
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – RSSAC Work Session (3 of 4)
Saturday, March 7, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

DAN GLUCK I will also post them in chat for your reference. This session is largely for RSSAC members and invited guests, but is open to observers. If you do wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. With that, Jeff, do you want to kick us off, or should we go straight to Manal?

JEFF OSBORN Go ahead.

DAN GLUCK Manal, you want to kick us off?

MANAL ISMAIL Thank you. Thank you, Dan. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. On behalf of Chris, Avri, and myself, I would like to thank you for making time on your busy agendas to discuss reviews. I do apologize for not being able to join you in person due to the situation in the region. Are the slides projected somewhere? I cannot see them here.

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.

DAN GLUCK

I am about to share my screen.

MANAL ISMAIL

Okay. Meanwhile, let me just go quickly through the agenda or what to expect in the slides. First, I am going to go through a quick introduction for those who may need it, and then we will present the first iteration of the draft proposal. Basically, walking through the five proposed review categories or buckets as we call them.

We will have opportunities, and I am speaking now on slide two, for questions and comments after each bucket, but also at the very end. Ultimately again at the plenary on Thursday and afterwards as well.

If we go to slide three, please. As you may already know, the cross-community group is started 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. The group has two members from each SO and AC. We have Jeff and Ken from the RSSAC. We have two members from the Board, two from ICANN staff, and we are supported by an awesome team from org. We have allowed active participation by observers and invited co-chairs of ATRT3, Cheryl and Pat, to become members of the group as experts.

So far, we have had twenty plenary meetings within the wider group, but also at least weekly meetings among the co-chairs and the support team. We are currently at an initial design proposal

that we are presenting for discussion during ICANN 85. You should expect this draft proposal to be refined after ICANN 85 and posted for public comments after reflecting inputs we will hear from you throughout this week. Afterwards, a draft report will be compiled again for public comments and for discussion at ICANN 86.

If we go to the following slide, please. This is our work phases. Phase one is fact-finding, which we have completed, but still very much welcome any further facts that you may want to share. Phase two is on analysis and development of proposals, and this is where we are now. Again, as mentioned, we have an initial design for discussion here at ICANN 85, and we will be gathering input throughout the meetings this week, whether the bilaterals with the different parts of the community or the plenary session on Thursday.

The following phase is going to be the finalization of the proposals again for discussion at ICANN 86 in June, with the ultimate goal of submitting the final report and any relevant documentation to the Board for their decision, hopefully by August 26.

Next slide, please. The draft proposal to simplify our discussion and drive faster progress, we have compiled a table as a one-stop shop listing key elements that we propose for discussion under each bucket or category of reviews in the rows and the reviews or categories in the columns. A screenshot of this table or working document is showing on the right side of the slide. The link will be shared with everyone. Once agreed, these elements would

ultimately be the nucleus of the group's report on the overall proposed review system.

The elements we have thought of are the focus—what subject areas are being examined for each review; methodology and intended outcomes—how subject areas are being examined and for what purpose; cadence—how often would reviews be conducted; prompted by—and this is meant to highlight where the review is established and what induces the review; the initiation process—the steps that should be taken to initiate the review; the scope—whether it is preset or agreed during the initiation process; who will carry out the review effort; to whom the review conclusions or recommendations will be submitted; and where the review originates or is derived from. In other words, does it correspond to an existing current review? Finally, we have some notes and brainstorming questions within the table as well.

Please let us know if you feel we have missed anything from this list that should be considered. In the following slides, we will go through each of the five category of reviews, two slides on each, noting in some cases options and some open discussion points that need your input. I will pause here to see if there are any requests for the floor or if Avri or Chris would you like to add anything to this quick introduction? Thank you, Alice, for sharing the link to the table in the chat. If not, then—

AVRI DORIA

I don't see anyone reacting. No one is reacting, and neither Chris nor I is volunteering to say anything.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you. Thank you, Avri, for letting me know. If I may request the following slide then. We started our work by thinking on the purpose of reviews in order to know what needs to be reviewed and formulated the following description: 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 these are the five categories. First, ICANN's execution of its commitments in its articles of incorporation, bylaws, strategic plan, and financial and operational plan, which we sometimes refer to as bucket A, but it is called accountability and transparency review.

Then also results of the supporting organization's advisory committees and NomCom Continuous Improvement Program as they relate to each SOAC and NomCom and to each other. This is the assessment of the continuous improvement or bucket B. Then, the overall structure and components of ICANN and of SOs, ACs, and NomCom to confirm whether fit for purpose, and this is the structural review. The fourth is the review of reviews just to confirm whether fit for purpose, which is a case similar to what we are having right now. Just in case another review of reviews is needed, we are trying to leave the door open for such review. Finally, we are trying to accommodate any emerging topic that meets the criteria

of a review, especially one that does not involve policy considerations and cannot be adequately addressed through other discussion forums, and of course, does not belong to any of the other buckets.

Ask here if there are any thoughts on the proposed categories or if you feel something is missing. Moving to the following slide, and here we are diving into the draft accountability and transparency review. First, on the methodology and intended outcomes, this review is intended 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 in the planning documentation. The community decides on priorities and set the scope within an already defined guide rails and through an agreed process.

Also, recommend improvement where necessary and identify key development areas that may strengthen effectiveness in support of the mission. In other words, not only focus on addressing gaps or shortfalls, but also recommending enhancements and improvements as appropriate. Second is the cadence. Here we thought of a flexible cadence conditioned on completion of steps as articulated in the initiation process. I have to say that we started here by thinking of a fixed cadence every X number of years—every five years, for example. But then there was a need to provide a bit of flexibility instead of hard cadence in order not to repeat the same problem with reviews stacking up, implementation of

recommendations accumulating, and resources being stretched very thin.

We thought it may be better to have a checkpoint before a new review is started to check on the implementation of the recommendations of the past review. Prompted by ICANN bylaws, but subject to agreement on cadence. It is also important to bear in mind how to ensure that such review is not delayed indefinitely. If we are considering when to start it and willing to delay it if we are running late on some recommendations from previous reviews, then there should be some measures in order not to delay it indefinitely.

On the initiation process, what we thought of is first community analysis. The community analyzes the implementation of prior review outputs and the effectiveness of deployed solutions and considers whether the timeline is meaningful. Second, the community evaluates the bandwidth, draft scope, and determines the associated prioritization. When we say the evaluation and prioritization, we spoke about the SOAC chairs and vice chairs mechanism that is already in place and how we can utilize this existing mechanism and whether it needs to be revisited if we are to rely on it. Third, the resource requirements to confirm that we have the required resources. Finally, the formal Board resolution to convene the review.

I will ask for the following slide, finish it, and we will pause for any questions or additions by Chris or Avri. But first on the scoping, if

we go to the following slide. Scoping is a variable scope within set boundaries or within already guide rails and to be agreed during the initiation process. The review is thought to be conducted by a cross-community group with the option to be assisted by an external expert. We went through a discussion here on the composition of this cross-community group, the role of external experts, whether external experts should be assisting or should be conducting as a fresh eye, and whether an external expert should be mandated or should be kept as an option. I think the convergence is towards having the external expert as an option, but happy to hear your views on this as well.

To whom the recommendations are made: in this case, it is going to be the Board. This originates from the currently existing accountability and transparency specific review. Finally, I would pause here to see if you have any comments or questions. We are here noting that this process should provide measures to ensure that subsequent reviews are not postponed indefinitely. Happy to hear what you think about the approach itself of this bucket. Should cadence be fixed or provide some flexibility? What do you think about using the current SOAC chair and vice chairs mechanism and whether the model needs to be revisited? And the role of external experts as some brainstorming questions.

Let me pause here and see if there are any comments or questions. If not, I will keep going. Next is the assessment of continuous improvement. As mentioned earlier, the purpose of this review is reviewing the results of the continuous improvement program of

the SOACs and NomCom. It is intended to be a lightweight effort to confirm the CIPs were completed in adherence to the agreed framework, to test the CIP outputs and ensure the conclusions are supported, to compare these outputs and identify good practices that may be beneficial to groups or serve to enhance collaboration, and to ensure actions are followed through on as intended.

We agreed to have a set cadence based on the CIP cycles. Already the SOACs and NomCom are expected to report every three years as a maximum. So the set cadence here follows the CIP cycles of the different SOACs and NomCom. Worth noting that this is currently being piloted following the ATRT3 recommendations, allowing for consideration of a minimum of two assessment reports from each of the constituencies. It is expected to be prompted by ICANN bylaws. Initiation would start by submission of SOAC and NomCom reports and then the cross-community group would be convened.

Going to the following slide, please. Regarding the scope, the scope is predetermined in the bylaws, so it has a fixed or predetermined scope, which is the assessment of the continuous improvement. The review is proposed to be conducted by a cross-community group with the option of being assisted by an expert. The output or recommendations are to be submitted to the relevant SOAC or NomCom. It was also discussed that if the Board or org are discussed materially in the review, they should also receive the report.

As mentioned earlier, this derives from the continuous improvement that was recommended by ATRT3. Finally, just to note that this is a pilot and whether the assessment of continuous improvement should also be used to assess the results of this pilot. One question that came up during our discussion as well is whether the Board should also undertake a continuous improvement program in accordance with the CIP principles and whether this should apply to the Board as it does to the different parts of the community. Pausing here to see if you have any thoughts on the identified approach for this bucket or if you have any questions, or if you would like more time to think it over.

AFSHAAN ABDUL

I don't see any attempt to think it over. I mean to comment. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Abhi. The following review will be the structural review. This bucket has to do with reviewing the overall structure and components of ICANN and of SOs, ACs, and NomCom to confirm whether they are fit for purpose. Regarding the methodology and the intended outcomes, we currently have an unfinalized discussion, so we have here two options that we would like to seek your feedback on. The first one reads: focused on the review 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, a need for a new

structure. It does not cover internal structures of existing SOs and ACs unless specifically requested. It discusses structural issues at the request of SO or AC and where SO or AC leaders determine the issue needs addressing.

Whereas option two, as proposed by the GNSO ISPCP, reads: A 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. The first one is focusing on the structure of ICANN as a system and does not interfere with SOs and ACs structures unless or only if it is requested to. Whereas the second option mandates examination of structures of SOs, ACs, and NomCom every time it is conducted. Every option has its pros and cons. I hope we can receive feedback from you as to which one is more sensible or more appropriate.

On to cadence, I will stop at the end of this review and again seek your input. The cadence here we agreed should have a set cadence but did not specify an exact number of years. We thought to keep it for the community discussion. What we originally discussed was ten years, but we thought it would be good to hear from everyone how many years at an interval would be appropriate. Occurrence to be confirmed based on community agreement. So again, whether this review should be on unless canceled by the community, or off until triggered by the community is also one question. Though, I believe our discussions were more in favor of

having it cadenced and having the community cancel it if it is not needed.

Another option for this review is to be prompted out of cadence through an ad hoc review process. If we have something that is urgent and pressing and we cannot wait for the X number of years to have the scheduled structural review, then an out-of-cadence one could be prompted through the ad hoc review process, and we will get to the ad hoc reviews shortly. It should be prompted by ICANN bylaws again and subjected to an agreement process. The community should agree through an agreed process. Again here, when we refer to this community process, are we speaking about the SOAC leaders' existing mechanism or something else? Any thoughts on this would be very helpful.

On the initiation process, again, the first step is consultation on the need to convene the review according to set cadence. The community evaluates the bandwidth and the resources available. If confirmed, then the formal Board resolution convenes this review. Going to the following slide for the rest of the structural review. In terms of scope, this has a predetermined scope if it is triggered by cadence. It normally would follow a baseline scope, but may also have a variable scope within set boundaries if it was triggered based on a specific request from a certain SOAC or NomCom. Depending on whether it is initiated by cadence or fulfilling a request from an SOAC, this would also affect the scope.

The review should be conducted by a cross-community group, but here it was mentioned the importance of having the CEO and community leaders within this cross-community group given that this has to do with the structure. Again, there is always the option of being assisted by an external expert. Outputs should be submitted to the relevant SOAC or NomCom and then ultimately the Board, or to the structures directly. This would depend on whether we choose to go by option one or option two. This obviously is derived from recommendations made by ATRT3.

With that, I am pausing to ask if you have any thoughts on the two options identified for approaching this review. Which one would you go for? What cadence do you think would be more appropriate—how many years as an interval? If cadenced, should the community be consulted to trigger the review or stop it? Finally, if it is agreed to go for option two, how far should the review go deep into the different structures? For example, the At-Large—they have five regional At-Large and further At-Large structures. The GNSO also has houses and stakeholder groups.

How deep should a review look into the structures and substructures of ICANN, should we favor option two? Also, should the NomCom be part of the structural review? Again, the tendency from the discussion was towards yes. Finally, as mentioned, the role of independent experts across all reviews is something that needs to be refined or at least explicitly agreed on. Pausing here to see if there are any immediate reactions to this. Otherwise, I am

hoping that you just need more time to think them over and hope to hear back from you. Yes, Ken, please go ahead.

KENNETH RENARD

Yeah, this is Ken. Looking at those two options there, RSSAC is pretty small and simple. We don't have all the houses and different pieces. While both of those options have merit, I personally tend to favor the one that specifically says not going into the SOACs. We have the CIP. That is our review of us. That is kind of my gut. On cadence, I will pick a number out of the air—five years. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Ken. I am sure the GAC would be of the same view, not having a review getting into the structures of the different SOs and ACs. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF OSBORN

Yeah, I have got to agree with Ken. Ken and I have been attending the meetings for the review of reviews, and I am in awe of the amount of work being done in some of the organizations. For the RSSAC, it really is a fairly simple group. We don't develop a lot of policy. We basically have an important day job, and then we come here to be able to provide advice and guidance if anybody has a question about what we're doing during the day.

I think it's sort of remarkably simple. We are ahead of the process on our continuous improvement. We have got a framework developed, and we are pretty happy about how that has gone. Like

I said, I am in awe of the amount of work everyone is doing. I wish there was a way we could figure out how to be more helpful, but I think we are a fairly small cog in this amazing machine. Thank you so much for what you do. I am in awe of the work.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

This is Chris. I haven't got the Zoom room turned on, so my apologies. I completely understand what you've said, and I just want to push back on a couple of things. One, five years is way too often for a structural review. That is not happening. To go back to your key point, which is how far down you go, this is part of the real challenge. Here is the issue: if you look at the GNSO and you say, "How do you fix an issue there?" there are two ways. One way is to say the continuous improvement work throws up that there are structural issues in the GNSO, and then through whatever mechanism, whether it's an assessment process or a review of the CIP, the people who do that review throw it back in and say, "You guys have a structural problem. You need to fix it."

The question then becomes, if they can't fix it because they actually can't themselves in that environment come to some sort of consensus, how do we create a process that the community can actually look at it? That is one thing. The second way to think about a structural review is how do you bring new things into ICANN? If

you guys had decided in your work that you wanted to be an SO rather than an advisory committee, which I think was on the table and discussed, how would that happen? There is actually no process that exists in ICANN to create a new SO other than, presumably, the Board just goes away and says, "Let's do that." That probably isn't within the way that ICANN should be doing these things.

So one of the purposes of a structural review would be to look at the external world and say, "What's out there that maybe should be part of ICANN, and what's out there that absolutely definitely shouldn't be part of ICANN?" The structural review is meant to do that as well. I completely understand your point about you not wanting the structural review messing about in your delicate, balanced structure. The problem for us is how do we then create a circumstance where, where there are problems, they get fixed? That is the real challenge. I completely accept what you say, and I suspect that what you say is going to be echoed. I think Manal said she thinks the GAC will feel that way, and I suspect the ccNSO is going to feel that way too. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA

The problem is it's not a hypothetical.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Correct.

AVRI DORIA

And so if you had one of you that said, "No, we don't want to keep it as it is, we want to change it," what would they do other than be frustrated and bring it up again and again?

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Chris and Avri. I fully agree that we do need a mechanism to be there if and when needed by whichever part of the community. But as you said, Chris, I fully understand the RSSAC position as well. If there are no further requests for the floor, then let's move to the review of reviews. This is to cater for any future need for a review of reviews like this one. It will be intended to audit the review system and assess whether it is performing as intended and is still fit for the purpose of enhancing accountability and transparency.

Again, the cadence. There was a discussion whether we need a set cadence here, so every N number of years where the occurrence is confirmed based on community agreement, or have it prompted out of cadence through an ad hoc review process. It is expected to be prompted by ICANN bylaws again, subject to an agreement process. Same discussion on whether the SOAC chairs and vice chairs mechanism is a good one for this. This is basically to avoid any bylaws breach or violation like what we faced at the beginning of this process.

Regarding the initiation, first it is going to be a consultation on the need to convene the review according to set cadence, again with the community evaluating the bandwidth and resources, and

ultimately going to the Board for forming a resolution to convene the review. Going to the following slide on scope. The scope should be predetermined in the ICANN bylaws. Again, this is expected to be conducted by a cross-community group, with participation from the CEO and community leaders, again with the option to be assisted by external experts if needed.

Recipients of the outputs are the SOs, ACs, and NomCom, and ultimately the Board. This originates from a component of existing ATRT mandates. So the current ATRT is mandated to look into the reviews in general, and so this is considered a component of the mandate of current ATRT. On the notes we have here, this review could be used as the mechanism for a review of the CIP itself. As mentioned, it could be an ad hoc review rather than maintaining its own bucket. It could also be triggered through a recommendation by the accountability and transparency review to occur as an ad hoc review.

So again, we still have some open questions. Do we need a set cadence for this one to check if another review of reviews is needed and cancel it if not? In which case, how many years should the cadence be? Or should we have it only when necessary through the ad hoc review mechanism as opposed to a regular cadence? Whether this upon-demand thing should go through the ad hoc review process or as a recommendation coming out of the accountability and transparency review. We have also mentioned a threshold for demand: how many SOs and ACs need to agree before

we can say there is demand, or how many SOs and ACs need to object before we can say, "No, there is no demand."

I am pausing to see if there are any requests for the floor before going to the last bucket of reviews, which is the ad hoc reviews. If we can go to the following slide, the next one. Thank you. The ad hoc reviews. What triggered this discussion was how often do we need certain reviews? Do we really need them to take place on a cadence basis, or some of them could be a one-time review or reviews that are needed occasionally or whenever a certain threshold is met? This opened the door for on-demand reviews, which may be more accurate than ad hoc—or ad hoc may be a bit misleading. So also, if you have a good suggestion for a name for this bucket of reviews, it would be most welcome.

This is meant to cater for a review of any emerging topic that meets the criteria of a review, specifically one that does not involve policy considerations, cannot be adequately addressed through other discussion forums, and is not covered by any of the other review buckets. It is mandated to address a narrowly scoped topic that qualifies for review based on established criteria as we have just explained. The cadence here: it is convened under exceptional circumstances, so there is no cadence per se, but a threshold should be met. Basically, the community is the gatekeeper for this type of reviews as opposed to hard-coded periodic reviews. It is more of event or purpose-driven rather than cadence-driven. It is

based on demonstrated need, which should be confirmed by the community.

It just needs to be allowed by the bylaws. So the prompting to convene should be defined in the bylaws and the initiation process would be to submit a topic through a dedicated and agreed process. Then the SOACs discuss and consult with the Board or community on bandwidth, estimated resources, timeline, and feasibility. Secure resources accordingly, including any needed prioritization, and finally and ultimately, the Board's formal resolution to convene the same.

Going to the following slide on scope. As you can guess, it is going to be a variable scope depending on the topic, and this is to be agreed during the initiation process. As you can see, it is always recommended to have the scoping during the initiation process so that we can guarantee that once the review team is formed, it hits the ground running, it has the right expertise, and it doesn't waste time in scoping. Most importantly, the scope would then be already agreed upon by the community.

The review is conducted by—this depends on the agreed scope, and there is always the option of having an external expert. Recommendations are to be submitted, depending on the reason of the review, either to the Board and/or any of the supporting organizations, advisory committees, or the NomCom. It doesn't really correspond to any existing reviews. Finally, but equally important to note that it may be used to address existing topics of

specific reviews such as competition, consumer trust, consumer choice, registration directory service, and security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS, which already aligns with what the ATRT3 recommended.

So I am stopping here to ask if this is a type of review that we need, and should the review of reviews fall here or maintain its own separate bucket? Let me see if there are any immediate comments. If not, if there are no comments or questions and no additions by Chris or Avri, anything before we conclude?

DAN GLUCK

Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Sorry. Hi. Hi, Manal. This is Lars Liman from NetNode. I have a concern. There's one thing that I haven't heard here but I had hoped to hear, which was an overarching look at the amount of resources used by ICANN to maintain all these reviews. To me, for me to hear that they will be conducted when the community has reviewed the bandwidth and resources available, this system doesn't seem well-designed. If we have to check whether we have the resources to perform a review that we see as important to maintain transparency, I think the picture is slightly unbalanced. Was there ever any instructions to look at the overall consumption of resources and try to limit them? Or how was this taken into account somehow in this work?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I can have a crack at responding to that. I think that actually what we're trying to say in the slide is exactly what you've just said, which is that there needs to be a check each time to make sure that we do have the resources. I think one of the key inputs that we've had from the organization itself is, look, you can say that there should be a review and that's fine, but there has to be a budget; there has to be the money. I don't think anyone's suggesting there isn't the money, but nonetheless, there has to be the money and there have to be the resources to do the review.

Some reviews, such as a full-blown structural review, will be a lot more resource-intensive than maybe just a simple assessment of what the CIP results are. The intention is that you put in place the mechanisms to ensure that you don't just launch a review just because it says you should. What we're trying to avoid is that the bylaw says you've got to do it in this year, and so you've got to do it in this year no matter what. That's actually what we want to try and avoid, so that we don't end up with everything jumbled up with review bumping into review, and each review is properly thought through, resourced, and scoped before it starts.

But to look at the overarching question of have we looked at the resources needed as a whole: no. I'm not sure how we would. We need to be clear what the reviews are first, and then I think we can look at whether there are too many. We're already talking about that to some extent. For example, we're talking about bucket D.

Now's not the time to start renaming the buckets. Bucket D could actually not be a bucket at all. The review of reviews could very simply be an ad hoc review. That's fine. So that reduces it by one, and then there are other things that we can work on. I think we're getting there, but we haven't got there yet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Fair enough. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

If I can add to that, I think that's part of the process that we're in now—defining the types. What we move into now, once people have bought into the types and the constraints and the attributes, is that okay, having talked about all that, now what reviews do we actually need? Are we going to put in a plan? As you said, part of that is what can we afford to do?

I think that the question you're asking is a very big part of our next step in terms of what kind of resource goes into this—big resource or little resource in terms of people, and big resource or little resource in terms of money. That's going to take working with staff and such to figure that out. But I think that's one of the things that differentiates this part that we're in of defining types of reviews and now defining a plan that includes actual reviews that would get done.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Lars, for the question, and Avri and Chris for the answers. So, Lars, it's definitely on our thinking, but not as deeply formulated as you would have hoped for, and it is difficult to do so without having the overall compilation of all reviews, and then we can see how we can manage.

With that, we are just at the hour. I would like to ask you to stay tuned for the upcoming public comment proceeding. Again, we count on your input. Agreeing to things is equally good as well if you don't have any concerns. We welcome observers and active participation by observers, and for more information, you can follow the link and happy to receive any input you may have at inputonreviews@icann.org. Finally, you can follow our work and listen to all the recordings of the group's calls and the co-chairs' calls on the wiki page. Looking forward to your participation at the plenary session on Thursday and between now and the final submission in August. Thank you. Thank you, everyone.

JEFF OSBORN

Manal, thank you so much, Chris and Avri, all of you. We really appreciate it. But Chris, I saw you headed for the button. Did you have something to say?

AVRI DORIA

It—

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I just wanted to say that the key thing to be sure of is that your input is heard. So I think one of the key issues is going to be the structural review options that are on the table. There will be views in both directions, and I think it's really important just to make sure that your voice is heard as loudly as other voices are heard. I think there are solutions. I think we can find a way of saying, "Well, if you want to have a GNSO structural review, we can find a way of making that happen that doesn't necessarily mean that everybody else has to put up with the same levels." But I do think it's important that the stuff you really care about you actually make sure your voice is heard. Whether that's on the working group, which is great, in writing through submissions to the list, or actually the plenary, fantastic. Appreciate it. We hear you.

DAN GLUCK

Anything else, anyone? We're slightly past time.

AVRI DORIA

Only thing I would add is anytime, even outside that context, you find us with a drink in our hands, you know, let us know.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Fair enough. We'll take that. Thank you all very much. If there's nothing else, Daniel?

DAN GLUCK

Please stop the recording.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, all.

MANAL ISMAIL

Recording stopped.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]