

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement (CCOICI) Review of Working Group Self- Assessment Requirements

Status of This Document

This is the Recommendations Report of the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement (CCOICI) as a result of its review of the GNSO Working Group Self-Assessment (WGSA) Requirements.

Preamble

The objective of this Recommendations Report is to document the CCOICI's deliberations on its review of the existing GNSO Working Group Self-Assessment as outlined in its [assignment](#). The proposed changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures (GOP) were published for [public comment](#) in conjunction with changes to the GOP that are recommended by the Statement of Interest (SOI) Task Force. Following its [review](#) of the input received, the CCOICI updated this report accordingly and is submitting it to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

Note, this document contains redlines to denote updates that are expected to be made to existing documents.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| A. CCOICI WORKING DOCUMENTS | 3 |
| B. ANNEX 1 – WORKING GROUP GUIDELINES SECTION 7.0: WORKING GROUP SELF-ASSESSMENT | 4 |
| C. GNSO OPERATING PROCEDURES - 6.2 WORKING GROUP CHARTER TEMPLATE | 5 |
| D. WORKING GROUP SELF-ASSESSMENT | 6 |
| E. PROPOSED PERIODIC SURVEY - NEW | 13 |
| F. SURVEY TOOL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS | 18 |

A. CCOICI Working Documents

Based on the CCOICI deliberations to date, which have been documented [here](#) and [here](#) amongst others, proposed updates have been suggested to reflect these deliberations in a number of existing documents, namely:

- [GNSO Operating Procedures, Annex 1 – Working Group Guidelines Section 7.0: Working Group Self-Assessment](#)
- [GNSO Operating Procedures, 6.2 Working Group Charter Template and GNSO Working Group Charter Template](#)
- [Working Group Self Assessment Survey](#)

In addition, the following new document and survey tool requirements have been developed:

- [Periodic Survey](#)
- [Survey tool technical requirements](#)

Proposed changes to existing documents are viewable in redline format.

B. ANNEX 1 – Working Group Guidelines Section 7.0: Working Group Self-Assessment

(See proposed updates to this section in the GNSO Operating Procedures in redline below. Note, any changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures need to be posted for public comment before these would take effect.)

A WG Self-Assessment instrument has been developed as a means for Chartering Organizations to formally request feedback from a WG during its lifecycle as well as part of its closure process. The objective of these assessments is to inform the Chartering Organization of potential issues that might need to be immediately addressed (periodic survey) or that might need to be improved for future efforts (closure survey). WG members are asked a series of questions about relevant WG dimensions and participant experiences. Sample surveys are available here so that WG participants can review, in advance, how they are designed and what specific information will be solicited, but to accommodate specific circumstances, the Chartering Organization may add or remove questions as it sees fit.

Deleted: the team’s inputs, processes (e.g., norms, decision-making, logistics), and outputs as well as other relevant

Deleted: Screenshots of the questionnaire have been assembled into a PDF (see link below)

Deleted: they are

The WG’s charter is expected to indicate if and when a periodic survey and/or closure survey is expected to take place, taking into account the expected complexity and duration of the WG effort. In addition, the Chartering Organization may decide at any point to conduct a self-assessment if it is of the view that this may provide important information that will facilitate the Chartering Organization’s role as manager of the process.

Deleted: G

If a periodic survey and/or closure survey is conducted, coordinating with the Chair, the Staff Support Team will provide a unique link (URL) to the online questionnaire along with open and close dates and any specific instructions. Staff will then perform the following actions:

Deleted: During the WG’s closure process,

- Monitor the online process providing status updates to the WG Chair;
- Provide technical assistance to WG members if requested;
- Notify the Chair when all team members have completed the questionnaire; and, following the close date,
- Summarize the feedback in a written report to the Chartering Organization.

At the earliest opportunity, the Chartering Organization will review the survey results and discuss whether immediate improvements (in the context of a periodic survey) or future improvements need to be considered. In its review of the survey results, the Chartering Organization may consult, as deemed necessary, with others such as the WG leadership, Council liaison to the WG, staff support and/or the Ombudsman.

C. GNSO Operating Procedures - 6.2 Working Group Charter Template

(See proposed updates to this section in the GNSO Operating Procedures as well as the current charter template in redline below. Note, any changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures need to be posted for public comment before these would take effect.)

Introduction: This Section of the Guidelines is organized and structured to be a template containing specific elements that are recommended to be considered by any group intending to produce a specific Working Group Charter document.

(....)

6.2.4.4 Working Group Self-Assessment

This section of the Charter should describe any instructions for WG self-assessment (periodic and/or closure) including any feedback that is requested by the Chartering organization. This section might also indicate if there is any specific format, template, or prescribed manner in which the feedback is to be provided.

Deleted: Closure and

Deleted: final closure

Deleted: and/or self-assessment

Working Group Charter Template (see <https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/gns0-groupname-charter-yyyyymmdd-template.dotx>)

Working Group Self-Assessment & Closure:

Deleted: Closure &

At the latest following the publication of the Initial Report, a periodic self-assessment will be conducted amongst the WG. The results of this self-assessment will be presented to the GNSO Council.

The WG will close upon the delivery of the Final Report, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the GNSO Council. Following the delivery of the Final Report, a closure self-assessment will be conducted.

D. Working Group Self-Assessment

(See proposed updates to the existing Working Group Self-Assessment in redline below.)¹

PAGE 1

Working Group Self-Assessment
Working Group:

Welcome & Introduction

Thank you for accepting the invitation to complete this questionnaire concerning your experiences with the above named Working Group (WG). Your Chartering Organization (CO) and other ICANN stakeholders are keenly interested in learning about the effectiveness of its chartered teams by asking participants for their assessments, perspectives, and insights concerning various aspects of the Working Group's operations, norms, logistics, decision-making, and outputs. The results of your feedback will be used to identify improvement areas in the guidelines, tools, methods, templates, and procedures applicable to Working Groups.

You may remain anonymous when responding to this survey, meaning that you do not need to provide your name. If you choose to provide your name and/or email address, this will only be seen by staff administering this survey. Staff will only use this information to get in touch with you if there are any follow-up questions after the survey has been administered.

After this survey is closed, a report will be produced summarizing the results. The report will include:

- Aggregated responses to all questions in which respondents select from a menu of choices or from a numerical scale.
- Full text of any narrative responses, such as comments or explanations of their numerical scores.

The report will be publicly available:

- It will be sent to Council leadership, the WG leadership team, and the Council liaison to the WG and will be shared with the full Council, upon request.
- It will be sent to the publicly-archived Working Group mailing list and posted on the Working Group's public wiki.

If you have any questions or concerns about this self-assessment instrument, please send an email to: gns0-secs@icann.org and we will try to address them promptly.

This questionnaire is organized into six short sections and should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Some of the questions will ask you for an effectiveness rating (1-7 Scale), after which there will be an opportunity within each major section to add free-form text comments. You are encouraged to provide supplementary explanations or other supporting information that will help the Chartering Organization understand and interpret your input. All of the questions asking for an effectiveness rating are optional. If you do not wish to respond to one of these questions you can leave the slider at a value of zero, corresponding to "No Answer." Survey questions that are mandatory are marked with a red asterisk.

¹ [The version of the self-assessment included below is the most recent version, which has undergone minor editorial updates since the original version.](#)

Deleted: Summary reports will be shared not only with your Working Group, but the larger GNSO stakeholder community. ¶

¶
Confidentiality: Providing We will be asking you for identifying information is optional. to ensure that each response is valid. Your individual responses will not be accessible by anyone other than the ICANN Staff Administrator and they will not be disclosed or published in a way that could be matched to your identity. ¶

PAGE 2

Section 1 - Participant Identification

Before we get started with the first Section, the following questions [allow you to provide identifying information.](#)

1. Name [free text field - optional]
2. Email Address [free text field - optional]
3. Primary Organizational Affiliation_- [dropdown - optional]

- Business Constituency (GNSO)
- Intellectual Property Constituency (GNSO)
- Internet Services Provider Constituency (GNSO)
- Non-Commercial Users Constituency (GNSO)
- Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency (GNSO)
- Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)
- Registry Stakeholder Group (GNSO)
- Registrar Stakeholder Group (GNSO)
- [Nominating Committee appointee \(GNSO\)](#)
- [Nominating Committee appointee \(other\)](#)
- [At-Large Advisory Committee \(ALAC\)](#)
- [At-Large Community](#)
- Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)
- Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
- Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
- Address Supporting Organization (ASO)
- Country Code Supporting Organization (ccNSO)
- Other

4. If you selected "Other" for Primary Organizational Affiliation, please specify: [free text field]

5. Working Group Role* [dropdown]

- Chair or Co-Chair
- Vice Chair
- Work Track Leader
- Member
- Liaison
- Observer
- Advisor/Consultant
- ICANN Org Support
- Other

6. If you selected "Other" for Working Group Role, please specify: [free text field]

In the next three sections, you will be asked to rate the EFFECTIVENESS (Scale 1-7) of several Working Group performance dimensions organized into Inputs, Processes, and Outputs; the scale interpretation will be provided appropriate to each element.

Deleted: It is not required to provide this information. are intended to ensure that (1) each response is being provided by a recognized member of the Working Group and (2) we only receive one submission per individual. Your identity will remain strictly confidential and no attempt will be made to associate individual responses to survey results.

Your Chartering Organization (CO) understands that, when answering survey questions, it may seem challenging to assign a single numerical rating to any team dimension in which a broad spectrum of experiences occurred. You are asked to think about the overall effort and provide the most honest and accurate representation in your best judgment. Learning and process improvement are the goals and there are no right or wrong answers. Recognizing that there may be important dynamics that simply cannot be captured in a single rating, you are encouraged to use the free-form comment box within each major section to provide supplementary explanations that will help the CO understand and interpret your feedback.

PAGE 3

Section 2 – Inputs . . . includes the charter/mission, team members, tools, and resources Thinking about the overall EFFECTIVENESS of the Working Group's Inputs, how would you rate each of the following six elements on a scale where **1=Highly Ineffective** and **7=Highly Effective**:

| Assessment Category | Rating | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| 7. The Charter/Mission of the WG where: 1-Highly Ineffective means confusing, vague, ill-structured, unbounded, unrealistic (e.g., time, constraints), unachievable; and 7-Highly Effective means understandable, clear, well-structured, bounded, realistic (e.g., time, constraints), achievable | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| 8. The Expertise of WG members where: 1-Highly Ineffective means that, collectively, team members did not possess an appropriate level of knowledge/skill to fulfill the mission; and 7-Highly Effective means that team members, collectively, were appropriately knowledgeable and skilled to accomplish the mission | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| 9. The Representativeness of WG members where: 1-Highly Ineffective means narrow, skewed, selective, unbalanced; and 7-Highly Effective means broad, diverse, balanced | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| 10. The external Human Resources (e.g., briefings, experts, consultants) provided to the WG where: 1-Highly Ineffective means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and 7-Highly Effective means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| 11. The Technical Resources (e.g., systems, tools, platforms, templates) provided to and utilized by the WG where: | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |

Deleted: , liaisons

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| <p>1-Highly Ineffective means difficult, challenging, clumsy, awkward, tedious, slow, not helpful/useful; and</p> <p>7-Highly Effective means easy, straightforward, clear, efficient, fast, helpful/useful</p> | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>12. The Staff Support Resources (e.g., meeting support, guidelines, documentation, drafting) provided to and utilized by the WG where:</p> <p>1-Highly Ineffective means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and</p> <p>7-Highly Effective means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>13. Comments about the WG's Inputs:</p> | <p>(Free-form Text Box)</p> | | | | | | | | |

Deleted: Administrative

PAGE 4

Section 3 – Processes . . . includes norms, operations, logistics, and decision-making

Thinking about the overall EFFECTIVENESS of the Working Group's Processes, how would you rate each of the following elements on a scale where **1=Highly Ineffective** and **7=Highly Effective**:

| Assessment Category | Rating | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| <p>14. The WG's Leadership where:</p> <p>1-Highly Ineffective means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and</p> <p>7-Highly Effective means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful.</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>15. The Council Liaison to the WG where:</p> <p>1-Highly Ineffective means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and</p> <p>7-Highly Effective means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful.</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>16. The Participation climate within the WG where:</p> <p>1-Highly Ineffective means inhospitable, unilateral, frustrating, unproductive; and</p> <p>7-Highly Effective means inviting, inclusive, accepting, respectful, productive</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>17. The Behavior norm of WG members where:</p> <p>1-Highly Ineffective means disruptive, argumentative, disrespectful, hostile, domineering; and</p> <p>7-Highly Effective means accommodating, respectful, collaborative, consensus-building</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 5

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| <p>18. The Decision-Making Methodology (e.g., consensus) where: 1-Highly Ineffective means broken, ignored, not observed, disrespected; and 7-Highly Effective means honored, followed, observed, respected</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>19. The Session/Meeting Planning (e.g., agendas) where: 1-Highly Ineffective means disorganized, haphazard, unstructured, untimely notice; and 7-Highly Effective means organized, disciplined, structured, timely notice</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>20. Comments about the WG's Processes:</p> | <p><i>(Free-form Text Box)</i></p> | | | | | | | | |

Deleted: 6

Deleted: 7

Deleted: 18

PAGE 5

Section 4 - Products and Outputs

Thinking about the overall EFFECTIVENESS of the Working Group's Products and Outputs, how would you rate each of the following elements on a scale where **1=Highly Ineffective** and **7=Highly Effective**:

| Assessment Category | Rating | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| <p>21. The Working Group's primary Mission where: 1-Highly Ineffective means not achieved, fulfilled, and/or accomplished per the Charter; and 7-Highly Effective means completely achieved, fulfilled, and/or accomplished as directed</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>22. The Quality of the WG's outputs (a.k.a. deliverables) where: 1-Highly Ineffective means incomplete, inadequate, materially deficient/flawed, unsupported; and 7-Highly Effective means complete, thorough, exhaustive, reasoned, supported</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>23. Comments about the WG's Products and Outputs:</p> | <p><i>(Free-form Text Box)</i></p> | | | | | | | | |

Deleted: 19

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 21

PAGE 6

Section 5 - Personal Dimensions

As a result of having invested significant time and effort volunteering on a Working Group, your Chartering Organization is interested to learn about your own personal Engagement, Fulfillment, and Willingness-to-Serve in the future.

| Assessment Category | Rating |
|---------------------|--------|
|---------------------|--------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| <p>24. My <u>personal Engagement</u> in helping the WG accomplish its mission: 1-Participated Never; and 7-Participated Extensively</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>25. My <u>personal Fulfillment</u> considering the time, energy, and work efforts I contributed to this WG: 1-Highly Unrewarding; and 7-Highly Rewarding</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>26. Assuming all other conditions are suitable (e.g., subject, interest, need, fit, availability), I assess my <u>personal Willingness-to-Serve</u> on a future ICANN Working Group as: 1-Extremely Unreceptive; and 7-Extremely Receptive</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>27. Comments about Personal Dimensions:</p> | <p><i>(Free-form Text Box)</i></p> | | | | | | | | |

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 3

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 5

PAGE 7

Section 6 - Demographics

Your Chartering Organization has a few final questions that will assist in framing your experience with this Working Group.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>28. How did you learn about the WG (Select any/all that apply)?*</p> | <p>Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was informed or invited by my SG/C or ICANN-affiliated organization • I was contacted by an ICANN Staff member • I was contacted by an individual seeking to recruit volunteers for the WG (e.g., GNSO Councilor, interim Chair) • I learned about the WG through one of ICANN's websites (or Wikis) • I learned about the WG from another organization external to ICANN • A professional colleague or associate informed me about the WG • Other |
| <p>29. If you selected "Other" in the question above, please explain:</p> | |
| <p>30. Approximately how long have you been involved with ICANN?*</p> | <p>Drop-down options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 1 year • 1 - 2 years • 2 - 4 years • 4 - 6 years • 6 - 8 years • More than 8 years |

Deleted: 6

Deleted: 7

Deleted: 28

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>31, Considering the most recent twelve months, approximately how many hours per <u>week</u> do you spend on ICANN-related activities on the average?*</p> | <p>Drop-down options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 2 hours • 2 - 5 hours • 6 - 10 hours • 11 - 15 hours • 16 - 20 hours • More than 20 hours |
| <p>Please feel free to provide any additional feedback about your Working Group experience, any improvements that should be considered, this Self-Assessment, or any other matter not covered elsewhere in this questionnaire</p> | <p><i>(Free-form Text Box)</i></p> |

Deleted: 29

Deleted: ↵

E. Proposed Periodic Survey - NEW

Note, the below periodic survey is a proposed template survey. Council leadership, in consultation with the GNSO Council liaison to the WG, may decide to modify the survey to be able to hone in on certain aspects of the WG's functioning should there have been indications that there are potential issues. In addition, the Council and/or Council leadership can follow up with the WG members and/or leadership for any follow up conversations it deems necessary to assess if there are issues that need addressing.

Periodic WG Member Survey - [Working Group Name]

The GNSO Council is seeking your input about the functioning of the [Working Group name]. As the manager of the policy development process and other GNSO projects, the GNSO Council regularly reviews work underway within the GNSO. This includes a regular review of the functioning of WGs, including WG leadership. Please take a moment to reflect on your experience in [Working Group name] and respond to the questions below.

You may remain anonymous when responding to this survey, meaning that you do not need to provide your name. If you choose to provide your name and/or email address, this will only be seen by staff administering this survey. Staff will only use this information to get in touch with you if there are any follow-up questions after the survey has been administered.

After this survey is closed, a report will be produced summarizing the results. The report will include:

- *Aggregated responses to all questions in which respondents select from a menu of choices or from a numerical scale.*
- *Full text of any narrative responses, such as comments or explanations of their numerical scores.*

The report will be publicly available:

- *It will be sent to Council leadership, the WG leadership team, and the Council liaison to the WG and will be shared with the full Council, upon request.*
- *It will be sent to the publicly-archived Working Group mailing list and posted on the Working Group's public wiki.*

Category #1 - Participant Identification

Before we get started with the first Section, the following questions allow you to provide identifying information.

1. Name [free text field - optional]
2. Email Address [free text field - optional]
3. Primary Organizational Affiliation [dropdown - optional]
 - Business Constituency (GNSO)
 - Intellectual Property Constituency (GNSO)
 - Internet Services Provider Constituency (GNSO)
 - Non-Commercial Users Constituency (GNSO)
 - Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency (GNSO)
 - Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)
 - Registry Stakeholder Group (GNSO)

- Registrar Stakeholder Group (GNSO)
- Nominating Committee appointee (GNSO)
- Nominating Committee appointee (other)
- At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
- Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)
- Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
- Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
- Address Supporting Organization (ASO)
- Country Code Supporting Organization (ccNSO)
- Other

4. If you selected "Other" for Primary Organizational Affiliation, please specify: [free text field]

5. Working Group Role* [dropdown]

- Chair or Co-Chair
- Vice Chair
- Work Track Leader
- Member
- Liaison
- Observer
- Advisor/Consultant
- ICANN Org Support
- Other

6. If you selected "Other" for Working Group Role, please specify: [free text field]

Category #2 General Effectiveness

Thinking about the overall EFFECTIVENESS of the Working Group's Inputs, how would you rate each of the following elements on a scale where **1=Highly Ineffective** and **7=Highly Effective**:

| Assessment Category | Rating | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| A) The Charter/Mission of the WG is: 1-Highly Ineffective means confusing, vague, ill-structured, unbounded, unrealistic (e.g., time, constraints), unachievable; and 7-Highly Effective means understandable, clear, well-structured, bounded, realistic (e.g., time, constraints), achievable | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| B) The external Human Resources (e.g., briefings, experts, consultants, liaisons) provided to the WG are: 1-Highly Ineffective means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and 7-Highly Effective means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| <p>C) The Technical Resources (e.g., systems, tools, platforms, templates) provided to and utilized by the WG are: 1-Highly Ineffective means difficult, challenging, clumsy, awkward, tedious, slow, not helpful/useful; and 7-Highly Effective means easy, straightforward, clear, efficient, fast, helpful/useful</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>D) The Staff Support Resources (e.g., meeting support, guidelines, documentation, drafting) provided to and utilized by the WG are: 1-Highly Ineffective means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and 7-Highly Effective means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>Any other issues or concerns that you think the Council should be aware of in its role as the manager of the process as it assesses the functioning and effectiveness of the WG?</p> | <p>(Free-form Text Box)</p> | | | | | | | | |

Thinking about the overall EFFECTIVENESS of the Working Group's Processes, how would you rate each of the following elements on a scale where **1=Highly Ineffective** and **7=Highly Effective**:

| Assessment Category | Rating | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| <p>A) The Participation climate within the WG where: 1-Highly Ineffective means inhospitable, unilateral, frustrating, unproductive; and 7-Highly Effective means inviting, inclusive, accepting, respectful, productive</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>B) The Behavior norm of WG members where: 1-Highly Ineffective means disruptive, argumentative, disrespectful, hostile, domineering; and 7-Highly Effective means accommodating, respectful, collaborative, consensus-building</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>C) The Session/Meeting Planning (e.g., agendas) where: 1-Highly Ineffective means disorganized, haphazard, unstructured, untimely notice; and 7-Highly Effective means organized, disciplined, structured, timely notice</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>No Answer</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | No Answer | | |
| <p>Other comments about the WG's Processes:</p> | <p>(Free-form Text Box)</p> | | | | | | | | |

Category #3 Leadership

The leadership team of [Working Group name] consists of [description of structure - for example two co-chairs, three co-chairs, one chair and two vice-chairs, etc.]. You will be asked to respond to each question as it applies to each member of the leadership team.

For each of the first 7 questions, you will be asked to respond to a statement with one of the following (with scores assigned to each option to facilitate the analysis of the survey results): Strongly Agree (15), Agree (12), Neutral (9), Disagree (6), Strongly Disagree (3), or N/A (0). If this statement is not applicable to you or you do not have an answer, please select N/A. "N/A" responses will be omitted during the calculation of final scores. For each of these questions, you will be able to provide additional details in the comments box to explain your answer. The final question in the survey allows you to share any additional remarks that are not covered in the other survey questions. This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Facilitate Working Group deliberations to align with the scope and expectations of the charter and PDP work plan

1. The Working Group leadership facilitates goal-oriented working group meetings aligned with the requirements of the Working Group's charter and work plan.

[Name 1]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

[Name 2]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

Comments:

2. The Working Group leadership adequately manages disruptive behaviors such as raising irrelevant issues or reopening topics that have already been closed.

[Name 1]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

[Name 2]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

Comments:

Facilitate Working Group meetings, decision making, and delivery of work product to meet the required deadlines of the charter and PDP work plan

3. The Working Group leadership keeps the Working Group on track to meet target deadlines through discussion items or deliverables.

[Name 1]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

[Name 2]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

Comments:

4. The Working Group leadership is responsive and effectively communicates with Working Group members.

[Name 1]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

[Name 2]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

Comments:

Neutrality/Impartiality

5. The Working Group leadership ensures fair, objective treatment of all opinions within the Working Group.

Leader 1: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

Leader 2: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

Comments:

Identify diversity of views within the WG

6. The Working Group leadership is able to seek and identify a diversity of views within the Working Group (Examples to consider when answering this survey question: Did the Working Group leadership assess and encourage representational balance? Identify and address “capture”? Determine when outreach is necessary to bring in additional views? Undertake this outreach when appropriate?)

[Name 1]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

[Name 2]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

Comments:

7. The Working Group leadership works to identify common ground among members as well as areas of divergence, consistent with the Standard Methodology for Making Decisions included in Section 3.6 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines.

[Name 1]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

[Name 2]: () Strongly Agree () Agree () Neutral () Disagree () Strongly Disagree () N/A

Comments:

8. Other: Do you have any additional remarks that you would like to share?

Comments:

Thank you for your input!

F. Survey tool technical requirements

The CCOICI also discussed the expected minimum technical requirements the survey tool would ideally possess. The CCOICI understands that it may not be possible to find a tool that is able to deliver on all these technical requirements in one single tool, but it would like ICANN org to investigate what tools are available that would meet most of these requirements.

- The survey tool should be usable with the top 3-5 browsers on the market (<https://gs.statcounter.com/browser-market-share> [gs.statcounter.com]);
- Links to reference documents are clickable and/or selectable;
- A progress bar, a “page # of #” or a sentence on top of each page to indicate progress and amount of questions / pages remaining;
- Ability to save responses and come back to these at a later stage;
- Ability to generate unique survey links for survey participants to ensure unique responses as well as allowing participants to participate without having to identify/disclose personal details.