



Final DRAFT | Survey Questions & Edits

ccNSO Review

Below are the final draft survey questions that have been updated based upon feedback from the RWP. Remaining questions for clarification and discussion on the RWP call are highlighted in yellow.

Overarching Changes

- The survey will automatically redirect ccNSO members and Councillors to the ccNSO member-specific section (Question 5), and all other respondents will automatically be redirected to the Continuing Purpose section (Question 10).
 - This survey will be open to anyone in the ICANN community. The interviews were also open to anyone in the ICANN community. Responses will be analyzed alongside information about respondents' affiliations.
 - Statements beginning with "Some interviewees..." were shortened and turned into questions. Throughout the survey, explanations are posted noting questions that were developed based on comments and observations from interviewees.
 - Five questions were deleted (see p. 6) to shorten and focus the survey.
-

Demographic Information

1. Name: (*Providing your name is optional as the survey is confidential; however, we encourage you to provide your name so that we may ensure we do not receive duplicative answers and so we may follow-up with questions of clarification, as needed*) [Comment box]
2. Gender: [Multiple choice: Male, Female, Other, Prefer Not to Say]
3. Region: [Multiple choice: Africa, Asia Pacific, Europe, Latin America / Caribbean, North America]
4. Role(s): (*Choose all that apply*) [Multiple choice: ccNSO member, ccTLD manager / ccNSO non-member, ccNSO Council, ICANN staff, ASO, GNSO Council, Stakeholder Groups & Constituencies, ALAC and RALOs, GAC, RSSAC, SSAC, ICANN Board member (current or former), Other + Comment box for elaboration on specific roles]

[*Survey structure: ccNSO members and Councillors will be directed to question 5; non-members will be directed to question 13*]

Questions for ccNSO members

5. (*changed*) How long have you been involved in the ccNSO? [Multiple choice: 0-2 years 3-5 years 6-9 years 10+ years]
Old Text: How long have you been a member of the ccNSO? [Comment box]

6. (*changed*) If you are a ccNSO member, why did you join? (*Choose all that apply*)
 [Multiple choice: to learn about the ccNSO/ccTLD management, to learn about ICANN's policies and procedures, opportunity to network/build relationships, opportunity to learn new skills/management approaches for ccTLDs, opportunity to serve in a leadership position (for example, on the ccNSO council, participate in work groups, on the ICANN Board), to be engaged in ccNSO policy development, oversight of IANA functions, Unsure, Other (*Please elaborate*) + Comment box]

Change: Added 2 multiple choice options:

- "To be engaged in ccNSO policy development"
- "Oversight of IANA functions"

7. (*changed*) Do you feel that you have opportunities to actively engage in areas of work that interest you and/or that you think are important? Yes, I have opportunities to engage. No, I do not have opportunities to engage. I would actively engage if I had more opportunities. No, I do not have opportunities to engage. There is nothing I want to actively engage in. Other (*Please elaborate*)
 [Comment box]

Old Text:

- What would enable or enhance your engagement in the ccNSO?
- What would enable more active contributions among ccNSO members?

8. (*changed*) What would make you more likely to volunteer within the ccNSO?
 [Comment box]

Old Text: What might motivate you to volunteer within the ccNSO (for example, working groups/Council roles)?

- a) Are there any barriers to volunteering? If so, please describe.

To discuss: Whether all respondents – not just ccNSO members – should respond to this question, as was suggested in the feedback from RWP.

The following question was developed based upon comments, suggestions, and concerns received by interviewees.

9. (*changed*) To what extent are you satisfied with the organizational culture of the ccNSO (i.e., what we do as a group and how we do it)? [Rating scale: 1-Very dissatisfied, 2-Dissatisfied, 3-Neutral, 4-Satisfied, 5-Very satisfied, No Comment]
- a. If applicable, what ideas do you have to enhance the ccNSO's organizational culture? [Comment box]

Change: Removed an additional comment box (formerly this question had both a part A and B).

To discuss: Our rationale for including this question and its relevance to the scope of the review.

To discuss: Whether all respondents – not just ccNSO members – should respond to this question, as was suggested in the feedback from RWP.

Continuing Purpose

10. Which of the following purposes of the ccNSO are most important from your experience and perspectives? (*Choose all that apply*) [Multiple choice: Policy development, Internationalization of ICANN community, Information sharing/cross-learning, Generating collective security for ccTLDs, Other: (*Please elaborate*) + Comment box]

The following questions were developed based upon comments, suggestions, and concerns received by interviewees.

11. (*changed*) Should the ccNSO's role in facilitating information and knowledge exchange among ccTLD managers be formalized and expanded? [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree]
- a. If you agree, what ideas do you have for formalizing or expanding this role? [Comment box]

Change: Moved question to the Continuing Purpose section; eliminated the Knowledge Exchange/Repository section.

To discuss: Our explanation for the terms “formalized and expanded” and/or alternative wording possibilities?

12. (*changed*) Many interviewees underscored the invaluable role the ccNSO Secretariat has in maintaining institutional knowledge. Are you concerned about this "single point of failure" if the lead of the ccNSO Secretariat staff were to depart the role? [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree]

- a. If you agree, what ideas do you have for addressing this concern?
[Comment box]

Change: Moved question to the Continuing Purpose section; eliminated the Knowledge Exchange/Repository section.

Structure & Operations

The following questions were developed based upon comments, suggestions, and concerns received by interviewees.

13. Are there efficiencies to gain in the structure and operations of the ccNSO Council? [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree]
- a) If you agree, what ideas do you have for enhancing the efficiency of the ccNSO council's structure and operations? [Comment box]
14. *(to discuss)* Would it be beneficial to develop an onboarding process for newer ccNSO members, beyond the orientation they receive as newcomers? [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree + comment box]
- To discuss:* Clarification of the term "newer" – alternative wording possibilities?
To discuss: Our rationale for including this question.
15. Do you think that there are adequate opportunities for newer individuals to take on leadership roles in the ccNSO given their lack of visibility and/or opportunities for visibility? [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree]
- a. If you disagree, what ideas do you have for enhancing visibility of new potential ccNSO leaders? [Comment box]
16. *(changed)* Do you think that the 2004 ccNSO rules, which require 10% or more of the members to call a vote to veto a Council decision within 7 days of publication, is too high a threshold for a group with over 160 current members? [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree]
- a. If you agree, what suggestions do you have for addressing it? [Comment box]
- Old Text:* Some interviewees indicated that the 2004 ccNSO rules, which require 10% or more of the members to veto a Council decision within 7 days of publication, is too high a threshold for a group with over 160 current members. Please indicate your level of agreement with this observation. [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree + comment box]

17. (*changed*) Please provide any additional comments or observations about the ccNSO's structure and operations [Comment box].
Change: Question was moved to the end of the Structure and Operations section.
-

Accountability

The following questions were developed based upon comments, suggestions, and concerns received by interviewees.

18. Are you concerned about the growing overlap between ccTLD and gTLD managers (for example, a single company manages both gTLDs and ccTLDs and participates in both the ccNSO and GNSO)? [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree]
a. If this is a concern for you, what ideas do you have for addressing it? [Comment box]
19. (*to discuss*) Should the ccNSO do more to support transparency around adoption of best practices by ccTLD managers with the aim of enhancing accountability? [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree]
a. If you agree, what ideas do you have to address this? [Comment box]
To discuss: Our rationale for including this question and the relevance of questions about transparency to the scope of the review.
20. (*changed*) What are ways to improve the diversity of participation of the ccNSO Council **and/or** the level of engagement of ccNSO Councillors? [Comment box]
Old Text: Some interviewees expressed concern with the levels of consistency in terms of ccNSO Councilors' engagement. Please indicate your level of agreement with this concern. [Rating scale: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree + comment box]
-

Final Page

21. (*changed*) **Optional:** If you have any additional comments related to the three criteria of the ccNSO review (continuing purpose, structure and operations, and accountability), please share them in the space below. [Comment box]
Old Text: Please provide any additional input related to the three objectives of the ccNSO review: continuing purpose, structure and operations, and accountability [Comment box]
Change: Question was moved to a new page at the end of the survey. It is no longer in the accountability section.

Deleted Questions

- How would you rate your level of engagement in the ccNSO to date?
- In general, how would you rate others' level of engagement in the ccNSO?
- To what extent do you see a continuing purpose for the ccNSO within the ICANN structure?
- Some interviewees noted that some ccNSO committees mandate a certain number of non-member participants, and that as a result, meeting this requirement is becoming more difficult considering the growing number of ccTLDs that are ccNSO members.
- Some interviewees expressed concern regarding the levels of participation in the ccNSO across the regional ccTLD managers.