
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GAC: Discussion with Cross Community Group on Reviews of Reviews
Sunday, March 8, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

GÜLTEN TEPE

Are you ready? All right. Welcome to the GAC discussion on Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group session on Sunday, 08 March at 04:30 PM local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form.

Please remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I leave the floor over to GAC Chair, Nicolas Cabellero. Over to you, Nico. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much, Gülten. Welcome back, everyone. I hope you enjoyed the fantastic coffee and tea they have here in Mumbai. This session is going to be running for one hour. That is until 05:30 PM local time, of course. Manal and my distinguished colleague from the UPU, Tracy Hackshaw, are going to be walking us through the

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.

details and the nuances of the Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group updates.

Just to give a little bit more color to the discussion, and I do not want to get ahead of myself, but there are five different areas we are going to be analyzing today. The first one being accountability and transparency, the second one CIP assessment, the third one a structural review, and again, Manal and Tracy are going to give us the details. Then the Review of Reviews itself, and finally an ad hoc or on-demand review as per if needed. So without further ado, let me hand the floor to Manal Ismail, former GAC Chair, by the way. Manal, the floor is yours.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Nico, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. On behalf of Abbie, Chris, and myself, co-chairs of the Reviews Cross-Community Group, I thank you for making time on the GAC busy agenda to discuss the topic. I think it is a timely discussion as the board has posed the question on reviews to the community. There is a plenary session seeking community feedback on Thursday.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Manal, sorry to interrupt you. Can you hold on just a little bit? Because we are having issues with the sound. We cannot hear you well. Can you hold on for a second?

MANAL ISMAIL

Sure. I am going to try the headset.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

This is better. Try the headset just in case in order to see if it is better because we were having trouble before. So can you try the headset?

MANAL ISMAIL

Sure. Just a second. Is it any better now?

NICOLAS CABELLERO

This is pretty good. Yeah, let's try this. Thank you. Over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Okay. Thank you. I was just saying it is a timely discussion as the board has posed the question on reviews to the community. Can you hear me?

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Can you put the microphone a little bit closer to your mouth, please? Maybe that would do it.

MANAL ISMAIL

Is it better now?

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Better now. Yes. Please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL

Okay. I was saying it is a timely discussion as the board has posed the question on reviews to the community. There is a plenary session seeking community input on Thursday, and there will be an upcoming public comment opportunity shortly after ICANN 85. As you may all know, the group was chartered to manage the fundamental evaluation of reviews set out in ICANN bylaws as a whole system, including their implementation and proposing a refreshed system of reviews. The group has two members from each SO/AC. Tracy Hackshaw from—

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Manal, sorry to interrupt you again, but we are having issues once again with the sound. Maybe if you could please, and sorry about this, can you try again without a headset just in case because it was not working.

MANAL ISMAIL

Better now?

NICOLAS CABELLERO

A little better. Okay. Let's try this.

MANAL ISMAIL

Maybe I can switch off my camera and get my sound.

NICOLAS CABELLERO Maybe that would do it. Yeah. Maybe it is the bandwidth. I do not know. But yeah, let's try that.

MANAL ISMAIL If you still cannot hear me, Tracy could walk the GAC through the table I am trying to present.

NICOLAS CABELLERO Okay. But the sound is way better now, for sure.

MANAL ISMAIL Okay. Let me try to get this done. The GAC has two members, Tracy and myself. We have finished the fact-finding phase but welcome any further input. We are now in the design phase where we have the proposal you see on the screen. We have prepared a slide deck, but for the sake of time, I thought maybe we can just focus on the table. We have circulated this table last week. I hope you had the chance to look into it.

As Nico mentioned, we have five review categories proposed, or buckets as we sometimes call them, as you can see them in the columns, all sharing a shared purpose, which 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. These are namely the accountability and transparency review for reviewing ICANN's execution of its commitments in its articles of

incorporation, bylaws, strategic plan, and financial and operational plan.

Bucket B, or the second category, is assessment of continuous improvement to review results of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees and NomCom continuous improvement program. The structural review will be mandated to review the overall structure and components of ICANN and of SO/ACs and the NomCom to confirm whether they are fit for purpose. The Review of Reviews itself, just in case we need one, we left this door open. Finally, ad hoc reviews to accommodate any emerging topic that meets the criteria for a review, specifically one that does not involve policy considerations and cannot be adequately addressed through other discussion forums.

With that, let's go through column by column. For each of the reviews, we have identified a few key elements that we propose discussing for each review category. We have done the focus for all now on the methodology and intended outcomes for the accountability and transparency. The methodology and intended outcome is to evaluate the extent to which ICANN is delivering on aspects of its mission, commitments, and core values as prioritized during scoping by examining procedures and processes used and outcomes and progress achieved in respect to goals set out in planning documentation.

In other words, the community here decides on the priorities and sets the scope of the accountability and transparency review, but

within already defined guardrails and through an agreed process. The reason here is to hopefully ensure that the review team, once formed, would hit the ground running with a set scope, with members with the needed expertise, and a clear way forward in terms of an agreed-upon scope by the community. Recommendations could also suggest improvements where necessary and identify key development areas that may strengthen effectiveness in support of the mission.

Recommendations do not only focus on addressing gaps or shortfalls but also recommend enhancements and improvements as appropriate. On the cadence, first, we were going for a set cadence, something like every five years. But then we decided maybe flexibility is needed here so that if we have a backlog of recommendations or something that is not finalized from previous reviews, we can have some flexibility here. This review should be prompted by ICANN bylaws and be subject to agreement on cadence. All reviews will need to be reflected somehow in the bylaws or at least be allowed, if not mandated by the bylaws, to avoid any breach or violations like the one we faced at the beginning of this process.

One question here would be: Should cadence be fixed, strictly every five years? Or is it okay to provide some flexibility in order not to run into a similar situation having reviews stacking up, implementation of recommendations accumulating, and resources stretched very thin? If we are providing some flexibility, how do we ensure that following reviews are not delayed

indefinitely? These are all brainstorming questions. I will pause after each bucket to see if you have any immediate reflections or any questions of your own.

On the initiation process, the first step would be community analyzing implementation of prior review outputs and considering whether the timeline is meaningful. A second step would be for the community to evaluate the bandwidth, drafts, the scope, and determine the prioritization. Here, there was a suggestion that maybe we can rely on the existing SO/AC chairs and vice chairs mechanism, where they can consult with their constituencies and relay their voices or speak on behalf of the community through consultation with their constituencies.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Can I stop you there for a second? Sorry to interrupt you, Manal. Can I stop you there just for one second? This is something we discussed yesterday with the SO/AC leaders, and the many problems that are especially for me as the GAC Chair and for the future GAC Chair as a matter of fact, or for any of the vice chairs, in terms of giving whatever opinion or any kind of intervention in that regard on behalf of the full GAC without discussing with the GAC first. Do you have any idea on how to address that potential problem?

MANAL ISMAIL

Why are you assuming that it is not going to be in consultation with the GAC? In fact, I think the other way around. The chairs and vice chairs will be asked to consult with their constituencies and formulate a position.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Okay. Got it. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

And the third step is the resource requirements to be confirmed, and finally, the formal board resolution to convene the review. On the scoping, it is seen as a variable scope, but again, within set boundaries. The full scope of the accountability and transparency review should be already known. But within this very broad scope, the community may prioritize a few things to review at a certain review. It is not that we are going to review everything every time in full, and this is where the prioritization comes. This is all to be pre-agreed during the initiation process.

Who should conduct the review? It is proposed to be a cross-community group, again with the option to be assisted by external experts if need be or if chosen. Again, this was a topic of discussion: the role of external experts, whether they are a fresh eye to the process and should be the ones running the review, or if the community knows better about how they run things and would be in a better position to do their own reviews, again with the option

of consulting experts. The discussion was more leaning towards having the external experts as an option.

Recipients of the outputs or the recommendations are obviously going to be the board. This is basically to see if this proposed review has some corresponding current review. In this case, the corresponding existing review is, of course, the accountability and transparency one. I will pause here to check if there are any thoughts on the identified approach for this bucket. Whether the cadence should be fixed or is it okay to provide some flexibility, and what could be measures to ensure that this flexibility will not result in an indefinite delay of following reviews?

Your thoughts about using the SO/AC chairs and vice chairs mechanism to consult with the community and be their voice in scoping and so on. And whether this mechanism needs to be revisited because some said that the meetings are not open, are not public, and are not recorded, so the community cannot really tell what is going on. Finally, the composition of the cross-community group and the role of the external experts in that respect. I am pausing to see if there are any immediate reactions to this.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Manal. Let me check if we have any comments or questions in the room or online. I do not see any hand online so far. Let's see if we have any immediate reaction in the room. I do not

see any hand either. So that means that we are good to go. Back to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Nico. I will proceed then, and I will pause after each bucket to check how it goes. Second is the assessment of continuous improvement. For this one, this is meant to be a lightweight effort to confirm the continuous improvement programs were completed in adherence to the agreed framework, to test their outputs to ensure conclusions are supported, comparing the outputs to identify good practices that may be beneficial to others, and ensure actions are followed through on as intended.

The proposed cadence here is based on outcomes from the third Accountability and Transparency Review Team. The set cadence here is based on the CIP cycle itself. So the SOs, ACs, and NomCom report every three years, maximum every three years. The set cadence here would follow this cycle. This is being piloted currently, so the current CIP is a pilot, allowing for consideration of a minimum of two assessment reports for each SO and AC or NomCom. And then there will be some assessment to the output of this as well.

Moving to the following element, this is going to be prompted by ICANN bylaws. The initiation process would start by submission of the SO/AC and NomCom reports. The cross-community group would then convene. Regarding the scope, the scope is

predetermined in ICANN bylaws, so it has a fixed or a predefined scope, which is the assessment of the SO/AC and NomCom continuous improvement. The review is proposed to be conducted by a cross-community group, again with the option of having an external expert.

Outputs are submitted to the relevant SO/AC or NomCom. But there was a suggestion also that if the board or org are discussed materially, they should also receive the report. This corresponds to the continuous improvement recommended by the third Accountability and Transparency Review. As I mentioned earlier, this is still a pilot. So this will need to be assessed or reviewed at some point in time. Also important to note that this review does not include a review of what the different constituencies are doing in terms of their continuous improvement.

I mean how they deal with things, how they are running their own assessment. It is an internal matter of each SO and AC. But this is to assess the results of this in light of all the reviews that will be in place. Finally, one question was put in that context: Should the board undertake a continuous improvement program as well in accordance with the CIP principles? Or in other words, should the continuous improvement process apply to the board as it does to the different parts of the community? I am pausing here again to see if there are any thoughts on this bucket of reviews, which is already in place running but as a pilot.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Manal. Let's see if we have any reaction in the room or online. The question is: Should the board undertake a CIP in accordance with the CIP principles? Is that correct, Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL

Yeah. It is one of many questions. So if there are any thoughts or comments on the bucket itself, and this is an open question that we discussed, but we had diversions in views within the group.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Okay. Thank you for that, Manal. I do not see any hand in the room. I see—okay. USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Manal. Susan Chalmers, United States. Just a question on this specific question. Does the board already have committees and mechanisms to review its operations?

MANAL ISMAIL

There is the Board Governance Committee. There is the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. I am not sure what mechanisms exactly would be used to have the board within the continuous improvement program front. But I was thinking because the board already asked the GAC about the reviews in general, maybe we can ask them if they have any initial thoughts on this open question.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Would that be okay for you, USA? Okay. So let's do that, Manal. Thank you. The floor is still open. Any other comment or question? I do not see any hand in the room, Manal, or online, so back to you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Nico. And this will take us to the third category of reviews, which is the structural review. And here we have two options for the methodology and intended outcomes that we would like to seek the community's feedback on. The first one reads: The methodology and intended outcome should be 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 need. Example, the need for a new structure, and does not cover internal structures of existing SOs and ACs unless specifically requested, and also discusses structural issues at the request of SOs and ACs only where the specific SO or AC leaders determine the issue meets a threshold.

The second option, and this is proposed by the GNSO ISPCP constituency, reads: Mandatory review examining structures in terms of dynamics, placement, composition, and representation, plus overall structural coherence and effectiveness. And it should include associated board composition and decision-making processes. To make the comparison easier, the first option focuses on structure as a system and not getting into SO/AC structures unless requested to do so. Whereas the second option mandates

examination of structures of the SOs and ACs every time it is conducted.

Each of the options has its own pros and cons. The first doesn't really get into the SO/AC NomCom internal matters and also doesn't do a review of everything every time, wasting effort and resources if the review is not needed. But at the same time, if top structure of a certain SO or AC believes a structure review is needed, it makes sense to allow this to happen irrespective of whether the whole SO and AC thinks it should. So I am trying to give the essence of the discussion and providing both points of view.

Any thoughts on the two options identified? And which one would you see more appropriate? On the cadence—again, the thinking here was having a set cadence but on long-term, so ten years was mentioned, but again, we are not putting here any specific numbers. We are leaving it to the community to decide on the cadence now. Under structural reviews, the cadence is every N years. We did not specify a number here, but we were talking in the range of ten years so that it is not something that is happening every day.

And occurrence to be confirmed based on community agreement. Again, even with the set cadence, there was a discussion whether the review should be on anyway unless the community decides to cancel it if it is not needed or the review should be explicitly asked for by the community.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Manal, at that point, just to chime in, I would say ten to fifteen years, which more or less would coincide with the new round of new gTLDs, right? Just to give you an example. It does not have anything to do, but just to provide some background. I would say that in order to avoid having the same problem after three, four, or five years. Not that I have very strong feelings in this regard. It is just to provide some potential ideas here. But again, the floor is open, and I see a hand from Switzerland. Please go ahead, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Maybe also to give Manal an opportunity to have a short pause in her description of where the process stands. I would have a question, and maybe I am a little bit ashamed that I have such a question because maybe I should know. But this structural review, how does it fit with existing review types? Because accountability and transparency is well known. The CIP assessment, as you said, is a pilot experience. The Review of Reviews is what you are doing right now and could be done in the future.

And I guess the ad hoc on-demand review is also a new type of potential review. So I was wondering, is this structural review a new type reflecting something that exists? And then I would have to apologize for not knowing that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

No need for any apologies, Jorge, and thank you for the question and for giving me a pause. It derives from recommendations made by the third Accountability and Transparency Review. It relates to the holistic review, if you recall the term. I think there was a recommendation by the third Accountability and Transparency Review Team to have a global review of ICANN structure once in a while to make sure that, for example, if there is a new stakeholder group that would like to be represented within ICANN, this will never emerge from the CIP, for example, if it is a totally new stakeholder group.

Something else regarding, as I mentioned, if a subgroup feels misrepresented or feels that there is a need for structural review, this also needs to be looked at. I remember Chris always used the ccNSO as an example. For example, if the IDN ccTLDs think they are not well represented within the ccNSO and they would like to have this reviewed, so this could be an option. Again, as I said, there are two proposals here. One is making this possible only if and when requested by the SO or AC, whereas option two is having this part of any structural review. Nico, would you like to manage the floor?

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Yes, that is the idea. Thank you so much, Switzerland, for the question. I have the European Commission next. Unless, Jorge, you tell me that your question is related to this.

JORGE CANCIO

I am sorry, Martina. Hello, by the way. It is a little bit of a two-finger, in the sense that we know or at least the experience was that the ATRT reviews are extremely broad. And in fact, there was a lot of discussion whether the ATRT could do the Review of Reviews itself. So I was wondering whether the group is discussing to really be very specific on the scope of the ATRTs in the future, in this new type of structural review.

Otherwise we have the risk that we will have another overlap and another process proliferation within ICANN, which is something that is rather time-consuming and kills the inclusivity of the system. So maybe that question. And of course, I think that the function of a structural review is very important, but yeah, maybe it deserves a lot of discussion before setting it into the bylaws. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Jorge. And two quick things. First, everything is still open for discussion, so I hope we can have this discussion. I hope colleagues will have the time to really read the material thoroughly, and we can surely discuss again. And second, the structural review and the Review of Reviews were both mentioned within the ad hoc reviews as well.

Some were of the view that they are big enough to be a standalone bucket with set cadence to make sure they do happen even if every big number of years. Others were saying that we could have them

whenever we need them, so they could qualify under the ad hoc bucket. I leave it at this and back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Manal. Thank you so much. European Commission, sorry to keep you waiting. Martina, please go ahead.

MARTINA BARBERO

Thank you very much, Nico. This is Martina Barbero, European Commission for the records. And first of all, just to acknowledge and thank Manal and Tracy for all this work on this Review of Reviews process. This is important work. We do understand that it comes from a place where the current system seems to be not maybe as effective as we wish it would be, and there is a need to rethink everything and put all the ideas on the table. And we appreciate these brainstorming efforts and Manal for presenting the initial outcome from the group.

This is a question we already asked to Manal, but we wanted to bring it to the entire GAC because when we first look at the table, for us, there were two reviews mandated by laws that were missing, which was SSR, Stability, Security and Resilience Review, and the CCT, Competition, Consumer and Trust. And those are two bylaws-mandated reviews that from where we stand are quite important. I understand that the last CCT, for instance, was not particularly successful in terms of implementation of the actions. Some are still pending.

I think there was even the cost-benefit analysis before the new round that came from CCT too, that we never actually had in the way that the GAC wanted to have. But just to say that I understand that these two bylaws-mandated reviews could fall under the first bucket or the last bucket. Still, the slight question concern remains for us because stability, security and resilience are very important topics and of course, also consumer, competition, and trust.

So in sincerely gathering feedback from the community, I just wanted to highlight that maybe we need to think how to make those topics really embedded in some of the buckets or visible in any event, because missing them altogether might be slightly worrying for some parts of the community. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Martina, and thank you for bringing up this important point. Definitely they are not left out. Both of them are two very important reviews. The CCT is already a conditioned review with any new round. And both the Competition and Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice and the Security, Stability, and Resiliency, they are both part of or embedded in ICANN's commitments, core values, and mission.

So they could be part of the accountability and transparency, and they could be spun off as needed under the ad hoc reviews bucket. Again, it is an open discussion. What brought up the ad hoc review bucket? Frankly, I do not like the term ad hoc. I do not think it is the

best description for this bucket. I think maybe on-demand or something along the lines would be more accurate.

But again, what brought up this whole thing is whether all reviews need to be cadenced or periodically conducted or whether some of them could be done once or upon demand or based on some condition. I see other hands, so back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Manal. I have the USA next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Manal. Susan Chalmers, United States. And Manal, please allow me to extend my sincere thanks to you for your engagement in this important work and for keeping the GAC updated and tied to the process. Just a general reflection here: For the average person, this chart is not easy to unpack, and in some respects, it is not inherently logical. May I just ask that we scooch the chart up? Thank you.

For example, the overarching tab right there, 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. The overarching header for the five buckets of reviews shares the title of the first bucket of reviews, and I appreciate how this can make perfect sense to folks who have been inside the ICANN tent for many years, but it should be accessible to an outsider.

I know this is mid-draft, but just offering some feedback that perhaps it could be suggested that when this work is done, some effort be put into communications to ensure that it is clear to the average person who wants to understand how ICANN is keeping itself accountable. There was a proposal put forward to refine and make less vague the instructions for the accountability and transparency review, the PIR proposal. I think the original statement indicated that review should ensure that ICANN's culture remains consistent with its mission.

But what does that mean? And what does it mean to an ICANN outsider? Well, an ICANN outsider cannot understand what the ICANN culture is, and in any event, it is just a bit of a vague term. So any efforts made to sharpen, to clarify the language, and to make it more accessible to the average person would be welcomed. Because if ICANN's review system cannot be understood by the outside world, then that is going to be a fundamental issue. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Yes, very quickly. All noted, Susan, and as Martina mentioned, we were just trying to compile everything in one table for ease of discussions and having a one-stop shop for everything and ease of comparison as well. But this is not a final draft. These are more of the building blocks that if agreed, we can get out the draft report easily. The culture and the vague words you are referring to are not there anymore.

I hope the current language under accountability and transparency is not of concern. Otherwise, I appreciate sharing any concerns or any suggestions for modifications. Back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Manal. Thank you so much. UPU, Tracy, please go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Hi. This is just an operational issue, Manal. We are ten minutes away from the end, so is there any possibility maybe of doing a summary of the next two so we could get to the questions? I think that is the ask here in the room. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Tracy, and sure, I can go. I am glad we are having the discussion, so even if we do not go through everything, even breaking the ice with the table for everyone to review at their convenience and come back with comments would be great. Taking your point on time, the fourth bucket of reviews is the Review of Reviews. And this is, as Nico mentioned at the beginning, to cater for any future need for such an exercise.

Again, there is a proposal to have a set cadence. We have not agreed on the number of years. And occurrence is to be confirmed based on community agreement, meaning that if we agree to have it every ten years, it does not necessarily mean we will do it every ten years. It means that every ten years we will check whether we

need to do one or not. So this is occurrence to be confirmed based on community agreement. It also may be prompted out of cadence, so if there is a pressing issue that mandates a Review of Reviews, we can have it prompted out of cadence through the ad hoc review process.

And again, it is prompted by ICANN bylaws, and there is the initiation process. I will not get into this for the sake of time. It is there for your own read. Scope is predetermined in ICANN bylaws. Again, it is conducted by a cross-community group. There was a suggestion here to specifically add the CEO and community leaders here in the Review of Reviews and in the structural review as they are big reviews that would need the leadership and the CEO's involvement. They all have the option of being assisted by an expert.

And here the recipients of the outputs would be SOs and ACs and the NomCom and ultimately the board. This one originates from a component of the ATRT mandate. So the accountability and transparency review is mandated to look holistically at everything which is sort of also a Review of Reviews. It looks also at what happened in the past reviews. Do we need a set cadence to check if another Review of Reviews is needed and cancel it if we do not need it?

In which case, how many years should this be? Should we have it as an ad hoc review initiated only when necessary, as opposed to a regular set cadence? Or should it come out as a recommendation

by the accountability and transparency review? So three options here. Either a set cadence—and they are not mutually exclusive. It could be a set cadence and still be triggered under certain circumstances out of cadence. It could also come out as a recommendation by the accountability and transparency review.

What is the threshold for the demand for such a review? Is there a threshold and how to measure it? And could it be used as the one to review or to assess the output of the pilot of the continuous improvement program? In the remaining few minutes, going to the final bucket, and this is the ad hoc or on-demand review. As I mentioned earlier, this was triggered by a discussion on how often do we need certain reviews. Do we really need them to take place on a cadence basis? Or could some of them be a one-time review or an occasional review or a conditioned review?

It is meant to address a narrowly scoped topic that qualifies for a review based on established criteria and convened under exceptional circumstances. So should a threshold be met, we can have this topic reviewed. Again, the community is the gatekeeper here of these reviews, as opposed to a hard-coded periodic review. They are event or purpose-driven rather than cadence-driven, and they are based on demonstrated need that is confirmed by the community.

But again, it would not be a topic that could be addressed through a policy development process or some other existing mechanism. Again, the process to convene should be defined in the ICANN

bylaws. I leave the initiation process to your own reading. The scope is variable here and to be agreed during the initiation process since we do not know the topics upfront. Conducted by—again, depends on the agreed scope. It should be conducted by the relevant skills or the relevant expertise needed, again with the option to be assisted by an expert.

Recipients, again, would depend on the topic of the review. This one does not really originate or is derived from or corresponds to any of the existing reviews. But to Martina's point, it may be used to address existing topics of specific reviews such as competition, consumer trust, consumer choice, registration data services, security, stability, and resiliency of DNS, which aligns with the output of ATRT3, by the way.

Some open questions here. Is this a type of review that we need? Should the Review of Reviews fall here or maintain its own separate bucket? And the CCT and the security and stability, again, depends on how we look at the scope of the accountability and transparency. They could either be part of the accountability and transparency or be triggered under the ad hoc reviews. I am pausing here to see if there are any last questions in the remaining couple of minutes.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

I do not see any hands, Manal. As a matter of fact, we only have two more minutes. I do not know if you would like to wrap up at this point.

MANAL ISMAIL

Sure. So three things here. I would really appreciate if colleagues could look into the table and come back to Tracy and myself with any questions you may have. We can, with your permission, Nico, hold the call if needed or bring the co-chairs of the cross-community group for a wider discussion if we wish. Second, since we received a question from the board on this, I was also wondering whether we can also ask the board how they see this heading, too.

Do they have any initial thoughts on where this is going? And second, also, if they have any initial thoughts on the proposal to also have the board within the CIP program. I leave it at this. I hope this breaks the ice for everyone to engage in the plenary on Thursday morning, 07:00 PM local time. Back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you so much, and certainly we will have the chance to ask the board on Tuesday at 03:00 PM during our meeting with them. Tracy, any final remarks at this point?

TRACY HACKSHAW

No, I think it is time. I think we should wrap, yeah.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

For the sake of time, yes, let's wrap up. So tomorrow at 09:00 AM in the morning, Monday, we will have the welcome ceremony, so I will see you there. We will wrap up here. Thank you so much for your time. And thank you, Manal. Thank you so much for the hard work. You actually deserve a big round of applause at this point. Thank you so very much. Okay, so we will reconvene tomorrow at 09:00 AM in the morning for the welcome ceremony. Thank you so much.

STAFF

Recording stopped.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]