
ICANN84 | AGM – ccNSO: Review of reviews session
Tuesday, October 28, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Good afternoon, everybody. Please take your seats. We're going to start in a minute. You'll be amazed to hear we're using Mentimeter. Please log in as per normal. Exactly

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Okay. We're ready to begin. Please start the recording. Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Review of reviews session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with my colleague, Joke Braeken, are the participation managers for this session.

Please note, this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be

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.

given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak.

Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you, and with that, I will now hand the floor over to Chris Disspain. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to the review of reviews session for the ccNSO. I am on the cross-community group as a representative of the ccNSO, and so is Annaliese. And together, we are going to take you through a series of questions and find out what you think. Some of you may have been in the session on Monday. The questions are the same, but we will ask you, even if you did put your reply in on Monday, to put your replies in again today. And I know that a number of you weren't in the session on Monday, because I took notice of all the names. No, I didn't really.

And so, we're going to deal with review of reviews. I guess, everyone knows the history. Everyone knows that the reviews have been a bit stuck. And the board at the last meeting decided that the best thing to do would be to suspend everything and to get this review of reviews done. We're working to an extremely tight schedule. We hope to have this done in essence by the time we get to the second meeting of next year sort of parceled up and sent off

to the board by then. But hopefully we'll achieve that. So, can I get the first slide, please?

Okay, that's all the boring stuff. Let's have the next one. That's even more boring. No, that's a list of all the people who belong. This is quite an unusual thing for an ICANN cross-community group, because there are only two people per SO and AC, two. This is incredibly impressive, because normally there's at least three and sometimes five. So, we're doing very well. Next slide, please.

Oh, sorry. No, I should also say and, the board has two members, not just liaisons, actual members of the CCG. And the staff have two actual members of the CCG because we thought it was really important to get buy-in. So, rather than just floating around pretending to be paying attention and being liaisons, they're actually members and they actually participate properly as such. Okay, the prep work. Here we are. This is what we are currently working on a statement of purpose. Now, that statement of purpose's intent is just a first draft. We're going to get to it in a minute. It is just a first draft. And it's that that we're going to seek your feedback on today.

But before we do that, I just wanted to quickly run through what is within the remit of the review of reviews and what is not. So, what we are looking at are the reviews and their past outcomes including the periodic review of structures and operations, annual review, specific reviews. That's accountability, transparency, CCT, et

cetera. Previously conducted reviews and reviews that have previously been formally recommended.

What we are not looking at is the organizational reviews, the old-fashioned independent experts would come in and do a review of each of the SOs and ACs. And we're not doing that because those have already effectively been replaced by this continuous improvement work, which I know the ccNSOs has been doing its own continuous improvement for a long time. And clearly, we will need to build a review of that CIP work. So, if we can flip to the next slide.

What is not included in the charter is the independent review process, which we just talked about, the reconsideration request, community mediation, the empowered community process, and then reviews established through the IANA stewardship transition, which are the customer standing committee effectiveness review, whatever that is, and the IANA functions review, including the special IANA functions review. So, those ones are excluded, we're not covering those.

So, to be clear, we're not covering those ones, and we are not actually looking at the—we're treating the independent reviews as no longer existing because they've been replaced by the CIP, okay? So, our purpose document, which is the next slide, looks quite daunting, but it actually isn't really. What it basically says, and I'll say this again, this is a first draft. So, all of the feedback that we've

had so far, the feedback we got on Monday—we had a webinar in prep week. We got feedback there. We're getting feedback today.

The GNSO we're looking at it tomorrow, and then on Thursday, we're all going to meet again in the big room and talk some more about it. It's all about looking at this document, and even when we finish, even when we think that you guys are comfortable, that it's kind of okay, it's still not going to be set in stone. We're going to keep referring back to it, but we're just going to use it as the foundation for our next lot of work, which is to go into depth.

So, here's what we're saying, we're saying the purpose of reviews is to assess whether ICANN is fulfilling its mission, commitments and core values as set out in the bylaws in a transparent and accountable manner. And the way that we do that is by reviewing four things. The first thing is reviewing ICANN's execution of its commitments that are set out in its articles, its bylaws, the strat plan and the financial and operations plan.

And then there are a number of bullets there that list the sorts of things that one would be looking at. So, the activities processes and culture remain consistent with the mission, the commitments and the values, that it's meeting its stated goals and objectives, that communication channels are effective and accessible and decisions and outcomes are reported clearly, stuff like that.

And then the second thing is the results that we would review, the results of the SOAC NomCom continuous improvement program as they relate to each SOAC or NomCom and to each other. So, let's

take an example. Let's say the ccNSO does its continuous improvement program and it produces a report at the end of a three-year cycle and it says, we're brilliant. We're the best communicators in the whole of ICANN. We talk to everybody, everybody loves us, we're fine.

And the GAC produces its continuous improvement report and it says, we never hear from the ccNSO. They don't turn up. We don't even know that they're here. Clearly, a review is going to look at those two things and go, "Look, there's a problem here. Something's gone wrong." So, it might come to the ccNSO and it might say, guys, we know you think you're brilliant, and of course you are, but you have got an issue with the GAC that you need to solve.

There's another possibility for a B review, which is probably slightly more controversial. I'm going to continue to use the CCs as an example, and that's this. We do our continuous improvement work, we produce a report and the CIP review comes along and it does a whole heap of interviews and surveys. And it discovers that the internationalized domain names ccTLDs are not happy. They don't feel as if they are enrolled. They don't feel as if they're a part of the ccNSO. This would never happen, of course. And so, they might then look at a recommendation that says, you guys need to do some work on this and you might want to look at how you are structured.

And if you think about it, that's exactly what we did ourselves when we kind of set out to solve the IDN ccTLD manager problem. But they might do that. So, there could be some recommendations that actually suggest that one looks in your structure, okay? So, that's that one. Then there's C. C is the sort of overall structure of ICANN and its SOs and ACs. C is where you would say there should be two boards. There should be a policy board and there should be a finance board, a corporate board and a policy board, which is something that has been suggested before in the ICANN model.

C is where you might say the board is too big, the board is too small. You look at the overarching structure and say, there needs to be a new SO. We should bring in a new advisory committee. This one, C, is the sort of one you would do not very often. You might do it every 10 years, too, because this is a time-consuming, overarching review exercise.

And then finally, D is a review to make sure that the ongoing reviews are fit for purpose. And again, that's not something you're going to do every two or three years. You might do that every six, seven, eight years, something like that. So, bearing in mind that none of this is set in stone, it's just a first-brush attempt to kind of set out what the purpose is. Why are you doing the reviews? The last paragraph, so as to, where necessary, recommend improvements or paths towards improvement for any problematic issues found in the reviews and make those recommendations to the board or the empowered community.

So, the sorts of questions for the community to be thinking about are these, or this really. I think what X should be reviewed, whatever X is, should be reviewed. Does this purpose cover X? It's not going to say specifically X, but does the overarching purpose, does X, whatever X is, fit in to that overarching purpose? If it does, great. If it doesn't, then the purpose needs adjusting. It doesn't mean that X, whatever you think should be reviewed, ends up being reviewed. But we want to make sure that the purpose covers the things that the community thinks should be reviewed, okay? Right.

So, now we're going to go to the Mentimeter questions. We'll just wait patiently. Can you skip that for now? And that, and that. There we go. So, the usual thing, log-in, code, menti.com, 83437672. We're getting lots of thumbs up, which is—I don't know what that means, but I guess, it just means everyone's happy. Of course they do. I'll leave it up for another sort of 30 seconds or so. The code is at the top of the slide, and it's going to stay at the top of all the slides, so we should be all right.

All right, the first question is a yes, no, maybe question. So, do you think that this first draft of the purpose of reviews is heading in the right direction? Yes, no, it depends, or more information is needed. Okay, at the moment there's a race between depends and more information, and more information is in the lead with four. It's gone to six now. Okay, I should shut up, because otherwise, I'm going to influence the vote. Okay, so we've got 19, 20-ish yeses, which is

great. And we've got some depends and more information is needed.

I would love it if some people who said more information is needed could perhaps put their hand up and speak and tell us why they think more information is needed, or more specifically what more information is needed. Anyone? Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Thanks, Chris. Oh, God, that's loud. So, I remember one of the reviews years ago, and I got interviewed by some consultants. I don't know why I got picked. [inaudible] just said, "Please, could you talk to these people and tell them what you think about all the different parts of ICANN." Possibly because I had got a reputation for being a bit difficult and opinionated and gobby. But anyway, they asked me all sorts of questions about stuff I didn't even know about like ALAC, and I don't think I'd heard of. It was my first ICANN meeting. So, I can see that they got some slightly odd feedback across the community to develop their recommendations.

And I was really surprised because I saw the same consultants the next meeting and the next meeting. It felt like the purpose of ICANN was to continually review itself. And it was a happy byproduct, if anything useful, apart from that happened. So, that was kind of my first impressions of it all. So, I'm a bit of a review cynic, I would say. So, what I would like to see in this is some sort of statement of principle that what we're looking for in terms of this review is a fit

for purpose, minimum viable product type approach to things, if that makes sense.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes, it does and it's a very, very good point. Thank you. Just so everyone knows, we're capturing all of this and we're going to hopefully synthesize it into something for Thursday that will include some of these comments and so on. So, hopefully we'll be able to feed this back on Thursday and get more. Does anyone else want to say why they said it depends or what information is needed? Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN

I voted yes, but I also attended the session yesterday. But I suppose an observation would be pretty hard to object to it. It basically says you're going to review everything. And so, I think your real challenge, I could see this ending up being a 10-year review process because you're trying to review everything. So, I think the key thing is that's a good sort of scope. But you've actually got to look at how do you actually make the review effective.

And to do that, you actually need to focus it on where the problems are. There's no point reviewing. Do we like the microphone set up in this room? No one's raised an issue. So, I think we need to focus our time on that. So, I think you really have to get to the nub of what are the core issues, no more than five, that people think is wrong and focus on those.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think that's right. I think the intention of the document is, and it will change. This is, as I keep saying very, very much a first draft, yes. The intention of the document is to get clear that there are some foundational things. You can't review against smoke. You've got to review against something. So, the foundational documents are basically the bylaws, the strat plan, the ops plan. Those are your foundational documents. Those are the things that tell you what it is you're supposed to be looking at, right? And then it's just a question of what do you do?

I think there are some set things. I think we have to have—if you're going to have a continuous improvement process, you've got to have some kind of review. It doesn't make sense to not have a review of the continuous improvement process. So, I think that's kind of a no-brainer. What it looks like is entirely a different matter and may well be incredibly controversial. But the principle of having it makes perfect sense.

And then it's about some form of accountability review, which is what A attempts to do. But I acknowledge that A goes into a huge amount of bullet points. And again, the reason for that originally is that when we wrote it was, we wanted to sort of—we didn't want to just leave it completely empty, but put stuff in so that people could look at it and do that. Would my thing be covered? But you're correct, the final document and the final process needs to be much

tighter. So, I agree with you 100 percent. Anyone else before we move on? Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER

Jordan Carter here, just for the record. Just to slightly follow on from Bruce's point, it may be that once you've got the purpose of the reviews done, you need to do a middleware piece of analysis that looks at where are the pain points giving effects to this? Because it might be that there's elements of the bylaws and something else and something else that affects implementation. And so, I actually want an implementation review rather than a bylaws review and a something else review and a something else review.

So just encourage you as you block the work to sort of maybe be quite dynamic. And it might mean that rather than a set and forget framework of reviews, there's an automatic review of the set of reviews every few years once the problems that were identified through that have been solved.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes, agreed. One of the things that's been floating around the community in the last couple of days is the idea of having—you have your reviews, however many there are, let's just say there are three. But you also have a separate thing that is not part of the bylaws as your guidelines for reviews. And every review must be

done in this way. These are the guidelines. So, instead of having the rules made up for each review, it's actually mandated.

And that you revisit, which is kind of what you're saying, you revisit that on a fairly regular basis and say, are these guidelines fit for purpose to make sure that the reviews themselves are as efficient and effective as they can possibly be? But it's just a suggestion that's been raised. Okay, we're going to go to the next question. And these are now—all these questions are now the ones where you get to write whatever you want to write. So, what is missing from our list of purposes? Is there any way we can have the—you want me to slow down? Okay.

Is there any way we can have the list, the purposes document on one screen and the Mentimeter on it? No? Oh, dear, so sad. Okay, never mind. I beg your pardon? Such is life. What is missing from our list of purposes? Is there something on that list, the CIP review, the structural review, the review of reviews and reviews against the stuff that ICANN does in accordance with its strategic plan? Yeah, the review of review of reviews has been discussed. It has been discussed? We're going to start it in parallel with this. Interesting. We'll wait and we'll come back to it.

Whoever wrote the top reason for review, would you be prepared to say why? What you mean by that? Think about whether you're prepared to say something that was useful. The external voice, sanity check one. I think it would be intended, and I don't want to get too deep into the weeds here, but I think it would be intended

that any review would be able to and may even be mandated to have external expert advice, and that may not be the same thing, but certainly, the idea that it would just be the community itself without any help may be not good enough.

Preventing the GNSO self-dealing and pretending it's perfect. I don't know anyone who pretends that the GNSO is perfect including all of the GNSO, but I take the point. You might have missed it, but didn't hear much unmeasurable KPIs. No, because that's not a purpose, but it is definitely a requirement of a review when we get down to the next phase, which will be designing the reviews.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

I think that's an important point down the bottom there, Chris, other concepts and mechanisms that were fit for purpose in 1999 still the most efficient way of getting things done. I think that's kind of the purpose of having the review and reviewing all of these things and making sure it's critical for the legitimacy of ICANN and for the multistakeholder governance that we are able to review ourselves and adapt as necessary rather than wait for external forces to make us do things. It's much better if we can address our issues. And so, we'll need to make sure that any reviews that are designed can do all of these things.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think that's right. The history of this is that these reviews effectively arrived, and the first batch of these reviews effectively arrived in, I think, 2010 or 2009 and were written on the back of an envelope with a meeting with Larry Strickling, who was then the head of NTIA, and Paul Levins, who was the ICANN executive who was charged with the affirmation of commitment work. That's where we got ATR from and security and stability review and so on. But you are correct, just because those were okay then doesn't make them okay now.

We're going to come to the, what does good look like, because that's actually one of the questions, so we'll get back to that. But I note that although this is all about efficiency and effectiveness, and I completely agree, feasibility, and that's exactly right. The key to this is that we create a small number of effective and efficient reviews that are reviewing things that matter, and that we're able to run those in the background of ICANN without having the reviews being the main work that ICANN does. That's really, for me anyway, the essence of it. Anyone want to say anything? Anyone got any comments they'd like to make?

On the what went well and what didn't go well, we are planning to have, once we get out of this ICANN meeting, we're planning to have a series of, at least one and maybe a series of webinars, not webinars, because they'll be interactive rather than just listening, that are going to deal with specific targeted questions, and one of those questions is likely to be, tell us what you think worked out of the previous reviews that have been done and tell us what you

think didn't work. Obviously, that can be both from the point of view of you were on a review team or you were affected by some of the recommendations. So those sorts of things we're going to get to as part of our fact finding, but I think that all the efficiency and effectiveness stuff makes perfect sense.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Can I ask about the safeguards that slow processes down? Did the person who put that in feel like explaining it?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

[Peter]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Yeah, it was triggered by that comment on the 1999 purpose and fit for. I think when this was started off, which was a bit before my time, there were other circumstances that required different balances in the ccNSO between the regions, having three counselors per region, the power of the NomCom to add additional talent to already a quite large group but all these things made perfect sense. We were a new organization; ICANN could not mess up because the world was watching.

And so, I think at that point in time, there were a lot of safeguards built in to strengthen that process. And I'm wondering if some of these safeguards in the light of today's circumstances and

geopolitical climate still stand. Are some of them still necessary?
That was my [inaudible].

CHRIS DISSPAIN

It's a really interesting question. I sort of feel as if that's actually something that the review itself might look at depending on what the review is looking at, then it might come up there. But you're right. I mean, there is that whole thing about, if you look on the purpose, there is a thing about, is the model, is ICANN structure fit for purpose? And that purpose being today, obviously not the purpose that it was. The reason for being may not have changed, but it's got to be dynamic enough to be able to be used properly. Carry on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Indeed, Chris, I think you're nailing it there. So, what I sometimes see in reviews is that we're checking whether we do something according how we're supposed to do it. Not necessarily on whether we're doing something according to what would be the most efficient way to get it done now, not in 2009.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

And that's also an interesting question, because generally speaking, reviews look back at something and say, this was the foundational document. Has it been done the way that it should have been done? There also needs to be a process that looks forward. I was talking to Roelof about this earlier on. That's more

of a strategy than a review, right? Reviews kind of by definition tend to be looking at what's happened. But the strategic planning process, and I don't know how many of you have actually looked at the current strategic plan, but I have to say, it's a pretty amazingly good document.

You might not necessarily agree with the strategy, but the colors are like—no. But the actual document itself, the work that went into that, it's a really good document. And the process by which that document comes into existence is enrolling of the community, but people don't necessarily pay attention to it. But again, your point is right, that's where perhaps we need to be looking at what shape should it be, and then reviewing backwards from there but I agree with you. Okay.

So, anyone else got any comments or questions on this particular piece before we move on to the next question? Okay, let's move on to the next question then. What are the things you think should be reviewed? So, we should review what? This is open to anything. We should review staff dress sense maybe. So far, no one has typed anything. So, we should review nothing. We should review each of the SOs and ACs on a regular basis, maybe. Don't worry about what regular means for the moment, just we should review them. Those of you who've been around as long as I have will remember that the first thing the ccNSO did after it was formed was immediately launch a review of itself. Okay.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

So, just on the question about changing to a system of ad hoc reviews. That is something that the group has discussed and I think it is something that we're likely to consider as well as ad hoc reviews may be necessary and I think that the members of the group have recognized that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah. One of the reviews that we do, that we put in place might be not a review as such, but a process for how you create a review on an ad hoc basis because you needed to. So, I don't know, I can't think of an example. Roelof, go ahead.

ROELOF MEIJER

Yeah. Thanks, Chris. Roelof Meijer from .nl. I made that comment and I wasn't suggesting that we add it to the present system. But that we might consider it as an alternative because the present system, all the reviews are in ICANN's bylaws and we do them according to the bylaws, even if we haven't finished implementing the recommendations from the previous review. And I think by now we recognize that a lot of stuff is a lot better than 20 years ago.

So, I was just thinking maybe we could consider changing to a system where in the bylaws we quantify the number of people or communities or both that have to support the request for a review and then if that number is reached, ICANN has to execute that review or that part of the community.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Now that's a really interesting thought. It has come up. It came up in discussion today in the CCG meeting. Did you want to say something, Annaliese? It's all right. You sort yourself out and we'll get to you in a minute.

It came up. I would simply ask you to think about whether we would have a perception problem if we did that to the outside world. If we don't have any sort of clear, public-facing review in the governments from outside of ICANN, look at ICANN, and say it doesn't even review itself. I'm just suggesting that might be an issue. Annaliese?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Yes. We sort of did discuss the optics of that, and if it wasn't leaving ourselves open to criticism, if there isn't a regular review, and if there is a perception, I guess, that reviews are launched and then some completed or parked for whatever reason, then shifting to only an ad hoc basis might not be seen as ideal by all parts of the multistakeholder community. But certainly, by governments, I think, would be expecting a solid multistakeholder system to be effectively able to review itself.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah. Do you want to say anything?

ROELOF MEIJER

Well, jokingly, I could say, well, the community could ask for a review of the particular review policy, but also, it feels a bit like

having to choose between a rock and a hard place because I wonder which optics are worse, doing the reviews without being able to implement the recommendations because the whole system is blocked by all the other reviews, or everybody, if there is enough support for a particular review, can ask for a review and it will be done then, yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think the principle of being able to have an ad hoc review and have a process for creating that ad hoc review makes perfect sense. The discussion is more to do with whether it's the only way you do it. But if you look at one of the things that's on here, the inefficient use of time of ICANN meeting weeks, too many parallel meetings, blah, blah, blah. I mean, that's true for some of us anyway. Now, that's a classic example, meeting structure. It would be ridiculous to put in place a regular every five-year meeting structure review. This doesn't make any sense, but it is something that you might want to say things that bad that we need an ad hoc review of the meeting structure.

So, rather than having to create this weird kind of thing that Sally did [inaudible] been doing about, it's not really a review. It's just a group of people gathering to discuss the possibility that we might change the way we do meetings. There would be a way of just saying, actually, we think we should do an ad hoc review. Now, that kind of makes sense.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Yes, and I'm not disagreeing, but just to also add to the other part of the conversation. Sorry, I've completely lost the thought I was going to say, then. It'll come back.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

It will. You ran a huge session about an hour ago, so I'm not really surprised. Okay. Are there any other comments and questions on this one? Anybody want to add anything? Anybody want to make any—

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

I remembered what I was going to say. Sorry, just disappeared right when I opened my mouth. Another part of the conversation today was an understanding that we will have to look at what didn't work in other review. What has worked and what hasn't worked. So, when you're talking about having reviews and then unable to implement recommendations, I think, it is important that that is a factor. We have had a discussion about that and we will consider that and seek input.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes. We've also been talking about the backlog. I was slightly surprised when we started talking about the fact that there's still Work Stream 2 stuff to do. But then it was pointed out by Pat Kane, who was in our session, on our CCG session earlier on today that ATR3 did actually give a recommendation which has been accepted

on how to deal with the backlog, how to sort of retire stuff that is stuck in backlog.

So, we may actually not have as much of a backlog as we think we have, but it is there. It does have an effect on what we can decide and what we can't decide. Anyone else before I move on to the next one? This is all great because it's all going to go into our data collection. Okay, next one. This is the last one of these questions. Complete the sentence. A review succeeds if it, and it is not an acceptable answer to say it doesn't happen. A review succeeds if it what?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

I think that trust and accountability one is absolutely critical. We'll be certainly hoping that the result of any review is stakeholder trust and accountability results in effective change. Does it always need to result in change? Are we only looking to do reviews if something needs to change or...?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I want to make a personal comment about the trust and accountability one. I agree with it 100 percent and there are— ICANN sometimes misuses the word trust. At one point, on the board, 2017 or something like that, we sort of decided that we had an issue with trust and that the community didn't trust the board and didn't trust org. And we did some huge amount of work on that. And what we discovered is that actually, what mostly people meant

was we didn't do what they wanted and therefore we don't trust you. We don't trust you because you don't do what we want.

So, I'm always a little bit wary of using the word trust because it's misused a lot. But that said, I completely agree that the reviews need to deal with accountability and trust. There's some really good stuff here and some very specific stuff lasts no more than six months, produces a maximum of 10 recommendations and approved by the board within three months and implemented within six. Wow, that's impressive. Who said that? Irina, that's ambitious and brave. Go ahead.

IRINA DANELIA

Thank you. Irina Danelia speaking from .ru. I'm a little bit provocative here, but you may see that it aligns with other suggestions. And my point is that if the review suggests to eat an elephant, it's not a suitable outcome. It should suggest how to eat it by pieces, and if the recommendations of the review cannot be approved by board in a reasonable short timeframe, it means either recommendations are bad or it works badly.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes, I agree.

IRINA DANELIA

I cannot last for ages.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah. I agree with you, and I think we've had some examples. We had some examples with the security and stability, SSR2 where we ended up pausing it halfway through because it was a bit lost, but it made a bunch of recommendations. And I forget how many, but they were quite a lot. And some of those recommendations were made to the SOs and ACs.

Actually, that's not what that review was meant to do. It was supposed to make recommendations to the board. So, the recommendations went to the board and the board said, "Well, we can't make the GNSO do this. We don't have the power to make the GNSO do this." So, recommending that this happens in the GNSO to us, it's a waste of time because there's nothing we can do about it. So, you're right. The reviews need to understand themselves. The guidelines need to be very clear. This is what you do in a review.

One of the things that we talked about that has come up a couple of times in discussions, it's been about the importance of chairing. And that we need to get some chair training into this organization, so that people in the community and the Cs and the Gs everywhere are actually trained on how to chair effectively because it's the chair of the review, the chair of the committee, the chair of whatever it is that actually makes it as effective and efficient as possible. So, that's something that we've been talking about.

Annaliese, did you want to say something? No? Okay, no worries. I'm slowing down, Joke. Thank you. And I apologize to the interpreters. Anyone got any other comments that they want to say

before we just go back to the end slides and talk about the future? So, all of this stuff is being collected. It's going to be put into a synthesis kind of set of themes. Those themes will come up on Thursday in the room, the big room. Davidson, go ahead.

KEITH DAVIDSON

Thank you. Just a comment to add to what has been just posted by everyone or by most of the people. Of course, that review is a very important process for us to look into the future. But everything should also keep a very good eye on what ICANN has already done so well, so much for such a long time. So, to not be that disruptive in order to just look ahead without preserving the core issues that led us here. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes. You have to have your basic—these are the jobs that we have to do. Nothing must interfere with those, so I agree. So, we're going to be looking at these themes on Thursday. And again, taking input, do you think these things make sense? Seven people said things that sounded like they should have very clear KPIs. Does everyone agree to this? Yes, 26 people said that we should all wear green shirts. How you feel about that? So, that's kind of where we're going to go on Thursday. And then we're going to have this kind of ongoing dialogue. So, could we go back to the slides, starting with the one that had the time frame, the four boxes? Is that possible? Is it up there?

Brilliant. Marvelous. So here we are. We're in phase one, fact-finding. That's what we're doing right now. We anticipate at this stage we think we'll have finished this by sort of mid-December. And that will include, as I've said, we hope a number of online discussions with the community where we'll be talking about specific things, and also, probably where we'll be looking further at the stuff that's come up this week. We can only do so much on Thursday. We don't have a lot of time.

So, we're going to have to roll some stuff forward into online meetings. Then we go to phase two, which is analysis and development of proposals. Phase three is obviously the finalization and phase four is the report and decision-making. So, we anticipate a fairly large lump of work on this will be in Mumbai in March. We are anticipating that we have done a fair bit of work. We are relying on all of you and the rest of the community to involve yourselves [intersessionally].

All of our CCG calls are open. Anyone can come onto the call as an observer. We are operating at the moment on the basis that observers can type anything they like in the chat. And if they really want to speak and they put their hand up, we will probably let them speak. And unless that gets out of hand, we will operate that way. So, it's not just a closed group discussion with the CCG folks. Next slide, please.

So, that's us, that's Thursday session. We all know that that's coming. And the next one.

Yeah, so we also have an email address input on reviews at ICANN.org. It's publicly archived and you can send your notes, your thoughts, your input to that. We have a wiki which is available and that has on it that document that you've seen. It has on it a background document, which is actually really quite interesting and worth reading. It feels like it's quite big, but it really isn't because as usual with ICANN, there's a sort of bucket load of appendices which you don't have to look at if you don't want to.

But there's a very interesting background about each of the reviews. How many recommendations they made. Were they implemented? How many of them were implemented and so on and so forth. And that is really worth looking at and its very interesting background information. And as I've said, observers are welcome. So, any last thoughts? Irina?

IRINA DANIELIA

Thank you, Chris. Irina for the record. Maybe I missed or did not fully understand, but the timeline said that we are going to finish by, let's say, next fall. And in the same time, one of the items to review are the results of the CIP program, which will not be delivered within next two years.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

No. One of the reviews that we are highly likely to recommend is a review of the CIP work. So, that review would start whenever the first cycle is finished or the second cycle is finished, and so on,

right? So, that is one of the reviews that we are likely to recommend. But we're not reviewing ourselves. We are not doing that review, right? Does that make sense?

IRINA DANELIA

Yeah. Just for clarity. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So, the goal is that by the time we get to the middle meeting of the year, in the top-secret location that nobody knows, we will basically be finishing up at that meeting. We will be taking the final pieces of the community. We might go away at the end of that meeting and then finalize the sort of what font are we going to use and what color will the document cover be? And then we're going to send that off to the next step of the process. And we anticipate that although we might still be there, they might need to come back to us, but that will basically be it. Yes?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Yes. I was just going to, before we wrap up, ask. So, in this session, we went back to the question, are we on the right—or is it the purpose is on the right track.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

There was not quite 50/50, but closer to 50/50 than perhaps we would have liked. People who said yes and people who said depends or need more information. I just wanted to check-in before we finish about whether we can do anything to—and if so, what sort of more information would you like? What would you like us to do to give you confidence that the purpose is on the right track?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Anybody want to address that? Hopefully, some of the information that's come out of the questions has been helpful to sort of bring you to a better understanding. And also, again, I'll say it, it's just a draft. It's just intended to be a draft. The final purpose document, which obviously will be a part of our recommendations, the purpose of reviews is this, that won't happen until we've done all the rest of the work. We're just using this as our foundational basis for now. Yeah.

So, if there's anything you need, if there's anything you want, please come on Thursday if you can and add to the general discussion. And you'll hopefully see some of the things that you suggested included in the documentation, included in the themes. This exercise of this review of reviews is only going to work if we get the community enrolled in this process and everybody participates as much as they possibly can. Any other questions and comments before I make one? Yes, Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN

Just to follow up, Chris. I heard in the session yesterday there was questions asked of the reviews that have been done in the past. How many or what percentage of recommendations had been implemented? You just mentioned there was some data on that. Is that right?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

There's a background document.

BRUCE TONKIN

A quick sense of what that data is.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Not really because I don't know it particularly well, but it is on the wiki. So, if you go to the wiki document which is there, there is a background document. But sort of the general answer to your question is that actually, I think, and I can't give you the actual data, Bruce, but I think—no, it's more than that. It's more than half. It's more than half. Yeah, quite a lot of them may have been implemented but of course then the argument is, well, you haven't implemented it the way that I intended it to be implemented. So, you end up kind of in a no-win situation.

Okay. I have a very important announcement to make. We are all heading off at the end of this. Hopefully, not the end of this. We're going to go to the board shortly. But after the board, we're all

heading off to the boat across the road on the river, to celebrate with a toast to Becky, amongst other things. Now, I'm told by Bart, who is the master of all of these things that everyone will get three free drinks. You don't have to have three. If you only want two or one, that's perfectly fine. No one's going to force you. But your ticket is three.

So, if you think you might need more than three, you should probably take some money with you, or ask someone with some money. No, I mean, cards are fine. I'm sure they take cards. I don't think they're pirates just because they're on a ship. Or as in fact, Pierre suggests, you just befriend someone who doesn't drink and then they can give you their drink card. So, if anyone who doesn't drink would like to go and see Pierre afterwards, they could.

So, that was the very important piece. The other thing to tell you is the timing, so it's from 6:00. There will be a very brief presentation to Becky at 7:00. And we know that people have other places that they need to be. Some people might want to eat. Some people might want to go off to other parties or whatever, so please, stick around at least until we finish that thing at 7:00. It won't last more than 10 minutes, at the most 15 minutes. Enjoy your three drinks. Did I miss anything? What did I miss?

BART BOSWINKEL

Not with respect to the cocktail, but the meeting with the board will be in the auditorium on the third level. So, where the opening ceremony took place.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Bart. Anyone got any last comments or questions either about the ship, the drinks, what we've talked about? Thank you all very much for your attention. We'll see you in the front of the board in a minute. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]