



## RySG Feedback on the Refined Outline of Suggested Reviews System

12 May, 2026

The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) thanks the Review of Reviews Community Coordination Group (Reviews CCG) for their important work on ICANN Reviews, and for the opportunity to provide input.

The ecosystem ICANN operates in, including the Domain Name System (DNS) industry, is rapidly evolving. The ICANN New gTLD Program: 2026 Round this year is anticipated to further accelerate the diversification of the domain name space. The industry continues to evolve as a dynamic, technology-driven landscape that emphasizes security, sector-specific relevance, new scripts, orienting new community members to policy work, and navigating emerging technologies. The operational demands for keeping pace with the ecosystem in fulfillment of ICANN's [mission](#) will only intensify. This impact is not on the horizon; it is unfolding now.

We are taking this opportunity to reiterate prior RySG input and provide additional feedback to the Reviews CCG, in light of the updated review system outline ([Refined Outline of Suggested Reviews System](#)), webinars and community comments.

### **Background**

Prior RySG input shared to the Reviews CCG ([18 February](#)) and to the ICANN Public Comment on the FY27 Budget ([12 February](#)) stated:

- The execution of reviews is not keeping pace with the ecosystem, and concurrent reviews are leading to a backlog in the implementation of recommendations.
- The Reviews CCG received community [feedback](#) that “Clarity of problem and clarity of solution are key.”

- This problem is operational in nature. Even if a review is sound in scope and competency, it will ultimately be ineffective unless the operational problem is solved first. The RySG suggests the Reviews CCG address the operations of reviews first, as the scope of reviews is subject to change as ICANN evolves.
- RySG emphasized the need for ICANN to become agile in response to market and regulatory changes.
- There is a disconnect between the level of resources required by the ICANN Reviews process, the ICANN FY26–30 Strategic Plan, and the Draft ICANN FY27 Budget. RySG encourages that ICANN provide sufficient resources for reviews in the budget to address ICANN Reviews.

In response to community comments on resourcing reviews, the ICANN org [Public Comment Summary Report ICANN FY27–31 Operating & Financial Plan, ICANN/IANA FY27 Op Plans & Budgets](#) (2 April 2026) stated:

- ICANN Reviews are cross-functional, and ICANN does not have a single, consolidated [cost] figure for past cycles.
- ICANN will evaluate ways to describe the “Review and Strategic Initiatives” category in the FY27 Budget to better clarify the description of this work.
- ICANN agrees that institutional agility and adaptability are vital for continued success.
- ICANN is evaluating possible execution methods, which include improving decision-making within the organization, ICANN’s role in PDPs, and assessing organizational structure.

## Feedback

The RySG reiterates the **need for specific operational details** in the upcoming Draft Report, in light of the Public Comment Summary Report, updated review system timeline, and community comments expressed during the webinars.

The RySG considers the introduction of a **Reviews Scoping Committee** to be a positive addition, provided that its tasks and mandate are clearly defined in detail and the role of the SOs/ACs is formally established.

Concerns shared during [Webinar 1](#) questioned “how the CCG arrived at a 15-year cadence” for a particular review, with the CCG noting that “this is still open for discussion”. It will be important to clarify details and rationale about **cadence and the composition of the groups** working across different review types, including any potential “On-Demand” reviews to ensure Community resources are not overtaxed. Additional clarification about how to avoid overlapping reviews that strain community resources would be helpful.

Concerns shared during [Webinar 2](#) centered on the “the time it takes to do a review and implementation”, and how “important to rethink and see what the real cadence we want to

have is”. In response the CCG stated it would add which group will monitor implementation of review recommendations/outcomes to its list of issues, and acknowledged: “We have limited experience with this and as such, input is welcome.” Additional clarification about how to **avoid overlapping reviews that strain community resources** would be helpful. To better clarify how the proposed new reviews compare to or differ from existing reviews, we support incorporating the tenets of the existing reviews into the new reviews.

ICANN Reviews are cross-functional, and ICANN does not have a single, consolidated cost figure nor function for reviews. These Reviews are inherently cross-functional and have significant operational and financial impacts across the organization. Despite this, ICANN currently lacks both a centralized cost-tracking mechanism and a dedicated operational function responsible for assessing and managing the cumulative impact of Reviews. The RySG previously observed that ICANN org’s Executive function included staff focused on operational oversight. ICANN should be able to **consolidate Review-related costs, evaluate operational impacts, identify duplication, and develop measurable KPIs to assess Review effectiveness**. Without this capability, ICANN lacks the transparency and operational accountability necessary to properly manage the Review process.

The RySG once again thanks the Reviews CCG for their work on this important initiative, and for the opportunity to provide input. The RySG welcomes further engagement on the Review of Reviews.