
ICANN83 | Prep Week – ICANN Board Engagement with the ICANN Community
Wednesday, May 28, 2025 – 18:30 to 19:30 CEST

WENDY PROFIT

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN Board Engagement Session with the Community. The topic is Reviews. My name is Wendy, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Interpretation for this session will include French and Spanish.

If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, unmute your microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, including the language you will speak if other than English and speak at a reasonable pace for our scribes and interpreters. I will now hand the floor over to the chair of the ICANN Board of Directors, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Wendy. Welcome, everyone, and thank you for joining us for this engagement opportunity ahead of ICANN83 in Prague. First of all, the Board and I would like to thank you for embracing the concept of these Prep Week Community Board sessions that we started roughly a year ago. It is a great occasion for interested

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.

community members to talk directly with us on specific topics and we very much value this time together.

We have listened to your comments from past sessions and input on the format. And as a result, rather than having breakout room conversations, we will spend this 60-minute session on a single plenary topic. Today our discussion will focus on reviews. Over the past several meetings, the Board has heard strong interest from the ICANN community to rethink our review processes, to evolve and adapt to the future. On Monday, the 19th of May, the Board passed several resolutions towards the future reviews.

First, we've asked Kurtis and Org to prepare a plan for a community dialogue, including a key engagement session at the ICANN84 meeting. To allow for further ongoing work in the SOs and ACs on continuous improvement activities and broad community participation in a robust community dialogue on reviews, we concluded the current Pilot Holistic Review. The Board also resolved not to initiate the fourth Accountability and Transparency Review, ATRT4, at this time, but rather to consider next steps following the community dialogue.

The Board also confirmed that the Continuous Improvement Program should progress as planned and that organizational reviews are deferred until the first cycle of the CIP is complete. On behalf of the Board, I'd like to express my deep thanks to the entire Pilot Holistic Review Team for their hard work, as well as to the ICANN community for your continued commitment to ensuring

that our reviews process continues to serve its purpose to assess our accountability, transparency, and effectiveness.

Today with this engagement session, we wish to continue our dialogue with you to define the path ahead. Alan Barrett and Becky Burr will lead this conversation. You're encouraged to share your thoughts on what success looks like and how we can achieve this together. We will spend the next 45 minutes in discussion and we'll use the remaining time to summarize our main points. So, without any further delay, Alan, Becky, the floor is yours.

ALAN BARRETT

Thank you very much, Tripti, for that introduction. This is Alan Barrett, and Becky and I will be leading the session. So let me say a few words about what got us to this point. ICANN has been doing reviews for roughly 15 years since the affirmation of commitments, and it's also about almost 10 years since the IANA transition that also added a requirement for reviews encoded in the bylaws. So, reviews have greatly contributed to what ICANN does today.

But over the past 10 or 15 years, ICANN and the Policy Development Process and the community's needs have all evolved. So, things don't remain static. And so today, there's a sense that the current way we do reviews is no longer really fit for purpose. Recommendations from reviews have often been difficult to implement, taking a very long time. Also, there's a sentiment in some parts of the community that there's just not

enough bandwidth to do all the reviews at the cadence which is specified in the bylaws.

And so, the Board has made some decisions as Tripti explained. And the Board is very much committed to ICANN remaining accountable and transparent and effective. So, we have deferred some reviews, but that's not because we're trying to get away from accountability. That's because we want to better align the community needs to the way we do reviews. And the Board has the responsibility to ensure that the ICANN work best matches the community needs.

So, we're planning a community dialogue. This is not that dialogue. This is just to talk about how the dialogue might proceed. So let me hand over to Becky for a further introduction and then we'll move on to discussion. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

I don't really have much to add other than this is a very important conversation and a very important initiative that we're kicking off today. And we expect to work closely with the community in order to identify the best way forward to ensure that ICANN continues to remain accountable as the landscape evolves. So back to you, Alan, and carry on.

ALAN BARRETT

Okay. Thank you, Becky. So today, this is not the dialogue that Tripti talked about. We're planning that at the next ICANN meeting

towards the end of the year. Today, what we would like to do is to conduct some brainstorming about how to plan the dialogue. So, we'd like to hear what suggestions you might have for an efficient process. Maybe we should have some calls with a small group or something to collect information and we anticipate that that'll lead towards a plenary session at the ICANN84 meeting. So, we'd also like to know how can the community, Board and Org best work together to prepare for active engagement? I'm sure you've got lots of ideas, so let's hear them. The queue is open.

BECKY BURR

We've got absolute silence here. I think everybody is still contemplating. So, I think maybe we can say a little bit more, but I see Anne's hand. So, Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, thanks so much, Alan and Becky. I'm just wondering if we could post a link to the Board Resolution. I don't know. I think it's probably new information for many people and so it'd probably be good if somebody would actually go through the main points. I don't know.

BECKY BURR

Sure, that makes perfect sense. Wendy, can you put the Board-
- Oh, Karen Lentz has done that and it is in there. Alan, do you want to walk through this resolution or shall I?

ALAN BARRETT

Oh, I can do it. Yeah, just give me a few seconds to open it to refresh my memory. Yeah, so it was a little more than a week ago on the 19th of May, the Board had discussions about reviews for a long time and more than a year ago in 2023, the Board resolved to defer ATRT4 for a year. And recently, the Board revisited that decision and decided to defer it again.

We've had a Pilot Holistic Review and the chairs of the Pilot Holistic Review found that it was difficult for them to see the objectives. And we've had letters from various parts of the community to the Board about reviews. And taking all that into account, the Board has decided to-- Let's see, I'm looking at the resolve clauses here. The Board directed the president and CEO to initiate work to design a review program that is fit for the intended purpose of enhancing ICANN's accountability, transparency and effectiveness.

So that's what we're talking about here. We're in the very first stages of designing a review program. And we feel that we can do some brainstorming here. Then maybe we'll, as a result of this brainstorming, I don't know what might come out of it, but maybe it'll be a proposal for a small committee or working group or some such thing, which will then produce some suggestions to discuss at the ICANN84 meeting.

The Board also resolved that the Continuous Improvement Program should progress and that all the organizational reviews

will continue to be deferred until the Continuous Improvement Program produces first set of results. The Board decided to conclude or stop the Pilot Holistic Review, again, to allow further work on continuous improvements and on the community dialogue that we've been talking about. And so, we don't know whether or not the Pilot Holistic Review will ever be restarted in the same form. It could be that something completely different comes out of it.

The Board decided to again defer the ATRT4 pending the community dialogue and to continue deferral of the security and stability review and the registration data services specific reviews until the community dialogue can perform the next steps. And there's more, but that's the essence of it. The Board decided to defer a whole bunch of reviews to let the Continuous Improvement Program carry on and to initiate planning for a complete overhaul of the way we do reviews. Okay, Anne, back to you.

BECKY BURR

Well, let me just add just a little bit more background. We have had 15 years of experience with Specific Reviews initially under the affirmation of commitments and nearly 10 years since the IANA transition in 2016. The reviews have contributed greatly, but the multi-stakeholder policy development process and the community needs have also evolved significantly. And there's a sense both at the Board level and what we've heard from the

community that the current review models may not be fit for purpose.

And so, we think that the current review recommendations have been difficult to implement in a manner that demonstrates ICANN's ongoing accountability which is the purpose of these reviews. So to be clear, the Board is committed to ensuring that ICANN remains accountable, transparent and effective, but in order to accomplish this, it's our view that we need to better align community needs and the maturity of ICANN to develop a reliable transparent review model that reflects a refreshed consensus regarding the areas and cadence for reviews, as well as the manner in which the reviews are conducted in the current ecosystem.

And we believe that a community dialogue is an essential part of that process. So, as Alan said, we are in the very initial stages of this discussion and we want to use this time that we have today to brainstorm with you about how we get from where we are today to where we need to be in terms of reviews, and in particular, what work do we need to get done now to lead up to and prepare for an effective engagement session on this topic at ICANN84 in Oman. So now I see Anne's hand and then followed by Chris. Please go ahead, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thank you so much, Becky. It's Anne again, Anne Aikman-Scalese from GNSO Council non-voting appointed by NomCom. In terms

of how we got the discussion going, which I understand to be the purpose of this session, it's a question related to the continuous improvement group that's been working. I don't know if that is a cross-community working group working under those guidelines and whether or not this whole topic is within their charter. Does the Board foresee getting input from that group in terms of how to engage or get recommendations for a revised review process?

BECKY BURR

So just to quickly answer, I think the Board would welcome input from all parts of the community. The Continuous Improvement Program, the first round is up and running and the individual SOs and ACs are working on continuous improvement programs for the individual SOs and ACs. So, we do anticipate getting more input from that process. And of course, that process is a relevant issue here, but it is not in the particular or sole province of any one group in the community in our view. Chris, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Becky. Hi, everyone. This is Chris. I just wanted to make a couple of points really. The first one is I think we'd all be pretty clear on what we think this review—I'm just going to call it review of reviews, I can't think of anything else to call it—what this review of reviews is going to do. I mean, it's job is to, it seems to me to say, what should we be reviewing and then provide some guidance as to how we should be reviewing it. And that guidance might

include things like cadence and scope and parameters, but nothing more detailed than that.

I'd be surprised if there was anybody who didn't really sort of agree with that. The key for us, I think is, assuming everybody does understand and agree that, is how do we do it, is what is the best way to do it. And there are a number of different possibilities, I suppose. One would be some form of, as Alan said a couple of times already, a sort of specially formed working group and so on.

But the only other point I wanted to make was to suggest that whatever it is we decide to do, if I could put in a plea for Board involvement, rather than just liaison, if we could, given that it's going to be looking at ICANN and the reviews, we think actually having the Board involved as members of the working group, rather than just having a liaison would be immensely helpful. That's just my two cents worth on that score. Thanks.

ALAN BARRETT

Okay. Thank you very much, Chris. And yeah, I'd also like to thank you for your great work as one of the leads of the Pilot Holistic Review, which I know you found the work challenging and we really appreciate what you've been able to do. Thanks. Yeah, I think I agree with the idea of having Board involvement, not merely liaison, but it's not my decision, of course. Right. Anyone else? I don't see hands in the queue.

BECKY BURR

We definitely understand that this news in terms of formal Board action is relatively new, so people may be still digesting. I see that Cheryl has a comment in the chat about what you're hearing is a description of an ATRT, which is an existing mechanism. And I assume your question is, why are we having this process if in fact we already have an existing mechanism to do that?

I think, Cheryl, it's a fair question, but we specifically talked about whether an ATRT4 wouldn't be the right plan or the right place to make these recommendations on the future of reviews. And the Board's decision on this, it's view that in fact an ATRT isn't the right place to do this, was informed by the community's experience with and input on the current review program. We did hear from a lot of members of that. We thought about this and we determined that our fiduciary obligations required a concentrated and focused effort, specifically focused on reviews.

That is clearly something that an ATRT could have done, but the potential scope of ATRTs under the current bylaws is much broader and far more diffuse. In the end, it was our conclusion that we really needed a concentrated effort on updating reviews that the topical breadth and operational structure and limitations for what an ATRT might be would not necessarily support well. So, it's not as if we're-- I mean, we definitely did consider whether an ATRT was an appropriate place to do it, but in the end, we concluded that far more focused scoping was required to do that. Okay, no questions, just listening. Chris, I see your hand again.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes. Hi, me again, yes. Just listening to what you've just said, Becky, and what Alan said earlier on, it strikes me that one of the advantages we have here is if we choose to take a particular pathway, is that ATRT and other reviews have kind of happened as a closed group, where yes, they go out for comment and so on and so forth. But I wonder if this isn't given the importance of this and how-- And I know there's a fear about cross-community working groups in the community and everywhere really, but I think properly managed, they can work.

And it strikes me that, actually, this is the sort of thing where we should probably consider having a group of, sort of members of a working group, but having them, all of those meetings, as we've done in the past for various different reasons. We did it with the transition, we've done it in other ways as well, where we have it completely open for anyone to attend and anyone to listen and observe and to be able to put comments in whilst the working group members are having their discussion and have those comments treated as being inputted on.

So, you ask for brainstorming, this is brainstorming. Have those comments inputted whilst the discussions are taking place and dealt with, not necessarily in that moment, but on a sort of report back mechanism, so the whole of the community feels that they're involved, even if it's only like, I don't know, 15 people or 20 people or whatever, who are actually part of the working group. I just

think that because this is so important, it would be incredibly valuable if we were able to pull that off. Thanks.

BECKY BURR

Thanks, Chris. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thank you. Thanks, Chris. It's Anne again. And I think it could be very constructive potentially to use the cross-community working group. We have had some challenges with those working group guidelines in terms of the fact that they're not actually treated in the bylaws with respect to the Board's obligation on the recommendations that come out of cross-community working groups, so it might be that--

I know that on PDPs, of course, we have a mechanism where if the Board does not want to adopt the recommendation, it comes back to GNSO Council and we work with you to form a supplemental recommendation or whatever. With respect to cross-community working groups, we don't have that kind of mechanism available. It's not in the guidelines for cross-community working groups. And so, I think those would need to be modified if we're going on such an important topic to have a cross-community working group and have provisions which are more similar to the bylaws provisions with respect to any recommendations that might not be adopted by the Board.

BECKY BURR

Thanks, Anne. I think that we've been sort of deliberately not affixing an acronym to what this undertaking is for a variety of reasons, including the fact that there's not a spelled-out bylaws-related description of what a CCWG is and how it works. I will also say, frankly, that we did have a \$28 million CCWG, which we very much are not looking forward to here. So, something like some kind of a group, a committee, but taking into account Chris's observation regarding the need for openness in the process and also the need for Board involvement in the process, I think is something that we really do want to explore.

Fiona Alexander has a comment in here, in the chat, saying that the point of the affirmation reviews was to examine ICANN's execution of tasks, not to short-circuit policy development or push new policy development, and she worries that the initial framing has been lost over the years, and is there a way to tee up that discussion and get back to basics.

And I think that is part of what was driving, as I said, not just the Board's concern here, but also concern that we heard from all parts of the community, that we weren't getting-- it was being increasingly difficult to have implementable results that really focused on that accountability and how do we demonstrate and maintain and enhance ICANN's accountability through this process.

So, I hear you on the CCWG, but I think what we are thinking about is we really need to define a process that is very particular and very

appropriate for the task at hand and obviously spell out how that would work so that everybody understands. There's more discussion about ATRTs being a closed box, and I think that one concern was that the way the ATRTs are made up, it doesn't necessarily feel sufficiently inclusive for the purposes that we have here. Avri has comments here. Anybody else? Anne, your hand is up. Is that a new hand? Please go ahead if it is.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, go ahead with Avri first, and then I just have a question after Avri.

BECKY BURR

I think Avri has just a comment in the chat saying the Board should reconsider its decision to bypass ATRT4.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Okay. So, in terms of process and developing the engagement that you're talking about, Becky, and sort of a different sort of maybe creating a new mechanism for doing this, does the Board feel that ultimately it will be proposing a new framework for reviews, or is it looking for the community to recommend a framework to the Board?

BECKY BURR

This is a bottom-up multi-stakeholder organization, and I don't think that the Board is proposing anything top-down, but I think

maybe talking about this in siloed ways as something that comes either from the community or the Board may be not the best way to think about this. Maybe the best way to think about it is a collaboration with Board and Org and community to come up with, to identify what we need to be reviewing and how we conduct those reviews in order to accomplish the accountability goals.

ALAN BARRETT

Can I jump in here quickly? This is Alan. I don't think the Board wants to just specify how reviews should be done. I think that's a community job. But I think the Board wants to ask the community to figure out a way to specify how reviews should be done in the future. And I've seen comments from Avri and Cheryl about why didn't we just use ATRT4 for that, and I have a lot of sympathy for that view.

I also thought for a time that we could use ATRT4 to figure out how to do reviews in the future, but the difficulty with that is the Board doesn't have the power to tell an ATRT4 to focus on a particular topic. So, if the Board wants a group to focus on how reviews should be done, the Board could not rely on ATRT4 for doing that because they don't take direction from the Board. Thanks.

BECKY BURR

Just to follow up on Alan's comment, I know that there are a lot of folks who really feel like what we're describing is an ATRT4, but for the reasons that we've described, that's not where the Board

believes. Given the breadth and scope of possible ATRTs, we felt a more focused process was required. Avri, please go ahead.

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, I want to challenge the notion that the ATRT that was constit-

BECKY BURR

I think Avri has frozen for me. I don't know if she has for anyone.

LEON FELIPE SANCHEZ

Yeah, she's frozen to me too.

AVRIA DORIA

... bylaws way that has been deemed for this function, to go around that at this point. I mean, I write my short piece on why I think this is a travesty, that this really is an incredibly damaging event for ICANN to go around this. It may need to be fixed. It may need to be talked about. It may need to be debated until we're blue in the face, but you have a mechanism. You've decided that you don't trust it, but that you trust yourselves more. And that strikes me as incredibly dangerous and incredibly problematic. I hadn't intended [Audio glitch - 00:33:38], but I'm really, really, really frightened by what you guys are doing. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

Thank you, Avri. As I said, the point here is not to be top-down. The point here is to identify a collaborative community-involved

process to make sure that the resources, and that is community time, org time, Board time, and financial resources as well, that those are being used effectively and in a fiduciary responsible way to accomplish what we need to accomplish in terms of the accountability enhancements. And I know that there are strong feelings in the community on all sides of this question. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG

Yeah, thank you. Alan Greenberg speaking. I guess I'll just point out that another option is to have an ATRT to, if not instructed, request that its focus be very narrow and specifically to look at reviews including ATRT. And should they choose to ignore your request, you can disband it. You can stop it. You can halt it. You've done that before.

So, there's a mechanism by which you could use an ATRT to do the work you're talking about and not add another year or two years to the process, which is what we're talking about with what you're proposing right now. It looks like yet another ICANN mechanism to elongate and stretch things out to the longest possible time instead of trying to do something expediently and effective. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

Thank you, Alan. Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Hi, Becky, and hi, everyone. And taking up on that last note on not trying to elongate things too much, that was one of the concerns of the ccNSO regarding the proposal to review the reviews that it wouldn't take forever. So, I think that having a concise or at least a timeline goal to achieve this, it's very important.

So as a very, let's say, high-level suggestion, it seems to me that whichever type of group that's doing this should have, of course, a charter, scope and process set up as soon as possible. And from now until the next ICANN meeting, to have milestones they should work on, drafting how they are planning to get the community's input on reviews so that they could have a feedback gathering session, maybe in Oman.

With that input, they could work on seeing all these divergent views and how to converse them later, doing an analysis and synthesis, and then by Mumbai, discuss the proposals they have seen and tops next ICANN meeting, then have a public comment where everyone can have a say and tops next ICANN meeting after Mumbai, have a solid finished proposal so that it wouldn't take forever. Because that's one of the things that happens with the reviews, that they take too much time.

So having a fixed timeline, I think, fixed with flexibility, of course, in the sense that, okay, maybe pace could be too much, too fast, but again, it shouldn't be prolonged more than, I don't know, one, two months so that we have a goal set where we are going and when we want it. And of course, that should go accompanied with

a budget and not only thinking about money, but as you have said before, voluntary resources that will be doing this work through this project. So, I hope that helps.

BECKY BURR

Thank you, Alejandra. That's very concrete and very helpful. And those are the kinds of suggestions that we're looking for. We do want to understand, for example, what information do we need to collect in order to have, for example, have an effective conversation in Oman? And I think that's what one of the things that you're pointing out, Alejandra, is how do we get the input of all of the SOs and ACs on these various reviews.

I know Sebastien is noting that each review has a time limit. I actually think that the ATRT has a time limit, but the others don't. And going back to Alan's comment about we could provide guidance to an ATRT and disband them if they don't follow that guidance. I think that has the potential for elongating this process even more. And that was something that we wanted to avoid. Let's just follow up on the kinds of very concrete suggestions that Alejandra was coming up with. That's the kind of brainstorming that would be very helpful. Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thanks, Becky. Again, just a quick question, because I see we have a whole lot of participants. But could you guys just quickly address, and maybe Chris is the one to do this, but the Pilot Holistic

Review and what was on their plate and what views came out of the what we call the PHR, the Pilot Holistic Review in connection with this whole idea of the review of reviews. Where did we end up there with that group?

BECKY BURR

So, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah, I can, and I don't think-- Sorry, let me just turn my video on for the purposes of this exercise. I'm not sure that we did. We wrote a letter to the Board, which outlined what we thought. And in that letter, we said, it appeared from some of the discussions that have taken place in San Diego, sorry, in, not San Diego, Seattle, that begins with an S, Seattle, that the Board was contemplating the possibility of looking at reviews in the round as a whole and that was a matter for them.

But to be very clear, we said in our letter, if you decide you want to continue with the Pilot Holistic Review, then this is the way forward that we suggest you use. And that was to basically to bifurcate the CPI to a separate -- thank you, Karen -- to bifurcate the continuous improvement work into a separate section and to have a separate working group work as a part of holistic review mechanism. And in fact, change its name to a holistic review design team, which was what we thought was more actually what it was supposed to be doing.

And so, we said we can do this if you wish. And then it was up to the Board to make a decision about whether they wanted to do that, to take that road or to do what I've consistently referred to as a review of reviews. In both cases, we said, if you decide to do the review of reviews, we strongly recommend to you that you keep the continuous improvement stuff going, because that's already nearly-- the design of that and the completion of that effort isn't very nearly finished. And that is what in fact, the Board has done. And Karen Lentz has posted in the chat for your enjoyment, the letter that Sophie Hey and I wrote to the Board, which sets out our suggestion in respect to the Pilot Holistic Review. I hope that's helpful. Thanks.

ALAN BARRETT

Yeah, thanks very much, Chris. This is Alan Barrett again. Okay, I don't see any more hands. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Yes, thank you. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Just to underline what Cheryl said on the chat, the position of At-Large, and we want to reiterate what we wrote to the Board. It's still our position, and therefore, we think that it's also important that we try to take into account what end users think about that.

And now, on a personal view, as an ATRT3 member, I would like to thank you for putting all what we suggest to the garbage. It is a pity. We love our time, we lost our strengths, we lost a lot. And the

Board decided that the 18 months we spent was not a good work. Thank you for that. But we will keep that in mind. Thank you very much.

BECKY BURR

Thank you, Sebastien, for that. I just want to point out that the continuous review work is indeed ongoing. Alejandra?

ALAN BARRETT

Sorry, Sebastien, I think we should let him respond.

BECKY BURR

Thank you, Alan. Thank you, Becky. And sorry, Alexandra. Please, read again what was proposed by ATRT3 regarding the Continuous Improvement Program, and you will see that we are not in the same world. The same name, but it was not supposed to be under like that. And it's why I consider that everything is in jeopardy here. But thank you.

ALAN BARRETT

Okay. Thank you, Sebastien. I respect your comments. And I will take another look at the ATRT3 recommendations. Alejandro, on to you now.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you. Just to add another suggestion to gather input from such a diverse community as ICANN is, I would like you to look into

the open space technology. This is a methodology that we have used in the ccNSO when we want to tackle a broad topic. So, it might be useful for the gathering of these divergent views in the first session, as I mentioned before. So just have a constructive note there.

ALAN BARRETT

Okay. Thank you, Alejandra. Any more hands? Okay, Becky.

BECKY BURR

Yeah, I was not familiar with open space technology. I just looked it up. And I think it might be helpful for us to know a little bit more about how the ccNSO has used it, because it does seem like potentially very interesting organizing principles for the work we're doing. Chris, I don't know if you want to respond to that or something else.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah, I do, Becky. Just to say that it's kind of similar to what we did with when Fadi was here. I can't remember the name of the organization. It doesn't have to be outside people in the member organization that came in. You had the four corners of the room and lots of different things. Yeah. Post-it notes everywhere and stuff going on. That's kind of what it is. And that's worked pretty well for large gatherings of ICANN people in the past. Just to give you a sort of rough idea. Thanks.

ALAN BARRETT

Okay. Thank you, Chris. All right, we have about 10 minutes until the schedule at the end of this session. I don't see any more hands. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, thank you. It's Anne again. The question, I think one of the process questions we have is in developing input to the Board on this review of reviews. Generally speaking, the MSM, which we tout worldwide, works on the basis of developing at least a rough consensus.

And so, I think we need to look at ways to measure if we're developing some new tools that are faster, we would need ways to measure consensus on any new model for reviews. I don't have a solution to that, but it's a factor, I think, as we are advocating for the MSM and especially in this WSIS+20 year that we would need to be quite specific about how we will arrive in this new mechanism as at least a rough consensus.

ALAN BARRETT

Thanks, Anne. Yes, that is very important. We need input from all parts of the ICANN community and we do hope to get rough consensus before we change anything. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG

Thank you. Alan speaking. I'll just make a very brief comment. Consensus is a hard thing to achieve in ICANN sometimes, especially when some of the positions are so far apart and demanding consensus often ends up resulting in a least common denominator, which does not necessarily address issues. Just noting that and consider that as you go forward. I understand the concept of bottom-up and I understand the desire for consensus. I'm just not convinced it can happen that way. Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT

Yeah, thanks. That's a very good point. Tijani

TIJANI BEN JEMAA

Yes. Alan, what's the alternative if consensus is not achievable? What do you propose?

ALAN BARRETT

What do we do if consensus is not achievable?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA

Not you. Alan Greenberg, it's a question for Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG

I don't have an answer. It's not one that I'll present in this forum anyway. I think the Board needs to consider that though and understand that simply putting in place a process and demanding that we come to consensus to do something may not have a result

that will achieve the actual aims that we went into it with. I'll be glad to talk about this more in private. I'm not sure I have an acceptable answer and I'm not sure how unacceptable some of the answers are.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA

May I make a comment on that?

ALAN GREENBERG

I'll note there are some answers in the chat or comments in the chat that I think are very relevant.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA

Since we start to contest, not to contest, to speak about not having a consensus is something that we can accept. Some other people are saying that multi-stakeholder model is something that we don't have to speak about and our continuous improvement, etc. So, I see that we are going back of what we wanted, of our core values, our model or core model of working. Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT

Thank you, Tijani. Anne, I see you next.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, thanks, Alan. It's Anne again. I wonder if a survey tool would be useful to the Board. In other words, if you state your assumptions, presumptions or whatever in the survey and develop

some questions, hopefully rather quickly, even questions that could be discussed in the session in Prague. Surveys, I think, were effective with respect to how do we meet. And in terms of how we engage in this dialogue, I do wonder if a survey with very focused questions would be helpful to the Board.

ALAN BARRETT

Thank you, Anne. I think that could indeed be very helpful. Yes, we could initiate the survey asking what people think about the current reviews, how are they doing well, how they are not doing well, and ideas for how to improve them could all be encoded in questions of the survey. Very good idea. Okay, I think it's about time to wrap up. We have only a couple of minutes left. Tripti, can I return it to you?

TRIPTI SINHA

Well, thank you, Alan and Becky. And thank you, everyone, who's joined the call for this candid discussion. And indeed, we heard some painfully honest feedback, which is good. This is what makes the multi-stakeholder model so exciting, right? We're getting all kinds of viewpoints and there's a lot of variance in it. So, before we conclude, we've got four more minutes. I'm going to ask Becky and Alan to summarize the key takeaways from this discussion.

ALAN BARRETT

Okay, this is Alan. Let me give it a go. Clearly, we are not close to consensus at the moment. We've heard a lot of people expressing

opinions that the Board made a mistake in deferring ATRT4. I think that's a decision that's already passed. There's concern that by deferring ATRT4, the Board may be trying to escape its accountability. Personally, I don't think that's the case. I think we're trying to improve the whole review process. We've heard some ideas for a survey. I think that's good. And I'm not sure that we have any concrete way forward. I don't think we have a design of a committee or anything for the next step. We still have to think more about that. Becky?

BECKY BURR

Yeah. So, I do think we heard some interesting suggestions here. First of all, I want to reiterate Tripti's acknowledgement that the community has very disparate views on this. There are strong feelings on all sides of this and noting Anne's and other comments about consensus. The feeling was that there is not consensus that the current reviews are working and are contributing to enhanced accountability and transparency.

I think we heard that we needed a whole community dialogue, a dialogue that involves the community members, a dialogue that involves Board members participating, not simply sitting on the sidelines and being liaison. Obviously, the org, folks from org have an important role to play here. We've heard a suggestion that we figure out an efficient mechanism, but one that even if it has a committee of a certain number of people is by nature open for the entire community to participate in.

We did hear a good suggestion about doing some information gathering through a transparent survey, which I think could contribute. I mean, we definitely need some input to form the basis of this. And I think our next step is to continue this dialogue and get to a place so that we have, without undue delay, a design for a process to look at reviews, to understand what it is we need to be reviewing in order to ensure that ICANN remains accountable and how we do that and what the cadence is on those reviews.

So, while I did hear a lot of frustration from people who feel like we are insufficiently, that we have that we failed to recognize the value of the ATRTs, I think we have heard some very concrete proposals, and we just need to move forward on next steps. And consensus and bottom-up and whole community involvement should be the watchwords of that process.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Becky. And thank you, Alan, for the summary. There's still much work ahead of us. Thank you, everyone, for joining the call and for your honest feedback. We will start crafting a path forward. And we will see you all in Prague. Safe travels to everyone. And this meeting is closed now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]