

Questionnaire for Individual Respondents

- Which SO or AC are you a member of?

1. **Board Related Questions** - Item 1 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing and improving Board governance which shall include an ongoing evaluation of Board performance, the Board selection process, the extent to which the Board's composition and allocation structure meets ICANN's present and future needs, and the appeal mechanisms for Board decisions contained in these Bylaws.
 - 1.1. Please indicate your satisfaction with the Board's performance overall for the last two years (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 1.2. Please rate the effectiveness of the Accountability Indicators as they relate to Board performance as found in <https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators> 3.3 (Ineffective, Somewhat Ineffective, No Opinion, Effective, Very Effective)
 - 1.3. Do you consider the diversity amongst Board members satisfactory? (Y/N)
 - 1.3.1. If NO - Which areas of diversity do you feel need improvement? (select all diversity factors you think apply)
 - 1.3.1.1. Geographical/regional representation
 - 1.3.1.2. Language
 - 1.3.1.3. Gender
 - 1.3.1.4. Age
 - 1.3.1.5. Physical disability
 - 1.3.1.6. Diverse skills
 - 1.3.1.7. Stakeholder group or constituency
 - 1.4. How satisfied are you with the Nominating Committee's selection of Directors for the ICANN Board over the past 2 years (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 1.5. Please indicate your satisfaction with the accountability of the Board under the new accountability mechanisms such as the Empowered Community (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied).
 - 1.6. Rate the mechanisms ensuring the Board's Transparency (Ineffective, Somewhat Ineffective, No Opinion, Effective, Very Effective)?
 - 1.7. Do you think they need to be improved (Y/N)?
 - 1.8. How would you rate the importance of the Board implementing the Transparency Recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability WS2 which would affect it. (Very Important, Somewhat Important, No Opinion, somewhat not Important, Not Important)
 - 1.9. Are you satisfied with the Board's decision-taking process over the past two years?(Y/N)
 - 1.10. Are you aware of the training program for the Board members? (Y/N)

- 1.11. Are you satisfied with the financial information that is provided to the public by ICANN? (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 1.12. How would you rate the usability of the financial information overall (1 to 5, Not Useful, Somewhat Not Useful, No Opinion, Somewhat Useful, Very Useful).
 - 1.13. Have you ever filed a Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) request with ICANN? (Y/N)
 - 1.13.1. If so, what information were you seeking? (text box)
 - 1.13.2. Did you receive the information you requested in full? (Y/N)
 - 1.13.3. Did the material you received answer the question that you had? (Y/N)
 - 1.13.4. Please feel free to add any other thoughts you have about the DIDP process.(text box)
2. **GAC Related Questions** - Item 2 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC's interaction with the Board and with the broader ICANN community, and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS;
- 2.1. Should GAC accountability be improved? (Significant Improvements needed, Some Improvements needed, Minor Improvements needed, No Opinion, No Improvements needed)
 - 2.2. Should GAC transparency be improved? (Significant Improvements needed, Some Improvements needed, Minor Improvements needed, No Opinion, No Improvements needed)
 - 2.3. In your view are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the Board? (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 2.4. In your view are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the SO/ACs? (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
3. **Public Comments** - Item 3 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input (including adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof);
- 3.1. Please rate how effective the current system of public consultations is for gathering community input (Very Effective, Somewhat Effective, No Opinion, Somewhat Ineffective, Ineffective).
 - 3.2. Do you believe the concept of Public Comment, as currently implemented, should be re-examined? (Y/N)
 - 3.3. Have you (or a group you directly contributed to) responded to a public consultation in the last year? (Y/N)
 - 3.3.1. If YES

- 3.3.1.1. How many responses have you (or a group you directly contributed to) submitted to public comments in the last year (none, 1, 2 more than 5, more than 10).
- 3.3.1.2. Would you (or a group you directly contribute to) respond more often to public comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a Survey Monkey or similar format (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).
- 3.3.2. If NO
 - 3.3.2.1. What prevented you from responding? (select all that apply)
 - 3.3.2.1.1. Do not have the time to produce a detailed response
 - 3.3.2.1.2. Subject was too complex
 - 3.3.2.1.3. Consultation document was too long
 - 3.3.2.1.4. Language issues
 - 3.3.2.1.5. Time to respond was too short
 - 3.3.2.1.6. Other
 - 3.3.2.2. Would you (or a group you directly contribute to) respond to public comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a Survey Monkey or similar format? (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).
- 3.4. Should the responses made to public comments by individuals and external organizations/groups be considered equally ((Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)
- 3.5. Should the responses made to public comments by SO/AC's and the Board have more weight than other comments? (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)
- 3.6. How useful are staff reports on public consultations (Very Useful, Useful, No Opinion, Not veryUseful, Not Useful at all)
- 3.7. Should Staff Reports on ICANN Public Consultations clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were accepted and how? (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).
- 3.8. Should Staff Reports on ICANN Public Consultations clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were rejected and if so why? (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)
- 4. **Support for ICANN decisions** - Item 4 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community;
 - 4.1. Do you believe the Internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board over the past 2 years? (Y/N)

- 4.2. Do you generally support the decisions made by the Board over the past 2 years? (Strong Support, Support, No Opinion, Do not Support, Strongly Do not Support).
5. **PDPs** - Item 5 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations, and effective and timely policy development; and
- 5.1. Have you participated in or contributed to any Policy Development Process in the last five years? (Y/N)
- 5.1.1. If YES
- 5.1.1.1. Did you have difficulty with any of the following? (select all that apply)
- 5.1.1.1.1. Scope too large or unclear
- 5.1.1.1.2. Time required
- 5.1.1.1.3. Level of knowledge required to effectively participate
- 5.1.1.1.4. Calls are at an unworkable time
- 5.1.1.1.5. Language issues
- 5.1.1.1.6. Other
- 5.1.1.2. Please rate your satisfaction with the transparency of the process (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
- 5.1.1.3. Please rate how accountable the process was to the community (Accountable, Somewhat Accountable, No Opinion, Somewhat Not Accountable, Not Accountable)
- 5.1.2. If No, why? (select all that apply)
- 5.1.2.1. Scope is too large
- 5.1.2.2. Cannot commit the time required
- 5.1.2.3. Do not feel qualified
- 5.1.2.4. Calls are at an unworkable time
- 5.1.2.5. Language issues
- 5.1.2.6. Other
6. **IRP** - Item 6 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing and improving the Independent Review Process. This is not being considered by ATRT3 given the ongoing work of the IRP-IOT.
7. **ATRT2** - Item 7 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing the extent to which prior Accountability and Transparency Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect. The implementation and effectiveness of the recommendations made by ATRT2 are being evaluated by ATRT3.

8. **Periodic Reviews** - Item 8 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - The Accountability and Transparency Review Team may recommend to the Board the termination or amendment of other periodic reviews required by this Section 4.6, and may recommend to the Board the creation of additional periodic reviews.
 - 8.1. How would you rate the effectiveness of the periodic reviews (ATRT, SSR, WHOIS, etc.) as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws (Very Effective, Somewhat Effective, No Opinion, Somewhat Ineffective, Ineffective).
 - 8.2. Should Periodic Reviews (ATRT, SSR, WHOIS, etc.) be reconsidered or amended? (Y/N)
 - 8.3. Should Organizational Reviews, those reviewing SO/AC's, also be reconsidered or amended? (Y/N))

9. **Accountability Indicators** - This was added as a topic for ATRT3 by the plenary
 - 9.1. Have you looked at the ICANN Accountability Indicators which can be found at <https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators> (Y/N)).
 - 9.1.1. If YES
 - 9.1.1.1. how would you rate their usefulness overall (Very Useful, Useful, No Opinion, Not veryUseful, Not Useful at all)
 - 9.1.1.2. How would you rate these for effectiveness in measuring accountability for ICANN (Very Effective, Somewhat Effective, No Opinion, Somewhat Ineffective, Ineffective)

10. **Other questions submitted**
 - 10.1. Do you believe the information ICANN makes available should be better organized to facilitate searching for specific topics? (Y/N)
 - 10.2. Are you aware of ICANN's open data mechanisms, including the Information Transparency Initiative or the Open Data Initiative, or about ICANN's transparency policies more generally? (Y/N)
 - 10.3. Are ICANN's mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global internet community?(Y/N)
 - 10.3.1. If NO, in your opinion what level of improvements would be required to correct this? (1 to 5, 1 = Minor and 5 = Significant)
 - 10.4. Do you feel that the NomCom, as currently constituted, is a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy in?(Y/N)
 - 10.4.1. If NO, in your opinion what level of improvements would be required to correct this? (1 to 5, 1 = Minor and 5 = Significant)

Note - auto email = thank you and here is your link to conitnue

Questionnaire for SO/ACs

- Which SO or AC is responding?

1. Board Related Questions - Item 1 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing and improving Board governance which shall include an ongoing evaluation of Board performance, the Board selection process, the extent to which the Board's composition and allocation structure meets ICANN's present and future needs, and the appeal mechanisms for Board decisions contained in these Bylaws.

- 1.1. Please indicate your SO or AC's satisfaction with the Board's performance overall for the last two years (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 1.1.1. If Very dissatisfied or Somewhat Dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)
- 1.2. How does your SO or AC feel regarding the Board's interaction with your SO/AC? (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 1.2.1. If Very dissatisfied or Somewhat Dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)
- 1.3. Please rate the effectiveness of the Accountability Indicators as they relate to Board performance as found in <https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators> 3.3 (Ineffective, Somewhat Ineffective, Unaware of these, Effective, Very Effective)
- 1.4. Does your SO or AC consider the diversity amongst Board members satisfactory? (Y/N)
 - 1.4.1. If NO - Do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)
- 1.5. How satisfied is your SO or AC with the Nominating Committee's selection of Directors for the ICANN Board over the past 2 years (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 1.5.1. If Very dissatisfied or Somewhat Dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)
- 1.6. Please indicate your SO or AC's satisfaction with the accountability of the Board under the new accountability mechanisms such as the Empowered Community (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied).
 - 1.6.1. If Very dissatisfied or Somewhat Dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)
- 1.7. Rate the mechanisms ensuring the Board's Transparency (Ineffective, Somewhat Ineffective, No Opinion, Effective, Very Effective)?
 - 1.7.1. If Ineffective or Somewhat Ineffective do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)

- 1.8. How would your SO or AC rate the importance of the Board implementing the Transparency Recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability WS2 which would affect it. (Very Important, Somewhat Important, No Opinion, somewhat not Important, Not Important)
- 1.9. Is your SO or AC satisfied with the Board's decision-taking process over the past two years?(Y/N)
 - 1.9.1. If No, Do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)
- 1.10. Are you aware of the training program for the Board members? (Y/N)
- 1.11. Is your SO or AC satisfied with the financial information that is provided to the public by ICANN? (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 1.11.1. If Very dissatisfied or Somewhat Dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)
- 1.12. How would your SO or AC rate the usability of the financial information overall (1 to 5, Not Useful, Somewhat Not Useful, No Opinion, Somewhat Useful, Very Useful).
- 1.13. Has your SO or AC ever filed a Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) request with ICANN? (Y/N)
 - 1.13.1. If so, what information were you seeking? (text box)
 - 1.13.2. Did you receive the information you requested in full? (Y/N)
 - 1.13.3. Did the material you received answer the question that you had? (Y/N)
 - 1.13.4. Please feel free to add any other thoughts you have about the DIDP process.(text box)

2. **GAC Related Questions** - Item 2 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC's interaction with the Board and with the broader ICANN community, and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS;

- 2.1. Should GAC accountability be improved? (Y/N)
 - 2.1.1. If YES, What would you suggest? (Text response)
- 2.2. Should GAC transparency be improved? (Y/N)
 - 2.2.1. If YES, What would you suggest? (Text response)
- 2.3. Is your SO or AC satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the Board? (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 2.3.1. If Very dissatisfied or Somewhat Dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)
- 2.4. Is your SO or AC satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the SO/ACs? (Very dissatisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, No Opinion, Satisfied, Very Satisfied)
 - 2.4.1. If Very dissatisfied or Somewhat Dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)

3. **Public Comments** - Item 3 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input (including adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof);
 - 3.1. Please rate how effective the current system of public consultations is for gathering community input (Very Effective, Somewhat Effective, No Opinion, Somewhat Ineffective, Ineffective).
 - 3.2. Does your SO or AC believe the concept of Public Comment, as currently implemented, should be re-examined? (Y/N)
 - 3.3. Has your SO or AC responded to a public consultation in the last year? (Y/N)
 - 3.3.1. If YES
 - 3.3.1.1. How many responses has your SO or AC submitted to public comments in the last year (none, 1, 2 more than 5, more than 10).
 - 3.3.1.2. Would your SO or AC respond more often to public comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a Survey Monkey or similar format (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).
 - 3.3.2. If NO
 - 3.3.2.1. What prevented you from responding? (select all that apply)
 - 3.3.2.1.1. Do not have the time to produce a detailed response
 - 3.3.2.1.2. Subject was too complex
 - 3.3.2.1.3. Consultation document was too long
 - 3.3.2.1.4. Language issues
 - 3.3.2.1.5. Time to respond was too short
 - 3.3.2.1.6. Other
 - 3.3.2.2. Would your SO or AC respond to public comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a Survey Monkey or similar format? (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).
 - 3.4. Should the responses made to public comments by individuals and external organizations/groups be considered equally ((Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)
 - 3.5. Should the responses made to public comments by SO/AC's and the Board have more weight than other comments? (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)
 - 3.6. How useful are staff reports on public consultations (Very Useful, Useful, No Opinion, Not very Useful, Not Useful at all)
 - 3.7. Should Staff Reports on ICANN Public Consultations clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were accepted and how? (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).
 - 3.8. Should Staff Reports on ICANN Public Consultations clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were rejected and if so why? (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

4. **Support for ICANN decisions** - Item 4 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community;
 - 4.1. Does your SO or AC believe the Internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board over the past 2 years? (Y/N)
 - 4.2. Does your SO or AC generally support the decisions made by the Board over the past 2 years? (Strong Support, Support, No Opinion, Do not Support, Strongly Do not Support).

5. **PDPs** - Item 5 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations, and effective and timely policy development; and
 - 5.1. What role should SO or ACs play in fostering buy-in from their community to ICANN's policy-making? (Text response)
 - 5.2. How could your SO or AC improve this? (Text response)

6. **IRP** - Item 6 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing and improving the Independent Review Process. This is not being considered by ATRT3 given the ongoing work of the IRP-IOT.

7. **ATRT2** - Item 7 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - Assessing the extent to which prior Accountability and Transparency Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect. The implementation and effectiveness of the recommendations made by ATRT2 are being evaluated by ATRT3.

8. **Periodic Reviews** - Item 8 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws - The Accountability and Transparency Review Team may recommend to the Board the termination or amendment of other periodic reviews required by this Section 4.6, and may recommend to the Board the creation of additional periodic reviews.
 - 8.1. How would your SO or AC rate the effectiveness of the periodic reviews as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws (Very Effective, Somewhat Effective, No Opinion, Somewhat Ineffective, Ineffective).
 - 8.2. Should Periodic Reviews (ATRT, SSR, WHOIS, etc.) be reconsidered or amended? (Y/N)
 - 8.3. Should Organizational Reviews, those reviewing SO/AC's, also be reconsidered or amended? (Y/N))

9. **Accountability Indicators** - This was added as a topic for ATRT3 by the plenary
 - 9.1. Has your SO or AC looked at the ICANN Accountability Indicators which can be found at <https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators> (Y/N)).

- 9.1.1. If YES
 - 9.1.1.1. how would your SO or AC rate their usefulness overall (Very Useful, Useful, No Opinion, Not veryUseful, Not Useful at all)
 - 9.1.1.2. How would your SO or AC rate these for effectiveness in measuring accountability for ICANN (Very Effective, Somewhat Effective, No Opinion, Somewhat Ineffective, Ineffective)

10. Other questions submitted

- 10.1. Do you believe the information ICANN makes available should be better organized to facilitate searching for specific topics? (Y/N)
- 10.2. Are you aware of ICANN's open data mechanisms, including the Information Transparency Initiative or the Open Data Initiative, or about ICANN's transparency policies more generally? (Y/N)
- 10.3. Are ICANN's mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global internet community?(Y/N)
 - 10.3.1. If NO, where do you think these shortcomings lie, and how could they be improved? (text response)
- 10.4. What procedures do you have in place within your SO/AC for electing NomCom representatives? (text response)
- 10.5. Do you feel that the NomCom, as currently constituted, is a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy in?(Y/N)
 - 10.5.1. If NO, where do you think these shortcomings lie, and how could they be improved? (text response)
- 10.6. Does your SO or AC have formalized or instituted term limits for membership? (Y/N/Does not apply)
- 10.7. Does your SO or AC have formalized or instituted term limits for leadership? (Y/N)
- 10.8. What is your SO or Ac's feedback regarding the presence of a Board member or non-voting Liaison selected by your SO/AC? (text response)
- 10.9. Does your SO or AC have a transparency policy? (Y/N)
 - 10.9.1. If yes, please describe or provide a link to any formalized transparency processes/protocols/policy that your SO or AC uses. (text response)
- 10.10. Does your SO or AC have a transparency policy? (Y/N)
 - 10.10.1. If YES, when was the last time it was revised?(text response)
- 10.11. Does your SO or AC have a conflict of interest policy (Y/N)
 - 10.11.1. If YES,
 - 10.11.1.1. please provide a link or description? (text response)
 - 10.11.1.2. Does this include an evaluation component? (text response)
- 10.12. If NO, have you ever experienced or perceived challenges related to conflicts of interest? (Y/N)
- 10.13.

Specific Questionnaires

- **Board**

- How was the implementation report of October 2018 for ATRT2 recommendations reviewed by the Board.

- **GAC**

- Do you believe GAC accountability could be improved? (Significant Improvements needed, Some Improvements needed, Minor Improvements needed, No Opinion, No Improvements needed)
- Do you believe GAC transparency could be improved? (Significant Improvements needed, Some Improvements needed, Minor Improvements needed, No Opinion, No Improvements needed)
- Regarding recommendations from ATRT2 - GAC Operations & Interactions -Recommendation 6 – implementation – Is additional work required to complete this?(Y/N)
 - If YES what would this be? (Text Response)
- GAC Operating Principles have had very few changes since their original publication. Are there any elements in these GAC-OP which you believe require improvements with respect to Accountability and Transparency? (Text Response)
- In your view are GAC interactions with the Board and other communities satisfactory? (Not Satisfactory, Somewhat Satisfactory, No Opinion, Somewhat Satisfactory, Very Satisfactory)
 - If Not Satisfactory or Somewhat Satisfactory what kind of improvements would you suggest?(Text response)
- Would adding steps in the current process between GAC and the Board improve the interaction effectiveness and transparency? (Y/N)
 - If YES what would you suggest? (Text Response)

- **Staff**

- Has ICANN established a clear process for implementing objectives and mechanisms to generate metrics? (text response)
- Do the current metrics and objectives reflect and link with organizational processes? (text response)
- Is there a communication strategy developed regarding accountability? (text response)

- What formal process has or will ICANN put in place to review its accountability indicators (text response)

