

RECOMMENDATION 5, 9, & 17: WORKING GROUP SELF-ASSESSMENTS	
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT	
Part One – Which ICANN Objective does this meet	
Promote role clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem rooted in the public interest. Also, evolve policy development and governance processes, structures and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective and responsive. See Strategic Plan main web page at: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/strategic-engagement-2013-10-10-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/strategic-engagement-2013-10-10-en</a> .	
Alignment with Strategic Objectives	
<b>Goal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shared understanding by Board, staff and stakeholders of the allocation of responsibilities for design, development and implementation of policy and operational processes.</li> <li>- Shared understanding of the roles, responsibilities and accountability of the Board, staff and stakeholders.</li> <li>- Board, staff, and stakeholders use best practices and exercises appropriate behavioral norms.</li> </ul>
<b>Project/Recommendation</b>	<p><u>Recommendation 5</u>: That, during each Working Group self-assessment, new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 9</u>: That a formal Working Group leadership assessment program be developed as part of the overall training and development program.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 17</u>: That the practice of Working Group self-evaluation be incorporated into the PDP; and that these evaluations should be published and used as a basis for continual process improvement in the PDP.</p>

SCOPE DESCRIPTION
Scope Statement
<p>Recommendation 5 and 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff to provide the GNSO Review Working Group with a proposed modification of the Working Group Self-Assessment Survey to include a) new questions on how Working Group member input has been solicited and considered and; b) a new assessment survey for Working Group leadership.</li> <li>2. Based on the proposed modifications the GNSO Review Working Group to determine if revisions are necessary to the GNSO Working Group Guidelines and, if so, draft them for public comment and then present them for approval to the GNSO Council.</li> </ol> <p>Recommendation 17:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The GNSO Review Working Group to review current procedures for self-evaluation in the PDP Working Group Guidelines and will work with staff on possible modifications, which will be published for public comment and then provided to the GNSO Council for approval.</li> <li>2. Following GNSO Council approval, staff to amend the GNSO Operating Procedures with the new revisions.</li> </ol> <p>The GNSO Review Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented.</p>
Out of Scope
The above scope is sufficiently clear.

<b>Assumptions</b>
None.
<b>Deliverables</b>
None.

**OPTION ANALYSIS**

None were considered or were necessary to be considered.

**SOLUTION**

Recommendation 5: The Working Group Self-Assessment currently includes the question, “How long have you been actively involved with ICANN?” This provides information about whether the respondent is new to ICANN or a more experienced member of the community. Section 4 of the Working Group Self-Assessment asks respondents to rate on a scale of 1 to 7 their personal level of engagement in helping the WG accomplish its mission, personal level of fulfillment, and willingness to serve in future groups. There is also a text box for respondents to provide comments. Staff recommends adding a second free text field to this page with the question, “How was your input solicited and considered by the Working Group?” While all respondents will be prompted to answer this question, those analyzing the results will be able to filter and view responses only from newcomers if they choose to do so.

Recommendation 7:  
 Section 2 of the Working Group Self-Assessment asks respondents to rate on a scale of 1 to 7 effectiveness of participation climate, behavior norms, decision-making methodology, and session/meeting planning. Section 3 requests input on the same scale regarding effectiveness of the primary mission and quality of outputs/deliverables. Section 2 and 3 also have free text fields for comments. Staff suggests adding an additional question to Section 2 and 3. For Section 2: “How did performance of the Working Group leadership (Chair/Co-Chairs/Vice-Chairs) impact effectiveness with respect to norms, operations, logistics, and decision-making? Please provide examples.” For Section 3: “How did performance of the Working Group leadership (Chair/Co-Chairs/Vice-Chairs) impact effectiveness with respect to products and outputs? Please provide examples.”

Recommendation 17: Discussion of the Working Group Self-Assessment is currently included in Section 7.0 of the Working Group Guidelines. Use of this assessment is standard practice in PDPs and other Working Groups in the GNSO. In the self-assessment questionnaire, members are asked a series of questions about the team’s inputs, processes (e.g., norms, decision-making, logistics), and outputs as well as other relevant dimensions and participant experiences. Processes regarding the self-assessment questionnaire are included in Working Group Charters under 6.2.4.4 Closure and Working Group Self-Assessment. Working Group Self-Assessment results are posted on the Working Group wiki and are available to be reviewed by the GNSO Council, staff, and community members and acted upon if results of the survey warrant follow up action. Therefore, this recommendation has been implemented.

No updates are needed to the Working Group Guidelines to modify the Working Group Self-Assessment template as described above.

**GNSO Review Working Group Determination:**

[staff suggestion]: The Working Group has reviewed the suggested changes to the Working Group Self-Assessment questionnaire addressing recommendations 5, 7 and 17 and with these changes deems the recommendations to be implemented.

**KEY DEPENDENCIES**

None.

**RISK IDENTIFICATION**

None.

**KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

It is not clear to staff whether a KPI applies in the implementation of these recommendations.

**NECESSARY TO PROCEED****Next Phase Activities/Resources**

Staff resources.

**APPROVERS**

Name	Title	Approval Status	Date
GNSO Review Working Group			

**REVISION HISTORY**

Date	Version	Description	Author
21 November 2017	V1	Original Draft.	Emily Barabas, Senior Policy Specialist

**Attachments, as applicable:**

- None