



ccNSO Review Draft Interview Questions

Review Objectives

In accordance with the review guidelines, Meridian will assess:

- (i) whether the organization, council or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure,
- (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness; and
- (iii) whether that organization, council or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders.

RWP Comment: This is a very general DoW applicable to all reviews. In order to keep focus on the particular review, we suggest to make the scope more precise:

- (i) whether the ccNSO has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure,
- (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness; and
- (iii) whether the ccNSO is accountable to its members.

Draft Interview Questions

Draft interview questions are outlined below and include questions pertinent to each of the three assessment categories. Italicized questions are meant as follow-up or guidance.

Introduction: *Demographic questions*

1. Name¹
2. Affiliation(s) (gender/region/sector)
3. Involvement and role(s) within ccNSO: please describe your engagement with the ccNSO and your understanding of ccNSO's role within ICANN.
 - a. *Current or former member*

¹ Interviewee names will be kept confidential by the Independent Examiner, and other demographic information will only be reported in the aggregate. Quotes or summaries included in the final report will not be attributed to particular interviewees.

RWP Comment: Members of the ccNSO are ccTLD managers. No ccTLD manager has ever left the ccNSO. Even if management of a ccTLD changes, the ccTLD manager is still a member. Hence, the ccNSO has no former members. We can talk about current or former participants (i.e. individuals, representatives, employees of ccTLD managers), not members (i.e. ccTLD managers).

b. *Length of engagement*

c. *Past or current roles*

4. Are you involved in any other ICANN Supporting Organizations, councils, or committees or processes? If so, which ones?

Objective 1: Whether the ccNSO has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure

RWP Comment: We believe that the interviewees should give their views on the ccNSO, its activities, etc. Whether the ccNSO has a “continuing purpose” or not, is – as indicated above according to review guidelines - for the IE to assess. We believe that IE’s assessment will be based, inter alia, on responses received. In addition, the purpose of the ccNSO is multi-faceted as the ccNSO performs different functions. Questions about **the purpose** (emphasis added) need to be related to the function(s) the respondent has in mind.

5. What are your criteria for assessing whether an organization, council or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure?

RWP Comment: As indicated above, the questions should be focused on the ccNSO, not on other structures. It should also be noted that the constituent parts of the ccNSO are ccNSO Council and membership.

Further, we also believe that this question is too complicated and will distract the interviewees from the main subject of the interview. In addition, if each interviewee gives their own criteria, it will not be possible to carry out a comparative analysis of responses. In the end, it might show that the interviewees do not agree on what “continuing purpose” means and it will not bring us any closer to the evaluation of the ccNSO.

We propose that you develop a list of relevant criteria (could be based on the previous or other reviews) and ask interviewees to give their evaluation of the ccNSO against those criteria and make explicit which function of the ccNSO they have in mind.

6. How would you describe the ccNSO’s purpose in relation to each of the criteria you just outlined?

7. Could you share any examples of entities similar to the ccNSO that meet the criteria you outlined?

RWP Comment: we are not aware of any entities similar to the ccNSO. It is also not entirely clear why would the interviewees assess other entities. If compared to other Supporting Organisations under the ICANN umbrella, the question is only relevant to those who participate in those other SO/ACs.

8. From your perspective, does the ccNSO have a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure? Why or why not? (*Do you have specific suggestions for ccNSO's continuing purpose within the ICANN structure?*)

RWP Comment: we suggest that the interviewees concentrate on the purpose of the ccNSO and the function(s) they consider to be the most relevant to them, leaving the final conclusion to the IE.

Objective 2: *Whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve the ccNSO's effectiveness*

9. What are your criteria for assessing effectiveness of an organization, council, or committee?

RWP Comment: See above with respect to the question No 5.

10. How would you describe the ccNSO's effectiveness in relation to each of the criteria you just outlined?
11. Could you share any examples of entities similar to the ccNSO that meet the effectiveness criteria you outlined?

RWP Comment: See comments above with respect to question No 7

12. Given those criteria and your own experiences and observations what, if any, changes might you suggest in the ccNSO's structure or operations to improve its effectiveness (*keeping in mind that final recommendations should adhere to the SMART criteria*)? And why? (*What would be the intended effectiveness outcomes of those changes?*)

Objective 3: *Whether the ccNSO is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders*

13. What are your criteria for assessing whether an organization, council, or committee is accountable to its constituencies and stakeholders?

RWP Comment: See comments above with respect to question No 5. In addition, please note that the ccNSO accountability is also subject to the CCWG Accountability WS 2 recommendations.

14. How would you describe the ccNSO's accountability in relation to each of the criteria you just outlined?

RWP Comment: See comments above with respect to question No 7

15. Could you share any examples of similar entities that meet the accountability criteria you outlined?
16. From your perspective, is the ccNSO accountable to its constituencies and stakeholders? Why or why not? (*Do you have specific suggestions for how it could improve its accountability?*)

RWP Comment: Again, there is a fundamental question: To whom the ccNSO and other SO/AC are accountable, which is a fundamental issue that was discussed in WS 2 (see comment above) and resulted in ICANN wide recommendations.

Wrap-Up

17. Do you have any final questions or comments to share?

RWP Comment: Please keep in mind that majority of ccNSO members are not native English speakers. For them English is second or third language. They also come from different cultures with different understanding of effectiveness, accountability, etc.