

20140507_GNSOWebinar_D877

Haley LaFramboise: Hello. My name is Haley, and I'd like to welcome you to this briefing webinar on the Upcoming Review of Review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization.

Today's session will last for approximately 60 minutes, and we will have several presenters starting Ray Plzak, Chair of the Special Improvement Committee of the Board; Jen Wolfe, GNSO Counselor; and Larisa Gurnick, ICANN staff.

At the end of the presentation there'll be an opportunity for Q&A. If you are on the phone and would like to ask a question, please dial #3 and the operator will add you to the queue. Or you can -- or you can type your questions with the chat part at the bottom of your screen. Should we run out of time, or if you have additional questions after the session, please send them to mattashtiani@icann.org.

This session is being recorded and links to the presentation materials will be posted on the announcements page or ICANN.Org. You'll also find the links and a part titled Notes.

Lastly, I'd like to remind you to remind you to mute your computer and phones, whilst I hand you over to Ray.

Larisa Gurnick: Hello, everyone. This is Larisa Gurnick. Ray, are you on the line with us?

Ray Plzak: Yeah. I was can you hear me now? I was speaking.

Larisa Gurnick: Now we can hear you. Thank you very much, Ray.

Ray Plzak: Okay. I don't know what happened. So, I guess you all missed my brilliant opening remarks, so I have to try it again. This is Ray Plzak, the Chair of the Special Improvements Committee. The topic we are exploring is the GNSO Review, and I'd like to spend a few minutes talking about what it is, and what it is not. And I think I really want to start with what it is not.

This is not an activity to discuss GNSO reform, although in the course of conducting the review there may be things that are drives that could provide input into any type of a GNSO reform discussion that would take place.

I'm sure, as you are all aware, that there many things that are happening today that are going to affect the way the GNSO looks in the future. The most obvious one of course, is the addition of new sort of generic Top Level Domains; the number of associated registries and registrars. In addition, the transition of the oversight with the IANA function could have some impact on the structure of reforming the structure of GNSO. We don't know that yet.

So what are we going to focus on? We are going to focus on organizational effectiveness. The bylaws say that the review, that they are supposed to do, or could one or two things, one is look at

organizational effectiveness, and the other one, is determined by whether or not the organization should, in essence, continue to exist. We are not going to address that latter matter; we are only going to spend time with the organizational effectiveness.

So if we look at what's the purpose. We are going to look at our -- is the organization currently is achieving its purposes? We are looking at the processes, the means by which you go by doing the work, and we are looking at outcomes of these processes. We are not going to spend a lot of time on the policy development process, because the ATRT2 did that, and so instead those recommendations will be incorporated into the criteria to make sure that things are covered.

We are going to look at GNSO working groups, we are going to look at the GNSO council, GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies. And in the course of doing this, obviously, they are likely to be topics coming up that we -- regarding structure. And so, we will take those on, but again, this is not a reform.

One thing that the GNSO could start doing right now, in effect that the strategic plan is about to -- the planning processes have started to kick off, if you look at it from a strategic perspective, what things would have to be done to reform the GNSO? In that case you would have been looking at getting things into the strategic plan which would then go to the operating plan, and then obviously in the budgets and so forth. But again, we are going to look at what is looking at -- what we are looking at with organizational effectiveness.

Later on, you'll hear some -- the aspects of what all of that involves, we are going to manage this in a clear scheduled process, to trying to get it done in an efficient manner, so that we can get the implementation of the changes done as soon as possible.

So, with that, I'll turn you over to Larisa. Thanks.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you, Ray. Appreciate your comments. Hello, everyone. Thank you for joining this briefing. I'm Larisa Gurnick, ICANN Staff responsible for the facilitation of the GNSO Review.

The GNSO Review is an important part of ICANN's commitment to continuous improvement, it is based on ICANN's bylaws requiring that each structure be reviewed on a five-year cycle. The current review process was designed to empower the GNSO to be a part of the solution, and ongoing improvement. The involvement of the GNSO in the broader community is an integral part of this process. The GNSO community will have opportunities to suggest and introduce change to improve its effectiveness. These opportunities will be through self review within the 360 Assessment, as well as direct involvement via the GNSO Review working party, and other interactions, and you'll be hearing more about this shortly.

The review will be performed by an independent examiner selected through a competitive bidding process. It's expected to start on or about the 1st of July. Throughout the review the focus will be on the development of useful recommendations and manageable implementation plans and efforts. The objective of the review is to examine organizational effectiveness in accordance with objectives and quantifiable criteria.

The review will be conducted by an independent examiner selected through a competitive bidding process. An open request for a proposal was issued on the 22nd of April, and we have expressions of interests that have been proposals from 10 parties. Proposals are due on the 13th of May, and the Structural Improvements Committee is expected to confirm the appointment of an independent examiner at their meeting in June in London. The review work will be defined by tightly-scoped contract. Various work methods are expected to be used.

At this point I'm pleased to introduce Jen Wolfe, of the GNSO Council for a brief overview of the 360 Assessment. Jen?

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. Can you hear me?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Great. Well, good morning to everyone. Yes. It's my pleasure to speak with regard to the 360 Assessment. Many of you are likely familiar with the term 360 Assessment, it's used very frequently in many companies and other organizations to allow for all of the parties involved with our work, to provide some feedback. So the intention with the 360 Assessment is to allow Council Members of the various stakeholder groups and members of the community to provide feedback on how the GNSO is performing as a whole, so that we are able to conduct this type of self-review of our organization.

We will have a Working Party Committee which we'll speak about in just a few minutes, from the GNSO, that will help you provide the guidelines and structure and scope of that self-review, and there will certainly be opportunities for the communities to have input what that 360 Assessment will look like. So that is an important part of the work methods to the overall review. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Jen. As Jen said, the 360 Assessment will provide the examiner with data in the early part of the review. Additionally, the examiner will use available documentation, records and reports to assemble and quantify the needed information. And this information will be used as the basis for formulating their findings, and recommendations. The assessments of the recently-concluded second Accountability and Transparency Review Team will also be integrated into the review work. Limited interviews will be conducted as needed in order to fill in the gaps and the information gathering.

The review will be conducted based on objective and quantifiable criteria, these criteria will be refined within the next month, and will serve as the basis for the 360 Assessment as well as other data gathering and assessment phases of the review.

In developing and refining the criteria, the Structural Improvements Committee will leverage previously-developed categories and frameworks. To some of you these may be familiar as macro, micro elements discussed over the course of the past few years. Elements that are applicable to this review will be selected from these categories. We are currently in the proprietary (ph) phase of this review.

The review is expected to start on or about 1st of July, with draft report presented at the end of September. Clarification and response by the GNSO Community will take place in October; public comment period during the month of November and December, with the final report issued in January.

Once the Board of Directors accepts the report, the implementation phase will begin lasting for about one year, depending on the nature of the recommendations. The implemented improvements will be given a chance to become operationalized and practiced during the next two years. The impact of implemented improvements will be tracked and measured throughout the implementation and operation phase.

However, in preparation for the next review cycle, the GNSO will go through a more formal effectiveness self assessment. Here you'll have another view of the entire review process with the three main components being review, reporting and implementation.

Conducting an effective review is an effort that will involve many teams. The Structural Improvements Committee will provide oversight, prepare recommendations for Board action, and approve implementation plans. Staff will be responsible for the RFC, refining the criteria, implementing the 360 Assessment, recommending an independent examiner, monitoring the process to ensure timely and effective progress, and providing support throughout the review.

The independent examiner will conduct the review work, analyze and consider the outcomes of the 360 Assessment and conduct all data gathering and analysis activities. They will integrate ATRT2 recommendations and assessments, prepare report and recommendations and engage with the GNSO community for clarification and response to preliminary and final findings.

The Structural Improvements Committee requested that a review working party be formed to serve as a liaison and to coordinate various activities. Such as, provide input on review criteria on the 360 Assessment, serve as additional conduit for input from and request to the GNSO, its constituency stakeholder groups and the council. Act as a sounding board to be able to offer objective guidance, reactions and comments during the preliminary conclusions and assessments in helping to ensure that the report issued by the independent examiner, accurately reflects the GNSO structure, scope and dynamics. This party will also coordinate with the GNSO community to prepare an implementation plan, and champion implementation of improvement activities.

And now I will turn this over to Jen, once again, for an update on the formation of the working party. Jen?

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Larisa. We have formed a small group from the GNSO Council to start this process and we had our first meeting yesterday. We determine that it would be appropriate to schedule weekly meetings, and to that to the Council in our meeting tomorrow the idea of expanding the scope to the large community so that we would have more members of the community as part of this working party.

Our plan is to have weekly meetings between now and the London to assist in the structure and formation of the 360 Assessment as well as to determine if any sort of additional supplemental self review would be helpful. To the extent we think further assessment may be helpful, we can make recommendations to the GNSO Council at that time in London. So that is our plan as to the working party, and certainly appreciate any feedback from anyone in the community about the scope of who should be involved in that process. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Jen. This concludes our prepared presentation. We would like to thank you again for your participation and open the floor for comments.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi. As a reminder, please remember to press hash-tag 3 in order to get into the queue to ask your questions.

Larisa Gurnick: While we are waiting for questions, I see that in the chat Avri has typed several questions. First off, "Was the terms of reference of the independent examiner examined by the GNSO community?"

In Singapore there were discussions with the GNSO Council about the scope, the proposed scope of the review and Ray Plzak presented information which is quite similar to what we are sharing with you today. So, the GNSO community was aware of the scope and nature of the proposed review.

And then there is a second question. "Under Report, I assume the 'Board Approve' is not a predetermination but rather indicates --" I'm sorry, "--indicates a Board review was possible approval for further consultations?" And that is correct.

Matt, can you please read the next question?

Matt Ashtiani: This is Matt, for the record. We actually have another question from Ivan Libervich (ph). Ivan says, "Ray, you say that this is not about GNSO reform unless it is (inaudible); it is not reasonable that the review, having done its due diligence, or suggest modifications that (inaudible/audio skip) reform? Please elaborate."

- Ray Plzak: I'm sorry. I couldn't -- I couldn't hear the question.
- Matt Ashtiani: Sure. It's not a problem, I can restate it. The question comes from Ivan Libervich, Ivan says, "Ray, you say that this is not about GNSO reform unless it is (inaudible); it is not reasonable that the review, having done its due diligence, or suggest modifications that would be constituted as 'reform.' Please elaborate."
- Ray Plzak: I understand what Ivan is saying, he's saying that the recommendations from the review could construed as being recommendations for a reform, and the answer to that question is, yes. So what I was trying to get to was the fact that there needs to be a larger discussion with regards to GNSO reform and the output from this review would certainly be fed into that reform discussion.
- Larisa Gurnick: There is another question from, Wolfe (ph). "Is this small council group supposed to be the review working party, or are other GNSO members invited?"
- And as Jen indicated, the invitation will be expanded to the entire GNSO community and any member is invited to participate.
- Are there any additional questions? I see Phillip is typing. The question from Phillip, "To what extent is this review of policymaking and not just the GNSO?"
- The second accountability and review transparency, Accountability and Transparency Review Team had conducted, as part of their work, a review of the PDT and that a report and findings and recommendations will be considered as part of this review, but the work will not be duplicated.
- Matt Ashtiani: Hi. This is Matt Ashtiani, for the record. We have a follow-up question for Ray, from Ivan. Ivan notes, "Thanks for the answer, Ray. Are there any plans to formalize the GNSO reform process during the lifecycle of the review?"
- Ray Plzak: Actually, I think that the impetus for GNSO reform should come from within the GNSO. I think that it's up to the GNSO to have a very, very large hand in working towards its own future. I think from a spirit of bottom-up, of community involvement, that there should be a substantial look at that. Now, I can certainly, on my own, give you a number of things that I would see as being positive reforms for the GNSO, but that would be part of a larger process.
- So I'm sure that there are persons in the GNSO that are a part of that reform, and that I know there are some that are actually actively discussing it. And so, I think it's a matter of the GNSO getting organized around the thought and trying to figure out strategically where it is they want to go.
- Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Ray. I think there was a question from Alan, a clarification on something that Jen said, is their review working party membership -- would be open to any GNSO community member; I believe is what Jen meant.
- Matt Ashtiani: Hi. This is Matt Ashtiani, for the record. We have a comment from Jonathan Robinson, for clarification. Jonathan notes, "My understanding is that the Group has proposed to extend the Council Group and be opened to community members in order to form the working party."
- Larisa Gurnick: There is a follow-up question from Alan. "Jonathan or Jen, would one of you like to qualify please?"
- Jennifer Wolfe: Hi. This is Jen. I think this was something that we have slated on the agenda for the GNSO Council Meeting tomorrow, was to clarify that exact point, whether it is the GNSO community, the ICANN community. And Avri had made a point too, one of the discussion points we had, was how do we keep the Group small enough to be manageable while also providing the opportunity for everyone to participate? So, to answer that question, I think that is slated for discussion tomorrow among the Council members to discuss.

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks, Jen.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi. This is Matt Ashtiani, for the record. We've been able to unmute everyone's lines. So if everyone can, please, use the queue if they wish to speak, and an automatic announcement will go out in just a second once the lines are open.

Announcement: Listen-only mode is not off.

Matt Ashtiani: So, if you're muted and you wish to make a comment or ask a question, please press *7.

Larisa Gurnick: There is a question, "Could you describe in more detail --" And the question has scrolled off my screen, sorry about that. "Could you describe in more detail --" I believe it was the 360 Assessment process' "What is it, and how does it work?"

The 360 Assessment process involves several components. It's an opportunity to survey different groups of individuals to collect feedback. In this case the assessment will involve the GNSO community in the form of a self-review, as well as questions will be addressed to the broader ICANN community, the Board, and the Staff. Questions will be developed based on the criteria that will be used for the GNSO Review. There will be a user-friendly online type of tool that will enable a broad participation by people in all these different groups. The information collected through this process will be summarized and will be used as one of the data-gathering inputs by the independent reviewer.

There is a question, "Will the external processes that are underway be taken into consideration?"

I could get a clarification as to what external processes are being referenced here, that would be helpful.

There is a comment from Phillip, "This GNSO Review is the most challenging ever as a function of ICANN's new stakeholders, and a web of relationships between the old users and suppliers and that now exist. A typical user may be simultaneous. A DC (ph) member, and IPC member, a Registry, and have a supplier contractual relationship with the older registries for the backend services. Will 360 Assessment cover this?"

Thank you for that comment, and we will certainly consider the complexities of these relationships as we work through the 360 Assessment approach.

Are there any other questions? Well, thank you very much. It does not seem that there any other questions at this time. Please feel free to contact either Matt Ashtiani or myself, with any further feedback or questions, and we look forward to a productive review. Thank you very much.