Transcription ICANN Dublin
GNSO session Saturday 17 October 2015
GNSO Review Update

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

(Jonathan):   Okay everyone let's come and hear about the GNSO review. All right so we're ready to go with the recording. If I could ask anyone to continue any other conversations outside the room, otherwise join us in the conversation on the GNSO review.

                Okay so here we have the opportunity to have an update from Jennifer Wolfe who has – I'm never quite sure of the title we had for you Jennifer, unless you were there to liaison to the review, or you chaired the…

Jennifer Wolfe: You can pick whatever title you like, it's fine.

(Laughter)

(Jonathan):   Okay, I'm going to hand straight over to Jennifer who is supported by Larisa Gurnick from ICANN staff and we can talk about the work that's going on in the GNSO review. Go ahead Jennifer.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. And if I could go ahead and – great, that first slide is up. So thank you for the opportunity to present today during your working session. Since the last update during the council meeting which was on the 24th of September, there's been a few developments that I'd like to bring to your attention.

On our agenda as you can see on the slide I'd also like to provide an update of our current work plan, our revised schedule, our feasibility assessment and specifically respond to some questions that were raised during the last meeting and in the course of several meetings about the methodology and the scope of the review.

So if you could hold your questions as I go through this until the end that would be very helpful.

So probably most importantly at the OEC meeting that was held on the 28th of September, the committee was briefed by Westlake Governance on their final report and recommendations. I also had the opportunity to provide updates on the work by the GNSO Review Working Party to assess the feasibility of all of the recommendations. And I highlighted the concerns we had regarding recommendation 23.

The OEC readily agreed to extend the timeline that we had so that we would have sufficient time to adequately reach out to the community and prepare our response. So they will not be meeting on this again until after the meeting her in Dublin.

We also had a subsequent very productive session as the GNSO Review Working Party to assess the feasibility assessment of all of the recommendations. And we determined that to efficiently get feedback on all 35 recommendations we actually created our own survey to gather some information and help us organize it a bit more effectively.

As you may recall the GNSO Review began back in July of 2014. So I'd like to give you just a status update of our timeline. Bring up the next slide please.

So as you know the final report was issued by Westlake on the 15th of September. And they presented to the OEC on the 28th of September. Just a few other details on the meeting with the OEC that I thought would be important since there was a lot of concern about Recommendation 23.

The OEC had a long conversation about it to consider the review process, the importance of community engagements and ample timeframe for the feedback loop at this critical juncture. And they're very eager to hear from us; which we were very happy to hear that. They want to give us the additional time that's needed to do our work and to provide a written response on all of the recommendations including Recommendation 23.

So I think when we spoke last there was some urgency of how quickly would the OEC be responding and they've clearly given us additional time.

Could I have the next slide please?

So, you know, we are that Review Working Party and we love surveys. So we decided to create our own. And there were really two reasons for that. We spent probably about 30 minutes getting through one recommendation on our call and we realized we weren't going to be able to get through all 35 in a reasonable timeframe.

So we created a survey that would allow us to essentially accomplish two things. One, help everyone on the working party, you know, frame their own thinking. Go back through all of the recommendations and try to help frame thinking in a couple of ways. One, how easy or difficult would the recommendation be to implement. What would the cost of it be? Is it aligned

with the strategic direction of the GNSO? Does it impact other groups? And is any additional information needed?

So we have – I think we have half – have we had more? Larisa do you know? We had about half of our working priority – maybe we've had some more.

Larisa Gurnick: (Unintelligible).

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, all right. So we've had a good number.

(Jonathan):   Jennifer – sorry, just checking. This is for the GNSO review (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Correct. This is for the GNSO (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan):   This isn't about some survey that you want…

Jennifer Wolfe: It's not. If somebody would like to complete it I would certainly welcome that additional feedback. But we were using this to organize our work so that we could do it a bit more efficiently.

So most of our members have completed it and we'll be meeting on Monday at 7:00 am if anybody would like to join us. We'd love to see you. Breakfast will be provided just in case you need an incentive.

But we'll be going through this and what I think it's going to do is really help us organize our thoughts and our – take these 35 recommendations and be able to bucket them into what do we think should move forward, so that we can provide that to the OEC.

Could I have the next slide please?

So I know there've been a few questions raised about, you know, what was the role of the working party. You know, the methodology. I think last time the questions was, you know, who do I go to if I don't like something that was done. And so we want to make sure we provide answers to all the questions that have been raised.

So just as a brief recap this is actually the first time that's there's ever been a working party aligned with the organization being reviewed. And this is the first time that we used the 360 Assessment. So our role as the working party has been to serve as a liaison between the GNSO, the OEC and the Independent Reviewer.

We provided input on the criteria for the 360 Assessment specifically on how we though questions should be framed. And adding questions and even an additional survey on the PDP when we didn't think it was being adequately covered. We were there to answer questions that the Independent Examiner had from a GNSO insider perspective and our role now is to respond to the recommendations and provide our own recommendation on how we think the OEC should proceed.

Along the way of course we've been very actively involved in outreach. I want to be clear that our role was not to conduct the survey or to tell Westlake what to do or how to do it. I'm going to cover just a little bit more about their methodology to make sure we answer those questions.

Could I have the next slide please?

So I know there were also some questions about how Westlake was selected. We as the Review Working Party – we were not involved in that process. So staff has put this together and if you do have questions Larisa is here and can help answer questions about how Westlake was selected. They

did follow a standard ICANN procurement processes. There were seven proposals submitted and ICANN staff has said they do not just pick the lowest bidder.

But they actually, you know, carefully evaluate all of the criteria in the RFP. Bids received ranged from less than $50,000 to over $1 million, with the lowest and highest representing significant outliers. Westlake's bid pricing was in the median range when adjusting for those outliers.

Next slide please?

So the criteria for the selection of the Independent Examiner, those were all published in the RFP. They're up here on this slide. I'm not going to read through all of this but this was scoped out by the OEC prior to our involvement, and was the scope for the independent review.

Could I have the next slide please?

So onto the methodology question; first of all it's important to recognize that the review is to be conducted by an independent party. So that means inherently it has to be independent of the GNSO, the Board and staff. So we've pulled out the provision of the bylaws that calls for the review to be independent.

And while the interaction with the GNSO Review Working Party proved to be very valuable, as an independent examiner, Westlake must perform or must form its professional opinion independent of, you know, anything that we might have said, the Board or staff. And I think that's where we saw some changes in the final report that maybe we didn't feel like we had a heads up to, but that really is in their purview as the independent reviewer.

So as you might expect, some of the recommendations are very logical. Things that I think most of us would agree make sense and that those should

proceed. Some probably are a bit more contentious and may not be appropriate to proceed. And that's where we'll have the opportunity to make those recommendations to the OEC.

If I could have the next slide please?

So on the scope of work the OEC Chair determines the scope of work and methodology. So when that question was asked of whom do I go to if I'm not happy about this, you can go to the Chair of the OEC. And I know there have been some questions that should have been statistically valid and those are all great questions and ones that certainly should be addressed with the OEC for future reviews, but it was not part of this process.

Can I have the next slide please?

The scope of work also included – oh shoot I just missed – can you go back one slide please.

So I want to make sure – you can see here the first three bullet points, the scope of the work that was included. And again this was set up by the OEC. And then if you can go to that next slide. And yes, that's the fourth bullet point.

So where I think there were some issues on Recommendation 23 came from this fourth bullet point on the scope of the review. And that was that they were to look at the three Board-approved recommendations from the prior review. And so that's where that came from.

Can I have the next slide?

So…

(Jonathan):   Question from a remote participant.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure, go ahead.

(Jonathan):   I think it's – Chuck is that you on the remote? Come in if you'd like to ask a question.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan and thanks Jennifer. I'm curious several extensions of the whole project – I assume results are being processed (unintelligible.) Do we know how much of an increase from the original bid that the copy went up, the cost went up?

Jennifer Wolfe: So I'm going to hand that to Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: About 35% of the original. This is Larisa Gurnick.

Chuck Gomes: Do we have a dollar amount associated with that?

Larisa Gurnick: Chuck as we've indicated before, the information having to do with the details of the contract is something that's not disclosed for contracting purposes. So we've shared sufficient information on all the information that we could as assisted by my legal and procurement colleagues; not to disclose information that contractually we're not able to disclose relative to people that went through the bidding process. But we're not able to quote the specific numbers.

(Jonathan):   Thanks go ahead Jennifer.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, so just to close out and then we can certainly dig more into questions. I just want to review what we have accomplished since we started this process. We've had 21 meetings, 23 public sessions, 178 people completed the survey; which – and there were 40 interviews. And I think what's important to point out is that's really the best results that we've ever had in a review.

In the past we only had an average of 71 surveys, so we've significantly increased that. We had 1300 unique page views to the Wiki. We had about seven Webinars, Vlogs and videos and we received public comments from 12 organizations and three individuals. So we feel very proud of the work that we've done and are prepared to move forward in discerning what we think about the recommendations and making our own set of recommendations to OEC.

If you have not had a chance to look at this, please feel free to give us feedback. Again, we'll be meeting on Monday at 7:00 am. Each of your groups has representatives, but we certainly welcome feedback from everybody on the recommendation so that we can incorporate that into our thinking; and we as the GNSO Review providing our perspective on the recommendations that have been made.

I'm happy to take questions.

(Jonathan):   Go ahead (Ahmed).

(Ahmed):   Thanks and thanks Jennifer and Larisa. I was actually going to ask whether it would be okay to slightly extend the deadline for the survey because I know it was supposed to be midnight tonight I believe, right? Is that possible at all?

Jennifer Wolfe: I'm going to ask (Sharla) sitting over there. If we give more time, is that a problem?

(Sharla):   (Unintelligible).

Jennifer Wolfe: To analyze it.

(Sharla):   (Unintelligible) get it in tomorrow morning.

(Ahmed): Tomorrow morning?

Jennifer Wolfe: Could you do it – yes, I mean what we want is to give them time so they can analyze it so that we come to the meeting with, you know, something crunched out of the responses.

(Ahmed): What would the next action be after you analyzed the comments?

Jennifer Wolfe: Well so then we'll come to our meeting on Monday and we'll be able to know which recommendations was there widespread agreement for, which ones, you know, are going to need more discussions so we can prioritize. So if we have a whole bucket that we can say okay everybody really agrees with this then we don't have to spend a lot of time talking about it. If we – we can then pick the ones that need more time. So it will help us plan our, you know, 90 minute timeframe to be as efficient as possible.

(Ahmed): So I see how delays can be problematic then. Okay if we could extend it until tomorrow morning; try to get it done before then.

Jennifer Wolfe: Even if it doesn't, I mean, I would say (Sharla) is going to have to do her analysis tomorrow. Certainly if you still want to complete it – what I found is it was very helpful to frame my thinking just in the way that we're trying to look at this in terms of, you know, what is the cost, how easy is it? I think those things will help us be able to prioritize the recommendations.

(Ahmed): Sorry (Sharla).

Jennifer Wolfe: No that's okay. You know what; there was one more slide I wanted to make sure we put up too. I'm sorry, just missed that. You can go to the next slide. Yes, just to add this additional information. In case you were curious about how the surveys broke down, this was a 360 Survey if you recall. So it was everyone, it was all around the ICANN community, not just the GNSO.

So you can see here the breakdown from the various groups. Obviously both the interviews and the survey responses were about half from the GNSO, but the other half came from around the community so I thought that would be helpful to know.

Did you have something Larisa, I'm sorry.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa Gurnick. Relative to the question on the survey deadline. What I would propose is that we keep it open, perhaps until end of day tomorrow. We will do our analysis tomorrow morning, but then people that have the opportunity to still complete the surveys; we'll bring that information to the meeting. It may not be fully quantified, but at least there will be an opportunity to do that after the meeting.

So that way everybody has a chance to contribute, if that's all right?

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you and thanks (Sharla). I know it's a lot of work at the last minute, thank you.

Any other comments or questions?

Okay, good.

(Jonathan):   Good. Thank you very much.

END