

Second IANA Naming Function Review (IFR2)

Terms of Reference

Adopted 6 February 2024

Table of Contents

Section I: Review Identification	2
Board initiation	2
Name(s) of RT Leadership	2
Review Workspace URL	2
Review Mailing List	2
Background	2
Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables	3
Scope	3
Required inputs	6
Dependencies on Other Organizations	7
Deliverables	7
Requirements for Recommendation Drafting	9
Timeframes	11
Section III: Formation & Dissolution	12
Membership	12
Changes to Review Team Membership, Dissolution of Review Team	13
Section IV: Decision-Making and Methodologies	13
Decision-Making Methodologies	13
Accountability & Transparency	17
Reporting	18
Subgroups	19
Outreach	19
Observers	19
Closure & Review Team Self Assessment	20
Definitions	20

Section I: Review Identification

Board initiation	https://www.icann.org/en/board-activities-and-meetings/materials/approved-resolutions-regular-meeting-of-the-icann-board-10-09-2023-en (10 September 2023)
Name(s) of RT Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Koch, ccNSO Co-Chair appointment • Ashley Heineman, GNSO Co-Chair appointment
Review Workspace URL	https://community.icann.org/display/ifr/IANA+Naming+Function+Review
Review Mailing List	https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ifr2-team/
Background	<p>The IFR is an accountability mechanism created as part of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) stewardship transition to ensure that ICANN's IANA work through Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) meets the needs and expectations of its naming customers. Under the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Board must convene an IFR no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous IFR was convened. The ICANN Board convened the first IFR on 16 September 2018.</p> <p>The second IFR team (IFR2) will conduct the review in accordance with the scope specified in the ICANN Bylaws. The review focuses on PTI's performance of the IANA naming function against the contractual requirements in the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function Statement of Work. The naming functions under review include management of the Domain Name System root zone, a critical function for the ongoing operation of the Internet.</p> <p>The IFR does not replace the work of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC), which reviews PTI's service level performance of the naming function on a monthly basis. The IFR takes a broader look that includes identifying if the requirements of the contract still meet the needs of customers, and whether amendments should be considered. The full scope of the review is available in Section 18.3 of the ICANN Bylaws.</p> <p>IFR2 meetings and working procedures will be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest</p>

	<p>extent possible. More information can be found on the IFR2 wiki space.</p>
--	---

Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables

<p>Scope</p>	<p>This review team is tasked, as per the <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3:</p> <p>“(a) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract in relation to the needs of its direct customers and the expectations of the broader ICANN community, and determine whether to make any recommendations with respect to PTI's performance;”</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3(a), the review team will assess the needs and expectations of IANA Naming function direct customers and the broader community, and then determine if there are any gaps in PTI’s performance. The IFRT will examine PTI’s performance against SLAs originally developed by the community; review PTI’s annual Customer Service Survey; discuss PTI’s performance with the Customer Standing Committee; solicit input through the first Public Comment of an Initial Draft; and other methods that the Review Team deems appropriate.</p> <p>“(b) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;”</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3(b), the review team will assess all IANA Naming Function related requirements in the contract and SOW and determine if PTI has met these. The IFRT will do so through such means as interviews with PTI and ICANN staff and/or community subject matter experts, available monthly reporting and monitoring tools, as well as IANA audit reports that apply to IANA Naming Functions.</p>
---------------------	--

“(c) Review the IANA Naming Function SOW and determine whether to recommend any amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW to account for the needs of the direct customers of the naming services and/or the community at large;”

OBJECTIVE: Consistent with ICANN’s mission and [Bylaws](#), Section 18.3(c), and based on the analysis conducted for 18.3.(a) and 18.3.(i) in particular, the Review Team will review the IANA Naming Function Contract and SOW to determine if the needs of IANA Naming customers are fully covered through a review team analysis.

“(d) Review and evaluate the openness and transparency procedures of PTI and any oversight structures for PTI’s performance, including reporting requirements and budget transparency;”

OBJECTIVE: Consistent with ICANN’s mission and [Bylaws](#), Section 18.3(c), the review team will assess PTI’s procedures while considering any customer feedback on the openness and transparency for such procedures as assessed in 18.3.(a) and (i). The review team considers PTI oversight structures to include, but not exclusive to: Board oversight, management, community committees and other accountability mechanisms.

“(e) Review and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the EC with respect to actions taken by the EC, if any, pursuant to [Section 16.2](#), [Section 18.6](#), [Section 18.12](#), [Section 19.1](#), [Section 19.4](#), [Section 22.4\(b\)](#) and [Annex D](#);”

OBJECTIVE: To date, no Empowered Community (EC) actions have occurred in relation to [Bylaws Section 16.2](#), [19.1](#), [19.4](#), [22.4\(b\)](#) and [Annex D](#).

The review team will evaluate the performance and effectiveness of actions taken by the EC in relation to [Sections 18.6](#) and [18.12](#), as [approved](#) by the Board in September 2023 completed by the EC in November 2023.

“(f) Review and evaluate the performance of the IANA naming function according to established service level expectations during the IFR period being reviewed and

	<p>compared to the immediately preceding Periodic IFR period;”</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: The review team will review relevant monthly reporting and monitoring tools to evaluate the performance of the IANA naming function according to established service level expectations, and directly evaluate these against the findings from the first IFR.</p> <p>“(g) Review and evaluate whether there are any systemic issues that are impacting PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;”</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3(g), the IFRT will review any complaints and escalations to IANA to evaluate if there are any systemic and/or recurring issues, while also considering input from the community.</p> <p>“(h) Initiate public comment periods and other processes for community input on PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW (such public comment periods shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN);”</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: Consistent with ICANN’s mission and Bylaws, Section 18.3(h), the review team will solicit input from the community on PTI’s performance through such means as holding consultations with the community; a Public Comment period such as for an Initial Draft; and other methods that the Review Team deems appropriate.</p> <p>“(i) Consider input from the CSC and the community on PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;”</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: Consistent with ICANN’s mission and Bylaws, Section 18.3(i), the review team will discuss PTI’s performance with the Customer Standing Committee; and solicit input from the community through such means as holding consultations with the community; a Public Comment period such as for an Initial Draft; and other methods that the Review Team deems</p>
--	--

	<p>appropriate.</p> <p>“(j) Identify process or other areas for improvement in the performance of the IANA naming function under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW and the performance of the CSC and the EC as it relates to oversight of PTI; and”</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: Consistent with ICANN’s mission and Bylaws, Section 18.3(j), based on the Review Team’s findings from 18.3.(a) to 18.3.(i), the Review Team will make recommendations for specific measurable steps that can be taken to improve any deficiencies or gaps.</p> <p>“(k) Consider and assess any changes implemented since the immediately preceding IFR and their implications for the performance of PTI under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW.”</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: The review team will review the implementation of recommendations provided by the first IFR and the impact of implementation on performance of PTI under the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function SOW.</p>
<p>Required inputs</p>	<p>Per ICANN Bylaws Section 18.4. IFR REQUIRED INPUTS</p> <p>“In conducting an IFR, the IFRT shall review and analyze the following information:</p> <p>(a) Reports provided by PTI pursuant to the IANA Naming Function Contract and/or IANA Naming Function SOW during the IFR period being reviewed, any portion of which may be redacted pursuant to the Confidential Disclosure Framework set forth in the Operating Standards in accordance with Section 4.6(a)(vi);</p> <p>(b) Reports provided by the CSC in accordance with the CSC Charter during the IFR period being reviewed;</p> <p>(c) Community inputs through public consultation procedures as reasonably determined by the IFRT, including, among other things, public comment periods, input provided at in-person sessions during ICANN meetings, responses to public surveys related to PTI’s performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW, and public inputs</p>

	<p>during meetings of the IFRT;</p> <p>(d) Recommendations for technical, process and/or other improvements relating to the mandate of the IFR provided by the CSC or the community; and</p> <p>(e) Results of any site visit conducted by the IFRT, which shall be conducted in consultation with ICANN (i) upon reasonable notice, (ii) in a manner so as to not affect PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract or the IANA Naming Function SOW and (iii) pursuant to procedures and requirements reasonably developed by ICANN and reasonably acceptable to the IFRT. Any such site visit shall be limited to matters reasonably related to the IFRT's responsibilities pursuant to Section 18.3.”</p>
<p>Dependencies on Other Organizations</p>	<p>The review team will ensure the work it undertakes does not duplicate or conflict with the purview the following efforts:</p> <p><u>CSC Effectiveness Review</u></p>
<p>Deliverables</p>	<p>Per ICANN Bylaws Section 18.10 COMMUNITY REVIEWS AND REPORTS</p> <p>“(a) The IFRT shall seek community input as to the issues relevant to the IFR through one or more public comment periods that shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN and through discussions during ICANN's public meetings in developing and finalizing its recommendations and any report.</p> <p>(b) The IFRT shall provide a draft report of its findings and recommendations to the community for public comment. The public comment period is required to comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.</p> <p>(c) After completion of the IFR, the IFRT shall submit its final report containing its findings and recommendations to the Board. ICANN shall thereafter promptly post the IFRT's final report on the Website.”</p> <p>The draft report should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Overview of the review team’s working methods, tools

	<p>used and analysis conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Facts and findings related to the investigation of the objectives identified in the scope. ● Resolution to all questions raised in the scope or those that arose subsequently during the course of the review (as appropriate). ● Summary of public consultations and engagement conducted. ● 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. ● Preliminary feasibility assessment. ● A preliminary impact analysis to measure the effectiveness of the recommendations proposed by the current review team, including source(s) of baseline data for that purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identification of issue. ○ Definition of desired outcome, including identification of metrics used to measure whether recommendation goals are achieved, where possible. ○ 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. ○ Surveys or studies. ● All recommendations should indicate a preliminary, non-binding level of consensus they have received, as defined in this document. This is to inform the community during the public comment period to indicate the level of review team support for each recommendation, without binding the review team on their support level in the final report. <p>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 and, in addition, a section detailing the</p>
--	--

	<p>public comments received on the draft Report and an explanation of why and how they were incorporated into the final report or why and how they were rejected by the review team. Each recommendation shall include the level of consensus received from the review team members, as defined in this document. The final report of the review team shall be published for public comment in advance of the Board's consideration.</p>
<p>Requirements for Recommendation Drafting</p>	<p>The IFRT shall review and analyze the following information (per Bylaws Section 18.4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reports provided by PTI pursuant to the IANA Naming Function Contract and/or IANA Naming Function SOW during the IFR period being reviewed. ● Reports provided by the CSC. ● Community inputs through public consultation procedures, including public comment periods, input provided at in-person sessions during ICANN meetings, responses to public surveys related to PTI's performance and public inputs during IFRT meetings. ● Recommendations for technical, process and/or other improvements relating to the mandate of the IFR provided by the CSC or the community. ● Results of any site visit conducted by the IFRT. <p>The Review Team must ensure recommendations comply with Bylaws Section 18.5: IFR Results and Recommendations, and Section 18.6: Recommendations to Amend the IANA Naming Function Contract, IANA Naming Function SOW or CSC.</p> <p>Per Section 18.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recommendations must directly relate to matters discussed in Bylaws Section 18.3: IFR Responsibilities. ● Recommendations should identify improvements that are supported by data and associated analysis about existing deficiencies and how they could be addressed. ● Recommendations shall include proposed remedial procedures and describe how those procedures are expected to address such issues. ● The IFRT's report shall also propose timelines for implementing the IFRT's recommendations. ● The IFRT shall attempt to prioritize each of its recommendations and provide a rationale for such prioritization.

- In any case where a recommendation of an IFRT focuses on a service specific to gTLD registry operators, no such recommendation shall be made by the IFRT in any report to the community (including any report to the Board) if opposition to such recommendation is expressed by any IFRT member appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group.
- In any case where a recommendation of an IFRT focuses on a service specific to ccTLD registry operators, no such recommendation shall be made by the IFRT in any report to the community (including any report to the Board) if opposition to such recommendation is expressed by any IFRT member appointed by the ccNSO.
- Notwithstanding anything in the Bylaws to the contrary, the IFRT shall not have the authority to review or make recommendations relating to policy or contracting issues that are not included in the IANA Naming Function Contract or the IANA Naming Function SOW, including, without limitation, policy development, adoption processes or contract enforcement measures between contracted registries and ICANN.

Per Section 18.6:

- The IFRT may recommend amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract, IANA Naming Function SOW and/or the CSC Charter. The IFRT shall, at a minimum, take the following steps before an amendment to either the IANA Naming Function Contract, IANA Naming Function SOW or CSC Charter is proposed:
 - a. Consult with the Board.
 - b. Consult with the CSC.
 - c. Conduct a public input session for ccTLD and gTLD registry operators
 - d. Seek public comment on the amendments that are under consideration by the IFRT.

In regards to Review Team actions:

1. IFRT actions require a consensus agreement, though consensus does not have a numerical definition
2. Members who disagree with an action may file a minority dissent to be included in meeting minutes/or

	<p>reports</p> <p>3. IFRT meetings and work shall be open to the public and follow transparency procedures</p> <p>The Secretary acting for the IFRT will transmit meeting minutes, recordings, transcripts, etc. to mailing lists and icann.org.</p>
<p>Timeframes</p>	<p>The review team shall to the best of its abilities 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. The work plan is a roadmap towards reaching milestones and is subject to adjustments as the review team progresses through work.</p> <p>Progress towards time-bound milestones defined in the work plan shall be tracked and published on a Fact Sheet.</p> <p>Estimated high-level timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● By end January 2024: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develop and adopt of the Terms of Reference (includes scope, objectives, deliverables) ○ Develop and agree a practical and actionable path for the work, with timelines and milestones (work plan) ● January 2024 - April 2024: Fact-finding and data analysis. ● April - September 2024: Assemble and agree draft findings and recommendations. ● 10 - 13 June 2024: ICANN80 (RT could consider community engagement) ● October - December 2024: Draft report available for public comment (community engagement at ICANN81, 9 - 14 November). ● January - March 2025: Assemble final recommendations and update draft report based on public comments received.

Section III: Formation & Dissolution

Membership

As per the ICANN Bylaws, the review team has been selected by ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees (SO/ACs).

Name	Region	SO / AC Appointment
Ashley Heineman (Co-Chair)	NA	RrSG
Peter Koch (Co-Chair)	EUR	ccNSO
Carlton Samuels	LAC	ALAC
Edowaye Makanjuola	AF	GAC
Jonathan Robinson	EUR	RySG
Lars-Johan Liman	EUR	RSSAC
Lyman Chapin	NA	SSAC
Olga Cavalli	LAC	ccNSO
Rafik Dammak	AP	NCSG
Rajiv Prasad	NA	CSG
Rick Wilhelm	NA	RySG
Sami Ali	AP	ccNSO
Brett Carr	EUR	CSC Liaison
Alan Barrett		ICANN Board Liaison
Steve Conte		ICANN Liaison
Marilia Hirano		PTI Liaison

	<p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The ASO and IAB declined their right to appoint a liaison to the team. ● Per the Bylaws, Section 18.8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (d) The IFRT shall be led by two co-chairs: one appointed by the GNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (b)-(e) of Section 18.7 and one appointed by the ccNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clause (a) of Section 18.7. <p>The ccNSO appointed co-Chair is Peter Koch. The GNSO appointed co-Chair is Ashley Heineman.</p>
<p>Changes to Review Team Membership, Dissolution of Review Team</p>	<p>Dissolution of review team: This review team shall be disbanded once it has submitted its final report to the ICANN Board and received Board acceptance.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Replacement and Removal of Members: The review team will follow the replacement and removal of members stipulations from Bylaws 18.8.(h).</p>

Section IV: Decision-Making and Methodologies

<p>Decision-Making Methodologies</p>	<p>Per ICANN Bylaws Section 18.9 MEETINGS:</p> <p>(a) All actions of the IFRT shall be taken by consensus of the IFRT, which is where a small minority may disagree, but most agree. If consensus cannot be reached with respect to a particular issue, actions by the majority of all of the members of the IFRT shall be the action of the IFRT.</p> <p>(b) Any members of the IFRT not in favor of an action</p>
---	---

(whether as a result of voting against a matter or objecting to the consensus position) may record a minority dissent to such action, which shall be included in the IFRT minutes and/or report, as applicable.”

(c) Refer to Bylaws Section 18.5 for further clarification on approval methods.

All minority dissents must detail the analysis or recommendations in the final report with which its author(s) disagree(s), including a rationale for that disagreement.

The authors of minority dissents are encouraged to provide alternative recommendations that include the same details and context as is required from the recommendations in this document.

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. A rule-of-thumb for judging consensus is that the decision is supported by 80% of the review team. (*does not override Bylaws Section 18.5 for specific situations)
- **Strong support but significant opposition** - most of the group supports a recommendation but a significant number of members do not. (*does not override Bylaws Section 18.5 for specific situations)
- **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 judging the extent to which consensus has been reached, it may be useful for each team member to consider which of the following categories they apply to them.

Disagree: I have a fundamental disagreement with the core of the proposal that has not been resolved. We need to look for a new proposal.

Stand aside: I can't support this proposal because ... But I don't want to stop the group, so I'll let the decision happen without me.

Reservations: I have some reservations but am willing to let the proposal pass.

Agreement: I support the proposal.

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 leadership 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 review team leadership makes an evaluation of the designation and publishes it for the group to review.

ii. After the review team has discussed the review team leadership's estimation of designation, the leadership should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.

iii. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the leadership makes an evaluation that is accepted by the review team.

iv. In rare cases, leadership 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 leadership 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 leadership 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 leadership 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 in a review team disagree with the designation given to a position by the leadership or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:

1. Send email to the leadership, copying the review team explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
2. If the leadership still disagrees with the opposing member, a straw poll shall be conducted to determine

	the result.
Accountability & Transparency	<p>Per ICANN Bylaws Section 18.9 MEETINGS:</p> <p>“(c) IFRT meetings, deliberations and other working procedures shall be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest extent possible.</p> <p>(d) The IFRT shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following each IFRT meeting. Recordings and transcripts of meetings, as well as mailing lists, shall also be posted to the Website.”</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The review team and supporting members of ICANN organization will endeavor to post (a) action items within 2 business days 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.</p> <p>The review team will maintain a wiki, https://community.icann.org/display/ifr/IANA+Naming+Function+Review, on which it will post: (a) action items, decisions reached, correspondence, meeting agendas, background materials provided by ICANN, members of the review team, or any third party; (ii) audio recordings and/or streaming video; (b) the affirmations and/or disclosures of review team members under the review team’s conflict of interest policy; (c) input, whether from the general public, from ICANN stakeholders, from ICANN organization, the ICANN Board, Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, etc. Absent overriding privacy or confidentiality concerns, all such materials should be made publicly available on the review team website within 2 business days of receipt.</p> <p>Email communications among members of the review team shall be publicly archived automatically via the review team email list, IFR2-team@icann.org.</p>

	<p>Email communication between team members regarding review teamwork 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 ICANN organization.</p> <p>When possible, a non-confidential summary of such discussions will be posted to the public review email list.</p>
<p>Reporting</p>	<p>Review team members are expected to perform their reporting obligations and provide details in terms of content and timelines.</p> <p>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 RT vis-a-vis the community. In addition, reference to the quarterly Fact Sheets, assembled by ICANN organization, should be made.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. The exception is any information that involves confidential information.</p> <p>Members of the review team are volunteers, and each will assume a fair share of the work of the team.</p> <p>Members of the review team shall execute the investigation according to the scope and work plan, based on best practices</p>

	<p>for fact-based research, analysis and drawing conclusions.</p> <p>The Board Liaison will follow the work of the review team and will provide informal guidance and advice as the work of the review team progresses. The review team will engage in dialog with the dedicated ICANN Board Caucus Group, if and when a caucus group is assembled; 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.</p>
Subgroups	<p>The review team can create as many subgroups as it deems necessary to complete its tasks through its standard decision process, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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. <p>The review team may terminate any subgroup at any time.</p>
Outreach	<p>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 throughout the review.</p>
Observers	<p>Observers may stay updated on the review team's work in several ways:</p> <p>Mailing-Lists Observers can follow the review team exchanges by subscribing to the review team mailing-list with read-only rights.</p> <p>Attend a meeting virtually or in person All meetings, whether in person or online, will be open to</p>

	<p>observers. The exception is for any part of the meeting where information that involves confidential information.</p> <p>The calendar of scheduled calls and meetings is published on the wiki.</p> <p>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 review team’s publicly archived mailing address.</p>
<p>Closure & Review Team Self Assessment</p>	<p>The review team will be dissolved upon the delivery of its final report to the Board and acceptance of the final report by the Board, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the ICANN Board are being requested. Some review team members may be requested to remain available to support the implementation of the review teams report.</p> <p>Following its dissolution, review team members shall participate in a self-assessment, facilitated by supporting members of ICANN organization, to provide input, best practices, and suggestions for improvements for future review teams.</p>

Definitions

Unless otherwise noted, the IFR2 Review Team is operating under the definitions within the following:

- ICANN Acronyms and Terms: <https://www.icann.org/en/icann-acronyms-and-terms>
- IANA Naming Function Contract: https://www.icann.org/iana_pti_docs/151-iana-naming-function-contract-v-30sep16