Working Group Self-Assessment Questions

PAGE 1

Working Group Self-Assessment
EPDP on Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs

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.

Confidentiality: We will be asking you for your name and email address. This this will only be seen by staff administering this survey. Staff will use this information to confirm that the survey is only being completed by individuals directly associated with the working group and 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: gnso-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.

PAGE 2

Section 1 - Participant Identification

Before we get started with the first Section, the following questions 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.

1. Name* [free text field]
2. Email Address [free text field]
3. Primary Organizational Affiliation [dropdown]

- 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]

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.

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 <u>overall</u> 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

Reminder: 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."

Thinking about the <u>overall</u> EFFECTIVENESS of the Working Group's <u>Inputs</u>, 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	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	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	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	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
11. The **Technical Resources** (e.g., systems, tools, platforms, templates) provided to and utilized by	

Assessment Category	Rating
the WG where: **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	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
12. The **Staff Support Resources** (e.g., meeting support, guidelines, documentation, drafting) provided to and utilized by the WG where: **1-Highly Ineffective** means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and **7-Highly Effective** means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
13. Comments about the WG's Inputs:	*(Free-form Text Box)*

PAGE 4

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

Reminder: 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."

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

Assessment Category	Rating
14. The **WG's Leadership** where: **1-Highly Ineffective** means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and **7-Highly Effective** means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
15. The **Council Liaison to the WG** where: **1-Highly Ineffective** means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and **7-Highly Effective** means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
16. 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	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
17. The **Behavior** norm of WG members where: **1-Highly Ineffective** means disruptive, argumentative, disrespectful, hostile, domineering;	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer

| | and
7-Highly Effective means accommodating, respectful, collaborative, consensus-building | |

Assessment Category	Rating
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	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
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	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
20. Comments about the WG's Processes:	*(Free-form Text Box)*

PAGE 5

Section 4 - Products and Outputs

Reminder: 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."

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

Assessment Category	Rating
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	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
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	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
23. Comments about the WG's Products and Outputs:	*(Free-form Text Box)*

PAGE 6
Section 5 - Personal Dimensions

Reminder: 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."

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

PAGE 7

Section 6 – Demographics

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

28. How did you learn about the WG (Select any/all that apply)?*	Options: ● 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
29. If you selected "Other" in the question above, please explain:	*(Free-form Text Box)*
30. Approximately how long have you been involved with ICANN?*	Drop-down options: ● Less than 1 year ● 1 - 2 years ● 2 - 4 years ● 4 - 6 years ● 6 - 8 years ● More than 8 years
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?*	Drop-down options: ● Less than 2 hours ● 2 - 5 hours ● 6 - 10 hours ● 11 - 15 hours ● 16 - 20 hours ● More than 20 hours
32. Please feel free to provide any additional feedback about your Working Group experience, any improvements that should be considered, or any other matter not covered elsewhere in this questionnaire	*(Free-form Text Box)*
33. The Council is piloting revisions to this survey to improve its utility for future improvements, including more explicit questions about the quality of staff support (question 12), WG leadership (question 14), and the GNSO Council Liaison (question 15). Please feel free to share any feedback on these revised questions or an other feedback you may have on the Self-Assessment.	*(Free-form Text Box)*