ICANN85 | Prep Week – Review of Reviews Update
Monday, February 23, 2026 – 08:00 to 09:30 PM IST

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN85 Prep Week Review of Reviews CCG session being held on Monday, February 23rd, 2026 at 14:30 UTC. My name is Yvette Guigneaux and Daniela Chomikova and myself are your participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded, excuse me, and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session, and I will also be posting some instructions for your preference in the chat if you prefer to use that mechanism. During this session, questions will only be read aloud if they're submitted to the Q&A pod, which can be found on your Zoom toolbar. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. Only questions posted in the Q&A pod will be read aloud in this session as time permits and when directed by the chairs of this session.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom. Please state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking, if speaking a language other than

English. And please speak at a clear and moderate pace. That does it for me. And now I will hand the floor over to Avri Doria. Avri?

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, Yvette, and to everybody welcome on behalf of my co-chairs, Manal and Chris, and on behalf of the very active staff that is supporting us through all of this. So let me start. We're here to do the webinar on Review of Reviews. Can I have the first slide, please? Do I need to -- anyhow, we're doing it on the Review of Reviews. These first few slides are slides that I think you've all seen before, but if any of you are new or this is the first time, this is what we're here about.

So, we're here to sort of talk about the work that's being done in the Review of Reviews Cross Community group, which has been chartered to manage a fundamental evaluation of reviews set out in the ICANN bylaws as a whole system, including their implementation and propose a refreshed system of reviews.

So far, we've had 19 meetings. We meet each week and the co-chairs and the staff that's supporting us meet at least once a week, so we're keeping very active. Our current status is that at the meeting that's coming up, ICANN85, we'll be proposing the first part of the design for reviews for discussion. At this meeting, we're sort of introducing that design so that it won't be completely new to show people the things they can go read, the issues to think about before getting to the meeting.

After this meeting, so the next step would be an actual draft report. So, in other words, after ICANN85 and the conversations that come out of that and the work that comes out of that, we'll be proposing a draft report in June. Not that much time between now and June. Although if I look out at the snow blizzard I'm having now, it seems like an infinite time away.

So, our estimated completion date for this project is August of '26 with a final report and documentation, you know, which will be shared with the board and the enhanced community and all of you. And as I say, we're working really quite hard to make that happen. So next slide, please.

So, this slide you've all seen before. It only gets one little change each time and that's that we are here. And the we are here is in phase two, which is, we've done our fact finding. Obviously, fact finding never ends. If there are more facts, we hope to find them. If you know of facts we don't know, please let us know. But we've moved on and we're in the process of doing the analysis and developing a proposal. And so, that's where we are now.

And we're in the midst of that, this webinar and the meeting in, you know, Mumbai and not only the main meeting we'll have there, but all the separate meetings that have been planned with the ACs and the SOs, et cetera, are also part of that. And then we'll go back to figuring out how to turn it into a draft report. So that's where we are in the phases. Next slide, please.

So, this is where we are. There was a discussion. We've been discussing buckets for a bit now, trying to figure out, going from the purposes of review and all the analysis and the facts. And over the period between the two meetings, we've been doing a lot of bucket work. Anybody that's heard any of the reports, read any of the reports, discuss these in your own meetings, we've talked about. So, the buckets are here outlined, the A, B, C, D, and E that you see there are there. So, we have these.

There's the accountability and transparency, that remains a very important thing, review. The review isn't necessarily exactly the same review that was there. We don't know exactly yet because that shows up in the draft, but it's the execution of commitments, articles of corporation, bylaws, strategic plan, financial and operation plan, and other sets of rules that we've set for ourselves. Chris will talk more about this going forward.

Then in B, there's the results of the SO/AC/NC Continuous Improvement Program as they relate to each other and to themselves, as they relate to each other and to each other. Right. As they relate basically to all the other elements that we have here. Manal will be taking us through that one.

Then there's structural review, one of the things that's been talked about that hasn't happened since the beginning. And that's whether the overall structure, the components, the way it's built of the SOs, ACs, and NCs are fit for purpose. And that'll be looking at everything from the very large to some degree of the small as we break down our organization. And we look at the various pieces that we are interested in looking at. Manal will also cover that one.

Then there's a recurrence of Review of Reviews. We're doing this now, first time and ever and although it was a little part of the ATRT, if people remember, but it's a big job to, you know, shoehorn into something else. So, you know, the Review of Reviews, is this something that we want to plan again already for 10 years, 15 years hence? Or is this something that'll happen when it's needed? And I'll be going through that one.

And then there's the one we're calling the Ad Hoc Review, which is basically all the other reviews, whether they're already in the bylaws or reviews that come up as necessary in time and where those get gathered. And I'll be talking a bit more about that one.

I think that's the end of my first bit of introduction here. And before I move on to Chris, I do want to just stop and see if there's anybody that needs to ask something of clarification. Do we have any questions, Yvette, that I should address before moving on?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: No, ma'am. At this point, we do not.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. So, if there's no questions there, Chris, please take it away.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Avri. Hi, everyone. Welcome. Nice to see so many people. Looking forward to seeing some of you, hopefully face-to-face in Mumbai. I'm going to do two things. I'm going to talk about the overarching way that we're looking at the structure of the reviews and then dive into A, the accountability and transparency review. So, could I have the next slide, please? Thank you.

On the right-hand side of this slide, you will see a part of a working document, a table, and there is a link to it. So, you can click on it and go and see the whole table, and it is how we are dealing with each of the reviews.

Each one of those is in a vertical column, the currently five reviews, accountability, transparency, CIP assessment, and so on. And then there is a row for purpose, for objectives. What are the objectives of the review's cadence? Who initiates it? Scoping, are there any thresholds? Who's the review conducted by? To whom are the recommendations made? Obviously, that's important. Does it correspond to any existing current review? Where is the current review and where will the review be established?

And then some notes and, Anil, yes, I think we can organize a copy of the PowerPoint for you. I imagine that's going to go up on the schedule page at the end of the session as they normally do for these things. So, thanks for that.

So, that document we'll be dealing with in more detail. Each of the slides we're going to go through takes one of the columns, one of the reviews, and addresses each of the rows. And in some cases, we've got some options and some things to talk about, but all of this is open for discussion.

And just to be clear, we are having a plenary session in Mumbai on the Thursday morning. And we are also currently planning to meet with all of the SOs and ACs, I think, if not all, most of the SOs and ACs in Mumbai. We're definitely meeting with the GAC, the Cs, the Gs, At-Large. Not sure about the others, but there are meetings and we will go to those and we will be talking directly to them, culminating in the plenary session on the Thursday morning, right before the public forum.

So, if you don't get to speak in the plenary session about the Review of Reviews, you can take your comments into the public forum and speak there. May I have the next slide, please? Here we go.

So, this is A, accountability and transparency review. We have sort of two ways of looking at this, option one and option two, of looking at the objectives. I'm going to go into a little bit more detail in a second, but in the outline, option one is based on priorities, so decide what the priorities are. Establish a scope for review of a specified strategic goal, goals or initiatives, to look at the accountability and transparency, and to confirm whether what was delegated was completed efficiently. That's one way of looking at it and I'm going to go into some detail in a second.

And the second way of looking at it is to focus on assessing how the activities progressed on the strategic plan. And if such progress has been accomplished in line with the commitments and core values.

Those options are not that dissimilar to each other, but they do have some different nuances.

And one of our goals is to come out of Mumbai with a clear understanding of which way forward the community thinks is best. Could I have, Alice, whoever is in charge of the slides, the detail of options one and two, which I know is not part of the slides, but it's part of a different document? There we go. Okay.

So, as I said, there are two options and I just want to go through it so that you have a clear understanding. So one is, this has been put forward by PIR as a suggestion and that's option one, which is the purpose of Bucket A reviews is to evaluate the extent to which ICANN is delivering on its mission in compliance with its commitments and core values, and to recommend performance improvements as appropriate.

These reviews will be conducted by examining specific, discrete processes, procedures, outcomes, and progress against goals set forth in ICANN's strategic plan, financial and operational plan and/or other community adopted documents governing the steps ICANN undertakes to deliver on its mission.

So those are going to be called, if we do this, they'll be called ICANN's performance documents. When you're doing a review, you obviously need to review against something and these would be the performance documents. And they're in the context of the Mission statement, the Commitments, the Core Values, the Expected Standards of Behavior, the Community Participant Code of Conduct and/or other community adopted documents governing the manner in which ICANN carries out its work. Which the suggestion is we call them standards documents.

And those documents obviously can be changed. For example, we've got some new ones in the pipeline. There's a SOI document that deals with ethics, which has become a new document, so that would become part of the standards documents. So that's one way of looking at it.

And the alternative to that is, if you go to the third source, which is the Review of Reviews Cross Community Working Group which was our original draft, we said the purpose of reviews is to assess whether ICANN is fulfilling its mission, commitments, and core values as set out in the ICANN bylaws in a transparent and accountable manner by reviewing. And then we listed under A, Bucket A, a number of bullet points, including things like activities, processes, and culture that they remain consistent with mission, commitments, and values and so on.

We listed all of those and then we had a small team go away and work on that. And they came back and they said they think that the elements listed in Bucket A would need to be reformulated so that they have a clearer implementation path. So, I don't propose to go through the bullet points in any detail now. This document is available for people to look at and we'll be referring to it consistently during our meeting in Mumbai.

The point, I think, is this, the PIR approach is based on the principle that actually having the bullet points carries a high risk of either having too much detail or too little detail or a combination of both. And that actually a broader brush gives more flexibility to the community to build an accountability, a transparency review in a more flexible way that is scoped out properly by the community. So, those are the two differences.

In other words, option two would seem to be slightly more restrictive in listing the bullets, acknowledging that those bullets themselves will need to be worked on anyway. Option one is a bit more flexible with more sort of ability for the review to be built, as I said, in a more flexible manner, but with the boundaries of referring to the two types of documents.

The performance documents, which is what you measure the performance against, as in what you're reviewing against and the standards documents being the things that you refer to, to decide what you're going to review.

I know that's a lot for everyone to take in and the reason why we're having this webinar now is to prep everybody so you can read it, consider it, and then come to Mumbai or be remote in Mumbai and participate in the deeper discussion. Can I go back to the slide, please? Thank you very much.

So, this, irrespective of which way we choose, the current suggestion is that we set a cadence of every five years. That it's initiated by the board, be a bylaw mandated review and so kind of by definition it needs to be initiated by the board. That the scoping, which I think Anne goes to some extent to your question in the chat, would be pre-agreed through an agreed process.

The idea would be that some form of community-based scoping group and there's been discussions around the possibility of it being built around the SO/AC chairs and vice chairs who are the elected representatives of the SOs and ACs could do that role, but that's only in the very early discussion stages. They would do the scope, which would then be given to the review team.

The advantage of that, of course, is that, what that means is that when you form your accountability and transparency review, you already know what the scope is, which enables you, each SO and AC, to choose people with the necessary experience of the particular things that are going to be looked at in that accountability and transparency review to be their representatives.

And yes, Becky, as you quite rightly say, in all cases with community input. Well, in case it's not clear, there's no suggestion that the chairs and vice chairs of the SOs and ACs could go into a small dark room and decide for themselves what the scope should be. If they would run SO and AC based community processes.

Then thresholds. The threshold means is there something that needs to happen in order for this review to happen? The answer is no. It would be mandated in the bylaws and it would happen every five years. It's not subject to anything. It just happens.

Review conducted by, well, that's to be discussed, but there is already a process for the way that the accountability, transparency reviews put together, but we will need to revisit that. Once we get to a point where we're clear what it is that we're building, in other words, once we're clear on the option, and we know that we're moving forwards, one of our next jobs will be, how will you put that review together? How many people should it be? How should the representative across the SOs and ACs be based?

To whom are the recommendations made, the answer is they're made to the board. And what's the corresponding current review, the corresponding current review is the accountability and transparency review.

So, I realize there's an awful lot of information there. I realize that the slide itself doesn't contain as much information as the other document that I put up, but I'm assuming that other document is available on the Wiki and if it isn't we will make sure that it is.

Before I open up for questions on this particular slide just to say we will have questions and answers, questions and comments at the end on everything, but each of these reviews we're going to do a quick Q&A on in situ. Before I do that, I can see a note from Suzanne. Oh, Suzanne is getting a response from Karen. Thank you, Karen. So, does anybody have any comments or questions that they want to bring up on this particular slide now?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX Chris? Oh, I'm sorry.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Yes, Yvette.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX You may have already answered it. We did have --

CHRIS DISSPAIN I have answered. I think I have, but Anne's hand is up so away you go, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE Thanks so much, Chris. And also, I want to first communicate appreciation for all the hard work you guys have done. It's quite a brain trust you have there with the CCG group as incredible minds that work on this and thank you so much.

Regarding that based on priorities explanation that we were given, which it sounds quite holistic in terms of the community, you know, having input on scoping. But I guess part of me was really hoping that this group, this CCG would be doing scoping because as we know, scoping exercises can be rather labored. There can be disagreements. They can take a long time.

You can have people saying, "We want, you know, reviews on security and stability because DNS abuse is a huge issue." And you can have another large contingent in the community saying, "No, DNS abuse is down and DNS abuse is not about security and stability because it's, you know, beyond scope."

And so, when you use a phrase like based on priorities and you talk about the idealistic view of the community getting together and deciding on the scope, I see some very significant issues with that. I was really hoping that this CCG could do more work on scope. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

But Anne, I hope I've understood you correctly and I'll respond before going to Hadia. If I've understood you correctly, that would be a huge challenge because the accountability and transparency review remit is huge. And so, without some form of prioritization methodology and scoping exercise each time you do it, if we were to try and work out today what the scope of all accountability and transparency reviews going forward would be, that would be incredibly difficult.

What I think we're saying is that you base it around, whichever option you choose, it's based around the mission, the bylaws, the strategic plan, and all that stuff, all of which are kind of -- the mission and the bylaws are obviously sort of baseline company documents and then there's the strategic plan, which changes and the community has input into and so on. But for review to be workable, it needs to have a clear understanding of what it is that it's specifically reviewing.

You can't go into a review and just have this huge broad-brush scope. So, given the wide funnel of what is available for reviewing, it seemed to us that what we needed to do was to say there needs to be some prioritization in order for the review to be effective and efficient.

And that prioritization means this time around, we should review this, and next time we might review that. I hope I'm making myself clear. I can see comments in the chat, which I'll get to in a second, but I think it is about requiring some sort of specificity review.

And the fundamental difference between the current way that reviews are looked at, the accountability and transparency review is looked at, I'm sorry, and the way that we're suggesting it should be looked at, is rather than have the scoping done by the review team, in other words, the review team is formed and then they go into a room and say, "This accountability and transparency review, we're deciding to look at this." You actually have the scoping done beforehand, which enables the review team to be shaped in a way that is most expert at reviewing the things that need to be reviewed. I am sorry I took so long to answer that question. Hadia, the floor is yours.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Thank you so much, Chris. So, I have two questions. The first is related to the slide that we have just in front of us. And the way I see it, that option two doesn't actually include priorities because it says, "Focus on assessing how activities progress on the strategic plan." So, it talks about this strategic plan as one general thing.

While option one actually does say, you know, "Pick a specific strategic goal or initiative to look at." So, I don't know if I'm reading it right, but I don't see any kind of prioritizing in option two. That's my first question. And for me, I think option two would seem easier or less complex.

My other question is related to -- you mentioned that you make the reviews against performance. And my question is, where do these performance documents come from? Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN The documents that are currently listed are the -- can we put up the other document again, please, team? Thank you. If you look at the first paragraph, the PIR one, it lists the performance documents, Hadia, and they are the suggested to be the strategic plan, the financial and operational plan, and other community adopted documents governing the steps that ICANN undertakes to deliver on its mission. So those are the suggested documents that you look at from the point of view of performance and then you've got your standards documents, which is the contextual documents that you look at.

I'm not going to comment on your point about priorities in respect to number two. I think that's probably right. Although I suspect that working more closely on what is on the second option on that sheet would involve us, I think of necessity if we were going to go down that road and to redraft the bullet points in coming up with priorities because otherwise, I don't think it's actually workable.

Manal, Byron, Avri, and Jonathan are in the queue and then I'm going to close the queue at that point otherwise we're going to run out of time and we need to move on to the next slide bearing in mind that we're going to have plenty of time to discuss this in Mumbai. Manal go ahead please.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris, and I raised my hand to answer Anne's question. You already covered it very well. Just a quick addition is that we agreed that the scope of Bucket A is very broad and it is not a requirement that we review everything every time so there needs to be some scoping.

And also, during the discussion, it was mentioned that this scoping can be done, as you mentioned, through the community and before the review team is established. So, it can also inform the establishment of the review team and ensure that the review team will hit the ground running and not waste a lot of time in scoping. And does not come up with a scope that is a surprise to the community. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks very much, Manal. That's exactly correct, I think. Byron, go ahead, please.

BYRON HOLLAND

Thanks. First, thanks for all the work that's gone in so far. My question is really more around the logistics of it and the five-year timeline. My sense is that one of the reasons we've gotten into this whole thing is the fact that reviews are starting to stack up and we barely dealt with prior review and the implementation or hadn't even gotten into an implementation before it was time for the next review.

So, I'm wondering if you could just give some color and context on the thinking and the discussion around maintaining a hard five-year review cycle on this and sort of the puts and the takes on that. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah. Thanks, Byron. I think we think that part of the issue is the fixed cycle for all of the reviews. And when we move on to other reviews, you'll see that we're not, with the exception of -- well, we're suggesting a fixed cycle for some of them, but that fixed cycle is much wider.

I think we think that the accountability and transparency review probably does need to have a fixed cadence. If we get feedback from the community that the five-year cycle is not, and that feedback is just as valid coming from the organization, let me be clear, not just from the community, but if org and the board says, "We think it should be six, we're worried about timing," that's fine, we're open.

The five years is merely at this moment a suggestion, and it could be, as I said, six. So, I don't want us to get tied up too much in the actual five years. I think it's more important to accept that in the cases of some reviews, they probably do need a fixed cadence.

In the cases of others there could be gating factors, there could be the ability on the community to stop the review and say, "We don't need it," or even the reverse, we only have it if the community wants to start it.

The challenge with those exercises however is that you have to build a mechanism and the threshold and then that becomes really challenging because how many SOs and ACs do you have to gather to say no? Or how many SOs and ACs do you have together to say yes? And that becomes quite challenging.

But I accepted completely that one of the purposes of this work that we're doing and our final design is to try to ensure as much as possible that we don't end up in that collapsing on each other reviews right the way down the line, because that puts us back to some extent to where we started. Hope that gives you a flavor of where we're thinking. Avri, go ahead, please.

AVRI DORIA

Okay, thanks. Yeah, I want to go back a little bit to the question that Anne asked and that came up a bit in Hadia's. One of the things that's being done in terms of scope, in terms of prioritization is -- and you've asked can the CCG do it beforehand, I think at a very high level that's what we're attempting to build mechanisms to do.

That's one of the reasons why when you look at these, we have, how is it initiated? Who does the scope? You know, what are the thresholds, you know, that warrant having such a meeting if you look at that? In each of those, so each of these reviews is being put sort of in a lane where it's dealing with issues.

Now, a specific question, and then each of those has to be done I think as Chris has explained, there are the items that happen in time that are the exigencies of the moment that we can't predict when they're going to need to happen.

One of the reasons is that's why we have what we're calling the ad hoc, and I'll talk more about it, but that is where we've put the consideration for all those reviews that Anne asked about. What about the security and stability? What about this? Those go in there and I'll talk more about it.

So, what we're trying to do is sort of putting everything in a lane, giving conditions on which it can be and that's the rose within the table of how you do the scoping. Yes, you're right, it can always end up difficult. But I think for the CCG to do it, the task almost becomes one of those, you know, of putting the ocean in a bucket. So, I think that, you know, that's how we're working on it. Hopefully it'll work, but thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Thanks, Avri, and finally, on this slide, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK Thanks, Chris. And a couple of things got touched on a little bit, I think, already, but I was going to ask, with the board being the initiator at the risk of causing trouble, I mean, are we going to also empower the board to unilaterally delay a review? Or are we going to build something that requires community or something like that?

It seems like we're going to need to do that exercise that you described in any case to avoid a bylaw breach that we found ourselves in at the start of this process. So that was one thing.

And the other is that with these two options, both seem to be taking the notion of review, and I was trying to get at this on our last call, kind of taking that term review literally. In other words, here's an objective, did we meet that objective? And are we missing the opportunity to look for improvements of accountability and transparency that might not be failure based on some existing goal set?

I mean, we might be able to stretch some goal to make it seem like an opportunity to improve, but is there a way to build into this, the ability to explore options for improving accountability and transparency as opposed to just looking for the failure of something specific from an existing document?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you. I think if I just personally respond to that second one first, I think you raise an exceptionally good point. I think we need to capture that because I do think that an accountability and transparency review should have the ability to consider, not just what's gone on within the scope and the priorities, but a section, if you will, that looks forward.

So, I think that needs work and it needs a considerable amount of discussion, but I think it's certainly worth something worth pursuing. I think we should put that in our bucket. And Alice, I'm relying on you to remind us that we've got to discuss that at some point.

And the second thing, I just want to go back to the initiated by the board, yes, I agree, but I think we're in danger of kind of reading too much into that. It merely is the fact that it needs to be initiated by someone for it to be a formal review, but I take your point that we should be careful to ensure that we don't build a system that enables delay. There's a price to be paid for having the formal timing and then we need to make sure we get the timing right. So, thank you, Jonathan, very hopeful.

I'm going to pass across now to Manal who's going to talk about the next review, in fact the next two reviews. Manal, the floor is yours.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris, and next we have Bucket B, or the assessment of continuous improvement. And as Avri explained, this is meant to look into the results of the SO, AC, and the Nominating Committee Continuous Improvement Program as they relate to each other.

The assessment is intended to be lightweight effort with the objective to confirm that the Continuous Improvement Program were completed in adherence to the agreed framework, which sets common guidelines for everyone with flexibility to adapt to your own needs.

And to test CIP outputs, to ensure all conclusions are supported, compare CIP outputs to identify any good practices that may be beneficial to other groups or serve to enhance collaboration. And ensure that the actions are followed through on as intended or in other words, all promised actions were fulfilled.

The cadence here will follow the CIP cycles of the different constituencies so this is the assessment of the CIP. So, normally it would follow this cadence at least every three years. Each SO, AC, or NC will undertake a formal process to evaluate and report on their continuous improvement activities, which would allow the consideration of a minimum of two assessment reports for each.

The initiation, we didn't feel there is need for initiation. The thinking here was that this is not a review per se, not in the same sense as the other reviews, but it's more of an assessment step that happens on a set cadence of the CIP cycle and hence may not need to be formally initiated.

On the scoping, it is a fixed or predefined scope, which is the assessment of the SO, AC, NC continuous improvement. The threshold, again, this being a continuous and ongoing effort, so it doesn't need a threshold to meet. It's an ongoing thing. Review here is proposed to be conducted by a cross-community group and recommendations are made to the relevant supporting organization, advisory committee or nominating committee.

And corresponding current review, there were none at the moment. This doesn't correspond or replace a current review, so the CIP itself corresponds to the organizational reviews, but the assessment of the continuous improvement has no current equivalent. It's important to note that this does not include a review of the CIP itself and how each and every constituency is dealing with its stuff.

And one brainstorming question that was flagged during our discussions is whether the board should also undertake a CIP in accordance with the CIP principles. I'll pause here.

As Chris mentioned, we will be pausing after each bucket and then we will allow additional questions at the end of the five buckets. Any comments or questions? I'm trying to catch up with the chat. So, I have Alejandra and then Chris. Alejandra, please, go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Manal, and hi, everyone. I was listening to both bucket proposals so far and one of the questions I have now it's, how have you considered the resources needed to do all these reviews?

Because if we're having from Bucket A every five years and these, every three, six years, have you done any analysis on the heavy load that some years may take when they coincide in doing two efforts at the same time or? Because that's one of the reasons why we're having the Review of Reviews, right, to not overload ourselves as it currently is. So, I was wondering if there is anything in the background for this proposal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Alejandra, and indeed, resources is one aspect that we are keeping in mind and discussing. One thing regarding Bucket A is the scoping. As I was saying, we don't need to review everything every time so that we can have an exploding number of recommendations and this is where the prioritization thing came.

And with the Continuous Improvement Program, again, this was meant to reduce the burden of having significant reviews at some point in time, but the incremental developments seem to reduce the burden a bit. I'll leave it at this and give the floor to Chris first, and then Avri. Chris, please, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Manal. I put my hand up to raise something else, but I just want to pick up on what you've said and address Alejandra's point, which is a great point. Obviously, one of the key issues is the timing and how long this all takes and it is something that we're very aware of, Alejandra.

I think, and we haven't got to the point yet of looking at the logistics of it because to some extent it depends on what you build as to how the cadence is affected, right? And I think we're looking at this assessment of the continuous improvement as very much a sort of lightweight thing. And it may be that -- it says in here, cadence every three or six years, it may be that actually and I'm just making this up, but it may be that, in fact, it's better served by having a standing CIP assessment committee, which is just a couple of people from each SO and AC that are appointed to this sort of ongoing working group.

And they actually start in year three and then they go to year four and they do something. What they did, they do something they didn't do in year three and then go year to five and something they didn't do in year three and four and so on.

So, I think there is lots of scope for flexibility here, but you're absolutely right that one of the key points is that we don't end up collapsing this whole thing in on itself because of the cadence of the reviews. We also, of course, and we'll get to the structural review in a minute, if that's going to happen every sort of 10 years, we need to build that into the equation as well.

I just wanted to address the other point, the two questions here. It doesn't include a review of the CRP itself. Manal, I apologize if you said this, I might have missed it, but my understanding is that the CIP that we're running is in essence considered to be a pilot. And so, therefore, there is going to need to be a review of it at some stage and we need to build, we need to remember that.

And the second point is, second bullet point there on notes and questions is the question of the board. This came up in our discussions. It's something that I think I'm very keen to get board feedback on at some point, but also, I think from the community, which is, you know, there's a continuous improvement process. That continuous improvement process should probably be just as applicable to the board as it is to everybody else, so that's something for us to consider. Thanks very much, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL Thank you, Chris. And just to note Adam's comment in the chat, I think I saw he was not -- I don't suggest that the board itself may undertake CIP. So, it's good to hear from everyone what they think. Avri, sorry to keep you waiting. Please, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA Quite all right. Yeah, I mean, in looking at Alejandra's question, I think one of the things is, there seemed to be an assumption in the question that we would restrict ourselves to only one review happening at a time.

I'm not necessarily sure that the group has accepted that basic limitation since CIP is always going on and there may be overlaps.

I think we had an avoidance of having six of them happening at the same time and yes, we have to find what is the overload point for both staff utilization, costs, and people.

Very often, if, for example, when we get to ad hoc and we're looking at stability, that's different people that are looking at consumer interest. So, perhaps those two could happen at the same time, perhaps they couldn't, but I don't think we've accepted the notion, perhaps we should look at it, that there can only be one review at a time. But we have to minimize it away from ending up with five, six, eight of them going on at the same time, which was the situation we had gotten into when you raised the alarm.

So, I just wanted to sort of say, we're somewhere in between there, but haven't zeroed in on how you actually do that cost analysis of staff time, which is really hard to figure out and, you know, community time, which is also difficult to figure out and how you find that. But we actually haven't done any kind of calculation on that thing yet, but we're definitely aware of it. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you. Thank you, Alejandra, and thank you very much, Chris and Avri, very good points. And I see no further hands, so maybe we can move on to Bucket C, which is the structural review.

And I saw a question from Alfredo earlier asking how in the CIP impact, what scoping will be done. This was asked in the context of Bucket A, I think it's more relevant in the context of Bucket C because the results of the CIP may impact the structural review itself. Let's go through the template that we already have for each of the buckets.

So again, this bucket has to do with whether the overall structure and components of ICANN and its SOs, ACs, and nominating committee are fit for purpose. In the objective, we had two. We have two options here that we haven't concluded on.

First one is focused on structure of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model as a system to recommend changes as needed to improve effectiveness or address a specific gap or example need for a new structure. It does not cover internal structure of existing SOs and ACs unless specifically requested. And discusses structural issues at the request of SO or AC and where this SO or AC leaders determine issue meets threshold.

The second option and this is a proposal from the ISP-CP constituency of the GNSO and the proposal suggests that this review be mandatory review, examining structures in terms of dynamics, placement, composition, and representation. Plus, overall structural coherence and effectiveness, includes associated board composition and decision-making processes.

It was suggested to have this on a set cadence, something a bit long-term, like every 10 years. Again, there was a discussion whether it should be on unless cancelled by the community, or should be triggered by the community. So, the discussion converged that it's better to have it cadenced and have its time known and an occurrence can be cancelled based on community agreements.

So, if the community agrees that we don't need one at this point in time, then the review can be cancelled. Also, discussions were around what if something urgent or pressing happened that mandates a structural review, so we thought that a structural review may also be prompted out of cadence through ad hoc review process, which Avri will explain later.

Initiation, we had this first suggested to be by the board, but then the initiation may differ depending on whether the review is mandatory as an option two. So, if it is mandatory, so it will be according to a cadence. There will not be a consultation with the community. Otherwise, the suggestion was that the board consult with the community if we are going to go for option one.

The scoping, again, it has a fixed scoping as a baseline. The scope can be updated in case of an SO or AC requesting specific things to be looked at during a structural review and with CIP feeding into structural reviews as well. And this is to answer Alfredo's question too.

On thresholds, yes, it needs to meet a threshold and the next obvious question would be, who determines whether or not the threshold has been met? Again, this was another discussion between having the SO and AC leaders determining this agreement.

In discussing this, the empowered community was also mentioned, but as was discussed, it's a rigid and very formal mechanism. It was intended to have a limited scope, a set of concrete, well-defined powers, and not all community groups are represented in the empowered communities. So, we thought the SO or AC leaders' platform is more flexible in nature and can accommodate this. But also, some members flagged the need to revisit the current SO, AC leaders' model to ensure more transparency, at least in discussions related to structural reviews.

The review is to be conducted by a cross-community group again, but it's suggested to include the CEO and community leaders and maybe as an option assisted by experts.

Recommendations should be made to SO or AC, then the board or structures directly, again, depending on which option we are going to go with and it has no corresponding current review. So, I'm mindful of the time we have.

The first obvious question is, what thoughts do you have on the two options identified for approaching this review? The first being looking at the whole thing as a system and not getting into SO or AC issues unless there is an explicit request, and the second examining the structures. And I'm reading the rest of the questions.

Only SO or AC leaders determine or does it include board leadership and executive staff leadership? And this applies on all the occurrences of the SO and AC leaders' mechanisms. Is this only the SO or AC leaders, or is there a need to have more representation and staff in this mechanism?

And finally, if we are to review the structures, how far down should the review go and should this address the nominating committee? So, for example, the At-Large has five regional At-Large organizations and At-Large structures. Same the GNSO, it has houses, it has stakeholder groups. So, how far is the review expected to dive?

I'll stop here and pause to see if we have any comments or questions. And apologies for not keeping an eye on the chat. And Chris, please, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Thanks, Manal. I just wanted to see if I could trigger some questions by perhaps being, in my inimitable way, slightly controversial. First of all, just as a no-brainer, it seems to me, of course, the NomCom has to be reviewed as part of the structural review. It's an integral part of ICANN's structure. If you're going to do a review you need to look at it.

I just want to draw the distinction between option one and option two because I think it's quite important whichever way around it is. Option two, by making it mandatory what that means is that the structural review, let's say it's every 10 years, must look at each of the structures in terms of its dynamics, its placement, its composition. Whereas in option one it's, you'd only look at that at the request of the SO and AC.

Why does that matter? Well, depends which way you look at it. If there was an SO, let's imagine there's an SO that has some substructures within it that those substructures don't believe is working efficiently and effectively. If in order to get that looked at by a structural review, it was necessary for the SO itself to request that to happen, that would mean that presumably if the substructures in that SO didn't hold sway with the SO as a whole, then it wouldn't be reviewed. If it's mandatory to look at it, then you look at it come what may. And so, that's the distinction, it seems to me.

I think there are pluses and minuses on both sides. The minus you must look at it is that you end up looking at stuff that you really don't need necessarily to waste time, effort, and money on because there's no reason to look at it, but you just have to because that's what the review says. Equally, on the other side of it, if a part of an SO is in fact broken, it seems to me that it may be sensible to allow a review to take place irrespective of whether the whole SO thinks it should, but those are just some passing thoughts. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL — Thank you very much, Chris. Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Thank you, Manal. Michael Palage for the record. So again, Chris, I would agree with you about the nominating committee. I've made a number of public comments about that and some of the deficiencies, but I actually think that that's something very interesting to look at.

The nominating committee has been through two reviews, and in both of those reviews, there was a call to address the potential capture by the ICANN board by unaffiliated directors. And despite being raised in both reviews, it's never been addressed. And that, I think, is a fundamental concern and question we should be asking because what really calls for my attention here is about the review being conducted by the community and quote-unquote, assisted by the expert.

I really think if we want to get this right, we need some independent experts to objectively look at the entire structure and identify deficiencies. If this is just internal groups looking at themselves, some of which potentially could be captured, are we really going to be addressing the underlying problem? And again, let's go back to the nominating committee and the fact that two independent reviews have identified an issue, which has failed to be proactively addressed in the last 20 years. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Michael. I saw a thumb's up from Osvaldo and a plus one from Siva in the chat and thanks for the valuable contribution. We're taking notes and we will be looking into all the input received.

Any other requests for the floor before I hand it over to Avri for the following bucket, the Review of Reviews? If not, then we have a final chance for questions after Avri finishes, but first, over to you, Avri, please. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, Manal, and thank you, everybody, for having questions and using time. Unfortunately, it's pushing us towards not necessarily having enough time. So, what I'm going to do on this one is, I will go through both of the next two slides and then do questions on both. They're not that dissimilar, so hopefully that will be okay. I'm really excited by the number of questions we've had. Can I have the Review of Reviews? Yes, that's where we're at. Okay.

This is what we're doing now. I mean, it is kind of confusing. We're in the middle of the Review of Reviews and now we're saying, but will we need another one? And that's actually a question that the CCG is, I would say, still somewhat divided on.

It's no, that this was a once in a lifetime necessity versus no, it's going to happen that every 10, 20 years or so, you know, you're going to have to look at your reviews and say, "This used to be a thing also that was done in the ATRT." But if we're unburdening the ATRT from some of the extra work it was doing because it made it too burdensome a review, then this is indeed one of the things that shouldn't be overlooked.

So basically, the questions came out on it, should there be a threshold? Should there be, you know, like there was this time, a threshold of demand that, wait, wait, wait, reviews aren't working anymore? They're no longer performing as they should. They're no longer enhancing, you know, the organization. They're just dragging it down and therefore, let's do one.

So that kind of, should there be a cadence where we say, we're going to check every 10 years to see if it's necessary to do this, but only if we get positive support from the community through the SO or AC organization, or whatever mechanism, will we actually do it? So, those are still open questions that we're in now.

The other is just another one of the ad hoc reviews. I don't mean just one of them. They're important reviews, but reviews that only happen when they're necessary, as opposed to on a regular cadence. Reviewing accountability and transparency is, in a sense, always necessary. We need to make sure that we're there. I'm not going to come to questions, Michael, until the end of both slides.

So, you know, do we have this on a cadence or not? So that's one of the questions. Or should this be one of the reviews conducted by a cross-community group, as it was this time, CEO, community leaders, assisted by expert? To whom are the recommendations made? They're made to the SOs and ACs directly or its representative body. And then to the board, if the SOs and ACs think, “Yes, this is the right way to go,” then it's said to the board. There's no review it relates to bylaws. It relates to this review. You know, do we do this one again?

CHRIS DISSPAIN Have we lost Avri?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX I think we may have.

AVRI DORIA Am I back?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX You're back.

CHRIS DISSPAIN You’re back, yeah.

AVRI DORIA Okay, I think there was a glitch there while I was talking. Apologies, I don't know what was missed, but basically, you know, one of the questions was, what do we review within the reviews? Is this where SIP gets reviewed? Is this an ad hoc, as I'd already asked, you know, et cetera? So, let's move on.

Since I spoke about the ad hoc, let me move on to that one, and then we'll go to questions to the extent that we have time.

Remembering we can ask questions continuing from now until after ICANN85. So, moving on to the ad hoc.

The ad hoc review came out of this, it was an emerging conversation, but of do we really need to always do all of these? Do we always need to have a security and stability when we haven't necessarily implemented everything from the last one? Do we need a, you know -- we're constantly doing work on DNS and DNS problem mitigation and such. Do we need to add a review that looks at it or is enough work going on?

The CCT has been mapped to rounds, you know, coming up with the next one. Does it happen there? How often does it happen, et cetera? So, these are kind of reviews. Perhaps the Review of Review is one of those that only happens periodically. So, when we look at these, they're basically all threshold-based reviews in terms of the way it's talking about.

When there is a need, when there is a demonstrated need, when there is a community sense of a need, then one needs to be done. So, these are definitely threshold-based and such. You know, who conducts these is sort of up to what the review is and those would vary. The scoping of those would vary depending upon and there would be processes.

One of the things we need to do in defining an ad hoc review mechanism in the bylaws is define what kicks it off, what initiates it, what the thresholds are, how we determine who gets the recommendations. We've seen many cases where the board gets a recommendation and says, “Oh, those aren't for us. Those are for an SO. Those are for an AC.”

So, these correspond to current reviews that we have in the bylaws. They correspond to any reviews that we've wanted to have, but didn't have a mechanism for. So, you know, this is a major piece. It's one that still needs a lot of definition, but I remind people that at the moment, we're coming up more with the type of reviews, it's in the next bit of work that we take on where we actually define the reviews themselves and what needs to be done.

At this point, we're dealing with types of reviews. So, is this a type that we need to support? And with the previous slide, is the Review of Reviews a type of review that needs to support with particulars to be discussed? I will stop now and open it up to questions. Thank you for letting me combine the two. Michael, thank you for your patience and then I have Anne.

MICHAEL PALAGE Anne, you can go first if you like.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE Oh, well, thanks, Michael. I'll jump into that. On the last slide with ad hoc reviews, Avri, if we could go there, and the current corresponding reviews being CCT, SSR, RDSR, it is of concern that these would be considered issues that would be addressed on an ad hoc basis.

I think, you know, you said earlier, hey, accountability and transparency are always important. And so, what we're suggesting now in the table is that accountability and transparency is covered under Bucket A and that will be determined, you know, based on priorities. And it strikes me that these are almost flipped.

That in other words, the priorities' part would be more appropriate for ad hoc review, whereas these items that currently correspond that are listed as ad hoc actually go quite directly to the bylaws obligations that are stated for accountability review and transparency review. So, I think that these are flipped. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I think that's something that we'll have to bring back to the group and discuss further. I think perhaps there's probably something in the review of priorities where what we're talking about is specific priorities for specific reviews at specific times.

And there was just a feeling that when lots of work is already being done on security and stability, and there are things from previous reviews that haven't been implemented yet, is it really necessary to do another one at that time? Or is it something that you look at the priorities and say, "No, implementing the goals from last time is probably a higher priority than talking about it some more."

But it really is a good discussion to take back to the CCG and I leave it at that one, but open for discussion. And I know you're one of the observers in the CCG, so I'm sure we'll get back to this question. Michael, please.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Yes, thank you, Avri. Michael Palage, for the record. Avri, I wanted to address your comment about the community being a gatekeeper of these reviews as opposed to hard-coded periodic reviews. My question to you and the rest of the team would be as follows.

My comments earlier about the NomCom, the experts talked about the ICANN board potentially being captured by affiliated directors. So, following on that theme, my concern about the community dictating when reviews would happen, what happens if the ICANN community is captured and they actually like the status quo and do not want it to happen? And again, this goes back to my previous comments about the review being conducted by external experts, not being assisted by external experts.

So, to me, the point that is really concerning here is what happens if there is capture in one or more ICANN constituency or stakeholder groups? How do we address that and not let them determine it? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. First of all, I go back to the Articles of Incorporation. This is a bottom-up community-driven organization so what we have to deal with here is recognizing when we reach a threshold within the community that it is indeed a community issue as opposed to a single individual or a single group's interest that's pushing things forward that is so-called capturing.

I think that we have to think about capture, which we kind of always do when we're coming up with, what is the threshold to kick something off? What is the threshold to prevent something and such so that we're not stuck? But the reviews, in a sense, we have to remember from articles and such are the bottom-up oversight of this organization.

And to say, well, but if the community is captured, then we need to bring in an expert, sort of defeats what is basic to the organization. So, we have to make sure that we have thresholds and such that prevent that from being actuated. And I'll leave that at that for now, but basically, we can't review with the community because it might be captured is, I think, a very self-defeating notion that we really have to work against. Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Avri. And once again, I find myself having put my hand up to say something and now saying something else as well. Just to build on what you just said, with which I agree, I think we would do well to remember the hoops and machinations that we all went through back in 2016 when we did the transition and built the empowered community mechanism.

I'm not suggesting that the empowered community mechanism is a useful mechanism for these purposes, but we have gone through a process of discussing this and talking about, how do we build something that ensures that absent 100% capture, which you could argue isn't capture anymore because it's 100% of the community that feels the same way, how do you deal with it?

And I think we've got mechanisms in place to do that and the threshold that you've mentioned would need to be cognizant, would need to be built. But bearing in mind the fact that you'd want to make sure that things couldn't be blocked with insufficient -- you'd need a significant proportion of the community to be against something for it to be blocked, which brings me back to the other point about these ad hoc reviews.

I think it's really important that we don't read too much into the term ad hoc. We've discussed on the CCG that it may actually be the wrong term because it implies, you know, almost a sort of, oh, we've just decided to do this in the moment, let's do it, you know, and that's not what we mean.

What we mean is that it's a review mechanism that allows a review to be spun up on anything, really, because there is a sufficient weight in the community to trigger, to meet the threshold to have that review happen, which is why I would suggest that things like the SSR review -- I do kind of think of the CCT as slightly different for a number of reasons because I think that's cadenced around the new gTLD program. But certainly, the SSR and the RDSR reviews, I think, actually hold themselves out precisely as fitting into the ability to be spun up as and when they are required.

In other words, a portion of the community believes that here is the scope that we think an SSR review should be doing. They go and they get agreement from sufficient numbers of the community, sufficient parts of the SO and AC community that it is necessary and it's spun up and run with a very discreet and sensible purpose.

In other words, it is event driven. It is purpose driven for a particular reason and rather than simply being put in as a requirement every five, six, or seven years, no matter what it must be done and then you figure out the scope once you realize you have to do it.

So, I do acknowledge there are arguments the other way, but I think that this, the concept of having a sort of ad hoc, and I again, not necessarily the right term, review actually works really well and feeds really well into the thing about, how do you deal with cadence? How do you deal with not having too many reviews and so on and so forth? Thanks, Avri. I'll shut up now.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you and before going on to you, I'm actually going to switch now since we only have nine minutes left to open questions. So, anybody that has a question on anything, please, you know, raise your hand, but also remember, we're going to have lots of time for discussion on this. And I'm really happy that we've got to the end of this with a pressure on time, as opposed to it being one of those where there's dead silence at the end of it. So, I'm really happy with everybody's curiosity. Okay, Anne, and then anyone else that has a question that came up from the other ones, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Okay, many thanks, Avri. It's Anne again. I think that Chris mentioned some accountability mechanisms that ensure that, you know, there will be an independent check and he mentioned empowered community as an independent check. And this goes to the issue, of course, that Michael raised and also, you know, we do have the request for reconsideration and the independent review process.

But I did want to point out that those processes are quite laborious and expensive and we've seen some of them come out, you know, in a way that sort of began to question whether we truly have the two very important things that you mentioned, Avri, when you said accountability and transparency are always important. And so, you know, again, what I'm not really seeing is a systematic review of those procedural concerns.

I think that when we talk about priorities and we talk about then current issues, that that is more appropriate for ad hoc review. In other words, an issue arises, the community thinks it's important to address it, that's an ad hoc issue. Whereas accountability and transparency are actually procedural issues that should be themselves systematically addressed as independent way as possible and not based on whether this person, or that person or this SO or that AC thinks that now is the time to do it. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Siva, please.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY

Yeah, in a scenario where the board or the community is captured, how do we ensure that the reviews happen without the influence of the captured interests or the captured body?

That is something that we probably have to look into and this is probably where the ad hoc review can come in. An ad hoc, not only in terms of how the ad hoc process is commissioned, but also how it works. Even its own processes could be ad hoc. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Okay, thank you. I don't have any other questions. Can we have the next slide up, please, since we only have six minutes left?

So, we obviously care about the input and I don't know whether Chris and Manal, since we don't have any pending questions, want to take the last comments since I've been talking for a bit now. So, Chris, Manal, do you have anything you want to say in our last six minutes?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think Manal is going to take us through the other two slides.

MANAL ISMAIL

Sure. I'm happy to take the remaining two slides. Obviously, your input is very important. We count on your input. Please stay tuned for the upcoming comment proceedings on the draft design proposal and the draft report. We have started discussing today the elements of this report. We felt the structure of the table could help drive some progress and some consensus. Once we agree on this, we will start drafting the report.

As you may have already known by now, observers are welcome to contribute and join the group and share their views. And for more information, you can follow the shared link. It's also on the slides and the slides are publicly posted in the session description.

You can also send us your input at inputonreviews@icann.org, which is publicly archived and again, more information is available. And finally, you can follow the work of the group and listen to the recordings of our meetings, plenary and co-chairs on the Wiki page and the link is also shared. And thank you, Yvette, for sharing the email address where everyone can share input. And thank you, Alice, for sharing the link to becoming an observer.

So, let's keep the conversation going. This is just a warm-up for Mumbai and we look forward to continuing this discussion. If we can go to the following slide, please, and this is our last slide. Just to share with you all the sessions relevant to our topic today.

So first, we're having our plenary session on the Thursday, 12th March at 19:00 local time, 3:30 UTC, but before that, we have throughout the week, different parts of the community are increasing time on their agendas for discussing reviews.

We have the RSSAC meeting on Saturday 16:30 local time, 11:00 UTC. On Sunday there are three sessions, the GNSO on Sunday 10:30 local time, 5:00 UTC, At-Large also on Sunday 16:30 local time, 11:00 UTC and GAC at 16:30 local time, 11:00 UTC on Sunday as well.

On Wednesday, the ASO AC meeting with the Review of Reviews leadership at 9:00 local time, 3:50 UTC. And the ccNSO will be meeting on Wednesday as well, 16:30 local time, 11:00 UTC and this is throughout the week.

On the Thursday, as I mentioned earlier, we will have the plenary session. Again, we look forward to your valuable contributions to our continued discussion. It's very important that we keep this constructive discussion going until we come up with the final report, hopefully by August, as agreed. So, before I conclude, any last comments, Chris or Avri?

CHRIS DISSPAIN Nothing from me.

MANAL ISMAIL Okay. Thank you, Chris, Avri, and thanks everyone who joined our session today and thanks for our fantastic support team. We look forward to your continued contributions and to your active engagement in person or online in Mumbai. Have a good rest of your days and enjoy the prep week. Bye.

AVRI DORIA Thank you, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]