

CCOICI WG Self-Assessment - Early input survey

Generated using [Clicktools](#) on Tuesday October 12 2021 09:45:27

1. Your name *

1 Flip Petillion

2 Wisdom Donkor

3 Sebastien Ducos


4 Olga Cavalli

2. After having reviewed the different materials, what are your initial thoughts with regards to improvements and enhancements that can be introduced? Please keep in mind that the objective of the WG Self-Assessment is to "formally request feedback from a WG as part of its closure process". It can provide valuable information to the GNSO Council about possible areas for improvement and as indicated in the instructions "to help identify at an early stage potential issues".

- 1 I would add a section allowing the feedback on how the chair; co-charis; vice chairs are doing. If it is there, I don't see or missed it.
- 2 The frequency of email with documents links sometime gets missing within emails. This makes it difficult sometimes to follow a particular discussion process.

If possible, a structured document dashboard needs to be introduced for working group members to easily make reference to present and previous documents and links.
- 3 A general revision of the WG Self-assesment is ok but I cannot think of improvements

3. Do you think it is a good idea to conduct a more periodic survey during a WG's lifecycle?




1 - Yes	80% (4)	2 - No	0% (0)
3 - I have not formed an opinion yet	0% (0)	4 - Other	20% (1)

4. If you responded 'other' to the previous question, please specify:

No responses

5. If you responded 'yes' to question #3, with what regularity do you think the survey should be carried out?




1 - Every six months	66.67% (2)	2 - Every year	0% (0)
3 - Upon achieving a milestone, such as publication of Initial Report or draft Final Report	33.33% (1)	4 - Other	0% (0)

6. If you responded 'other' to the previous question, please specify:

No responses

7. If you responded that there should be a periodic survey, should the Working Group Self-Assessment at the end of a WG's lifecycle remain in place?




1 - Yes, in its current form	50% (2)	2 - Yes, but it should be modified	25% (1)
3 - No	0% (0)	4 - I have not formed an opinion yet	0% (0)
5 - Other	0% (0)		

8. If you responded 'other' to the previous question, please specify:

No responses

9. Should an assessment of the performance of WG leadership be part of the WG Self-Assessment?



1 - Yes	50% (2)	2 - No	25% (1)
3 - I have not formed an opinion yet	0% (0)	4 - Other	0% (0)

10. If you responded 'other' to the previous question, please specify:

No responses

11. If you answered 'yes' to question #9, please have a look at the draft survey that was developed as part of the PDP 3.0 deliberations (see <https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/pdp-3-13-wg-member-survey-leadership-performance-10feb20-en.pdf>). Could this serve as a starting point? If yes, what further questions should be added, if any? If no, how should the CCOICI go about creating such a survey?

- 1 Yes - and that answers my question under 2 above.
- 2 Collective survey approach will be the best approach, this will prevent the denigration of individual volunteers. We should seem to be encouraging every one who comes forward to volunteer.
- 3 Yes

12. If you answered 'yes' to question #9, how can a potential chilling effect be avoided, meaning that volunteers may not step forward for leadership roles out of concerns of being criticised in the survey?

- 1 to be discussed: role for the ombudsman? ; confidential feedback to Council leadership?
- 2 the leadership of the GNSo should evaluate ,before the WG is launched , the interest of the council membres

13. Are there any other aspects or issues the CCOICI should consider or take into account as it deliberates on this topic?

- 1 Periodic retreat for working group members will be key to helping group members in reflecting and learning from present and previous activities.