

ICANN Reviews – Terms of Reference

Introduction

Good practices suggest that the Terms of Reference (ToR) should demonstrate how the objective of the review will be accomplished within the available time and with specified resources. Terms of Reference in general must provide a clear articulation of work to be done and a basis for how the success of the project will be measured.

This template provides guidance and examples of the issues that review teams should address in their ToR and also provides some examples and best practices (where applicable) to facilitate completion. Review teams may adjust this template to their individual needs, addressing all relevant issues appropriately.

Review Name:	Third Review of ICANN Accountability and Transparency (ATRT3)
Section I: Review Identification	
Board Initiation:	Resolution 2018.10.25.15
ToR due date:	Due date for ToR, as per Board Resolution: 3 June 2019 Revised due date: Submission date:
Announcement of Review Team:	20 December 2018
Name(s) of RT Leadership:	Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Patrick Kane
Name(s) of Board Appointed Member(s):	Maarten Botterman
Review ICANN org URL:	https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/specific-reviews/atrt
Review Workspace URL:	https://community.icann.org/x/QK7DAw
Review Mailing List:	https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/atrt3-review/
Important Background Links:	Bylaws Section: Accountability and Transparency Review Review Team Selection: https://community.icann.org/x/QBpyB RT Announcement: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2018-12-20-en
Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables	
Mission & Scope	
Background	
At its meeting on 25 October 2018, the ICANN Board initiated the third Review of ICANN Accountability and Transparency to review “ICANN’s execution of its commitment to maintain and	

improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that the outcomes of its decision-making reflect the public interest and are accountable to the Internet community ("Accountability and Transparency Review")."

Mission and Scope

This Review Team is tasked, as per the Bylaws, Section 4.6 (c):

*(i) The Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN's execution of its commitment to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that the outcomes of its decision-making reflect the public interest and are accountable to the Internet community ("**Accountability and Transparency Review**").*

*(ii) The issues that the review team for the Accountability and Transparency Review (the "**Accountability and Transparency Review Team**") may assess include, but are not limited to, the following:*

(A) assessing and improving Board governance which shall include an ongoing evaluation of Board performance, the Board selection process, the extent to which the Board's composition and allocation structure meets ICANN's present and future needs, and the appeal mechanisms for Board decisions contained in these Bylaws;

(B) assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC's interaction with the Board and with the broader ICANN community, and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS;

(C) assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input (including adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof);

(D) assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community;

(E) assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations, and effective and timely policy development; and

(F) assessing and improving the Independent Review Process.

(iii) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior Accountability and Transparency Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(iv) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team may recommend to the Board the termination or amendment of other periodic reviews required by this Section 4.6, and may recommend to the Board the creation of additional periodic reviews.

(v) *The Accountability and Transparency Review Team should issue its final report within one year of convening its first meeting.*

(vi) *The Accountability and Transparency Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years measured from the date the previous Accountability and Transparency Review Team was convened.*

Objectives

In line with the Bylaws, and after considering the limited scope proposal and feedback, the Review Team agreed by consensus to define the scope of the Review to address the following objectives:

- *(Objectives reflecting agreed scope of the review to be developed by the Review Team and inserted below, with each bullet providing (a) description of the Objective and (b) relationship to Specific Review requirements and to ICANN’s mission as noted in the Bylaws)*
- *Objective 1– description and relationship to ICANN’s mission*
- *Objective 2 – description and relationship to ICANN’s mission*
- *Objective N – description and relationship to ICANN’s mission*

As noted in “Considerations with regard to Review Team Recommendations,” objectives must be consistent with both ICANN’s mission and Bylaw requirements for this Specific Review. In addition, objectives should be set forth in priority order and accompanied by a description of prioritization criteria applied by the Review Team.

If, after the ToR has been adopted and sent to the Board in response to its resolution to constitute the review, the Review Team decides by consensus that the ToR and/or scope needs to be amended, the Review Team must update its ToR (including providing a rationale for any revisions to the ToR, work plan and scope). The revisions must be submitted to the Board along with an explanation for the modification. ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees should also be notified of these updates.

Definitions

Review Team to provide definitions for any and all relevant terms and/or principals contained in the scope.

Deliverables & Timeframes

The Review Team shall respect the timelines and deliverables as outlined in this document. The Review Team shall develop a work plan that outlines the necessary steps and expected timing in order to achieve the milestones of this review, as agreed on below. The Review Team shall follow its published work plan to address review objectives within the available time and specified resources.

Progress towards time-bound milestones defined in the work plan shall be tracked and published on a

Fact Sheet and will be posted on the [wiki](#).

Timeline:

- [insert milestone date]: Define and approve terms of reference and work plan
- [insert milestone date]: Fact-finding and assembling materials
- [insert milestone date]: Assemble draft findings
- [insert milestone date]: Approve draft findings and engagement with community at
- [insert milestone date]: Produce and approve draft report for public comment
- [insert milestone date]: Assemble final recommendations and update draft report based on public comments received, engagement at ICANNXX
- [insert milestone date]: Adopt final report for ICANN Board Consideration

Deliverables:

The Review Team shall produce at least one **Draft Report** and a **Final Report**. The Draft Report should include the following:

- Overview of the Review Team's working methods, tools used and analysis conducted.
- Facts and findings related to the investigation of the objectives identified in the scope, and address all questions raised in the ToR.
- Data provisions on all aspects described in the scope (see above), and an analysis of information/data collected.
- Self-assessment of what processes (pertinent to the scope) work well and where improvements can be made; the self-assessment ought to be based on and refer to facts, findings, and data provision wherever possible.
- Preliminary recommendations that address significant and relevant issues detected.
- A preliminary impact analysis and a set of metrics to measure the effectiveness of the recommendations proposed by the current Review Team, including source(s) of baseline data for that purpose:
 - Identification of issue
 - Identification of metrics used to measure whether recommendation goals are achieved
 - Identification of potential problems in attaining the data or developing the metrics
 - A suggested timeframe in which the measures should be performed
 - Define current baselines of the issue and define initial benchmarks that define success or failure
 - Metrics may include but are not limited to (Refer to the GNSO's [Hints & Tips Page](#)):
 - Data retained by ICANN (compliance, finance, policy etc.)
 - Industry metric sources
 - Community input via public comment
 - Surveys or studies

At least one draft report will be submitted for public comment, following standard ICANN procedures. The Review Team may update the draft report based on the comments and/or other relevant information received, and submit its Final Report to the ICANN Board. The Final Report shall contain the same sections as the Draft Report. As mandated by ICANN's Bylaws, the Final Report of the

Review Team shall be published for public comment in advance of the Board's consideration.

Considerations with Regard to Review Team Recommendations

Review Teams are expected to develop and follow a clear process when documenting constructive recommendations as the result of the review. This includes fact-based analysis, clear articulation of noted problem areas, supporting documentation, and resulting recommendations that follow the S.M.A.R.T framework: **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**ealistic, and **T**ime-Bound.

Additionally, the Review Team is asked to share its proposed recommendations with the ICANN organization to obtain explicit feedback regarding feasibility (e.g., time required for implementation, cost of implementation, and potential alternatives to achieve the intended outcomes). Proposed recommendations should be provided in priority order to ensure focus on highest-impact areas.

To help review teams assess whether proposed recommendations are consistent with this guidance, testing each recommendation against the following questions may be helpful:

- What is the intent of the recommendation?
- What observed fact-based issue is the recommendation intending to solve? What is the “problem statement”?
- What are the findings that support the recommendation?
- Is each recommendation accompanied by supporting rationale?
- How is the recommendation aligned with ICANN’s strategic plan, the Bylaws and ICANN’s mission?
- Does the recommendation require new policies to be adopted? If yes, describe issues to be addressed by new policies.
- What outcome is the review team seeking? How will the effectiveness of implemented improvements be measured? What is the target for a successful implementation?
- How significant would the impact be if not addressed (i.e., very significant, moderately significant) and what areas would be impacted (e.g., security, transparency, legitimacy, efficiency, diversity, etc.)?
- Does the review team envision the implementation to be short-term (i.e., completed within six months), mid-term (i.e., within 12 months), or long-term (i.e., more than 12 months)?
- Is related work already underway? If so, what is it and who is carrying it out?
- Who are the (responsible) parties that need to be involved in the implementation work for this recommendation (i.e., community, the ICANN organization, the ICANN Board, or a combination thereof)?
- Are recommendations given in order of priority to ensure focus on highest impact areas?
- If only five (5) recommendations can be implemented due to community bandwidth and other resource constraints, would this recommendation be included in the top five? Why or why not?

Finally, review teams are encouraged to engage in ongoing dialog with the ICANN Board Caucus Group, both at regularly-scheduled checkpoints (e.g., ICANN meetings) and as needed when the

review team reaches a milestone and could benefit from feedback on agreed scope or any recommendations under development to address that scope.

Section III: Formation, Leadership, Other Organizations

Membership

As per the ICANN Bylaws, the Review Team has been selected by the Chairs of ICANN’s Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees (SO/ACs). Members and their gender, SO/AC affiliation, and region are:

#	Name	Gender	SO / AC	Region
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				

Note: ASO declined the invitation to participate in ICANN's Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3).

The ICANN Board has appointed Maarten Botterman to serve as a member of the third Review of ICANN Accountability and Transparency (ATRT3).

By consensus, the Review Team has selected a leadership team, consisting of Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Patrick Kane as its co-Chairs.

Roles and Responsibility of Review Team Members

Responsibilities for all review team members include:

- Attend all calls and face-to-face meetings whenever feasible.
- Providing apologies for planned absence at least 24 hours in advance.
- Actively engage on email list, including providing feedback when requested to do so through that medium.
- Actively engage with relevant stakeholder groups within the ICANN community, and within each team member's local constituencies.
- Provide fact-based inputs and comments based on core expertise and experience.
- Undertake desk research as required and in accordance with scope of work, including assessment of implementation of recommendations from prior reviews.
- Be prepared to listen to others and make compromises in order to achieve consensus recommendations.
- Participate in drafting and sub-groups as required.
- Comply with ICANN's expected standards of behavior.
- Comply with all Review Team member requirements, including those described in the "Accountability and Transparency" and "Reporting" sections of this document.

Roles and Responsibilities of Review Team Leadership

Responsibilities of the review team's leadership include:

- Remain neutral when serving as Chair or Vice Chair.

- Identify when speaking as an advocate.
- Maintain standards and focus on the aims of the Review Team as established in this Terms of Reference.
- Drive toward delivery of key milestones according to the Work Plan.
- Ensure effective communication between members and with broader community, Board and ICANN Organization.
- Set the agenda and run the meetings.
- Ensure that all meeting attendees get accurate, timely and clear information.
- Determine and identify the level of consensus within the team.
- Provide clarity on team decisions.
- Ensure decisions are acted upon.
- Build and develop team-work.
- Manage the team's budget and financial reporting to maintain accountability and transparency.

Changes to Review Team Membership, Dissolution of Review Team

Dissolution of Review Team:

This Review Team shall be disbanded once it has submitted its final report to the ICANN Board.

Implementation Phase:

The Review Team shall identify one or two Review Team members to remain available for clarification as may be needed during the planning phase of implementation of Review Team recommendations.

Removal and Replacement of Resigned or Removed Members:

If a review team member is sufficiently inactive or disruptive as to cause at least 50% of review team members (excluding the member in question) to request their removal, such member will be asked to resign. If such member refuses to resign, the SO/AC that endorsed the member will be requested to withdraw their support and nominate a replacement. Should the SO/AC not take action, the member can be removed by a 70% majority vote of the review team members (excluding the member in question). Voting shall be by secret ballot.

The SO/AC whose member resigned or was removed may elect to nominate a replacement in accordance with its own internal procedures, if it considers it beneficial to do so due to the status of the review. The SO/AC may nominate a member from the initial group of applicants it received or, alternatively, publish a call for volunteers to receive new applications. It shall inform the review team leadership of their procedural decision and indicate a timeframe by which the new member will be nominated.

Depending on the status and remaining timeline of the review, or any other factors, the relevant SO/AC may choose not to nominate a replacement candidate.

Support from ICANN Organization

Members of the ICANN organization assigned to the Review Team will support its work, including project management, meeting support, document drafting if/when requested, document editing and distribution, data and information gathering if/when requested, and other substantive contributions

when deemed appropriate.

Dependencies on Other Organizations

[Review Team to insert here any dependencies on other key organizations within the ICANN Community, such as the ICANN Board, any other Review Teams that may already be gathering input of relevance to this Review Team, and any GNSO Policy Development Working Groups that may be working on related policy issues.]

Section IV: Decision-Making and Methodologies

Decision-Making Methodologies

The Bylaws state: “(iii) Review team decision-making practices shall be specified in the Operating Standards, with the expectation that review teams shall try to operate on a consensus basis. In the event a consensus cannot be found among the members of a review team, a majority vote of the members may be taken.” The procedure should align with the Bylaws.

[Note: The following material is based on the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, Section 3.6 and have been adopted in recent cross-community working groups. If a Review Team wishes to deviate from the standard methodology for making decisions or empower the Review Team to decide its own decision-making methodology, this section should be amended as appropriate while maintaining alignment with the Bylaw text provided above.]

The Review Team Leadership will be responsible for designating each decision as having one of the following designations:

- **Full consensus** - no Review Team members speak against the recommendation in its last readings.
- **Consensus** - a small minority disagrees, but most agree.
- **Strong support but significant opposition** - most of the group supports a recommendation but a significant number do not.
- **Divergence** - no strong support for any particular position, rather many different points of view. Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinion and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that it is worth listing the issue in the report nonetheless.
- **Minority view** - a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to a **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, and **No Consensus**; or, it can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.

In cases of **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, and **No Consensus**, an effort should be made to document that variance in viewpoint and to present adequately any **Minority Views** that may have been made. Documentation of **Minority View** recommendations normally depends on text offered by the proponent(s). In all cases of **Divergence**, the Review Team Chair(s) should encourage the submission of minority viewpoint(s).

The recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on recommendations

should work as follows:

- i. After the Review Team has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the RT Leadership makes an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group to review.
- ii. After the Review Team has discussed the RT Leadership's estimation of designation, the Chair(s) should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.
- iii. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the Chair(s) makes an evaluation that is accepted by the Review Team.
- iv. In rare cases, a Chair may decide that the use of a poll is reasonable. Some of the reasons for this might be:
 - A decision needs to be made within a time frame that does not allow for the natural process of iteration and settling on a designation to occur.
 - It becomes obvious after several iterations that it is impossible to arrive at a designation. This will happen most often when trying to discriminate between **Consensus** and **Strong support but Significant Opposition** or between **Strong support but Significant Opposition** and **Divergence**.

Care should be taken in using polls that opinions cast do not become votes. A liability with the use of polls is that, in situations where there is **Divergence** or **Strong Opposition**, there are often disagreements about the meanings of the poll questions or of the poll results.

Based upon the Review Team's needs, the Chair(s) may direct that Review Team participants do not have to have their name explicitly associated with any Full Consensus or Consensus view/position. However, in all other cases and in those cases where a group member represents the minority viewpoint, their name must be explicitly linked, especially in those cases where polls were taken.

Consensus calls should always involve the entire Review Team and, for this reason, should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all Review Team members have the opportunity to fully participate in the consensus process. It is the role of the Chair(s) to designate which level of consensus is reached and announce this designation to the Review Team. Member(s) of the Review Team should be able to challenge the designation of the Chair(s) as part of the Review Team's discussion. However, if disagreement persists, Review Team members may use the process set forth below to challenge the designation.

If several participants (see Note 1 below) in a Review Team disagree with the designation given to a position by the Chair(s) or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:

1. Send email to the Chair(s), copying the Review Team explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
2. If the Chair(s) still disagrees with the complainants, the Chair(s) will forward the appeal

to the Board liaison. The Chair(s) must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainants and in the submission to the liaison. If the liaison supports the Chair's position, the liaison will provide a response and his or her reasoning to the complainants. If the Board liaison disagrees with the Chair, the liaison will forward the appeal to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC), the Board committee charged with overseeing Specific Reviews. Should the complainants disagree with the liaison's support of the Chair's determination, the complainants may appeal to the Chair of the OEC or his or her designated representative. If the OEC agrees with the complainants' position, the OEC should recommend remedial action to the Chair.

3. In the event of any appeal, the OEC will attach a statement of the appeal to its Board report, once the Review Team has submitted its Final Report. This statement should include all of the documentation from all steps in the appeals process and should include a statement from the OEC (see Note 2 below).

Note 1: Any Review Team member may raise an issue for reconsideration; however, a formal appeal will require that a single member demonstrates a sufficient amount of support before a formal appeal process can be invoked. In those cases where a single Review Team member is seeking reconsideration, the member will advise the Chair of their issue and the Chair will work with the dissenting member to investigate the issue and to determine if there is sufficient support for the reconsideration to initial a formal appeal process.

Note 2: It should be noted that ICANN also has other conflict resolution mechanisms available that could be considered in case any of the parties are dissatisfied with the outcome of this process.

Accountability and Transparency

Teleconferences and face-to-face meetings will be recorded and streamed, to the extent practicable, and subject to Confidential Framework provisions. However, the record shall reflect this decision, as well as the underlying considerations that motivated such action.

The Review Team and supporting members of the ICANN organization will endeavor to post (a) action items within 24 hours of any telephonic or face-to-face meeting; and (b) streaming video and/or audio recordings as promptly as possible after any such meeting, subject to the limitations and requirements described above.

The Review Team will maintain a wiki, <https://community.icann.org/x/QK7DAw>, on which it will post: (a) action items, decisions reached, correspondence, meeting agendas, background materials provided by the ICANN organization, members of the Review Team, or any third party; (b) audio recordings and/or streaming video; (c) the affirmations and/or disclosures of Review Team members under the Review Team's conflict of interest policy; (d) input, whether from the general public, ICANN stakeholders, the ICANN organization, the ICANN Board, or Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, etc.; and (e) Fact Sheets, detailing relevant metrics on the review including attendance records of review team members, progression of work, and budget updates. Absent overriding privacy or confidentiality concerns, all such materials should be made publicly available on the Review Team's website within 48 business hours of receipt.

Email communications among members of the Review Team shall be [publicly archived](#) automatically via the review email list, atrt3-review@icann.org. Email communication between team members regarding review team work should be exchanged on this list. In exceptional circumstances, such as when required due to Non-Disclosure Agreement or Confidential Disclosure Agreement provisions, non-public email exchanges may take place between Review Team members and the ICANN organization. When possible, a non-confidential summary of such discussions will be posted to the public review email list.

Reporting

Review Team members are expected to perform their reporting obligations and provide details in terms of content and timelines. Reporting should start when a review team is launched and should continue until its conclusion. The Review Team should include in this section (a) the information to be reported, (b) the report format to be used, and (c) report intervals, to assure accountability and transparency of the review team vis-a-vis the community. In addition, reference to the quarterly Fact Sheets, assembled by the ICANN organization, should be made.

[Review Team to insert requirements here, replacing example below:]

Review team members are, as a general matter, encouraged to report back to their constituencies and others with respect to the work of the review team, unless the information involves confidential information.

While the review team will strive to conduct its business on the record to the maximum extent possible, members must be able to have frank and honest exchanges among themselves, and the review team must be able to have frank and honest exchanges with stakeholders and stakeholder groups. Moreover, individual members and the review team as a whole must operate in an environment that supports open and candid exchanges, and that welcomes re-evaluation and repositioning in the face of arguments made by others.

Members of the review team are volunteers, and each will assume a fair share of the work of the team.

Members of the review team shall execute the investigation according to the scope and work plan, based on best practices for fact-based research, analysis and drawing conclusions.

The review team will engage in dialog with the dedicated ICANN Board Caucus Group; for example, when the review team reaches a milestone and could benefit from feedback on agreed scope or any recommendations under development to address that scope.

Subgroups

The Review Team can create as many subgroups as it deems necessary to complete its tasks through its standard decision process, as follows:

- Subgroups will be composed of Review Team members and will have a clear scope, timeline, deliverables and leadership.
- Subgroups when formed will appoint a rapporteur who will report the progress of the subgroup back to the plenary on a defined timeline.
- Subgroups will operate per Review Team rules and all subgroup requests will require

Review Team approval.

- Subgroups can arrange face-to-face meetings in conjunction with Review Team face-to-face meetings.
- All documents, reports and recommendations prepared by a subgroup will require Review Team approval before being considered a product of the Review Team.
- The Review Team may terminate any subgroup at any time.

Travel Support

Members of the Review Team who request funding from ICANN to attend face-to-face meetings will receive it according to ICANN's standard travel policies and subject to the Review Team's budget. When a Review Team face-to-face meeting is held in conjunction with an ICANN meeting, and when outreach sessions have been scheduled, Review Team members, who are not funded otherwise, may receive funding for the duration of the ICANN meeting.

Outreach

The Review Team will conduct outreach to the ICANN community and beyond to support its mandate and in keeping with the global reach of ICANN's mission. As such, the Review Team will ensure the public has access to, and can provide input on, the team's work. Interested community members will have an opportunity to interact with the Review Team. The Review Team will present its work and hear input from communities (subject to budget requirements).

Observers

Observers may stay updated on the Review Team's work in several ways:

Mailing-Lists

Observers may subscribe to the observers mailing-list ATRT3-Observers@icann.org by sending a request to msi-secretariat@icann.org. Calendar invites to ATRT3 meetings as well as agendas are forwarded to this mailing-list.

In addition, observers can follow ATRT3 Review Team exchanges by subscribing to the ATRT3 Review Team mailing-list with read-only rights only.

The ATRT3 observers list is available [here](#).

Attend a meeting virtually

All meetings, whether in person or online, will have a dedicated Adobe Connect room for observers to participate: <https://participate.icann.org/atrt3review-observers/>.

Attend a meeting in person

When Review Team members gather for public face-to-face meetings, observers may attend to share their input and questions with the Review Team, as appropriate. The calendar of scheduled calls and meetings is published on the wiki:

<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=66083787>.

Email input to the review team

Observers may send an email to the Review Team to share input on their work. Remarks and/or

questions can be sent to the following address: input-to-atrt3@icann.org.

Independent Experts

As per the Bylaws (Article 4, Section IV(a)(iv), the Review Team may engage independent experts “to render advice as requested by the review team. ICANN shall pay the reasonable fees and expenses of such experts for each review contemplated by [Section 4.6 of the Bylaws] to the extent such fees and costs are consistent with the budget assigned for such review.”

For the purpose of this review, independent experts are third parties that may be contractually engaged to support the Review Team’s work. Should the need for independent experts arise, the Review Team will consider the scope of work required, expected deliverables, necessary skills and expertise, and the budget implications associated with the project. To initiate a request for an independent expert, the Review Team will create and formally approve a statement of work which includes:

- A clear, specific project title and concise description of the work to be performed
- A description of required skills, skill level, and any particular qualifications
- Concrete timelines for deliverables, including milestones and measurable outcomes
- Any additional information or reference material as needed to detail requirements

The leadership will communicate the Review Team’s request to the ICANN organization for processing in accordance with ICANN’s standard operating procedures. Selection of experts to support the work of the Review Team will follow ICANN’s procurement processes. The Statement of Work will inform the procurement path to be followed (RFP or no RFP). In either case, the ICANN organization will search for an expert that meets the specified criteria, evaluate each candidate relative to the criteria, negotiate contract terms, and manage the contracting process.

Closure and Review Team Self-Assessment

The Review Team will be dissolved upon the delivery of its Final Report, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the ICANN Board are being requested.

Following its dissolution, Review Team members shall participate in a self-assessment, facilitated by supporting members of the ICANN organization, to provide input, best practices, and suggestions for improvements for future review teams.