



Review of the ccNSO

Where we are

Jean-Jacques Subrenat

Chair, ccNSO review WG

Marco Lorenzoni

Director, Organizational Review

October 2009

Where we are

TOR
writing

Cons.
selection

Ind.nt
review

WG
work

Impleme-
ntation

Assess.nt
effects

- RfP widely advertised on professional websites worldwide



IMCNZ Institute of Management Consultants New Zealand



Canadian Evaluation Society



October 2009

Where we are

TOR
writing

Cons.
selection

Ind.nt
review

WG
work

Impleme-
ntation

Assess.nt
effects

- RfP widely advertised on professional websites worldwide
- 8 proposals received, from USA, Russia, New Zealand, Senegal, France, South Africa

Request for proposals:		ccNSO external review	
Bidder:		001 - aaa	
Name of proposal evaluator:		Assessor 1	
	Max score	Evaluator's score	Minimum threshold
Understanding of the assignment (total)	25	0	15
- Understanding of the Terms of Reference	15		
- Understanding of ICANN and its mandate	10		
Qualification of bidder (total)	40	0	20
- Previous similar activities conducted for national / local organizations	5		
- Previous similar activities conducted for other international organizations	10		
- Previous similar activities successfully carried out in ICANN	5		
- Geographic and cultural diversity, multilingualism, gender balance	10		
- Suitability of proposed CVs	10		
Proposed methodology and tools (total)	55	0	30
- Suitability of timetable	10		
- Work organization and methodological approach	15		
- Suitability of proposed data gathering tools	15		
- Suitability of proposed data analysis / validation methods	15		
Financial offer (total)	20	0	10
- Max efforts respected or acceptably justified in case of deviations?	10		
- Overall value for money?	10		
OVERALL SCORE	140	0	75
Comments (if any):			

- Selection criteria known in advance by bidders
- Selection panel (4 people)
- Final selection endorsed by Structural Improvements Committee

And the winner is.... Items International (FR)

They scored first under the criteria Qualification of bidder (22/25), Proposed methodology and tools (31/40), and Financial offer (17.5/20). They scored second under the criterion Understanding of the assignment (22/25)

Independent review: milestones

- Mid November: start of review – kick off(s)
- Inception: document analysis, phone interviews, survey
- March 2010, Nairobi – f2f interviews, validation
- Early May 2010 – draft final report
- Second half May 2010 – final report
- June 2010, Brussels – presentation final report
- Public consultation



Thank You

Jean-Jacques Subrenat

Chair, ccNSO review WG

Marco Lorenzoni

Director, Organizational Review

October 2009