
DUBLIN – At-Large Review Working Party
Sunday, October 18, 2015 – 08:00 to 09:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

HOLLY RAICHE: First of all, to everyone who is here on time, fantastic. We will have words with those who aren't ([inaudible] the Chair). I'd like to introduce two of the people who will be talking to you: Larisa, who is, as you can see, the Director of Strategic Initiatives. And everybody knows Xavier anyway. But between them, we're going to be going through the process of the ALAC review. You've heard some of this before, but this is a good roundup where we're up to and what are the next steps. Xavier is going to talk about money. Maybe not. Procurement.

We are hoping that Jen Wolfe, who was essentially the Chair of the review team for the GNSO, will be able to stop by and actually share with us some of the lessons the GNSO has learned from its review. And if we have time, we'll go into the slides that I produced. But first, thank you, Larisa; and over to you.

LARISA GURNICK: Good morning, everybody. Thank you for having us here to talk to you about the At-Large review that will be coming up. Next slide, please.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

For the agenda, we'd like to cover today the review timeline and milestones. Xavier will talk about the procurement process, which is the next important milestone in this activity. We'd also like to talk to you about review scope and various other aspects of the review process that will be incorporated in the RFP, and collect feedback from all of you on those important elements.

If we have time – and I realize this is a very ambitious agenda – we'll also begin some conversations about the self-assessment and formalize some of the ways that you might take a look at the recommendations from the prior review. As Holly suggested, lessons learned. And then just a couple of useful tools to share with you. Next slide. One more.

Since the last time that we spoke in Buenos Aires, there was actually a board action that confirmed a slower review schedule as we had anticipated at the time that we had anticipated at the time we spoke to you. So the review is scheduled to begin in April of 2016. That means that the independent examiner will be secured and in place at that point, and that organization/group of people would be beginning their review.

So in the meantime, we are preparing for the—

HOLLY RAICHE:

Don't listen to this. Sorry, I'm getting rid of the sound.

LARISA GURNICK: We're preparing to kick off the procurement process, which is why Xavier's here to present that information to you. The other important activity during that process will be...

HOLLY RAICHE: This is so bad.

LARISA GURNICK: Do you need a second?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK: The other important activity will be to agree on the scope of work. Next slide, please.

This is a more detailed look at all the activities and milestones that are ahead of us, and I would very much like feedback from this group. Staff would really appreciate feedback as to whether this is a realistic proposal of the timeline for the activities that are to take place.

So, starting with the appointment of the independent examiner, which would take place in March, and as I said, review being

launched in April, we're essentially plotting out a roadmap to conclude with the delivery of the final report somewhere in the February of 2017 timeframe, and the key activities that would take place in between, as you can see, would be interviews and community service, which we'll talk about a little more during the methodology portion.

There's time for the independent examiner to do their analysis and come up with preliminary findings. At each of those milestones that you see — preliminary findings, then the next step would be draft report, publication of draft report for public comment — at each one of those points, there would be opportunities for the independent examiner to interact with this Group, the Review Working Party, to ensure that their understanding is accurate, that their data that they've collected is factual, and to collect any feedback about usefulness and feasibility and accuracy of what they're coming up with.

With that, the final report, after the public comment process and after the analysis of feedback from the community, the independent examiner would produce a final report that would be shared with the Review Working Party first, and give this group the opportunity to review the recommendations, weigh in on the recommendations, and offer any views before the final report would be published, as I said, in February 2017.

Holly, do you want to discuss this at this point?

HOLLY RAICHE: My suggestion is we wait until at least... Unless there are any questions. Are there any questions at this stage? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Forgive me; I was a few minutes late, and maybe you've already covered this. What about the details of the timeline before this?

LARISA GURNICK: Can you go back to the slide just before, please? So this is a high-level timeline, the details leading up to the start of the review, which we showed on the other timeline as April of 2016. The time between now and then is essentially spent on preparing to launch the competitive bidding process, the RFP, and doing the self-assessment, which is evaluating the recommendations from the 2008 review.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I know what the parts of it are. I'm presuming that we will be seeing the solicitation for the reviewer and have a chance to input into it before it's actually sent.

We also had earlier discussed the concept of at least Holly and I or some subset of the group seeing the actual submissions and being able to comment on them prior to the time that the reviewer was actually selected. So I hope there will be involvement at both of those stages.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Alan. A couple of things. The purpose of today's session is to review a lot of the information that you mentioned. So the review criteria for the evaluation of the independent examiner, we've got that information to present to you, and also Xavier's here to walk us through the RFP process and the opportunities to weigh in on the selection criteria and how the whole process works in order to maintain the independent nature of the examiner and the review process. So if you bear with us for just a few minutes, we'll get there. Next slide, please.

I don't think we need to spend a whole lot of time on this slide. I just want to draw your attention to the fact that this would be the proposed charter for the Review Working Party. This has been adapted from the charter that was used for the GNSO Review Working Party.

In the interest of time, what I would propose is that you review these high-level elements, and then there would be a draft document circulated to everybody here in preparation for the

next meeting, at which time you might wish to discuss this charter in more detail and adopt the charter.

But essentially, it outlines the responsibilities of this group as a Review Working Party to serve as a liaison between the community and the independent examiner as well as the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, provide input into the scope of work in all the things that we had already mentioned this morning, and offer objective guidance throughout the review process to ensure that the findings and the recommendations that come out at the end of the report are accurate and useful. Next slide, please.

Breaking down the activities and milestones of the Review Working Party, in the October/November timeframe, it would be adopting the charter, confirming the timeline, the scope of work, the criteria — both the criteria for the review as well as the criteria for selecting the independent examiner, as well as the methodology.

The November through March timeframe would be spent on doing the initial assessment of the 2008 review recommendations. We also refer to it as the self-assessment. But that would be your internal evaluation of the success to which the recommendations had been implemented from the prior

review, as well as considering various lessons learned from that review.

HOLLY RAICHE:

And what I will probably be doing is reminding everyone after this meeting, those who are confirmed as members of the Working Group, that we do have timelines, and probably recirculating these documents so that everybody's had a chance to look at them, not at 8:00 in the morning when you're tired, and we can provide feedback probably by mid-November, and we can start that process.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Holly. In the April/July timeframe, the critical activities would be to provide input into the data collection that the independent examiner would undertake, the surveys, and the interviews. So some of the areas that we had already brought up I think at the last meeting, something for you to think about is the individuals from ALAC and At-Large organization that would be on the list to be interviewed in one-on-one interviews — something for you to start thinking about — as well as another area having to do with methodology that would be to start thinking about is what kind of selection criteria to apply to evaluation of the ALSs, because there are nearly 200 ALSs.

When the independent examiner starts looking at means of assessing how effective those organizations are, it seems that there would be some sampling that would be appropriate, and that would be very useful to get guidance from the Group as to what would be a meaningful approach. I'm not going to cover the other aspects in great detail, because that's really pushing it out into the latter phases of the review process. It may be a little less relevant at this point. Next slide, please.

At this point, I would like to introduce Xavier. Xavier is going to talk to you about the process, the ICANN procurement process, as well as the steps in selecting the independent examiner.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Larisa. Good morning, everyone. I'll do it in English just because it's going to be more convenient for me. Sorry. Next slide, please.

I will provide assortment of information on the procurement process at ICANN, generally speaking, which of course applies also to the specific project of the review for At-Large and the selection of an independent examiner.

Very quick overview. What we are going to conduct a request for proposal, which is an offer to bid on a scope of services. So we're going to say we would like this work to be done, and offer to bid

on that, offer services. It's going to be opened, and qualified vendors will say, "Yes, I want to do this service. This is how I intend to do it, and for how much." There's going to be, of course, a lot more information being provided, but I'm making it very high level at this stage.

ICANN usually conducts an RFP (a request for proposal) for any project where the spend is expected to be \$150,000 or more. There's no magic in that number. It's a practical limit that helps defining the number of RFPs that we will conduct, and it's also a threshold that starts to represent a fairly significant amount of work, and therefore for mainly transparency purposes on how ICANN uses adequately the public funds that we conduct RFPs.

For those of you who may know commercial organizations, this is a very low threshold in commercial organizations. They would conduct RFPs at much high levels than that. We conduct RFPs at a lower level because we wanted to demonstrate and guarantee the adequate usage of funds, and an RFP is a tool to do that, because it provides competitive bidding. So what is the purpose of an RFP?

The purpose of an RFP is to help obtaining the best and most adequate services at the best price. This is one of the objectives. The second objective is to support an independent supplier procurement process, which means that it helps with very

public, defined criteria to obtain bids by vendors who will be evaluated against those criteria and chosen on the basis of having been evaluated as per those criteria, and not on the basis of having been picked because they're the cousin of the cousin of the cousin. That's what independence means at the end of the day.

We conduct also RFPs for projects where the spend is lower than \$150,000 for key strategic projects, for projects that sometimes have a direct impact on the community. It can also be high-risk projects or highly visible projects, or projects that are relative to public interest.

I'll mention just one that I know better because we conducted it for ICANN when we chose to renew our annual independent auditor for the financial statements, which is a requirement. Our financial statements are audited every year, and it's conducted by an annual and independent auditor. When we renewed that auditor, the spend was expected to be less than \$150,000, but it's so important that everyone understands that we choose an independent auditor that we conducted an RFP process to do that. And it also helped us ensuring and being able to demonstrate that we had made a very open RFP asking for a bid from any accounting firm, and we had very clear criteria. We had a very clear evaluation. And at the end of the day, we picked the auditor that actually was meeting best the criteria, who actually

happened to be the most expensive. It's not necessarily to choose the cheapest. It's to choose the most adequate vendor for the services required.

But it was a spend of less than \$150,000. It was approximately \$100,000 that we paid our auditors, but it we felt it was relevant and necessary to do an RFP. Next.

So this is a relatively complicated slide, but the bottom line is the ICANN team here, including legal, including procurement, including the functional team members who are Larisa, and Charla and [Song], is supporting the process of selection of an independent examiner.

There will be, of course, advice and consultation from the advisory groups, the OEC, the Board, and of course yourselves. And the vendors will be responding to the RFP through procurement, and through the evaluation process, using the input from the advisory groups, an independent examiner will be selected.

The procurement team will do a number of things. We do RFPs all the time, so we have a certain amount of templates and documents to create the list of requirements. And of course, this is a functional expertise the procurement team will receive from the functional team members who will themselves receive your input on what do we want to do, how do we want to do it, and

what do we think the vendors need to know or have as an expertise to be able to conduct adequately that review. Yes, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think, Alan, that sort of puts a diagram on your question. The Working Party, which is us, this shows how important it is that all of us, if we've got feedback on the criteria that we think necessary, the timeline that Larisa was talking about was October/November. So that's when we, as a group, have to come up with a set of criteria. Now, that's obviously not going to be all of the procurement criteria, but if it matters — and it does matter — that Xavier's team has criteria for what we want done, then in fact the timeline says you need that kind of feedback, say, November — October/November — in the timeline. Thanks.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Yes. And obviously in the process it is key to very well define the requirements, because this is what the vendors are going to use to determine whether they think they're qualified and to demonstrate in their bid that they are qualified.

So when you create an RFP process, you really need to really pay attention at the upstream part of defining the criteria, because this is driving everything that happens next.

I would like to go to the next slide because it explains a little bit more why there is... Can we go to the next one first? Very important in an RFP.

For both the objectives that we mentioned earlier, remember the objective is obtaining best-suited vendor at the best price and obtaining an independent vendor. Therefore, there are various rules of confidentiality that apply to the group that proceeds with the selection process.

These rules of confidentiality notably that apply to the RFP core team — which is basically the staff of ICANN, between legal and procurement and Larisa and Charla and [Song] that applies to that group — those rules are there to ensure that the people who participate into the request of the bid, into the evaluation of the bid, are independent. We sign — all the staff signs — every year a conflict of interest document that says, “I have no conflict,” or, “I have a conflict with this firm,” for example, because my spouse is maybe on the board of that firm, things like that. Conflict of interest could be something completely legitimate. It’s simply that you have a relationship with the company, for example.

So these rules are very important because throughout the process, you want to maintain from beginning to end the integrity of the selection process to guarantee the independence of the vendor at the end, and more importantly, to be able to

demonstrate to anyone else. And that means for all of you, you will be sensitive to the fact that anyone else outside of At-Large needs to know that the examiner was independent, that it's not a friend of any of yours who's done the review, who is going to be sympathetic to At-Large [inaudible], because it was a friend of a friend of a friend.

So the independence is very important for the ICANN staff, but we're there to help you. For you, the independence should be key. And of course it's key for you because you want an opinion, one, and you want to be able to tell your colleagues in the community that an independent review has been conducted. Therefore, the bids are received by a small team that evaluates those bids.

What this team does is very simple. There are criteria. There are bids. Each of the bids are evaluated against the criteria one by one, with a scoring of you meet the requirements or you don't meet the requirements. Sometimes the scoring can be from 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, for example, because there's ways to meet them halfway or ways to meet them fully or ways to not meet them at all. The scoring is then summarized across all the vendors, and the scoring helps defining which vendor is the best-placed.

I mentioned earlier the RFP that we did for an independent financial auditor. We picked the auditor that has had the largest

scoring, the highest score, as simple as that. And again, I mentioned that that bid was actually the most expensive one, but it was scoring across the board — across all the criteria — highest in the group.

Why is there so much confidentiality requirements to the team that evaluates? It's fairly simple. You want to have a limited number of people having knowledge of all the bids. It's a practical requirement, simply because you don't want that anyone gives by mistake, by error, or by design information about one vendor to another vendor. It's very easy to make a mistake. I'll give you an example.

You may think you have to really want it to pick up your phone and say, "You know what, I'm going to talk to you about the other vendor." This is not how it happens.

But when we have, for example, demos of a service that happens in an RFP process — my team and a few people at ICANN, we've gone through about 20 demos over the past month for an application for a software. When you ask questions to a vendor, you can't mention the names of the other vendors that are in the bid at the same time because they're going to know, "Oh, our competitor is X. I know X, and I know what they do well, and I know what they don't do well, and I'm going to twist a bit my offering to demonstrate how much better I am from that X."

Then you have already a twisted bid, and it's not independent anymore, because the vendor is going to make himself or herself look like he's better than the other one in a fashion that's not independent.

So we need to be very careful in the confidentiality of the information from the time the bids are submitted until after the examiner is selected, because then the other bidders will be told, "You've not been selected," and then everything can be open.

But between those two steps, everything needs to be very confidential so that the independence of the selection process is maintained and the outcome is that an independent vendor has been selected. Any questions on what I just said? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Two questions. You said in the case of the independent auditor, you selected the one with the highest total.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does your process require that?

XAVIER CALVEZ: No. I mentioned there were many criteria, of which cost. Cost was one of the criteria of selection, but there were many other things that were important in the selection of the vendor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't asking about the cost. Are you required to pick the one with the highest total points?

XAVIER CALVEZ: No...

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me be specific.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yeah, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I've participated in many such RFP evaluations. There are times when, for whatever reason, you do not formulate the questions and the criteria sufficiently so that you end up with someone meeting the numbers, but you know they are not the right bidder.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I completely agree. The criteria or importance [inaudible] in defining the work. The rating is never an extremely accurate, absolutely accurate exercise. So to your point, there may be some qualitative elements to the requirements that are very challenging to put a number against. And the scoring is only a tool — thank you for that question, it's helpful to explain the process — the scoring is only a tool to help you sort out and compare in an equivalent fashion the various bids. But there are elements that are a little bit subjective sometimes, and therefore you may end up with having a scoring that's at 4.5 or 1 and at 4 for the other, but there are specific advantages of the one that has four versus the one that has 4.5 that is going to make you say, "I'm going to pick that one, the one that has four." But we know why. We will spell out why it is that one that we picked instead of the highest scoring vendor. It's perfectly fine.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. That's far more enlightened than many organizations is all I'll say. The other question is — and you've talked around it, but I'll be very specific, and I mentioned it in my earlier intervention — I believe it is very important for perhaps a very select part of the organization being reviewed to have an opportunity to see the actual response. Not to participate in the evaluation, but as a first step. I'll use the exact the same words I used when I asked this question the first time.

I have completed many such RFPs. What you say and how someone not directly involved in the detailed process is... Okay, I'll be blunt. Review committees can be manipulated. You can create reviews, you can create proposals, that sound very good, and those who are more familiar with the actual subject matter may recognize they're hollow, whereas someone completely dispassionate and not involved in the process may not quite see that.

Everyone who completes an RFP does their best to make it sound good. So my personal feeling is it is worthwhile letting — in this case I, Holly, Cheryl who has done enumerable numbers of these before also — to have an opportunity to review and submit comments to the review team. Not involved in that process at all. The response I got at that point from the then-chair of the board committee was “sounds completely reasonable.” I'm wondering is it still completely reasonable?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I'm trying to make sure I understand what you think the input is that that review by — and the one you mentioned — is going to address or bring. I'm not clear as to what would not happen if it would not happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not quite comfortable. I don't feel quite comfortable answering this is specific detail. I have been involved in a review of a set of RFPs within ICANN about two years ago. Some of you may know which review I'm talking about. Some of the submissions claimed a level of expertise which we knew to be incorrect because familiarity with the group that was being reviewed, the entity that was being reviewed, and the specific reviewers who were named. That kind of information may not have been fully available to an impassionate RFP review group within ICANN or an unconnected one.

I can be clearer offline. I don't feel comfortable talking about names.

XAVIER CALVEZ: No, no. The bottom line, you just described an RFP process that was not independent, because it was twisted with information that was confidential and should have remained confidential and became public, because you said that the bidders were known. Right? Isn't that what you just said?

ALAN GREENBERG: I said the bidders were known to...

XAVIER CALVEZ: Outside of the evaluation team?

ALAN GREENBERG: But if it had been done purely within ICANN staff, that might not have been known.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Sorry, I thought you said the names of the vendors had been known, right? Outside of the evaluation team.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Let's talk offline, please.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I was just going to say can we stop this conversation? I think you can talk to Xavier offline, but I'd like to continue.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Right, but I need to answer the question, Holly. The process that we are suggesting to guarantee independence does not allow anyone outside of the evaluation team to receive the bids and see them exactly for the reason that I said earlier. We can't guarantee independence of the process if someone else other than review team sees the bids. We can't.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's complete the discussion.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Sounds good. I think we're more or less at the end. I want to make sure I mention all the steps that are important. Let's go back to the process for a second.

This is the step where you and others will provide input on the requirements. This is key, because everything that happens in the selection process is going to depend on that. This is how we are going to evaluate the vendors, so this is key. The process then goes with preparing the document that will be made public to the vendors to say, "This is what we need done; please bid on it." This is the document that will be prepared there.

This document will be published on the website, on our website. If you want to bid, bid. And we're going to receive possibly questions from vendors. And when we receive questions from vendors, we ensure that we give the opportunities to all the vendors to ask questions, and the responses to those questions are provided to all the vendors even if the vendor didn't ask the question. This is to ensure all the vendors have the same information. Because we can't give an information to just one vendor, even if that's the vendor who asked the question, and not give that same information to the other vendors. We need to ensure complete independence of the bids by everyone having

the same information, and therefore equal chances to be able to use that information to provide a bid response.

So we're going to respond to questions. The vendors are going to submit their proposals. This is the respondent [area]. They're going to submit their proposal. These proposals will be evaluated one by one, then compared to each other. That's where the scoring happens. And a selected vendor, a suggested vendor, will come up out of that exercise, and the evaluation will be submitted. The summary evaluation will be submitted to the advisory groups, meaning you, so that you can see this is how the responses came through, this is how they were evaluated, and this is who comes on top. So you will have provided input here and you will see the output here.

But again, to belabor the point that Alan and I were discussing, this part — sorry, this part here needs to be extremely, tightly confidential. This part, there's no problem. This is going to be public. That document is going to be public. You can review it before it's published so that you ensure that all the criteria have been correctly spelled out. You have other things to do. I think that's the main things I wanted to mention. Are there any questions?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Seun, you had a question. And Alan and Eduardo, in that order.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I just want to ask, the advisory group, what are they composed of? Then the other question is at that stage of evaluating proposals, isn't there a way to make... I think it should be easy to make the proposals, those that submitted proposals, to be anonymous, even though the content of what they wrote will be available. I think it should be...

XAVIER CALVEZ: It's very difficult to do that. Very difficult to do that.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Even if you give them different identities and...

XAVIER CALVEZ: We could erase the names. That would be a relatively straightforward exercise, but that doesn't guarantee anonymous content. Alan I'm sure knows that as well. You have logos. When a vendor says, "I'm present in those cities," for example, all over the world, well, that's verifiable. Anyone who wants to figure out... It depends also on how known the vendors are.

When we did the audit, for example, there's nine firms that are global in the world. Our criteria was we want a global firm. There's nine. Everybody knows them. So we can remove the

names, we can try to remove the logos and [some], but anyone with a little bit of knowledge would have known who's who. So it's very difficult. It's more complicated than it sounds.

You had another question, I think? Yeah, the advisory groups. Can we go back to the previous slide? Because we showed that.

This is the advisory groups. You guys here, the board from the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. It's a subset of the board members here who are particularly looking at the review process. Rinalia Abdul Rahim chairs that committee.

HOLLY RAICHE: We know that. That question we've got on our Wiki, the name of our own Working Party, and then the Structural Improvements and who's on that. That information is already known, but we can go over that later.

XAVIER CALVEZ: There was Alan and...?

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, Eduardo, and then Sebastien. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we go back to the original slide we were on? Thank you. The box in the upper left-hand corner, review input requirements. There's an arrow coming into that. I assume that's the standard boilerplate requirements used in the GNSO review and things like that. I presume we're provided with that. We're not just given a blank paper.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Absolutely. Yeah, absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I can't tell what's on the next slide.

XAVIER CALVEZ: We're telling you it's on the next slide.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll revise my crystal ball.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. I have a quick question. If I'm submitting an RFP, and I lose, can I sue ICANN for that saying unfair process? Is that possible?

XAVIER CALVEZ: It's absolutely possible. Anybody can sue anyone for anything. Certainly a vendor who thinks that he or she has been unfairly evaluated or ranked in the process can sue ICANN on the basis of the fact that he or she has lost money as a result of being excluded for an RFP process unfairly. This is another risk that we manage by having a very confidential process and a very straightforward process with clear criteria that are public, because then we can say everyone knew what the process was. We document very strictly the evaluation process. There's nothing that... We try to document every element of the assessment to say why was that criteria ranked this way for that vendor, and when we put a number, then the number is there, but we also add comments as to the whys and [inaudible] that led to the ranking so that that's documented and we can go back to it.

We've never had that problem before except once. We had the problem once, and we didn't have any problem demonstrating that we had an independent process.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm asking this question because if you get sued, does that hold the whole process?

XAVIER CALVEZ: No. If we feel that we have — and I'm maybe speaking a little bit out of turn, so I should check with our legal teams — but my presumed answer is that if we feel that we've adequately proceeded with the vendor selection process and the evaluation process, we probably think that we have the right vendor for our services that we are looking for. So we could proceed.

Now, I guess circumstances could drive that answer to be different, maybe, if it's a very permanent vendor, if there's information that's been alleged of leaking information and so on, maybe we would need to investigate further, if you see what I'm saying, and maybe it would lead to a require to stop the process. I guess it would depend a bit more on the circumstances.

I think Sebastien has a question.

HOLLY RAICHE: We had Sebastien, but it has to be quick because Larisa still has loads of slides to go through. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: One question. Is it an open meeting of the current members of the Working Party?

HOLLY RAICHE: There is an open invitation. It will be circulated later.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am asking now. Is it an open meeting of the Working Party? I am not asking that. I am asking if this meeting here is an open meeting.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, this is an open meeting.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Then please, Holly, when you answer to Seun that he must know everything about this question that we know you know, but as a new ALAC member, he doesn't know or he may not know what you are saying that we know. Then I would like very much that, first of all, we don't talk about this group as a working party because we are not a working party. We are meeting open with people from outside the working party, first.

And second, please be kind with all the people in this room. They don't know. If they ask questions about the process to learn, because we are here for that.

The last point I want to make. I will leave the room because I heard and I learned about this, and I know that I have friends who will answer the bits, and it will be better for me to be outside.

I just want to be sure that we are open arms to new members of ALAC and to any participant to this meeting. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. At the end of this, there's going to be a link that's going to show every single document that Seun wanted. And believe me, this is not the last time we're going to talk about it. Seun, her last slide has got a Wiki that we actually — it's our Wiki, and every single document you asked for is on there. Larisa, go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Holly. Gisella, if you could advance to slide 16, I think it would be useful to take a look at what the standard selection criteria are.

Alan, to your point, these are the standard criteria that have been used in previous reviews, and this would be the a starting place. The opportunity to refine these selection criteria, that's exactly what we want to talk about. So I would invite you to take

a look at these categories of criteria and see if there's anything that you feel is missing from here as well as offer any specific suggestions or ideas for how a particular I would think [category] to knowledge and expertise. If there is some specific evidence of this knowledge and expertise that you would like to include in the selection criteria to ensure that the independent examiner to get selected has the appropriate qualifications to do the job.

I'd also like to add that its committee meeting yesterday, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee discussed placing some limits on independent examiners being able to conduct more than several reviews within a certain given review cycle. So I think we'll hear more about that limitation. And that's really to ensure that there are opportunities for new independent examiners to come in, and fresh points of view and fresh perspectives to be brought to the review process so that it's not the same providers doing all the reviews all the time. So that's one additional element that was discussed just yesterday.

Does anybody have any thoughts or questions on these categories of criteria? These would be the items, as Xavier indicated, that would be embedded in the request for proposal. This would be the information that the independent examiners would have to respond to to demonstrate why they're qualified or how they're qualified and so on.

HOLLY RAICHE: First of all, thank you, Larisa. This slide is particularly important because we are supposed to be coming up with the sort of detail not only against those general criteria, but if we have other categories that we think will assist in the review, will insist on getting the sort of answers that Alan would like to get, which is a really good review, I think we start with slide 16, think about the qualities that we want to review or the skill sets, and probably put [it just] slide 16 details, anything else, is something we really should aim for. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: I notice that we're practically out of time. What I would suggest – and Holly and I discussed this already – that there would be a call scheduled within the next several weeks after everybody has had a chance to relax and catch up after the ICANN meeting, and the agenda for that call could be the specific items that are time-sensitive, which would be the selection criteria, the review methodology, as well as the review criteria. All that information is available in the slide deck.

I'm sorry that we ran out of time and couldn't cover it in detail, but we will make sure that you all have access to this information and any additional notes and links that would be useful, and then we could have a very focused next call to really

discuss these critical elements that we need your input on basically during the month of November leading up to the preparation of the request for proposal, which we intend to post publicly in early January, right after the holidays, in order to keep to our timeline. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Any questions for Larisa before we let her go? She's got a full day ahead, as do we. Her slides, Xavier's slides, will be on our ALAC Review Wiki page, so all of the information that we talked about this morning will be available. There's also a list of members of the Working Party, the people who put their hands up some time ago, to participate.

What I'm going to be asking everybody for is if your name's on the list, and after looking at these slides, thinking about it, you think you don't have time or you've lost interest or whatever, just don't confirm. But we want confirmation from people that you still want to be part of the Working Party, and we would expect in the next couple of weeks to have the first call to ask people to start contributing in the critical ways that Larisa has highlighted in terms of the methodology, in terms of the criteria, because that's our opportunity to [hope we get everybody and] we get it right. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you all very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]