

Charla Shambley

Subject: FW: Follow up items from GNSO Council Meeting on 24 September

From: Larisa B. Gurnick

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 12:26 PM

To: 'council@gns0.icann.org' <council@gns0.icann.org>

Cc: Jen Wolfe (jwolfe@wolfedomain.com) <jwolfe@wolfedomain.com>

Subject: Follow up items from GNSO Council Meeting on 24 September

Dear members of the GNSO Council,

I understand that there were some questions raised at your meeting on 24 September in connection with the briefing on the GSNO Review, and staff would like to provide additional clarifying information.

Competitive Bidding Process and Selection of Independent Examiner

In connection with the open competitive bidding process used to select the independent examiner, a total of 7 proposals were submitted. All bids were reviewed and evaluated for all data responsive to the RFP, not just the low bid. Price was one of many considerations. 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 the significant outliers. Once all bids were evaluated, Westlake was selected as the most qualified consultant relative to, but not limited to, the following high level selection criteria:

- 1) Understanding of the assignment
- 2) Knowledge and expertise
 - a. Demonstrated experience in conducting broadly similar examinations
 - b. Not-for-profit experience
 - c. Basic knowledge of ICANN
 - d. Geographic and cultural diversity, multilingualism, gender balance
 - e. Suitability of proposed CVs
- 3) Proposed methodology
 - a. Work organization, project management approach, timelines
 - b. Suitability of tools and methods or work
 - c. Clarity of deliverables
- 4) Flexibility, including but not limited to meeting the timeline
- 5) Reference checks
- 6) Financial value
- 7) Conflict of Interest

=> Additional information about the [RFP](#)

=> GNSO Review [FAQs](#)

Staff is available to provide the GNSO Council a more complete overview of how the competitive bidding/RFP process functions, including what information is required to be kept confidential for the benefit of the process' integrity.

Review Methodology

The methodology used for the GNSO Review followed best practices and professional standards for independence, proficiency and due professional care. The current GNSO Review achieved 178 completed 360 Survey responses and 40 one-on-one interviews, compared with an average of 71 survey responses and 60 interviews for prior Organizational Reviews. Information was collected through a variety of means – online 360 Survey with quantitative and qualitative

aspects, one-on-one interviews that resulted in twice as many individuals interviewed as originally planned, extensive desk review of documents and in-person observations during three ICANN meetings. Additionally, Westlake participated in the majority of the 21 GNSO Review Working Party calls and 23 public sessions held at ICANN meetings and considered feedback provided by the GNSO Review Working Party as well as by others through formal public comment process and other feedback means. The Independent Examiner provided their rationale in response to community feedback throughout the process (for example, see [Comparison Chart](#))

=> Detailed information on Review Methodology is included in the [Final Report](#), Section 3 (pages 24-30).

Thank you for your continued interest and support of this important accountability mechanism.

Larisa B. Gurnick
Director, Strategic Initiatives
Mobile: 1 310 383-8995
Skype: larisa.gurnick