I am submitting this comment on my own behalf noting the following credentials:

- I have been actively involved in ICANN for over 12 years;
- I have served on ATRT2 as a Vice-Chair and was particularly responsible for ATRT2's consideration of the first WHOIS Specific Review;
- I am serving on the RDS-WHOIS2 Review team and hold the position of Chair;
- I was a Member of the CCWG-Accountability which integrated the Specific Reviews into the Bylaws;
- I served as Chair of the ALAC and under the new Bylaws was one of the selectors for the SSR2 and RDS-WHOIS2 Review Teams;
- As Chair of the ALAC, I was one of the group of AC/SO Chairs that addressed the Board's halting of the SSR2 Review and facilitated its restart.

Based on this, I believe I have some basis for making the following remarks.

The remarks map to the sections of the document and range from minor typographical errors to significant content.

I would like to start by noting that this document is FAR superior to its predecessor and I wish to thank the ICANN organization for this great improvement.

2.3 Call for Volunteers

The SO/AC Chairs MUST be involved in the process of publishing the Call for Volunteers. In a large number of cases, previous calls have had substantive errors or omissions which caused unneeded efforts and difficulties.

The decision to extend the call MUST include the SO/AC Chairs and not be done unilaterally by the ICANN organization.

In the third sub-bullet of "Fields", it is not clear if a candidate may name only more additional SO/AC or whether they can specify several (or all). The statement must be clarified.

The candidates should be told that they may be contacted by their designated SO/AC(s) for additional information (as later described under the nomination process).

2.4 Eligibility Criteria for Review Candidates

Under the skills required, Leadership and group management should be included as a desirable attribute.

2.5 Review Team Selection Process

In the last paragraph before 2.5.1 "SO/ACs must each provide a list of up to SEVEN nominated candidates".

2.5.1 SO/AC Nomination Process

There should be a provision for a voice interview. That allows for a more flexible skills assessment and also allows gauging the quality of the candidates English speaking and comprehension capabilities (a problem in some past cases).

2.5.2 SO/AC Chairs Selecting the Review Team

In the second-to-last paragraph, it says "If the review team, once established, determines that it does not have either an adequate skill set or diversity, it shall confer with the SO/ACs how to resolve its shortcomings.". Surely this should be with the SO/AC Chairs. The concept of a review team conferring with the entirety of all seven SOs and AC is mind-boggling. How would a review team confer with the entire GAC, or entire GNSO?

3.1.9.1 Review Team Members

"Actively participate" needs to be further enhanced. In many cases, it is presumed to mean attendance with virtually no "active". Also, it is essential that for teleconferences, team members be able to participate with good voice connectivity. Listening and typing in comments is a particularly poor method of participation, but is quite commonly thought to be sufficient by some team members.

3.1.9.4 SO/AC Chairs

There seems to be an extraneous "for the review team" in the third bullet.

3.1.11 Determining Review Team Leadership

The review team MAY decide on the format of leadership before the call for leadership positions is issued but it should be possible to defer that until the leadership candidates are known. Depending on the style, skills and time availability of the candidates, different combinations might be preferable (such as co-chairs vs a chair and vice-chairs).

Once leadership candidates are known, they should be given the opportunity to resolve the leadership configuration amongst themselves prior any vote. For a large team, more than three might be desirable (ATRT2 had a chair and three vice-chairs and it worked out very well). Similarly if there are two or three candidates they should be given the opportunity to decide amongst themselves what leadership format should be recommended to the review team.

3.2.2 Scope

A face-to-face meeting is the preferable venue for finalizing the terms of reference, and it is unlikely that such a meeting can be scheduled to occur within 8 weeks of the inaugural meeting (based on recent experience and 3.8.1).

3.8 Budget Management

The original budget is set by ICANN organization prior to the review team being convened. But it needs to be fully reviewed by the review team leadership once selected including a full briefing of the costs associated with various review team activities. Moreover, if a review team spans fiscal years, the review team leadership should be given an opportunity to provide input into the annual budgets.

It needs to be made clear EXACTLY what staff costs (including travel are borne by the review team budget). This has been a problem in some recent reviews.

3.8.1 Managing Budget Implications of Face-To-Face Meetings

In the last sentence of the 2nd paragraph, it is not clear what the meaning of "final" is.

I note that face-to-face meetings are CRITICAL to successful review team outcomes.

120 days (four months) is a fine guideline, but may not be practical, particularly for a review that is limited to terminate in twelve months. It is particularly onerous for the activities of finalizing reports and reviewing public comments – both of which benefit greatly from being done face-to-face.

3.11 Decision-Making Procedure

Review teams should be given the opportunity to adapt, add or replace decision methodology by unanimous consent (which of course would need to be documented in the Terms of Reference). The RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team did this and it significantly helped the process.

3.13 Modifications to the Scope of Work While the Review is Underway

Having to pass any changes to the scope to the SO/ACs makes no sense. The original scope is established by the review team and agreed to by the Board. It is not clear that the SO/ACs have the knowledge or understanding to pass judgement on the changes. Moreover the time-frame of six weeks or more adds an unreasonable delay to a review process that is time-constrained.

A review team, and particularly the ATRT, must be able to act in response to things it discovers as its processes are being carried out. Certainly this requires the review team to believe that a change is needed, and the Board must approve (and the changes publicized). But it is not clear what is added by going to the SO/ACs and the time-delay is a very serious issue (particularly id some SO/ACs simply do not respond).

4.5 Implementation Shepherd

Shepherd travel should be allowed if deemed important by the ICANN organization.

Alan Greenberg
20 February 201