Introduction to the GNSO Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

Welcome to the GNSO Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment! This Assessment complements the main GNSO 360 Questionnaire.

The purpose of this brief Supplementary 360 Assessment is to seek your views on a specific GNSO Working Group.   You will be asked which Working Group your responses are in reference to. If you wish to provide feedback on more than one Working Group, please complete this brief survey once for each Working Group you are providing feedback on.

The 360 Assessment, including the Supplementary 360 Assessment, has been formulated and implemented by the Independent Examiner, Westlake Governance. The data collected via this survey will be summarised and analysed by Westlake, and used as an input into the overall GNSO Review.

Some questions are mandatory and some are optional. Mandatory questions are marked with an asterisk (*).

Many questions provide a text field for your comments. Most of these fields are limited to 600 characters. If you wish to provide more input than will fit into the field, please note it in the final comment section or email Westlake Governance at gnsoreview@westlakegovernance.com.

1. Westlake will maintain your confidentiality. We will not identify you in material we quote or share with the GNSO and staff unless you grant us specific permission by ticking the box below.

○   I consent to being identified by name as the author of my feedback

About you

Be sure to click NEXT in order to save your responses.

Please provide your name and affiliation when submitting your response, as required by ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior and Public Comment Rules and Procedures.

*2. Your name and contact address:

Name:

Email Address:

3. Please give your affiliation (i.e. a company or non-profit group that you are member of that is relevant to your interest in the WG), if any:

*4. Which GNSO Working Group are you commenting on in this survey? (If you wish to provide feedback on more than one Working Group, please complete this brief survey once for each Working Group you are providing feedback on.)

- ○ Domain Tasting
- ○ Fast Flux
- ○ gTLD Contact Translation
- ○ IGO / INGO
- ○ IRTP Denials
- ○ IRTP Part A
- ○ IRTP Part B
- ○ IRTP Part C

- ○ IRTP Part D
- ○ PEDNR
- ○ Proxy Accreditation
- ○ Thick Whois
- ○ UDRP Lock
- ○ Data & Metrics (non-PDP)
- ○ Policy & Implementation (non-PDP)

- ○ Other: please provide the Working Group Name

Questions about this Working Group

Be sure to click NEXT in order to save your responses.

*5. Working Group participation:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable
The Working Group welcomed and included all interested stakeholders	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group has an appropriate balance of views and affiliations	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group has informed and constructive discussions	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group achieves consensus	○	○	○	○	○	○
Working Group volunteer workload is reasonable and does not cause overload	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please expand if you wish:

*6. Working Group support:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable
The Working Group has sufficient secretariat staff support	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group has sufficient ICANN technical staff support	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group has sufficient travel support	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please expand if you wish:

*7. Working Group meetings:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable
The Working Group is well chaired	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group is effective in planning and prioritising its agenda items	○	○	○	○	○	○
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and frequency	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and wikis)	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group's documentation, transcripts, and recordings are published in a timely manner	○	○	○	○	○	○
Action Items and follow up work are well-managed	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please expand if you wish:

[ ]

*8. PDP progress: (if the group has no PDP or has not completed its PDP, please mark "Not Applicable" in the relevant questions)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable
The Working Group's charter is appropriate to its task	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group's initial report was thorough in addressing the charter	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group incorporated community feedback well	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Working Group's outputs were delivered in a timely manner	○	○	○	○	○	○
All input and opinions were appropriately addressed and reflected in the final report	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please expand if you wish:

[ ]

9. How do you believe the Working Group is seen by other parts of ICANN, including other parts of the GNSO?

10. Are there any other comments you would like to make about this working group?

Thank you

The team at Westlake Governance thanks you for completing the questionnaire.

If you would like to expand on any of your answers, or send us supplementary information, please send email to gnsoreview@westlakegovernance.com.

This questionnaire was about a specific GNSO working group. Please give us your views about the GNSO in general by filling in the main GNSO 360 Questionnaire, which is also linked from the GNSO Review home page.

When you leave this page, your browser will be redirected to the GNSO Review home page.