
HEIDI ULLRICH: I think that we're all here. We also have Ron, as you will now see – Ron Sherwood. Alan, I think we're ready to start.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have a whole five minutes of introduction as the agenda shows.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It says that on the agenda; that's what you're going to do, Alan. Come on.

[HOLLY RAICHE]: No, no. He's got a clear path.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's not debate the agenda, please.

We're here. This is the first call with the ALT to discuss the upcoming review and what's going to be going on. I'm going to turn it over directly to Ray and/or Larisa to lead us through the functional part of this call.

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Alan. This is Ray. [inaudible] wherever you are, everyone.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time speaking. Larisa's actually going to do the presentation. The only thing I want to call your attention to is when she gets to the slide that talks about roles, I want you to notice

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.

that the participatory role of the SIC – and by that, extension to the Board – is very small and that it's one of oversight and it's one of processing output from the review that's provided from the review process.

What that means is this review is your review. There are some things set up to help keep it objective and independent, but in the end it is your participation and your operation of the work party that's going to help this Review Team succeed.

Having said that, I will now turn it over to Larisa, and she can take it away. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you very much. Hello, everybody. Pleasure to be meeting with you today.

The purpose of this presentation, as Ray suggested, is quite straightforward. We want you to be able to walk away with an understanding of the review process, the timeline that is being proposed for the At-Large review, and the roles and responsibilities. This is in preparation for what would be next steps, which would be a formal kickoff by the Structural Improvements Committee and the official start of the At-Large review.

As far as the objective of the review is concerned, the reason we're having these reviews is to comply with the requirements of a provision that's included in the ICANN bylaws and to examine organizational effectiveness of each structure, At-Large being one of them.

For this particular review, we're in a unique situation in that where the GNSO review, which was the first of this second cycle of organizational reviews, is still underway. We've been working on that review since summer 2014. Have lots of lessons learned, and we'll certainly bring all that intelligence and information into the planning and the conduct of this particular review so that we continuously get better.

The review is conducted by an independent examiner who is selected by a competitive process based on some very specific criteria, such as knowledge and expertise (including specific knowledge of ICANN), qualifications of the team and particularly their ability to function independently and not have conflicts of interest, how they propose to run the methodology to ensure that the objectives of the review are met, obviously ability to deliver high-quality report and useful recommendations and costs. Those are the kinds of things that are considered in the process of reviewing the competitive bids and ultimately selecting the independent examiner, which is confirmed by the Structural Improvements Committee.

We plan to use a tightly-scoped contract so that deliverables and scope are very clear from the get-go.

The working party, which you've probably heard some discussions about, is the term that started being used by the GNSO review working party. We've adopted it and are happy to bring it to this review as well, if that would be alright with you. In substance, it's a group of people that would be designated by the ALAC. The function of this working party is to serve as a liaison between the Structural Improvements

Committee, the ALAC, the At-Large community, and the independent examiner.

In practical terms, that working party is very essential to the conduct of the review in the sense that they get involved in the formulation of questions and 360 assessment to make sure that everything is relevant and clear, that they make recommendations on various other aspects of the review as you'll see when we get into roles and responsibilities. Most importantly, the role of this working party is to ensure that when the independent examiner starts formulating initial findings and recommendations, that those are based on solid facts and accurate information.

As far as work methods, there are several specific ones that are used for the reviews. First, there's the examination of all the documentation of which there's definitely no shortage of around the ICANN community – lots and lots of documents, records, reports. Then, of course, another important element is observation, being able to observe the proceedings of the different organizations also provide some useful information to the independent examiners.

We used the 360 assessment for the first time for the GNSO review. It's an online tool, and it's intended to reach out to a broad audience. As the term 360 implies, it's intended to give opportunity to everybody to offer feedback on how well a particular structure is working – what's working well, what's not working, [inaudible], how improvements could be made. The 360 assessment reaches out, in this case, it would be to the At-Large community as well as other SOs and ACs, the Board, the staff, and anybody at all that is interested in providing a point of view.

Finally, another important component of the work methods is the interviews. We say limited interviews to underscore that perhaps in some of the reviews of the past, there may have been greater reliance on interviews and they may not have been structured in a predictable way. But the way we're hoping to conduct the reviews now is to use the interviews to really fill in the gaps and flesh out ideas and concepts that are not easy to get across in an online kind of a tool.

As far as the review criteria which are used throughout the review, they're based on objective and quantifiable and very specific means and measures that are applied consistently across all the reviews and then, of course, would be tailored as appropriate for this particular review. This is also intended to bring consistency and predictability across all the reviews.

Next, I thought it would be helpful for you to see what the whole organizational review cycle looks like. This is a five-year cycle, which means every five years we go through this process. As I mentioned, starting with the GNSO review was the beginning of the second review cycle.

We start with planning the review. That's the phase that we're in right now. We typically expect that would take 6 months of so. Then we have the actual conduct of the review, and the expectation is that would be 9-12 months, depending on the complexity of the review. At the end of which, there would be a final report, and you'll see the details in a moment. Then from there, we move into planning the implementation of recommendations, actually implementing improvements at the end that process.

Of course, the durations are indicative of a standard but could be changed, depending on the complexity and the breadth of the recommendations and the improvements. At the end of the implantation process, there would be an expectation that the improvements actually become part of the standard operating process.

This entire process is being applied by implementing improvements and standardizing the approach to bring more predictability and consistency to the entire review process.

I wanted to run through the timeline because, in practical terms, I'm sure that's what's really important to all of you as you plan out your work and your resources. The Plan the Review stage, the phase that we're in, we're proposing that gets kicked off now and lasts roughly through June. During this phase, we would develop a plan, ask you to form an At-Large review working party and run the competitive bidding process (the RFP) culminating in the selection of the examiner.

That would lead us to actually begin the Conduct of the Review somewhere around the start of July. For purposes of this timeline, we used nine months, so expecting that process would last nine months and culminate in a report and recommendations.

From there, we would move into the various Implementation phases, which at this point is probably less relevant because it's much farther out. But roughly, we're talking about Plan Implementation April through September 2016 and then beginning the Implementation after that point.

To drill down a little further into the more nearby and imminent parts of the review process, on this slide you can see that the review itself encompasses all the different methods of collecting information by the independent examiner. I'd like to underscore that during this phase in particular, the participation from the review working party as well as engagement and participation from the entire community is very important.

Just using some data points from the GNSO review, the 360 assessment, we were able to accomplish roughly 175 completed responses. We weren't sure what the target was being the first time we had done that, but now we have at least some ideas and benchmarks for what can be accomplished and what kind of effort it takes to ensure that the people in the community are aware and engaged and participating in the review process.

From there, the reporting phase of the review encompasses different steps and opportunities for the review working party as soon as the broader community to provide feedback, corrections, clarifications, and such.

Starting with the working text, which is just that initial draft from the independent examiner that presents their initial findings, observations, and formulations of recommendations as an opportunity for discussion and dialogue with the working party and others to make sure that they get it right. If they don't reflect certain aspects of the way the structure works accurately or if there is a lack of understanding or not the depth of understanding, that certainly would be an opportunity to make necessary corrections.

From that point, it moves into the independent examiners providing a draft report, which is the one that would then get posted for public comment and run through our traditional ICANN formal public comment process, which enables everybody to offer their views and feedback.

Based on that, there would be modifications and additional work that would end up in the final report being issued. At which point, the final report typically goes to the Structural Improvements Committee and they make a recommendation to the Board to, hopefully, accept the report.

Then from there, we move into the implantation phase, which encompasses preparation of the implementation plans and such, which also go to the Board for their approval. That's what kicks off the actual implementation process.

On this slide, you can see the roles and responsibilities. As Ray suggested, the Structural Improvement Committee's role is to provide oversight, accept the reports, and approve the plans. The way that's handled is by preparing recommendations for Board action to do that.

On the staff side, the responsibilities are to prepare the RFP and run the competitive bidding process, facilitate selection of the independent examiner, monitor the process of the review from a project management perspective, support the examination making sure that the independent examiners are connected with the right people – the right subject matter experts – and have all the data and facts that they need to conduct their work.

Staff also manages the report process, ensuring that key items are translated as necessary and posted for public information and then in assisting with preparation of the implementation plan.

Then the role of the independent examiner is actually to do all the work: to review the documents, the records; observe the proceedings; develop and run the 360 assessment; collect the findings and observations; conduct interviews; prepare the report; and, most importantly throughout this whole process, to engage with stakeholders for clarification and correction. It's a very close working relationship between the independent examiner and working party.

Then finally, the review working party, which once again would be formed by the ALAC, would be to assist with outreach and engagement to make sure that everyone in the community is aware of the fact that the review is going on, why it's important, and what their opportunities are to get involved and provide feedback and offer their views.

The review working party also helps coordinate the 360 assessment, making sure that the questions that are asked are relevant, clear, and appropriate for the particular structure. They also help coordinate interviews, and that is making sure that the right people are on the list and that all the people to provide a broad and diverse point of view and people that have specific subject matter expertise in a given area that the independent examiner is looking to delve into are made available and are identified for the independent examiner to interview.

Of course, once the observations and the findings start being formulated, it's providing clarification and corrections. Then once the

review is concluded, it's the preparation of the implementation plan to make sure that at the end of this whole process the recommendations are useful and valuable and helpful.

The next slide, I included some information that I'm not going to get into too much detail other than to say that I've used the GNSO review as an example of the kinds of materials and the kinds of information and communications that have been done for the GNSO review. For the At-Large review, we would do something similar, obviously tailor it based on input from the review working party to make sure that it's applicable.

But you can certainly peruse some of these referenced information items. The GNSO review wiki is a wealth of information about the entirety of the review. We've developed the FAQs, which have proven to be very helpful to continuously inform and update people on what's happening, why it's happening, what does it mean, and various other key communication elements.

Finally, I thought it would be helpful for you to see some of the GNSO review key statistics, which wouldn't be applicable completely, but it would give you a sense of the number of activities, the number of interviews, the number of responses received, and such various other quantifiable measures of how that review is proceeding and progressing. Similar tools would be put in place for the At-Large review.

That really concludes my formal presentation. Thank you so much for your attention. I'm happy to answer questions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Larisa. I'll start off a couple of questions, and we already have several other hands up.

The first one is, when we're talking about the working party side, given that you now have a sample size of one with the GNSO, what kind of size do you think would be optimal?

LARISA GURNICK:

Well, Alan, with the GNSO, they ended up with 20 people on the working party. There have been some people dropping off as is expected and new ones being appointed. In practical terms, as you would probably expect with any sort of a working group, there's a core number of individuals that are more consistently involved and others come and go as time permits.

But the 20 as a whole group, it's a large group and it's rarely all together. We tend to work mostly with about, I'd say, 10-12 people. For the GNSO working party, they chose to have a chair. That's really the only formal leadership structure that they've implemented. That has worked really well.

As a matter of fact, I know that we're going to try and connect in Singapore in person hopefully with Jen Wolfe who is the chair of the GNSO review working party to talk about some really practical experiences from her perspective and some words of wisdom that she might share.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Again, we don't need to go into any detail right now, but certainly Holly could use some advice and thoughts when we start getting closer to the 360 review. In the GNSO, the 360 review was successful in getting people to respond but initially very unsuccessful in getting GNSO people to respond, and specifically GNSO Council people to respond. Again, we don't need to discuss it in detail now, but what we need to do to go forward to make sure we get the people who are very active to actually respond and make sure we're getting their wisdom is something that I think we will need to look at.

One other quick question (or I hope quick): is it possible for a select number of people – and I say at most me, Cheryl, and Holly, but perhaps even less – to participate in the selection of the successful bidder of the reviewer. The reason? I'll be very blunt. I've participated in many bids like this wearing various hats over the years. I also participated in evaluating the bid that we did for a reviewer for the ATRT 2.

What people put in bids often is not quite 100% accurate and often overblown. It may well be useful to have people who are involved in the ALAC look at what they're saying and give some opinion as to whether we should take all of this at face value or not. I would not suggest that we participate into the evaluation, but being able to make comments to the evaluators might be a useful process. I don't know if that violates any cardinal rule or not though.

RAY PLZAK:

I would think what you're proposing is a good idea. We need to look at how we could do that. Certainly, the point of view that you would bring

in would be great. As you point out, you wouldn't be involved in the actual selection; you would be involved in making sure that the right information is there. Also, we have to make sure that we're not doing something that would go contrary to the contract process. Let us take that and work on getting you an answer, okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. One of my real worries is people sometimes say they don't have conflicts when, when you actually know some of the people, you realize there are conflicts there.

RAY PLZAK: That's what I'm thinking about. Those kinds of things are most useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier, you're next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I have a question of, I guess, semantics with regards to the use of 360 review in this context. I was under the impression that 360 reviews were only to do with people, personnel, and it wasn't a performance assessment but more of an assessment of skills and of the way that someone conducted themselves rather than something that runs on an organization. What would a 360 review entail when applied to an organization and not a person?

RAY PLZAK: Olivier, we settled on the term “360” after a long deliberation of trying to find a term that could be used that didn’t take a whole sentence or paragraph to explain, and so that’s why we settled on 360.

Granted, this doesn’t do what a 360 would do in the personnel management system where you would be lateral up and down. It does afford the concept that we’re going beyond just the ALAC. We are looking side-to-side, so we are doing something that the previous reviews didn’t do, which is look at the context of the entire organization’s view of the structure. At the same time, we are putting people into the process that wouldn’t have been contacted before.

It’s a term we settled on that is not completely, 100% descriptive, and like a lot of things in the English language, it’s as close as we can get.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Ray. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, a few things. First of all, thank you, Larisa. May I please put my hand up for that meeting that you’re going to have with the GNSO if that’s suitable? I would love to hear their wrap-up of what has happened and what they think and just have an opportunity to at least listen if that’s okay.

Second question: we are finalizing – and I haven’t even cleared this with Alan – it’s just a thought, but it would be useful even at an early stage in the Singapore meeting if we could talk to the ALAC as a whole and even use these slides to say, “This is what’s going to happen, and these are the timelines” as a way of actually having people start thinking about membership with the committee, whether it’s the favored 10 or the 20 or whatever. That would be really useful.

In terms of documentation, Heidi, thank you for the link, but it only goes to – and the stuff I can get out of it – is the ALAC At-Large improvements implementation project. I don’t see Westlake report that was the outcome of the ALAC review before, and I’d love to see that if I could. I’d also like to see any outcomes from the Westlake report on the GNSO as well if that’s available because I think those are really going to be very useful documents in thinking through what we want this time in terms of our review.

So, I suppose, three questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Holly. By the way, you were fading badly at the end.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, sorry. It’s 7:00 and it’s my soft voice. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, do you want to address anything? I think I have some comments on what Holly said, but why don’t you go first.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you, Alan. I have two quick responses to Holly's and I have a question of my own. Right now the tentative time of the meeting with Ray and Larisa to the full ALAC and the regional officers is Sunday the 8th, but again that's tentative and invitations have not yet gone out. So that may need to...

HOLLY RAICHE: Could I go?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, may I be put on that list maybe?

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, you're on the ALAC; you have to be there.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, thank you. I'll be there.

RAY PLZAK: Heidi, have you coordinated my schedule with Megan?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, not yet, Ray. The fact is that we have not invited any of your people to that Sunday session, so as invitations go out things normally shift quite a bit. But you're scheduled definitely for the Sunday, but I'll work with Megan to get the time.

RAY PLZAK: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Then the question about the Westlake report: Holly, we definitely have the At-Large one, and I'm not sure why it wasn't on the first review page. I'll look into that and send that to you.

Then my question is: Larisa, on the slides with the four columns – I think there were four columns – with the roles, for staff the last item was Implementation Plan. Can you explain a little bit about that? Is it the SI staff, or is it the At-Large staff on that?

LARISA GURNICK: That's a really good question. It would be At-Large staff. SI (Strategic Initiatives team), which is the team that I represent, are responsible for facilitating and project managing the review. Within our staff, we generally have a passing of the baton at the end of the review implementation moves to the support staff. Then we take more of an oversight role in a sense just to make sure that things happen in a timely basis, updates are provided to the Structural Improvements Committee, and such.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you. I do now see that the review working party, which is the At-Large group, they also have the joint responsibility of that. That is as it was last time. Okay.

LARISA GURNICK: Yes, and just to share further, not to harp on the GNSO review, but we use it just as a reference point because it's happening as we speak. I know that certainly there's an interest on the part of several of the GNSO review working party members to see it all the way through. They're eager to continue their work and their efforts into the implementation phase and really find that will be very good in terms of not just making sure that the review is conducted but that it's conducted in a useful manner and that the improvements that come out of it are actually useful and productive and helpful to the structure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Larisa. Larisa, Holly made reference to the Westlake GNSO report. What is the status of that right now? The timing?

LARISA GURNICK: Well, actually the Westlake team just delivered or is about to deliver the working text. We're getting ready to receive that, and we expect to

share the working text with the GNSO review working party within the next several weeks. Then they will have a series of engagements and interactions with the Westlake team to make sure everything is accurate and correct and provide any clarifications or corrections as necessary. Then the draft report will be posted for public comment. My apologies, I don't have the date in front of me. But it will be within the next several months that it will be posted for public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Presumably after revision if necessary based on the working party comments.

LARISA GURNICK: Absolutely. That's exactly how it's designed is that the working party have ample opportunities to really understand the basis for the findings. Not necessarily be happy with the findings, I suppose, but they key is to understand where the findings came from, that they're based on accurate, factual information and broad and diverse points of view and so on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I presume in our case, should the working party choose to show that initial draft – share it with the ALAC for ALAC comments – there would be no restriction on doing that if we chose to?

LARISA GURNICK: No. I think it's just a scheduling and a timing issue. If there is one thing I learned through the process so far is things always take considerably longer than any of us anticipate. I stand here humbled and prepared to be reasonable but still deliver within some sort of a meaningful timeframe.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

RAY PLZAK: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Ray.

RAY PLZAK: Back to the point of the draft working reports or the draft paper. One of the big problems with the last review was that you had a reviewer that created a report. Then the first thing you had happens was that the Board found a working group to write a report on the report. The organization under review never got to say anything about it.

What we decided was the best thing to do was get rid of the report on the report. We've done that. The second thing is that any time somebody looks at you or you look at your kids or whatever it is, you may not always get it right. You may not always understand quite what you're seeing.

That's why we want to have a very strong participation by the working party in the clarification – and we use the word correction – because there are many times when the independent examiner may have got something wrong or didn't quite understand what was happening.

Clarifications are also good because they will help to formulate a stronger recommendation. In the end, because of this clarification and correction process, we will get back to what Larisa has been referring to: useful recommendations that can be implemented instead of what we've seen in some cases in the past.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Ray. I will point out the intent going into the last review was not to have a Board subcommittee write a review of the review, but that is the way it turned out. But I take it to heart that you do not intend to repeat that. Thank you. I appreciate that.

RAY PLZAK:

No, it will not happen.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Holly, your first question said: when there is a meeting with the GNSO, can you be part of it? Can you elaborate what meeting with the GNSO you were talking about? The only one I heard discussed was one with Jen Wolfe and maybe with the entire working party, and since you're leading our effort you would certainly be part of that. Did I miss some reference to another meeting?

HOLLY RAICHE: No. That's absolutely what I was referring to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, you're not allowed to not be there.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's what we pay you the big bucks for.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there anyone else who has any comments or questions for our guests today?

[HOLLY RAICHE]: Just a comment. Larisa, given that there will be discussion amongst the At-Large group, can we actually borrow these slides as well or have access to the slides that have been developed?

LARISA GURNICK: Absolutely. Heidi and staff already have these slides.

[HOLLY RAICHE]: Oh, good.

LARISA GURNICK: Certainly, I'm happy to do this presentation for a broader group. I know Ray's schedule is very challenging, and I'm sure he'll do his best to attend as well. But we're happy and fully prepared to do this for a broader audience.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's very generous of you to let her steal your thunder.

[HOLLY RAICHE]: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope we set the tone here that we're a rather irreverent group.

LARISA GURNICK: So I hear.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We're fun, now. We are fun.

ALAN GREENBERG: We consider this important, but we still consider it important to make an occasional joke. Is there anything else that anyone wants to add before we adjourn? Before I have something to add? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I'd like to thank Larisa and particularly Ray for taking the time to be here today. I know this is not always easy to fit into our meeting schedules and agendas, but I do appreciate both of you being here and I look forward to going ahead with this.

RAY PLZAK: Alan, I want to thank you for inviting us to be here. I know that by working together, we're going to make this thing very successful. Thank you, guys, and look forward to seeing you in Singapore.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Ray.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, all. Thank you for your time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, all, for attending.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, Larisa.

ALAN GREENBERG: Most of this group will be back in, what? Another half hour or so for another meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Something like that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: 45 minutes, mate.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Time for a coffee, and we'll be back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks to all. Bye.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, all, very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please, remember to disconnect all remaining lines.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]