A.   Working Group Self-Assessment

PAGE 1

Working Group Self-Assessment
Working Group:

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.

You may remain anonymous when responding to this survey, meaning that you do not need to provide your name. If you choose to provide your name and/or email address, this will only be seen by staff administering this survey. Staff will only use this information 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 allow you to provide identifying information.

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

- 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)
- At-Large Community
- 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
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 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

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; and **7-Highly Effective** means accommodating, respectful, collaborative, consensus-building	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
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

Thinking about the overall EFFECTIVENESS of the Working Group's Products and Outputs, 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

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 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer

1-Highly Unrewarding; and **7-Highly Rewarding**	
26. Assuming all other conditions are suitable (e.g., subject, interest, need, fit, availability), I assess my <u>personal</u> **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:	
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
Please feel free to provide any additional feedback about your Working Group experience, any improvements that should be considered, this Self-Assessment, or any other matter not covered elsewhere in this questionnaire	*(Free-form Text Box)*

B.   Proposed Periodic Survey - NEW

Note, the below periodic survey is a proposed template survey. Council leadership, in consultation with the GNSO Council liaison to the WG, may decide to modify the survey to be able to hone in on certain aspects of the WG's functioning should there have been indications that there are potential issues. In addition, the Council and/or Council leadership can follow up with the WG members and/or leadership for any follow up conversations it deems necessary to assess if there are issues that need addressing.

Periodic WG Member Survey - [Working Group Name]

The GNSO Council is seeking your input about the functioning of the [Working Group name]. As the manager of the policy development process and other GNSO projects, the GNSO Council regularly reviews work underway within the GNSO. This includes a regular review of the functioning of WGs, including WG leadership. Please take a moment to reflect on your experience in [Working Group name] and respond to the questions below.

You may remain anonymous when responding to this survey, meaning that you do not need to provide your name. If you choose to provide your name and/or email address, this will only be seen by staff administering this survey. Staff will only use this information 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.*

Category #1 - Participant Identification

Before we get started with the first Section, the following questions allow you to provide identifying information.

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

- 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]

Category #2 General Effectiveness

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

Assessment Category	Rating
A) The Charter/Mission of the WG is: 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
B) The external Human Resources (e.g., briefings, experts, consultants, liaisons) provided to the WG are: 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

C) The Technical Resources (e.g., systems, tools, platforms, templates) provided to and utilized by the WG are: 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
D) The Staff Support Resources (e.g., meeting support, guidelines, documentation, drafting) provided to and utilized by the WG are: 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
Any other issues or concerns that you think the Council should be aware of in its role as the manager of the process as it assesses the functioning and effectiveness of the WG?	(Free-form Text Box)

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
A) 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
B) The **Behavior** norm of WG members where: **1-Highly Ineffective** means disruptive, argumentative, disrespectful, hostile, domineering; and **7-Highly Effective** means accommodating, respectful, collaborative, consensus-building	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer
C) 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
Other comments about the WG's Processes:	*(Free-form Text Box)*

Category #3 Leadership

The leadership team of [Working Group name] consists of [description of structure - for example two co-chairs, three co-chairs, one chair and two vice- chairs, etc.]. You will be asked to respond to each question as it applies to each member of the leadership team.

For each of the first 7 questions, you will be asked to respond to a statement with one of the following (with scores assigned to each option to facilitate the analysis of the survey results): Strongly Agree (15), Agree (12), Neutral (9), Disagree (6), Strongly Disagree (3), or N/A (0). If this statement is not applicable to you or you do not have an answer, please select N/A. "N/A" responses will be omitted during the calculation of final scores. For each of these questions, you will be able to provide additional details in the comments box to explain your answer. The final question in the survey allows you to share any additional remarks that are not covered in the other survey questions. This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Facilitate Working Group deliberations to align with the scope and expectations of the charter and PDP work plan

1. The Working Group leadership facilitates goal-oriented working group meetings aligned with the requirements of the Working Group's charter and work plan.

[Name 1]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
[Name 2]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
Comments:

2. The Working Group leadership adequately manages disruptive behaviors such as raising irrelevant issues or reopening topics that have already been closed.

[Name 1]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
[Name 2]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
Comments:

Facilitate Working Group meetings, decision making, and delivery of work product to meet the required deadlines of the charter and PDP work plan

3. The Working Group leadership keeps the Working Group on track to meet target deadlines through discussion items or deliverables.
[Name 1]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
[Name 2]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
Comments:

4. The Working Group leadership is responsive and effectively communicates with Working Group members.
[Name 1]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
[Name 2]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
Comments:

Neutrality/Impartiality

5. The Working Group leadership ensures fair, objective treatment of all opinions within the Working Group.
Leader 1: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
Leader 2: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A

Comments:

Identify diversity of views within the WG

6. The Working Group leadership is able to seek and identify a diversity of views within the Working Group (Examples to consider when answering this survey question: Did the Working Group leadership assess and encourage representational balance? Identify and address "capture"? Determine when outreach is necessary to bring in additional views? Undertake this outreach when appropriate?)

[Name 1]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
[Name 2]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
Comments:

7. The Working Group leadership works to identify common ground among members as well as areas of divergence, consistent with the Standard Methodology for Making Decisions included in Section 3.6 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines.

[Name 1]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
[Name 2]: ( ) Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( ) Neutral ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree ( ) N/A
Comments:

8. Other: Do you have any additional remarks that you would like to share?
Comments:

Thank you for your input!