

Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) Survey: GROUPS

1. Which SO, AC, GNSO constituent body, or RALO (Structure) is responding?

- SO/AC: ASO
- SO/AC: At-Large
- SO/AC: ccNSO
- SO/AC: GAC
- SO/AC: GNSO
- SO/AC: NomCom
- SO/AC: RSSAC
- SO/AC: SSAC
- GNSO constituent body: Commercial Stakeholder Group
- GNSO constituent body: Commercial Business Users
- GNSO constituent body: Intellectual Property
- GNSO constituent body: Internet Service Providers
- GNSO constituent body: Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group
- GNSO constituent body: Non-Commercial Users
- GNSO constituent body: Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns
- GNSO constituent body: Registrars Stakeholder Group
- GNSO constituent body: Registries Stakeholder Group
- RALOS: AFRALO
- RALOS: APRALO
- RALOS: EURALO
- **RALOS: LACRALO**
- RALOS: NARALO

Please note that all questions in this survey only cover the period from October 2016 (IANA Stewardship Transition) to August 2019.

ALAC COMMENT:

BOARD-RELATED QUESTIONS

2. Please indicate your Structure's satisfaction with the Board's performance overall:

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- No opinion
- **Somewhat dissatisfied**
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 2. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

certainly trying to find its way in a post transition world, with static or declining revenue projections, the disruption of the GDPR and far too many suggestions for organizational reform in the near term. That said, the behavior of the board is of people doing "their best," but not necessarily a reflection of increased accountability to the community. Unfortunately, the optics are just the opposite. A few examples rise to the top. The board unilaterally "paused" the SSR2 for reasons they deemed sufficient but *appeared* to be the result of the review team asking uncomfortable questions and one board member's personal issues with the team's leadership. This is simply NOT something the board would have done pre-transition. The idea of the board shuttering an *accountability* mechanism seems ridiculous and should have been handled differently in consultation with the community. Second, after setting a precedent of accepting ALL recommendations from review teams, the Board chose the very first review after the transition, the CCT Review to suddenly become conservative about organizational reform. While it's true that accepting all of the previous recommendations was a mistake and led to poor implementation, the optics of that sea change at that time were certainly not good. The board needs to take the extra step of involving the community in decisions that, in particular, involve changing expectations around accountability.

3. How does your Structure feel regarding the Board's interaction with your SO/AC?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- No opinion
- **Somewhat dissatisfied**
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 3. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

The At-Large experience with the Board is a mixed bag. On the one hand, the board was very open to modifications to the recommendations of the At-Large Review that didn't make sense and have worked with the ALAC to execute a more specific plan to address the findings.

On the other hand, it is, and to some extent, has always been the case that the organization is mostly focused on the welfare of the industry it supports and less so on the individual end users that ultimately feel the impact of ICANN policies. The entire operational readiness effort surrounding a new round is focused entirely on the convenience and predictability enjoyed by applicants. Again the optics of stressing that first rather than basic operational readiness for growth of the DNS seems backward and gives the appearance that the board more concerned about revenue than a secure and stable internet with high consumer trust.

4. Does your Structure consider the diversity amongst Board members satisfactory?

- Yes
- **No**

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 4. Which areas of diversity do you feel need improvement? (select all diversity factors you think apply):

- **Geographical/regional representation**
- Language
- **Gender**
- Age
- Physical disability
- Diverse skills
- **Stakeholder group or constituency**

Please explain:

With only one seat on the board, there is absolutely no possibility to show any diversity from the perspective of individual end-users -- be it geographical, gender, language or any other. This is unfortunate, as such end users' experiences and input probably vary more than with any other stakeholder group/constituency.

Better representation of the individual end user on the Board would be a good thing. Currently, there is only one board seat occupied by an At-large-selected representative but even if another is not held but a direct representative, selecting one whose primary use of the internet is as an end user would be a good idea.

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 4. Do you have any suggestions for improvements?

At-Large to have two seats on the Board

5. How satisfied is your Structure with the Nominating Committee's selection of Directors for the ICANN Board:

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- No opinion
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 5. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

Answer here (if applicable)

6. Please indicate your Structure's satisfaction with the accountability of the Board under the new accountability mechanisms such as the Empowered Community:

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- **No opinion**

- **Somewhat dissatisfied**
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 6. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

Again, a mixed bag. On the one hand, the Board attempts to react quickly to community disapproval but doesn't behave like an accountable body at the outset. The true mechanisms available to the Empowered Community have not yet been brought to bear so it is difficult to measure their ~~deterrent~~ effectiveness in holding the Board accountable.

7. Rate the mechanisms ensuring the Board's transparency:

- Very effective
- Effective
- **No opinion**
- Somewhat ineffective
- Ineffective

Please answer if you selected 'ineffective' or 'somewhat ineffective' to question 7. If ineffective or somewhat ineffective, do you have any suggestions for improvements?

Answer here (if applicable)

8. How would your Structure rate the importance of the Board implementing the Transparency Recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability WS2?

- **Very important**
- Somewhat important
- No opinion
- Somewhat not important
- Not important

9. Is your Structure satisfied with the Board's decision-taking process?

- Yes
- **No**

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 9. Do you have any suggestions for improvements?

Any expression of satisfaction in the Board's decision-taking process is dependent on an ability to hold the Board accountable for its decisions. While a level of transparency is present in the Board's decision-taking process - i.e. by way of public forums, open meetings, publication of minutes and resolutions as well as access to the records of its various committees - it is important not to conflate transparency with accountability. While transparency is necessary for accountability in many instances, it is certainly not sufficient.

10. Is your Structure aware of the training program for the Board members?

- **Yes**
- No

11. How satisfied is your Structure with the financial information that is provided to the public by ICANN?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- No opinion
- **Somewhat dissatisfied**
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected "very dissatisfied" or "somewhat dissatisfied" to question 11. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

The office of the CFO provides a great deal of information and has begun an excellent process to involve the community in the budget. At the same time, HOW decisions are made is not always obvious and ideally financial information presented to various SO/ACs should be tailored to that Structure/group rather than in the form of general overview. Get to the brass tacks. And it would be an achievement if ICANN financial data can be included in the ITI / ODI framework.

12. How would your Structure rate the usability of the financial information?

- Very useful
- **Somewhat useful**

- No opinion
- **Somewhat not useful**
- Not useful

GAC-RELATED QUESTIONS

13. Should GAC accountability be improved?

- Yes
- **No**

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 13. What would you suggest?

Answer here (if applicable)

14. Should GAC transparency be improved?

- Yes
- **No**

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 14. What would you suggest?

Answer here (if applicable)

15. How satisfied is your Structure with the interactions the GAC has with the Board?

- Very satisfied
- **Satisfied**
- No opinion
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 15. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

Answer here (if applicable)

16. How satisfied is your Structure with the interactions the GAC has with the SO/ACs?

- Very satisfied
- **Satisfied**
- No opinion
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 16. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

Answer here (if applicable)

TRANSPARENCY

17. Has your Structure ever filed a Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) request with ICANN?

- Yes
- **No**

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. What information was your Structure seeking?

Answer here (if applicable)

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. Did your Structure receive the information it requested in full?

- Yes
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. Did the material that your Structure received answer its question?

- Yes

- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. Please feel free to add any other thoughts you have about the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) process.

Answer here (if applicable)

18. Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the icann.org website should be better organized to facilitate searching for specific topics?

- Yes
- No

19. Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the community wiki website should be better organized to facilitate searching on the wiki?

- Yes
- No

20. Is your Structure aware of ICANN's open data mechanisms, including the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) or the Open Data Initiative (ODI), or of ICANN's transparency policies more generally?

- Yes
- No

SO/ACs

21. Are ICANN's mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global Internet community?

- Yes
- No

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 21. Where do you think these shortcomings lie, and how could they be improved?

Again, there is always the danger of serving the needs of the squeaky wheels instead of focusing on those not in the building. Much could be done to improve the organization's exploration of the impact of its decisions on individual internet users.

22. What procedures do you have in place within your Structure for electing NomCom representatives?

The ALAC Rules of Procedure provides for the ALAC to decide on its NomCom representatives, the candidates of whom are recommended by each respective RALO.

23. Do you feel that the NomCom, as currently constituted, is a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy-in?

- Yes
- No

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 23. Where do you think these shortcomings lie, and how could they be improved?

Before NomCom's selections are announced, the ALAC Leadership Team at least, should be consulted on the short-listed candidates for final consideration and feedback (buy-in or not should be noted).

24. Does your Structure have formalized or instituted term limits for membership?

- Yes
- No
- Does not apply

25. Does your Structure have formalized or instituted term limits for leadership?

- Yes
- No

26. What is your Structure's feedback regarding its selection of Board members or non-voting Liaisons to the Board?

Very Positive

27. Does your Structure have a transparency policy?

- Yes
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 27. Please describe or provide a link to any formalized transparency processes/protocols/policy that your Structure uses.

Answer here (if applicable)

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 27. When was the last time it was revised?

Answer here (if applicable)

28. Does your Structure have a conflict of interest policy?

- Yes
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 28. Please describe or provide a link to any formalized conflicts of interest processes/protocols/policy that your Structure uses.

Answer here (if applicable)

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 28. Does this include an evaluation component?

- Yes
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to the question above. Please provide details:

Answer here (if applicable)

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 28. Has your structure ever experienced or perceived challenges related to conflicts of interest?

- Yes
- No

PUBLIC COMMENTS

29. Please rate how effective the current system of Public Comments is for gathering community input.

- Very effective
- Effective (somewhat)
- No opinion
- Somewhat ineffective
- Ineffective

30. Does your Structure believe the concept of Public Comment, as currently implemented, should be re-examined?

- Yes
- No

31. Has your Structure responded to a Public Comment in the last year?

- Yes
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 31. How many responses has your Structure submitted to Public Comments in the last year?

- 1
- 2
- 5 or more
- 10 or more

Please answer if you responded 'no' to question 31. What prevented your Structure from responding?

- Did not have the time to produce a detailed response
- Subject was too complex
- Consultation document was too long
- Language issues

- Time to respond was too short
- Other:

32. Would your Structure respond more often to Public Comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a Survey Monkey or similar format?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- No opinion
- **Disagree**
- Strongly disagree

33. Does your Structure agree that responses made to Public Comments by individuals and external organizations/groups be considered equally?

- Strongly agree
- Agree (somewhat)
- No opinion
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

34. Does your Structure agree that the responses made to Public Comments by SO/ACs have more weight than other comments?

- Strongly agree
- **Agree** (as a general rule, they are more informed but perhaps that should change!)
- No opinion
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

35. Does your Structure agree that the responses made to Public Comments by the Board have more weight than other comments?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- **No opinion**
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

36. How useful are staff reports on Public Comments?

- Very useful
- **Useful**
- No opinion
- Not very useful
- Not useful at all

37. Does your Structure agree that staff reports on Public Comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were accepted and how they were included?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- No opinion
- **Disagree**
- Strongly disagree

38. Does your Structure agree that staff reports on Public Comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were rejected and the reason they were rejected?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- No opinion
- **Disagree**
- Strongly disagree

SUPPORT FOR ICANN DECISIONS

39. Does your Structure believe the Internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board?

- **Yes** (to the extent they understand them)
- No

40. Does your Structure generally support the decisions made by the Board?

- Yes, strongly support
- **Yes, support**
- No opinion
- No, do not support
- No, strongly do not support

POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (PDPs)

41. What role should SO or ACs play in fostering buy-in from their community to ICANN's policy-making?

Hopefully a fairly significant role. Ideally, SOs and ACs should all have some mechanism to reach beyond themselves for a broader consensus whenever possible.

42. How could your structure improve this?

Look into possible improvements in engagement and feedback mechanisms. Current mechanisms are too slow for the decision making processes inside ICANN, and in some cases, too complicated and/or onerous, particularly for public comments. Ideally, socialization of positions and solicitation of feedback would begin long before a public comment process.

SPECIFIC AND ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEWS

43. How would your Structure rate the effectiveness of the specific reviews (ATRT, SSR, RDS) as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws?

- Very effective
- Effective
- No opinion
- **Somewhat ineffective** (to date, implementation has been sub par)
- Ineffective

44. Should specific reviews (ATRT, CCT, RDS, SSR) be reconsidered or amended?

- **Yes** (how recommendations are handled and how often they take place)
- No

45. How would your Structure rate the effectiveness of organizational reviews (those reviewing SO/ACs as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws)?

- Very effective
- **Effective**
- No opinion
- Somewhat ineffective
- Ineffective

46. Should organizational reviews be reconsidered or amended?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you responded "yes" to question 46. Should organizational reviews continue to be undertaken by external consultants?

- **Yes** (probably but consideration should be given to implementation)
- No

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

47. Has your Structure looked at the ICANN Accountability Indicators which can be found at <https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators>?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 47. How would your Structure rate their usefulness overall?

- Very useful
- Useful
- No opinion
- **Not very useful** (again transparency is NOT accountability)

- Not useful at all

Please answer if you responded 'yes' to question 47. How would your Structure rate these for effectiveness in measuring the accountability of ICANN?

- Very effective
- Effective
- No opinion
- **Somewhat ineffective**
- Ineffective

PRIORITIZATION AND RATIONALIZATION OF ACTIVITIES

48. Should the ATRT3 make recommendations about prioritization and rationalization of ICANN activities?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 48. Whose responsibility does your Structure think it should be?

Answer here (if applicable)

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should such recommendations include a process to retire recommendations as it becomes apparent that the community will never get to them or they have been overtaken by other events?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should such recommendations aim to provide a general approach for prioritizing and rationalizing work for ICANN?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should the mechanism for making recommendations on prioritization and rationalization only apply to PDPs, reviews and their recommendations, or include other operational aspects in ICANN?

- **PDPs and Reviews**
- **Include other operational aspects**

Please answer if you selected 'include other operational aspects' to "Should the mechanism for making recommendations on prioritization and rationalization only apply to PDPs, reviews and their recommendations, or include other operational aspects in ICANN?" What does your Structure think these other operational aspects should include?

Operational readiness, compliance, outreach and engagement

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should the community or representative(s) of the community be involved as a decisional participant in any mechanism which makes recommendations for prioritizing and rationalizing work for ICANN?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Do you think the Empowered Community would be a good mechanism for making recommendations on prioritizing and rationalizing if its role was amended to allow this?

- **Yes**
- No

Please answer if you selected 'no' to the question above. Is there an existing structure which could fill this role?

Only alternative is a CCWG and boy are they awful! ;)

END OF SURVEY