
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – ASO AC Meeting with Review of Reviews CCG Leadership
Wednesday, March 11, 2026 – 9:00 to 10:00 IST

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Hello and welcome to the ASO Meeting with the Review of Reviews CCG leadership team. My name is Andrew McConnachie and I am a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

I will now hand it over to Hervé Clément to kick off the session.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you very much. It will be a good introduction. CCG, as you say, so we are full of acronyms and I think that this acronym issue could be part of a little discussion of this Review of Reviews subject. CCG for the Cross Community Group, because for the SOAC, we are not to be confused with the CCG because for us, the CCG is a group of the communication team within the regions, we have as well. So acronyms could be important in that.

Nevertheless, CCG also calls a Review of Reviews, is something initiated by the ICANN to review by definition, and in my sense as Hervé Clement personally, to simplify also that and make the things more powerful and more clear at the same time. It was

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.

requested for this group to have two representatives of each organization, SO and AC as well.

And so, we have started on this group with the participation on the chairing of Chris, who is present, Manal as well, and Avri also. And I will then give the floor to Chris, of course.

We have decided within the group that Akinori and me will be the representatives of the SO/AC for this work. And the objective on the idea of this meeting is first for Chris to present the work performed till yet. And also, for the SO/AC to ask questions and to receive your inputs for that. And before giving you the floor, I will give the floor first to Akinori who perhaps can add some words in addition to me. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA

Thank you very much, Hervé. Good morning, everyone, from Mumbai. My name is Akinori Maemura, one of the SOAC members, and then representative to the CCG Review of Reviews. Yes, the CCG ROR are already months old and then the ROR doing the discussion about how the reviews at ICANN should be done.

Today, I am really happy to have the update until now, and then having the perspective and comments, questions from the SOAC.

First of all, maybe a little bit unique portion of the SOAC. SOAC is one of the supporting organizations in ICANN, but the major part of the activity is done outside of ICANN, but the regional internet registries are for. So, that's a little bit different case from the cases

of the GNSO, ccNSO and some other the internal structure of ICANN. But with that, maybe this session will be very informative and valuable through the exchange between the SOAC and the CCG ROR. With that, thank you very much, Chris, for walking us through it. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you very much, Akinori and Hervé. It's great to be here. All the years at ICANN, I don't get to spend very much time with the numbers people, so it's actually very nice to be here. Actually, it's interesting. I think the ASO is closer to the ccNSO in the structure, because if you think about it, the CCs go home to do their work too, whereas the Gs kind of do it here. So, I think we actually have quite a lot in common. I think we have some slides.

I think Akinori said he wanted to use the slides, which is fine. Yeah. So, while that's happening, I think everybody knows that this happened, this came about because ATRT3 made a series of recommendations, one of which was the Continuous Improvement Program, which is great, and then that there should be a Holistic Review. That kind of got stuck in. I can do that. You're doing it? Okay. That kind of got stuck in the sense that we, that's the table. I can use that one if you want. Oh, okay. Okay, let's use the table. That's fine.

It has actually been slightly updated as well, and let's not worry about that for now. Yes. So, the Holistic Review Pilot threw up some issues, and the chairs of the pilot, which was me and Sophie

Hay, basically wrote to the Board and said, look, we can make this work, but if we make it work, this is what we need in order to make it work.

And the response from the Board at the time, from Tripti and the Board at the time was, well, okay, we get that, but how would you feel if we actually stopped everything and did a review of all of the reviews? And we said, well, if you're prepared to do that, that seems to us to make perfect sense. So, that's how we kind of ended up here.

We've met heaps of times. We've done a fair bit of work. Some of this stuff on this table will be more important for the ASO, and some of it is less important. So, I'm going to try and kind of pick out the things that I think you guys really need to think about and give us your feedback on, because some of it is kind of like a no-brainer. Others, other stuff is a bit more complicated.

So, at the moment, we have five buckets, five reviews. You can see them across the top. There are accountability and transparency, CIP assessment, Structural Review, Review of Reviews, and Ad Hoc or on-demand. I'm going to ignore the Review of Reviews. That was intended to be, the question being, should over time, in 10 years, there be another review of all the reviews? I think everybody thinks it's probably a sensible thing to do, but it doesn't need its own bucket. It can go under the on-demand bucket, which I'll get to towards the end.

That leaves us, in essence, with A, B, and C. B is the CIP assessment. I'm going to put that to one side, and if we get some time, I'll get to that. But I want to concentrate on A and C. So A is effectively the accountability and transparency review. We have made one significant suggested change, which is this. Actually, there are two significant suggested changes.

The first is that we ground the accountability and transparency review more into the documents of ICANN, so its mission, its core commitments, its articles of association, all of that sort of stuff, so that when an accountability and transparency review happens, it's going to be reviewing ICANN's performance of something, don't worry about what for the moment, against its values and its mission.

The second change that we've made is that we're suggesting that instead of forming a review team and saying, you go away as a review team and decide what you want to review, we're suggesting that you put a scoping team together first, and we think we're heading towards saying that should probably be the ICANN community leaders, so the SO and AC chairs and vice chairs.

Their job should be to say, at the next accountability and transparency review, we think you should review these things, here is your scope. What that means is that the review team, when it's put together, can be made up of people with expertise in the areas that the accountability and transparency review team is reviewing. So, for example, if it was to say, let's say that the scoping team

decided to review the IRT, implementation work of the transfer policy and various other policies, right?

You would put people who are involved in policy reviewing onto that, why is my phone buzzing so much? My apologies. Onto that review team, and they would be able to, that would hopefully have the effect of making sure that the review was concentrating very specifically on the areas that we suggest.

So, what we're basically saying in respect to, and I can see we have the slides up now, which is useful. We maybe go to the next slide. Yeah, you know where we are, that's my next one. That's an overview of all of the reviews, keep going, keep going. Here we go.

So, this is the one we're talking about right now. So, the idea would be that it is evaluating the extent to which ICANN is delivering on its mission, commitments and core values by examining specifically scoped community prioritized existing procedures and processes and the outcomes and progress achieved.

So in other words, it's looking at very specific things and it knows going in what it's going to look at. It's not intended that an accountability and transparency review would review everything, everywhere, all at once. Each time it does a review, there would be a very specific scope that the community would say, this is what we want you to review.

The hot issues are these. And it would also be tasked with looking forwards and saying what other things maybe should there be

improvements on. So, let's say that Artificial Intelligence in two years' time has meant that meetings are redundant. We don't need them anymore.

Obviously, that's ludicrous because why would we not meet? It's too important. But you see what I'm saying. That review would look at that sort of stuff and say, actually, maybe we should think about those sorts of changes.

So, that's the key kind of ongoing review that one imagines would happen with a cadence of maybe every five years, maybe every six years. We think that the scoping team should be able to say, if you imagine it's a five-year cycle, scoping team would meet in year four. We think they should probably be able to say, actually, you probably don't need to do a review in year five. Do one in year six.

And the decision about having the review should also be governed by what else is going on. Because part of the issue with existing review mechanism is the tumbling together of all of the reviews where they all end up happening at the same time. And you've got implementation of one review interfering with another review happening and so on.

What we're still working on is when you start a review, what's the stop and what's the start? So, the problem with the current bylaw is it says it's the accountability and transparency review every five years and it's five years from the start and finish. So, it's five years from the finish. Well, the finish is the finish, but then you've still got

implementation. And implementation can take, you know, years depending on what the review has recommended.

So, if you can imagine a circumstance where you've had your first new accountability and transparency review, there have been a bunch of recommendations. Those recommendations are being implemented. They haven't all been implemented. And in year four, the scoping team says, well, we do want to have a review in year five, but because we're still doing the work of implementing the previous review, we're going to make it a very small review.

There's one thing to review. Or they might say, don't have it, wait until year six. Or they might say, everything's been done so we can have a big review. We're trying to build in the flexibility and trust the community. And we're leaning towards leaders because we think if you as an ASO have elected somebody to be your chair and your vice chair, you've said, go and be our chair and vice chair.

Now, obviously, they're going to need to come back and talk to you. We're not expecting that they would turn up at a meeting and say, let's review the color of the walls. Don't worry about what my ASO thinks. I'm sure that'll be fine. But we are assuming you'll build mechanisms into your structure that says, right, this leadership group, which currently meets kind of on an Ad Hoc basis, we're going to put some transparency and accountability factors, things in, and that is going to be the one that's empowered to do the scope.

Okay, so that's what, those are the thoughts. I should say that there's much more detail in all of this, obviously, than there are on these slides. So, that's the sort of decisions for you to think about there is whether you're comfortable with a community approach, the community analyses implementation, and so on, whether you're comfortable with that, and whether you're comfortable with the concept of having that flexibility built in.

In other words, there will be a review every, let's say, five years, unless the community says we don't think it's necessary. And obviously, we need to build in what that threshold is. So, it might be three SOs, or ACs, or four, we don't know that yet. Does that kind of make sense? Okay.

Can we go to the review C, which will be skip over the review B slides? No, keep going. There we go, that one. This is, I think, the real, the real key one. There is no mechanism in ICANN currently to do a Structural Review. What is a Structural Review? Structural Review does two things, three things. It looks at the overall ICANN structure and says, is it fit for purpose?

So, it looks at all sorts of different ways, all sorts of different ways, it looks at the structures of the, it looks at the structure of the Board. Should we have, and I stress I'm just using examples here, I don't want anyone to think that these examples are anything other than merely examples. Should the Board be, should the Board be split into two? This has been talked about in various different fora for years. Should there be a policy Board and a corporate Board,

for example? That's the sort of thing that you would imagine a Structural Review would ask, you know, that sort of stuff. That's one area for a Structural Review.

Second area for a Structural Review is to look, is to look at the structures. So, do you look at, not just the Board, but do you look at the ASO? Do you look at the GNSO? Do you look at the ccNSO and say, are these structures the right structures?

And the third area for a Structural Review is to look at whether or not there's new stuff that should maybe be brought into ICANN. So, if you think about that as an example, Steve Crocker talks about, he believes there should be a home in ICANN for the DNS resolvers. Let's assume the community thinks that's a good idea. How would you structure that?

If you look at the RSSAC, in their deliberations for their new kind of existence, one of the things that they talked about was whether they should actually be an SO rather than an AC. Now, if you imagine the possibility that they had come back and said, we want to be an SO, we don't have a mechanism for that happening, right? We'd have to have some sort of community mechanism built into place to make that happen.

So, the concept of having a Structural Review is that it enables you to do all of those things. The question, the key question for each of the SOs and ACs, assuming you accept the principle, is this. Should the Structural Review be able to look at the ASO's structure or

should the Structural Review only be able to look at the ASO's structure if the ASO asks it to? That's a really key point.

Now, you won't be surprised to hear that the ccNSO is going to say, well, you can only look at us if we ask you to. But that there are significant voices in the GNSO that are saying, no, we think it should be mandated that you look. And the reason for that is because the GNSO thinks it needs to be restructured and it's challenged by doing it itself. Because they find it very difficult to actually come to consensus.

And they think, now I have said, every time I run these sessions, I have said, we cannot build a review mechanism just to solve the GNSO's problem. But what we can do is try and find a way of helping them to solve their problem.

Mandating a review of all of the structures may not be that way. But the key point is we need to get your feedback on this very, very clear question. Should the Structural Review be able to look at your structure or should it be automatically looking at your structure as part of its Structural Review? There's one other way of looking at it, which is, so there are three options really, although it only says two on the screen.

One option is you ask. The second option is it's automatic. The third option is that it can be done if enough of the rest of the community says we should look at it. So, think about that as a possibility. I'm not pushing any of these. I'm just trying to present them to you. So, there is that third possibility, which is three or four

of the rest of the community have said, actually, we think there's a real problem here. You need to look at it.

The other point I want to make is that there are other opportunities for each individual structure to be reviewed. I'm going to come to those. So, this is not the only way it can happen. But a Structural Review is obviously a full-blown community look. And the other point to make is, of course, your structure may end up getting reviewed anyway in this sense.

If a Structural Review says we need to bring in some differences. Within ICANN's mission, there are three new things out in the big wide world that we should probably bring into ICANN. I don't know. I mean, blockchain domains, just as an example, right? Bring those into ICANN. There are obviously consequential flow-on effects from that sort of thing coming in that involves not necessarily your structure being reviewed, but the structure's place in the organization being reviewed. Because instead of there being three SOs and four ACs, there might be five SOs and so on. So, there are obviously issues there.

And then there are consequential flow-ons from there, which is because let's say that you do, we do get three new structures within ICANN. Then you've got, what does that mean? Two, six new Board members, which takes the Board to being, you know, whatever that takes the Board to being. And does that make sense?

So, it's important to remember that sort of like the review mechanisms themselves itself is rarely, if ever, simply discreet to

one thing. There's often a whole heap of things that need to happen. I'm going to stop there and ask if there are any questions so far.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Chris. Just thank you for this very clear and useful explanation on what's the work about that. I will just comment on two aspects. As you can imagine, the SO is a specific supporting organization within this work as, first, we are comprised of two legs, which is the NRO-AC from one part and the SO-AC from another part. And the other specificity for that is that the functions of the SO-AC are fulfilled by a group, which is called the NRO NC this time, and who comes from the regions. So not from the ICANN per se, but from the region. So, it's one of the specificities which make us different on that way.

And the other aspect of that is that, so you ask the question about we have to update something because we have to stuck with the current world, which is not the world we were 10 years ago, 20 years ago. Of course, it's something so we are totally aware of because of our current ICP-2 work, because we have big folks currently about so what can we do to stick to the current world as it is. And we don't ask exactly the same question as within the group in terms of bylaws, so it's something that is to us. That's my two comments. And Kevin. Thank you.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

One of the things you brought up really resonated with me, which is along the lines of I have an impacted tooth, I need to get root canal. Everybody needs to get root canal. That is not a healthy way of doing things.

We are 15. There are other SOs and ACs that are similar in size to us. Many of the topics you bring up here are a denial of service against these groups. So, it's one thing that I've heard time and time again is silence is acceptance. That needs to be very carefully thought through because us not being able to participate because of the amount and the volume for the size of organization we are should not acquiesce.

And there needs to be a good process in that area where, okay, we've come to a decision now, because we can't spend 8,000 hours on a body dealing with whatever it may be. We have to figure out a way to handle that scenario.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes. So, I'm absolutely right. That input, preferably in a note from the ISO would be immensely helpful because it goes to several things. First of all, it goes to your participation in things like scoping exercises, although that shouldn't be too much of a challenge.

It's just making sure that you have a voice. It doesn't necessarily have to be, we're not imagining that you've got to have three or six people, but nonetheless, it's worth saying in that. But it also flips

through to actually, if you have cross community reviews that take up a huge amount of time and effort, you don't necessarily have the people, right?

So I think it's worth saying, and I completely agree with you, Kevin, I think it's worth saying with this particular review, the Review of Reviews, we will produce recommendations that will go first to you, not you as in the SO, but first to you as in the SOs and ACs. And we'll say, are you comfortable? You know, you might not agree with 100% of it, but you know, you decide that which you're prepared to die on a hill for, right?

Are you comfortable? And then assuming that there's a sufficient level of comfort, then it goes to the Board. And it's in essence been endorsed. And I think that's kind of a fairly healthy way of doing it. And I would imagine that these reviews would effectively, that we're recommending would end up being, certainly the Structural Review, by definition would have to be signed off by the community, right? Otherwise, it just wouldn't work. Did you want to say something?

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Yeah, I think the hardest thing and with the leaders, because I've been in a number of those leader sessions over the years, there's a misunderstanding of size and scope and scale. And I think the easiest one to use as an example, is gender and geographic diversity.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

And that's a wonderful topic. And it's a big, important topic for a group that is 1000 members. It's impossible, or it is actually structured in a way that is not possible for this SO. And it becomes very easy. You know, you can say, I'm going to put your myself in your shoes, and walk in those shoes, but it's not necessarily practical.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So, again, I agree with you. And it's worth saying that the reason why we've kind of started to coalesce around the what is currently, in essence, an unofficial leadership group, I mean, they do meet the SO and AC chairs and vice chairs, they do meet they had it started, it's probably worth giving a little bit of background.

It started in the in the Rod Beckstrom days, when he had a dinner on the first night of ICANN, or whichever you call day minus one of ICANN with the chairs of each of the of all of the SOs and ACs. And that kind of then morphed into something a little bit more. And so now they meet the chairs and vice chairs meet with senior staff on the first day of the meeting, just to go through some stuff.

It's not transparent. It's not accountable. And if we were going to, I don't think it's a problem, but I'm just saying it isn't. So, if we were going to use it for this, we would need to build in some specific, it

would need to become a specific role in this context and build in some accountability and transparency mechanisms. And it would need to be very clear that it is merely a function of your position.

So it doesn't really matter if you all happen to come from Europe, that's not our problem. You elect who you elect, and they're in those positions. And the point is that the sort of like the foundation of it is, is it kind of works as the bottom-up process, because it's bottom up because you've elected them, right?

But I'm not saying that that has to be that way. If you have other ideas about how we might have this kind of scoping mechanism in place, I'd love to, you know, I'd love for you to send them, put them in. Anyone else? Thank you. Andrei.

ANDREI ROBACHEVSKY

Yeah, thank you. I have a question to help me understand sort of impact of those three views from like both inside and outside. So, suppose SOAC, while there is a need to extend the scope or change the scope of work of SOAC, does it require, so let's suppose there is internal understanding at the NRO level of that, does it require this review?

So, how this relates to this review can be just, because I think the initial scope of work and role of SO was sort of is documented in the MOU between the NRO and ICANN. So, if the scope changes, is it within the scope of this work or is it something outside?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

No, I think if I understand you correctly, and I hope I do. I think what happens for you outside of ICANN is not in the scope of this work unless you choose to bring it in, right? So, you chose with some of the issues that you've had over the last couple of years, right? You've chosen to bring some of that into ICANN, but only underneath your own umbrella.

I can't envisage a situation where the work of the ASO would become, in the same way as I can't envisage a situation where the work of ccTLD managers would come under ICANN's umbrella. I mean, people try, right? People say, oh, well, we should extend the DNS Abuse requirements to all to ccTLDs.

And you have to say, well, yeah, you could do that on the basis that the ccNSO said that we think this is best practice, but you couldn't do it any other way. And even that's a bit of a stretch. So, I think if I've understood you, I don't think that there's anything that can I think if you had a review of your structure, right, then that would obviously may result in recommendations about your structure.

But I think even if you went with option two on the structure review and said it was mandatory for a review team to look at all of ICANN's structures and just see whether they're fit for purpose, even if that happened, and even if there were recommendations made that said, you know, I don't know, the ASO should all wear uniforms or something, those recommendations would be to you.

And you could always say no, in the same way that the external review mechanism used to, when we used to do the external

reviews, they used to work, the review, the independent experts would come and review. I don't know if the SO ever had one of those done. Did you? You have twice, yeah. So, so those recommendations, you can just say we don't like them, go away. And that's what At-Large did with the last review that they had. So, I think there's safeguards in place. Does that answer your question? Thank you.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Yeah, I remember that review that was done for us, not by ICANN, it was done by the RIRs independently, and it was very painful for us, not because of the content of the reviews, but because of the time drain and the constant pressure that was put on it.

We're going through a big review of ICP-2 right now. And that was one of the things that was mentioned yesterday was, we really got to get that solved before we look at the Review of Reviews, because the output of this document is going to have a big play on it. But one of the topics that is coming up in our ICP-2 is related to bias, and how you address bias.

And a lot of the things I heard, yes, it's great, you have to pick elected leaders, but what happens when they are chosen just to be disruptive when they're activists, or when they bring their bias of how they want to imprint on ICANN. And having some consistent messaging around what the reviews are, what the scope of the reviews are, the areas that you're going to look at may help, because if it is just a, hey, we're going to come up with what

randomly we want to do this time round, and then the next time it's some other activist, and it needs to be with the best intentions of improvement.

Again, it's more the denial of service that I see happening. What's the point of doing a review if you say thank you and just rip it up? Which is potentially an option. You want it to be well thought out and putting the emphasis on the people who are selecting the topics to prove out that it was done without bias, that it is in the best interests of the community, etcetra. Maybe one way of saying, no, you can't just pick and choose depending on the political will that's going on globally right now. This is really about ICANN the organization.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Right. So, again, I agree with you. And I'm going to be blunt. One of the current challenges, and I want to stress, I'm just speaking for myself, one of the current challenges is this. An ATRT review team gets put together. The numbers on those review teams are bizarre. I mean, they're there because of history, but it's bizarre. I can't remember what they are, but I think the ccNSO has like one or two seats.

You don't know going in what they're going to be talking about. They get in a room and decide what they're going to be talking about. The temptation to say, Kevin, I'll allow your pet topic to be on the agenda if you allow my pet topic to be on the agenda is high.

And frankly, I think that the results of the three ATRTs we've had so far have actually been extraordinarily good in spite of the fact that there are problems. That said, I think that those problems need to be solved. Now, you can always have edge cases. So, now go back to the suggested model of having the community sort of set the priorities. You can always say there'll be edge cases, but the whole point about it is that firstly, let's just call it the leadership group.

The leadership group would be operating specifically on the instructions of its SO and AC. Secondly, that they've been elected. And thirdly, the checks and balances are built in because actually it's the same number of people. So, in other words, your voice, whereas your voice on an ATRT right now is one voice or two voices out of 22, your voice on the leaders is one voice or two out of whatever it might be.

So, I think it does have some built-in mechanisms. This idea has some built-in mechanisms to try and overcome, but there's always going to be edge cases. I mean, okay, let's assume that the GNSO At-Large have a cunning plan to elect leaders who agree with each other and take over the world. I can't fix that, but I can give it the best possible chance, I think, by structuring it the way that we are suggesting. But your admonition about being really careful is important.

And again, if you put that into us as comment, what you're saying is make sure that the structure you use to set the scope is clearly

driven by the community and not just driven by the leaders and all of that stuff. Does that make sense? Excellent.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you. As I couldn't understand before going to Saul, there was Manal who wanted to react as you told me. Right?

AKINORI MAEMURA

I think, Manal, your hand was up. Do you have anything?

Manal? Maybe Saul.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Okay, Saul.

SAUL STEIN

I think it's very important that one doesn't mark one's own homework. But as Kevin's been saying, we also have to be careful we don't overburden ourselves with that homework. Which comes down to, as we've been discussing a lot with this ICP-2 things, is good governance.

Now, the SOAC, annually we report every year what we've been up to, what we've been doing, and we report and we check that everything is up to spec, that all our meetings have been open, our minutes are publicly available, we write a review of what we've done, we write a review of what we're going to be doing the next year. Yes. And that's all public.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yes.

SAUL STEIN

That's about being accountable and being held to account. And everyone can see that. And I think maybe that's the kind of structure that needs to be set across all the organizations about signs of things. I don't know if they do and I don't think they don't, but this is part of your review process, in my view. And if these things are being done on a regular basis, it lightens the load on everybody because it's a standard structure, it's routine, and it's easy to continue and do. Shall I stop?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

No, you carry on.

SAUL STEIN

Okay. And it's about a baseline of accountability. The other thing is you're talking about a Structural Review of the organizations. Now, maybe in some entities, it changes more rapidly than others. Certainly, ours is a very staid environment. Not to say that it will stay the same forever, but your structure, your strategy, or your structure in our world shouldn't be changing every three to five years.

So even, I know you were mentioning about a five-year process, but even something like this, probably a 10-year review process for the

structure is probably in line with things. And again, coming back to not marking your own homework, you can't often, when you're going down a road, you don't see it around you. You don't see that you need to change. So, to be able to say the organization can opt to -- the only option is for the organization to self-request. I think that doesn't work, but that needs to be about a 10-year process.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you. There is sort of two points in there. I'll deal with the last one first. There is absolutely, the intention is that the minimum period of time for a Structural Review would be 10. Some people say 12, 15, but minimum would be 10. We've never considered it to be. I mean, we think there's one, we think one needs to happen, like, you know, relatively soon on the basis that it's never happened, so it would make sense. But we think that, you know, then you go to 10.

On your first point, Akinori, could we go to the previous slides for bucket B, which is the -- go back one more. Right, yeah, that's it. So I want to address your -- you can't mark your own homework. The expression I use is that a fish can't see water. So where we are is, at the moment, there is this pilot Continuous Improvement Program. I have no idea what the ASO is doing with it, but it exists, and it's there, and it may well be the NRO has its own already.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Just to give you a piece of information on that, so we were requested by the NRO EC because of the ICP-2 work, Kevin, related at the moment, not to participate in that program for the moment, even if we think that it's a very important one.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah, before I go into this, Manal, did you want to say something at this point?

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris. Can you hear me?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes, we can hear you really well, finally.

MANAL ISMAIL

So, I originally raised my hand on the scope question, just to say that if the scope affects the scope of other SOs and ACs, then it surely belongs to the Structural Review. If it doesn't impact the scope of other SOs and ACs, then it's not. It's okay. Sorry, I couldn't unmute, and I typed it in the chat. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Manal. Could you go back to the previous slide, please? So, to go back to your question, so as you know, the CRP is happening. It's a pilot, right? And it's supposed to be a three-year cycle. You report at the end of three years. So, we started off by

saying, well, there is going to need to be some form of assessment of the CIP results. Why? Well, one, because you can't mark your own homework. So, your CIP, by definition, is your homework. And someone needs to look at it and say, well, the example I use is this.

So the ccNSO produces its three-year report on its CIP and says, we're the best SO on the planet. Everybody loves us. We're fantastic. And then the GAC in its CIP says part of the problem in ICANN is communication. And those CC folks never talk to us. Now, clearly, something needs to happen that sits above that that says, you know what? You don't need to talk to each other because you think you're brilliant. They don't think you're quite as brilliant as you think you are. Maybe you should get together and talk. So, that some form of assessment needs to happen.

Another reason would be to make sure that, and this is really minor stuff, but make sure that everyone's doing the process properly, looking at the principles. You can choose your own process, but you've obviously got to stick to the principles. And then a third reason might be to test the veracity of what it is that you say.

So the example would be with the ccNSO. The ccNSO says, structurally, we're absolutely fine. All of the ccTLD managers are very, very happy. And it turns out that when you actually go and talk to the IDN ccTLD managers, they say, actually, we're not happy. We don't think we're properly represented on the ccNSO council, for example. So, you might then say to the ccNSO, as part

of this assessment process, we think you may have a structural issue. You might want to go away and think about that.

So, remember I said at the beginning, there are other ways for structure to come up. This is another way for structure to come up. Now, if it comes up in this context, then it's very much you being told by the assessment, we're calling it an assessment, not a review, that you need to look inside and see whether you have a problem or not. What you do with it is up to you.

So, that's where we've got to with the marking our own homework. However, it is also clear that the CIP is a pilot, and it is also clear that from its operations over the last 12 months that there are some issues. I don't have all the details, but I'm being told by SOs and ACs that there are some challenges.

So, because it's a pilot, what we think is that we should probably recommend, we're considering whether we should recommend that rather than set up an ongoing assessment mechanism for the CIP now, we should say we recommend that there is a review of the CIP, not the output, but the actual process of the CIP at the end of the first cycle, and that that review should decide how the overarching assessment should be done based on any restructuring that they recommend for the CIP.

Now, that may be too complicated and maybe a step too far, but that's kind of where we are in our discussions right now.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Would that be a review of the review or the Review of Reviews?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I appreciate the effort you've made to say review as many times as you can in one sentence. No, it would be the CIP review, but I don't mind what you call it. You can call it whatever you like. Does that kind of deal with your points? Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

And yeah, Kevin.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

One last thing. I appreciate the Review of Reviews being there because the community, quite frankly, during IANA transitions created too much of a burden on itself, and I think that the overarching point to the Review of Reviews still needs to be learning the lesson of why it's happening in the first place. I think that what Saul said, where we are currently doing many of the things that are in the CIP conceptually, where we are looking at ourselves every year, and we are looking at the work that we've done, and then what the work is for the next year, et cetera, is a healthy amount of work.

It is not an undue amount of work. We're not now doing a third-party intervention, on that work, and there may be a good balance where, yes, somebody else looks at it every once in a while, or

somebody else helps us, or I give my sheets to one and they give the other, and we look at it and say, well, have you thought of this?

There's lots of low-impact ways. Creating committees, creating what I would call expensive processes is the reason why the Review of Reviews exists today. So maybe that's just, again, one piece of feedback is try to find lightweight solutions to what was heavyweight before.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So I agree with you, and again, feedback you should provide to us. Not all SOs are the same, or SEs are the same. Even the G and SO, which you could argue is that, well, both actually, the Cs and the Gs, usually generally have sufficient capacity to be able to pay people specifically to do this, and you guys don't, and that's perfectly fair.

So, we need to build a review system that is one-size-fits-no-one, rather than one-size-fits-all. So, yes, we need to do that. I wanted to just finish up. I know we've got about 10 minutes left. I wanted to just finish up with, if I could go back to the slides, that would be really helpful, with the final piece of the jigsaw, which is the last bucket. We're thinking about this idea of having on-demand reviews.

Now, Kevin, to go back to your point about the transition, actually, the current review system is a result of, and I'm going to say this, I'm being figurative here, although I was in the room, so I'm only

being slightly figurative. It's basically, it was Larry Strickling and Paul Levens in 2009, writing on the back of an envelope, when we did the affirmation of commitment with the US government, which was the first step in the transition, what do you think we should review?

And they came up with accountability, transparency, SSR, and whatever the hell else the other ones were. What was that? WHOIS? Thank you, Sebastien. Thank you. Of course. And I think that; it's about time to look at them. ATRT3 recommended that some of these reviews be sort of slowly moved to retirement, for want of a better way of putting it.

We think that we've solved the problem by having this concept of an on-demand review. So, you set a relatively high community threshold, it might be three SOs or three, whatever it is, you set a relatively high community threshold, and you come with a proposal that says, we would like a review on this.

And if it gets enough buy-in from the community, then you have, and the advantage of that is it means that you can say, if there is a security instability matter, you can have a Security Instability Review. I hope I'm being amusing in a good way. But you could also envisage a circumstance where the GNSO finally decides that it can actually, it really wants a review of its structure.

And it's eight years until the next Structural Review, and it actually wants a review. So, it goes to the Ad Hoc review and said the on-demand review and says, we want a review. So, that's the idea of

that. And that kind of sweeps up all of the rest of the stuff and makes it completely community driven. And it means you're not having reviews for the sake of having reviews.

It also means that you can test each time. Yes, we acknowledge the community wants to do a review on the color of the walls. We agree. The SOs and ACs agree. But not today, because today we're launching New gTLDs. That's ridiculous. We'll do it in a year. That gives you that complete flexibility on scoping. You can scope it as tightly as you like, as broadly as you like, all of that sort of stuff.

I will say, and because it goes back, Kevin, to your point about edge cases, I will say a lot of what this is based on is a fundamental principle that we have to trust the community. We have to trust each other. We have to accept that if we can't do that, we just can't work. And we've got to build in on the basis that if we have groups that are, you know, we've elected them leadership groups, whatever, that they're empowered to do something.

And all of the sort of like perturbation and the bees in a bottle stuff can happen within that structure. As long as that structure is sound enough, it will work. So, I just wanted to cover that last point. And that's probably thrown up some smiles and questions.

KEVIN BLUMBERG

Just the smile is, we have a term in our document called Ad Hoc auditing. And we've had a substantive discussion related to it. And you're calling it an on-demand is brilliant. Yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Well, we had exactly the same thing. So, we came up with Ad Hoc, and we all thought, well, that's fine. That makes sense. And then other people didn't understand it and weren't sure. And then it was, what do you mean? And then, I don't know where, I can't remember who said, I think it might've been Avri who suggested on-demand.

And I think that kind of works. Of course, the question then becomes by whom, but as long as you're clear about that, then actually it kind of works. So, good luck with that. You're very welcome. Steal it by all means.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Yeah. So, we are happy to have a very, so lovely, lovely music in the U.S. So, we're getting this discussion on the connection with the work. We are currently performing so far, but that's a good thing.

We have six minutes left. I don't see. So, within the group, we did the SOAC of hands. We will have tomorrow morning more general Review of Reviews meeting. I invite everybody to attend. It will be the opportunity to see the overviews on the global views on your synthase, as I can imagine about that. And you are very welcome. And so, with Akinori, so we are still supporting the work on that regarding the time we are offered to do. Thank you so much.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Thank you. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]