

---

MONTREAL – Fellowship Daily Session  
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 12:00 to 13:30 EDT  
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So, how was the morning today? A lot of sessions, hopefully. Good. So, today our session will be devoted to -- the first part we'll be talking about ICANN Reviews and I will be introducing you, my beautiful colleagues, here, who will talk about ICANN Reviews. And then, the last 15 - 20 minutes, we were requested by Universal Acceptance Steering Committee, the Working Group Chair, Ajay Data, to come here and to talk to you. So, we'll be expecting him coming.

With that, I would like to introduce my colleagues, Jennifer and Negar, who are from ICANN Review Team, and they will introduce themselves as well, so what the particulars they're engaged in. And we'll talk about ICANN Reviews and we'll be looking for interactive sessions and the questions coming from you. Ladies, the floor is yours.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Siranush. Hello, everyone. It's great to be here with you. My name is Negar Farzinnia. I'm a member of ICANN's Multi-stakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives Team at ICANN, and part of the work that my team and I do is oversee and run the Specific Reviews in the Organization. My colleague, Lars, could not be here, with us today, so I'll turn it over to my other colleague, Jennifer Bryce, to introduce herself.

---

***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.***

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, my name is Jennifer Bryce and, like Negar, I work for the ICANN Org in their Reviews Team so I'll cover some of the Organizational Review information a bit later in the presentation.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: In today's presentation, we will be going over a brief introduction to the Reviews. We will talk about the two types of Reviews, Specific and Organizational Reviews. At the end, we will tell you a little bit about how you can participate in these Reviews that are ongoing and then leave some time for questions and answers and help provide more information to you.

So, what are the Reviews? Reviews are anchored in the ICANN Bylaws. They're actually a very critical element and a mechanism to help ensure ICANN's accountability and ensuring that ICANN can maintain a healthy multi-stakeholder model. We have two different types of Reviews, as I noted, Organizational and Specific Reviews.

The Specific Reviews or Reviews that are focusing on, sort of, technical topics. There are four types of Specific Reviews. They are: Accountability and Transparency, Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review, Security Stability and Resiliency Review and the Registration Directory Service.

To tell you a little bit more about them, the Accountability and Transparency Review really looks at the way ICANN collectively works

---

together; the Board, the Org, the Community, relationships between the Board and the GAC, some of the principles that oversee how our Reviews are run.

Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review is actually looking at the new gTLD application round that was concluded a short while ago. We have done one of these Reviews and we have just completed that -- I'll tell you more about it later on in the slides.

The Security, Stability and Resiliency looks at the security of the domain name system. It's a very, very technical Review and is currently ongoing. We have an active Review Team and actually a member of the Review Team that's sitting here with you, Naveed, over there. So feel free to ask him questions afterward if you want.

And last but not least, we have the Registration Directory Service, which is, as some of you may know, used to be referred to as the WHOIS Review. That Review was also just concluded, and I will tell you more about this.

In the ICANN Bylaws, there were some Specifications noted about operating standards. These are supposed to be guidelines to help Review Teams have a standard mechanism for conducting their work, working with the Org and the Community and the processes that are involved in managing different aspects of this specific Reviews.

The Operating Standards is a document that was developed in collaboration between ICANN Org and the Community and the Board, and went through quite a few rounds of Reviews and discussion with

---

the Community and is a very comprehensive document, always open to change. So, as our work progresses, the Operating Standard guidelines could also be updated to include further information about the way we conduct our work. Let me turn it over to Jennifer to give you a brief overview of the Organizational Reviews.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Negar. So, Organizational Reviews are -- they obviously look at the ICANN structures, SOs and ACs, including -- well, as well as the NomCom and excluding the Governmental Advisory Committee. So you can see the SOs and ACs up there that the Organizational Reviews cover.

They're different from the Specific Reviews in that the Organizational Reviews are conducted by an independent examiner, so this is a third party external Organization that conducts the Review and that Organization is selected through a process which I'll get to a little bit later in the presentation.

And these Reviews typically take one year to complete and they happen no less frequently than every five years and much like the Specific Reviews, they are anchored in ICANN's Bylaws.

In terms of Reviews, and we'll go into a bit more detail later, but the Review cycle has -- actually the second Review cycle for these Reviews had just completed with the ccNSO Review, which the independent examiner provided their final report to the Board in August. And so that report is currently under consideration at the moment.

---

So, the next Organizational Review will be the GNSO and that will be the third round of Organizational Reviews and that will kick off again in 2023. However, between now and then, there's a lot of different opportunities to keep up with the Reviews and follow the work of the Reviews and engage with them so we'll get to that in a bit more but I'll hand that back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

So, to get a bit more into details about the Specific Reviews. As noted, they are anchored in Article 4.6 of the ICANN Bylaws. There's actually quite a bit of details about each and every one of these Reviews, a range of scope items that a given Review Team could possibly look at.

One thing that's critical to note here is that Specific Reviews are run by Community-Led Review Teams, as in Members of the Community volunteer, nominate themselves for the role of participating in the Reviews, and based on criteria and their expertise and the skill set as it matches with the requirements that are listed for possible Members who participate in the Review. The Review Team Members are selected by SOs and ACs.

Review Team Members do not necessarily have to be an official member of a given supporting Organization or Advisory Committee. However, when they do submit their application, they should seek nomination to be supported by one of the SOs or ACs.

And again, the SOs and ACs, based on the skill set criteria, background, diversity and a lot of other factors, nominate up to seven

---

Members for a given Review Team. And of course, that list gets tailored down because each Review Team cannot contain more than 21 Review Team Members.

And so, this allows for representation of all the SOs and ACs, essentially in the work of the Reviews, allows for differing viewpoints to come together. These Review Team Members are all volunteers, they all have their own full-time day jobs and they give their valuable time to come in the ICANN community and help us make progress towards having a better internet down the line and in the future.

I will go back one slide because I wanted to talk to you about the process of the Specific Reviews. In general, once the Review Team has been assembled, the work of the Review officially begins.

We go into planning the Review. The Review Team Members get together, they start thinking about what scope items they want to undertake for a given Review that they're focusing on, and they start doing the research and analysis, their findings. And eventually formulate a draft report with a set of issues and findings that will lead them into coming up with recommendations that would address those issues and findings.

This is, again, a cross-functional, cross-community work, meaning that once the draft report is ready, it will be published for public comment, so that all community Members, all SOs and ACs and any participants in the ICANN world, can comment on the report and provide their

---

input in terms of any issues or concerns that they see, any support that they see with the draft recommendations.

And those comments are then considered by the Review Team Members to assess whether they need to make any changes to their draft report and their draft recommendations. And once they've taken community input under consideration and they'll make any changes that they deem necessary into their report, they will, throughout the lifetime of the Review, finalize their report, and then officially submit that report to the Board for action.

What does that mean when they submit it to the Board for action? So again, there are details about this process listed in the Bylaws. The Board has up to six months from the date that they receive the final report, to review the report, get community feedback on the final report, and assess their recommendations and decide which recommendations they may want to accept or reject, with all the associated rationale.

All of this information will then be published for community input and throughout this process there will be a lot of communication and dialogue between the Board and the Community, and any Review Team Members who wish to engage in the ongoing work.

Once the Board decides on the recommendations, they will pass a resolution with the official document that details out their actions and the rationale for their actions, and essentially, the implementation

---

part of the process begins, that will implement all the recommendations that the Board has accepted.

These are just some high-level items about the methodology that the Review Teams employ. Everything that we do at ICANN is open and transparent. The work of the Review Teams is open and transparent, all of the calls and meetings are recorded, all of the email exchanges that are done on the mailing list are archived and open to public.

We maintain Wiki pages for each of the Reviews that houses all of this information, so everyone is more than welcome to look at these pages and look at the progress of the work of the Review Team. And in addition to that, you can participate as observers, meaning that you can sit in on the meetings if you're here in person or you can dial into the telephonic meetings that the Review Team has, you can read their mailing lists, observers typically don't get a chance to provide input. However, you can do just that, observe and just see the progress of work and follow the work of the Review Team.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: There are a couple of questions now, should we take it now?

ROLLA HAMZA: Rolla Hamza from Egypt, ICANN66 Fellow. Regarding to the previous slide, can we go to the previous slide, please. Not this one. This one, yeah. What happens if the Board rejects the Review? Is it going back to the -- conduct other Review? Or it's going to have a focus group or



---

something like that to modify or work on the rejected Reviews? Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Sure. Thank you for your question, a great question actually. So to clarify, the Board doesn't reject the Review, but it could reject the recommendations that result from a Review.

In the event that the Board does decide to reject certain recommendations, under the Bylaws, the Board is obligated to provide a detailed rationale as to why they're rejecting your recommendation. If a recommendation is rejected, it will not be picked back up during this cycle of Reviews. However, these Reviews are cyclical meaning that they happen at around every five years.

So if the issue that was a for some reason rejected in the past or the recommendation that was rejected in the past, if the next cycle of Reviews that begin under the future Review Teams look at it, and they deem it an issue again, and they would want to issue recommendations, the issue could always be picked back up or the recommendation could always be in some form re-recommended.

Typically, the Board does everything they can not to reject recommendations because that's not their goal. These Reviews are quite important to the work of ICANN, to the Community, to the Board and the Org. and the goal is that we have these independent Review Teams that are conducting research and analysis and they find areas

---

for improvement. So in the event that something is rejected, there is a good rationale for it, and not because they just disagree with it.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Mohit.

MOHIT BATRA: Good afternoon. My question is this, why is there no GAC Review? And, second, there's an observation that in ICANN Learn portal, I also took a course for all of these Reviews. So this is a very nice step that ICANN has taken. Okay and there are some other Reviews, like Trademark Clearinghouse, the TMCH Review, and New gTLD program implementation Review. So are they all managed together? Because these slides, for these two Reviews which I'm saying, are not mentioned here. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I can answer your first question, and then I'll hand it to Negar. And so, the Bylaws state that the GAC has its own Review mechanisms. It's actually, you know, quite a unique body within the ICANN environment, so it has its own separate Review mechanisms that are not covered under the Organizational Review.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you and regarding the second part of your question. Yes, there are other Reviews that are called out like you said, the Trademark

---

Clearinghouse, there is another Review called IFR Reviews, Review of the IANA function, or the PTI. Our Team doesn't manage those Reviews. Those are managed by separate Teams. And if you have any specific questions about those, I suggest that you submit the questions through Siranush, to their organization, and I'm sure someone will get back to you with the answer to clarify.

MOHIT BATRA: Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Mary Rose, and then Fidya.

MARY ROSE RONTAL: Good Noon. My name is Mary Rose, I'm from the Philippines. So I'm wondering how long does it take for the entire process to finish and when was the last Review conducted and when's the next? Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sure. I'm actually loving the Q&A because you guys are covering the slides, so we are going to skip through a lot of them.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So probably it's better to go [CROSSTALK]

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No, no, no, this is fine. This is good. I think --

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Okay.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: -- it's building the discussion quite well. So typically, with the exception of the Accountability and Transparency Review, which is mandated under the Bylaws to take only one year, the other Reviews do not have a duration limit at the moment. On average, Reviews take anywhere between 12 to 18 months, if the Review is done.

If the, you know, the scope items and the amount of work has been taken under consideration, they could take longer. We've had, the very first round of the Competition, Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice Review, that actually took considerably longer because there was a lot of research and studies that had to be done for that Review. And our other Reviews are currently ongoing.

Like I said, the CCT Review just finished its very first cycle because it's dependent on the new round of gTLDs and we've only had one, so far. Accountability and Transparency is currently ongoing and it's on its third round. The Security, Stability and Resiliency Review is currently ongoing and it's on its second round and RDS Review, the Registration Directory Service, is technically the second round of the WHOIS Review that just concluded, with the final report being submitted to the Board, beginning of September.

---

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Fidy.

FIDYA SHABRINA: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Fidy from Indonesia. I am ICANN66 Fellow. I want to highlight about your previous explanation regarding the Independent Party and the rendering process. So, can you please explain, does it means that the ICANN involves external parties, like probably consultants to do this Review? Because, as you know, to be held accountable an Organization have to be Reviewed by those outside of the Organization. If not, how can the Community be sure that this Organization is accountable to what they are doing? Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. So, that's exactly right. The Organizational Reviews are conducted by a third party independent examiner and so the Organization or Advisory Committee that's under Review, forms actually a Review Working Party and that's of Members from that SO and AC who volunteer to be a part of their group.

There's no limit on the numbers of that, usually it's around 7 to 10 people. And they work very closely together with the Org and with the independent examiner throughout the Review process. There's various stages at which the Review Work Party input is more heavy than others but it's very much a working together relationship.

---

And the Review Work Party follows the work of the Review throughout, there's usually bi-weekly or monthly calls, whereby the Reviewer Party can provide, you know, clarifications or corrections to the independent examiner, as well as the Org as well.

And as with Specific Reviews, all the work is on the Wiki, anybody can join the call as observers and so, that's how we make sure that the independent examiner is -- and there's a very clear scope as well, that's laid out and published in the request for proposals, that the independent examiner must stick to and a lot of that is grounded in the Bylaws. Again, the Review Work Party can contribute to the scope prior to its publication, provide some inputs. They can't necessarily force something to be in there, but they can certainly advise. Does that answer your question?

FIDYA SHABRINA:

Yeah. Can we just make a quick follow up on that? Like, does that mean the Independent Party can be like proposing if they can conduct the Review? Or how does it work? Like, is there any particular geographical proximity that they have to comply to? Or are there criteria that they have to fulfill in order that they can be the Independent Party to Review ICANN? Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

So, yeah, in their request for proposals there is a very clear guidelines as to the expertise that this independent examiner needs to have. There's no requirements from where they come from, or who

---

specifically they are, but it's quite a fine line in terms of having the experience --

As you have probably learned, you know ICANN ecosystem is quite unique and so being able to have the experience to understand exactly how it works, but also be impartial is something that we have had some challenges with in the past round of Reviews.

And so, one of the things that we're looking at for the next round of Reviews is how can we get more people to put themselves forward to be the independent examiner because it is a very narrow pool of applicants that we've had for the second round, just simply because there aren't that many Organizations who have had the skill sets and expertise to conduct the Review but also remain impartial.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And we'll take one more question. Mili, from there, and we'll continue -

MILI SEMLANI: Thank you. So my question is about how often do new Reviews enter the ecosystem and who initiates it, at what stage does it happen? Is it at the SO/AC level or at the Board level?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you for your question. So, as noted in the Bylaws, currently the way it is stated in the Bylaws, and I say currently because this might

---

change in the future, but currently, the way it is stated in the Bylaws, the Reviews are clocked off at a five-year cycle and what triggers the five year cycle is the Review Team being formed.

Meaning, for example, if the ATRT 3 Review Team started their work, beginning of April of 2019, five years from that point is when or a little bit before the five years from that point, we will start the process of calling for volunteers.

This process is kicked off by the Board and then initiated by the ICANN Org, whereas ICANN Org publishes a call for volunteers, publishing in consultation with the SOs and ACs and the chairs and the leadership's of the various constituencies, come to an agreement on the requirements and skill sets and diversity and all the essential elements that have to go into the call for volunteers, and then this document is published for a period of time, remains open so that we receive applications for anyone who wishes to nominate themselves for the Review.

The list of the nominees and this was an ACS that they were seeking nominations from, and then receive the complete list. It is shared with SOs and ACs and they will go through the process of determining who they want to nominate for a role on a given Review Team. Like I said, they can nominate up to 7 individuals from each SOs and ACs and then ultimately, the SOAC Chairs limit that number down to 3 Members from each SOs and ACs that are then selected for the Review Team.



---

So the actual selection happens by the SOs and ACs, the process is kicked off by the Board through a resolution and ICANN Org initiated by publishing a call for volunteers. I think we can skip a lot of these slides because you guys asked amazing questions. I think you've done your research, nicely done all of you.

So I'm not actually going to go through this in detail, also, like I said, we currently have 2Reviews in progress ATRT3 is a third round of Accountability and Transparency Review. The Review Team is in the middle of conducting the research on findings, and they are just about to publish their draft report for public comments, so feel free to follow up on this, read their draft report when it gets published. This is expected in December of this year.

The SSR2 Review is also in the phase of conducting its Review, they have made tremendous progress in drafting their recommendations and putting the research and findings together. Currently, the Review Team is looking to publish their draft report for public comments, early next year, possibly beginning of February, so keep an eye out for that. It's a very technical Review and probably has quite some interest to most of you.

The RDS Review was submitted as a final report to the Board in September so the Board is working to Review the final recommendations and take actions on them. Board action is expected early March of next year, and last but not least CCT Review concluded last year in September the final report was submitted to the Board and the Board took action by March of 2019, it is now in the

---

implementation phase, there are certain recommendations that were fully accepted which ICANN Org is working on planning for implementation and moving it forward.

Certain recommendations were put into a pending status to, for the Board to get more information and gain some clarity around the recommendations and a number of recommendations were then passed through to other parts of the Community where the Board doesn't have the remit to take action, such as policy-related recommendations. So they're all in the works and with that, Jennifer, take it over, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Negar. So, yeah, we've already covered quite a bit of this already, thanks to your questions, but let's go over specifically some of the scope items. So if you look at the third bullet, which talks about the goal of the Organizational Reviews and this text actually is written into the ICANN Bylaws.

So these three items for each Organization Review the independent examiner must provide a Review of so, that is whether the Organization, Council or Committee has a continuing purpose within the ICANN structure and if the answer is 'yes', whether any changes in the structure or operations are desirable to improve its effectiveness and then whether that Organization Council or Committee is actually accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups and others.

---

So those three things form the core of every Organizational Review, there are other elements that may be built-in and they formed the RFP the Request For Proposals, but this is the groundwork and then also, I'm not quite sure why it's not on here, but the Organizational Reviews usually look at the prior recommendations from the prior round of Reviews and whether those recommendations were implemented as well.

As I said, these Reviews are conducted no less frequently than every five years and that is from the moment that the Board receives the final report from the relevant Review Working Group. Okay, so the process is similar to this Specific Review. So in the Plan Review phase, I covered a bit of this earlier, that the Organization under Review will form a Review Working Group.

That's kind of the first thing that happens then ICANN Org publishes a Request for Proposals, which includes the scope and the Specific skills and expertise that we're looking for, for the independent examiner to conduct the Review.

As I said, the Review Work Party is able to share some input into that as well and that procurement process follows the standard ICANN procurement steps. Then Conduct Review Phase which is the second box there forms the main chunk of time, within the one year of the Review, and so this is when the Independent Examiner conducts their work and so usually they will look at documents and operating principles of the Organization under Review and they conduct interviews with Members of the Organization to Review, people who

---

have interacted with that, and often its Board Members, former Board Members, staff, community Members who are interested or have followed the work of that SO and AC.

So we usually conduct that quite early in the process, in the first couple of months, usually the numbers in the past round were about 40 to 50 interviewees, they also put out a survey, so anybody again, who has knowledge or has feedback to share on that particular Organization or Advisory Committee, then the independent examiner takes a look at the input that they have recently, and based on that they put together an assessment report and this is really the first time that the findings are shared with the general community for feedback and so this first assessment report phase is simply the findings.

At this point, there are no recommendations, there's not even really any formulation of recommendations. It's just, 'Here's what we found, do you agree with us?' that particular report goes out for public consultation. Yes?

ROLLA HAMZA:

Rolla Hamza --

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:

Rolla, can you talk closer to the mic for the interpretation purposes?

---

ROLLA HAMZA: Okay. Rolla Hamza, for the records. I wonder why there's no books for the Board action? That means that they don't need the Board action in that Review? Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks for the question. So, actually there's Board action at two times, well a number of times actually, the first is to kick off the Review, the Board actually passes a resolution to say, this particular Review starts and then they also accept the final report from the Independent Examiner and they accept a feasibility assessment which is a little bit later on.

So I'll get to the Board action, but thank you for reminding me to mention that. So, yeah, so after the assessment report, you know, the independent examiner takes the feedback, they consider that in building their recommendations, and then they publish a draft report for public comment and again, that's, you know, the Community can share their feedback. Then the Independent Examiner will take that feedback and produce a final report which it shares with the ICANN Board and at that stage, the Community under Review the SO and AC under Review, also forms a Review work implementation.

DECIMA COREA: For clarity, please. Decima Corea, ICANN66 Fellow from Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. You said something about the Independent Examiner but you ran straight ahead so I don't get it? Could you please repeat what you just said?

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, I think I was talking about when the Independent Examiner submits his final report to the Board after that stage, and the Review Work Party will react to the recommendations from the Independent Examiner.

So they put together a feasibility assessment of those recommendations which are then both the feasibility assessment from the SO and AC under Review and the final report from the Independent Examiner are considered by the Board and then the Board will take action to ask the improvements to be implemented, so this side is very high level and I covered a lot, so again, you know, I'm sure Siranush can give you our email addresses and we'll be happy to answer additional questions.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And I will be sharing this slide with you as well.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. Okay, so I think I covered a lot of this actually, in the previous slide, this talks just about the Review Working Party and how does how the Members of that Review Work Party are selected, so I'm going to move on.

Yeah, this is a good slide to talk, as I said, the Independent Examiner is completely independent as you would guess by its name, from the Organization under Review and knowledgeable about ICANN and

---

familiar with these processes, this is the bullet point, I said, can be tricky to balance with somebody who is independent, the first two bullets are kind of like, 'How do we make sure that we can achieve both of those things' and then throughout the whole Review process, there's community outreach via engagement sessions, and they generally come to ICANN meetings and present their findings, as I said, there is public consultation and public comment throughout the Review process as well.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Jennifer, there is a question from a remote participant where they can find the slides, are they uploaded somewhere or I can just ask the email address and send this to them?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, yeah sure, do you want to post them?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So I can post it to our today's session schedule and they can download from there. Thank you. Yes, Benjamin, please.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Hello, my name is Benjamin Akinmoyeje and I'm ICANN66, Fellow. I'm speaking in my own capacity. So I just wanted to ask, in Organizational Reviews, I know from my little understanding that Organizations have things that make them who they are, the

---

stakeholder -- has there been any Review that has tried to change the culture of an Organization, maybe because they are annoying or not very cooperative? So, yeah. Is there a possibility of that?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

So, by nature of the Review itself, yes, sir, absolutely, you know, there is the possibility that that would happen. In the second round of Reviews, you know, they were always found to be generally service continuing purpose all the three items are effective, obviously, there's room for improvement, hence the recommendations but so far nothing has significantly changed in the culture in terms of an outcome of the Review.

MARY ROSE RONTAL:

Mary Rose again, for the record. You mentioned about the independent examiner, but maybe mention a bit about how it's being formed, who composed the independent examiner and how they're being formed?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

So the independent examiner is generally a Team of consultants, it can be one person, but generally, it's a Team of people because it's quite a large amount of work.

Anybody can apply to do that, so as long as they, you know, meet the selection criteria, so they'll apply to the ICANN Organization and explain exactly in their application, how they intend to meet the



---

requirements, then there's an interview process and then it's a final selection process based on, it's a very standard scoring system that the procurement process uses.

And then there's also the Review Work Party which maybe is helpful to touch back on again, and that is the group of volunteers from within the SO and AC that is under Review, that is simply formed by people who volunteer to be a part of the Review who are happy to contribute a bit of their time to helping out with the Review process and so there's no specific criteria for that other than, you know, they're a member of the SO or AC under Review, and all of these meetings between the Review Work Party and the independent examiner are open to anybody to observe.

MARY ROSE RONTAL:

So the independent examiner is commissioned by ICANN Org and are they being paid?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Yes, so they are being paid, yes, it's paid work. So quickly then I will cover the slide up here, so as I mentioned the second round of Reviews is just kind of come to an end in terms of the work of the independent examiner and that was the ccNSO Review, which as I said, they submitted their final report to the Board in August.

And so, at the moment, the ccNSO itself is conducting that feasibility assessment that I mentioned, so, they are kind of taking a look at the

---

recommendations from the independent examiner and they will produce a report in the next couple of months that provides their input and the Board will consider in terms of how feasible the recommendations actually are to implement.

The RSSAC is also in that process as well as the SSAC, they're a little bit ahead, they will submit their implementation oh no sorry, they're in the implementation plan phase, so after the Board takes action on to accept the final report and the feasibility assessment from the Review Work Party, then the Board instructs the SO or AC under Review to form an implementation Team.

And so they will then be responsible for drafting the implementation plan, that instructs, you know, the ICANN Org Board how to actually implement the recommendations.

So again, I'm happy to answer questions about any of these. The Noncom Review just had a session this morning here at ICANN66, I believe the ccNSO had a quick session during their meeting on Tuesday, but I don't believe that any of the other ones are actually working on this particularly at ICANN66.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Okay, so we already sort of briefly talked about this 'How to participate. These Reviews like Jennifer and I pointed out are open, transparent and available to anyone to participate. You can do so by going to the web page listed here.

---

There are always opportunities to participate. The information is listed, it's often blogged about as well, you can ask to join an observer's mailing list and get information about meetings. If you do become an observer, you will get meeting invites for decisions. These meetings again, you can listen in, you won't be able to speak back to the Review Team telephonically if the sessions are taking place face to face.

You're more than welcome to go sit at a decision, like we have many observers here today and just listen to the dialogue; you can always participate in the public comment processes and provide input to the Review Team.

So there's a lot more information on this page that once you get the slide deck, you can dive into and find the different ways you can participate in the various opportunities there are for the Reviews.

This page just highlights the various community facing pages that contain all the detailed information about the Reviews throughout the lifetime of the Review. So these web pages are very content intense. So take some time, go through them. If you have any questions, please do let us know we are more than happy to provide guidance where needed and with that, I'll just leave it open to see if there any other questions.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Any final questions to our presenters? If not, I would like just to thank you, for you coming here and your time, I will be sharing the

---

presentation and will there be any questions, feel free to send them to me and I will coordinate the response to get a response for you. Thank you very much, ladies.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you and I see Naveed run away but I would really encourage you to talk to him and get some input from somebody who's participating in our Review.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: We'll catch him tomorrow. Thanks, everyone.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you very much. So, we have a lovely guest today, Ajay Data. Am I pronouncing correctly?

AJAY DATA: Yes.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So, Ajay Data is a Chair for Universal Acceptance Steering Group and he raised this issue yesterday at the public forum that why Fellows are not engaged in this communication, so we made our session a bit flexible and invited our dear Dr. Ajay to talk to you and to introduce 'What is this universal acceptance?' and 'How can Fellows be a part of this and how they can become an Ambassador for this important

---

topic?' Ajay, without further ado, we have 15 minutes, so the floor is yours.

AJAY DATA:

Thank you very much, Siranush, thank you for inviting me here. How many of you know universal acceptance? So, some of them do, some of them not. So let me take this opportunity to talk about the universe acceptance a little bit.

Universal Acceptance is about promoting a concept, where all the domain names and all email addresses are treated equally. It looks simple and you might wonder that is it not really happening?

But because there is a problem, this Universal Acceptance Steering Group was formed in 2015, to solve this global issue. If there's kind of a bug in the software or on a website, which we encourage people to solve, so that the people who adopt audience or long top-level domain names are able to communicate in their own preferred way or a language in their fashion.

So, how many of you know long top-level domain name exist? Doing you know long top-level, this is a terminology? So, long top-level domain name means top-level domain name is the right side of the dot. There is a domain name and there is a dot in between.

So, what is the right side of the dot is a top-level domain name and the left side is the second level domain name. So top-level domain name

---

used to be of three characters .com, .net dot .org when the Internet started way back three decades almost.

Now, with time, ICANN have started pushing Country code top-level domain names, which are of two characters like .us, .it, .in, you must be having Country code level in your own Country. With the change of the internet now, a new round came up, where you could have a top-level domain name of your choice, which could go up to 64 characters.

So now instead of a three character, it could work to 64 characters. Just keep this in your mind, so that you know when the programmers started developing the software, like browsers, email applications, they thought that there can be only three characters after the dot and they programmed it that way.

They did not realize that this problem can occur and we can have more characters in the domain name, and this created a Universal Acceptance issue.

Another problem came when ICANN started offering IDNs, Internationalized Domain Name, a domain name in your script, in your language, so now you could have a domain name in the language of your choice. Almost 60+ countries have adopted these domain names, where you could have an Arabic domain name or a Chinese domain name or a Hindi domain name. In India, we have 15, top-level domain names in different scripts, different languages.

So you could imagine that people now are likely to have not just gmail.com in English, people could have mail.India or mail.China in

---

their own script, not in English words. IDNs are supposed to have at least one non-ASCII character in a name to qualify as IDN.

This created a problem because programmers, their one problem is that they assumed that there can be only three characters after the dot and second assumption they did, that there could be only an ASCII in the domain name, which is not true. Now, you could have Unicode characters in the domain names.

So, now it requires a change. It does not require a change only on the front end, it requires a change also in the JavaScript, in the programming languages, in the functions and procedures, into the database, the way you store it.

So, Universal Acceptance have five principles to be UA ready: Accept, Validate, Process, Store and Display. I will repeat. Accept, which means what?

So if you have a website and I have an email address in Hindi, for example, `ajay@data.parrott` which is written in Hindi script, you could imagine in your own script, if you are very comfortable with that, and if I write that the script in your input box where I have to subscribe for a newsletter, also contact your website or subscribe to any -- imagine on icon on eBay or a railway ticket. If I use that email address will the website accept this, allow me to type, don't give me any error?

Second is to Validate. Second is when I press a submit button, it does not invalidate it. So validation should happen as per the standards of domain name rules or the email address rules, so that the email

---

address is completely validated, even if it is validated it, it should not be rejected as an invalid email address.

Third is Process, which means whatever work is required for that email address, if I am buying a ticket, if I am buying a material merchandise that invoice should come to me on that email, there is a process which somebody has to do.

Then you are sure to Store it well, so that wherever is required to use, let us say in browsers, if I have an email address or a domain name if I want to bookmark it, the browser should be able to store it in a bookmark or a history, the way I have typed it, not just reject it, or lose the formatting or the characters.

And the fifth is Display. So if I go back and want to see that domain name or email address, it should be displayed back the same way. So if you have the website, which you are interested in, if you have working in an Organization where you are having a website, you can try and see that you have an email address or you have an email address which you can type in any character set of your choice and try to form an email address, valid for email address, and see whether your Organization or your school, or your university, accepts that email address or not.

If they are not, then they are not UA ready. Now UA is important. I think, is any clear? Anybody want to ask a question here about the clarity? Because we have less time. Yeah.



---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just, sorry. Can you repeat the fourth one?

AJAY DATA: Okay. Accept, Validate, Process, Store and Display.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, thank you.

AJAY DATA: Yes. Yes.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Okay. We have only nine minutes and there is a session at 1:30, so we need to leave the room. Rocio, we'll go as far --

AJAY DATA: Quickly.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: -- as much time, as we have. Rocio, we'll start from you.

ROCIO DE LA FUENTE: Thank you. Rocio de la Fuente. I wanted to ask you, I saw that ccNSO had a session on a policy update for IDN ccTLDs -- if the Universal Acceptance Steering Group is going to participate on that policy update? Thank you.

---

AJAY DATA: No, we don't. I do participate. I am part of ccNSO council, but not as the chair of UASG. So this is a different ambit. Once the domain names come in life then our work starts. Yeah.

GABRIEL JIMENEZ: Hi, my name is Gabriel Jimenez. I'm a Fellow, group Fellow. I will speak by myself. I'm going to speak in Spanish. Could you please put the -- 'I understand that the biggest problem that Universal Acceptance has is that the programs are reading in English, rather than in other languages, where people are programming and creating new information systems, is that correct?'

AJAY DATA: It's not about the language problem, it's about when they created a input box for an email address, they put the checking that only [inaudible] is allowed or numbers are allowed, not the Unicode characters. And this is what requires to be added in that script, so that English is only allowed but all the Unicode valid code points which are required in as far as standards are validated in that string.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Lilian, please.

---

LILIAN KAMARA: Hello. My name is Lilian Kamara, ICANN66 Fellow from Uganda. I have a question, how long has this initiative been in existence and how can we participate as Fellows?

AJAY DATA: Excellent question, Lilian. I appreciate this. It started in 2015. I want all of you, I want to give you a website, UASG.tech. I will just repeat, UASG.tech and next time when you come to ICANN look for Universal Acceptance as your favorite topic and block your timings around that because we had many sessions during ICANN and I wish I could have talked to you in the last ICANN.

This is a topic which is for you. This is a topic for your community, who would like to participate in their own language; the people who would like to adopt internet in their own language and would like to break the barrier of just being dependent on English.

This is one of the very important topics and ICANN has the strategic plan in between 2021 to 2025, Universal Acceptance is a part of the Strategic Action Plan. So you can imagine that their entire focus is there, on Universal Acceptance and we all need, all of us have to work together to bring in the next billion people online.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Ajay, what I suggest, can you send us some brief links or information as we don't have the PowerPoint from you or any PowerPoint from

---

you, which I can share with the Fellows where they can find the links and the information so they can deep dive further into that info?

AJAY DATA: I was trying to pull my PowerPoint only, but I will send you the PowerPoint and the links both, they're at the end of the [inaudible] so that you can share with everybody. That could be very, very good.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Excellent, and we will take only last question, please.

YAZID AKANHO: Thank you very much. Is not a question, actually is a contribution. Yazid is my name, I'm coming from Benin, ICAN66 Fellow. We were lucky, in Benin, to have received the workshop on Universal Acceptance and after that workshop we actually did some tests.

We collected 100 domain names, we checked the mail servers and we checked if they were already Universal Acceptance and out of 128 mail servers we tested, only 37 where Universal Acceptance ready. So less than 40%. So it means that yes, you are true, there is a job we have to do that.

AJAY DATA: Exactly, thank you for validating my point in a practical sense and you are making my job easier for validating this point. Thank you for that and I think we have two-three minutes more.

---

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yeah. The guys are gathering already here.

AJAY DATA: So I think we understood the problem, right? Now, how do you participate? That's very important. You should visit UASG.tech website, and go to the bottom of the website, there are working groups. You can join those working groups. There are working groups for technology, there are working groups for communication, measurement, local initiatives, you can join in any of the working group you'd like to.

And if not, you can join the bigger work mailing list, where the entire communication happens. So we have around 450+ Members in that mailing list. So you just visit UASG.tech/subscribe.

UASG.tech/subscribe and you'll be able to sign up. Everybody's welcome. We do not have any filtration mechanism. You are welcome. You will be registered and you will start receiving email from UASG and you can start participating from there. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Excellent. Thank you very much, and see you in other sessions. With that, this meeting is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**