ICANN Business Constituency (BC) Comment on
[Continuous Improvement Program Framework](#)

17-Jan-2025

Background

This document is the response of the ICANN Business Constituency (BC), from the perspective of business users and registrants, as defined in our Charter. The mission of the BC is to ensure that ICANN policy positions are consistent with the development of an Internet that:

    1. Promotes end-user confidence because it is a safe place to conduct business;

    2. Is competitive in the supply of registry and registrar and related services; and

    3. Is technically stable, secure and reliable.

General Comment

The Business Constituency (BC) appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the Continuous Improvement Program (CIP) Framework. We recognise the importance of continuous improvement in enhancing ICANN's accountability, transparency, and effectiveness. The framework's evolution from Organizational Reviews led by Independent Examiners to a community-led program is a positive step towards empowering the ICANN community to take ownership of the process.

Key questions:

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.**

    BC Comment: We support the Continuous Improvement Program Framework (CIP Framework) as it is a step in the right direction for working on assessments within the ICANN community and a foundation for evolving Organizational Reviews led by Independent Examiners into a Continuous Improvement Program led by the ICANN community.

    Rationale: The CIP Framework's emphasis on community-led continuous improvement aligns with ICANN's mission and core values. The framework's

principles, criteria, and indicators provide a solid structure for assessing and improving ICANN's organizational effectiveness.

Suggestions for Improvement: We suggest clarifying the following aspects to ensure the CIP Framework is fit for purpose:

I. *Metrics and Evaluation Criteria:* Provide more detail on how the effectiveness of the continuous improvement program will be measured and evaluated via well-defined, quantifiable goals and objectives.

II. *Transparency and Accountability:* Strengthen the language to emphasize the importance of transparency and accountability throughout the Continuous Improvement Process.

III.　　　Ensuring Integrity and Fairness: Consider mechanisms to safeguard the integrity of the process and ensure that the continuous improvement program remains focused on meaningful improvements.

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**.

BC Comment: We agree with the five principles, as outlined on page 7, to apply across the organizational structures (SOs, ACs, and the NomCom) as they lead to better assessments and decision making in alignment with the ICANN Bylaws which provides a solid foundation for effective governance.

However, we note that structures of structures are effective (principle 2) only when they serve the interests of their sub-structures and maintain accountability (principle 3) to both stakeholders and sub-structures. Engaging a distinct consultation process for sub-structures is essential to achieve these goals.

Rationale: We believe that these principles align with ICANN's Bylaws and are essential for ensuring accountability, transparency, and effectiveness with ICANN's organizational structures. The alignment is crucial to fostering trust among stakeholders and ensuring that ICANN remains responsive to the evolving needs of the global internet community.

Suggestions for Improvement: To further enhance the principles, we suggest the following:

     I.   *Customization and Flexibility:* Offer guidance on how the framework can be tailored to accommodate the unique needs and diverse structures of SOs, ACs, and the NomCom.

     II.   *Emphasizing the importance of stakeholder engagement*: Highlight the critical role of stakeholder engagement in the process.

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.**

    BC Comment: We have reservations about the plan for the next steps to carry the Continuous Improvement Program out in two, 3-year assessment periods. While we support the overall objective of the CIP, we have concerns about the proposed timeline and its potential implications.
    Rationale: Our concerns are based on the following:

    I.   The proposed two, 3-year assessment period appears excessively long. Such extended timelines may lead to fatigue and decreased momentum, potentially undermining the effectiveness of the CIP.

    II.   The extended timeline may also lead to increased vulnerability to tactical behavior thereby heightening the risk of undermining the process's integrity.

    III.   The rigid two, 3-year assessment periods may not allow sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances or emerging issues.

    Suggestions for Improvement: To address our concerns, we suggest the following for a more flexible and adaptive approach:

    I.   Consider shorter and more flexible timelines (such as 18 months, 1x3 years, or 1x4 years) to maintain momentum and focus and ensure the recommendations are not outdated and/or irrelevant.

    II.   Develop and implement robust safeguards to mitigate the risk of increased vulnerability to tactical behaviour and ensure the integrity of the CIP.

Conclusion:

The BC supports the overall objectives of the CIP Framework and believes that if well-designed and effectively implemented it can be a valuable tool for continuous improvement within

ICANN. However, it is crucial to address the concerns raised above to ensure that the process is fair, inclusive and truly representative of the diverse interests within the ICANN community.

This comment was drafted by Arinola Akinyemi and Johnny Olufuye, with input from Vivek Goyal, Mason Cole, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Tim Smith, and Rachael Shitanda.
It was approved in accordance with our Charter.