

Continuous Improvement Program Framework

NCSG Comments

January 17, 2025

About NCSG

NCSG represents the interests of non-commercial domain name registrants and end-users in formulating the Domain Name System policy within the Generic Names Supporting Organisation (GNSO). We are proud to have individual and organizational members in over 160 countries, and as a network of academics, Internet end-users, and civil society actors, etc, we represent a broad cross-section of the global Internet community. Since our predecessor's inception in 1999, we have facilitated global academic and civil society engagement in support of ICANN's mission, stimulating an informed citizenry and building their understanding of relevant DNS policy issues.

We congratulate the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group (CIP-CCG) for the excellent work on the complex of coming up with a core framework for a community as diverse as the one we find at ICANN.

About this Public Comment

<https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/continuous-improvement-program-framework-21-11-2024>

What we need your input on:

1. 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:

- a. Do you support the Continuous Improvement Program Framework (comprising Principles, Criteria, and Indicators)? **See pages 6 and 8.**
 - Yes, we support the Framework.
 - We note that flexibility seemed to be the most important value of the framework, and, because of that, it would be fruitful to have more examples in-text to guide the structures' work when developing their own specific criteria and indicators based on the principles (as it was done with the principle of efficiency). The links provided are really helpful, but they show the disparity of details among different frameworks (see, comparatively, ALAC and NomCom). Thus, having some extra guidance to stimulate some level of formal harmony (level of detail, for instance) can be useful to better achieve the objective of reflecting a very diverse universe of structures, that are, however, part of the same ecosystem.
 - b. Do you agree with the five principles, based on the current Organizational Review objectives described in the ICANN Bylaws, to apply across the organizational structures (SOs, ACs, and the NomCom)? **See page 7.**
 - Yes, we support the principles as presented, and we would like to contribute with two comments.
 - It would be fruitful to have a brief explanation of the overlapping zones among principles, considering that this will naturally happen in a broad-ended method of review, as shown by the example provided regarding efficiency mentioning, in its criterias, the fulfilment of purpose. It is important to note that this is not in itself a problem, but can be a barrier for a harmonized approach between structures and the overall view of the ecosystem.
 - More importantly, the relation between structures and substructures could be better defined. Does the substructure have to follow a similar pattern as the one used by the SO / AC / NomCom? When the substructure does not develop a specific framework for itself, it is evaluated by the one developed by the structure? Some clarification of the intent of the CIP-CCG would be welcome.
 - We believe SO/AC should be ultimately accountable to the ICANN bylaws.
2. Agreement for the Continuous Improvement Program Framework to be adopted by each SO, AC, and the NomCom:

- a. Do you agree with the plan for the next steps to carry the Continuous Improvement Program out in two, 3-year assessment periods? **See pages 9 and 10.**
- Yes, we agree. The dialogue between the CIP and the Holistic Review seems to be positive, and should be implemented in a way that the input generated within the CIP is effectively taken into consideration during the Holistic Review, which included learnings regarding the methodology used.