

---

ICANN84 | Prep Week – Review of Reviews-An Update  
Wednesday, October 15, 2025 – 19:00 to 20:00 IST

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Hello everyone and welcome to the ICANN 84 Prep Week Review of Reviews CCG Update Session. It's being held on Wednesday, October 15, 2025 at 18:00 UTC.

My name is Yvette Guigneaux, and I will be your participation manager for this session.

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

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please feel free to raise your hand in Zoom, and when called upon, unmute your microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking in, if it's a language other than English. And please, for our interpreters, speak at a reasonable pace. That does it for me. I will now hand the floor over to Avri Doria. Avri?

---

***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.***

---

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, Yvette. This is Avri Doria speaking. And I want to welcome everybody to this session. I especially want to welcome the ICANN 84 Fellows and NextGen, who I'm told we have a fair number attending. So this is a really good time to have you here. So we're going to be talking about the Review of Reviews, which is the work being done in a cross-community group. Can we have the next slide, please?

During this meeting, we're going to cover a couple issues. First, how did we get here? Who are we? What is this cross-community group about, and who are the people that are participating? Then we're going to get into what has the group been tasked with? What is the remit of this group, and what has it been doing and getting done in the time since it started? The next question goes to how can you help? And we'll go through a lot of the plan for this moving further. But I'll give you a clue right now on how you can help, and that's speak your mind as to make sure that your points of view on this stuff get across. And it's one thing I wanted to say up front, because it's something we'll say a lot. It depends on hearing from you.

And then we'll go into questions and answers. Hopefully, there'll be lots of time for them. We've tried to leave it, and hopefully you'll have a lot of them. And with that, I pass the talking stick or the floor on to Manal, I believe.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Avri. This is Manal Ismail speaking. I'm an ECG member and one of the three co-chairs, along with Avri and Chris. So, by way

---

of background, on the 19th of May, the board sought community dialogue to develop a shared understanding of the areas and issues for which reviews will enhance ICANN's accountability, transparency and effectiveness.

On July 30th, some leaders of supporting organizations and advisory committees came up with a final draft charter that was prepared by them, and then shared with all SOAs, supporting organizations and advisory committee leaderships on the 25th of August, where it was confirmed and supported as the final charter, and then submitted on the 5th of September, and then submitted to the board and approved by the board on the 5th of September as a final charter. This triggered the creation of the Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group, where each of the seven SOAs and ACs nominated two representatives, in addition to two representatives from the board and two from ICANN.org. The group is supported by an extremely capable support team from ICANN and welcomes observers' participation. We have agreed to allow observers to share their views anytime in the chat and be given the floor at the discretion of the co-chairs. And there are also other means to participate, which we'll get through in following slides.

If we can go to the following slide, please, and this lists the names of the members of the Cross-Community Group. We do not intend to go name by name, but we thought to share the names here for you in case you want to reach out to someone for any questions or follow-up. Moving to the following slide, please, and here we would like to spare some time just to make sure we are all on the same

---

page regarding what's in scope of the Cross-Community Group and what's out of scope. So, first of all, what the group has been tasked to do.

The group is mandated to manage a fundamental evaluation of the reviews listed on this slide, which are set out in the ICANN by-laws as a whole system, and this is a keyword here, including their implementation and propose a refreshed system of reviews. So, these reviews are the periodic reviews of ICANN structure and operations, and this is section 4.4 in the by-laws, and sometimes also referred to as organizational reviews or SOAC reviews. And these basically, they review the performance and operations of each SO or AC other than the governmental advisory committee, as well as the nominating committee. Second is the annual review, again, section 4.5 of the by-laws, and this is an annual report on the states of the accountability and transparency reviews covering the status of the implementation of all specific reviews and the status of implementation of the recommendations. Then comes the specific reviews in section 4.6 of the by-laws, and these, as you can already see on the slide, are four reviews, accountability and transparency review, security, stability, and resiliency review, competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review, and registration directory service review.

Then two more bullets, one on previously conducted reviews, and these are any other reviews that were previously conducted apart from those that we are excluding on the following slide. And finally, reviews that have been previously formally recommended, and this

---

is meant to cover four reviews that has been recommended, for example, by the last accountability and transparency review team, ATRT3. Those were recommended but have not yet been conducted. So, everything that fits into any of those five bullets are within the mandate.

Then, finally, the continuous improvement program, and for those not familiar with the term, after two cycles of the organizational reviews, the community identified some challenges and opportunities to improve. And the third accountability and transparency review team in recommendation 3.6 called for organizational reviews to evolve into continuous improvement program. So, while the periodic reviews of ICANN structure and operations are included in the remit, as you can see on the screen, the charter prescribes that the group will not evaluate the continuous improvement program itself, but will take into account its work and will consider how it can best contribute to the broader system of reviews. So, basically, the existence of the continuous improvement program, its results, and how it contributes to the existence of them, Overall review system is in scope, but the details and how it is carried out by each and every individual SO or AC is out of scope. I hope I managed to clarify this part and next if we can go to the what's out of scope.

Here, the evaluation will exclude the following. First, the review of the independent review process. It's a process for independent third-party review of disputes and the review of the reconsideration requests. Again, a process by which any person or

---

entity affected by an action or inaction of ICANN may request this reconsideration. Review of community mediation, which is triggered when the board refuses or fails to comply with an empowered community decision within 30 days from being notified. The review of the empowered community processes, which are processes related to the nine powers given to the empowered community after the transition. And finally, the reviews established through the IANA stewardship transition, which are the customer standing committee effectiveness review and the IANA functions review. So these reviews, this list is out of scope. I'll pause here and I hope it's clear what's in the scope or mandate of the group and what's not. And I'm handing it over to Chris for more into the substance of our work. Over to you, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you very much, Manal. Good day, everybody. Good whatever time of the day it is to you all. I'm Chris Despain. I'm going to take you through a document which we have created. It is up on the wiki and links will be provided. It is a very first draft of the purpose of reviews within ICANN. One of the key initial points in the charter was for this group, for the CCG to figure out what the actual purpose of reviews is. So we have created, the CCG team has created this document. And this is going to be the subject of discussion today on this session, but also the key document that we're going to be talking about in Dublin in the sessions that we have in Dublin. And we're going to go through how those sessions are going to work a little bit later on during this session. So I'm just

---

going to do an overview of the document with you all. And then we're going to go straight at the end of that to Q&A on the document. So people can ask questions, make comments on the document. Then we're going to come back to more logistical matters. And at the end, there'll be another Q&A session that we can talk about and a couple of poll questions for you to respond to.

So I hope you can see the document on the screen. And basically, it sets out what we think. And again, I stress this is very much a first draft or input. None of this is set in stone. It's just us saying this is where we think we're at. We're really keen to have your input. So we start with an overarching statement, which is that 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 we do that by reviewing four things or four sections. First one is reviewing ICANN's execution of its commitments in its articles, its bylaws, its strategic plan, and its financial and operational plan. Namely that its activities, processes, and culture remain consistent with its mission, commitments, and values. That the board, officers, and senior management remain accountable to the global multi-stakeholder community. That ICANN is meeting its stated goals and objectives. That it's maintaining and, where necessary, improving robust mechanisms for public input, inclusiveness, accountability, and transparency. Outcomes of ICANN's decision-making are in the public interest, transparent and accountable to the global multi-stakeholder community. Communication channels are effective

---

and accessible, and decisions and outcomes are reported clearly and openly. And that ICANN duly takes into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities. All of those bullet points are effectively in the bylaws as things that ICANN needs to do.

And I would encourage you to think about not so much those words, but do all the things you think need to be reviewed fit within one of those bullet points, or within B, C, and D, which I'm going to get to in a minute. So do all the things. I think we should review the color of the walls at ICANN meetings. Does that fit into one of those bullet points or B, C, and D? Speaking of B, C, and D, B deals with the Continuous Improvement Program. As Manal said, we are not here to figure out the Continuous Improvement Program. That is in itself, that has already been done, and continuous improvement is currently underway. But there is going to be a need to review the output of the continuous improvement, and that is B. The results of the SO, AC, and C being NomCom, Nominating Committee, Continuous Improvement Program, as they relate to each SO, AC, and the Nominating Committee, and to each other. So that's a review of the outputs from the Continuous Improvement Program and how the SOs and ACs interface with each other. Then C is the overall structure of ICANN. It's SOs, ACs, and the NomCom. Are they fit for purpose? Whether those are fit for purpose? And then D is the ongoing reviews. So obviously, we are now starting the first ever review of reviews. And clearly, in a certain period of time, who knows how many years, there will need to be another review of the

reviews. And then the reason for doing all those reviews is the last sentence, which is, we do those reviews so as to, where necessary, recommend improvements or paths toward improvement for any problematic issues found in the reviews to the board and to the empowered community.

So that's our attempt at a very first draft of what we think is the purpose of reviews. Diana, I can see your question in the chat. The answer to that is I'm not certain that specific wordsmithing today is helpful, but that doesn't mean you shouldn't make suggestions if there's something that you think is important. But this is an open session, so anyone can suggest or say whatever they want to say. And if you want to suggest particular wording, please feel free to do so. What I'm really interested in is any comments on anything that anyone has to say about this document. I'm going to stress again before I throw open the floor that this is very much a first draft, and we are not wedded to any of this, but we think that this is a first step encompassing the purpose of doing ICANN reviews. So I'm going to, who's going to run the Q&A? Alice, are you going to run the Q&A? so I'm going to, Alice is going to run the Q&A, and then Avri and Manal and I, or actually any other members of the CCG can answer questions and indeed ask questions. Alice, over to you.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you very much, Jonathan. And hi, everyone. So I know we do have a question from Alfredo Calderon in the chat pod. Are we looking into updating, changing panels related to the reviews?

---

Chris and Avri, I think you offered an answer in the chat. Would you like to address this live as well?

AVRI DORIA

This is Avri. I'll jump in on it quickly. I think it's way too early to know that. I think that if you read the bylaws as they are now and think about how they may change, that becomes a very good question. But it's not a question that's being answered up front. It's a resultant. I think it'd be fair to say that if at the end of the day, with all discussions, and there are agreements about how things should change and those things require changes to the bylaws, then that would be a process that would be initiated later. I do not believe that the process would be initiated as part of the work that we're doing in the review. But for now, it's really too early to say thanks.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Avri. Let me go to the hand raise that we have from Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks a lot. And thanks, chairs, for your great overview of our work here. I guess I wanted to just add one caveat or extension to Chris's answer to Fiona, which is that wordsmithing this document isn't of great value. But if you detect that the wording might send us down a rabbit hole or fail to take us in the right direction in terms of the work we have to do, then I would say by all means to try to

---

make that correction. Because that's really the purpose of this document is to suggest the framework or the basis on which we're going to work going forward. So if you see any of that being askew because of the wording, then by all means, make those recommendations.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Jonathan. Let me go back to the Q&A part now with a second question from Alfredo Calderon. What is the timeline for a report from the CIP, thus opening it up to public comment?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think Karen was going to take that one. Were you, Karen?

KAREN LENTZ

Sure, I will, Chris. Thank you, Alfredo. So Manal spoke earlier about the charter for this effort, looking at the continuous improvement program as a part of the overall picture of reviews, but not into the details of the program. The continuous improvement program is built to go in cycles. So we are in the first cycle now of a three-year cycle or three years. So each of the individual supporting organizations and advisory committees within those three years have the discretion to plan and track their own milestones to be able to report at the end of that, by the end of that three-year period. So I'm going to put a link to that in the chat. And if there are further questions, feel free to reach out to me.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Karen. There's a hand raised from Fiona Alexander. Fiona?

FIONA ALEXANDER

Hi. Thanks, Alice. And thank you all for doing this work. It's super important for many of you that have been involved in this for a long time. So I just had two observations as I looked at the document, as you put up. And some of this is historical, so you can take it or leave it. But I do think it's important to keep the perspective that these reviews, at least the affirmation reviews, were focused on ensuring ICANN's accountability. And I don't see anywhere in the document the fact that the reviews themselves are this great accountability tool for the ICANN and the ICANN community. And I think it would be useful to somehow find a way to reinforce that through this conversation and through the process and the work that you guys are doing.

There's lots of different ways to have accountability at ICANN. The strategic plan process, the budgeting process, all of those things are tools for accountability. But ultimately, the reviews themselves are supposed to provide that construct as well. And I feel like some of that's been lost over the years. So I feel like reinforcing that through this exercise could be useful in some way. And I asked about the wordsmithing, just because as I was reading what you put up, there was one thing that jumped out at me. And again, I don't have to tell Chris to feel free to ignore me because he will. So

---

but it says ICANN's execution of its commitments. That made me stop for a second, because I always thought and assumed that what we're talking about is ICANN's execution of tasks. So we're looking for the execution of specific items that are how you implement your commitments. So I feel like this wording of execution of commitments is a little bit vague and broad. And again, I don't want to get into, even though I'm drawn to wordsmithing by design, I don't want to get into that. But I would just suggest taking a look at that, because I feel like it makes it a little imprecise to say ICANN's execution of commitments versus ICANN execute on actual specific items and core tasks or whatever that wording might be. Two observations, in the exercise, and look forward to, seeing what happens.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Let me respond to that, Fiona. Two things, I think. On your second point on commitments, I think I take your point. I think we use the word commitments because if I'm not mistaken, actually, they're actually described in the bylaws as commitments. But I may have got that wrong. But I think that's why we use the word. And your first point about actually the reviews themselves being an important accountability tool, I agree. And it may be that we can add something to the chapeau, the purpose of reviews is to assess, etc., that covers that point. And I appreciate that feedback. I think that's an important point. Thank you for that, Alice.

AVRI DORIA

Can I add a point to the answer? The chapeau does list that the purpose of reviews is to assess that these things are done in a transparent and accountable manner. So it's there, but I can see the general purpose in strengthening that and strengthening the nature of a review as an accountability measure itself. And that doesn't come through. So I think that's a really good suggestion. As for wordsmithing, Chris and I have totally opposite views on it. I think it's a wonderful enterprise. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I'm not against wordsmithing, Avri. I just didn't want to get into individual words on a community call. That was all well. Plenty of opportunity to do that. We've got a list set up, etc., etc. But yes, I agree. Alice, back to you.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Chris. And thank you, Avri. Manal, did you want to respond to this as well?

MANAL ISMAIL

Very quickly. Again, thank you, Fiona, for both points. I was just going to mention that we thought along the same lines. First thing we said, the ICANN commitments. And then the following question was in our brainstorming, then what are these commitments? And we started listing the bylaws, articles of incorporation, strategic plan, operating and financial plan. So we started with the overall overarching commitments. But I take your point. It needs to be

broken down into tasks, which we already did. But maybe we need to make it clearer as well as the accountability you mentioned as well. Thank you. Back to you, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Manal. We do have a question from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, timeline for this work on review of reviews.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I'll take that, Alice. Cheryl, doubtless you're not the only person who's asking that question. The current answer to that question is that we think, and we're still working our way through the timeline, but we think that we're going to be able to stick fairly closely, if not completely, with the timing of the charter, which sees us finalizing our work to go out to the board by the end of, now that I've said I can ask the question, I can't remember what the date is. Alice, you've got that information.

MANAL ISMAIL

I think it was August 26.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So following the second meeting, so you've got Mumbai, then you've got the second meeting to sign off and everything, and then it goes out to the board. So I think that's the goal. I think that aligns with the charter. But Cheryl, we are currently examining a work plan. And once we've got our heads around that work plan, and

---

hopefully by the time we get to Dublin, one of the things we're going to be able to do with the community is to go through that work plan in some detail and say, look, these are the milestones. These are what we think we need to do. And we're going to need your cooperation, because you're going to have to work as quickly as we do in order to meet these timelines. But we're very conscious that this needs to be done as quickly as possible. Do we have a slide on it in this session? Oh, we do. I apologize. My apologies. I didn't realize that we had. In that case, it's coming up Cheryl, and I shall shut up.

ALICE JANSEN

Hey, Chris and Cheryl. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Alice. And hi, everyone. Thank you for the work that's been done so far into this review. I just wanted to, I think, agree with Fiona and say it's a little like in this document, seeing the reiteration of what all those commitments are made me anxious, whether it was a comprehensive list or not, or whether anything had been missed. And I don't really think the list of those bullet point of commitments is necessary, because whatever the commitments are, the bylaws, this review system should help support that they're achieved. So I don't know if the synonym helps or hurts. So I don't know if the synonym helps or hurts. People have different views on that kind of thing, but if they are listed, it doesn't

need to be a complete list, otherwise people will start arguing about what is missing.

And the second point I was just going to raise is that the overall reason we do these reviews is to make sure that the ICANN system remains flexible and up-to-date in fulfilling its overall purpose. I think that's captured in the chapeau, but it might be useful to strengthen that language as you go. So just a comment for you to consider as you do the work. Thanks.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Jordan. I do not see any questions in the Q&A pod or hand raised. There was a question from Eduardo in the chat. Oh, Manon, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL

Just very quickly to respond to Jordan's comment on the sub-bullets, because we had also this discussion during our calls and some were of the view that we should have the chapeau sentence only and others were of the view that we should go through the breakdown so that we can make sure that the chapeau is accurate and reflects everything that we need to cover. And we decided to start from the details and then abstract into the chapeau paragraph. But yeah, just to reflect that we had this debate and we had both points of view within the working group. And I see Avri's hand up as well. So please, over to you, Avri.

---

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I didn't want to rush you, but it's very true that one cannot list everything. But if one lists nothing, then it becomes very ambiguous and it includes anything that anyone can think of. So finding the balance between listing what's necessary, indicating that there is no such thing as a complete list, but avoiding the highfalutin, very high-level words that say everything but nothing. So it's really trying to avoid either of those that became part of the exercise. So very much understand the problem with, oh, but you forgot to list this. But also the problem of a chapeau alone tells you mostly nothing. So thanks.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Avri. There was a question in the chat from Eduardo Diaz, which I believe has been answered by Jonathan. Is the review of structures expected to include both the board structure and the ICANN staff structure as well?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I can tackle that, I think it depends. And the answer to the logical answer to that question is yes, of course, it has to include it both. And I'll give you an example of why. Let's assume that as part of a structural review, new structures are added, new SOs are added, new ACs are added. There's clearly a consequence of that in the shape of the board. And even if you were to review one of the SOs and restructure it, there may be consequences that have an effect on the board. So the example that I've been using, which I use because I think it's incredibly unlikely, and so it's uncontroversial,

is that if the ccNSO decided that it thought it was better to have a separate SO for internationalized domain name, ccTLDs. So one IDN ccNSO and one ASCII ccNSO, not going to happen. But if that was the case, clearly there would be consequences that would flow from that to the board structure. One consequence might be there's no change because you can have one board seat each. But another consequence might be that there needs to be a change to the structure because the number of board members needs to change. So I think the answer to the question is entirely dependent on what happens. But yes, I think we have to be open to the fact that changes even at the SO and AC level will sometimes require consequential changes at the board level. I hope that's helpful.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Chris. I do not see any hand raised or questions in the Q&A pod. I think we can move on to the next item. And as indicated earlier, there is a final Q&A portion in this meeting. So you will have another opportunity to raise questions before we end the session. Avri, I will turn this back to you for the phases of work. If we could go to the next slide. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And this is Avri speaking again. Chris has already done a very good job of saying that we are at the moment, and hopefully it will stay that way, on a schedule that matches the charter's expectations. So basically planned against four phases. We're in the fact-finding phase at the moment. That takes us through the

---

meeting of ICANN 84. And basically, each of these phases has been timed with one of the meetings as the forcing function for getting things done. There's a very detailed type of chart being built underneath this to, as we fit each of the things that need to be done for each of the phases to go. So then we go through the analysis and the development of the proposals before the 85. Then we go into the finalization of proposals before ICANN 86. And finally, we go for presentation to the board. So that is the schedule at the moment. We're only still in phase one at first there, but see how we do. So that's basically the schedule that we're on.

And then it becomes that, how can you all help? Can we go to the next slide? So how can you help? You're helping now already by bringing up issues, by bringing up the need for a certain term, for a certain tool, for a certain flexibility to be built in. And at the ICANN meeting, there's going to be two sessions. The first session will be basically more conversation, going through these, using various methods to try and pull the contributions. I've sat in many conversations with many of you over the time, and I know that there's some strong views out there on various of the issues, various of the points that were made. I want to make sure that we do not get to the end of this and people are being frustrated that they couldn't say what they needed to say, that the discussion of a certain issue was never possible. Really working hard. So this session is a very important one for you to come loaded for bear, basically to come to make sure that you get to make your points and that they're there. Then we're going to take what's come out in

---

this session to help build that session. And then that session will help build the second session. We're going to go through and see what's understood, see what's not understood, see where there's still issues that we need to delve in, basically, and try and understand the feedback we've got, talk about it, and get more feedback to verify or falsify or what have you, to basically try and get to a synthesis and build on that for the task we've got now. It'll be very important, as I say, that you contribute. And we'll make sure that we leave time for some open mic-ing, if there's anything that we've managed to talk for weeks and two days, and we still haven't hit some point that we need to hit, that it's being designed to leave time to get those views said. One more slide, please.

No. So, and I know I keep saying the same thing over and over again, but I'm going to keep saying it over and over again. Your input is what this is about. It's the input of some of you that brought the problem to people's awareness, that we needed to do something. It's the comments that you've all made that have us, doing this exercise, or that many made. I want to emphasize again that observers are welcome. You need to register in your SOI and all that, but as Manal said observers will be notified of all meetings, can participate, can use the comment, really, and for the most part, will be given the ability to speak unless something unusual is going on. So it is at the discretion of the chairs, but I think all three of us have the intent to let people speak as much as need to. You could follow the work at that web address, and here's an email address to send input if what you want to write is an email, a text and

---

anything that you can do that to. You don't have to just speak. You can actually come and write your input. So there's many ways to input. Really, I'll say it again, don't want to get to the end of this and have people frustrated that they didn't get to speak their piece, that they didn't manage to get their point across, that they weren't understood. So really want to avoid that, and please reach out to any of us, either the co-chairs or the members of the group. The members of the group are supposed to talk it up within their own SOs, ACs, communities, etc. So make sure you talk to them. Make sure you give them the information they need to present your view. And with that, I believe I pass it back to Chris for some more Q&A.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you very much, Avri. I want to just address some of the points that have been made in the chat. But before I do, I'm not sure if you said it or not, but just to be clear, I think that input on reviews at ICANN.org email is meant to be an interactive address. So it is for your input, but I would love to see some seriously vibrant debate on that list. If we try and just do this face-to-face at ICANN meetings, it's going to be even more challenging than it is already. So if you want a wordsmith, if you want to bring points up and you disagree, please do so respectfully on the list. Jeff, you made a couple of points in the chat. You're right. It is clearly important that reviews don't stop us from doing the work that we're supposed to be doing. I have been involved in organizations who have figuratively reviewed themselves to death. And that's not a recipe for success. It's a recipe for disaster. But that said, reviews are also

---

incredibly powerful and incredibly important. And in organizations like this one, it's important that they happen on a clear, regular basis, but that we don't end up, and let's be blunt, in the situation we were in before, which is reviews falling over each other, toppling into each other, stuff not having happened, doesn't matter whose fault it was. When we set it all up in the first place, no one imagined it would end up the way that it did. And we need to try and fix that. But thank you for raising the point. I agree with you 100%.

And there was another thing I just wanted to address in the chat. It was Fiona's point about, which Cheryl noted as well, which is that thing about this is not meant to be a way of doing PDPs. This is all about reviewing the stuff that needs to be reviewed in respect to ICANN's commitments, if indeed commitment is the right word, and the results of CIP and structure. It's not about work that should otherwise be done in a PDP. And thank you, Fiona, for raising that point. I think that's very important. I want to go back to Jordan's point about the bullets and whether they're necessary or not. Just to say, I want to repeat the question that I asked the community to consider between now and Dublin. Is there something that you think, it doesn't matter whether what you think should be reviewed actually ends up being reviewed for the moment. The overarching question is there something that you think that should be reviewed that is not covered by the chapeau and the four sub points underneath the chapeau? If it's covered, then when we get into the actual work of building what we need to build, we can talk about whether it should be covered or not, whether it should be reviewed

or not. But if it's not covered, we want to know about it now. If you don't think that one of the things you want to be reviewed is covered by the chapeau and the bullet points of A, B, C and D, then we need to know about it. And you should bring that to Dublin so that we can talk about it. With that said, are there any questions, comments about anything at all? You can go back to the document, you can talk about timing, you can talk about anything. Are there any comments or questions at this point? Please put your hand up if there are.

AVRI DORIA

I just put my hand up to say that you don't have to wait to Dublin for that. Again, you can send us an email. I'm just amplifying that if you see some bullets that are missing, send us an email so that we don't even have to wait to Dublin and we can create discussion and questions around them. So the sooner we've got information about your concerns, the easier we can build it into that first session.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Avri. Does anyone else have a comment or a question or anything that they want to bring up?

MANAL ISMAIL

Before we ask our questions.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN                      Indeed. Manal, back to you. so ... Hang on, Anne's hand has come up. Anne's put her hand up.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE              Sorry, Chris. Thanks much. I had put the question in the Q&A.

CHRIS DISSPAIN                      I'm sorry. My apologies. I didn't see that.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE              Well, that's all right. Under the new code of conduct that the board passed, I believe, in September meeting, I'm curious as to how that affects several different activities going on within ICANN. And in this particular case, I'd like to know if there have to be disclosures by CCG members, not only that the employer, which I'm assuming is in the SOI, but other affiliations or even client information, because it seems to be quite specific in the code of conduct about information that has to be disclosed.

CHRIS DISSPAIN                      You raise a very good point, Anne. Thank you for bringing it up. There was, I think, a staff ... Is Russ on the call? Russ, did you put a blog out relatively recently on the implementation of the code of conduct?

---

RUSS WEINSTEIN                      I did, Chris. Thank you for mentioning that. I did. Hello, everyone. This is Russ Weinstein, Senior Vice President of Policy for ICANN.

AVRI DORIA                            Uh-oh, I'm getting an echo.

CHRIS DISSPAIN                    No, it's fixed now, I think.

RUSS WEINSTEIN                    Thanks. And I think the blog was put in the chat relative to the code of conduct and statements of interest. And all of us on the CCG all submitted statements of interest. And I'm happy to remind my colleagues to take a look at that code of conduct and make any updates they feel are necessary and appropriate with that. So, I think that's the short answer to that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN                    Thank you, Russ. And Anne, so as a start of all of our calls, and I think you know this because all the GNSO calls start in the same way. Does anyone have an update of their statement of interest? What we haven't done and you have my commitment that we will do at the next meeting, which I think is next CCG meeting, which is next week, is to ask our members to read Russ's blog, read the code of conduct, and consider whether they need to make specific changes to their SOI in the light of the changes or rather the

introduction rather of the new code of conduct. So, I hope that answers your question and is helpful.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

It does. Thank you so much, Russ, and also, Chris, for the attention that you are giving to this. Very much appreciated.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Anne. And now I think it is over to Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris, and thank you, everyone, for the interactive discussion. So, we have worked on a couple of questions to poll whether we are heading in the right direction and we are on the right track or not. So, if we can have the first poll question, please.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Here we go.

MANAL ISMAIL

So, having heard from the presentation today, are you clear on what the review's cross-community group mandate is? And the choices are yes, no, or more information is needed to be able to decide. Maybe we can give it a minute or so.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

If we can quickly display the result of the first question.

MANAL ISMAIL

And we would definitely like to hear from the 7% who do not feel they are confident about understanding the group's mandate. And also the 17% who need more information. We are more than willing to provide any further information. Please let us know what you're missing and we will be more than happy to share it with you. And if there are any follow-up questions on this right now before we go to the second poll question. If not, then can we please put the second question up?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Let me go ahead and do that.

MANAL ISMAIL

Having also discussed the purpose of reviews, this very initial draft that the group compiled, do you think this very first draft of the purpose is going in the right direction? Again, choices are yes, no, depends if there is a certain condition or more information is needed. And I see Leon in the chat saying that all lawyers will answer depends.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Let's share the results.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Oh, excellent.

MANAL ISMAIL

So we have 66% who feels we are heading in the right direction. 3% feels no, 14% depends, and 17% need more information. Again, please follow up on this on the mailing list. We will be more than happy to provide any further information to take into consideration any conditions that would speak in favour of the depends. And if there is anything that we can do also to address the no, please let us know.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

If you said no, I completely understand that it might be uncomfortable to speak up in the room, and that's perfectly fine. Please feel free to send an email to obviously to the list if you're prepared to, but if you're not, you can send an email to any of us, to Avri, to me, or to Manal, or to Alice or Karen. And if you don't know our email addresses, somebody will. And please do, because if you don't think we're heading in the right direction, that is incredibly important that we hear from you. So thank you.

AVRI DORIA

And once we're in Dublin, grab any of us.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Oh absolutely. good point.

AVRI DORIA

So you don't even have to put it in writing, you can just grab and if it needs to be treated with without attribution, that can be done too, because what's most important is the idea that you're bringing up, not who it's coming from.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay.

MANAL ISMAIL

Any final questions in the remaining couple of minutes? Any comments? Well, we cannot stress more the importance of your input. And thank you for your time today and for your active participation. We count on your continued contribution and feedback throughout this process. And Russ, please your hand is up. Go ahead.

RUSS WEINSTEIN

Thanks. I was just going to point to Anne's comment in the chat. But maybe we want to touch, just reinforce, she mentions, I'm in the more info needed category, because I need more time to review the purpose document. And assume this will be discussed in detail in Dublin.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

This will be the main topic of discussion in Dublin. And all those of you who are here on this call will have to sit through the whole introduction again. Sorry about that. But heaps of people are not

---

on this call. So yes, we're going to do it all again in Dublin. It's like concert number two. It's like the difficult second album. And we'll do it all again. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Russ and Chris. And indeed, so this is just the beginning of it. We will continue. This is the fact-finding phase. So we will continue to bother you with requests for more input. And please be encouraged to join and engage in the review session in person or remote during the Dublin week. And consider joining the group as an observer. We meet on a weekly basis. And follow our work on the group's wiki and send us your input on the email address that we've shared. I think with that, we are good to close. I wish everyone a good day and safe travels to Dublin if you intend to be there. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**