

July 1, 2014

INTRODUCTION TO THE SURVEY

Why your feedback is important

GNSO serves an important function – it is responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains¹.

This review² is part of ICANN’s commitment to continuous improvement, accountability and transparency. It uses mechanisms and measures to maintain public confidence in the viability, reliability and accountability of ICANN.

The purpose of the review is to evaluate organizational effectiveness of the GNSO, acknowledge areas that are working well, identify areas that need improvement and affect needed changes.

The quality, validity and acceptance of the GNSO Review and the resulting improvements depend on relevant and useful feedback from a diverse and representative group of people. This is the cornerstone of ICANN’s bottom-up multistakeholder model.

Respond in a way most suitable to you

A new component within the organizational review, the 360 Assessment is designed to gather data from the GNSO community, other ICANN structures and community members, the Board and staff. Two versions of this survey will be available – one for those who have a fundamental understanding of the GNSO organization and a more detailed version for those who possess an in-depth understanding and experience with the GNSO.

The GNSO is comprised of various structural components: GNSO Council, GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, and GNSO Working Groups. The 360 Assessment is designed to cover the GNSO organization as a whole (see "GNSO Overall") as well as each of its structural components.

We invite you to provide feedback on any and all of these structural components.

¹ [Article X](#) of ICANN Bylaws provides further detail.

² ICANN’s [Bylaws](#) require that its structures, including the GNSO, be reviewed on a five-year cycle. According to the Bylaws, the goal of the review is “to determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness.”

GNSO Review – 360 Assessment Mock Up

July 1, 2014

The assessment consists of several sections: Purpose, Organization and Participation, Execution, Outcomes and Other.

Please add comments or additional feedback into the “Other” section and into the free-form text sections available for each question.

You do not have to answer all questions.

Translations options – to be developed.

What happens to your feedback

The feedback will be summarized and analyzed by the independent examiner. It will be supplemented by other methods of data collection – review of documents and one-on one interviews.

We ask that you provide your name and affiliation in line with [ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior](#) and [Public Comment Rules and Procedures](#), when submitting your response. You have the option to keep this information confidential - it will not be shared publically and will be used confidentially in the data gathering and analysis stage by the independent examiner.

Glossary of terms

For the purposes of this survey, please use the following definitions.

Groups - The GNSO is comprised of various structural components: GNSO Council, GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, and GNSO Working Groups. For purposes of this survey, each of the structural components will be referred to as a “Group.”

Output

Outcome

Other terms to be added

July 1, 2014

SURVEY QUESTIONS

General information about responder

What is your name?

What is your email?

What is your affiliation, if any?

How many ICANN meetings have you attended?

Have you been involved with the work of the GNSO?

Have you held a leadership role at ICANN?

Which statement best describes your knowledge about the GNSO:

- I have general knowledge and would like to participate in the **general** survey
- I have in depth knowledge and would like to participate in the **detailed** survey

GNSO Review – 360 Assessment Mock Up

July 1, 2014

Note: Questions will be divided into two surveys – general and detailed. Some questions may be included in both surveys.

Format of answers will be suited to the question (Yes-No-Don't know or "On a scale of x to x...").

Every question will provide an option to add free-form text.

Purpose

1. Has the Group been effective in achieving its purpose as defined in its Charter or Bylaws [include link to the applicable document, where appropriate]?
2. How accountable is the Group to the ICANN Community?

Organization and participation

3. Are the stakeholder communities well represented and appropriately involved in GNSO constituencies?
4. Are the stakeholder communities well represented and appropriately involved in GNSO stakeholder groups?
5. Are the stakeholder communities well represented and appropriately involved in the GNSO houses?
6. Are the stakeholder communities well represented by the GNSO Council?
7. Are the stakeholder communities well represented by the NomCom Appointees?
8. Are the stakeholder communities well represented by the liaisons?
9. Does the Group comply with established rules and processes?
10. Does the Group have sufficient human resources to accomplish its work?
11. Does the Group have the appropriate financial resources needed to accomplish its work?

GNSO Review – 360 Assessment Mock Up

July 1, 2014

12. Is information about organizations and individuals that comprise the Group publically available and up to date?
13. How effective is the Group in encouraging new participants from the global community to become involved in the Group to avoid volunteer burnout?
14. Does the Group encourage participation from all geographic regions?
15. Does the Group encourage participation from all key interest areas?
16. Does the Group make participation easy?
17. How effective are the training programs and materials available to ease new participants into the organization?
18. Do the participants provide appropriate technical expertise to complete the work?
19. Do the participants engage sufficiently to complete the work?
20. Is the governing or leadership body (e.g. Council, Executive Committee) of the Group balanced and appropriately representative?
21. How effectively does the Group coordinate its work with other SOs and ACs?
22. How effectively does the Group coordinate its work with other GNSO Groups?
23. Does the Group communicate in plain English and provide appropriate translation resources?

Execution

24. Does the Group establish long and short-range plans to inform and guide its activities? If the answer is “no” or “don’t know”, please skip next question.
25. How well aligned are the Group’s goals and objectives with the long and short-range plans of ICANN as a whole?
26. Are there mechanisms in place to address workload issues and requests from the Board/staff?
27. Are these mechanisms sufficient to deal with 'external' requests (not initiated by the GNSO) or should additional mechanisms be explored (and if yes, which ones)?

GNSO Review – 360 Assessment Mock Up

July 1, 2014

28. How relevant are 'external' requests to the work of the Group?
29. How well does the Group incorporate and use technology (e.g., software tools, automation) in conducting its work?
30. Are the scheduled meetings and conference calls appropriate in terms of timeliness, duration, and frequency?
31. Are the tools used by the Group on a regular basis to conduct its work (i.e. email lists, wikis, etc.) effective?
32. How effectively does the Group manage its meetings and conference calls in terms of advance notification?
33. Does the Group have planned agendas?
34. How effectively does the Group prioritize and plan its agenda items?
35. Does the Group encourage discussion during meetings and conference calls?
36. How effectively does the Group manage action items and follow up work?
37. How timely is the documentation and publication of the Group's meetings and conference calls (transcripts, minutes, reports)?
38. How effectively does the Group use and incorporate available expertise in conducting its work?
39. Does the Community have adequate time and sufficiently clear information to offer feedback on the Group's outputs?
40. Are there any additional processes, practices, or procedures that, if implemented, would materially improve the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the Group? What are they?

Outcomes

41. How well do the Group's key outputs meet your expectations?
42. Do the outputs accomplish vital needs?
43. Are the outputs complete and thorough?

GNSO Review – 360 Assessment Mock Up

July 1, 2014

44. Are the outputs implementable?
45. Have the outputs produced desired outcomes?
46. Has the Group completed a sufficient number of decisions?
47. Has the Group completed a sufficient number of proposed policies?
48. Considering the demands of a bottom-up multistakeholder model, is the applicable body able to develop policy recommendations in a timely manner?
49. Has the Group applied any metrics to determine impact of its outputs?

Implementation of prior recommendations

50. Has the GNSO implemented previous review's recommendations?
51. How effective have the overall implemented improvements been in achieving the intended goal?
52. How effective have the NomCom Appointees been?
53. Is the role of NomCom Appointees well understood?
54. How effective has the two-house structure been?
55. Does the house structure make a substantial difference to GNSO policy processes?
56. If you feel that the implemented improvements have not been effective in achieving the intended goal, what have been the impediments?
 - Not enough time for improvements to make a difference.
 - A change in the environment – recommendation is no longer appropriate/applicable.
 - Implemented improvement did not work as planned.
 - Other, please explain

Other

GNSO Review – 360 Assessment Mock Up

July 1, 2014

57. What other input and comments would you like to provide?

DRAFT