



ATRT3 Individual Results

Generated using [Clicktools](#) on Tuesday September 17 2019 15:44:38


Which Structure are you a member?




Please answer if you answered 'At-Large' to question 1. If you belong to an At-Large structure, which one?



Which region are you from?




Please indicate your satisfaction with the Board's performance overall:



1 - Very satisfied	7.14% (4)	2 - Satisfied	48.21% (27)
3 - No opinion	16.07% (9)	4 - Somewhat dissatisfied	14.29% (8)
5 - Very dissatisfied	14.29% (8)		

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.




1 - Very effective	1.82% (1)	2 - Effective	40% (22)
3 - No opinion	32.73% (18)	4 - Somewhat ineffective	12.73% (7)
5 - Ineffective	12.73% (7)		

Response: 55


www.clicktools.com

Do you consider the diversity amongst Board members satisfactory?



Response: 54


Please answer if you answered "no" to question 5. Which areas of diversity do you feel need improvement? (select all diversity factors you think apply):



1 - Geographical/regional representation	56% (14)	2 - Language	24% (6)
3 - Gender	40% (10)	4 - Age	20% (5)
5 - Physical disability	20% (5)	6 - Diverse skills	24% (6)
7 - Stakeholder group or constituency	56% (14)		

Response: 25

How satisfied are you with the Nominating Committee's selection of Directors for the ICANN Board:




1 - Very satisfied	12.96% (7)	2 - Satisfied	50% (27)
3 - No opinion	18.52% (10)	4 - Somewhat dissatisfied	7.41% (4)
5 - Very dissatisfied	11.11% (6)		

Response: 54


www.clicktools.com

Please indicate your satisfaction with the accountability of the Board under the new accountability mechanisms such as the Empowered Community:



1 - Very satisfied	9.09% (5)	2 - Satisfied	38.18% (21)
3 - No opinion	23.64% (13)	4 - Somewhat dissatisfied	20% (11)
5 - Very dissatisfied	9.09% (5)		

Rate the mechanisms ensuring the Board's transparency:




1 - Very effective	9.09% (5)	2 - Effective	36.36% (20)
3 - No opinion	21.82% (12)	4 - Somewhat ineffective	21.82% (12)
5 - Ineffective	18.18% (10)		


Response: 55

www.clicktools.com

Do you think the mechanisms ensuring Board transparency need to be improved?



How would you rate the importance of the Board implementing the Transparency Recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability WS2?




1 - Very important	58.49% (31)	2 - Somewhat important	24.53% (13)
3 - No opinion	11.32% (6)	4 - Somewhat not important	3.77% (2)
5 - Not important	1.89% (1)		


Response: 53

www.clicktools.com

Are you satisfied with the Board's decision-taking process?




Are you aware of the training program for the Board members?



Response: 54

www.clicktools.com

Are you satisfied with the financial information that is provided to the public by ICANN?




1 - Very satisfied	18.52% (10)	2 - Satisfied	40.74% (22)
3 - No opinion	22.22% (12)	4 - Somewhat dissatisfied	22.22% (12)
5 - Very dissatisfied	3.7% (2)		

Response: 54

www.clicktools.com

How would you rate the usability of the financial information overall?




1 - Very useful	22.22% (12)	2 - Somewhat useful	42.59% (23)
3 - No opinion	29.63% (16)	4 - Somewhat not useful	11.11% (6)
5 - Not useful	1.85% (1)		

Response: 54

www.clicktools.com


Should GAC accountability be improved?



1 - No significant improvements needed	5.66% (3)	2 - Minor improvements needed	22.64% (12)
3 - No opinion	13.21% (7)	4 - Yes, some improvements needed	32.08% (17)
5 - Yes, significant improvements needed	26.42% (14)		

Response: 53


Should GAC transparency be improved?



1 - No significant improvements needed	7.55% (4)	2 - Minor improvements needed	24.53% (13)
3 - No opinion	11.32% (6)	4 - Yes, some improvements needed	26.42% (14)
5 - Yes, significant improvements needed	30.19% (16)		

Response: 53

In your view are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the Board?




1 - Very satisfied	3.77% (2)	2 - Satisfied	37.74% (20)
3 - No opinion	22.64% (12)	4 - Somewhat dissatisfied	20.75% (11)
5 - Very dissatisfied	15.09% (8)		

Response: 53

www.clicktools.com

In your view are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the SO/ACs?




1 - Very satisfied	7.69% (4)	2 - Satisfied	36.54% (19)
3 - No opinion	17.31% (9)	4 - Somewhat dissatisfied	28.85% (15)
5 - Very dissatisfied	9.62% (5)		

Response: 52

www.clicktools.com

Have you ever filed a Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) request with ICANN?



Response: 52

www.clicktools.com

Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 19. What information were you seeking?

No responses

Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 19. Did you receive the information you requested in full?

No data to display

■ 1 - Yes

0% (0) ■ 2 - No

0% (0)

Clicktools

Response: 0

www.clicktools.com

Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 19. Did the material you received answer your question?

No data to display

■ 1 - Yes

0% (0) ■ 2 - No

0% (0)

Clicktools


Response: 0

www.clicktools.com


Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 19. Please feel free to add any other thoughts you have about the DIDP process.

No responses


Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the icann.org website should be better organized to facilitate searching for specific topics?




Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the community wiki should be better organized to facilitate searching on the wiki?



Are you aware of ICANN's open data mechanisms, including the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) or the Open Data Initiative (ODI), or about ICANN's transparency policies more generally?




Please rate how effective the current system of Public Comment consultations is for gathering community input.




1 - Very effective	4% (2)	2 - Effective	46% (23)
3 - No opinion	2% (1)	4 - Somewhat ineffective	32% (16)
5 - Ineffective	16% (8)		


Do you believe the concept of Public Comment, as currently implemented, should be re-examined?



Have you (or a group you directly contribute to) responded to a Public Comment consultation in the last year?



Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 25. How many responses have you (or a group you directly contribute to) submitted to Public Comments in the last year?




1 - 1	5% (2)	2 - 2	20% (8)
3 - 5 or more	45% (18)	4 - 10 or more	30% (12)

Response: 40

www.clicktools.com


Please answer if you answered 'no' to question 25. What prevented you from responding?



1 - Did not have the time to produce a detailed response	37.5% (3)	2 - Subject was too complex	25% (2)
3 - Consultation document was too long	25% (2)	4 - Language issues	0% (0)
5 - Time to respond was too short	12.5% (1)	6 - Other	25% (2)


Response: 8

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?




1 - Yes, strongly agree	18% (9)	2 - Yes, agree	64% (32)
3 - No opinion	8% (4)	4 - No, disagree	6% (3)
5 - No, strongly disagree	4% (2)		

Should the responses made to Public Comments by individuals and external organizations/groups be considered equally?




1 - Strongly agree	32% (16)	2 - Agree	36% (18)
3 - No opinion	6% (3)	4 - Disagree	22% (11)
5 - Strongly disagree	4% (2)		

Should the responses made to Public Comments by SO/ACs have more weight than other comments?




1 - Strongly agree	14% (7)	2 - Agree	34% (17)
3 - No opinion	10% (5)	4 - Disagree	30% (15)
5 - Strongly disagree	12% (6)		

Should the responses made to Public Comments by the Board have more weight than other comments?



1 - Strongly agree	8.16% (4)	2 - Agree	26.53% (13)
3 - No opinion	16.33% (8)	4 - Disagree	28.57% (14)
5 - Strongly disagree	20.41% (10)		

How useful are staff reports on Public Comments?




1 - Very useful	16% (8)	2 - Useful	56% (28)
3 - No opinion	12% (6)	4 - Not very useful	10% (5)
5 - Not useful at all	6% (3)		

Response: 50


www.clicktools.com

Do you agree that staff reports on Public Comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were accepted and how they were accepted?



1 - Strongly agree	8.16% (4)	2 - Agree	34.69% (17)
3 - No opinion	16.33% (8)	4 - Disagree	28.57% (14)
5 - Strongly disagree	12.24% (6)		

Do you agree that staff reports on Public Comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were rejected and why they were rejected?




1 - Strongly agree	4% (2)	2 - Agree	38% (19)
3 - No opinion	22% (11)	4 - Disagree	20% (10)
5 - Strongly disagree	16% (8)		

Response: 50

www.clicktools.com


Do you believe the Internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board?



Response: 47

www.clicktools.com

Do you generally support the decisions made by the Board?




1 - Strongly support	14.29% (7)	2 - Support	48.98% (24)
3 - No opinion	14.29% (7)	4 - Do not support	12.24% (6)
5 - Strongly do not support	10.2% (5)		


Response: 49

www.clicktools.com

Have you participated in or contributed to any Policy Development Process?



Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 35. Did you have difficulty with any of the following? (select all that apply)




1 - Scope too large or unclear	48.48% (16)	2 - Time required	84.85% (28)
3 - Level of knowledge required to effectively participate	60.61% (20)	4 - Calls are at an unworkable time	33.33% (11)
5 - Language issues	6.06% (2)	6 - Other	6.06% (2)

Response: 33

www.clicktools.com

Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 35. Please rate your satisfaction with the transparency of the Policy Development Process (PDP).




1 - Very satisfied	8.82% (3)	2 - Satisfied	52.94% (18)
3 - No opinion	14.71% (5)	4 - Somewhat dissatisfied	11.76% (4)
5 - Very dissatisfied	11.76% (4)		

Response: 34


www.clicktools.com

Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 35. Please rate how accountable the PDP process was to the community.




1 - Accountable	17.65% (6)	2 - Somewhat accountable	44.12% (15)
3 - No opinion	20.59% (7)	4 - Somewhat not accountable	11.76% (4)
5 - Not accountable	5.88% (2)		

Please answer if you answered 'no' to question 35. Why have you not participated in any Policy Development Process?




1 - Scope too large or unclear	40% (6)	2 - Time required	46.67% (7)
3 - Level of knowledge required to effectively participate	33.33% (5)	4 - Calls are at an unworkable time	6.67% (1)
5 - Language issues	6.67% (1)	6 - Other	20% (3)

How would you rate the effectiveness of the specific reviews (ATRT, SSR, RDS, etc.) as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws?



1 - Very effective	0% (0)	2 - Effective	48.98% (24)
3 - No opinion	28.57% (14)	4 - Somewhat ineffective	16.33% (8)
5 - Ineffective	6.12% (3)		


Should specific reviews (ATRT, SSR, RDS, etc.) be reconsidered or amended?



Response: 45

www.clicktools.com

How would you rate the effectiveness of organizational reviews, those reviewing SO/ACs as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws?




1 - Very effective	0% (0)	2 - Somewhat effective	40.82% (20)
3 - No opinion	16.33% (8)	4 - Somewhat ineffective	30.61% (15)
5 - Ineffective	12.24% (6)		

Response: 49

www.clicktools.com


Should organizational reviews be reconsidered or amended?



Response: 46

www.clicktools.com


Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 39. Should organizational reviews continue to be undertaken by external consultants?



Response: 39

www.clicktools.com


Should the ATRT3 make recommendations about prioritization and rationalization of ICANN activities?



Response: 48

www.clicktools.com


Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 40. Should such recommendations include a process to retire recommendations as it becomes apparent that the community will never get to them or they have been overtaken by other events?



Response: 34

www.clicktools.com


Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 40. Should such recommendations aim to provide a general approach for prioritizing and rationalizing work for ICANN?



Response: 35

www.clicktools.com


Please answer if you answered 'yes' to question 40. Should the mechanism for making recommendations on prioritization and rationalization only apply to PDPs, reviews and their recommendations. or include other operational aspects in ICANN?




Please answer if you selected 'include other operational aspects' above. What do you think these other operational aspects should include?

- 1 how transparency is handled across ICANN's activities
- 2 ICANN org implementation of recommendations
- 3 Finance
- 4 Regional public forums as were held in the run up to the 2011 gTLD round
- 5 staffing, budgetary
- 6 outreach, operational readiness
- 7 ccwg and other work undertaken by more than one SO or AC
- 8 Meeting strategy including regional/specialist meetings
- 9 bringing ICANN meetings to the essence

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 40. Should the community or representative(s) of the community be involved as a decisional participant in any mechanism which makes recommendations for prioritizing and rationalizing work for ICANN?



Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 40. Do you think the Empowered Community would be a good mechanism for making recommendations on prioritizing and rationalizing if its role was amended to allow this?



Response: 34

www.clicktools.com


Please explain:

- 1 too many particular and hidden interests of participants
- 2 Empowered Community has a very specific role that should not be expanded
- 3 The group is small
- 4 The empowered community is currently (still) dominated by Contracted parties and the IPR lobby. Repeatedly denying ICANN's responsibility for the public interest and the conditions of competition.
- 5 I don't think the EC has emerged as a visible and effective entity
- 6 Not with the current Bylaws; possibly with proper mandate
- 7 The EC as it is currently composed was selected to a more general purpose

Please answer if you selected 'no' to the question above, "Do you think the Empowered Community would be a good mechanism for making recommendations on prioritizing and rationalizing if its role was amended to allow this?" Whose responsibility do you think it should be?

- 1 Boards
- 2 No. Not until the empowered community is radically rebalanced.
- 3 possibly
- 4 Yes, possible.
- 5 A "body" similar to the EC but separately selected


Are ICANN's mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global Internet community?



Response: 47


www.clicktools.com

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 41. In your opinion what level of improvements would be required to correct this?




1 - No opinion	0% (0)	2 - Minor improvements needed	22.73% (5)
3 - Significant improvements needed	77.27% (17)		

Do you feel that the NomCom, as currently constituted, is a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy in?



Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 42. In your opinion what level of improvements would be required to correct this?



1 - No opinion	0% (0)	2 - Minor improvements needed	31.82% (7)
3 - Significant improvements needed	68.18% (15)		