
ICANN84 | AGM – Review of Reviews - Session 2 of 2
Thursday, October 30, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

ALICE JANSEN

Hello and welcome to the Review of Reviews session 2. My name is Alice Jansen and I'm a Participation Manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Committee Participants Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. We will also post them in the chat for your reference. Interpretation for this session will include Chinese, French, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Only questions posted in the Q&A pod will be read aloud during this session as time permits and when directed by the chair of this session.

Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak in, if speaking a language other than English, and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to the co-chairs of the Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group, starting with Avri Doria. Thank you very much.

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 very much, Alice, for initiating this. Before I start, I'm hoping that there are some ICANN newcomers amongst us. I want to welcome you. I want to make sure you know how welcome you are and how welcome your voices are. I hope to hear you. I hope to hear your comments, both in the meeting and after. So this is the Review of Reviews session number 2. We had a session earlier in the week on Monday where we collected many of opinions and many points of view and many recommendations.

Can I have the next slide, please? And have started discussing them in terms of, yes. So what's going to happen today-- oh yeah, that's right, I forgot I had the clicker. I'm so used to asking for a next slide that I actually forgot I had power.

So anyhow, we're going to start with the summary of input received throughout the week. So we had the input that we received on Monday. We also had received a lot of input in individual conversations and conversations in the various meetings throughout the week, in the various supporting organizations, in the various advisory committees and such.

So we're going to look a little bit at the summary of those and I emphasize that it's a summary. What we've tried to do is sort of abstract most of those. We've had help both of people who participated remotely, for example, Robert Guerra, who's a member of the cross-community working group, did some very

good work. And then people on the staff, Alice and others among them, have tried to sort of consolidated them.

When you look at them, I'll ask you to look at them and understand that there's a lot of material behind any one of those statements and all of that material remains available and open within our archives for people to go back and say, when I look at a four-word statement, what topics did it include? During that, we'll probably try to go through that very quickly, not stopping for questions unless there's something absolutely life and death urgent, because then we want to have an open mic.

During the open mic part, we want to make sure that there is no important opinion, no opinion at all because all opinions are open, are important that's been forgotten. We really would like that none of you walk out of this room, either those in the room or those in the room online, walk out of the room saying, I wish I had said this, that basically you take the opportunity to basically speak the piece that you need to speak. And then we'll go into, at the very end, an overview of the next steps. We're trying to devote most of the time in the meeting to the open microphone.

Okay, so let me now go to the next, oh, that's right, I got it again. I keep forgetting that I have a clicker. So just to see, we're not going to talk about it now and it's probably hard, oh no, you can probably read it. This is the current state of the purposes of a review that we'll be working in. This will remain a living document.

We will, after this discussion, we will then in our first meetings with the cross-community working group as we proceed, we'll try to update it to match all the concerns that we've heard, all the purposes, etc., that have come to us. It hasn't changed this week and it's not changing in this particular session, but it will be changing, as I said. It's a living document. It'll always be there for people to go back to, to refer to, and to suggest changes to as needed. I'm not going to go through it at this point. I think I've gone through it many times with many of the groups, as I'm sure my partner co-chairs have done in various groups. So hopefully everybody's had a chance to hear it discussed at least once, if not multiple times.

Okay, so what we heard, did I miss one? So what we've heard among the general principles of what people want, what are the purposes, what people need to see in reviews, they have to be simple, fresh, clear, meaningful, and impactful. They have to be measurable and actionable, not just hand waves. They have to align on outcomes. They have to support ICANN in achieving its objectives more effectively. They have to be effectively scoped so that you know what's going to happen in one. They have to be future-proofed. I always add on that one, for some meaning of future-improved.

Reviews are reviews. They're not policy meccams. It can't be used to sort of go around and create a policy within the guise of a review. And there needs to be an in-depth assessment of review challenges

and successes. So a review doesn't just happen, but a review is also assessed. A review is studied. A review needs to be understood.

Clarifications on the draft that we've got standing is people ask, how do you define the multi-stakeholder model of ICANN? Not a small task, a very interesting task. How do you define culture? Several times when we're looking at the purposes, the word culture comes in. What is ICANN's culture? How do we define it? By whose definition are you working at a particular time? Consider referring to exact bylaw references. In the purposes we speak of the bylaws in a general sense, we need to look at it in a more specific sense.

With respect to the continuous improvement bullet points, how do they impact each other? Understanding the impact they have to each other. The responsiveness to constituencies, the continuous improvement occurs in specific constituencies. It occurs with effects on other ones. How does that work? How do we pay attention to that? Other duties as assigned is sort of one of those catchphrases that should probably be attached to almost every one of the purposes that one finds.

And what does components of ICANN refer to? We talk about structures and its components. Do we mean just the SOs and ACs? Do we mean the constituencies below them, subgroups? How do we include the organization, the staff? Do we include the Board? How is all of the components included?

And then consider whether enumerating the list under A, remember on the first one when we had, we then went into all

specifics and there was a real question there of, do we list them all? If you start to enumerate them all, have you included them all? Does that make it confusing? Is it enough to just sort of stay, refer to the notion and then the other recommendations that have come through, for example, about strategic plans that in some sense are meant to include them all? I will now click one more time and then I'll pass on the clicker.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Avri, for passing the floor and the clicker. So next is on feedback on what should be reviewed. And regarding that, we have received feedback on ICANN governance, including delivery against ICANN's mission, compliance with commitments and core values, conflicts and statements of interest, code of conduct, financial models, empowered community and many other things.

Also on ICANN adaptability and ICANN ecosystem and the multi-stakeholder model. And this one also covers the interrelation between SOs, ACs, nominating committee and the Board, ICANN structure, overlaps or gaps between the different SOs and ACs, interaction among all constituencies, equality of representation, handling of advice, composition of the Board, ICANN community volunteers and so on.

Also on community agility and this has to do with the SO, ACs consistency with the ever-evolving governance, sustainability of volunteers, leadership skills, diversity and openness, stability of

the SOs and ACs, pace and efficiency of their processes and succession planning in the different ICANN groups.

Then we come to effectiveness and basically effectiveness of everything, staff effectiveness, community effectiveness, effectiveness of reviews, efficiency of the Board and effectiveness of the policies and making sure whether the policies really meet the intended purposes. Then comes the public input including effectiveness of communications and technologies, engagement and having one single ICANN engagement calendar for the different SOs and ACs, Board and executive obligations post the engagement and effectiveness in bringing the diverse views together.

And then we had accountability and transparency not only to the community here but also ICANN's accountability to the outside world, trust and again compliance and we had some specific topics highlighted during the week. This included DNS abuse, universal acceptance and travel support allocations.

Finally, we had some ideas also shared during the week. One on having the strategic plan as basis for reviews of ICANN's delivery of its mission in accountable and transparent manner and process for reviews to be established on demand and ad hoc basis so guidelines for how such reviews should be conducted or also micro reviews and ad hoc reviews.

So with that we've reached the important part of our session today which is your input. We have an open mic session now and if you

have any questions or further input or follow up remarks on the initial recap we've had on the input we've gathered so far if you feel that your point was misunderstood or was not reflected in the initial recap we had so please come up to the mic. And with that I'm passing over to Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Manal. So hi everyone, this is your chance again. Happy to go back to any of the individual slides if you want to refer to a particular bullet point. Happy to hear anything at all you have to say about the past. Happy to have you talk about your experiences of past reviews if you've been involved. Happy to hear anything at all whether it's to do with as long as it's to do with reviews. Whether it's to do with the points that we've gathered on these slides, please do come to the microphone otherwise it'll be a very short session. Yes, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Chris. We have a question in the Zoom room from Sivasubramanian Muthusamy. Definitions are necessary but should the process to arrive at definitions take long and should definitions be rigid? How about a certain degree of flexibility as we go? End of question.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay, I mean that's an interesting question. I think you can, which we can read in a number of ways. If you go back to the ATR bylaw

and I'm obviously paraphrasing here. It basically says it's an accountability and transparency review and you can review pretty much whatever you want as long as you, as long as amongst the things you review, you review these things and then there's a list of the things that you can review.

One of the questions that we're going to be asking ourselves is should the reviews be tightly, very tightly scoped or should they be loosely scoped or do you solve the kind of loose scoping issue by having some very tightly scoped reviews that everybody's really clear what they're doing.

And then there is a notion of having what we're calling at the moment an ad hoc review. So you build a process by which a part of the community and obviously who that is, which how many bits of the community are necessary to make it happen say there should be an ad hoc review. And I'm trying to think of an example. Okay, say that the results of WSIS+20 had a significant effect on the way that ICANN does its work and lives to its mission. Then you could use an ad hoc review to talk about that and look at that and see whether or not as a result of that you need to make some changes to the bylaws or to the mission, etc. That may not be the best example, but it is an example.

So the question of definitions is really important. You'll have seen on one of the slides, one of the questions was what do you mean by multi-stakeholder model? What are the sections of the community

that we refer to and so on? So I completely acknowledge the question. Avri, Manal, do you want to say anything?

AVRI DORIA

I can add a little on definitions. Definitions are indeed, as the question implied, very, very important, but the notion that one could ever arrive at a definitive, closed definition that permitted no more discussion, no more clarification is hard for me to imagine. I'm hardly in a position to say it doesn't exist, but it's really hard for me to imagine that any definition is more than a best definition at a point in time for the work that we're trying to do.

In some sense, these cold working definitions, living definitions, the definitions vary as we progress, as we evolve, so do definitions. But we really do have to get the best of a definition that we can agree to as a definition to work with for that purpose at that point in time. Beyond that, I'm not sure how far we could ever go.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay. Sébastien. There you go.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

For the record, Sébastien Bachollet. Well, first of all, among the ideas that we could have and we could put forward, the idea is also about implementing a recommendation before launching a new review on the next topic. Well, perhaps we should review or launch

a review on where we are in terms of implementing recommendations on a totally different subject.

I've been making some calculations on the group's composition, the group that is in charge of the review of reviews after the discussions that we had with the Board earlier on. The Board talked about the fact that diversity is absolutely essential. It's number two in our concerns and our priorities. This is my result, the result of my calculations. One member for the African region, two for the Asia-Pacific region, three for Europe, three for Latin America and the Caribbean, and nine for North America. Nine. So that's half of the composition or half of the members of the group. As for gender, 12 men, 6 women.

Well, there you are. The fact that you don't have any rules for the composition of this group, the fact that we don't have or we didn't follow the rules of the working group composition rules is the reason why we have this composition. This is a very imbalanced group in terms of regions, in terms of gender. Unfortunately, I think this is going to be a huge hurdle for our work. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Sébastien, thank you for that feedback. I'm going to make a couple of comments and then I'll open the floor for anyone else. So just to be clear, and for those in the room who weren't necessarily either here or paying attention when the CCG was set up, the composition of this cross-community group was agreed amongst the SO and AC

leaderships, the chairs and vice chairs of all of the SOs and ACs and the Board.

And it was agreed to be two representatives from each SO/AC Board staff and those were chosen by each of the SOs and ACs using whatever process they use. In the case of the ccNSO, which is the one I can speak to, there was a call for volunteers, there was an interview process and a decision. I do appreciate the feedback, however. Avri, Manal, anything? No? Okay. Russ.

RUSS WEINSTEIN

Thanks, Chris. This is Russ Weinstein from the ICANN team and I'm on the CCG. I think we had some really productive discussions this week, so thank you for the co-chairs for their service in this project, first of all. I thought the session on Monday was really informative and helpful, and I think we're really close to our mission on phase one and I wanted to offer a suggestion.

So in phase one we're supposed to come to alignment with the community on purpose and then move forward to the what and how we do reviews and I feel like today we're moving a little bit into the what and how and maybe if we pull back and agree on purpose. I think we were really close on sort of what we were referring to as the chapeau statements about alignment and assessment of ICANN's effectiveness, and then an alignment to the strategic plan being something that seemed to emerge.

A lot of the feedback, the way I interpreted it, was giving us guiding principles of how the reviews should be done. Not the what or the how, but giving us some boundaries that can help us design that next phase. So I wonder if we can take and leverage the feedback we got from the community this week and construct a short statement of purpose with some core principles that will then enable us to close out phase one and move into phase two, which is going to be a hard phase, frankly, but that's sort of where my head's at right now.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Russ. A couple of comments to make on that. So we're going to at the end of this open mic session, we're going to look at the timeline and that includes obviously what to do with the purpose document. To reiterate what Avri said at the very beginning, it's not intended to sign off on this. This is intended to be a document that continues to change as we go through our work. And in fact, the final, if you will, purpose document will only really be able to be completed once we know where we're at, because it's going to need to cover everything. And this is intended to just be a starting point. It was always intended to just be a starting point.

So we're going to have a call of the CCG next week and we're going to go through in more detail the feedback that we've got and sort of jig around with the document a little bit to just make sure that even in its what we'll call its second draft form, it's reflective of the

feedback. Some of those discussions may be challenging because there are some opposing views. Some people say leave the bullets in, some people say take them out.

And then just to get back to your point about phase two, yes, but we haven't yet, we think, finished fact-finding. So we're going to have a series of calls over the next little while, not long, that are going to be a number of community calls that are going to be specific and we'll talk a bit more about those when we get to that point. Okay. Super. Thank you. I think Cheryl was next. Avri, did you want to say anything? Manal? No? Okay. Cheryl. I know you'll get there. Or you don't really need the microphone yet. You're not on, Cheryl, so to speak.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR

There we go. I hear the echo. Cheryl Langdon Orr speaking in a personal capacity, but I am from the At-Large community and I've had a tiny, tiny little bit to do with a few reviews over the years. I just wanted to, and this is simply opinion, right? I am very pleased to see the possibilities on our discussion points to look at tightly scoped, very, very tightly scoped reviews for very, very well-purposed intentions, but they also need to be time-bound and they certainly need to be transparent. So I think if we can up the ante on the transparency aspect of how these processes end up being designed, that will be very useful indeed.

I'm very pleased to hear the potential for the ad hoc ones to come in and meet occasional needs. That's great. But what we do need

to also make sure we do with regard to whatever operating principles are in place is make sure that the expectations on those members of these review teams are clearly understood by the bodies that appoint them and by the individuals who say yes, and if the individuals who say yes to serve in these capacities do not meet those expectations, there has to be the right to recall or to toss them out because we cannot carry dead wood in these important processes and I would argue we certainly have in the past. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Cheryl. I'm going to go to an online question next and I'm going to go to, I can't see who that is, the next microphone over there, then Bruce, then there. Okay, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Chris. We have a question from, well, comment from Robert Guerra who's a reviewer reviews member. I appreciate all the comments regarding what should be in scope for reviews. It seems like a very comprehensive list. Interested in hearing feedback from the community on what might be or not in scope, how to prioritize items to be reviewed and timelines if any needed to complete them. End of comment.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay, so, Manal, go ahead. So, Robert's on the CCG. So, Robert's asking effectively everyone in the room to think about whether you

have feedback on how to prioritize items to be reviewed and timelines if any needed to complete. So, that's a thing to think about and see if you want to comment on it. Go ahead.

PEARL RISBERG

Hello, I'm Pearl Risberg. I am from NTIA, US Department of Commerce, and also grateful to be an observer to the Review of Reviews cross-community group. As the Review of Reviews CCG works to fulfill its charter, we should ensure the outcomes from this effort do not reduce rigor in ICANN's accountability simply because rigor is hard. Accountability is central to ICANN's ability to fulfill its commitments, a sentiment we have heard shared by many of ICANN's stakeholders throughout this week. Beyond the issue of accountability, we must examine the ability of ICANN's review system itself to evolve. ICANN has never been, nor will it ever be, completely static.

Finally, there are procedural aspects of the reviews, including methodology, timelines, composition of the review teams, and implementation challenges, which may be contributing to missed deadlines and backlogs of recommendations. As we shared in the GAC, we continue to actively monitor and engage in the work of the Review of Reviews CCG, including to ensure that it does not stray from the commitments ICANN and the community made nearly 10 years ago. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Pearl, thank you. I think we can say that all of the things you listed are part of the grab bag of things we know we need to deal with, so I don't think you've said anything that we think is not within our remit. I agree.

AVRI DORIA

But thank you for constantly reminding us.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks. Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN

Thank you, Chris. Bruce Tonkin from .au. A couple of things just reacting to the feedback slide up there. One is I think the heading there should be efficiency and effectiveness, and then you just have staff community reviews underneath, and efficiency and effectiveness are two different things.

The other thing that you might add to the list, I think, could be a performance reporting framework that's missing from that list, because one of the things that makes reviews hard is you don't have the data to actually use to start your review. So I think if we have clear metrics and we have the right reporting and performance reporting frequency, that should actually help us focus on the areas that need more work.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Bruce. I think that makes sense, and we are obviously taking notes and we'll build all that into our discussions. Yes, sir. Is that Lawrence?

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE- Yes, so this is Lawrence. I had the opportunity of contributing to the process of putting the charter together from the GNSO perspective. So looking at the CCGs charter on the third page, talking about the purpose, goals, and the scope, it did list out certain areas where the reviews were to cover, and there was also explicitly in that documentation areas where reviews were not to be impacted. These were reviews of the independent review process and a few others.

But of specific interest is the first area that reviews were to cover, which is periodic review of ICANN structure and operations. And looking at the feedback we have here, I don't know if the periodic reviews were substituted for some other process listed up here, and just wanted to get some clarity around that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Lawrence, I think that's covered by, and if I can get this to work, there we go. I think that's covered by B and C. Now, we know that we need to work on the wording of those, but those are the two sections of the purpose that deal with the structures, not so much the operations, but certainly the structures. The big one, C, is the overall ICANN structure, and the smaller one, B, is the individual

SOs and ACs, both as individual items and as they exist and operate interface with each other. So I think that deals with the structure.

And then on the operations, I think that's part of A. So there are a number of bullets in that point A that go to things like staff meeting the goals, etc., etc., is ICANN operating in accordance with its bylaws and strategic plan. Does that deal with your question?

LAWRENCE ROBERTS OLAWALE- Yes, so happy to hear that from what you're saying. We should expect the work to impact on the periodic reviews. Is that a confirmation?

CHRIS DISSPAIN Can you be a bit more specific by what you mean by periodic reviews?

LAWRENCE ROBERTS OLAWALE- So taking a cue from my own constituency, for instance, the GNSO, we've had the periodic reviews suspended for the fact that we were expecting work on a holistic phase. So this process we're now engaged, the review of reviews, it's the expectation of some of us that what should have been done in terms of outcomes for the GNSO as structural process will be carried out in this particular phase.

MANAL ISMAIL

Yeah, just to ensure you, Lawrence, that whatever is in the charter is definitely in scope and covered by the purpose of reviews Chris referred to. What was on the slide, if this is what you were referring to, is just additional feedback that we heard throughout this week. But everything in the charter that is listed as in scope is already in scope. And I think we have a slide in the appendix that lists what we already have in scope exactly as mentioned in the charter.

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE- Thank you for the clarification.

MANAL ISMAIL

And yeah, we're getting to it. We just annexed it because we, yeah. So this is what's in the charter listing what's in scope, including the periodic reviews of ICANN structure and operations and again the CIP to the extent that it feeds into the collective system of reviews, but not how it works individually within each and every SO and AC.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah, I think that's right. And Lawrence, I think to sort of your really specific point about the GNSO is that what used to be the independent reviews, where the supposedly experts from outside came in and did a review of the structure. I hope I get this right, ATRT3 recommendations included that those stopped, that they were replaced by the continuous improvement program. And what we are including, which has happened, this continuous

improvement program has now begun. And what we are including in our work is the B, slide B, sorry, bullet point B in the document, which is the thing that is actually creating a review of that work, which is the replacement for the independent reviews.

So that's going to be. And you can envisage a circumstance where that review of the GNSO silo itself is going to review the GNSO silo itself, but also how the GNSO interrelates with all the other SOs and ACs and vice versa. You can envisage a circumstance where that review might, and I'm going to, I'll go back to using my ccNSO example because it's an easier one to use.

If you imagine a circumstance where the ccNSO produces its CIP report, and that is the subject to this review, and the ccNSO's CIP report says we're wonderful, we're the best SO, we're by far the best SO, we communicate brilliantly with everybody, everybody loves us. And as part of that review, the reviewers talk to the GAC, and the GAC says, thing is, we never see them. We just don't have arrangements to talk to them. Well, obviously there'd be a recommendation one imagines from the review that said, you need to work on this because even though you think you're wonderful, the GAC is less convinced that you're wonderful.

That's one example. The second example might be that in the interview process of doing the review, it becomes clear that the IDN-ccTLDs in the ccNSO are not happy, that they don't feel as if they are particularly well represented in, I hasten to add, I am making this up, right, that they don't feel as they are well

represented in the ccNSO. And that might lead to a recommendation that says you should think about your structure. You should think about how the ccNSO deals with the IDN-ccTLDs.

So there's scope in the B review to deal with both small improvements in communications and all sorts of other things, but also to say back to the SO, you need to think about how you structure yourselves. And then in C, you have this overarching structural review, which does all the big thing, and it's not even possible that that would look at structure of the SOs and ACs as well. Did I say that all right?

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, I'm going to see--

CHRIS DISSPAIN

It's just my opinion, to be clear. Everything is just our opinions.

AVRI DORIA

I think that generally is the case. I mean, to differentiate, first of all, we will not, the reviewer of reviews will not do any structural reviews itself. But it should, and one of the reasons we use that word components, that is not defined there, I think was specific, is that one of the things we need to enable in our discussions of how to structure ongoing reviews is the ability to review the structures, review the substructures, review the components. So while it is not the job of the reviewer of reviews to do any of that review, it is the

job, I believe, and I think it's in there, to provide the capability for those reviews to eventually happen.

And I think the kind of reviews that we're looking at is, is the structure of this SO appropriate, or does it need to be restructured, does it need new components, constituencies, does it need new subcomponents, parts of constituencies, etc., to, in other words, fulfill its purposes. It wouldn't be the purpose of the RoR to do that, but the RoR should not come out of its work, of its completion work, without having defined a way for that to happen, given that we've gotten a pretty good indication that there are places where that kind of depth, that kind of diving down review is necessary, and so I hope I've covered it, sort of saying, we've got to make the picture of the review possible, but we mustn't do the review itself.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Avri. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

I will speak in English. Sorry for that. I am very happy that everybody gave their interpretation of the ATRT3 recommendation. Please ask the chair of ATRT3 to give the interpretation of ATRT3 team, because I don't recognize myself as a member of ATRT3 on what you say about the reviews, the CCIP, and the proposed Holistic Review. I will not take your time in trying to give my interpretation. Please ask the chairs. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Sébastien. If Cheryl or Pat want to come to the microphone, they're very, very welcome. While Pat is making his way, I'll put this slide back up again, because these are the two, two, a couple of ideas we've heard. We've sort of covered a bit of the ad hoc thing, but any feedback you can give us on these or any questions you might have about what this might mean, strategic plan and ad hoc stuff, we'd be really interested in hearing. Pat, the floor is yours.

PAT KANE

Thank you, Chris. Pat Kane, co-chair of ATRT3. I will not try to speak for Cheryl unless you nod. I can speak for Cheryl for this moment only. I'm also a VeriSign employee. ATRT3 created six recommendations that were meant to be complementary of each other in terms of finding ways to create fewer recommendations and give a process for review, prioritization, and retirement of recommendations that couldn't get done through the development and introduction of the CIP and taking a look at streamlining some of the other review teams.

The holistic review was introduced because we had not done a whole view of the ICANN community since 2002, I believe, is what we'll be focused on. And we recognize that there was not a process to take a look at the white spaces in between organizations within ICANN. So that was the gist of what we tried to accomplish within ATRT3. Now, I do recognize that in 2026, we are going to be at transition plus 10, and it really is the right time for us to review the

accountability mechanisms that we have in place for the Board, the organization, and the community.

So as we go through that, I've listened to people talk, for today and for Monday, and I've been in a couple of different sessions where different groups have spoken, and I think that if you listen to what Pearl has reminded us of, I think if you take a look at what Kieren McCarthy said also on Monday, and what Cheryl talked about from the standpoint of scope, I think if we're time-bound, we have good scope.

Kieren pointed out leadership on Monday, and we take a look at leadership and training in terms of how do we lead these groups, we can move into the future. And I think even if you take a look at some of the purposes of the review of reviews, there's a lot of ATRT3 themes in that. And so I'm pleased that we're doing this and moving forward on this, but we do have to think about, again, time-binding, leadership, and scope. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Pat, and I can confirm that we are, I mean, those are things that are top, not the only things, but are top of mind. And we're clear that what we come up with needs to be operationally implementable, not just round one, but it needs to follow, to be operationally implementable in series, because it's no good, it works well the first time, but then it fails the second time because

you bump into stuff that just doesn't work, so we're aware, we're very clear about that.

Okay. So, anyone got anything else? We've got these ideas, as I said, the strategic plan as a basis for reviews. Anybody want to talk to that? Or mention ad hoc, or is there anything else that anybody wants to cover?

AVRI DORIA

I want to ask a question, at risk of getting myself in trouble. Not a surprising thing for me to do. When Sébastien stood up, I had the impression we were getting something wrong. When I listened to just now, I didn't see where that disagreed with what's being said, so I am obviously confused between what Pat said and what Sébastien said.

There seemed to be a gap there, that we were missing a point, that I was, not we, I'm not going to speak for the others, but that I was missing a point somewhere, and yet, when Pat spoke, I said, yeah, that corresponds to what I think we're trying to do, but when Sébastien spoke, I had the impression that we were missing what we were supposed to be doing, so I want to try and get that clarified or understand, because this is the important time to understand. Do we understand what you're talking about? And at the moment, I don't. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you. Thank you, Avri. I guess, no, I will not. Pat is very diplomatic, and therefore, it's his role, and maybe I will be a little bit less diplomatic, as you know, as usual, I will say. I will try to summarize what was my understanding. The Continuous Improvement Program was set up to replace the organizational review, because we had a lot of inputs that it was not going in the right direction. We lose a lot of time. It was more true for some of the SO/ACs, less for others, but it still was a real trouble. It's why we, when I say we, sorry for that, it's ATRT3 team, we consider that we need to change way of doing it, and in many organizations, you have a possibility to Continuous Improvement Program.

If you look carefully to the recommendation, if an organization wants to do the Continuous Improvement Program as it was done before, with an external reviewer, it's still possible. It could be done. Therefore, the question is that we all talk about a lot of things, but in some details, it's already written inside. The holistic review was supposed to be.

Since 2002, we have silo reviews. We evolve those reviews, but in the same time, we consider that it's important to have a global view of the organization, and it's why the holistic review came onboard, to see how we can evolve the relationship between each SO/AC, and including the NomCom, including the Board, including staff if needed, and so on and so forth.

I think there is a question around the CIP, if there is a question, just set up a call, and we discuss again on that, and exchange the argument. Pilot holistic review went through a lot of work about the holistic review. We may not need to restart that now. It must be done later on when the reviewer review is done. But the other point is that considers that ATRT3 recommendation about the specific reviews, all were postponed, therefore there were no duplication of work, and so on. But now that we are in this discussion, just try to take into account what was done, and to see how we need to evolve, or to change, or to revolutionize the way we do reviews.

It's why, sorry to be a little bit long, but I have the impression that we are not on the same page about the role and the goal of the continuous improvement program, and to stop my last sentence is, the CIP in my mind was to be bottom up. It start by a big, big work at the global level, and we lose a lot of time on that. It's a pity. We need to do step by step at the local, at the bottom in each substructure of the SO/AC, in the SO/Acs. And with that, I think it would have been more easy to go to the future, to take into account the CIP at the global level. The three years was also set up for purpose, but I have no time to discuss that here. Once again, thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And definitely appreciate you taking the time now to sort of get us clear on that. And the CIP, for better or for worse,

however it was started or not, is an ongoing thing. And while we are not to review the process of that because it's doing its thing, we are to look at its outcomes, and how they affect the rest of what we're doing. So very much appreciate you bringing it up, and very much appreciate you continuing to remind us of it as we move forward, and hopefully we'll get it right. As I say, I admit to sometimes being slow to understand things.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Sébastien. Thank you, Avri. We have probably time for one more if anybody wants to take the mic. If not, I'm going to pass it back to Manal, to take us into the home straight of this session. Last call. Manal, the floor is yours.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris, and thank you everyone for the feedback and input we've received. I know we also have more than 100 participants online in Zoom, so it's good to have this interest.

I believe you are quite familiar with this diagram by now. It presents the four phases of the cross-community group per our charter. So Phase 1, the fact-finding, as we mentioned earlier. Phase 2, analysis and development of proposals. 3, the finalization of proposals. And 4, the final report and the decision-making. But we thought maybe we need at this stage to dig a bit deeper, to provide you with projected milestones, noting that this has not yet been discussed or signed off by the working group as a whole.

So on the 18th of November, as has been mentioned earlier, hearing from everyone this week, we agreed to hold a webinar on the 18th of November. In fact, two webinars, one at 06:00 UTC and one at 18:00 UTC to accommodate for all time zones. These two webinars will focus on hearing from you about your experiences and feedback on successes and challenges of past reviews. So please stay tuned to the relevant announcement and we look forward to your active participation.

By the 19th of December, we will have compiled our findings and refined the purpose of reviews, building on what we heard during the ICANN84 week. We will then share this hopefully solid version with the nominating groups. Again, noting that it's a living document as Chris and Avri mentioned, that will continue to be refined and fine-tuned in parallel with our work to accommodate for anything that we may have overlooked.

Next, we will have the nominating groups. We'll then have until the 30th of January to review the refined purpose statement. And meanwhile, from the 1st of January to the 6th of February, the plan is to develop proposals for a refreshed system of reviews to be shared with the nominating groups for feedback from the 6th till the 20th of February. Any comment?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah, thanks. I just wanted to say, on the 18th of November, that's, we're calling it a webinar, but it's going to be open, but the whole point is everyone comes and tells us what they think the successes

and challenges were from past reviews, either because they were on the review team or they were affected by the results or whatever it might be.

And the second thing I just wanted to say was it's not impossible that we will have, between now and the 19th of December, we might have some other sessions that are very specific about stuff, targeted discussions online about particular questions that come up in our deliberations in the next few days. Next week, when we go back and look at all this feedback in the document, we might find that there are a couple other things that we want to come to the community about.

So I just wanted to flag that and to say that the easiest way of keeping up to speed with this is if you register as an observer. You obviously have to come to the sessions. But if you register as an observer, what that means is that you are, you're going to get the mail on the mailing list and that will tell you what's going on. So if I could encourage everybody to do that, that's the best way of keeping up to speed, even if you don't think you can involve yourselves in the sessions. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris. And I think also we discussed that we may be asking if you would like to share questions or comments prior to the webinar itself, so that we can also take it into consideration during the discussions.

Next, by the 27th of February, we will-- on the 27th of February, we plan to start the public comment on draft proposals until the 3rd of April. And meanwhile, from the 7th till the 12th of March, we plan to outreach on draft proposals, also through ICANN85. And by the 10th of April, we plan to have identified the preferred proposal building on public comments and feedback received at ICANN 85.

From the 10th of April till the 8th of May, nominating groups will be invited to weigh in on the preferred proposal. And in parallel from the 10th of April till the 15th of May, work will be in place to build out a draft report. I'm posing also any-- Sébastien, please, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

I'm sorry. Thank you. On the 18th of November, what you call webinar, first of all, what will be the length of the meeting? And the second question, it's our suggestion, it's to split the discussion between the organizational review and the specific reviews, because the discussion will not be the same for those two, therefore, maybe more time or maybe two different webinars, but at least I suggest to you to split the two topics. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

That's an excellent suggestion, Sébastien. I think we can do that. Alice, how long are we planning?

ALICE JANSEN

90 minutes per session.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

90 minutes. So I think there's both going to be 90 minutes long. I don't want to do them two separately, but we will commit to splitting the session into the two sections. That way, everyone will have the opportunity to talk about the specific ones they want to talk about. So thank you. That's an excellent suggestion. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris. And thank you, Sébastien, for the suggestion. So all this is being just discussed during this week, so we are still building the agenda. And any further feedback from anyone would be most welcomed, of course.

So on the 18th of May till the 10th of July, we will have public comment on the draft report through the 3rd of April. I'm repeating myself, I'm sorry. Yeah, so on the 18th, starting the 18th of May till the 10th of July, we will have public comment on the draft report through the 3rd of April, and from 8th of June till the 11th. We will outreach on the draft report, benefiting from the ICANN week at ICANN86 as well.

And from the 10th of July till the 31st, we will be finalizing the report and then inviting nominating groups to consider this report between the 31st of July and the 29th of August. And by that date, we hope to have finalized everything for submission to ICANN Board. The final report along with the documentation of the

support from the nominating groups. I'm pausing here before we move on, if we have any questions or comments.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

What is the actual date of that second public comment period closing? Because it obviously isn't the 3rd of April.

ALICE JANSEN

July 10th.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

The what?

ALICE JANSEN

July 10th.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

July the 10th, that's the closing date. Okay, thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL

Okay, that's why I got confused. I thought I'm repeating the previous slide. So this is July 10th, apologies. So if there are no further comments on the projected milestones, again, with the caveat that this is going to be discussed among the cross-community group, then again, your input is critical. So please consider joining the group as an observer, as Chris mentioned, and as you may have already known, the observers are very much

welcomed to share their views as well. So not only you will be receiving the mailing list, but also provided the opportunity to share with us your input.

Also, of course, participating to the webinar on the 18th of November, and sending your input at any point in time over email to inputonreviews@icann.org. And finally, following our work on the designated wiki page. Yes, sure. So go ahead, if you have any comments.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I was just sitting here thinking, how can I be controversial? So we're being held to this extremely tight timeline. I'm happy that we've agreed that we'll do our absolute utmost to keep to it. And on the 29th of August, or the 1st of September, we submit the report to the Board. Could I encourage the Board to start thinking about making some sort of time bound commitment to deal with the report, so that it doesn't disappear into the black hole that can occasionally happen with the Board, and that we get something from the Board at some point while we're in the middle of this process that gives us a clue as to how long the Board thinks it's likely to take considering the report, bearing in mind, of course, that implementation will be required after it's been approved. I think that would be fantastic. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris. And finally, for all attendees, we have this very short survey to seek feedback, particularly from newcomers. We hope you take the time to answer four quick questions to help us better serve you.

And with that, any final remarks, Avri or Chris? Okay, I think we are giving everyone six minutes back. And thank you very much for your active participation, and looking forward to your continued input. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]