ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 22 November 2023 at 12:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/0wC1E

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

JULIE BISLAND: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Approval call, taking place on Wednesday, the 22nd of November, 2023. For today's call, we have apologies from Susan Payne. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you. And over to our Chair, Manju Chen. Please begin, Manju.

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.

EN

MANJU CHEN: Hi, welcome everybody. We are kind of short on attendance. I guess people probably they're like sad who thought this is over. But actually we have some few more tasks to do. But I hope it's relatively lightweight, so we won't be doing dealing with contentious topics as we used to. But that will be my welcome, I guess. Welcome everybody. Sorry for the low attendance. And I guess we can get started.

So the second item on the agenda is we should reveal the framework of this continuous improvement pilot because this thing, it was a pilot, and I was reminded that in the original motion from Council when they passed the motion to start this pilot, they were asking, well, to a stage, you have to review if the pilot is working. That's why we had this document ready. It was the proposed framework to kind of review how this pilot has been going on. This is the original charter. So this was the objective of this committee. I'm not going to read it, of course. And you can see the scope. But then I guess the most important part is we finished a few important tasks that were assigned to us from this charter, which is, I guess, let me see. It should be on page seven.

Yeah, we had some possible assignments, and we finished a few. Probably it will be better if we just move to the one that's the review framework. Can we do that, Julie? Framework for continuous improvement pilot review proposal? That one? I guess not this. This one? Oh, yes, this is this the one, the proposal. So in the proposal, we have already a few questions. Can we roll down to—We can probably see first this. Yeah. These are the questions that were suggested in the proposal. Oh, it probably is kind of hard because it's split into two pages. But sorry, Julie, can we put up

the Google Doc? Probably it's easier for everybody to see. I'm sorry. I also have it in the chat. So if you guys want to see it on your own screen, you can see it from your own screen.

So these are the questions proposed in the proposal. And we are planning to send out a survey to those who were on the CCOICI and those on the task force and also probably councilors. I'm not sure about councilors, so we can discuss that too. Like who should we send to for this survey?

So these are the questions. Probably, we will have to kind of make it more answerable because these are like general questions and they'll have to write ... Probably, we can discuss also whether we want it to be like open questions or whether it's like a degree where they can choose from one to five, like super helpful or not helpful, super clear or not clear, those kind of question formats. So that will be our discussion today. The first discussion. If you didn't have time to read the questions, you can probably read it now. I'll give everybody one minute and we can start the discussion. What do you think is missing in these questions and how do you think we should ask the questions? Is it better for them to have open questions and open answers, or should it be like a matrix, they should be able to choose from one to five? And who do we think should receive this survey and answer the questions? Berry, hi.

BERRY COBB: Hi, Manju. So just reading through these questions, and admittedly, I'm not a survey design expert, but one thing that I have picked up over the years is to avoid what they call double barrel types of questions. So take, for example, the question

number one and the tail end of the sentence was clear and appropriate. You know, if we have a sliding scale as a response and if you really kind of break this down, it's conceivable that the objectives were clear, but were they also appropriate? And how do you answer it if they were clear and not appropriate? So that's one thing the group should take into consideration.

The second part is that when we look at like, I think it's—So question five as an example, there's really two questions there that should be broken out. So if the framework should not continue, tell me why. Or if it does, then how do you want to deal with the future work and processes and procedures? And part of the reason why I'm bringing this up is I'll be on point to help load the survey into our new survey tool. And so that's just something for the group to consider. And then the final statement I'll have is when a few of these questions are looking for free form input or open text input, I would pay extra careful attention to how that question is phrased so that we can get more targeted type of feedback. And an additional point to it is if you are asking an open text or open response type of question or expecting that kind of answer, it might also be helpful to marry it with something that we can quantitatively also attribute to the comment. So do you support this, yes or no? If you selected yes or no, describe why you said something so that way we can start to weight the balance of the question from a quantitative perspective. You know, 40% said yes, 60% said no. And then here's why they said yes or no. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. It was extremely helpful. And I also heard that the org is moving from the old survey tool you were using to a new one. So that's also one of the reasons why we cannot really have a template. Well, we haven't even assessed the question yet. So it's reasonable we haven't had a template. But can you also share, when are you fully moved to the new survey tool? And if we have the questions done, when will it be kind of loaded into the survey tool as you suggested? Okay, okay, cool. So I guess we will have to really fully bake the questions. But so aside from Berry's super helpful suggestions, does anybody else have any other suggestions? I'm not seeing any hand or comments. Oh, Desiree, please.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yeah, I can see that wisdom also said, I think Berry made great comments to distinguish between double ask questions in the question number one. But also, I think we should agree what the response should look like. So we're talking about the objective, the scope and mechanisms, and to leave room for some qualitative response. And the most important thing is that the questions are clear. So we have the CCOICI and we have a task force. And then we should also—For example, the question number three, it's clear, if not, what other mechanisms should have been considered. So there is a good follow up question to clarify. So maybe there, there's no need for a note. But in the question number four, I think, do we make a sub list in the question four, we'll leave it as a qualitative question, you can possibly gain some insight from the answers into previous questions, if they agree that the scope was right and if they agreed that the objective of the

EN

framework was right, then probably they would agree that the mechanisms maybe could be improved. But I think we should also make it very smooth, trim, and maybe not go over 10 minutes survey. I think that would be my recommendation.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Definitely, we don't want people spend too much time on the survey, we want it to be easy to answer, but also, the answers will be helpful.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: We've done some of the surveys in the past. And it's always good to see who could respond to the survey, who is it aimed to? Who is our target audience? Is it people closely watching it? Or is it the GNSO only? Or is it targeted to ALAC or other SOs? I think it would be good to bear that in mind. I would assume it's only CCOICI, but the questions that we cover are related to the whole of community. So I don't know how it was done in the past. It's my question.

MANJU CHEN: So in the proposal, it is suggested that the survey is amongst CCOICI and task force members, and of course, the former members, because we got some change of members during the whole pilot. And regarding how it was done, I guess the problem is, it's never done because this is a pilot. This is like we try this thing, right? So we will be the pioneer on this thing probably. So I see Berry is suggesting in chat, could be council to other respondents for more capacity. Interesting. So Berry is

suggesting, apart from what was suggested in the proposal, which is CCOICI members and task force members, current and former, we can also send the survey to council and to the SG and C leaders. Leaders? Is it leaders or? Yes, leads. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: Yeah, sorry. The more appropriate would be chairs, I suppose. Although the IPC calls themselves a president, not chair. But either way, I think what's also important here is this feedback could and hopefully will be useful about the future direction of this group. I think what's important to keep in mind is what the future looks like. So to give context about how this group was formed is many years ago, there was a standing committee on continuous improvements. It was born out of the implementation from the last GNSO review. And then at the time, I think the activity was light or not robust enough to keep it going. And now fast forward to implementation of Work Stream 2 and a lot of these other topics, this is the second generation of that kind of standing committee on continuous improvements, just really under a different name and different people that are volunteering. So now fast forward to a year from now or maybe a little longer. If you're not aware, the implementation of ATRT3, one of the recommendations is for the communities to implement a continuous improvement program that is meant to replace what the organizational reviews did in the past. So here very soon, I believe each of the SGs and Cs are getting ready to nominate or put forward representatives from their respective groups to help define what this overarching continuous improvement framework is going to look like. I have to presume that they will deliver their outcome, which is some sort of

framework that can measure continuous improvement across all of the community groups. And then finally, assuming that the board signs off on what they've implemented, then all of that comes our way back to the GNSO to actually implement and execute against that continuous improvement. So the point being here is one way or another, the GNSO is going to have to figure out what is the platform or mechanism by which the GNSO will conduct its continuous improvement. And so is the structure of the CCOICI, which I still very much dislike this acronym and I love acronyms, is it appropriate that it still be reporting to or managed by the council? If so, then fine, we can continue forward. If it's not appropriate, then what is going to be this vehicle by which the GNSO must contribute and develop and execute against a continuous improvement framework? So I think that's very important to really think about what the future is doing in addition to the framing of these particular questions, which is really about what has happened over the last year and a half. Because what has happened the last year and a half, that work was very specific to general improvements, which is not going to look anything like what's going to be in the coming years when this actually gets put into operation. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Super helpful. So I guess a few points. One is we should have this survey also sent out to the SG and C leaders. Does anybody disagree with this? It's your chance now to speak up. If not, I guess we can decide that our audience of this survey will be our CCOICI task force current and former members and the councilors and also the SG and C leaders.

EN

But regarding we should not only look back to what has been done, but also to take the continuous improvement framework, which I actually put in a chat. This is the one that they're asking all SO AC and SG and C to send a representative to, to look at the continuous improvement framework. So looking into this, how does I guess CCOICI fit into this or does it fit into this? Should we change a format? I'm not sure. Do we want to kind of put these questions into this survey too? Because it was supposed to be a review kind of question survey. But I think it would actually definitely be helpful to expand the survey in a sense, considering this continuous improvement framework and it's like an ICANN community group thing will be happening probably this if we do this survey and the answers will be very good feedback to that cross community working group or whatever group it's called too. Do people have any opinion on this? Do you think we should?

So let me put it this way. If you think we should not ask questions regarding the future, which is, for example, how do you think this can fit into the cross community? I don't know how it's called the community coordination group of the CIF. It's an acronym too. CIF is continuous improvement framework. Do you think we should include questions regarding this or not? If you think yes, please put one in the chat. If you think no, please put two in the chat. Desiree, please.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: So just to verify what you asked for, you said if we are supporting a suggestion that this survey goes out to the leadership of other SGs, we should put plus one. Is that what you asked?

EN

MANJU CHEN: I guess we already agreed that this should be going out to the leaders. But I guess my question is, do we want to add more questions that's more regarding the future?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: I believe if we ask questions about the future, perhaps we should refer to what Berry mentioned these recommendations coming out of ATRT and that the community seemed to be feeling a little bit overwhelmed with too many reviews and [inaudible] a steady platform, yet a lightweight where continuous improvements could be made, I think then we could ask an open-ended question in a way with some suggestions to say how they envisage this platform as a future.

My concern here is that if we are only asking questions in this pilot about the pilot that we have on SOI, it has not been seen as successful, which should not, although everyone worked towards its success. I think I wouldn't like that to tarnish the work the important work that the CCOICI does. And so we should have some wording about the future and why we as this group believes that incremental adjustments are probably something that community can cope with or leave it an open-ended question about the future.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you very much, Desiree. I think also Thomas has put in the chat, it will be useful. It makes sense to ask questions re: the future. But then the question is, I guess, who should be drafting

these questions? Should we, I guess, will we have volunteers who, will you all now have the links to the document? I would suggest whoever have the heart to add questions to this survey, to this document and see, just modify when you see fit. Of course, I will work with our extremely helpful, always very supportive staff to probably try to come up with questions too, but I will definitely appreciate anyone's help. And yes, Berry, you were, you just been volun-told if you could please, please put your, what you were saying so gracefully into text and then put it to the survey, we will be extremely helpful. We'll be extremely grateful because you've been extremely helpful.

So I guess we kind of have a few directions, motions for this part of the agenda. First is, we will refine the questions. It's going to be a team effort, but of course we will rely heavily on Berry, who is the expert of almost everything. And everybody is welcome, of course, to jump into this doc and add questions if you see fit. And we will also decide, we, I've also agreed that this survey, when it's done, when we, when we have the questions done, we will send out the survey to not only the CCOICI and task force members, but also councilors and all the SG and C leaders. I think these are the two most important motions. Did I miss anything? I don't see anyone correcting me, so I guess we can move to the next agenda item. Let's see what it is.

Ah, it's another community coordination group. So they sent in a request to us. Oh, this is my email to the council list. Because the WS2 coordination group was tasked to deal with the recommendation, but that recommendation we have already done, and we are waiting for other, actually, stakeholder groups and

SOACs to complete their tasks so we can move forward. But Julie, can you kind of roll down to see the original, do we have the original request from Alperen?

These are the questions. How does your group approach this recommendation? Does your group intend to implement this group practice recommendation or not? Our answer is actually we have already dealt with this recommendation and we already implemented our recommendations, I guess, in a sense, from the council side. And the second question is, should the CCG discuss these recommendations immediately or wait until the other unfinished AC and SO complete this task? So this, my personal opinion is, of course, to wait because always the fewer meetings, the better. But I'll check with you guys too. What do you think? Should the CCG wait? Or do you think we should ask them to do whatever should be done immediately? Thank you, Thomas. I also agree with the fewer meetings. So I guess our question, our answer to the second question will be wait until each relevant AC and SO to complete the recs. And do we think this recommendation should be handled elsewhere? Which means probably, I don't know, to that newly established CIF CCG, or the WS2 can still handle this? I personally think actually it would be useful, well, it would probably not be a problem to just move this task to the CIF CCG, which is the one Berry talked about that's dealing with the continuous improvement recommendations from ATRT3. Because this is kind of a continuous improvement kind of recommendation too. But I guess, so we can draft our response, because I guess it's an easy response. And then I'll circulate it to the group. And then if we agree, we will present it to the council and let council think if it's a great response. But so for the last

questions, do you guys think it's okay we suggest that it's moved to the CIF continuous improvement framework community coordination group? If you think it's okay, please put one in the chat. Thank you. Thank you guys. So I will be drafting the response. Oh, thank you, Julie. Thank you so much. So Julie will be drafting the response and we will circulate the draft to our list first. And after no disagreement, we will present it to council. And if council is okay with this, we will send this back to the WS2 community coordination group. So that was our third agenda item. What is our next agenda item?

Oh, membership. I guess whoever is here is like, thank you for still signing up with me, still being members on this committee. We will go chase those who haven't appointed their new members to this committee. And hopefully next time when we have the meeting, we will have full attendance. And I guess that's the item. And AOB. Does anybody have any ALB? I guess one of the AOB is to decide when will we meet next time. So next week, we're going to have the SPS, right? And the week after next week, I will be in KL for the IDN EPDP working group face to face meeting. So I guess we will have to have the meeting in the week of 11 to 15 of December. So it's gonna be 13 of December. Are you guys okay with next meeting scheduled to 13 of December? The usual time? Of course, we'll confirm again on the list too, just to make sure everybody knows what time we're suggesting. But if I'm not seeing objections, we will tentatively schedule the meeting on 13 of December. And in the meantime, hopefully we'll come up with better questions for the survey. Julie, when is the deadline for document submission, whatever thing for the council?

EN

JULIE BISLAND: It's the 11th. So if we want to get that response to the council, we'll have to get it to the council by the 11th. And then get it on the agenda for the 21st.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, so I guess that's an easy one. We can do it for the third agenda item. We will try to submit it before the deadline for the next council meeting. And so I think that's a wrap up of our meeting. Thank you. Thank you guys for coming. And I'll give you back 15 minutes of your life. Thank you. Thank you very much. See you guys hopefully next week. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]