
ICANN84 | AGM – Review of Reviews - Session 1 of 2
Monday, October 27, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Go to menti.com and log in using the numbers on the screen. We really need you to be in Mentimeter so you can participate properly in the session. There are going to be questions, thought bubbles, all sorts of things. Thanks. Alice?

ALICE JANSEN

Hello, and welcome to the Review of Reviews Session 1 of 2. My name is Alice Jansen and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Committee Participant 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. I will be posting the information in the chat for your reference. During this session, questions will only be read out loud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include Arabic, 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. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Only questions posted in the Q&A pod will be read out loud during this session as time permits and

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.

when directed by the chair of this session. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to the Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group co-chairs, starting with Manal Ismail. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Alice. If we can please make sure that participants trying to join through the Zoom room are allowed in.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

It is now. Cool. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL

Okay. Perfect. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone, here in Dublin and online. Welcome to the first of two sessions on Reviews. A very special welcome to newcomers who are attending their first ICANN meeting, and I hope you will find this session fun to attend. As Chris mentioned, we will be using Mentimeter. This session is meant to be interactive. And we have a set of questions that we would like you to answer using the Mentimeter. Please either scan the QR code or go to www.menti.com and enter the code you see on the screen. You will also find it on the following slides to make sure that anyone getting to the session late will also be allowed to reach the Mentimeter. Avri, would you like to say something specific to our newcomers?

AVRI DORIA

Yes. To newcomers or even to some of the old timers who haven't paid any attention to reviews, there's sort of been a thing that are going on inside, there is a really fine document that is information on Specific Reviews that gives you the historical background in how we got to where we are now. So, I really recommend that in your time after this or whenever, you take a look at that document to get the background. But especially for newcomers who are coming into this discussion for the first time. It's a useful resource. Enjoy.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you. Again, welcome, everyone, on behalf of Avri, Chris, and myself as co-chairs of the group. I hope you manage to scan the QR code or go to the URL. If not, the information will be on the following slides as well. If we can go to the following slide, please.

Quickly, the Cross-Community Group on Reviews, as you may know, is organizing two sessions during the ICANN84 Week in Dublin. The first session, the one we are in now, will focus on providing a very brief background on what's in and out of scope of this group, per its approved charter. And the majority of the session will be dedicated to your inputs on the draft Purpose of Review Statement and how you can continue to provide such input beyond this session.

On Thursday, we will have our second session, same time, same place, in order to provide you with a summary of the inputs we

received so far throughout this week at this plenary and other individual SO/AC sessions, present the group's work plans, scheduled milestones and key deliverables, and again, allow an open mic for any further remarks you may wish to share. Can we go to the following slide, please?

The Cross-Community Group on Review of Reviews is mandated to manage a fundamental evaluation of the reviews set out in the ICANN Bylaws as a whole system, and this is a keyword, including their implementation and propose a refreshed system of reviews. Within our scope, we have the periodic review of ICANN structure and operations. You may find people also referring to periodic reviews as Organizational Reviews or SO/AC Reviews, which after two cycles were recommended to evolve into Continuous Improvement Program. The Cross-Community Group will not evaluate the Continuous Improvement Program itself, but will take account of its work and will consider how it can best contribute to the broader system of reviews.

Its existence, results and how the Continuous Improvement Program contributes to the overall review system is in scope, but its details and how it's carried out by each individual Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee is out of scope. We also have the Annual Review, which is an Annual Report on the state of the Accountability and Transparency Reviews, including the implementation of all other Specific Reviews. And we have the Specific Reviews, and these are namely the four reviews you already see on the screen. Also, previously conducted reviews, and

this is basically to cater for any other reviews that were previously conducted, apart from those that we are excluding on the following slide. And finally, reviews that have previously been formally recommended but have not been started yet.

With that, if I can ask to go to the following slide, please. This evaluation will exclude the following reviews, the independent review process, where independent third-party reviews disputes, the reconsideration request requested by any person or entity affected by an action or inaction of ICANN Board or staff, the community mediation requested if the board refuses or fails to comply with an Empowered Community decision within 30 days from being notified, Empowered Community processes related to the nine powers of the Empowered Community. And finally, reviews established through the IANA stewardship transition, namely, the Customer Standing Committee Effectiveness Review and the IANA Functions Review. If you feel you need further information on any of those reviews, you can check the ICANN Bylaws Article 4 where you will find more information on all reviews.

Apologies for the long introduction. As said, this session is meant to be interactive, and with that, I will pass the floor over to Chris. Over to you, please. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Good afternoon, everybody. I'm going to take us through the draft in a second, then we're going to open up some questions on

Mentimeter. I know I'm going to keep saying this, and it's boring. If you haven't yet joined Mentimeter, go to menti.com and put in the code 5323 4252. It's on the top of the slide. You really do need to do that if you're going to participate and give us your thoughts. We are going to use the microphones as well. They're here and here. I may actually ask people who've answered a question in a particular way if they're prepared to come and explain why, but we'll deal with that when the time comes.

This document is very much a first draft. We did present it in Prep Week on a Zoom session, to those that were there when we talked about it. But I want everyone to understand, it is a first draft, and it's built, but we're really keen to get your input and the input from the rest of the community so that we can sign off on this draft of a Statement of Purpose relatively soon, because that is what we are going to be using as the standard against which we build the reviews. I'd say it again, it's a first draft.

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 then there are four separate sections. The first one, with all the bullet points, is ICANN's execution of its commitments to its Articles, Bylaws, Strategic Plan, and Financial and Operational Plan. We think those are the foundational documents, the Bylaws, the Articles, the Strategic Plan, and the Financial and Operational Plan.

Then there are a list of bullets. The Review would review ICANN's execution of its commitments. Namely that its activities, processes, and culture remain consistent with its mission, commitments, and values. The Board, officers, and senior management are accountable to the global multistakeholder community. ICANN is meeting its stated goals and objectives. ICANN has been maintaining and, where necessary, improving robust mechanisms for public input, inclusiveness, accountability, and transparency. Outcomes of the decision-making are in the public interest, transparent, and accountable to the global multistakeholder community in accordance with the stewardship transition. Communication channels are effective and accessible in decisions, and outcomes are reported clearly and openly. ICANN truly takes into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities.

Using the foundational documents, there would be reviews looking at those bullet points. Whether it's one, two, six reviews, don't mind that at the moment, just the principles. The second one is to review the results of the Supporting Organization, Advisory Committees, and NomCom's Continuous Improvement Program, as they relate to each SO/AC and the NomCom and to each other. At the end of a continuous improvement cycle, there would be a review of what each of the SOs and ACs has reported in its continuous improvement, and to make some suggestions maybe for improvement, if necessary.

Then C, whether the overall structure and components of ICANN and its SOs, ACs, and the NomCom are fit for purpose. That's the sort of overarching Structural Review that you would have heard us referring to on occasions in discussions. Then finally, just because we love doing a Review of Reviews, whether the ongoing reviews in the future are fit for purpose. The idea is that those reviews are done so as to, when necessary, recommend improvements or paths towards improvement for any problematic issues found in the reviews, and make those recommendations to the Board and the Empowered Community.

I'll say it again, this is very much a first draft, we're very keen to get input. The sorts of things that you might want to think about is this is what I think should be reviewed, would what I think should be reviewed be covered by this broad-brush purpose or not? That's just an example of one thing to think about.

This document has been published on our Wiki, it's been out for a while now, and the purpose of this session is to kind of talk about it, get your feedback and your input.

Can I have the first question up, please? Just before we do that, again, QR code, if you want to use that, or menti.com, 5323 4252. This is the only question that's really a straightforward answer question, as in yes, no, maybe. Do you think that this first draft of the purpose of reviews is heading in the right direction? Not saying it's set in stone, etc., but is it heading in the right direction? You can say yes, you can say no, you can say it depends, or you can say more

information needed. There are lots of people out there connected to Menti, so please answer the question. We're heading at 22. Two people say no. Eight, it depends, more information is needed. I'm going to call it in about another minute or so.

What I'm going to ask you is if you said it depends or you said more information is needed and you're prepared to say why, what it is depends on to you or what more information you think you might need, if you're prepared to do that. Actually, if you said no and you're prepared to say why, then please come to the microphone and tell us. We would really appreciate that. If you're not comfortable, that's perfectly fine, there'll be opportunities for you to do it online. But if you feel as if you're able to, that would be great if you could come and explain just briefly. And it's not an inquisition. I promise we won't quiz you as to why you think what you think. Okay. Let's stop at that point. We have 10 people saying more information, 9 saying it depends, 2 saying no, 35 is saying yes, it is heading in the right direction. Does anybody want to come and say anything at all? Thank you. Hi, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA

Hi. I hope you can hear me. My name is Irina Danelia, I'm with .ru, a ccTLD Registry. All I see in this draft document is perfectly right. But thinking about the discussions before this process started, I recall that we have heard a lot about that we have too many reviews and too many recommendations, and we really have no resources to deal with all this. Here in the draft, I think nothing about potential

efficiency or somehow optimizing the workload for the community. Because we may end up that all the reviews we have, we've seen Bylaws and they fit for purpose, and we just stayed with what we have and what the issue will remain there. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you. Manal, Avri, do you want to respond to that? You don't have to. If you'd like to, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you for the question. We're just here focusing on the purpose of the reviews. But what you rightly mentioned is going to come in future discussions when we get to work on the input we've gathered from everyone, and then work on the analysis and try to provide how to be more efficient and effective and having one holistic system of reviews. Avri, anything you would like to add?

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I actually really like the question because it got me thinking of when we're going through purposes, there's no sort of balancing of the purposes of one being a critical purpose that must happen frequently versus one being a purpose that's nice to have that we may want to see occasionally. I'm wondering as we look at the purposes as we go a little further with it, whether there is any waiting on a purpose or whether there's any kind of way of thinking of the purposes of critical nature. The same thing that people look at when they're doing—heaven forbid that I'm mentioning this—

but risk analysis of how critical is it that you do something versus not that critical. It is a good purpose. We probably should do it but... So, I thank you for that because it really does say within the purpose, they aren't all equal, are they? And if they aren't all equal, then how do we judge that? Thank you very much for that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Avri. That's clearly a piece of work that we're going to have to move on to once we've established the sort of ground rules. Becky?

BECKY BURR

I'm participating in this work as an observer. I'm not one of the Board members. I do think that we're heading in the right direction. But I think when we focus on the purpose, if we say is ICANN executing on its mission in accordance with its commitment and core values, then that entire list is encompassed within it. And what makes me nervous about having the list there as part of the purpose is it picks and chooses among the things that are commitments and core values.

When I look back to your point, Avri, about which purpose is more important, I think one of the problems with the reviews in the past is that they've been stuck in a framework that was developed at a fixed point in time and what you will want to review over time will change. Because what's going to be important is what the community thinks is not where the performance is wagging. To me,

getting the A, B, and Cs but without the list underneath is going to give you more flexibility to determine at any point in time what needs to be reviewed and what's more important.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Becky. Manal, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Becky. This was a very interesting discussion we had among the group as well, having one broad bullet that would encompass several things versus having a breakdown of what we really mean by this abstract and broad bullet. We were between two views. One is that when we have the broad thing, it might be interpreted differently and understood differently by different people. We just wanted to make sure that we are talking about the same things. But it's a good point that we need to be future-proof and not be very prescriptive. But as I said, we were fearing to have different interpretation to something that is quite broad and might be interpreted differently. Thank you, Chris. I think we have online as well, right?

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Manal. We have two questions in the Q&A pod. I will read the first one from Anonymous Participant. "As a totally newcomer to this topic, I'm puzzled by bullet D and what ongoing reviews in the future means. Could someone explain what this

means exactly and whether this refers to ongoing or future reviews?” End of question.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay. That’s bullet point D, or rather point D, which is whether the ongoing reviews in the future are fit for purpose. And what I think that means is when we have decided what we, the community, have decided what we think the reviews should be, there should be an occasional review to make sure that those reviews continue to be fit for purpose. That’s what we mean.

AVRI DORIA

It’s basically a notion of a never-ending review of reviews that happens periodically that we don’t just review our reviews for fitness now, but five years from now that is also entered into, I believe, is what we meant.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Avri. Sebastien, you want to take the microphone? I’m guessing you’re going to speak in French.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

If you allow me, Chris, I will do that. I’m not going to go into the details. That’s not the question here. It’s the only time that I will do this. But please do read what was written in Review #3 on Accountability and Transparency. No, we were not doing many reviews at the same time. They had all been stopped, all of them,

except for one, which is the one that will come after the new gTLD round with the exception of ATRT, which was supposed to come right after the one that was proposed to be created, which was the Holistic Review. We are all saying there is too much to do, which might be true, but the work that was done with Team 3 had as an objective to answer the question, and answer was no, there wasn't too much. Well, anyway, I'll stop there on this because I want to talk about the Continuous Improvement Program.

But without going into the details, I think that there is something that we need to rethink in this document, and that is who does what. One of the reasons why we might imagine to stop the review on Security and Stability is that the ICANN Org teams have increased in skills, in power. We don't have just 50 staff at ICANN, we have 400 staff, so we may not need to do things in exactly the same way. And that is the purpose of the group. But perhaps adding that it depends on who does what, who did what, I think that should be taken into account. Again, it is one of the reasons why, as far as I'm concerned, ATRT3 had stopped the reviews. Maybe staff could do the work. Maybe we didn't need as many of those reviews as what we needed at the time of the IANA transition 10 years ago. Thank you so much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Sebastien. I appreciate it. Alice, we have one more question online. Bruce, I'll take it from you. Then we're going to move on to the next question. Question online then, Bruce.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Chris. We do have a question from A. Heineman, GoDaddy, “Sorry to take a step back, but why were the IANA-related reviews considered out of scope? Because they don’t pertain to ICANN Org and its groups?” End of question.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Sorry, you mean from the slide? That would be from the pink slide that Manal talked to. I can’t remember why they were—

AVRI DORIA

I believe that was a Board decision that when we got our instructions and our charter, they were excluded. It’s a good question, perhaps, but it’s not one that I think we have the answers to. I would guess it’s because they were brand new.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

You may be right. Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN

Thanks, Chris. Bruce Tonkin from the .au registry. I’m just sort of rereading this a few times. I think all the words there are right, but perhaps a little bit of the emphasis. Right in the first sense, you’re talking about commitments. Then a little bit later, it talks about ICANN is meeting its stated goals and objectives. I think part of the challenge here is that a lot of the reviews that you’re looking at, it’s actually reviewing, essentially, community voluntary processes.

It's not, I think, ICANN in terms of Strategic Plan and the plan that the CEO is executing on. I suspect that that's probably fairly easy to evaluate, is the staff, if you like, meeting its objectives? I think it's less clear when you start dealing with the community groups. And I think what would be important to make the review effective is, if you're looking at the GNSO, for example, what are the actual commitments of the GNSO within a particular period in such a way that they're measurable? And the same with the ccNSO and the ALAC and so on. Because I think that framework is not really there at the moment.

I'd really encourage, when you're looking at objectives, that you might have a mix of measures that might be what were referred to as leading measures, but activity measures, but also some measures that really measure the outcome. Because too often at ICANN, I see that the measures that are there are activity measures. We met 10 times, we had 20 people attending this meeting. We had 100 people from 10 countries attending this. Those are all activity measures. But we don't actually have a target that says reduced DNS abuse by 10% this year, which is an outcome measure. I think for the reviews to be effective, I think you need to have clear outcome measures. And those outcomes need to flow into the volunteer part of the community as well.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you. That's really useful, actually. We're going to move on to the next question. Now, this is a free flow. This is entirely you can

type whatever you like. Please, don't be rude. What is missing from our list of purposes? We don't really have the ability, with apologies, to translate from various different languages, so I do apologize. If you could manage to type in English, we'd appreciate it enormously. What is missing from our list of purposes? One way of thinking about this question is, well, something I think needs to be reviewed is not covered by one of these. It doesn't matter what it is for the moment, but something I think should be reviewed isn't covered by this list. Clarity between 4.4 SO/AC Reviews and 4.6 Organizational Reviews. I'm not sure I understand what 4.4 and 4.6 is. Is that a reference to Bylaws? It's a reference to Bylaws. Okay.

Clarity between the reviews of SO/ACs and the Organization Reviews, which are also currently in the Bylaws. Is that right, Mary? That's right. Okay. Thanks. Is that the only thing? Because this will be a very short question if that's the case, and we can move on.

Assessing how SO/AC processes are consistent with ever-evolving governance and transparency. That's a really interesting point, actually. I wonder if that wouldn't be covered by the Continuous Improvement. Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA

I was just wondering, after this, we may want to invite the person that wrote one of those, the 4.4 and 4.6, to come up and loosen it further.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I was just waiting until we had a few. Performance and execution speed of the Org. I don't think you can know until an analysis of why and how the current reviews have actually failed. Fair point. While people are still typing things, as Avri says, if you said clarity between 4.4 and 4.6, again, if you're prepared to come to the microphone and speak to that, that would be immensely helpful. In fact, if you said anything, really, and you're prepared to come and expand on it, we'd really appreciate that. What about the carve-outs for GAC and ASO? I'm not sure I understand what that means, but if you want to come and ask the question... Is that you, Kieren? No, we're not going to let you speak, Kieren. Kieren McCarthy censored at ICANN meeting. Hang on a second, mate. Just try again.

KIEREN MCCARTHY

Go to the other one?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

That's working.

KIEREN MCCARTHY

Here we go. I put in the 4.4, 4.6 question, showing what an ICANN geek I am. I was on ICANN staff and I was part of the team that did the whole Affirmation of Commitments shift. And that's where the 4.4, which was ATRT Consumer Review Stability—I forget what they were. And then the SO/AC Reviews came a little bit later, I believe. So, I do think it's important to distinguish between them because

they are fundamentally different. One looks at the organization, one as a whole, which I think they're pretty good reviews. And the other ones look at, what Vint Cerf used to say, navel-gazing. That's how I've always felt about the SO/AC Reviews.

My point of view on this is that we haven't spent enough time looking at those 4.4 reviews. I mean, there's been a lot on ATRT, as we know. But a lot of the recommendations made in the other reviews were ultimately not accepted by the Board. And I think that in itself is worth looking at. Why? Why did it not work? Because if a review is providing recommendations and the Board's not accepting most of them, that's a process that isn't working. So you need to look at that. I do think with those reviews that particularly—I mean, there's only been one of the—I have to get it up. The consumer—

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Consumer transparency of trust.

KIEREN MCCARTHY

Yeah. I recall the conversations had about what kind of reviews ICANN should take on in order to step away from the U.S. government, i.e., how to continually grow and improve ICANN. And that was quite an important one, and that's just sort of been left by the wayside. I do think that it would be good to look at that, because I do think that ICANN would benefit, especially with this new gTLD round, from having picked up greater understanding of

the actual market that it's looking at. There was only one of them. There was two of the other two, and there's been three ATRT.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think I'm right on this. The CCT Review is out of scope because it's part of the—no? It is? Okay, it is in scope.

KIEREN MCCARTHY

Look at that. I do recall that one of them, I think the SST, like the majority of recommendations ended up not being accepted. I would say look at that. That's really important. And then when it comes to the Organizational Reviews, I did some policy work a few years ago now, and I was talking to a lot of people, I think I spoke to you as well, about Internet governance and where ICANN fit in and what changes could be done. And as part of that, I spent/wasted three days going through the SO/AC Reviews in order to make sense of them. I thought, "I'll come up with a great document and it will say, 'This is how ICANN is changing, and this is what the acceptance is, and how these organizations need to shift, and how they...'" I abandoned it because it was absolutely impossible to make sense of all the recommendations. Number one, there was a huge number of them, and number two, they were inconsistent with one another. Then I dug into a little bit more, and there was endless argument about them.

It was very clear to me, trying from the outside to say, "How did this process go?" I effectively abandoned trying to do it because it was

so complicated, there were so many recommendations, and they didn't work with one another. It's a long way of saying I defend this approach because it's not working, it has become very complicated and it's not really helping ICANN out at all. But I will flag that I do think that the 4.4 ones that came with Affirmation of Commitments should be where the focus of the organization should be, because there's still real value in that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay. Thank you. Do you want to respond to that, Avri?

AVRI DORIA

I have one thing that I want to check on. When you first said almost all of them were rejected, I had an immediate reaction of, "Really?" What I think we need to do based upon your comment is—I know when I look at these things, unless you happen to have the stats on you. But when I look at these things, I always find that the ones I care about most have been rejected, and therefore, it becomes most of them have been rejected. I think what we need to do is follow up on that with, it would be good to do a survey and find out exactly as we went on how many were accepted, how many were rejected, and how many were partials, how many were accepted but. And I don't know the answer to that, but your question makes me want to know the answer to that.

MANAL ISMAIL

Just to note a very helpful document that has been compiled by staff, and it is provided for the group as background information, and I would encourage all the community to look into this document so that we have the same information that we are going to analyze. It is on Specific Reviews. It has all the reviews so far, how many recommendations came out of those reviews, how many were accepted, how many were rejected, and how many were redirected to the community. It is very helpful and very inspiring, and it has tables and statistics. It's a bit long but easy to go through, and I would recommend this for everyone.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks. Kieren?

KIEREN MCCARTHY

My sympathy to the staff that had to compile that. I did run a quick check. The SSR, for example, they put in 63 recommendations, which is already a lot, 38 were ultimately rejected. There is no point in sticking in right now. It's a flag. There was the WHOIS, 22 and 6 of them were rejected. Then there was the Consumer Review one. The ones that were rejected were about pricing, most of the registrars got upset about it. Also, about abuse. If we have a look subsequently, there are so many conversations about abuse. And if we look at what we are going with gTLDs, it would be really good to have had that pricing information. What I'm flagging is some of these reviews, the things that they highlighted were really good,

and if we had looked at them, ICANN would be in a better place right now.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Kieren. I appreciate that. I'm going to go to an online question from Alice and then to Sebastien. Alice?

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Chris. There's a question from Becky Burr, "Doesn't subpart D presuppose that the end result will be a list of new Specific Reviews, rather than a future-proof process for deciding what to review at any point in time? I don't think that's the right direction for what it's worth."

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay. Thank you. You may be right. We need to play with the wording. I think we know what we mean. We need to check that what we mean is actually what it says. Sebastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

I will do in English to allow you not to take your headset. I am not supposed to, but I wanted to answer what Kieren asked. The answer is maybe the reason why ATRT3 suggests to evolve the Organizational Review to a Continuous Improvement Program, it's exactly where we start with and why we end up with the CIP. Therefore, I understand that we don't need to go into detail in that.

I forget to say one thing at the beginning. I feel that we need really to find a way to give information to people who don't know about the reviews. Here, you have a lot of people who know almost everything about this topic. If we want to work for the future, we need to work for people who don't know today what was the reviews and where we are going. It's maybe not your task, but it's a need for ICANN to implement a program to explain what was the reviews up to now and why we are talking about this. I forget one other point. I will come back. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Not to worry. I think we've captured most of the stuff on the screen. Obviously, this gets kept, right? We don't just throw this away. Alice?

ALICE JANSEN

Just to remind everyone to please speak slowly and clearly. Chris, I think we can move on to the next question. Time management. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Can we just go back for one second? I just want to make sure there's nothing really—there's a heap of interesting stuff on there. We can scroll. We're going to capture all of this and we're going to find a process that enables us to continue this discussion. Maybe we'll do a series of online sessions to actually look at these topics and get

some discussions started with people who are prepared to come into a Zoom Room to talk about it.

Let's go to the next question. "What are the things you think should be reviewed?" This is your opportunity to say, "I think we should review whether the staff should all wear merino wool uniforms," or "We should always paint our computers green," or whatever. What do you think should be reviewed?

Article 1. Okay. Multistakeholder model. Travel support allocation. Again, if you're prepared to come in briefly, explain why you've put up what you've put up. That would be immensely helpful to us all. You want to say something?

AVRI DORIA

Curiosity on the multistakeholder model. We had that whole long multi-year, and all of a sudden, I wonder where that got to and what would happen if we tried it again. It was just a question that came to mind as I saw that there. Because we did have a multi-year review that took a lot of people and a lot of time.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

As often happens with these responses, there are some that, at least on their face of it, are obviously clear and make sense. Take, for example, interrelations between SO/AC and C Board. I mean, that is at least in part considered under B where you're looking at the results of the SO/AC Continuous Improvement Program as they relate to the SOs and ACs and to each other. That sort of thing we

may already have had. Overlaps or gaps between SOs and ACs. Again, you might think that the CIP stuff might look at that or the structural considerations. Interaction among all constituencies and other independent groups inside ICANN. Avri, do you want to say something?

AVRI DORIA

On the last one where you said about the gaps. That's one where the reviews of structures, and then people go on, and substructures and components and interactions between them does get sort of expanded to be that particular point.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Again, anybody, please, come to the microphone and speak to what you've said or what somebody else has said. Jordan, I can see you wandering up. The floor is yours.

JORDAN CARTER

Wandering up, yes. Hi, Chris. I'm Jordan Carter, .au. The one that I had put up was a bit about tracking implementation and making sure that implementation of review findings happens. There's an angle to this that I've heard people talk about but I don't know whether it's real or not, which is that reviews with ostensibly different purposes sometimes come up with recommendations that are similar or that might conflict with each other. What I've also heard from people who have followed these more closely is that sometimes this can induce a bit of paralysis. There are two

Community Reviews. They were doing their job properly. They came up with different approaches. The same thing, what do we do?

I think that maybe one thing that could be part of this process is making sure there is a clear way to deal with situations like that, and that if things come from these reviews that are clearly not workable, that that's said clearly in any rejections. And that where there are clashing or different reviews, there's some process or way to resolve those contradictions, and to make a clear choice about it, rather than being paralyzed by two different ways of trying to do the same thing. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you. It sort of launches two thoughts into my head. One is that, obviously, one of the things we all need to do, the CCG will need to do is to look at these things and ask ourselves the question, "Are they things that should be reviewed? And if they are things that should be reviewed, are they covered by the purpose and under which review would they happen?" They might not be, but they might be.

But the second thing is, they may very well be things up here, which are issues, but are not things that will be covered by a review. There may be a situation where we have a bottle full of things that are things that concern the community, but are not going to get covered by reviews, and then there needs to be some sort of thought into how we would deal with that. Obviously, it won't be

the Review of Reviews job, but I think we could. I could envisage a circumstance where we made a recommendation at the end that said, “Look, these things are not reviewable, but it’s clear that they are issues and they should be considered.” Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL

First, there are some participants that cannot hear you properly, Chris. I think it’s something with the audio. If we can make Chris’s voice more—

CHRIS DISSPAIN

It doesn’t need to actually make my voice—anyway, never mind.

MANAL ISMAIL

I also hear a little bit of echo. I’m not sure if it’s only me. I hear better from the headset. Thank you, Jordan, for bringing up the implementation. One observation I also had on implementation, and I got to learn this from the document I was referencing, is that implementation time is variable and it basically starts when the review ends. If the review is scheduled for, for example, every five years, if it takes one year, then implementation may take up to four years. If it takes three years, then implementation is stuck with only two years, which is also very difficult to plan for and predict. Alice, do we have a remote question? Please, go ahead.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you. We do have a question from Sivasubramanian Muthusamy. “Why are reviews invariably and elaborately formalized, lengthy, expensive years-long process? Why can’t they be five or six of those committed meetings in a coffee shop for two evenings in a row to pick up one topic, such as ‘amend Article 1’ or a lesser topic such as ‘competition and trust’ and feed into the formal process? This is not to say anything against that elaborate reviews, but micro reviews, ad-hoc reviews, or ad-hoc deliberations could be immensely productive and helpful if those who gather are committed and wise enough.” End of question. Chris, please, speak louder, if possible.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

You want me to speak louder? Okay. I will do that. Do you want to say something here?

AVRI DORIA

I actually think—I mean, it’s a solution part that we should hold on to, but this whole notion of every time we do sit down for review, it’s taken a while and we’ve had a really big box of things that we want to review. By the way, on hearing people, it really helps if you keep one of the headsets in your ear all the time. Makes hearing a whole lot easier. I think I’ve learned that now why some of those older folks are always wearing the ear set because it helps.

The other thing that we have on the implementations is often an implementation is the difference in interpretation. We have a set of

people, often the staff that say it is done, and you have a set of people, often the people that came up with the recommendation that says kind of what I mean. Now, in policy stuff, we've gotten beyond that, hopefully, with the Implementation Reviews. We don't have that notion in reviews and that may also be part of the solution space for later.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Avri. We're going to move on to the next question unless there are any last comments. Nope? Okay. Next question. Yes, Chris?

CHRIS CHAPMAN

Sorry about the late notice. Chris Chapman, vice chair of the Board for three days and one hour. I've been debating whether I'd say anything, but I think it's a nice opportunity for me to just chip in here the question about what we should review. I think this whole discussion is a really big deal. There initially was enormous tension about the Board invitation to review this matter, and I think it was a very courageous thing for the Board to do. I think it reflects a Board willingness to get this back on track. I think it was a very honest decision to say, "Enough is enough. This series of reviews is currently a train wreck and not going anywhere."

Our chair, this morning, spoke perhaps too kindly about my critical thinking that I brought to the table over the last couple of years. That's perhaps only because I like to simplify things rather than

complicate things. One of the things that when I first came onto the Board I initially noticed was that clause 4.6, I think, which essentially deals with the review of ICANN as an organization. It starts with this horrific list of the administrivia, and then cascades down to layer after layer of the intent of the reviews. Now, I just think a review is simply, ultimately, a mechanism to fine-tune your accountability. It all rolls up to accountability.

The question up there was, “What do you think we should review?” At the moment, I think that this statement over here on the left-hand side is actually very eloquently put together document as a starting point for dealing with where we currently are under the Bylaws. It accepts that our starting position is the current way in which the intent is set out. I would suggest ultimately from first principles that we need to review what we want out of the transparency, accountability, and review mechanisms. Because if you’re starting from a suboptimized position, and I think 4.6 is suboptimally expressed, you’re going to be forever just reinventing the wheel on a suboptimal outcome. In my view, it’s all about accountability. And when it comes to accountability, I can think of no finer document than the Strategic Plan.

I’m biased about that because with Martin, I co-chaired it over the last several years. But the Strategic Plan and what follows from it, the Annual Plan, the Financial, the Operational Plans, etc., etc., are all subsets of that Strategic Plan. Virtually, everything listed under the dot points in little a are manifestations or should be manifestations of that Strategic Plan. I see my impression of the

Board and Org, I can't speak for before three years ago. I came in in September '22, there was a lot of tension around. Since then, we saw our present CEO go. We were effectively almost two years with enacting. We had, to some extent, a chair who was having to be an executive chair. It was a very unusual period with a lot of flux. And there was a lot of things going on, particularly with the next round.

I think you have a Board now that wants, is crying out for, to demonstrate accountability. And the best way to do that, leaving aside the sort of reviews articulated under 4.4, the best way to do that is to say to the Board who is supposedly doing that to the organization, "Are you delivering against the Strategic Plan?" That's all you need to say. That's all you need to ask. Because if you are, you are delivering against the Articles, the Bylaws.

Now, if the answer is, "No, there's more," that means that the Strategic Plan is flawed. The Strategic Plan hasn't been properly devised to be that ultimate accountability mechanism. And this is a personal view. It's not endorsed by the Board. I just feel liberated to say that. And I'm suggesting that—and it may be an entirely unhelpful intervention suggestion, but I say it because I think there is a genuine desire by the Board to be held accountable and to demonstrate accountability. I think in that context, delivery against the Strategic Plan, which I must say over the last three years, I have seen very little visibility by Org or the Board to demonstrate delivery against the previous Strategic Plan. I think that's the

ultimate document. That's probably more than I was going to say but I hope that's helpful.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you for being liberated. It's worth mentioning, I think, that part of what you're saying is, I think, has premised on the fact that that Strategic Plan goes through a whole series of community exercises to become the Strategic Plan and is effectively endorsed for, a better way of putting it, by the community. So, it's not just a document that's prepared in a vacuum. It's a valid point. Avri, did you want to say something? No at this stage? Okay, cool.

Chris, thank you. While we've been doing that, we're listening to you. People have been answering the question, "Complete this sentence: A review succeeds if it..." Brings about change, visible or invisible, but impactful. Recommendations are clear, logical and implemented. Fulfills its purpose and concludes in time. Fair enough. Produces outcomes that are actionable and measurable. Does anyone want to come and talk to any of this? These are all really, I think, sensible measures of why a review might be successful. Some of it's the same thing said in different words, obviously, but again, it's stuff that will take away with us and consider. If anyone wants to, there's an opportunity. Otherwise, that's the last question, right? Yeah. So then we're going to go back to the slides and finish off. Anyone else? Last opportunity to take the microphone. While you're thinking about that, just to say there

will be another microphone opportunity on Thursday so you have another chance. Anything online? Nope? Okay. Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN

I feel short. Ashley with GoDaddy. I don't know if this is the right place to flag it, but I think the success of a review also comes down to who's chairing the review. And I think people who volunteer to be chairs are always well-intentioned but aren't necessarily well-equipped to do the job. I think that has a lot to do with how long these reviews take. I don't know how to improve that other than maybe trainings involved or more rigorous criteria, I say this, but I don't see why any reviews should take more than 18 months. And I think, otherwise, it's a waste of all of our time. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks. Your point about training is interesting. I was having a conversation with some other people earlier today about the need for chair training in the ICANN community. Thank you for that. Any other comments, Avri?

AVRI DORIA

I totally agree with the 18 months. It's one of the things that I was always very happy with with the ATRT, is that it was a time-limited review, and it sort of overcomes that desire to stuff everything into the box and sort of say, "What is the most important and what can you get done in 18 months?" I think it's a great recommendation, because after 18 months, you lose track of why you're there.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I guess I might lose track sooner than that, but nonetheless, yes. Okay. No more comments at the moment. Back to whoever's going to take us through the next bit. Avri, is that you?

AVRI DORIA

Yeah. I think I've got the last bit. First of all, I really want to thank—and we're going to have to spend more time going through all these things that were written. I really appreciate the ones that sort of took us in a slightly different direction, because it is true, I think, what Chris was saying, in some sense, we're trying to fix what we've got when we're doing most of the conversation we've had. Whereas Chris threw in a different perspective and a couple people agreed with him that sort of gave me a perspective I didn't have. I've personally never thought of the Strategic Plan as anything more than an exercise that the Board did that you had to get through and you got it and you went into the end, and then you moved on. To think of it as something that focuses that you actually have to review against, for me, was kind of a radical new thing. I really very much appreciate that and very much forces me into.

It points to what I wanted to say is that we really need people thinking about this and thinking outside the stream that we've been in, outside the track that we've stayed in and trying very hard to fulfill what's in the Bylaws as opposed to look at what's new. Between now and the second session, I invite everybody to take all the things that are there and start thinking anew that if we're

getting beyond what we've done and we're getting beyond what we've gotten stuck with, how do we do it? Please contribute. This input is critical. I think we've got an input today that already forces us to think in different directions. And I really look forward to the conversations in the group as we follow up on this and as we set up the second session. I want to insist that people understand that observers are welcome and we don't have a notion of observers being quiet. We have observers that can participate. We have several Board members, and more Board members wouldn't be a bad thing either.

Send in input. Only a few people talked, only a few people contributed. If you've got any ideas, if you've got any questions, if you've got any speculations, please send them in. It would be a pity to miss a brilliant idea because someone didn't send it in, or someone didn't want to talk, or someone felt that it was a dumb idea, or someone felt, "Well, it was similar to something was already said so I'm not going to bother saying it again." Say it again. Sometimes hearing the same idea twice in different words helps you actually understand the idea. Don't be inhibited by just about anything in terms of sending your idea in. And the work is followed. There's the URL there.

Then I want to return at the moment, just one second, to the newcomers. I don't know how many newcomers put in ideas or had them. But as you can see, having new ideas is really what we need to have. Having come in anew, it's not like you've never done anything before, you've come in with a whole set of notions, a

whole set of experiences, a whole set of knowledge. Please apply that to the problems you're hearing about. Please apply that to the history that we've had of reviews and give us the benefit of that fresh view. As I say, I've been dealing with reviews one way or another for two decades now. Really, having people that haven't been dealing with them is incredibly important and refreshing. Please, newcomers, everybody, take the chance, put your ideas out there, follow the work, observe it. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

[Inaudible]

AVRI DORIA

I think so. But I wanted to pass it back to somebody else to say we—

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Well, just to say last call. We have a couple of minutes left if anybody does want to rush to the microphone.

AVRI DORIA

If you have that last billion flash of idea. That was not what I meant.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

That was cool. There's a question in the chat, apparently.

MANAL ISMAIL Asking whether the mentee input will be published on the Wiki page.

ALICE JANSEN Yes, we will have the information published. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Anything else from anyone else? Please tell your friends what a great session this was and come on Thursday for even more fun and joy and excitement. To those of you who did come to the microphone and make contributions, thank you very much, and we'll see you all soon. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]