
ICANN86 Seville | PF – Review of Reviews
Monday, June 08, 2026 – 11:45 to 13:15 CEST

ALICE JANSEN

When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use physical microphones to speak. Only questions posted in the Q&A pod will be read out loud during the session, as time permits, and when directed by the chairs of this session.

Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak, if speaking a language other than English, and speak clearly at moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to the Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group Co-Chairs, Avri Doria, Chris Disspain, and Manal Ismail. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you very much indeed, Alice. Hello, everyone. Welcome to the GAC Annex of the Convention Centre. Nice of you to make the effort to walk down the path and wander in. It's great to see you here. I appreciate that there are lots of sessions that are clashing with this one and it's great that people have made the effort. We really appreciate it. Avri's right here. Manal is online. Manal, are you there?

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.

MANAL ISMAIL

Yes, Chris. Can you hear me?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Fantastic. We can hear you, faintly, but hopefully the volume will get turned up. So, we're here today to run through the Review of Reviews. I'm standing up because I hate presenting sitting down, and also, I can see when you cringe if I say something more easily, if I'm standing.

We're here to talk through the -- we've got a draft report out. We have had comments on that draft report. It's out for everyone to look at. And we were originally intending to have the document out for public comment prior to Seville and then have a session in Seville that was part of the public comment. But we decided that we thought it was more important. We got the document out in its sort of second or third draft, that we got input from you here in Seville.

We've got a session with the GAC tomorrow, for example. We may be seeing some other groups, and obviously we have this session, to get some feedback. And then we can possibly make some amendments to the document after Seville, over the next sort of 10 days after that. And we will then put it out for public comment, and the 40 days and 40 nights of public comment will begin.

And then our goal is to get the public comments in, and Avri will talk later on about the time frame. So, we're going to do a very broad-brush overview. I hope everyone's had a chance to look at the

document. We are here to have a discussion, not to spend an hour and 15 minutes doing presentations so there's no time for questions. So, there may be long periods of silence while we wait for you to put your hands up and ask questions.

If I could have the first slide up, please, or the second slide, rather. Thank you. Okay. So, this is the overview. Effectively, there are cadence reviews and on-demand reviews. And the cadence reviews are the accountability and transparency review and the structural review. And the on-demand reviews are special topics, emerging topics, and consequential effects. Avri is going to take us through a little bit of the detail on those, but just an overview.

The Accountability and Transparency Review is intended to be every five years. It is deferrable, I'll come back to that in a minute, that every five years is intended to fit into the five-year ICANN strategic planning process so that the recommendations of an Accountability and Transparency Review would come out in time in the five-year cycle to enable the strategic planning exercise to take any of those recommendations into account that might be relevant for the strategic plan.

There is a scoping process for that review. Currently, the Accountability and Transparency Review has a list of things in the bylaws that it can look at, plus a whole heap of other things it can look at whatever it wants. And that scope isn't set until the review team gets in a room and decides what the scope is. Our proposal is that there should be a scoping process before you impanel the

review team, and we'll talk a little bit more about how that works a little bit later on.

So, there's a scoping process, and then the review team is chartered. The advantage of the scoping process is it enables you to put people, each SO and AC and Board, to put people onto the review team who have a level of expertise in the things that that review is going to be looking at. The structural review is the big one. That is the thing that looks at all of the SOs and ACs, et cetera, et cetera. And again, Avri will go into some more detail on that.

That is currently, we're saying the cadence of that is every 15 years. Now I want to be clear with everybody, there is currently not consensus on the CCG about that. There are some people on the CCG who think that that is too long. However, we're currently saying 15 years because we think that the process that we've put in place or that we want to put in place will obviously take some time. It's a long process because you need to do a whole heap of things to make it work.

Once you've got the recommendations, they then need to be implemented. Then they need to be out there in the world for a while before we've considered the possibility of reviewing them again. And so, some people started off by saying it should be every 10 years. And some people started off by saying it should be every 20. And kind of by process of trying to get to a consensus, we said 15. But there are still some people who think that's too long.

There is no scoping process as such because it is an open review. It's intended that the structural review will be a cross-community working group. That is a particular ICANN animal that is effectively, there isn't a review team, there is the community, and then there's a small leadership team of the cross-community working group, a chair and so on. It's what we did for the transition. Basically, anyone can turn up, anyone can speak.

Then you've got the on-demand special topics. The point about the special topics is simply that we identified a number of things that currently have a fixed review. Security, stability, and resiliency, CCT, etc. And what we feel is that those are important, but that the way to deal with that is to put them into the on-demand bucket and to say that every X number of years, say every three years, ICANN will formally write to the SOs and ACs and say, are there any security, stability, and resiliency topics that you think there should be an on-demand review on? Are there any new gTLD topics that you think there should be an on-demand review on? And so on.

More detail is in the document. Obviously, that also has a scoping process, obviously, because you need to scope it. And then, emerging topics is stuff that bubbles up from the community. So, if the ccNSO wants to do an on-demand review on whether or not ICANN staff should all wear uniforms, if they could get support for that, that would go into the scoping committee and then there would be an on-demand review for that. I want to be very clear that I'm not a proponent of uniforms for staff, just in case anyone was

wondering. And then finally, there's the consequential effects review.

And what that is about is dealing with where an SO or an AC makes their own changes to their structure, which they can do at any time, and they might very well do as a consequence of the Continuous Improvement Program, for example, and that there are then consequential effects on the rest of ICANN by that change in the structure. So, for example, you might need to look at seats on the Nominating Committee.

You might need to look at seats on the Board. You might need to look at the fact that suddenly an SO has split into two. Say the ccNSO decided to have an SO for IDN ccTLDs and an SO for ASCII ccTLDs. That would have an effect. You'd need to work that out. So, that's what that one is. And then finally, the one-time continuous improvement program pilot. So, the current continuous improvement program is a pilot, and the intention is that there should be a one-time review of not of the outputs of it, but the actual process itself.

And that should happen after the first three years, probably. And in that review, they would look at the process, it might be that it's way too top-heavy, it might be over-engineered. Not that ICANN would ever over-engineer anything, but it might be over-engineered, and they might need to streamline it. But that review would also make recommendations for how the outputs of the CIP will be treated. So, they might be, for example, feeding into the

structural review or feeding into the on-demand reviews and so on and so forth.

So, that's the overview. Avri's going to take us through a bit more detail now, and then we'll come back and talk a little bit more about the scoping process, and we'll start the questions. Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Avri speaking, and I hope you'll forgive me for remaining seated as opposed to being proper and standing and giving a presentation. So, we probably should go to the next slide. And very much appreciate these things having been put into blocks like this. So, yeah, the next slide basically breaks down a little bit about what each of the types of review is like in more detail and what it's more about. One of the things to notice is that there are many types of reviews here.

There's three basic types as we went into the accountability and transparency, the structure, and all the on-demands, and those are the ones that were represented in that top box. Now, one of the things that you don't notice here, unless you start to count up how often we have these, is how many reviews there are. And one of the questions that comes up is, how do you avoid having too many reviews at the same time?

The problem that was considered the downfall in many ways of our previous setup is because, and that's because, and this is still being

discussed, is how many reviews can you have at a time? And there are some strong advocates of one review at a time, max. There are others that say, well, that gets a little hard because we'll be in a constant state of delay because people may have a good reason for an on-demand review, but how long will it have to wait in the queue before it can happen?

So, that's part of the work that we're not describing here, and it's really in the document, is the review scoping committee, in terms of them looking at things, them doing what is needed to do a review in terms of budget, in terms of facility, in terms of capability in the community, et cetera, and which needs prioritization. So, one of the things you're used to, perhaps, in policy aspects of how do you prioritize the work that gets done, likewise we'll have in reviews.

It's part of what was already introduced in trying to deal with the overwhelming number of pending recommendations we had from previous reviews. But that, as opposed to being later, after you've had the recommendation, now you wait in your queue for implementation. This would actually be queuing before you actually did the review because not that many can happen at a time. One of the other things you'll see in this chart is things are mentioned on bylaws.

I think there's a belief, and I think it's probably a fairly solid thing, is that a review has to be reflected in a bylaw for it to have the power of bottom-up oversight, the power of a community doing its

own oversight, it really needs to be anchored in the bylaws. Several of these are already a bylaw. There's already a bylaw for ATRT.

That would need to be perhaps modified some for the new variation of ATR because it no longer includes the Review of the Reviews because that's now an on-demand review. So, some of the features of one or the other of those will need to change. The accountability and transparency review is basically sticking pretty much to the issues of accountability and transparency as much as possible without getting into many of the other duties it had sort of picked up over time.

And those, like one of the duties of ATRT, was reviewing how all the other reviews were going. And in this case, the idea was, no, that's specific, that's what you're doing now, and that's what the Review of Reviews is about. It's an on-demand review that happens when it is. And also, it's not that we never did any structural review. We've done little bits of structural review, but they often fell in some other review and weren't necessarily something that was in the bylaw.

So, each of these reviews, because one of the issues that people have brought up is, but security, stability, and resilience is important, and that's why it's a bylaw. Yes, and it remains a bylaw. The bylaw may need to be modified somewhat to fit in the context of an on-demand review to put in the notion that, no, you're not doing it every five years, you're checking on it.

One of the things that Chris didn't say that I normally might have interrupted him, but if there's something that needs to be done after three years, you don't have to wait five years. You could just say, we've got an SSR emergency, we need to do an on-demand review now. Now, you might have to get into the queue and deal with prioritization, depending on how many reviews we can do at a time.

And that's not an easy issue. It looks like an easy issue to say, only one or maybe two is okay. But we also have to look at the stages of a review and the stages of review where some of the beginning stages are fairly light, and if another review is finishing up while something fairly light is going, then maybe you can situate. Likewise with reviews, and this is an issue that we haven't tackled yet in many ways, although it is discussed to some extent.

And by the way, I was missing things that are in the review document, and Alice was nice enough to point out things that I was missing, so I actually went and re-read the thing last night. There's an amazing amount of stuff in there, an amazing amount of details on things, even like the one I'm bringing up now, implementation. But implementation has the longest tail. Staying away from why it has a long tail for the moment, but has one of the longest tails.

And if implementation is part of a review, does that mean you can't have another review while some previous review is being implemented? So, that whole subject of how many you can have at a time is still pending. And just to point out that there are lots of

those subjects that are pending for the last bit, the last quarter of our work, once we get through the comments on this one.

So, anyhow, and that. The structural review is divided into three pieces. Between the pieces, there's possibilities for deferrals. And we talked a little bit about deferrals. When you read the document, I'm not going to get into the specific, deferrals are something that are strictly defined and how you go about the process and it's formal and et cetera.

So, it's not easily done, but it's programmatically done. So, the first thing is you look at the external landscape, has anything changed about the world we exist in that demands that we review our structure? People aren't using domain names anymore. We better have a structure that takes that into account. That's not true. That's not my belief. That's just a comment I hear in the wind. Any number of things.

There's a lot of topics we don't even think about anymore. Does that enter our review? The way people look at us, the way, whatever. So, there's an external review that has got external experts, et cetera, and it comes back with a context. And this is something we've seen a little bit of when we're doing the strategic plans. And there's an environmental view beforehand of, what is the situation we're existing in? Then after that, there's the internal landscape of we go through and say, okay, what's got to be gone?

In the organization, how do we need to change? What do we need to do? And these are all fairly lengthy processes, and that's what

gets us to the 15 years between. And then there's the thing that was talked about, the implications. If we decide to change something in those first two phases about anything, and really structural review is meant to be anything from the concept of how we're divided into SOs and ACs even how we work with staff, how we work with boards, anything like that is available for review.

That's not saying that it all will be reviewed, that that's up to how we get there, but nothing is left off the table is the notion that's there at the moment. It is a review from A to Z, or Zed as the case may be. So, that one goes there. There is deferral because you could look at the beginning and sort of say, oh, my word, there's a lot to do. But we don't have the ability to do that.

Let's put this off until we finish this other review that's ongoing. You know, a situation we will get to at the beginning. Which review comes first? It's almost like one of those puzzles you ask as a kid. Which comes first, the next ATR or the first structural? I've heard proponents of both. How do you make those kinds of decisions?

Those would be things that are going on. Those are things that the Review Scoping Committee and others will be working on. And a lot of those mechanisms are also described in the draft. Then we get into the special topics. You'll notice that some of those are already bylaws determined. All those bylaws will probably need to be tweaked in order to make them fit, as I said, to the new on-demand structure.

They're not regular. They're no longer cadenced. How they're staffed differs. And there's Review of Reviews, for example, doesn't have a bylaw. It's mentioned perhaps in the ATRT review, but it doesn't have its own bylaw. So, if every review does need to have a bylaw that it's anchored in, then this is one that will need to be looked at.

The emerging topics, okay, there can't be a bylaw for any possible emerging topic, but there'll need to be something that structures, that anchors any review on an emerging topic, that gives it the form of something that there's a scoping committee, something that the board approves getting going, something where there's a cross-community group that's doing the work, something that then goes to all the community to get their buy-in to the conclusion when it goes to the board.

Those kinds of structures will need to be bylaw defined. Or at least that's the notion that's ongoing at the moment, that they just can't sort of free float on that, but such. And then the consequential effects review also, those are the reviews that actually can change the structure of ICANN, can change the number of board seats, can change the number of EC participants, et cetera, the empowered community participants.

Those would also need to be anchored in a bylaw. You can't just add members of the EC willy-nilly. You would have to have some structure under which that is done. And finally, I don't think we need a bylaw for the CIP process. That's a one-time. But basically,

if you put in a major process that is representing and replacing the whole organizational type review that is currently in the bylaw, that bylaw for organizational reviews that's there will need modification.

So, even though we perhaps don't need a bylaw for CIP one-time review, we will need to deal with that. So, that's both a quick sort of look at what's in there in terms of the kinds of reviews and going a little bit into depth on what they are, but also some of the prerequisites for them getting there.

And that work on new bylaws, revised bylaws, and all that, is something that is just postulated as probably being necessary, but has not been worked on yet. And with that, I'll pass it back to you, and hopefully I went in the right direction for you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Avri. We're just going to talk a little bit about the review scoping committee and then we're going to do questions, discussion, etc. This is the proposal for the Review Scoping Committee. It is intended to be leadership representatives or designees from each SO or AC. We started off by saying it should be the chairs or vice-chairs of each SO or AC.

We were asked by the chairs and vice-chairs to say could they put a designee on because they might be too busy to actually do it and that's fair enough. But the concept is that these are people who have been elected into a position, generally speaking, and so

therefore they have already got the imprimatur of their SO and AC as being in a leadership position.

That said, to be very clear, it is intended to be a representative role. It is not intended to be a you are there in your personal capacity. You are very much there as a representative of your SO and AC. Representation from the ICANN Board, same thing applies. Representation from Org. And then the leadership from the immediately preceding ATR in the event that we are talking about scoping of an ATR.

Because clearly, one of the things that we have been very lucky on the CCG is that Cheryl and Pat both agreed, who were chairs of the last ATR, agreed to be part of this and to help and to provide background information, which is incredibly helpful. So, we think that the scoping committee should have that representation on it. Obviously, it's dependent on them still being around in the community, but that's the way these things work. So, it's intended to be a central coordination mechanism.

The SO and AC leaders already meet. They meet on a fairly regular basis at an ICANN meeting. They meet with the Board. They meet with the staff. It's not an official grouping, but it does happen, and we think that this should become this particular piece of it, the Review Scoping Committee should be chartered, properly chartered, and actually be effectively an official ICANN committee.

We also think that, I think, personally think, that actually, providing a bit more beefing up of the roles of the leaders of the SOs and ACs

is actually a good thing generally speaking anyway. Their job is basically to manage the resources and the bandwidth. So, let's take an example of the ATR, they would reach out to the community and say, it's time for an Accountability and Transparency Review, what do you think the topic should be?

And each SO and AC would come up with their own topics, they would be cross-pollinated across the SOs and ACs, and the scoping committee would end up eventually, and it's all the details in the report, end up with a short list. There's a whole heap of criteria that they screened things on, and there are two screening processes. There's a screening of the topics to find out where the topics mix.

So, At-Large might have come up with a topic, and the GNSO might have come up with a topic that used different words but are essentially the same thing. So, the scoping committee would kind of bash that together and make a topic that satisfies both of those. And there's also a bunch of criteria on budget and on volunteer capacity and staffing capacity and so on and so forth.

And the intention would be that the scoping committee would be liaising with the relevant people in ICANN and saying, okay, how many topics can we have in this review that we've got the time for, the budget for, the staff for, and the volunteers for? And it might be three topics.

It might be five topics. Who knows? But at every step of the way, everything they do is a recommendation that goes back to the SOs and ACs and needs to be endorsed by the SOs and the ACs. So, they

are not a decision-making body. They are a representative body of the SOs and ACs.

They also do the same thing with deferral, if there's a feeling, that the recommendations from the last ATR are one year away from being finalized, and therefore the next ATR is due to start in six months, but we should defer it for six months so that those are dealt with. They can make that recommendation to the community, for example.

And they also make the recommendation back to the community to say, we think there should be a consequential effects review. Or we don't need one because there are no consequential effects of the changes that the GNSO has made or the CCNSO has made. And then just finally on the thresholds, the intention is that it's basically to -- we're saying five SOs and ACs is a threshold for things.

However, we're open to feedback on that. Some people think that four is enough. We were kind of split between four and five, bearing in mind that obviously it's the scoping committee that will be taking the vote, if you will, of the SO and AC into the scoping committee. So, if people think it should be four, there are seven right now, so let's assume there are seven, it clearly can't be three, and it would be clearly daft for it to be six.

So really, it's either got to be four or five. So, we're open to discussion about whether you think four is enough or it should be five. What would they decide? Should it be deferred? Is the scope acceptable? Should we have an on-demand review on the staff

uniforms and so on? So, about what those thresholds should be, whether you think it should be four or five. And obviously then, as I said, there'll need to be a charter.

So, we'll go to that later because we'll deal with that when we finish the questions. Is that okay? Okay. So, I think, on that note, we're ready to take questions. I just want to check in with Manal. Manal, is there anything that you want to add to what Avri and I have said?

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris. You've covered it very well, both of you. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Manal. Okay, the floor is yours. It's a very long walk back to lunch. Russ.

RUSS WEINSTEIN

Hi, this is Russ Weinstein from ICANN staff, part of the CCG. Chris, Avri, thank you for the presentation, and Manal, thank you for all the great work being your chair with Chris and Avri. You guys are all doing great. Could we go back to slide three? The table-ish, yeah.

So, Avri, as you were describing this, the orange boxes are the on-demand reviews, right? I guess I was a little surprised or didn't understand that you were expecting that we were expecting to essentially hard-code the text on the right into the bylaws.

AVRI DORIA

Hard code the text is probably at least 17 steps further than what I was thinking. It was that for a review to have the power of a review, at least this has been my understanding to date, it needs to have a touchstone within the bylaws that describes its existence and describes its process to an extent.

So, in other words, it describes things like a review is initiated by the Board. The outcome of a review is approved by the relevant SOs and ACs and the Board when it's over. Kind of constructs, that the review will have the following types of participants.

So, there's a basic structure that basically identifies, because otherwise it's just an activity that we engage in and doesn't have the power. Yes, it's still just a recommendation at the end. The Board can still say, thank you very much for the recommendation of the review, but no, we don't like it and this is our reason.

It can also say, yes, and then a year later say, eh, it didn't really work, we've changed our mind. But it's not going to hard-code necessarily all the detail. It's just going to basically give a structure that defines its legitimacy as a review that affects ICANN.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think that's right, Russ, but let me just add a couple of things to it before you come back. If you think about it for a second, there's going to need to be a bylaw that says there is a process for on-demand reviews, right? I can see that a part of that bylaw would be

a section that said there are a number of topics on which every, let's say, three years, ICANN will reach out to the communities in a specific way and ask them if they've got reasons to have those reviews.

That's what we're talking about as being in the bylaw. So, it will say, you will reach out and say, are there any security, stability, and resiliency topics that the community wants to do a review on? Right, that's what we're saying, I think.

So, it's not hardwiring those words, but it is hardwiring the process because we think currently security, stability, and resiliency review is part of the bylaws. It shows a level of respect that we think that it deserves. What we're doing is effectively changing the process, not changing the focus on security, stability, and resiliency. Does that make sense?

RUSS WEINSTEIN

Yeah, thanks. So, I certainly agree with the concept that the process for on-demand reviews needs some definition in the bylaws. No dispute on that. I guess I wasn't sure we were using those in that first orange box as specific things versus notional examples. And so, I think that maybe we got to tease that out and make sure we're all aligned on that, whatever it is.

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, I'm going to jump in on that. I think at first, that was kind of the notion. I think at the moment, I'd be very careful saying that

because the number of community members from different parts of the community that have said, no, security, stability, and resiliency is much too important to be left out of the bylaws. That it is critical to our existence that we have that as one of our bylaws.

But the Registration Directory Services, no, I mean if we don't have bylaws on those, on the compounding and transparency, then anything can happen, and we lose our commitment to those. So that's one of the reasons, I think, for perhaps there needs to be something, perhaps more than there shall be one of these reviews every five years, to this is a critical issue and this is an issue that the community must review every X number of years to see whether it needs, not review, should look at every couple of years to see whether it needs a review.

And if there's a crisis, it can be in on. In other words, it was too important for people, and I think a bunch of us got that impression, that it was just too important to take away its bylaw status. And if you don't take away its bylaw status, then perhaps Review of Reviews needs bylaw status too, because we're taking it out of ATRT. So, that's the kind of thinking that's there.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

To be clear, and this is a really important distinction, it is not do you want to have a security and stability review? It is, are there any topics that fall under the heading of security and stability that you think there should be an on-demand review on?

So, it's not intended to be a holus bolus review of everything that is security, stability, and resilience. It's intended to be, you are, you, ICANN asking the SOs and ACs every X number of years, do you have any topics that would fall under security, stability, and resilience that you think we should do an on-demand review on?

That's the point. And we think they deserve the respect of being called out specifically in the bylaws as topics and pushed out to the community rather than waiting for them to bubble up from the community itself, because they're important right and they currently sit there as reviews. Anything else, Russ?

RUSS WEINSTEIN

Not at the moment. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay. Anyone else? Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Great. Thank you. Kathy Kleiman. Echoing. Is this better? Okay. Should I get closer or farther? Okay. For the purpose of this discussion, I was vice chair of the first WHOIS Review Team, and I have lots of questions for you. But first, I want to thank you for an incredible amount of work. I'm an observer, and you can just see the incredible amount of work going on.

Second, I just want to say I'm very concerned about the bylaws. When we created the bylaws, we created them with a great amount

of inside and outside involvement, international involvement, and attention. We're not going to get that now because we don't have the crisis of the transition. A lot of people thought when we signed off on the bylaws, we signed off on them for a long time. So, I just want to put a pin in that.

The bylaws is a big deal. But let me ask my first question because I've actually got lots of questions. An emerging topic. How can you do a review of an emerging topic that doesn't exist? That doesn't seem to be a review. Reviews are about something you've engaged in, right? Well, Avri, let me ask the question. How do you do a review of something that's not even part of our discussion yet?

I think of reviews as something that comes after. Reviews seem to be inserting something new into the process that doesn't seem to be review material. So, I'm going to ask about emerging topics, and I'm also going to ask about what's the line between a review and policy, and particularly policy development. Thank you. It all seems to be kind of blurring.

AVRI DORIA

Let me try to answer. It is not that there would be a review of the generic term emerging issues. It would be there would be an emerging issue. Blockchain is doing this to our domain names, or there is quantum and it is affecting us in the following ways and we need to review how we're dealing with it.

So, that would be a specific topic that would get the request for an on-demand review and it would be reviewed. You don't want to see it, I understand that. It would be reviewed by the scoping committee whether there was indeed an issue that was worthy of being reviewed.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

It means an issue emerging in the community. It doesn't mean an issue that's -- It means, is there something in the community that is bubbling up as an issue that we should do a review on? If you take my example of which of the staff wear uniforms, which is the most outlandish example I can think of, and that's why I keep using it, that's an issue that's emerging in the community.

There are all sorts of things that come up in the community that you might want to look at and decide are worthy of a review. Or you might not. But the point is we want to build in the flexibility to allow for the community, by agreement, to say we think there should be a review on this particular thing, whatever it might be.

You could say that, and I think actually Avri, it's a good thought. Should we look at ICANN's involvement in domains in the blockchain? Should the community look at that? That's an example of something that you might want to review. Kathy, go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN

But if I might follow up, that breaks the concept. You've changed the definition of review now. Review was started as accountability and transparency, stability, and security -- I'll wait. And who is review? Reviewing things we've already done, and so, here you're talking about new issues, emerging topics that seems to fundamentally belong somewhere else in the ICANN process. It's not a review because we haven't done anything yet. It's that the accountability concept fundamentally changes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Jonathan, did you want to respond to that? Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Kathy. And I think this has actually been a conversation within the group a little bit because what cart and horse kind of issues that we have, because it has been part of the work of the ATRs to look at ways that accountability and transparency might be improved. In other words, they weren't necessarily looking back at things that were promised or not delivered, et cetera.

But there were opportunities for improvement of accountability and transparency. So, how do you account for reviewing accountability and transparency, which is something that's been around forever, it's not new, but could it be improved? And then you might have something like a review of how we're doing on human rights, how we're doing on DNS abuse, something that goes

across silos and might benefit from a review sort of more holistically or something like that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Exactly right. That's the intention.

KATHY KLEIMAN

So, we're talking about defining it in some way to review what we've already done. It would seem to be, again, somewhere else than ICANN, and I've got other questions as well, to introduce new concepts. So, a human rights review would have to do with the fact we've been talking about we have a human rights framework, thanks to Avri, we've got human rights impact assessments, thanks to Farzi, we're working on, I could see a human rights review. But a blockchain review, again, emerging topics seem like something else because there's nothing to review yet.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

But if that's what the community wants though, Kathy. What we're doing is creating a process by which the community, the majority of the community, can spin up something that it thinks that's important to consider as a review. That's all. It is to some extent about looking forward. The very start of this process, Jonathan and various other people said, what do we do about looking at the stuff? I get you don't agree, which is fine, but that's why we've ended up where we've ended up. Did you have any other questions?

KATHY KLEIMAN

I'll wait for some others first.

AVRI DORIA

Before we get to the next one, you did ask the question about policy and where the dividing line is. That is a hard conversation, and we've had little bits of it going along. And I'm one of the ones that argues that it's one of those very, very fuzzy lines. I mean, it's still a fuzzy line even today, but it basically is identifiable.

And that's one of the things that the scoping committee composed of leadership is able to say, how you basically deal with that fuzzy border that exists between those two, what we consider policy that can be consensus policy, et cetera, and what would be considered policy in any organization other than ICANN that has its strict definition of policy.

And that's why you have a group that can look at that fuzzy thing and know that that's where the border falls and know that thing that you're bringing up that is technical policy, so-called technical policy, and such.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Just to finish that off, there's also one kind of line, and I acknowledge it depends to some extent on your definition of policy, but what we're very clear about, I think, is that a review, be it an ATR or an on-demand review, can make a recommendation

that there should be a policy on something, but it can't make a recommendation of what that policy should be.

So, we could say we recommend that the GNSO develops a policy on GNSO uniforms, but it can't say they should be green or yellow. That distinction I think we're sure about. What we're still sort of discussing in detail is can we be more specific about what we mean by policy. But the fundamental principle is that the review itself cannot set policy that is the GNSO's role or the ASO's role or the ccNSO's role. That is what the SOs are for.

Kathy, I'm going to give you one more go, then I'm going to go to someone else, and we can come back to you if you want. Okay, fine. Osvaldo, I know, is in the queue. So, Osvaldo, Manal, and then Greg. Thank you. Osvaldo, go ahead.

OSVALDO NOVOA

I have several comments. I tried to be --

CHRIS DISSPAIN

A little closer to the microphone, a little closer.

AVRI DORIA

The same admonition that I just got is you got to speak into the microphone.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Okay. Can you hear me now? Yes. Several comments, I go step by step on this same chart. Regarding the ATRT, I think there are some basic, how do you say, issues that should be in scope always in the ATRT, because the transparency and accountability, that are in the bylaws actually right now, they should be kept specific for this review, that's all. Going to the structural review, I think that a three-year, almost four-year review is too long.

I said that in the group. It's not only my opinion, it's not just me, I talked with several people that think the same thing. It should be shorter, 18 months at the most. ATRT has been done in one year. I don't know why a structural review cannot be done in 18 years. Scoping all ICANN, not only the SO/AC, but ICANN Board and ICANN Org relationship with the rest of ICANN. Then going to special topics.

I think the security, stability, and resiliency is fundamental to the work of ICANN. It shouldn't be on demand. It should be periodically mandated and reviewed, not only because something is working bad, but to ensure that it's working correctly and perhaps to check if there is any improvement to that. I think we could always find improvement. And also, the registration directory service, those are services fundamental to ICANN that have to be provided regularly and with, how do you say, confidence.

So, I think it's necessary to review them periodically. And then finally, on the consequential effects review, I think this is a review

of the results of another review. I think that this should be done in the initial review. I can recommend a change that affects the rest of ICANN. That change has to be approved by the Board, so it has to be evaluated, the consequences of it, prior to the approval by the Board. So, I don't think there is need for a consequential effects review, but that part of the review should be included in the initial one. That's all. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Just before we move on, I'm going to just clarify a couple of points. I know we've had this conversation before. Just to be very clear, the timelines that we've put in the report in respect to the structural review are merely estimates of what we think might be the right sort of times. We're not saying it can't be done any quicker, but equally it may be that it'll be slower.

I think it's really important to remember that when you're doing a review of the SOs and ACs and you've got a cross-community working group, these things take time, and it is an incredibly important issue that needs to play out over a relatively long period of time to ensure that we take what will be, if we make changes, what will be very big steps, and trying to ram all of that into a very tight time frame, to me, doesn't make sense.

I think that this should be done properly and not often rather than an attempt to try and do it really, really quickly. I wanted to just also address your point about the on-demand stuff. We are saying they're incredibly important, but if we can't trust this community

to identify that there is a reason to have a security and stability review and to spin one up because we need it, if we can't trust ourselves to do that, we might as well all pack up and go home.

Because at the end of the day, forcing a function of having a review about security and stability when there isn't a reason to have one, doesn't make a huge amount of sense to me. Having a process that allows you to do that with a consent of the community is what we're trying to achieve. And one last point. Yes, you are correct, the Board has to approve the changes.

The reason for having the consequential effects review in the document is because if the GNSO goes away and makes some changes to its structure, it will do so in its own way, and it does not necessarily have the full involvement of the rest of the community. The consequential effects need the involvement of the rest of the community to ensure that everyone is comfortable.

And to try and do that in a GNSO process for the rest of the community or in a ccNSO, what's the organization I belong to? The ccNSO process simply isn't going to cut it from the point of view of community engagement. We have Greg and then Becky, I think. I'm sorry, Avri, I apologize.

AVRI DORIA

I wanted to add one more piece on that, and that is that sort of bottom-up independence of the group. A group can decide that it wants to bifurcate into two groups. By implication, that gives them

a seat on the NomCom. But you don't want to necessarily stop them from bifurcating. You can bifurcate with uncertainty that you will get the seat on the NomCom from the community later.

You may have to go and present your case to the community. But to say that you can't have the bottom-up independence to bifurcate into two groups because you need the permission of the rest of the community for a seat on the NomCom first, limits that structural integrity of the bottom-up organization.

So, it's really, there's sort of the which comes first. But that independence to say, we don't get along anymore, we should bifurcate. Sure. They should be able to do that without needing the rest of us saying, and we're going to give you an NomCom seat.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think Manal is next in the queue, so I apologize, Greg. I missed Manal out, so if you don't mind. Manal, the floor is yours.

MANAL ISMAIL

It's okay. Thank you, Chris. Can you hear me?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL

Okay. So, just a few remarks. So, first of all, the on-demand reviews, unlike some people might think of that they deprioritize

the topics. In fact, it's the other way around. It just gives some flexibility to be uncadenced and focused, so not necessarily a full-blown review, as you rightly mentioned, Chris, but focus on a narrowly-scorched topic.

CHRIS DISSPAIN You're fading out, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL So, is this better?

CHRIS DISSPAIN Yes, that's fine.

MANAL ISMAIL Okay. So, I was saying that On Demand doesn't deprioritize topics. In fact, sometimes it prioritizes the topic if you want to initiate a review out of cadence. So, sometimes things are pressing and need to be, it's not to wait for a full cycle. On what Kathy mentioned on the existing situation rather than being forward-looking, I think when you review the existing situation, you can identify things that are missing or need to be accommodated.

And during the group's discussion, AI and blockchain were mentioned specifically. So, on-demand could look into missing things or address a pressing need for out-of-cadence reviews. Again, that has to be focused, tightly scoped, or narrowly scoped, and meeting the community thresholds. So, again, it's not

something that just one SO or AC can request, but it has thresholds to be met.

And on the policy, again, and I think you've covered this, Chris, sometimes we may need policy consideration or a recommendation that says this should be looked into in terms of policy. And I recall changing the language in the report itself to say consideration rather than anything else. And of course, not policy development. So, just consideration of policy could be also accommodated. I'll stop here and give you back the floor, Chris and Avri. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you very much, Manal. Thank you very much. Greg, the floor is yours. Then Becky. I've got a couple of comments. Yeah, back to Kathy. Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN

Thank you. This is Greg Shatan for the record. First, as a former member of the Policy and Implementation Working Group, I appreciate the discussion about policy and defining policy. However, in mentioning that group, I think that's an example of the kind of thing that now seems to be subsumed into emerging topics, and t's not really supposed to be. I think that I agree with Kathy that there's been some scope creep in this review of reviews working group.

And I think a review has two aspects. It has a backwards-looking aspect. If you read through the bylaw, each of the reviews is generally described as examining or assessing something typically against some form of criteria. And then there's a forward-looking section where you make recommendations about how things should be changed or approved, improved rather.

And I think that the non-policy or non-PDP working group process was intended to deal with reviews that were not part of an accountability process, which is what the reviews are intended to bolster, so that if there are issues that are not policy issues that need to be dealt with, they should be dealt with through non-PDP working groups, not by having a review of something that isn't really engaging in a review. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Greg. We've got Becky. And I apologize, we have Sebastien as well, and then we will go back to Kathy. Becky, go ahead.

BECKY BURR

I want to talk about the sense or suggestion that we've heard a couple of times that somehow we are doing away with any of the reviews that we currently have. Osvaldo specifically mentioned stability and security and resilience. If you look at the Accountability and Transparency Review, it's described very broadly to encompass assessing how ICANN is executing on its

mission, which includes fundamentally security, stability, and transparency, and whether it's complying with its commitments, core values.

So, if it's related to the mission or how ICANN accomplishes its mission, it is in scope of the Bucket A, what we're calling ATR review. So, the change is that we are looking at scoping at any particular time what is top of mind in the community, what is of most concern in the community. And sometimes that may be stability and security. Sometimes a stability and security thing will come up as a special topic.

But the fact that things are in the on-demand reviews does not mean they cannot be conducted in the ordinary course as part of the accountability and transparency review. And I think the concept is a little complicated, but it's fundamental to what we're doing here. We are deliberately establishing a grounded in the bylaws, but very broad scope of reviews.

And then we're leaving a safeguard for when something pops up and we need to do something faster. So, just for people who have said we need to have stability, security, and transparency reviews, yeah, that's right there. And that can be done. It's not excluded. It's not gone away. The same is true of all of the other reviews.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Becky. Just before we go to Sebastien, I just wanted to pick up on one point because I think we're getting, and it's our fault,

we're getting caught up in words, and as Avri always says, words are incredibly important, and the words we're getting caught up in are emerging topics. I want to be really clear here. The whole point about the scoping process is that that is the way that looks at whether this is a topic that should be the subject of a review.

So, I'm going to take a simple example. At-Large, and no offense intended to At-Large, At-Large could say, we think we should do a review on DNS abuse or ICANN's work on DNS abuse. If that gets the support of another SO and AC, that would go into the on-demand review process.

And I imagine that the scoping committee would look at that and they would say, that's policy, you shouldn't do it. In the same way, Kathy, that if in the event that an SO and AC suggested that we should have a review on whether or not blockchain domains have got anything whatsoever to do with ICANN, the scoping committee would say that is not the subject for review.

And I think, Greg, the same thing applies to the thing that you talked about. So, I think we need to be very careful. And I think what we probably should be saying is topics that the community suggests should be the subject to review. And the scoping committee should have very clear guidelines about what is reviewable and what is not.

That said, and I think, Jonathan, I'm picking up on a point that you've been making quite a lot, which is there should be, you think and I think others agree with you, there should be an ability to look

forwards and to use the review mechanism to do that, but subject to a number of very specific boundaries.

And I'll give you an opportunity to talk about that in a minute when I've gone to Sebastien. And Kathy, I haven't forgotten to come back to you. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

I will be speaking French because we have skilled and competent interpreters and I would like to thank the interpreters for their presence in service of the community. Now that you have all put your headphones on, my name is Sébastien Bachollet. I'm talking in my personal capacity and I'm an observer of this line of work. I would like to thank the cross-community group for all the work that has been accomplished and for the report that has been published.

The three past days I spent in Seville were not spent taking in the sites, but rather working on the documents. So, I worked on two pillars mostly, so I produced comments on the documents, but I also have to say that what is suggested is too complex to implement, to follow upon, to understand, and it's really hard to leverage all that has been done. And I believe that one of the targets of the working group should be simplicity.

So, I suggested an alternative proposal, which is to be certain, rife with flaws, but will let you go at it differently. I know that you have made a lot of progress on the rest of your document but I would like

to suggest an alternative solution and I will send an email by the end of the meeting. Thank you very much all for your work.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think my, not my battery, the microphone's battery. Jonathan, did you want to say anything about the forward-looking stuff before I go back to Kathy? You don't have to, but if you want to.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Well, I don't want to anger Kathy, but it's always a consideration. No, I mean, I've brought it up a few times that I don't want it always to be, if we look at how we're doing about something, part of that might be not against a specific commitment we made or a specific program we had but could we be doing better? And there have been recommendations that have come out of the ATR that are in that regard.

I also am a little concerned about the siloing that happens around policy as well. I think we bring up policy as a distinct thing when it's convenient, but it's always been a kind of a blurry line. And I think something like DNS abuse is a perfect example, or human rights, is a perfect example of something that's going to cross silos, because DNS abuse could have to do with how contract compliance is doing, could have to do with changes to contracts.

Those things are not policy. And so, you could have a review that could have implications for policy, and we might just need

safeguards to prevent treading on policy-specific recommendations.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

And for what it's worth, I completely agree with that. I think, as you've said, there are issues that would arise in compliance that touch on the way that the policy is being implemented and so on and so forth. You're absolutely right. So, we do need to build that in. It's just that it's a clear thing that the SOs make the policy and we just need to remember that, and if we build that into our system, we'll be fine. Kathy, your turn.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Kathy Kleiman again. So, I'm going to ask two different questions rather than reflecting on the excellent discussion. One has to do with, and there's a lot of air coming in too.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Much closer to the microphone, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Much closer to the mic. Okay. So, in addition to having a question of what's the definition of a review, which I don't think we should leave to the scoping team. I think that should be something that the community agrees on, and I don't think we agree on that yet. I have two questions. One has to do with timing and one has to do with scoping.

So, my question about timing is once upon a time -- am I too close now? It sounds like an echo to me. Once upon a time, reviews were unusual. They created excitement. They focused a lot of time and energy and we paid a lot of attention when Jonathan and his team came forward to talk to us about the ATRT.

Here, I think we risk the danger of going into an ongoing review cycle. And so, I wanted to ask you -- And to have particular groups feel entitled to having a review, especially the on-demand reviews. So, before we wind up with all sorts of independent review processes and people who believe they have rights, what kind of stops and limits can we put in so that we're not in an ongoing review?

I have to tell you, the scoping team sounds like a new NomCom, that they may be in continuous meeting, no derogatory intended to NomCom, but that we're going to need experts in the scoping team and in ongoing work. But I do want to go back to the other slide.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Can we answer that one first?

KATHY KLEIMAN

Yes, but can we go back to the prior slide? Just because it looks like so many reviews could be introduced. Are we going into a non-stop review cycle?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

We're absolutely not doing that at all. So, let's be very clear, ATR five-year cycle can be deferred. Structural review, 15-year cycle, can be deferred. The whole point about on-demand, Kathy, is it is because it's what the community wants. If five SOs and ACs want there to be a review on something that is reviewable, then it should be allowed to happen. It's a very specific topic.

And it seems to me to fly in the face of the multi-stakeholder bottom-up process to be suggesting that that shouldn't be a viable way forward. We have to trust each other and we have to accept that if there is enough of a head of steam up on a topic, then that should be able to be reviewed. It's as simple as that. So, at the end of the day, our goal is that there will be fewer reviews and reviews that are very, very topic-centric and very specific.

ATR is the exception to that because it's a wide -- Well, the structure one is, but ignoring that for a minute. ATR is an exception to that because it's a wide-ranging review on accountability and transparency. And the review scoping committee is not intended to be an ongoing thing. It is an ad hoc. It is a brought-together committee that comes together at very specific times for very specific purposes. And that is the intention of that. So, it seems to me it's exactly the reverse of what it is that you're saying.

BECKY BARR

Chris, if I might. Kathy, it would be great to see some intended scoping limits and some ideas for how much, because five years and 15 years can coincide again with on-demand in one time.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Oh, you're talking about how many reviews can happen at the same time?

BECKY BARR

In part, yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So, as Avri has said, we've got some work to do on that, because there is some disagreement, not disagreement, but some people think that you should only be able to have one review at a time. I think everyone agrees that if you're in the middle of a structural review, which is a big thing, and unless there's an emergency, you probably shouldn't have another review.

But I think people think that there might be possibly two on-demand reviews happening at the same time because one of them might be a review that involves security and stability experts, and another one might be a review that involves consumer trust experts, just as an example. So, I think that we need to work on that, so it's a very good point, and we acknowledge that. Avri.

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, we have Robert on the list, but I wanted to say just two quick things on it. One of the things that I think people are trying to prevent is a priori at this point in the world saying, and you shall never talk about A, B, or C. That basically leaving those things somewhat open to figuring them out as we move along without having to hit another crisis point like we ended up at this point or we ended up at the transition.

We seem to build ourselves rules that keep us from talking about things until there are enough of a crisis for us to start talking about them. The other thing is when you look at thresholds that say getting four or five of the SOs or ACs to agree to do something, that is a very difficult threshold to overcome.

Four or five to agree not to do something might be possible, but four or five to actually say we will engage in a process on this for the next year, that is not easily done. In fact, people have been talking about the thresholds having been set too high because if you need five SOs and ACs to agree with you to do something, that's not going to happen.

So, when you're looking for thresholds, I think some of them, and we can certainly talk about more if people have more, but there is already the notion of a very difficult threshold, which is all of us agreeing that something needs to be done. And I have Robert next.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Kathy, I'll come back to you again. Robert's next, and then we'll go back to Kathy. Robert.

ROBERT GUERRA

Sure. So, first of all, I'd like to thank all three of you for leading us in this adventure. I think one of the challenges, I want to comment on a couple of things that have been mentioned so far. This is a draft for sharing with the community to get feedback. And I think Sebastien and many others are making comments, which I think we will have to talk about and discuss. It is a change in the process of how things are done.

It may seem more complicated. We might need to improve our communication on how it actually will make things simpler or not. In terms of concerns that I've already shared with the group in our meetings, but wanted to echo them with others, is that there are a couple of challenges. I think one of the worries that I and some other colleagues have as well is the process as designed could be gamed by an actor.

And so, we need to make sure that it can't be abused. If far too many submissions for issues to be reviewed come in, it will overwhelm the system. So, how we deal with that is very important. In terms of thresholds and having the community and how they process it, though it's good, it does create an extra burden that different SO/ACs will now have to add in addition to all

the burdens that they have already. And so, that needs to be explained better. How much time will it take? Things like that.

So, some SO/Acs, as they have descriptions for leadership when that takes place, they need to know whether it's them or a delegate, and they have to add processes to be able to accommodate that. And I think then from my view, kind of from the SSAC, is if all topics come in, there are bylaws that say these are key issues that ICANN does that we prioritize.

So, if there is a security issue and the things that was there, do they get prioritized over others and what is emerging and what is not. And so, we've been discussing this, but I think there's people here who haven't. And so, I just wanted to make that aware to everyone. And one last thing, and I'll just say it in Spanish and I'll translate it myself. Thank you very much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

One point you made is because you point about different SOs and ACs operate in different ways, it's absolutely right. For everyone's information, we have met with the chairs of the SOs and ACs and sat with them and explained to them what we think we're going to be asking them to agree to do. And the feedback we've had has been generally very positive with the caveat that I, as a leader, should be allowed to appoint a delegate to the committee rather than having to do it myself.

And I get that because sometimes like the GAC chair, for example, may not necessarily have the time to be the GAC chair and to do this, and I also may be in the same position. So, acknowledged and accepted. And thank you for that. We have about 10 minutes or so left. Kathy, the floor is yours again.

KATHY KLEIMAN

I'm happy to wait if anyone else wants to enter the queue.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

No, you go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Okay. Kathy Kleiman. Avri, what you said about expectations of one review at a time, if that's the case, it would be wonderful to be able to document that in the materials, both for us, or somebody said something about perhaps having one review at a time is the expectation. If that is, let's document that, because that would be very interesting.

AVRI DORIA

It's an item still under discussion. As I say, there are proponents of that. There are proponents of two, and there are proponents of it's a more complicated question than just water two, because it has to do with what phase of a review, et cetera, et cetera. So, it's a question that's certainly being discussed, but it's not a determined.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Well, if there's a way to put it in and set an expectation, that would certainly relieve some of us, and there will be people in the future who will not know about this discussion. So, the more we can document, that would be great in the final report. My question now has to do with scoping and what you mean by scoping.

And I want to share some experience, because scoping is an issue that's being talked about in many areas right now of scoping and charter writing in many areas of the community. With the first WHOIS Review Team, we had broad questions. And we gathered data, and we gathered issues and concerns, and we gathered history that had not been documented before about the WHOIS and why it was the way it was.

Much of it had not been written down in one place before. So, we didn't know many of our issues until we actually dove into the history and the data, which made it harder from a perspective of scoping.

Often the review teams become the experts on their issues and discover, they come in with the tip of the iceberg and discover the rest of the iceberg, whether it's issues and concerns throughout the community or throughout the world or a history that directs us in a certain direction or more about the technology. They become the experts and they find the questions along the way. How does that

work into the scoping and charter process that you're envisioning is that the review team will find its own issues and concerns.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

There's nothing to stop the -- Did you want to say something, Avri? Okay. So, there's nothing to stop the scoping committee from saying there is a -- Let's talk about it under the heading of ATR, because it's just a bit easier that way. So, there's a process for which the SOs and ACs have been asked, what are the topics that you would like to put onto the next Accountability and Transparency Review. And let's just say that, for the sake of discussion, that ALAC says WHOIS.

They wouldn't say that because no one uses WHOIS anymore, but let's not worry about that. WHOIS. Now, if the other SOs and ACs agree that a topic should be WHOIS, it's open to the scoping committee, which I'll say again, is a representative committee, so everything they do is done with the interim. Why are you shaking your head?

KATHY KLEIMAN

So much is going to the scoping committee. We're assuming there are questions and many topics.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

The scoping committee could say, okay, there appears to be a feeling in the community that ATR should do a review on who is. That's it. That's the scope, WHOIS. Now, go away, do that review.

And if all of the SOs and ACs agree that, that they could do that, right? Equally, they could say, well, we think that's too wide a scope for a review.

What we think, talking for each of the communities, go back to At-Large and say, great suggestion, but can you be a bit more specific about what it is you mean by reviewing WHOIS? And then that scoping. It's a management committee, Kathy. It is not a decisional committee. It is a management committee. Avri.

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, let me just add a few things. I think at the beginning, I was hanging out on that same sort of principle is it really works well to have the committee doing its own self-scoping. And the replies that I've gotten that actually, well, it didn't matter whether I was convinced or not because a chair looking for the consensus of the group is that really there are too many elements that are missing from the group.

For example, everything that has to do with costs and bandwidth and all of those things that that group can't do. There's also the notion of doing it prior, doing the scope prior, because all the groups want to be able to pick the right person for the issues that are being discussed. There were other issues with just allowing the committee to go willy-nilly and pick its own topics because they know best is proving problematic to various groups at various times.

So there really was quite a split between the position you're making that, no, the committee knows best what its scope needs to be versus the community knows best what the scope needs to be, and it can get all the advising it needs. So, it really has been a discussion, but I would say, and this is why I sort of find myself going with that, is the consensus that we found within people talking about it is the advantage is on the side of a prior scope.

The community could certainly contribute as much to that scoping exercise. They can go to the experts and get opinions on that. But basically, it is too important to leave it to after the fact that you've picked a committee. The committee's also, oh God, if we put that in the scope, that'll take us an extra lot of work to do.

So, there's all kinds of issues on doing it after that you don't get on doing it before. But there are advantages both ways. But that's why and I think all three of the co-chairs sort of believe that the consensus, not only the group, but a lot of the community we've talked to, except for a few, there are those that disagree, is that the advantages are on the side of doing scoping first and doing scoping with people who are not likely to be the same ones that have to do the review.

You have a conflict of role when you're not only picking the what is reviewed, but the how and doing the review. So, it's a great discussion, and I recommend going back. And you talk about the history. Our history's all there. It's recorded, and when somebody decides they want to do a review of this, not only are all the

committee's meetings recorded, all of the chairs meetings are recorded, and it's all there for someone that really wants to do the deep digging on why we got to where we got.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

We're running out of time. So, I want to just wrap up now. Just to close up. We've got one more slide, which Avri will get to in a second. I just want to say one thing before we close and Avri does the final slide. The feedback is incredibly important and what would be fantastic is if the feedback could also be, I don't like this, what I suggest you do is this. So, Sebastien saying, I've got a simpler suggestion, which he's going to put in writing, is fantastic.

If what you think is, I don't like any of this, I want to go back to the way it was before, fine. Say so. What is very hard to correct off of is, I don't like this without an alternative suggestion about how you think we should deal with it. So, can I ask everyone who wants to provide us with feedback, the document is available for you to look at. You're welcome to send all the information in the document.

You're welcome to send emails into the input list, et cetera, et cetera. Please do that. Please provide us with the feedback. But please tell us what you think we should do instead of what we are suggesting. If you think it shouldn't be 15 years, there's no point in saying it shouldn't be 15 years and then not saying it should be two. I need to know, we need to know what it is you actually think. Avri, take us through the last slide.

AVRI DORIA

Really quite quick here. The release of the draft for public comment is going to be pretty much like a week or two after. We don't do anything the week after. But the week or two after we come, June 26th, is when this one will go out for public comment. There will be a quick update in terms of perhaps some things, but largely it'll be as it is. August 26th is our targeted date.

Yes, not specifically on the day of August 26th. Although June 26th could be actually the day. But is when we plan to release it to the SOs and the ACs for the whole approval cycle. So, there's the SOs and ACs doing their evaluation. Are they with it? Are they not? There's the Board. And then you see the mysterious and next steps. If there's agreement and support in the Board, that's one set of next steps.

And if they look at it and say, you've got to be kidding, that would be another set of next steps. So, thank you all for being here, and thank you all for putting up with it and doing all the writing of these. Really do read it. As I said, I read it again last night with a view of what was I gliding over.

The last time I read it, what paragraph didn't I pay a lot of attention to? And I found out that, oh, that paragraph was full of stuff I should have known. So, please do read it carefully. You have anything?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

That's it, everyone. Take care. See you later.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]