
ICANN86 | Prep Week – Review of Reviews: Contribute to the Draft Report
Thursday, May 21, 2026 – 17:00 to 18:00 CEST

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Hello, everyone, and welcome to the ICANN86 Prep Week Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group Session being held on Thursday, May 21st, 2026 at 1500 UTC. My name is Yvette Guigneaux and I am the Participation Manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted into the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom when called upon, unmute your microphone to speak. 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 reasonable pace. That does it for me and now I will hand the floor to Avri Doria. Avri?

AVRI DORIA

Thank you very much, Yvette. This is Avri Doria speaking and welcome to this webinar. Let's go right to the first slide. Okay. One of the things is this webinar will not try to recap everything that's

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.

been said before to try to recover the whole design that we've done. But there will be, you know, brief presentations on where we are in the process and the deliverables, and reminders, sort of a refresher on the current proposed system of reviews, but not necessarily all the discussions about how we got to where we got.

One reminder is, it's a proposed system of reviews. Everything that's in here is a proposal or on its way to becoming a proposal. Nothing has been decided in any finality yet, though certain things have been put aside as possibly decided. So, even if we start talking about, we have decided this, we have decided that, you should always hear the caveat that all decisions are in abeyance until we get to the end of the discussions.

Then we're basically going to go through a set of clarifications. We've talked through, you know, the proposed system several times already, and a lot of questions, both from webinars, from other conversations, from written comments received, both from the SOs and ACs and others, have all, you know, brought up a certain number of questions.

And what we're trying to do here is sort of, you know, talk about some of the ones that have come in that we have probable answers for, that we think we know where we're heading on and getting those in front of you so that you have as much information as possible on what's going up.

Then there'll be an overview of what's going on during the week of ICANN86 and then hopefully we'll have opportunity for questions

and comments, both during the presentation and others. I guess we'll be dealing with the QA pod, but also, as was stated, you know, putting your hand up still works and getting permission to speak.

And these presentations have been put together, it says down here, by myself, by Chris Disspain, Manal Ismail, and most importantly, by Alice Jansen, who puts all this stuff together for us to try and put our name on and try and make presentable to you all with our voice. So please, let me move on to the next slide.

The process we've been going through, we've talked about it, first of all, we've been chartered to manage a fundamental evaluation of reviews set out in the ICANN Bylaws as a whole system, including their implementation, and proposed a refresh system of reviews. And we have been doing that. And, you know, we started with analysis.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Wonderful thing.

AVRI DORIA

Excuse me?

LEÓN FELIPE SÁNCHEZ

He said it's wonderful.

AVRI DORIA

Okay, I'm not quite sure, but anyway.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

No, it's entirely my fault. I was not on mute. I will put myself back.

AVRI DORIA

Oh, oh, oh, oh, I thought you were -- No, never mind. Okay, so basically, it's a group of two members per SO/AC, two ICANN staff members, and two ICANN board members. And we brought in advisors from ATRT3, since so much of our discussion concerned things that they had basically talked through in depth and even come to recommendations on.

And then we have observers, and our policy on observers has been very open and sometimes that's really good because in some cases we have active observers speaking a lot when we don't have active members in that same sort of vein. So, it's actually been very good to include the observers in our process and they've been important contributors to the work we've done. And of course, you know, the ICANN organization, you know, staff organization has been incredibly supportive and this wouldn't be happening without them.

Our current status is that we are advancing discussions and refining proposals and that's what this meeting is in the midst of, the refining proposal stage. And then our next steps are, continue to discuss, hopefully some at this meeting. A draft report for public comment should be coming out soon and they'll be a draft

comment that will be initiated sometime shortly after ICANN86. Quickly looking for hands. Next, please.

So, phases of work. This is a slide that anybody that's been to any of these meetings before has seen frequently. We have the little we are here moving across the four blocks here. I think we're further along in phase three than the we are three that here shows, but basically, we're in the process of trying to finalize the proposals, and that means clarifying, that means going into the details. It's a refined outline and it's the beginning of text that will show up in a draft report and then, as I said, for public comment.

Our next phase, once we've gotten through that public comment and received comments, will be finalization and decision making and presentations. We believe that we are still essentially on schedule, though we did decide to move the public comment to after the meeting as opposed to before. One of the things that's been a feature is getting, we set deadlines, for example, for SOs and ACs to get in their comments. It's difficult for them. There's so much work going on.

We speak of the bandwidth usage and the unavailability of bandwidth for reviews and indeed, we are seeing that lived in the ability to get our very busy SO and AC leaders to bring comments from them. So, you know, that's something that's going on and it's figured into our ongoing schedules. With that, I will stop and pass the floor to Chri Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Avri. Hi, everyone. It is I. If we could move on to the next slide, please. Okay, so this is the overview of the current proposed system of reviews and in the next slides after this one, we're going to go through each one. And we're going to simply take all of the questions for clarification that we had. Please explain this. What does this mean? And we're going to answer all of those questions and I hope that that actually clears up the challenges that people have had in understanding what's going on, but this is the overview.

In essence, three types of review. The Accountability and Transparency Review every five years, variable subject to a whole raft of measures and basically created with a scoping process, examining the existing procedures and processes. Assessing ICANN's performance, executing its mission, commitments, core values, and transparency obligations. That is what the Accountability and Transparency Review is for.

And there's a Structural Review again that's cadence of every 15 years again deferrable subject to some fairly high bars for deferring. We're suggesting that that is split into three phases. Phase one being an external landscape assessment. Phase two being the internal landscape are the structures fit for purpose? Do they need to be changed, et cetera? Are new structures required? And how do the existing structures interact with each other and the world at large? And whether any existing structures need to be transformed

or phased out? A lot more detail on this is obviously provided in the document. And then phase three, which is, you look at the map of any structural changes that would need to be made to SOs and ACs and you then say what other structural changes need to be made?

And then the third type of review is an On-Demand Review. By definition it's on demand so there's no cadence. There are some special listed topics which we anticipate the community will be prodded by org every X number of years to say check-in, do you want to do an On-Demand Review on matters that would fit under security, stability, and resilience, a Review of Reviews, and aspects of a gTLD program? We've singled those out because in the past they have had dedicated reviews. And then the rest of that will be emerging topics, anything identified by the community or the board, again, subject to the community's acceptance that there is indeed a need to have these reviews. Again, the details is in the document.

And then finally, under on-demand, what we're calling the Consequential Effects Review and this will kick in automatically in the event that an SO or AC decides to make changes to its own structure which of course it can do at any time. Or changes are made to its own structure for some other reason, there will then need to be a community review on what are the consequential effects of that review? Do the changes that the ccNSO has internally made mean that there need to be some changes to the nominating committee, there need to be some changes to the

board, there need to be some changes to some sort of regional structures? So, that's a Consequential Effects Review.

That's there to allow for the fact that sometimes changes in a structure, in an individual structure or a number of structures in ICANN may occur outside of the cadence of a 15-year Structural Review. And that therefore, rather than waiting 15 years or 10 years for the next Structural Review to arrive, you do a Consequential Effects Review. So, that's the overarching structure of the reviews. That hasn't changed from the last time we spoke. It's been refined, it's been slightly added to, but fundamentally that's what we said when we last had a webinar on this. So, could I go to the next slide, please?

Okay, so how did we get to this point? We had webinar sessions on the 5th of May. We called for Nominating Group input, as Avri's already pointed out and discussed, with calls and processes are continuously open to active observers and contributors, as we've said. And we also had, Avri, Manal, and I had a meeting with the SO and AC chairs group to discuss the standing scoping committee which is the committee that will do the scoping exercise for the ATR and for on demand.

And we wanted to make sure that the chairs understood the direction that we were heading in and the responsibility that we were suggesting that they should take. I think that was a really good call and there's a general acceptance that we're heading in the right direction. I'm going to move on to the next slide and

everyone's welcome to put their hands up if they have questions or comments that they want to make as we go ahead. I think we can put our hands up in the room as far as I'm aware. I'm sure somebody will tell me if we can't.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Yes, you can predict it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So, I'm going to -- Thank you, Yvette. So, I'm going to deal -- Oh, Anne, go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yes, thanks so much, Avri and Christian. This is a very brief comment just to say that we really do appreciate the ability of the observers to contribute to this process and thank you for including those ideas in the early stages. It's easier now, for me personally anyway, to step back now that you've gotten to this point. Thanks so much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Anne, much appreciated as is your input and everybody else who's been an observer as well. Osvaldo, go ahead.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Sorry, this is Osvaldo for the record. No, I just wanted to make a comment. My constituency is preparing a document, but I wanted

just to give a heads up regarding what we are observing, in particular the Structural Review.

From what I understood of the proposal is every 15 years to do a review, but the 15 years as I understood, it starts to be counted from the moment the recommendations of the previous review are implemented. So, we start the Structural Review, we have almost three years to finish it, then several more years to implement the recommendations, whichever they are. It can be a short time or it can be several years like it happened with NomCom, and then we start the next 15 years period. So, it could be [CROSSTALK].

CHRIS DISSPAIN

No, that's not correct, Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Is that how I understand it?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

That's not correct, Osvaldo.

AVRI DORIA

Can we skip this?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

If we can come back to this when we get to the slide on the Structural Review, Avri will go through that when we get there. Sorry, Avri.

AVRI DORIA

The question is directly addressed under Structural Review so we'll get to your questions. Good questions, though. Back to you, Chris. Sorry to interfere. I just wanted to say that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

No, not at all. I was heading in exactly the same direction. Thanks, Avri, and thanks, Osvaldo. We'll get to it on the next slide. So, this slide contains the questions for clarification that we've had, the input that we've had from all of the groups that have provided us with input, including individuals on the webinar. We've obviously kind of smashed together questions that are the same question, even if the words were used slightly differently, but we're going to just go through this and answer those questions.

So, the first question is, what does the planning cycle refer to? And the answer is that refers to, where we mentioned the planning cycle in the Accountability and Transparency Review, what we're talking about is ICANN's strategic planning cycle, which is a five-year cycle. And that brings us to the second question which is, what's the rationale for the cadence of having an Accountability and Transparency Review every five years? And the answer to that the intention is that it is tied to ICANN's strategic planning cycle.

So, Accountability and Transparency Review should operate on the same cycle. For example, it's intended that recommendations from an Accountability and Transparency Review may very well inform a strategic plan. So, our current thinking is, and I may get these numbers slightly wrong, but our current thinking is you would want to have your recommendations from an Accountability Transparency Review ready before the next strategic planning cycle starts so you might have your Accountability Transparency Review.

Let's say that's an 18 process, I've got no idea at the moment, but let's say that it is, you might want to have that in year two and a half to the end of year three. So, at the beginning of year four, when you start the strategic planning cycle for year five, you have the recommendations. So, that's the rationale for the cadence.

And that takes us to the next one, which is when does the clock start for the cadence? And the answer to that question is, we think, board action date on the final report of the previous review. So, what we're saying is, once the board has accepted, or not, but let's assume, accepted the recommendations, that's when the clock starts to tick. Why can we do that when implementation might take longer?

We can do that because we've built in the flexibility of the possibility of deferring the start of the next review. And one of the reasons why you might want to do that for a fixed period of time is because you're still going through the implementation stages of

recommendations of a previous review. So, we believe that we can say the clock should start from the date that the board accepts or rejects the recommendations from the current Accountability and Transparency Review.

The next question is, what is the composition of the Standing Scoping Committee? Should it include the Nominating Committee? So, on the composition of the committee, the answer is it is composed of the SO and AC chairs or their delegates. We were asked by the chairs if -- Given that some chairs, obviously some people have day jobs, they're busy, et cetera, could they -- Sorry, my screen is playing up, just give me a second, could they appoint a delegate?

And our response to them was, yes, they could appoint a delegate. However, we felt strongly and we are likely to say this in our recommendation, that the delegate needs to be somebody who has been elected into a position so a vice chair or a member of a council. In the case of the ccNSO, for example, council members are elected and so on rather than just somebody plucked out of the community.

The reason for that is because the Scoping Committee is incredibly important and we want to make sure that the members of that committee already have, if you like, the endorsement of their community by having been elected to that position. So, there's them, there's ICANN org, there's the board, and also the former leadership of the last Accountability and Transparency Review.

So, in this case, in the next Accountability and Transparency Review, in the event that Cheryl and Pat are prepared to do so, they would become members of the Scoping Committee because they were the chairs of the last Accountability and Transparency Review. Yes, Robert, the floor is yours.

ROBERT GUERRA

Yeah, no, just a comment. Just different SO/ACs have different structures in terms of how their members or their leadership get selected. In the case of the SSAC, we have an SSAC membership committee that appoints and renews members. And so, that's maybe something we may want to think about going forward because the members are brought into the group into a slightly different process than others. So, I just wanted to say that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

No, thanks, Robert. That's important information. Look, ultimately, it's going to be up to each SO and AC, what they do, but we just want to be clear what we think the right steps are. At the end of the day, let's be honest SO and AC is going to do what they like and they're going to use their own processes, which is fine. As long as we're clear what the charter of the scoping group is and we're clear what the authority is.

And it's a representative role to be very clear as well. These people on the Scoping Committee are not acting as individuals. They are

acting very specifically as the representatives of the SO and AC that they're involved with. Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, I think what really is most important is that there's some intentional act to have that person represent your SO or AC. So, it's just not, oh, I can't make the meeting, you go. So, whether it's selected by your membership committee or in some other way and accepted by you all in the way you go about accepting things, as long as it's an intentional act where one can point back and say, "Yep, that person was representing them." Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah, exactly and Becky, I acknowledge your point in the chat regarding accountability and being accountable to the group. And Anne's point also, for example, the GNSO has what's called the Standing Selection Committee to identify candidates to act for the council. And again, that would be an endorsement because the Standing Selection Committee would have endorsed that person. But nonetheless, we still need to do a little bit of finessing on this and make sure that we've got the right balance between the workload that is put on to chairs and the need for this committee to have the right representation on it. I'm conscious, I don't want us to run out of time so I'm going to move on.

On the Nominating Committee, we're still discussing whether there is a role for the Nominating Committee or not. I think we're clear

that there isn't a role for the Nominating Committee, but there might be a role for whatever this oversight thing is that the Nominating Committee is supposed to have in place, but we're still discussing it. So, let's not get into that now.

The next one is what is the difference with the former Accountability and Transparency Review? Well, I think there are quite a number, but the key difference is the scoping exercise. The Review of Reviews scoping exercise basically means that the review team does not decide what its scope is. The scope is decided before you start, before you put the review team together. And the key point there is that, A, you know exactly what you're doing, what you're going to do up front, so you can budget properly, you can timeframe properly. And you also can put the right people on the review who have the level of knowledge that's required to deal with whatever the topics are that this particular Accountability and Transparency Review is going to undertake.

The second difference is that the Accountability and Transparency Review would no longer be chartered to do a Review of Reviews, which was a component in its previous mandate because we are now going to have the ability to have an on-demand Review of Reviews and that's where we are with that.

The next one is, would Bylaws articulate that the review can be delayed with community consent? The answer is yes. The delay procedure, the deferral procedure, is a procedure that involves the recommendation for deferral by the Standing Scoping Committee,

but requires the community to agree and yes, that would be part of the Bylaws.

If deciding to postpone a review, will the topic be the same? I think we think that whether there is a need to restart the scoping process depends on the length of the delay. So, if, for example, you delayed for three months because you were just finishing up some implementation, or you wanted to drop into the next budget cycle for some reason, you probably wouldn't need to revisit it. But if you delayed for a year, and again, I'm making that number up, you would probably want to revisit it. So, we're working on that, but yes, the answer is maybe. Depending on the delay, how long the delay is, it may be necessary to revisit the scoping exercise.

That takes us through that slide. I'm really happy to answer any comments or questions if there are before I pass back to Avri to take us through the next slide. I'm not seeing any hands so on that basis, I'm going to take it that we're comfortable, and Avri, I'm going to pass it back to you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Avri speaking, and if you are comfortable for now, you can always come back with questions later. And looking at the Structural Review, as you see, Osvaldo, the why, your question was already at the top of the list, waiting for discussion. And indeed, there is confusion here.

Just to give a little bit of the origin, the need for a Structural Review originally came out with discussions like, it's been over 20 years and we haven't reviewed our structure in 20 years or more, we need to do something. Well, 20 years is too long, that was the argument. So, 10 years felt too short to people so we said, let's start with 15 and see where we go with it.

Now, the other complication is, we had not resolved at that point whether we were going to be start to start cadence or finish to start cadence. In other words, would one be five years or 15 years after the previous one started or would it be after a decision was made? In regard to the ATR, we decided it was an end to start. In other words, the five-year counter started when the board made its decision because that gave enough time for implementations or other.

When we started talking about this one, started getting into it a little deeper, the 15 years makes sense if it is start to start. In other words, if every 15 years, we start another Structural Review. So basically, the kind of cadence it is would be attached to the review. Or if we say, no, it's simpler to have them all start, you know, end to start as opposed to start to start, then we would probably change this to a 10-year cadence.

Because if you look at the structure that we've got on the Structural Review, it takes at minimum the way it is now, and this can all change, but it takes at minimum three to four years to complete it and that's before you start the implementation. And so, having one

come too quickly, we wouldn't even understand the new structure yet before we were back in review of the structure.

So, a 10-year gap between the time that you start your implementation or what have you, and you come to the next one, maybe more reasonable or we say start to start, that every 15 years you start the Structural Review process, it unwinds, you have a time between. So, that's something to be discussed, but it definitely takes into account, I think, Osvaldo's concerns in terms of too short, too long. I think that's a set of trade-offs we need to do upcoming in terms of, you know, is it 15 start to start or is it 10 end to start, et cetera? Okay.

So hopefully that takes a little bit of the issue and the problem out of why a 15-year cadence. And I think part of it is we're still discussing it, but it was important to have something to discuss from. And I keep checking to see if there are any hands on this before I move on. And how are we doing on time? We're about halfway.

Okay. And there's the names of the standard scoping. Yeah, that one, we decided we would pick a name for now because we kept using different names and we weren't ever really sure what we were talking about so we picked a name. It's a working name and as we move along, we may settle our names. I can see us having a meeting at some point where we go through all of these little naming and timing and whatever details, and make sure we've sort of tied all the bows.

Anyhow, when would the next Structural Review start? That's still an open question. We have two contenders for which is coming first. You know, we say we been delaying the ATR, you know, until this process was over. And so, it definitely has a call for being the first review that happens after the review of the review, recommendations are made, approved, implemented, et cetera. But also, we've had some strong calls from people saying, "Hey, it's been over 20 years on Structural Review. When does it start?"

Now, it all will [inaudible - 00:31:59] on a board resolution in the end because remembering on any of these reviews, you know, we get to decide up to a point, but then we make a recommendation to the board and the board is the one that has to say, "Yep, everything's in place. We've got the scope. We've got the budget. We've got the people. Yes, let's go with the review." So that decision, I think we will end up discussing it and perhaps making a recommendation on it or perhaps not, on which comes first.

We have discussed a couple times that no more than two reviews at the same time, but I'm not sure that I personally think doing an ATR and starting the Structural Review at the same time would be a reasonable thing to do. But then again, do we want to wait another five years for the Structural Review to start? Or maybe it only waits a year until the ATR is done. Anyway, that's where we are on that. So, it could be almost immediate and it could be a couple years down the road.

What is the interaction of the Structural Review with existing mechanisms for groups to make internal changes to their structures or operations? I think, as has been said, a group can change its own structure as long as it doesn't affect any other part of the organization whenever it pleases. How it does its own work, you know, really trying hard to maintain the bottom-up, you know, philosophy that we have on our SOs, constituencies, ACs, RALOs, whatever else we have, that they have a very strong bottom-up nature.

But at a certain point, if the proposed changes affect other parts of the organization, that they call for a change in the NomCom, you know, they call for a change, you know, in board seating or any other features that we've got, then that needs to go to the whole community.

Now, if this is just before a full Structural Review, yes, those things may be reviewed as part of that, but the most likely circumstance is that those changes will happen completely in their own time sequence and not be coordinated with a Structural Review. And that's where the on-demand, you know, reviews come in and there's that specific, you know, review to basically look at the recommendations being made, look at the changes that would be required in the structure and get the community to do a review on that particular issue and such. So, that's how they interact. But if your internal review changes your structure with no external

effects and no external dependencies, then you just go ahead and do it.

Where do CIP outcomes go and how are they used for the Structural Review? One of the things we keep in mind is the CIP. Sorry, I'm not supposed to say CIP. The CIP first of all, it's still a pilot. It still needs to come under review. One of the recommendations we have standing by is that there be a review of the CIP after the pilot is complete, but whether it's in the meantime, or perhaps as a way of looking at it later, CIP outcomes are mostly internal. I said it again, the CIP are mostly internal and that's largely where they go, is ways for the group, whatever group is doing the CIP, to improve itself. However, again, the CIP can have consequences and can be something that would call either for consideration as part of a consequential review, or it may have such.

Now, CIP itself -- Someday I'll learn not to say CIP, but anyway, the continuing improvements, the CIP, doesn't itself have the ability to call for an On-Demand Review, but the SO within which it is being done certainly has that, you know, ability to go and, you know, try to get support for that. And, you know, at any time, any group can go and see if they can get two of the SO/ACs to support an on-demand.

How they would be used in the Structural Review, I think anything that affects the structure would indeed be good items and issues to be discussed. How that all goes depends on many things, but they're available there for discussion and consideration. Okay,

where are we? Am I spending too much time? Probably. Okay, let me see. Where's the next one I was at?

Yes, there is a relation between Structural Review and principle one, but the CIP is about self-improvement. The Structural Review is about making sure that your self-improvements fit in with and aren't sort of disruptive to the whole system without having been dealt with. So, there's a relationship, but they are different parts of the process. One is, this is what we need to do to self-improve. Another one is, this is what the community agrees to do in those things that affect the rest of the community.

Is the Structural Review looking at board seats? Is it looking at the board? Then the question should really be, could it? And certainly, yes, it could. A Structural Review could indeed be looking at the apportionment of seats. One of the examples have given is, you know, a new SO or AC springs to life it would then need to deal with its representation on the board. How would that happen? That would be a consequential effect and a Structural Review could deal with it in its phase three, or it could be dealt with in, you know, a consequence review.

The phase three of the Structural Review and the consequence reviews are very similar mechanisms. So, if there is a pending joining of an SO or AC or the Structural Review says, you know, we need a new SO or AC, then it would bring about looking at board seats. You know, is it looking at the board or could it look at the board? It certainly could. One of the examples that's been brought

up many times over the years is, you know, this board really has two functions. It has its executive board function and it has its part of the policy function. Those really should be two separate boards. If that was one of the issues that was an issue of the day, then it could certainly look at the board and its structure, at least as it's being proposed.

Is the Structural Review looking at interactions between various structures? This one should probably have been the second bullet right under the cadence. Part of the whole purpose of the Structural Review, and I think that's one of the reasons we don't say it enough, is one of the initial purposes is to look at the whole structure as a whole, as its pieces interact, as its various functions are dealt with in the context of being a whole system. And so, yes, it's just the systemic view that looks as much and the interaction between the various structures as it does looking at the functioning and the ability of those structures to do their job. Okay, where am I now?

Are requests for structural change from substructures considered? I think part of it is still under discussion and understanding what we need. Only a few of the SOs and ACs have functional, fully defined substructures, things like constituencies and stakeholder groups, things like regional organizations and such. Not all of them do.

There needs to be a way, and in fact, one of the issues that brought us into all of this is that sometimes there are issues with substructures, but the structure itself isn't ready to deal with them

or isn't capable of dealing with them or doesn't simply want to deal with them. That needs to be something that can be brought to the Structural Review.

However, we need to always recognize that nothing can be imposed on the SO or the AC by the Structural Review. The SO or AC under discussion is part of the discussions. There's the phase two, the second part of phase two, where they get to review and discuss what's going on, et cetera. So, they could certainly be considered, but there'll need to be a definitive path for them to follow in that consideration. Okay, there's two more to answer. I'll try to get through them quickly. There are so many here. I'm trying to use notes so I don't go too much off into my own directions.

The composition, continuity, and transition of group members. There had been some discussion of should people be on more than one of these? You know, should you be on the first part and on the second part of a review for a multi-part review? And I think part of it is that it comes down to different parts of the reviews having different staffing, having different methods for finding its methods.

So, for example, phase one here is a liaison group to look at the external, to look at how we're going to do things. So, it's a certain kind of group and it's a very small group. The second parts of this, or the later parts of this, are proposed as being the cross-community working group norms and documentations and framing that's been done, and that's a much more open and such.

Could one of the liaison groups be part of it? It seems certain that they could, and no, we haven't really come up with a way or a reason to try and restrict it to there. And would the work be conducted under the constraints of Bylaws? Yes, always. And even if the results of this review, the Structural Review, or a consequential review would mandate a change in those Bylaws, that change would be done under the constraints of the Bylaws.

The whole procedure for following the Bylaws would be external to the Structural Review so any recommendations would go to the board and if the board pushed them forward, it would go through that whole process with the empowered community, et cetera. So, always under the constraints of the Bylaws and if Bylaws need to be changed under the constraint of the Bylaws. Thank you and I'll pass it on to Manal and I hope I didn't talk too long, but there were a lot of questions.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you. Thank you very much, Avri and can we go to the following slide, please? And this is the On-Demand Review, which is one of the new features of the refreshed review system being proposed, which can be convened upon demand, as the name implies, subject to community threshold to ensure wide support of this demand.

One of the clarification questions we received here was, does the envisioned Standing Scoping Committee have a final say on which reviews proceed? And the short answer here would be no, because

the committee itself is envisioned to comprise community leadership or representation from ICANN board and representation from ICANN org, in addition to leadership of past reviews in case of ATR. So, again, those representatives are the voice of the community. They have a liaison role to convey views of their constituencies and confirm the community consent before taking any decision.

And there are also thresholds to be met to confirm wide support of any reached decision. So, two of the seven SOs and ACs need to support a topic just to be discussed and five of the seven SOs and ACs need to support the topic to proceed for a review. And in case of deferrals, even this threshold increases if we have multiple deferrals, up to six out of the seven SOs and ACs. So yeah, that said, just to indicate the role of the community here, the main voice in decision making and ultimately any outcome of the committee would go to the board for approval.

Another general question was received regarding which group will monitor implementation of review recommendation outcomes and this is envisioned to be the usual ICANN implementation review team where community experts work together with ICANN or to implement policy recommendations. And also, it's important to note though that an open channel between the implementation team and the review team itself should be maintained to ensure that the recommendations are implemented as intended. So,

yeah, thus not disbanding the review group once they submit their final report.

I think this was the last clarifying question we received. I have to say that this is not everything we received in the inputs, but we parsed them carefully, all inputs. And these are clarification requests where we felt that we have already discussed them and we more or less have good agreed answers to them. But noting that they may need some further clarification in terms of the language in the report itself.

There is additional input received, but it is more substantial and is still under discussion by the cross-community group. I'm pausing here to see if there are any comments or questions on any of the slides, whether this one or what Avri and Chris presented. Anil, please go ahead.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN

Thank you, Manal. This is regarding overall reviews. When these recommendations of the Review of Reviews CCG will get finalized, I hope that there may be requirement in change in the Bylaws, which ICANN will take into consideration. This is question number one.

Question number two, when a Structural Review gets conducted and we find that there are some fundamental changes which are required, in fact, the Structural Review is to see the requirement of some fundamental changes. And we are saying that those changes will get implemented under the constraint of the existing Bylaws I

think this is required to be seen again by the committee because sometime the recommendations may further require change in the Bylaws to get them implemented. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

So, let me take the questions one by one. So, on the first one, indeed, the ultimate outcome from the cross-community group may indeed require some changes in the Bylaws so on the Bylaws question.

If I understand your second point well, you're asking whether if the outcome, for example, of the Structural Review also requires changes and I think this is obviously dealt with through the consequential review, which looks into any necessary changes in light of substantial change in the structure. And this includes board seats, it includes Bylaws, it includes the empowered community representation and process and so on, NomCom representation. So, anything that needs to change as a result of the Structural Review, but I'm sure Chris has more things to add. Chris, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Manal. No, you're absolutely correct, but it's worth saying that it's not impossible that any review, whether it's an ATR or an On-Demand Review or a Structural Review, will make recommendations that in the end require Bylaw changes. That is, it's entirely possible so it's just a function of what you do. And it's not a go, oh, we can't recommend that because it involves a change

to the Bylaws. If a recommendation is a recommendation that involves a change to the Bylaws, then so be it. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris and thank you, Cheryl, for the thumb up. And while we wait for further or any other requests for the floor, can we go to the following slide, please? And this is on ICANN86. So, as you already know, ICANN86, we have two sessions there. The first one is a community session so please join us in person or remotely to share your valuable inputs and unique perspectives to help us advance this current version of the draft report. The community session will take place during ICANN86 on the Monday, 8th of June at 11:45 till 13:15 local time, which is 9:45 till 11:15 UTC.

There is also Reviews Cross Community Group Workshop that will take place on the same day at 16:30 to 18:00 local time, 14:30 to 16:00 UTC, which you are most welcome to attend and observe. So, we look forward to your active participation during ICANN86 and your valuable contributions. Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks Manal. Just to say, I know you won't be in Seville, but Avri and I will be, and if any SO or AC or part of an SO or AC or small group of interested individuals wants to talk to us, all you have to do is to reach out. And if Avri and I can find the time and we'll do our best to do so, we'll be happy to come to whatever room you're in and answer whatever questions you may have. But please feel

free to take advantage of the fact that most of us will be in Seville and if you want us to meet, we will do so. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris. So, the following slide is, as you already know, active participation by observers is very most welcome and we truly appreciate all the valuable input we have received from observers in addition to the group members as well. And for information on how you can join as an observer, please check the link on the slides and you can also send us your input at any time at inputonreviews@icann.org, which is publicly archived. And again, for more information, you can check the link on the slides.

Finally, you can stay up to date on the work of the group by following our Wiki shown on the screen as well. And with that, if we can go to the final slide, it's absolutely for questions and comments. So, any very final requests for the floor?

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, this is Avri, I wanted to add to what Chris said about pulling us into discussions, whether it's in a room you're in or over a coffee cup standing during a break. It's not only for us to answer questions and as I'm especially in hearing, if there is anything we're missing, if there's any issue you're seeing, you know, for example, as Osvaldo reminding us about the 15-year issue so that we would look at it more, please also use those occurrences to just, even if

you don't have a question, but you got a comment, you know, catch us while we're there for the face-to-face conversations. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you and Chris, any final comments before we conclude? Okay. So, with that, thanks again very much for joining us today. We look forward to your continued input and valuable contributions and to your active engagement in civil discussions in person or online. Have a very good rest of your day. Thank you, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]