community Coordination Group considered how to balance the focus of organizational reviews on the structures as a whole and also just delve into the component parts of certain structures to those groups that have substructures where applicable.

So we noted in this preamble that the Community Coordination Group had concluded that the framework should apply at the organizational level to begin with. And as the community continues to work on how the overarching principles apply to each organizational structure and their respective substructures, any necessary adjustments and finetuning to these principles can evolve over time.

I know a few hands are up, so maybe I'll just call on Naveed next. Please go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Hello, everyone. I see Sebastien's hand is up so in case he wants to follow up, I would like to invite him to have this.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Oh, sure. Yes, please, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Naveed. Yeah, my question is exactly on this Page 7. You say it's written. Maybe I don't understand well, but if you can go to the top of Page 7, "The CIP-CCG consider how to balance the focus of organizational reviews on the structures as a whole." Once again, does "whole" refer to all the structure or does "whole" refer to each structure and substructure? Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Sebastien. It's articulated in this section here, but we can reference the language of the original ATRT3 recommendation 3.6

which stated that ICANN Org would work with each supporting organization, advisory committee, and the nominating committee to establish a continuous improvement program. And the continuous improvement program would have this common base between all the organizational structures but would also allow for customization so as to best meet the needs of each individual structure. And it was also noted that the results and the input from substructures of the organizational structures that have them would be aggregated into the organizational structure's assessment. So I hope I could articulate that well, but I just want to note that the answers to your questions are in the framework as well.

Thank you. I don't know if you have—your hand is still up—if you wish to further respond, Sebastien. Okay, it's down. Naveed, I think you were next. Would you like to go ahead?

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah, thank you very much. My question/comment is seeking clarification about this three-year assessment cycle that we mention in the document. Like year one, year two, and three. Year one states that we need to, you know, each SO, AC, and the substructures have to conduct satisfaction survey.

So my understanding since the beginning was that the survey is a part of assessment, but here it seems like the survey is the only way to identify the areas of improvement. The other inputs could be appointed [relative] analysis by SO/AC by themselves, like when they measure their indicators. So a measurement of the indicators could also serve as

an input to the assessment cycle. So was there a particular reason of just sticking to the survey here, or the information is not complete here? I just want to clarify my understanding.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Naveed. That's a great question, and I think we'll make sure that we clarify too that the framework is very much a part of the assessment period. Obviously, that's what has been worked on and that's the basis for this assessment. The survey is separate to conduct a satisfaction survey to identify areas that need improvement, but the organizational structures themselves will be utilizing the framework to report their continuous improvement program efforts and activities. And then those results will also be published along with results from the survey to inform any identified improvements, and they'll be shared with the broader community during these assessment periods.

So I just wanted to clarify that the framework utilizing criteria and indicators is very much a part of the assessment, and we can add some clarifying language here to that end so that people don't think it's just a survey. Thank you. I hope that answered your question. Damon, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure. Thank you so much, Evin. Not to backtrack too much, but I want to go back to the criteria. Specifically, Criteria 4 and the potential inclusion of the language of "in the benefit of a global Internet population." I did have a chance to discuss that with the GNSO Council today, and in general the council is supportive of including that

language. The reason is that ICANN is a nonprofit organization. Nonprofits have to have accountability and serve people beyond their inner organization. It's not like a for-profit company whose main goal is to generate profits for its shareholders, and so there is a significant difference there.

In addition to that, if you look at who ICANN serves, ICANN serves pretty much Internet users around the world. I don't think anybody here would say we want to exclude one region or country and say we don't serve them. So I think "global Internet population" is what it is.

The other reason is that when the council met with the Board a couple days ago, the first question that Tripti conveyed to us was along the lines of what are you doing for—she did not use this exact language. I forget exactly what it was, but it was something to the effect of, what are you doing for the global community, etc.?

So I think that's where council is coming down. If the majority in the room wants to change their minds, that would be great. If not, I just wanted to share where council was coming from. And I thank you so much for hearing me out today.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you very much, Damon. That's really important information coming live, so to speak, from the GNSO Council during ICANN81 and also in conversations with the Board and really appreciate you sharing this with the group.

I'd just like to ask how others would like to react to this. As noted, the majority of the group has expressed support for the principle as is, but we would welcome anyone's input in reaction to Damon's recent update from the GNSO Council. Thank you. Benjamin, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE:

Thank you. Concerning that point, if I'm getting it correctly, the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group feels like they [can't] be accountable to because to them it's problematic. How do you define wider Internet governance body? [Is this maybe wider ICANN community?]

There, our own understanding is we should be accountable as the bylaws have dictated. The bylaws should be the guiding principles because our stakeholders, our different groups are really dynamic and different. So they feel like the place we can rally around is the bylaws.

And I really told the councilors in the room that the issue is up now. Quickly express yourself. But I think when they get to the consciousness of this conversation, that they're going to bring it up. But I just wanted to mention in this room that that's what I hear in the room when I'm with them. But I don't know why they weren't conscious to it when it was being discussed in the concluding part of the GNSO's working session this afternoon. They should have responded and said this is how we feel about this conversation. But whenever I go to them and ask for their input and you bring this line and then say which community

are we responding to, it's the bylaws that should come up in that location.

I hope I'm clear. I'm talking about SOs, ACs, and NomCom being accountable to internal to its stakeholders. They are fine with that. Substructures where applicable and external to the wider ICANN structures, they feel a bit uncomfortable with that. That's what I'm saying.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'm sorry. Just to be clear, are they uncomfortable with the language as it's written there, or are they uncomfortable to the “global Internet population” language?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: They find that problematic because they can't define the “global.” Like, who are the global Internet structures?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I with say everybody that uses the Internet, but that's fine.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Benjamin—I see your hand is up—and Damon for responding. Benjamin, would you like to respond? Okay, thank you. Alan, I see your hand is up next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Two points. On the terms of the language in the principle, I personally support what Damon was saying. I think we do have an obligation to the Internet community. I agree to removing that phrase because, to be quite candid, this whole process is taking far too long. And if we're going to spend all of our time for the next two years talking about the principle, we'll never get any real work done. But I think Damon's comment is quite relevant, and ICANN does have a responsibility to the global community even if the individual subparts of ICANN don't directly have that responsibility.

I raised my hand originally, however, just to mention that you said and we agreed to that initially we're going to focus on the ACs and SOs. And if they have substructures, we'll worry about integrating those into the overall plans at a later time. I'm just raising the red flag that I've raised before that when we come to doing this it's going to be problematic because in many cases these substructures have mandates of their own and their improvement is not necessarily going to be easily [integrable] into the parent structure, as it were.

So the RALO may have different functions that are not going to be easily [integrable] into the ALAC and the Registrar Stakeholder Group into the GNSO. But at this point, I agree. We have to focus on the ACs and SOs. But I am raising the red flag that when we come to do any further integration, we're going to have to think carefully about just how to do that and what we're doing. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Alan, for your insightful intervention. I'm noting too that in addition to this being a pilot and the first time the community is working through this along with Org support as well, there will be some pain points and areas we need to work out as it's the first time. So we look forward to feedback, and maybe through this process there can be identified improvements as well. Because to your point, the organizational structures are each so unique as well as their substructures and how they relate to one another.

I see a couple more hands up. So if it's related to perhaps the Principle 4 discussion. Amrita, please go ahead. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Evin. Just to mention what I had mentioned in the chat because a few of them may not be in the Zoom room. From APRALO, we support the original text which was proposed with an explanatory note on "in the benefit of a global Internet population" when the draft comes out for comments. So I think that also takes care of to a certain extent, Damon, what you're saying and lets what comes in through comment period work.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Amrita. I'm not sure if Damon wishes to respond but thank you.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Amrita, just some clarity. So you're proposing putting in my language or other language? I don't fully understand.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: No. We are saying we stick to the original text which was proposed in Principle 4 which is this and we add an explanatory note on what you are proposing as what you have suggested as “in the benefit of the global Internet population.” Because if you look at the room currently, while as indirectly ICANN's SOs and ACs may not be I would say accountable to the global public directly because ICANN's mandate is also limited. What we are saying is we stick to the original text, but there could be an explanatory note on this is something which has also been proposed.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: That’s fine with me.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you very much, Damon and Amrita, for that clarifying exchange. Bukola, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, of course, it’s not Bukola at all. It’s Cheryl Langdon-Orr. But I’ve got my other ear in my phone in another room, so I can’t put my hand up in here. So thank you for that, Bukola.

Just from the At-Large Advisory Committee's perspective—and remember we’ve got the RALOs doing their things and us doing our things and that’s a whole lot of fun I can tell you—ambivalence is the actual position. We don’t mind with or without the text. So flip a coin,

which is pretty much what Bukola and I did, and we're perfectly happy to go with the flow on 4. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Cheryl and Bukola. Great. And too, maybe it's useful as well. There was a note shared on the list just to recap about this principle. Just a general reminder through this conversation, we can see that each structure can also get to define what this means for them. Just having a common understanding of this phrase across the organizational structures at this time is important.

So if we delve into what the "global Internet population" means for different groups and how does the wider ICANN community provide benefit to the global Internet population, it can get a little nebulous. So we just encourage that alignment and shared understanding will be helpful during the next phase of the continuous improvement program, which would be the self assessment by each organizational structure of their accountability. Thank you.

I see a couple more hands are up. Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Thank you. I like the wording as it is here, and I have some concerns adding more stuff about being responsible to global Internet users because I think that's outside of ICANN's scope and remit. I'm reading here ICANN's mission from the bylaws: "The mission of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems."

It doesn't say anything about Internet users or anything like that, so I think that's outside of it.

And I know the GNSO Council does come up with policies and procedures and things like that, but it's not intended to affect every single person on the Internet. And so I think it's a little bit too broad here. And there are definitely structures within the GNSO that don't do anything with Internet users. And I think there are areas where Internet users are being represented and dealt with through all the other various structures. And so I'm concerned about putting that in there because there are some areas of ICANN that would be reporting and responsible just internally within ICANN and the ICANN community. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Owen, for sharing that with the group. Tijani, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Evin. In my opinion—not in my opinion—for me, as much as you add accountability I would be more happy. So I don't mind to add what Damon proposed in case of agreement of the majority. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you very much. I see Damon has responded in the chat as well for adding context in the framework. Sebastien, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but finish with this topic. It's another topic. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Well, I note we're already 30 minutes into this item and we have a couple more items. I don't know if there is anyone else who would like to comment on this specific topic, but otherwise please go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. My difficulty here in the document, and I discovered that it's written a few times, the question of universal uniformity. I don't think that it could apply to ICANN. We can find to find a way to work the same way, but uniformity I think is a too strong word. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Sebastien. We'll look at that terminology and where it's being used in the framework. Thank you. So just on this item too before we move to the next one because we just took questions organically, but I did want to highlight a couple other sections in the framework for the group's attention. They are highlighted currently, so there are also a couple more edits added providing more information about the development of the framework this year. If we could go to the top of Page 5, Jessica. Sorry, to the main framework document, not the template one. The first document, thank you. Top of Page 5. Thank you.

So just at the top of Page 5 and also on Page 10 under next steps of implementing the continuous improvement program, this language is serving to clarify the relationship between continuous improvement program, the pilot holistic review, and the holistic review as they develop. Many of you in the room are particularly aware that the community is having active conversations about these initiatives during ICANN81. And we look forward to ongoing input from the community as the work progresses, including in this public comment proceeding on the continuous improvement program framework. Maybe we could also show Page 10 too just to flag so everyone can see that information too. Thank you so much, Jessica.

And just in addition to these two main documents, the framework itself and then the public comment proceeding, there's also an appendix document. It's that third tab, Jessica. Thank you. This just goes into further detail of the work to evolve organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program and the community's extensive and consistent work this year to that end. So just wanted to note that.

And from this conversation, we've taken a few action items to provide some additional clarity in this document surrounding Principle 4 besides the application of the framework and the next steps and not just the survey as well. And also the language terminology about universal. Thank you.

So if we could then just go over the next steps. This would be the webinar draft slide deck. Maybe if we could just display that, Jessica. Thank you so much. Oh, and Sebastien, is that an old hand, or would you like to provide a comment on that item?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, it's a new hand, but I don't know how you go from one document to the other. I am lost in translation. Sorry. I wanted to come back to the CIP framework public comment, please. I think it could be useful to ask also the one who say I agree to provide some rationale. I don't know why we are asking for the one disagreeing, but we can have good ideas from people who agree with the principles with the way we want to work. Therefore, I would like to be equal on the response and whatever if you agree or disagree, please provide your rationale. We could discover something interesting there. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you. I appreciate that, Sebastien. Okay, any comments on the framework? We'll also share these on the list, of course, as we have previously. And these documents are in the external Community Coordination Group Google Drive, so you are able to view and comment at any time too.

Okay, so just want to provide a high-level overview of this slide deck. This is the webinar that we mentioned we have planned, we're preparing and we'll edit in the coming week or two after ICANN81 to drive awareness and engagement on the public comment proceeding and the draft framework.

The public comment, as noted, is scheduled to open on Thursday, 21 November, and we're planning to hold this webinar soon after on Thursday, 4 December.

You see here on the screen is the proposed agenda. It's just like generic. Essentially, we would have an overview of the initiative to evolve organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program. How the Community Coordination Group's work has evolved over the past year. The draft framework itself, key points from that as highlighted in the public comment proceeding. And then opportunities for the community's participation and input, including the public comment but we also want to encourage driving engagement with you all as the representatives as you engage with your groups in the coming months on this effort and to incorporate any relevant feedback.

Much of these slides we can quickly skim through, but they should be familiar to you. They're from recent presentations on your work, most recently from the ICANN81 prep week webinar but also from previous slide decks provided to you that you used to engage with your groups throughout this year around April and July in particular. Thanks, Jessica. If we could keep going down actually to Slide 13 as well. Thanks.

This is also just highlighting the input from the public comment proceeding that we wish to ask from the community. ICANN Org will prepare talking points related to this webinar slide deck and work with the Community Coordination Group on promoting this webinar. We'll in particular also highlight the thorough engagement from the coordination group this year, noting that throughout 2024 all the community volunteers have been consistently attending the Community Coordination Group meetings every two weeks with the majority attending 80% or more of meetings. And you have all been

engaging consistently both within this group and also with your respective groups to develop the draft framework.

For example, one community representative noted [inaudible] connected two and a half months of continuous engagement and hard work with your organizational structure, including around ten working sessions. Other representatives to the group formed their own subgroup to discuss and align on the continuous improvement program and how it would be implemented within their own organizational structure. And your engagement will be instrumental toward moving into next steps of implementation, including addressing input from the public comment proceeding and socialization with your groups.

To that end, we do request volunteers needed to help lead facilitation and emcee the webinar after ICANN81. We would welcome any questions and feedback from the community at that time and also through public comment. Previously, we already had a list of a few volunteers. I think Sean Copeland, Bukola Oronti, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. So please let us know if you'd like to volunteer to emcee this, but we will be working with the whole group to promote awareness of this webinar in the coming weeks.

Sebastien, I see your hand is up. I'm not sure if that was an old hand.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's a new one. Sorry for that but one of my concerns both in the CIP discussion and in the pilot holistic review discussion, both can live separately. If you look at ATRT3 proposals, the first holistic review was

supposed to happen at the same time of the starting of the continuous improvement program, therefore they were not supposed to get anything from.

Therefore, I would like that we decouple the two. Yes, it will be good to have inputs, the work done by the CIP, but the work of the CIP is not to provide information to the holistic review. It's to do the continuous improvement program for each structure, and that's most important than anything else. The fact that this work will allow to give information to the holistic review is a second product of the work. Therefore, I think it's important to say that the first goal of the continuous improvement program is the continuous improvement of each structure and not to give anything to anything else. It's an additional product of that. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Sebastien, for providing that input. That's also—I know we have just about 15 minutes left. I don't know if anyone would like to react to the webinar, plans for the webinar specifically, but your comments are also just a good question in general or segue to the next slide. Oh, Irina. Please go ahead, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you, Evin. A minor comment related to what I see on the slide but also to the text of the documents. So talk about two assessment periods, three years each. Is that correct? Because when I read this CIP out in two three-year assessment periods, it's possible to be unclear. So it speaks about two periods each three years, yes?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yes, thank you for clarifying. We can maybe make that language a little more clear. I believe you're referencing Page 9 and 10 of the draft framework.

IRINA DANELIA: Yes.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yes, the assessment phase, one assessment period is three years, but it's separate into three phases and each is estimated to be one year in duration. So we're estimating there we be two three-year assessment cycles, and then the holistic review would eventually be able to review assess that information as input.

IRINA DANELIA: Yes, my second comment, maybe you want to mention what will happen after these two cycles.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Yes, so actually that is in some of the clarifying language that was added. We could show maybe the top of Page 10. The holistic review provided it will be supported by the ICANN community and approved by the ICANN Board, would review the continuous improvement efforts of each supporting organization, advisory committee, and the nominating committee, and look at how effectively these ICANN structures work together.

The pilot holistic review team which some of you are actually members of as well, the community volunteers there are designing how the eventual holistic review would work. And the combination of the continuous improvement program and the eventual holistic review together are expected to replace the organizational reviews.

Thank you for flagging that relationship, and I'm sure it will continue to come up as the community has conversations about these efforts. Sebastien, I see your hand is up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you. I will try not to be the “gardien du temps” but, no, the holistic review was not meant to replace organizational reviews. It was additional reviews with some inputs from what [inaudible] organizational review by the continuous improvement program. Therefore, the way you write that is, I feel, I am a little bit concerned. But that's not so important.

The second point is that in proposing these two, why [is it] six years and two time three years? Because of the number of organizations and because the holistic review is supposed to happen each six years and it was a reason to organize like that? Here we have a proposal to do all together the same thing at the same time. In ATRT3 it was proposed to do three organizations each year with not each of us. In-depth work for three organizations each of the three years. After the three years, we get all SOs and ACs and so on who are going through this in-depth continuous improvement period.

I am concerned that we will go all together because one of the reasons of this setup was because the organization and the community were saying there is too much going at the same time. And I guess for staff it's the same. If you have to do the same thing for all at the same year, the question of budget, of people, and so on, I am concerned with that.

But once again, I will try to stop to be the gardien du temps of the ATRT3 recommendations. Thank you very much.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Sebastien. I appreciate your feedback and perspectives, as always too. And just want to note as well because the ICANN Board directed the implementation of the continuous improvement program to be a pilot, the execution of the next steps of the continuous improvement program following the adoption of the framework offers flexibility for the activities and processes to evolve based on the needs of the organizational structures.

And this framework we're now here after one year of really consistent dedicated work by the community volunteers developing this framework. We're at a time to now publish it for ICANN public comment before adoption, so there will certainly be feedback incorporated. And we're aware too that there are currently a lot of discussions going on at ICANN81 about this effort.

So this is actually a good segue into just AOB and wanting to hear from the group too, anyone else in the room or even remotely, what have you been hearing from your groups during ICANN81 related to this work? Any concerns, questions, support, and how to best drive engagement

on this public comment so that we get the most constructive input as possible. We have about ten more minutes for the meeting, so just would like to open up the floor to any observations from the community during ICANN81. Thank you. Amrita, I see your hand is up.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Evin. Just to update. This is from At-Large. We did have a community discussion how we can enhance collaboration and cooperation between the RALOs and At-Large in implementing the continuous improvement process and whatever the RALOs or At-Large are thinking to do. So just as an update for all of you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you very much, Amrita. Anyone else would like to share any conversations that they've been having with their groups on this—positive, negative? I see also if I may call on Tracy. I see you in the Zoom room, but I'm not sure if you can comment about the engagement with the GAC on this effort during ICANN81. I'm not sure if he's there, but there was an engagement with the GAC on this effort, and so I'm sure we'll hear more from him as a next step.

Anyone, this would be a great time to share with the group specific input from your groups or any other meetings you've been having where this has come up either as a formal part of the agenda or just organically. Benjamin, please go ahead.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: As I said earlier, we've been having conversation about it, and I think we're also going to continue to have conversations about it. Especially concerning Principle 4 because that brought up a lot of back and forth. It was an interesting debate, and the conclusion these are some of the things my community has been sharing. So I expect them to either as councilors or in other avenues they have, you will hear their voices especially on their reservations on some of the principles, Principle 4 I mean. So I know the conversations we've had and I've shared it with them on the mailing list as well. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Benjamin. I appreciate it. Tijani, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you very much. We also as a NomCom, I met with the leadership of NomCom 2023 and 2024 leaders, and we discussed what we did so far. In any case, anything I said in this group was discussed before with the group with the leaders of the NomCom and everything is the opinion of those leaders. So we had this discussion here in Istanbul, and they are looking forward to the public comment and the upcoming steps of this program. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Wonderful. Thank you very much, Tijani. I appreciate this update from NomCom. Thank you. I'm not sure if there are any hands in the room or any other comments from anyone else. I know we're at a pretty

important timing for all this work, and a lot is happening just overall in ICANN. And it will be a really great opportunity to get feedback through public comment and engage on this work to promote greater understanding of how this can work as a next step.

So thank you very much. We have a few AIs for editing the draft framework, and we'll recap the conversations as usual in a meeting report and summary of next steps. And we'll be distributing information on the list about these final documents as well as promotion of the webinar as a next step to drive community engagement and attention on this work.

Well, thank you. I can't see everyone necessarily. I don't see any further hands in the room. So if there's no further input, I just want to thank you all for your diligence so much and being open and providing such insightful thoughts about this work. And thank you all for your diligence as we move forward in evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program.

So thank you very much. Yes, and please take a selfie. Have a great time in Istanbul. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]