Review of Reviews Cross Community Group - Outline of Draft Proposal for Discussion at ICANN85 - 27 February 2026

	Accountability & Transparency	CIP Assessment	Structural Review	Review of Reviews	Ad Hoc/On Demand Review
	The purpose of reviews is to assess whether ICANN is fulfilling its Mission, Commitments and Core Values as set out in the ICANN Bylaws in a transparent and accountable manner, by reviewing:				
Focus *What subject areas are being examined*	ICANN's execution of its commitments in its Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, Strategic Plan and Financial and Operational Plan	Results of the Supporting Organization (SO), Advisory Committee (AC), NomCom (NC) Continuous Improvement Program (CIP) as they relate to each SO/AC/NC and to each other	Overall structure and components of ICANN and of SOs, ACs and NC to confirm whether fit for purpose	Reviews system to confirm whether fit for purpose	An emerging topic that meets the criteria for a review, specifically one that does not involve policy considerations, and cannot be adequately addressed through other discussion forums
Methodology and Intended Outcomes *How subject areas are being examined and for what purpose*	Evaluate the extent to which ICANN is delivering on aspects of its Mission, Commitments and Core Values, as prioritized during scoping, by examining procedures and processes used, and outcomes and progress achieved in respect to goals set out in planning documentation. Recommend improvements where necessary and identify key development areas that may strengthen effectiveness in support of the Mission.	Lightweight effort to: ● confirm CIPs were completed in adherence to Framework ● test CIP outputs to ensure conclusions are supported ● compare CIP outputs to identify good practices that may be beneficial to groups or serve to enhance collaboration ● ensure actions are followed through on as intended	**Option 1:** Focused on structure of the ICANN multistakeholder model **as a system**, to recommend changes as needed to improve effectiveness or address a specific gap or need (e.g., need for a new structure). Does not cover internal structures of existing SO/ACs unless specifically requested Discusses structural issue(s) **at the request** of SO or AC and where SO/AC Leaders determine issue meets threshold. **Option 2:** Mandatory review **examining structures** in terms of dynamics, placement, composition, and representation, plus overall structural coherence and	Audit of the review system to assess whether it is performing as intended and is still fit for the purpose of enhancing accountability and transparency	Address a narrowly scoped topic that qualifies for review based on established criteria

	Accountability & Transparency	CIP Assessment	Structural Review	Review of Reviews	Ad Hoc/On Demand Review
			effectiveness. Includes associated Board composition and decision-making processes.		
Cadence *How often would reviews be conducted*	Flexible cadence conditioned on completion of steps as articulated in the initiation process	Set cadence based on CIP cycles (SO/ACs NomCom reports repeat every three years)	Set cadence (every n years). Occurrence to be confirmed based on community agreement. May be prompted out of cadence through ad hoc review process	Set cadence (every n years). Occurrence to be confirmed based on community agreement. May be prompted out of cadence through ad hoc review process	Convened under exceptional circumstances, should threshold be met
Prompted by *Where is the review established and what induces the review*	Prompted by ICANN Bylaws but subjected to agreement on cadence	Prompted by ICANN Bylaws	Prompted by ICANN Bylaws but subjected to agreement process	Prompted by ICANN Bylaws but subjected to agreement process	Process to convene defined in ICANN Bylaws
Initiation Process *What steps are taken to initiate the review*	1. Community analyses implementation of prior review outputs, the effectiveness of deployed solutions, considers whether timeline is meaningful in light of ongoing work, to inform need for review and scope setting 2. Community evaluates bandwidth, drafts scope accordingly and determines the associated prioritization 3. Resource requirements confirmed 4. Formal Board resolution to convene the review	1. Submission of SO, AC, NC reports 2. Cross Community Group convened	1. Consultation on need to convene the review according to set cadence. Community evaluates bandwidth and resources 2. Formal Board resolution to convene the review	1. Consultation on need to convene the review according to set cadence. Community evaluates bandwidth and resources 2. Formal Board resolution to convene the review	1. Submission of topic through dedicated process 2. SO/AC discuss and consult with the Board,org, community on bandwidth,estimated resources, timeline and feasibility. 3. Secure resources accordingly (including possible deprioritization) 4. Formal Board resolution to convene the review

	Accountability & Transparency	CIP Assessment	Structural Review	Review of Reviews	Ad Hoc/On Demand Review
Scope Parameters *Is the scope pre-set or is it agreed during the initiation process*	Variable scoping (within set boundaries) to be pre-agreed during initiation process	Scope as pre-determined in ICANN Bylaws	Pre-determined or variable scope (within set boundaries) depending on whether there is a request from a SO, AC or NC	Scope as pre-determined in ICANN Bylaws	Variable scoping to be pre-agreed during initiation process
Review Conducted by *Who will carry out the review effort*	Cross Community Group with the option to be assisted by expert	Cross Community Group with the option to be assisted by expert	Cross Community Group (CEO, community leaders), with the option to be assisted by expert	Cross Community Group (CEO, community leaders), with the option to be assisted by expert	Dependent on agreed scope. Option to be assisted by expert
Recipient(s) of Outputs *Who will receive conclusions and recommended actions (if any)*	Board	The relevant SO, AC or NC If Board or org are discussed materially in the review, they should also receive the report.	SO/AC/NC? then Board or structures directly	SO/ACs and NC? then Board	Board and/or SO/ACs or NC? depends on reason for review
Originates or Derives from *What is the root for this suggested review (if any)*	Originates from existing Accountability and Transparency Specific Review (ATR)	Derives from the Continuous Improvement recommended by the Third ATR	Derives from recommendations made by the Third ATR	Originates from a component of existing ATR mandate	Non applicable
Notes and Questions	Process provides measures to ensure subsequent review occurrence is not postponed indefinitely	CIP is a pilot\n\nDoes not include a review of the CIP itself\n\nQuestion: Should the Board undertake a CIP in accordance with the CIP principles?		Could be used as the mechanism for review of the CIP itself.\n\nCould be an ad hoc review rather than its own bucket\n\nCould be recommended by ATR to occur as ad hoc review	May be used to address existing topics of Specific Reviews (Competition, Consumer Trust, Consumer; Registration Directory Service; Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS)