GNSO Constituency Survey

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by ICANN Policy Staff
policy-staff@icann.org

28 January 2009

Table of Contents

Background and Introduction

This section contains information concerning the purpose of the survey, relevant background and references, as well as discussion of general design parameters/principles that informed its development and presentment.

Overview

In its final report on GNSO Improvements[1], the Board Governance Committee (BGC) identified a number of areas that will require significant development including standardizing and streamlining constituency operations, processes, and administrative support. In adopting the specific BGC recommendations during the summer of 2008, the Board is expecting that all constituencies will:

- Have access to a basic "toolkit" of administrative support services,

- Support the creation and implementation of a publicly accessible member database (consistent with individual privacy considerations);

- Have available a package of education and training programs supporting both knowledge and skill development needs; and

- Abide by a common set of participation rules and operating procedures

To assist the GNSO's Operations Steering Committee (OSC) and the implementation work teams that will be chartered in early 2009, the Policy Staff launched a project in September 2008 to collect community information about the above target areas both for benchmarking purposes and to generate data that could lead, ultimately, to detailed and actionable recommendations. Specifically, an online survey instrument was designed to collect individual constituency member opinions intended to inform the community's discussions concerning how those BGC recommendations might be implemented.

Survey Development and Design

The survey was designed and conducted using the Big Pulse online system (www.bigpulse.com). A first draft of proposed topics/questions was developed by the ICANN Policy Staff in July 2008 and subsequently refined in September 2008 during which time questions were added, reformulated, and, in certain cases, deleted.

Once the questionnaire was substantially completed and approved in draft form (early October 2008), two testing periods were structured during which we asked participants to evaluate both the questionnaire content as well as the online system's mechanics and overall ease-of-use.

---

[1] *Report can be referenced at: http://www.icann.org/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf*

- Test Period 1: 13-15 October 2008
  Participants: Policy Staff (L. Gasster, R. Hoggarth, K. Bour-Consultant Developer)

- Test Period 2: 16-21 October 2008
  Participants: Avri Doria, Philip Sheppard, and Wolf-Ulrich Knoben
  (Note: Steve Metalitz also provided content input; however, he did not test the online system during this period)

Feedback from both testing rounds was used to redraft certain questions for clarity and to improve the online presentation, instructions, and other elements to make it as user friendly as possible.

General Design Principals Followed in This Survey

- Anonymity: no individual responses have been or will be published.

- Freedom to Skip Questions: based upon testing feedback, respondents were unconstrained in answering questions, which means that they were permitted to skip questions and/or elements within individual questions. As a result, the reader will note that the number of actual responses to any particular question may be less than the total number of participants in the survey.

- Adding Placards: for questions that contained suggested answers (or "placards" in Big Pulse terminology), respondents were invited to offer additional write-in items that were then approved/edited for publication by the Survey Administrator and made visible to subsequent survey participants. A total of fifteen write-in placards were captured and approved during the course of the survey.

- Written Feedback/Comments: every question in the survey provided an option to offer additional unconstrained textual input. In addition, although no participants took advantage of the opportunity, there was a final feedback/comment section concerning the overall survey experience presented after completing the last question[2].

Survey Announcement and Participation

The survey was formally announced via email (from Denise Michel) to Constituency leaders on 23 October 2008 (see Appendix A). The online system was available for respondents beginning 27 October 2008 and, after a twelve day extension from the original end date (2 December), it was officially closed effective 14 December 2008.

A total of 35 individuals registered in the survey cluster shown by Constituency below:

---

[2] *Three participants used this final feedback area to communicate a note to the Survey Administrator. Those comments did not bear on the survey's content or design and, thus, were excluded from this report.*

Constituency	Registrations	No Answers Provided	Net Participants
Registry (RyC)	5		5
Registrar (RrC)	5		5
Business (BC)	10	4	6
Internet Services Provider (ISPC)	1		1
Intellectual Property (IPC)	6		6
Non-Commercial Users (NCUC)	8	1	7
Totals………………..	**35**	**5**	**30**

As shown above, five individuals did not complete <u>any</u> questions. They were contacted individually by the ICANN Survey Administrator and, in all cases, they reported having insufficient time to complete the survey initially, including not saving any partial answers, and were unable to return to the survey before it concluded. Each individual was specifically asked if he/she needed assistance, but none reported any technical difficulties with the online system or any other dissatisfaction with the process. As a result of this circumstance, the official participant count for reporting purposes has been adjusted to **30**.

Survey Screenshots

For readers who wish to see how the survey appeared in the Big Pulse online system, screenshots of the introduction and registration pages as well as the individual questions are presented in Appendix B.

Raw Survey Data

After the survey period expired, a spreadsheet was created using report data downloaded from the Big Pulse online system. The sixteen (16) individual questions and the actual voting tabulations are presented in Appendix C. Please note that the there are two tabs in the Excel workbook:
- Tab 1 displays the raw questionnaire results
- Tab 2 contains individual unedited comments provided by survey respondents

About This Report

The pages that follow contain a summary of the final sixteen (16) questions presented to GNSO survey respondents. Although it was our original intention to provide survey findings by Constituency, given the modest and unbalanced participation levels, from a low of 1 to a high of 7 (see table above), it was decided that data summarization and analysis would only be meaningful at the aggregate GNSO level. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, displaying results by Constituency might compromise anonymity, especially in the case where only one participant registered (ISPC). For these reasons, no attempt has been made to extract or report survey data by Constituency including in Appendix C.

There were 4 main sections as shown in the Table of Contents (above) and one or more questions in each one. For each section, we show its heading and any background material that was originally provided to participants to help them understand the context for the series of questions that followed.

The general report format for each question is as follows:

- Question: restatement of the original question asked along with any specific instructions (e.g. rating scale) that pertained.

- Results: summary of the findings based upon interpretation of the raw data contained in Appendix C. In general, the report's position is to highlight only those responses that received a majority (> 50%) vote of the respondents. Where scales (e.g. 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High) were used in answering a question, this report recognizes only the combination of <u>favorable</u> responses received, namely 4's and 5's. The reader is invited to consult the raw data (Appendix C) if interested in the percentage of votes allocated to each of the five scale elements.

- Table: for all questions, respondents were provided an initial set of elements, items, or categories to select or rate. In each table, we display all of those original categories as well as any that participants suggested (write-ins) along with the number of votes received and the percentage (votes/respondents) achieved. To make it easier to identify the categories that were most favored, we re-sorted each table, high to low, based on voting percentage; therefore, readers should note that the categories are not in the same order as shown in Appendix C.

- Feedback/Comments: participant comments for each question were extracted verbatim from the online survey system and are presented unedited except for obvious punctuation and spelling.

- Summary: the last sub-section for each question contains a conclusion statement based upon the findings shown in the table. Again, the report's position is to highlight only those answers, responses, and/or elements/categories that received a majority favorable vote (scored 4 or 5) by respondents.

1.0 Constituency Toolkit

Background: ICANN Staff currently provides a variety of professional and administrative services to the GNSO and Council. At present, the various GNSO constituencies are generally left to develop their own support systems and processes. Consistent with the adopted recommendations of the Board Governance Committee (BGC), all official GNSO constituency groups are to be provided with a similar "toolkit" of services.

Question 1.1

Respondents were asked to indicate the relative importance (Scale: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High) of providing 12 individual services to all officially recognized ICANN constituencies.

Result: As shown in the table below (ranked high to low by percentage), of the 12 Staff services presented, 1-11 were scored either "4-Moderate" or "5-High" importance by a majority (> 14.5) of the respondents.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 29	Votes	Pct.
1	Assembling background and reference materials for Working Groups	26	90%
2	Support for organizing face-to-face meetings (e.g. date/time, location, equipment, telephone bridge and, in certain venues, arranging accommodations)	25	86%
3	Support for organizing teleconferences (schedule, announce, monitor)	25	86%
4	Support for the Policy Development Process (PDP) by drafting materials, under constituency direction and for constituency consideration (e.g. statements), tracking deadlines, summarizing policy debates	24	83%
5	Preparing minutes of formal constituency meetings and teleconferences	18	62%
5	Assisting volunteer leaders by identifying/scheduling liaison contacts within ICANN	18	62%
5	Constituency web site hosting and content maintenance (i.e. keeping site up to date with relevant documents and information)	18	62%
8	Provide grants/funding for constituencies to provide their own support	17	61%
9	Organizational record keeping (e.g. statements of interest, archives)	16	55%
9	Maintaining up-to-date member contact info, mailing/discussion lists	16	55%
9	MP3 recordings of meetings	16	55%
12	Assisting in conducting elections for constituency officers	11	38%

Feedback/Comments:

There was 1 individual comment offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"In my experience, it will be more effective initially to have the support provided directly by the ICANN staff, since there will be economies of scale on many of these*

functions. The present approaches are not very predictable in their delivery of services, and the reality is that supervision of the staff who do these functions will still be a burden to the constituency to supervise. Centralization of support that ICANN provides to constituencies should be given very strong consideration."

Summary: A majority of respondents appear to favor having the ICANN Staff perform certain functions for constituencies with the top four services (> 75%) involving assembling reference materials for Working Groups, organizing meetings and teleconferences, and supporting the PDP by drafting materials, tracking deadlines, and summarizing policy debates.

2.0 Constituency Database

Background: Recommendations adopted by the Board call for the establishment of a centralized registry (or database), consistent with individuals' privacy considerations, that is up-to-date, publicly accessible, and contains members of GNSO constituencies as well as others involved in GNSO issues (even if not part of a constituency, e.g. PDP Working Group participants). The intention is to advance transparency and support community interaction among other potential uses. The BGC WG specified one intended use of the database -- creation of "GNSO discussion lists."

Question 2.1

Respondents were asked in what ways could/would the establishment of a centralized constituency database (or registry) be beneficial or useful (Scale: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High)

Result: As shown in the table below (ranked high to low by percentage), of the 6 ways that a centralized constituency database might be utilized, 5 were rated either "4-Moderate" or "5-High" by a majority of the respondents. Please note that, for a few of these categories, there were 27 total votes versus 28 or 29 for others, which means that one or more respondents chose to skip certain line items, which was permitted in the survey design. The percentages reflect the correct denominator for each of the categories except #6, which is explained in a footnote.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 27-29	Votes	Pct.
1	Promoting constituency transparency	23	79%
2	Facilitating administration of constituency membership or member delegates	20	69%
3	GNSO discussion list(s)	18	67%
4	Locating/finding colleagues	16	57%
4	Address book accessible from the internet	16	57%
6	Facilitating Working Group creation	1	***[3]

---

[3] This item (or placard) was added by a participant late in the survey period and would not have been seen by a majority of respondents; therefore, its selection rate should be understood in that context.

There were 4 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"I doubt this will be a useful function. We should be seeking to make participation as lightweight as possible, not necessarily requiring all participants to be supplying contact data accessible to all."*

2) *"I am assuming that there will be strict privacy protection. I note that ICANN strips off the email address details for those who post emails to the public forum. The approach of a 'directory' raises privacy issues and it may be that ICANN will also encounter challenges with potential disclosure of personally identifiable information. Has this been researched already? It is not clear to me that this has been carefully thought through, so I am reserving input to some degree. A list of members and affiliations is one thing; complete contact details is another."*

3) *"There needs to be a distinction between organizational memberships and individual memberships. It appears that the BGC assumed individual memberships in constituencies, but many constituencies actually define members as organizations. Therefore, any centralized registry would probably need to include both types of members and, in the case of organizational members, would need to also include individual participants (delegates) for those organizations. Personal privacy will need to be protected. Individuals should probably have the right to control what information is public."*

4) *"It could also promote better cross-constituency interaction, for example, by replacing/supplementing the current GA mailing list with a list consisting only of members from actual constituencies."*

Summary: A majority of respondents indicated that a centralized constituency database (or registry) would have utility especially in promoting transparency, administering membership, facilitating discussion lists, locating colleagues, and enabling easy internet access to addresses.

Question 2.2

Respondents were presented with 16 categories/fields and asked to mark which of them should be collected and made publicly available as part of each individual database record. Respondents could select any number of the fields shown as well as write-in new ones for consideration (#7 was a participant write-in placard).

Result: Of the 29 individuals who responded to this question, the table below (ranked high to low by percentage) shows that only the first 5 categories/fields received more than a majority of votes (> 14.5).

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 29	Votes	Pct.
1	Name	28	97%
1	ICANN Constituency affiliation	28	97%
3	Function/role within constituency (e.g. Chairperson, Member)	27	93%
4	Professional Information (e.g. company, title, bus address/telephone, bus email)	24	83%
5	Time Zone	17	59%
6	Other organizational affiliations	13	45%
7	Preferred method of contact (e.g. email, phone, Skype)	9	31%
8	Personal information (e.g. address/telephone/email)	8	28%
8	Education and Training	8	28%
8	Experience	8	28%
11	Photos and images	7	24%
12	Honors/awards	4	14%
12	Professional certifications/accreditations	4	14%
14	Other address, telephone, contact information, personal web site	3	10%
15	None	2	7%
16	Instant chat/messaging accounts	1	3%

Feedback/Comments:

There were 4 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"Company, business affiliation, email should be sufficient."*

2) *"Designations above assume that the database will go forward, notwithstanding my general aversion to it."*

3) *"Again, keep this as simple as possible -- name, e-mail, constituency identification -- with any other fields optional."*

4) *"I was distressed to see many of these suggestions. ICANN is not becoming FaceBook or LinkedIN, I would hope. By even proposing that you would gather information that belongs in a bio, or c.v., such as professional certifications, etc., this seems to be a significant over extension of the purpose of having a simple list of the members, and the constituency affiliation. I would suggest that the name, title, and affiliation are suitable, and even the time zone, but oppose listing experience, education and training, and similar content. I suppose you can gather contact details, but you must have a disclosure statement to the individual that ICANN accepts no liability for how this information is misused. I'd advise against gathering it. Within a constituency, that can be gathered and published as a private membership directory."*

5) *"Address & telephone should probably be considered separately from email. Personal email address may need to be a required field if there is no business email although protection of privacy in that regard should also be possible."*

6) "I assume email addresses will be hidden behind a CAPTCHA-protected contact form, instead of posting the actual email address, to reduce spam."

Summary: A majority of respondents preferred that only essential information be maintained in a centralized database including name, constituency affiliation, role/function, professional information, and time zone.

Question 2.3

Respondents were asked to select any additional categories/fields, not selected above, that should be optional, that is, available for public disclosure solely at the option of each member.

Result: Of the 27 individuals who responded to this question, the table below (ranked high to low by percentage) shows that only the first category received more than a majority of votes (> 13.5).

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 27	Votes	Pct.
1	Instant chat/messaging accounts	14	52%
2	Other address, telephone, contact information, personal web site	12	44%
3	Photos and images	10	37%
4	Personal information (e.g. address/telephone/email)	9	33%
5	Experience	8	30%
5	Professional certifications/accreditations	8	30%
7	Education and Training	7	26%
7	Honors/awards	7	26%
7	Preferred method of contact (e.g., email, phone, Skype)	7	26%
10	Other organizational affiliations	6	22%
11	None	5	19%
12	Professional Information (e.g. company, title, bus address/telephone, bus email)	4	15%
12	Time Zone	4	15%
14	Name	0	0%
14	ICANN Constituency affiliation	0	0%
14	Function/role within constituency (e.g. Chairperson, Member)	0	0%

Feedback/Comments:

There were 2 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) "A particular individual may be speaking on behalf of 10, 100, or 1000 others in the organization that has delegated them to participate in ICANN activities. There should be an opportunity to note this."

2) "My concerns about gathering information that is not about one's membership in a constituency has been stated."

Summary: The majority of respondents indicated that the only <u>additional</u> category or field that should be included in a centralized constituency database should be instant chat/messaging accounts. Note that the bottom 5 fields were already selected for inclusion by a majority in the previous question; therefore, we would expect them not to be picked as additional fields in this response.

Question 2.4

Respondents were asked, among 7 choices presented, which position/title should own/control/manage the information database.

<u>Result</u>: This question required participants to select only one of the suggested titles/positions although additional entries could be submitted (#3 was a participant write-in). The first position/title shown (Rnk=1) received the highest number of votes across the respondent pool; however, no single category received a majority (> 14.5) of votes.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question	29	100%
1	GNSO Secretariat	10	34%
2	ICANN Staff	6	21%
3	ICANN Staff and Constituency Delegee	5	17%
4	Constituency Secretariats or other appointee/team	3	10%
5	No one	2	7%
5	No opinion	2	7%
7	GNSO Council appointee	1	3%

<u>Feedback/Comments</u>:

There were 4 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"GNSO + Constituency Secretariats should own the related data."*

2) *"Should be permitted to add/edit data relating solely to own constituency members."*

3) *"Your question about 'ownership' adds additional complexities to this. I am comfortable with the GNSO secretariat managing it."*

4) *"I would suggest that a standardized format should be required. Since the GNSO Secretariat supports the policy council, I have suggested a broader term of 'ICANN Staff'. However, the rules for what is gathered and displayed will have to be acceptable to the individual, and we must recognize that parties from Europe, for instance, will have very different expectations than perhaps someone from another region in terms of privacy expectations."*

Summary: As noted above, no single category received a majority vote; however, the GNSO Secretariat was the most prevalent position selected (34%). We note that "ICANN Staff and Constituency Delegee" was submitted ("write-in" placard) by a participant during the survey period and it received 17% of the votes. This answer subsumes the "ICANN Staff" category (those individuals might not have seen this additional option when they voted). The two categories added together received 11 votes, which would have placed it first, however, still not reaching a majority.

Question 2.5

Respondents were asked how information in the database should be added/updated/deleted.

Result: As shown in the table below (ranked high to low by percentage), the first category received 10 votes; however, no single category received a majority (> 14.5) of the 29 respondents.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 29	Votes	Pct.
1	Participants should voluntarily add/edit/delete information, as appropriate	10	34%
2	Participant and administrator	8	28%
3	Constituencies should collect information and control insertion/update/deletion	5	17%
4	Administrator/manager should collect information and control insertion/update/deletion	5	17%
5	No opinion	1	3%

Feedback/Comments:

There were 2 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"First, we need to determine what the level of information is that is gathered and displayed. Perhaps ICANN's conference registration database would provide the needed ability to gather/update a database."*

2) *"It would be very helpful if a common interface was provided for constituencies to manage this function."*

Summary: As with the previous question, no option received a clear majority of the votes; however if the first two categories are taken together (both mentioning "participants"), then one could reasonably assume that over 60% believe that individual participants should be able to add/change/delete information in the database.

Question 2.6

Respondents were asked what concerns, recommendations, or suggestions they have, if any, relating to how database information privacy should be protected.

Result: This question was intended to elicit additional feedback/comments and 8 respondents offered to provide input to this topic (see below).

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 27	Votes	Pct.
1	None to offer	19	70%
2	Comments below	8	30%

Feedback/Comments:

There were 8 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"Easiest to do if you don't even ask for any "non-professional" information."*

2) *"Privacy concerns and relevance of data...will it be updated? What about deleting info? How hard will that be?"*

3) *"Keep information collected to a minimum and only what is required for the purpose. (And what exactly is the purpose by the way? This should be clearly stated at the time of information collection. The statement above about "other potential uses" is a red flag to data protection problems in many countries). I believe this entire chapter needs a lot more thought."*

4) *"ICANN should respect the privacy of Internet users to the highest possible degree. Privacy should be the over-arching concern for this endeavor for it to succeed."*

5) *"Is obviously a critical are and ICANN should avoid gathering info that is not necessary, so that they will have less exposure in event of breach."*

6) *"No one can opt out of the basic information to make the database useful, that is a term of their participation, but each participant should be able to modify and/or limit additional data."*

7) *"Be sure to have data privacy information clearly displayed and get confirmation from participant for display of any information. Be sure to take into consideration the highest level of privacy laws and confirm requirements for displaying any data."*

8) *"Individuals should have to opt-in for any public display of optional information."*

Summary: A majority of respondents elected not to provide any additional feedback in the way of supplementary comments. Of the 8 who did offer input, the opinions vary, but it is clear that information privacy represents a concern and should be managed and controlled sensitively.

3.0 Knowledge & Skill Training

Background: Recommendations adopted by the Board commit to supporting the involvement of knowledgeable, experienced, and skilled participants in the GNSO. The Board Governance Committee Working Group (BGC WG) recommended that ICANN develop reference materials, training opportunities, and learning tools to help ensure that GNSO leaders and other constituents have the fundamental knowledge and skill sets necessary to effectively engage with the community on important policy matters.

Question 3.1

Respondents were asked, for each of the 13 knowledge curriculum topics (#10 and #13 were participant write-ins), to rate each one's relative importance (Scale: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High).

Result: As shown in the table below, ranked high to low by percentage, 11 of the 13 knowledge topics presented were scored "4-Moderate" or "5-High" by a majority of the respondents to this question. Please note that, for a few of these categories, there were 27 total votes versus 28 for others, which means that one or more respondents chose to skip certain line items, which was permitted. The percentages reflect the correct denominator for each of the categories except #13, which is explained in a footnote.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 27-28	Votes	Pct.
1	Functions of registrars and registries	23	82%
2	The Domain Name System (DNS) and how it works	22	79%
2	Overview of Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), registry agreements, and compliance	22	79%
4	Briefings on pending policy issues	21	75%
4	Add-on courses that explain emerging technical issues such as registrant abuse concerns, fast flux hosting, et al.	21	75%
4	ICANN primer including organization, community, bylaws, policy development, constituency groups (e.g. SO's, AC's), staff functions, and processes (e.g. bottom-up consensus), and intro to public meetings	21	75%
7	DNS-related technologies, trends and markets	19	70%
7	Policy background course on history and significance of key issues (e.g. new gTLDs, IDNs, WHOIS)	19	68%
7	GNSO organization, structure, responsibilities, and processes (e.g. PDP, WG, SC)	19	68%
10	ICANN staff member duties	18	64%
11	Internet fundamentals including TCP/IP and network protocols	14	52%
11	Interaction and dependencies between GNSO and GAC	14	50%
13	Relationship with ALAC	1	***[4]

---

[4] *This item (or placard) was added by a participant late in the survey period and would not have been seen by a majority of respondents; therefore, its selection rate should be understood in that context.*

Feedback/Comments:

There were 5 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"In connection with presenting ICANN staff member duties, short and long term ICANN targets should be covered too (strategy)."*

2) *"ICANN is an extremely different organization to "learn". (For example, I don't know how I would go about becoming active in ALAC). A "primer" would be extremely user for new participants."*

3) *"It is not ICANN's job to train people on the Internet and IP protocols. A functional understanding of the DNS and how it works is needed for policy development."*

4) *"Actually, all of these are valuable, but the level of detail would have to be addressed to ensure that it is appropriate. They would need to know something about all of these items and should have resources available to get more detail when needed."*

5) *"DNS training only needs to be at a fairly basic level, but minimal understanding of the DNS is essential."*

Summary: A majority of respondents indicated that 11 of the 13 knowledge curriculum topics presented are either of moderate or high importance as training subjects for GNSO participants. Training on the functions of Registrars/Registries, the DNS, the RAA, an ICANN primer, as well as pending policy and emergent technical policy issues received 75% or more votes.

Question 3.2

Respondents were asked what types of skill development programs they believed would be useful (Scale: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High) for ICANN to offer GNSO participants.

Result: As shown in the table below (ranked high to low by percentage), only the first of the 8 development programs listed received a majority (> 14) of votes.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 28	Votes	Pct.
1	Project management for team leaders	15	54%
2	How to build and nurture a Working Group	13	46%
2	Leadership/chairmanship in a voluntary organization	13	46%
4	Negotiation, compromise, and consensus	12	43%
4	Cross cultural interactions, awareness, and sensitivities	12	43%
6	Individual behavior in groups: what works and why	8	29%
7	Role of inferences, values, and judgments on group dynamics	7	25%
8	Interpersonal communications	6	21%

There were 4 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"I believe that all of the above skill sets should be already had for GNSO participants. ICANN is not a university :-)"*

2) *"Why compromise is an essential component in accomplishing universal ICANN goals."*

3) *"Most of these options sound like general indoctrination. Any such efforts should be focused on the specific skills useful to GNSO PDP. Obviously, the first topic would embrace some of the more general issues listed farther down, but in the context of a GNSO WG."*

4) *"I have strong concerns about ICANN thinking that it its job is to do personal development/versus training on the specifics of participating in ICANN's policy development process. ICANN should limit and focus its 'training' on the specifics that are central to actually acting within the Policy Development process. ICANN is not a professional skills development organization and should not take this role on. Its skills development should be focused on PDP process training; understanding the bylaws; how ICANN's Working Groups work; and what the rules and options for setting up and supporting. A training manual on different options to deal with resolution of different views -- small drafting groups, etc. can be provided in a written form. However, we really need to understand that we are not developing the next generation of leaders. IF there is a problem with some individuals abusing their leadership role, professional development is not the solution to deal with that. A clearly written manual with roles responsibilities, and the rule for removing an elected or appointed leader should be developed, with the input of a group of members of the community."*

Summary: Other than the category, "Project Management for Team Leaders," no other skill development area listed received a majority of votes. Most respondents to this question were generally not in favor of ICANN taking on skill development training except, arguably, where narrowly applied to the Policy Development Process including Working Groups.

Question 3.3

Respondents were presented with 7 training delivery system options (#1-ICANN meetings and #7 were participant write-ins) and asked to score each one's perceived usefulness (Scale: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High).

Result: As shown in the table below, ranked high to low based on percentage, the first 3 delivery methods received a majority of votes (> 14). Please note that, for a few of these categories, there were 26 total votes versus 27-28 for others, which means that one or more respondents chose to skip certain line items, which was permitted. The percentages reflect the correct denominator for each of the categories except #7, which is explained in a footnote.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 26-28	Votes	Pct.
1	ICANN meetings	18	67%
1	Distance learning-live instructor (e.g. webinar)	18	64%
3	Face-to-face session (e.g. classroom, presentation, tutorial)	15	58%
4	Workshops (e.g. hands-on, lab, practicum)	11	41%
5	Pre-recorded seminars (e.g. CD, DVD, web)	9	32%
6	Continuing/structured (e.g. prelim/fundamental courses, follow-ups, advanced, upgrade)	8	31%
7	Web-based coursework	1	***[5]

Feedback/Comments:

There were 3 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"Face to face time is so limited it should not generally be devoted to this..."*

2) *"If the training is about use of ICANN resources, rules/procedures, etc., orientation courses/programs may be useful. However, ICANN really needs to limit what it trains/educates on to the substance of its work, not take on capacity development and professional development."*

3) *"There needs to be a variety of training modes to accommodate the varying needs of participants. In-person classes can be excellent, but lots of people will not be able to take advantage of those. Multiple times for in-person training sessions should be offered at ICANN regional meetings."*

Summary: Among the alternatives presented, a majority of respondents indicated that only the following training delivery methods should be employed: ICANN meetings, distance learning (e.g. webinars), and face-to-face sessions.

Question 3.4a

Respondents were asked if they thought that a demonstration of certain skills, professional background, and/or experience should be encouraged before individuals assume leadership positions within the GNSO.

Result: As shown in the table below, a majority of respondents voted "Yes" to this question.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question	28	100%
1	Yes	15	54%
2	No	10	36%
3	No Opinion	2	7%
4	Neither	1	4%

---

[5] *This item (or placard) was added by a participant late in the survey period and would not have been seen by a majority of respondents; therefore, its selection rate should be understood in that context.*

Feedback/Comments:

There were 4 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"What does leadership position mean? Council member, or council chair only? I don't think that anybody would assume council chair position unless she/he is not sure about her/his capability."*

2) *"Though it may be difficult to establish hard and fast criteria...."*

3) *"I strongly recommend that there be clearly identified skills and experience [hardly suitable to identify professional background for being a volunteer leader] that are 'preferred' or 'strongly preferred'. I do not see how that can be required nor do I understand how ICANN would require a 'demonstration'."*

4) *"Demonstration of skills is ideal but, early in the WG model, we likely will have to use some leaders who have had minimal opportunity to demonstrate skills in the GNSO. In those cases, leadership experience in other fora should be considered. If at all possible, in cases where skills have not been previously demonstrated, applicable training may need to be a prerequisite before assuming a leadership role, although, we will probably have to be somewhat flexible on this in the early stages."*

Summary: A majority of respondents (54%) agreed that certain skills, relevant background, and/or experience should be demonstrated before individuals assume leadership positions within the GNSO.

Question 3.4b

Those respondents who answered "Yes" to the previous question (15) were asked, for each position identified, to rate the relative importance (Scale: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High) of subjecting it to minimum credentials and qualifications.

Result: As shown in the table below, ranked high to low by percentage, the first 4 positions were identified by a majority as being important enough to warrant having minimum credentials and qualifications established and imposed.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question	15	100%
1	Chair of PDP Working Group	13	87%
2	Vice-Chairs of PDP Working Groups	12	80%
3	Chairman of the GNSO Council	14	93%
4	Vice-Chairs of GNSO Council	13	87%
5	Members of the GNSO Council	7	47%
6	Officers of GNSO Constituencies	5	33%

Feedback/Comments:

There were 2 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"I rated the last two lower only to indicate that while it is important to apply these criteria, the ability of the constituency members to select whomever they choose to lead their constituencies and to represent them on GNSO Council should be constrained to the minimum extent possible."*

2) *"Constituencies should make their own decision as to what qualifications are important to their group for their officers."*

Summary: Of the positions mentioned, a majority of respondents indicated that only the f PDP Working Group Chair and Vice-Chair(s) as well as GNSO Council Chair and Vice-Chair(s) should be subjected to minimum credentials and qualifications.

Question 3.5

Respondents were presented with 7 alternatives (#5 and #7 were participant write-ins) for training at ICANN meetings and asked to select which <u>one</u> they thought to be most appropriate.

Result: As shown in the table below, none of the presented categories received a majority of votes by respondents to this question.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 28	Votes	Pct.
1	1 day	6	21%
1	½ day	6	21%
1	No time should be allocated	6	21%
4	Evening session (2-3 hour)	5	18%
5	A mix of time options	4	14%
6	2 days	1	4%
7	No opinion	0	0%

Feedback/Comments:

There were 5 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"Which time slot could be made available for GNSO training? The GNSO is already starting its meetings before the official ICANN meeting!"*

2) *"See previous answer. As much of this as possible should be conducted online by teleconference or at special face to face sessions, not general ICANN meetings."*

3) *"Training should be before or after the ICANN meetings."*

4) *"I believe that adding a day at the beginning or end would be the best approach and allow people to participate fully in the other aspects of the meetings."*

5) *"It would be okay to have a day set aside for training courses, but other training options should be provided during the week (e.g. evening sessions, 1/2 day at the end, etc."*

Summary: All of the options presented in this question received < 50% of the votes; therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that a majority of respondents do not believe that training should be held <u>during</u> ICANN general meetings. One of the comments suggested an option of holding training before or after ICANN meetings; however, another respondent noted that there are already sessions scheduled before the meetings for other purposes.

Question 3.6

Respondents were asked, by rating importance (Scale: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High) if GNSO training objectives should be extended to include the additional elements shown in the table below (#2 was a participant write-in).

Result: As shown in the table below (ranked high to low by percentage), only the first additional training objective received a majority (> 14) of votes.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 27-28	Votes	Pct.
1	Provision of internet training material	18	64%
2	Training available in multiple languages	14	50%
3	Availability of locally/regionally based on-site tutors and/or trainers	7	26%
4	Formal accreditation/certification for training completed	5	19%
5	Collaboration with local universities or other institutions	3	11%

Feedback/Comments:

There were 2 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"Does the first sentence indicate that the decision has already been made to make this a formal certification program with some affiliation with universities? Waste of time in my view."*

2) *"If training materials are provided on specific tasks associated with the work of the GNSO policy development process, then this should be in multiple languages. Internet should always be spelled with a "I", by the way, since the use of 'internet' is used by some to suggest that there is not a single authoritative Internet. Obviously, ICANN and its supporters are strongly committed to a single authoritative root. Use of Internet accessible materials should, of course, be part of any materials provided."*

Summary: Of the five alternative options presented, a majority of respondents indicated that only providing internet materials should be added to the GNSO's training objectives. We note that the second ranked category received 14/28 votes and was a participant write-in suggestion that some later voters might not have seen at the time they responded to the questionnaire.

4.0 Constituency Principles, Rules & Procedures

Background: To help ensure a "level playing field" for all GNSO constituencies, recommendations adopted by the Board direct that all constituencies have access to the same basic resources. As part of that vision, the Board has also asked that all constituencies adhere to similar, general operating principles and practices.

Question 4.3[6]

Respondents were advised that recommendations adopted by the Board commit to recruitment and outreach support to help boost constituency membership. In light of that statement, they were asked to indicate the relative order of usefulness (Scale: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High) for each resource area listed in the table below (#9 was a participant write-in).

Result: As shown in the table below, ranked high to low by percentage, only the first two categories received a majority (> 14) of votes although #3 achieved 50%. Please note that, for a few of these categories, there were 28 total votes versus 29 for others, which means that one or more respondents chose to skip certain line items, which was permitted. The percentages reflect the correct denominator for each of the categories except #9, which is explained in a footnote.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 28-29	Votes	Pct.
1	Networking	20	69%
2	Articles published in international trade publications	15	54%
3	Briefings for industry leaders, analysts, and other influential persons	14	50%
3	Partnering with professional and trade associations	14	48%
5	Conference and trade show speaking opportunities	13	46%
6	Promotional materials	11	38%
7	Press releases	10	36%
8	Paid advertising (e.g. magazine, newspaper, television)	5	17%
9	ICANN support for constituency members to do the above	2	***[7]

Feedback/Comments:

There were 3 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

> 1) "I assumed that my new option would be placed at the bottom rather than the top of the list -- and now I see there is no way to edit it -- so I hope people will get the drift. The point is that none of these efforts is likely to be effective if carried out by ICANN staff, it is much more effective for constituency members to be conducting outreach with ICANN support, financial and staff. I will also mention that in my experience

---

[6] Questions 4.1 and 4.2, initially framed for this survey, were intentionally suppressed from the final production version based upon community feedback during testing; however, the original numbering sequence was maintained.
[7] This item (or placard) was added by a participant late in the survey period and would not have been seen by a majority of respondents; therefore, its selection rate should be understood in that context.

over the past 9 years, the most effective recruiting tool for participation in ICANN is ICANN continuing to threaten to take policy steps that would be destructive of the interests of my constituency. This is simply a fact, not a recommendation for future course of action! I don't think that ICANN staff should be doing any of the above except in collaboration with the constituencies."

2) *"I believe too much of the ICANN Press Releases are geared towards the marketing and promotion of ICANN as opposed to information about the substance of the issues. Thus, I am reluctant to recommend more press releases or promotional materials. If ICANN can commit to less spin and self-promotion, then possibly Press Releases may be an option."*

3) *"The outreach should largely be to support the work of the constituencies themselves. Useful promotional materials are much needed. Networking opportunities are also a good idea. I would suggest that briefings for industry groups or industry associations would also be helpful, but frankly, briefings for analysts are not really suitable to the purpose of this recruitment and outreach."*

Summary: A majority of respondents indicated that networking and publishing articles in international trade publications were resource areas that should be utilized by ICANN for outreach and constituency growth/expansion. We note that the next category, external briefings, received exactly 50% of the vote.

Question 4.6[8]

To help make constituency and policy development information easy to find/access, respondents were asked if all constituency websites should contain common headings and design features.

Result: as shown in the table below, a majority of respondents voted "Yes" to this question.

Rnk	Total Number of Respondents to this Question: 28	Votes	Pct.
1	Yes	20	72%
2	No	6	21%
3	No Opinion	2	7%
4	Neither	0	0%

Feedback/Comments:

There were 2 individual comments offered to this question, presented below:

1) *"While tedious, the process of establishing and maintaining transparency is essential to the functioning of the system. Thank you for taking this task seriously."*

2) *"One size unlikely to fit all."*

---

[8] *Questions 4.4 and 4.5, initially framed for this survey, were intentionally suppressed from the final production version based upon community feedback during testing; however, the original numbering sequence was maintained.*

Summary: A majority of respondents (72%) indicated that constituency websites should contain common headings and design features.

ORIGINAL EMAIL (SAMPLE) SENT TO EACH CONSTITUENCY

Release Date: 23 October 2008

To: Chair/Secretariat/Leader, _____ Constituency

Dear _____:

The ICANN Policy Staff, in cooperation with the GNSO Council, is seeking broad based feedback on a number of Board Governance Committee (BGC) recommendations, specifically related to GNSO constituency operations, that were approved by the Board this past summer. To this end, we have developed an online survey instrument designed to collect individual constituency member opinions that will be used to inform the community's discussions concerning how those BGC recommendations might be implemented.

The survey contents, as well as the online system in which it is published (Big Pulse at www.bigpulse.com), have been through two months of design/development and more than three full weeks of staff and community testing.

The survey is planned to run from November 3rd – December 2nd [9] (30 days) taking advantage of the opportunity to stimulate participation at the ICANN meeting in Cairo. Actually, any respondents who log in starting Monday, October 27th will be permitted to complete the survey.

We are reaching out to you for your help in distributing an invitation to all members of your constituency. To assist you, we have drafted a self-contained and detachable email (below) that describes the background of the survey, explains its importance to the GNSO Improvements program, and contains step-by-step instructions. We ask that you circulate this invitation to your membership as soon as practicable since we know that many people will be traveling next week.

Each of your members, upon receipt of the email invitation, will be asked to participate in the survey by following the instructions provided, including self-registration. You will note that we have assigned a unique 6 character access PIN to your Constituency, which will enable your members to login and complete the survey. The purpose of the PIN is to discourage potential spammers and other spurious entries; therefore, it is important that it not be divulged to uninvited personnel. As a second precaution, we may ask your help to confirm registered names once the survey has commenced and/or upon its completion. If there are respondents that appear suspicious or cannot be properly identified, we have the option within Big Pulse to flag such entries so that they do not contaminate the official tabulations.

---

[9] *Extended to 14 December 2008 to provide more time for constituency personnel to participate.*

Our goal is to analyze the survey data during December and publish a report on or before January 1st, 2009[10].

If you have questions about this process, you may contact me or the consultant who assembled this survey instrument at our request: *{contact information redacted}*. Emails associated with the survey may be sent to: bpsurveyadmin@icann.org.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance. We hope that wide participation in this survey will provide the entire community with valuable insights and useful information that will lead to effective and efficient implementation of the various BGC recommendations.

Best regards,

Denise Michel
VP-Policy Development
ICANN
denise.michel@icann.org

** Suggested Email Invitation For Distribution to Members of the _____ Constituency **

Dear _____ Constituency Member:

The ICANN Policy Staff, in cooperation with the GNSO Council, is seeking to collect broad based feedback on a number of recommendations presented to the ICANN Board by the Board Governance Committee Working Group (BCG WG) on GNSO Improvements (for reference links, see bottom of this message). In keeping with ICANN's bottom-up consensus model, we believe that extensive community input will provide a rich foundation of opinions, comments, ideas, and, suggestions that will lead to informed, useful, and effective programs designed to enhance all GNSO constituencies.

An online survey has been developed that focuses on four specific areas of the BCG WG report relating to constituencies:

(1) Developing a standardized "Toolkit" of services;

(2) Creating a centralized membership registry or database;

(3) Knowledge/skill training for leaders and members; and

(4) Recruiting/outreach programs associated with constituency growth and expansion.

We encourage you to participate in this GNSO Constituency Survey. The collective results and tabulations will become input to various working teams/groups chartered to develop approaches and solutions for GNSO improvements consistent with the BGC WG recommendations. Your candid and honest feedback is appreciated and will be treated anonymously. We ask that you

---

[10] *Changed to end of January 2009 after extending the survey period by an extra two weeks in December.*

respond to the questions as an individual and not in any representative capacity that you may hold as part of this constituency.

You may provide input beginning Monday, October 27th – December 2nd [11]at which point the survey will be closed to further responses.

To access the survey, please enter the following link into your web browser https://www.bigpulse.com/m2597/intro[12].

Please read and follow the directions carefully once you reach the introduction page. You will be asked for some registration information and we urge you to provide a valid email address because it will be used to send a confirmation of your survey responses along with a link to return to the site in the event that you were unable to complete it on the first visit.

You will need the following 6 character PIN that authorizes access to the survey:

Access PIN: XY-999[13] *(...for _____ Constituency ONLY)*

This PIN is case-sensitive, so please be careful when entering. If you make a mistake, there are successively longer wait periods before you can reenter the PIN.

There is no ID or Password required to take the survey, only the PIN. For security reasons, please DO NOT release this PIN to anyone not specifically invited or authorized to participate in this survey.

If you have questions or encounter any technical difficulties with the survey, please forward an email to: bpsurveyadmin@icann.org.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation,

Signed:
_____ **Constituency**

Background Documents (February 2008):

Summary BGC-WG Report:
http://www.icann.org/en/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-summary-03feb08.pdf

Full BGC-WG Report:
http://www.icann.org/en/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf

---

[11] *Extended to 14 December 2008 to provide more time for constituency personnel to participate.*
[12] *This survey link is no longer active (closed 14 December 2008)*
[13] *Illustrative only; each constituency was provided its own unique PIN for security purposes.*

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON ENHANCEMENT OF ICANN/GNSO CONSTITUENCY SERVICES

Table of Contents

Note: the following pages contain actual screenshots captured from the Big Pulse online system (www.bigpulse.com)

---

[14] *Part B was intentionally skipped due to final changes in the survey design just before publishing.*

Welcome to the GNSO Constituency Survey: November 2008

SORRY! THE SURVEY CLOSED EFFECTIVE 14 December 2008

The ICANN Staff, in cooperation with the GNSO Council, is requesting constituency feedback on a number of recommendations that emerged from the Board Governance Committee Working Group (BGC-WG) concerning GNSO Improvements. Background documentation and reference citations were provided in the email inviting you to this link.

An online survey has been developed that focuses on four specific areas of the BCG-WG report relating to constituencies: (1) developing a standardized "Toolkit" of services; (2) creating a centralized membership registry or database; (3) knowledge/skill training for leaders and members; and (4) recruitment/outreach programs associated with growth and expansion.

You are encouraged to participate in this GNSO Constituency Survey and we only ask that you respond as an individual and not on behalf of any group or organization that you might represent. Your candid and honest feedback is appreciated.

The collective results and tabulations will become input to various working teams/groups chartered to develop approaches and solutions for GNSO improvements consistent with the BGC-WG recommendations. There will be many opportunities for community comment and feedback before any specific actions are taken or programs implemented as a direct result of this survey.

Following this brief introduction, you will be presented a registration page in which we are asking for some additional information about each respondent to the survey.

ICANN Survey Administrator

Click here to proceed to the Registration page...

ICANN GNSO Constituency Survey Registration

We appreciate your completing the following information, which will only be used to ensure that the survey was completed by an invited respondent.

SURVEY ANONYMITY POLICY
Technically, we configured this survey as "not anonymous" and you will see a note to that effect at the bottom of every survey page. This was the only option available within Big Pulse that would permit the ICANN Survey Administrator, an outside consultant, to audit/review responses for potential spurious content. This approach was taken as one of several preventive measures to ensure that the survey has integrity and that everyone's time and effort is not spoiled by entries that would otherwise contaminate the survey's overall value and integrity.

Please be assured that: (1) your responses are not accessible to or by anyone other than the ICANN Survey Administrator and (2) they will not be disclosed or published in a way that could be matched to your identity.

YOU MAY SAFELY IGNORE THE NOTATION AT THE BOTTOM OF EACH VOTING PAGE CONCERNING ANONYMITY. ICANN IS TAKING EXTRA MEASURES, WITHIN BIG PULSE, TO SAFEGUARD THE PRIVACY OF INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES.

Note: This message will be repeated again after you answer the 1st survey question.

Following this page, you will be asked to provide the PIN that was included in the invitation email you received. After carefully entering the case-sensitive PIN, you will be directed immediately to the 1st of 16 questions in the online survey. Most questions require clicking among choices to express your opinions about a topic although comment boxes are available throughout the survey and are welcome.

Although we hope that you will provide complete answers to all questions, most are not constrained to require a response AND you will always find options such as "No opinion" and "None to offer."

If you are unable to finish all survey questions in one visit or are disconnected accidentally, you may return and complete the survey. At the registration page, provide the same email address you originally entered, then select the 2nd option to recover signin details. An email will be sent to you along with a return link that will supply the login info automatically. You will need to enter the orignally supplied PIN at which point you will be permitted to continue where you left off. If you encounter problems, please write to: bpsurveyadmin@icann.org

ICANN Survey Administrator

(Continued on next page)

The following information was requested as part of the registration process

Email: [   ]

An email address enables you to request a forgotten sign-in name or password any time.
See our strict Privacy Statement.

First Name: [   ]

Last Name: [   ]

Phone Number: [   ]

Address: [   ]

ICANN Constituency: [Select   ▼]

☐ IMPORTANT: Please check the box indicating your agreement not to (a) impersonate any person, company, association, organisation, government, body or entity; (b) post any unlawful, threatening, abusive, defamatory, obscene, vulgar, pornographic, inappropriate, profane or indecent information or material of any kind, including without limitation any transmissions constituting or encouraging conduct that would constitute a criminal offence, give rise to civil liability or otherwise violate any applicable law.

[Proceed]

Note: The following pages in this Appendix display screenshots of the actual survey questions presented in the original sequence.

1.0 Constituency Toolkit

Background: ICANN Staff currently provides a variety of professional and administrative services to the GNSO and Council. At present the various GNSO constituencies are generally left to develop their own support systems and processes. Consistent with the adopted recommendations of the Board Governance Committee (BGC), all official GNSO constituency groups are to be provided with a similar "toolkit" of services.

> Click to exit this section without voting...

1.1 For each function or service listed below, please indicate the relative importance of providing it to all officially recognized ICANN constituencies. You may also add new categories and rate them in your response.

IMPORTANCE: 1-None; 2-Somewhat; 3-No Opinion; 4-Moderate; 5-High

1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Support for organizing face-to-face meetings (e.g. date/time, location, equipment, telephone bridge and, in certain venues, arranging accommodations)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Support for organizing teleconferences (schedule, announce, monitor)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Preparing minutes of formal constituency meetings and teleconferences
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Assisting in conducting elections for constituency officers
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Assembling background and reference materials for Working Groups
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Support for the Policy Development Process (PDP) by drafting materials, under constituency direction and for constituency consideration (e.g. statements), tracking deadlines, summarizing policy debates
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Assisting volunteer leaders by identifying/scheduling liaison contacts within ICANN
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Constituency web site hosting and content maintenance (i.e. keeping site up to date with relevant documents and information)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Organizational record keeping (e.g. statements of interest, archives)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Maintaining up-to-date member contact info, mailing/discussion lists
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	MP3 recordings of meetings
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Provide grants/funding for constituencies to provide their own support

> Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

2.0 Constituency Database

Background: Recommendations adopted by the Board call for establishment of a centralized registry (or database), consistent with individuals' privacy considerations, that is up-to-date, publicly accessible, and contains members of GNSO constituencies as well as others involved in GNSO issues (even if not part of a constituency, e.g. PDP Working Group participants). The intention is to advance transparency and support community interaction among other potential uses. The BGC WG specified one intended use of the database -- creation of "GNSO discussion lists."

Click to exit this section without voting...

2.1 In what ways could/would the establishment of such a centralized constituency database (or registry) be beneficial or useful? Please enter a response for each category listed. You may also add new categories and rate them in your response.

USEFULNESS: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High

1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	GNSO discussion list(s)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Locating/finding colleagues
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Address book accessible from the internet
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Facilitating administration of constituency membership or member delegates
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Promoting constituency transparency
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Facilitating Working Group Creation write-in

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

2.2 What information categories/fields should be collected and made publicly available as part of each individual record? [Note: we ask about which fields should be optional in the next question].

Please select as many categories/fields as you think are appropriate or choose "None" at the bottom of the list.

☐	Name
☐	Personal information (e.g. address/telephone/email)
☐	Professional Information (e.g. company, title, bus address/telephone, bus email)
☐	ICANN Constituency affiliation
☐	Function/role within constituency (e.g. Chairperson, Member)
☐	Other organizational affiliations
☐	Education and Training
☐	Experience
☐	Instant chat/messaging accounts
☐	Other address, telephone, contact information, personal web site
☐	Photos and images
☐	Honors/awards
☐	Professional certifications/accreditations
☐	Time Zone
☐	Preferred method of contact (e.g., email, phone, Skype) write-in
☐	None

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

2.3 Are there additional categories/fields, not selected above, that should be optional, that is, available for public disclosure solely at the option of each member?

Select those categories that should be optional or choose "None" at the bottom.

- [ ] Name
- [ ] Personal information (e.g. address/telephone/email)
- [ ] Professional Information (e.g. company, title, bus address/telephone, bus email)
- [ ] ICANN Constituency affiliation
- [ ] Function/role within constituency (e.g. Chairperson, Member)
- [ ] Other organizational affiliations
- [ ] Education and Training
- [ ] Experience
- [ ] Instant chat/messaging accounts
- [ ] Other address, telephone, contact information, personal web site
- [ ] Photos and images
- [ ] Honors/awards
- [ ] Professional certifications/accreditations
- [ ] Time Zone
- [ ] Preferred method of contact (e.g., email, phone, Skype)
- [ ] None

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

2.4 Who should own/control/manage the information database?

Select only one, but feel free to submit one or more additional categories.

- [ ] GNSO Secretariat
- [ ] GNSO Council appointee
- [ ] ICANN Staff
- [ ] Constituency Secretariats or other appointee/team
- [ ] ICANN Staff and Constituency Delegee write-in
- [ ] No one write-in
- [ ] No opinion

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

2.5 How should information be added/updated/deleted from the database?
Select only one, but feel free to submit one or more additional categories.

☐	Participants should voluntarily add/edit/delete information, as appropriate
☐	Constituencies should collect information and control insertion/update/deletion
☐	Administrator/manager should collect information and control insertion/update/deletion
☐	Participant and administrator write-in
☐	No opinion

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

2.6 What concerns, recommendations, or suggestions do you have, if any, relating to how database information privacy should be protected?
Select one.

☐	Comments below
☐	None to offer

Additional Comments:

3.0 Knowledge and Skill Training-Part A

Background: Recommendations adopted by the Board commit to supporting the involvement of knowledgeable, experienced, and skilled participants in the GNSO. The Board Governance Committee Working Group (BGC WG) recommended that ICANN develop reference materials, training opportunities, and learning tools to help ensure that GNSO leaders and other constituents have the fundamental knowledge and skill sets necessary to effectively engage with the community on important policy matters.

Click to exit this section without voting...

3.1 For each of the following knowledge curriculum topics, please rate its relative importance using the scale below. You may also add new subjects and rate them in your response.

IMPORTANCE: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High

1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Internet fundamentals including TCP/IP and network protocols
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	The Domain Name System (DNS) and how it works
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	DNS-related technologies, trends and markets
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Functions of registrars and registries
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Overview of Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), registry agreements, and compliance
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Briefings on pending policy issues
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Policy background course on history and significance of key issues (e.g. new gTLDs, IDNs, WHOIS)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Add-on courses that explain emerging technical issues such as registrant abuse concerns, fast flux hosting, et al.
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	ICANN primer including organization, community, bylaws, policy development, constituency groups (e.g. SO's, AC's), staff functions, and processes (e.g. bottom-up consensus), and intro to public meetings
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	GNSO organization, structure, responsibilities, and processes (e.g. PDP, WG, SC)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	ICANN staff member duties write-in
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Interaction and dependencies between GNSO and GAC
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Relationship with ALAC write-in

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

3.2 What types of skill development programs do you believe would be useful for ICANN to offer GNSO participants? Rate each program's relative usefulness using the scale provided. You may also add new categories and rate them in your response.

USEFULNESS: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High

1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	How to build and nurture a Working Group
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Negotiation, compromise, and consensus
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Project management for team leaders
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Leadership/chairmanship in a voluntary organization
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Interpersonal communications
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Individual behavior in groups: what works and why
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Cross cultural interactions, awareness, and sensitivities write-in
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Role of inferences, values, and judgments on group dynamics write-in

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

3.3 What would be the most effective delivery system for training? Rate each option's relative usefulness using the scale provided. You may also add new categories and rate them in your response.

USEFULNESS: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High

1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Face-to-face session (e.g. classroom, presentation, tutorial)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Distance learning-live instructor (e.g. webinar)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Pre-recorded seminars (e.g. CD, DVD, web)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Workshops (e.g. hands-on, lab, practicum)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Continuing/structured (e.g. prelim/fundamental courses, follow-ups, advanced, upgrade,
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	ICANN meetings write-in
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Web-based coursework write-in

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

3.4a Do you think that a demonstration of certain skills, professional background, and/or experience should be encouraged before individuals assume leadership positions w/in the GNSO?

Select one.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Neither

☐ No Opinion

Additional Comments:

3.0 Knowledge and Skill Training-Part B
Continuation

Click to exit this section without voting...

3.4b You answered "Yes" to the last question. For each position below, please identify the relative importance of subjecting it to minimum credentials and qualifications. You may also add other positions (categories) and rate them in your response.

IMPORTANCE: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High

1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**Chair of PDP Working Group**
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**Vice-Chairs of PDP Working Groups**
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**Chairman of the GNSO Council**
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**Vice-Chairs of GNSO Council**
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**Members of the GNSO Council**
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**Officers of GNSO Constituencies**

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

3.0 Knowledge and Skill Training-Part C
Continuation

Click to exit this section without voting...

3.5 At ICANN open meetings, how much time should be allocated to training?
Select one.

☐	2 days
☐	1 day
☐	½ day
☐	Evening session (2-3 hour)
☐	No time should be allocated
☐	A mix of time options write-in
☐	No opinion write-in

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

3.6 GNSO training objectives should be extended to include the following additional elements. Indicate each one's relative importance using the scale provided. You may also add new categories and rate them in your response.

IMPORTANCE: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High

1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Formal accreditation/certification for training completed
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Collaboration with local universities or other institutions
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Availability of locally/regionally based on-site tutors and/or trainers
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Provision of internet training material
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Training available in multiple languages write-in

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

4.0 Constituency Principles, Rules & Procedures-Part A

Background: To help ensure a "level playing field" for all GNSO constituencies, recommendations adopted by the Board direct that all constituencies have access to the same basic resources. As part of that vision, the Board has also asked that all constituencies adhere to similar, general operating principles and practices. Please provide your feedback in response to the statements below.

Click to exit this section without voting...

4.3 Recommendations adopted by the Board commit to recruitment and outreach support to help boost constituency membership. Please indicate, in your view, the relative order of usefulness for each resource area listed below.

USEFULNESS: 1-None, 2-Somewhat, 3-No Opinion, 4-Moderate, 5-High

1 2 3 4 5

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ **Paid advertising (e.g. magazine, newspaper, television)**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ **Conference and trade show speaking opportunities**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ **Partnering with professional and trade associations**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ **Briefings for industry leaders, analysts, and other influential persons**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ **Press releases**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ **Articles published in international trade publications**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ **Networking**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ **Promotional materials**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ **ICANN support for constituency members to do the above** write-in

Submit New Category

Additional Comments:

4.0 Constituency Principles, Rules & Procedures-Part C

Click to exit this section without voting...

4.6 To help make constituency and policy development information easy to find/access, it has been recommended that each constituency website should contain common headings and design features.

Select one.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Neither

☐ No Opinion

Additional Comments:

*** END OF SURVEY ***

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

1.1 For each function or service listed below, please indicate the relative importance of providing it to all officially recognized ICANN constituencies.

		Scale				
Number of respondents: 29 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 96.7						
Rank	Category	1	2	3	4	5
1	Support for organizing face-to-face meetings (e.g. date/time, location, equipment, telephone bridge and, in certain venues, arranging accommodations)	0	3	1	8	17
	Percentage of votes	0%	10%	3%	28%	59%
1	Support for organizing teleconferences (schedule, announce, monitor)	3	0	1	12	13
	Percentage of votes	10%	0%	3%	41%	45%
1	Preparing minutes of formal constituency meetings and teleconferences	4	3	4	8	10
	Percentage of votes	14%	10%	14%	28%	34%
1	Assisting in conducting elections for constituency officers	5	9	4	5	6
	Percentage of votes	17%	31%	14%	17%	21%
1	Assembling background and reference materials for Working Groups	0	2	1	15	11
	Percentage of votes	0%	7%	3%	52%	38%
1	Support for the Policy Development Process (PDP) by drafting materials, under constituency direction and for constituency consideration (e.g. statements), tracking deadlines, summarizing policy debates	3	1	1	8	16
	Percentage of votes	10%	3%	3%	28%	55%
1	Assisting volunteer leaders by identifying/scheduling liaison contacts within ICANN	2	4	5	7	11
	Percentage of votes	7%	14%	17%	24%	38%
1	Constituency web site hosting and content maintenance (i.e. keeping site up to date with relevant documents and information)	4	4	3	7	11
	Percentage of votes	14%	14%	10%	24%	38%
1	Organizational record keeping (e.g. statements of interest, archives)	2	5	6	8	8
	Percentage of votes	7%	17%	21%	28%	28%
1	Maintaining up-to-date member contact info, mailing/discussion lists	2	8	3	6	10
	Percentage of votes	7%	28%	10%	21%	34%
1	MP3 recordings of meetings	4	6	3	9	7
	Percentage of votes	14%	21%	10%	31%	24%
1	Provide grants/funding for constituencies to provide their own support	2	3	6	4	13
	Percentage of votes	7%	11%	21%	14%	46%

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

2.1 In what ways could/would the establishment of such a centralized constituency database (or registry) be beneficial or useful?						
				Scale		
Number of respondents: 29 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 96.7						
Rank	**Category**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1	GNSO discussion list(s)	2	2	5	9	9
	Percentage of votes	7%	7%	19%	33%	33%
1	Locating/finding colleagues	2	5	5	10	6
	Percentage of votes	7%	18%	18%	36%	21%
1	Address book accessible from the internet	4	5	3	9	7
	Percentage of votes	14%	18%	11%	32%	25%
1	Facilitating administration of constituency membership or member delegates	3	3	3	16	4
	Percentage of votes	10%	10%	10%	55%	14%
1	Promoting constituency transparency	3	1	2	13	10
	Percentage of votes	10%	3%	7%	45%	34%
1	Facilitating Working Group Creation	1	0	0	0	1
	Percentage of votes	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

	2.2 What information categories/fields should be collected and made publicly available as part of each individual record?					
Number of respondents: 29 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 93.3 · Ranked by votes		**29**				
Rank	**Category**	**Votes**	**%**			
1	Name	28	97%			
1	ICANN Constituency affiliation	28	97%			
3	Function/role within constituency (e.g. Chairperson, Member)	27	93%			
4	Professional Information (e.g. company, title, bus address/telephone, bus email)	24	83%			
5	Time Zone	17	59%			
6	Other organizational affiliations	13	45%			
7	Preferred method of contact (e.g., email, phone, Skype)	9	31%			
8	Personal information (e.g. address/telephone/email)	8	28%			
8	Education and Training	8	28%			
8	Experience	8	28%			
11	Photos and images	7	24%			
12	Honors/awards	4	14%			
12	Professional certifications/accreditations	4	14%			
14	Other address, telephone, contact information, personal web site	3	10%			
15	None	2	7%			
16	Instant chat/messaging accounts	1	3%			

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

2.3 Are there additional categories/fields, not selected above, that should be optional, that is, available for public disclosure solely at the option of each member?

Number of respondents: 27 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 90.0 · Ranked by votes — **27**

Rank	Category	Votes	%
1	Instant chat/messaging accounts	14	52%
2	Other address, telephone, contact information, personal web site	12	44%
3	Photos and images	10	37%
4	Personal information (e.g. address/telephone/email)	9	33%
5	Experience	8	30%
5	Professional certifications/accreditations	8	30%
7	Education and Training	7	26%
7	Honors/awards	7	26%
7	Preferred method of contact (e.g., email, phone, Skype)	7	26%
10	Other organizational affiliations	6	22%
11	None	5	19%
12	Professional Information (e.g. company, title, bus address/telephone, bus email)	4	15%
12	Time Zone	4	15%
14	Name	0	0%
14	ICANN Constituency affiliation	0	0%
14	Function/role within constituency (e.g. Chairperson, Member)	0	0%

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

2.4 Who should own/control/manage the information database?						
Number of respondents: 29 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 96.7		**29**				
Rank	**Category**	**Pref1**	**%**			
1	GNSO Secretariat	10	34%			
2	ICANN Staff	6	21%			
3	ICANN Staff and Constituency Delegee	5	17%			
4	Constituency Secretariats or other appointee/team	3	10%			
5	No one	2	7%			
6	No opinion	2	7%			
7	GNSO Council appointee	1	3%			
2.5 How should information be added/updated/deleted from the database?						
Number of respondents: 29 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 96.7		**29**				
Rank	**Category**	**Pref1**	**%**			
1	Participants should voluntarily add/edit/delete information, as appropriate	10	34%			
2	Participant and administrator	8	28%			
3	Constituencies should collect information and control insertion/update/deletion	5	17%			
4	Administrator/manager should collect information and control insertion/update/deletion	5	17%			
5	No opinion	1	3%			
2.6 What concerns, recommendations, or suggestions do you have, if any, relating to how database information privacy should be protected?						
Number of respondents: 27 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 90.0		**27**				
Rank	**Category**	**Votes**	**%**			
1	None to offer	19	70%			
2	Comments below	8	30%			

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

3.1 For each of the following knowledge curriculum topics, please rate its relative importance using the scale below.						
Number of respondents: 28 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 93.3		Scale				
Rank	Category	1	2	3	4	5
1	Internet fundamentals including TCP/IP and network protocols	2	7	4	10	4
	Percentage of votes	7%	26%	15%	37%	15%
1	The Domain Name System (DNS) and how it works	1	3	2	10	12
	Percentage of votes	4%	11%	7%	36%	43%
1	DNS-related technologies, trends and markets	0	3	5	12	7
	Percentage of votes	0%	11%	19%	44%	26%
1	Functions of registrars and registries	1	2	2	12	11
	Percentage of votes	4%	7%	7%	43%	39%
1	Overview of Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), registry agreements, and compliance	1	2	3	13	9
	Percentage of votes	4%	7%	11%	46%	32%
1	Briefings on pending policy issues	0	3	4	9	12
	Percentage of votes	0%	11%	14%	32%	43%
1	Policy background course on history and significance of key issues (e.g. new gTLDs, IDNs, WHOIS)	0	4	5	10	9
	Percentage of votes	0%	14%	18%	36%	32%
1	Add-on courses that explain emerging technical issues such as registrant abuse concerns, fast flux hosting, et al.	0	1	6	16	5
	Percentage of votes	0%	4%	21%	57%	18%
1	ICANN primer including organization, community, bylaws, policy development, constituency groups (e.g. SO's, AC's), staff functions, and processes (e.g. bottom-up consensus), and intro to public meetings	0	4	3	10	11
	Percentage of votes	0%	14%	11%	36%	39%
1	GNSO organization, structure, responsibilities, and processes (e.g. PDP, WG, SC)	1	4	4	8	11
	Percentage of votes	4%	14%	14%	29%	39%
1	ICANN staff member duties	1	3	6	12	6
	Percentage of votes	4%	11%	21%	43%	21%
1	Interaction and dependencies between GNSO and GAC	0	9	5	11	3
	Percentage of votes	0%	32%	18%	39%	11%
1	Relationship with ALAC	0	1	0	0	1
	Percentage of votes	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

Rank	Category	Scale				
3.2 What types of skill development programs do you believe would be useful for ICANN to offer GNSO participants?						
Number of respondents: 28 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 93.3		**Scale**				
Rank	**Category**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1	How to build and nurture a Working Group	3	4	8	10	3
	Percentage of votes	11%	14%	29%	36%	11%
1	Negotiation, compromise, and consensus	5	4	7	7	5
	Percentage of votes	18%	14%	25%	25%	18%
1	Project management for team leaders	5	3	5	10	5
	Percentage of votes	18%	11%	18%	36%	18%
1	Leadership/chairmanship in a voluntary organization	5	3	7	7	6
	Percentage of votes	18%	11%	25%	25%	21%
1	Interpersonal communications	9	6	7	3	3
	Percentage of votes	32%	21%	25%	11%	11%
1	Individual behavior in groups: what works and why	8	5	7	5	3
	Percentage of votes	29%	18%	25%	18%	11%
1	Cross cultural interactions, awareness, and sensitivities	6	5	5	8	4
	Percentage of votes	21%	18%	18%	29%	14%
1	Role of inferences, values, and judgments on group dynamics	8	6	7	5	2
	Percentage of votes	29%	21%	25%	18%	7%

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

3.3 What would be the most effective delivery system for training?						
Number of respondents: 28 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 93.3		**Scale**				
Rank	Category	1	2	3	4	5
1	Face-to-face session (e.g. classroom, presentation, tutorial)	5	4	2	7	8
	Percentage of votes	19%	15%	8%	27%	31%
1	Distance learning-live instructor (e.g. webinar)	3	2	5	12	6
	Percentage of votes	11%	7%	18%	43%	21%
1	Pre-recorded seminars (e.g. CD, DVD, web)	4	8	7	6	3
	Percentage of votes	14%	29%	25%	21%	11%
1	Workshops (e.g. hands-on, lab, practicum)	2	4	10	5	6
	Percentage of votes	7%	15%	37%	19%	22%
1	Continuing/structured (e.g. prelim/fundamental courses, follow-ups, advanced, upgrade)	2	10	6	5	3
	Percentage of votes	8%	38%	23%	19%	12%
1	ICANN meetings	4	4	1	11	7
	Percentage of votes	15%	15%	4%	41%	26%
1	Web-based coursework	1	0	0	0	1
	Percentage of votes	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%

3.4a Do you think that a demonstration of certain skills, professional background, and/or experience should be encouraged before individuals assume leadership positions w/in the GNSO?						
Number of respondents: 28 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 93.3		**28**				
Rank	Category	Votes	%			
1	Yes	15	54%			
2	No	10	36%			
3	No Opinion	2	7%			
4	Neither	1	4%			

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

3.4b You answered "Yes" to the last question. For each position below, please identify the relative importance of subjecting it to minimum credentials and qualifications.

		Scale				
Number of respondents: 15 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 50.0						
Rank	Category	1	2	3	4	5
1	Chair of PDP Working Group	0	2	0	4	9
	Percentage of votes	0%	13%	0%	27%	60%
1	Vice-Chairs of PDP Working Groups	0	2	1	10	2
	Percentage of votes	0%	13%	7%	67%	13%
1	Chairman of the GNSO Council	0	1	0	3	11
	Percentage of votes	0%	7%	0%	20%	73%
1	Vice-Chairs of GNSO Council	0	1	1	8	5
	Percentage of votes	0%	7%	7%	53%	33%
1	Members of the GNSO Council	0	3	5	4	3
	Percentage of votes	0%	20%	33%	27%	20%
1	Officers of GNSO Constituencies	0	6	4	1	4
	Percentage of votes	0%	40%	27%	7%	27%

3.5 At ICANN open meetings, how much time should be allocated to training?

Number of respondents: 28 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 93.3		**28**		
Rank	Category	Pref1	%	
1	1 day	6	21%	
2	½ day	6	21%	
3	No time should be allocated	6	21%	
4	Evening session (2-3 hour)	5	18%	
5	A mix of time options	4	14%	
6	2 days	1	4%	
7	No opinion	0	0%	

Appendix C
GNSO Constituency Survey Results

	3.6 GNSO training objectives should be extended to include the following additional elements.					
Number of respondents: 28 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 93.3				Scale		
Rank	Category	1	2	3	4	5
1	Formal accreditation/certification for training completed	11	2	9	5	0
	Percentage of votes	41%	7%	33%	19%	0%
1	Collaboration with local universities or other institutions	11	4	9	2	1
	Percentage of votes	41%	15%	33%	7%	4%
1	Availability of locally/regionally based on-site tutors and/or trainers	7	4	9	7	0
	Percentage of votes	26%	15%	33%	26%	0%
1	Provision of internet training material	3	1	6	9	9
	Percentage of votes	11%	4%	21%	32%	32%
1	Training available in multiple languages	5	2	7	8	6
	Percentage of votes	18%	7%	25%	29%	21%

GNSO Constituency Survey Results

	4.3 Recommendations adopted by the Board commit to recruitment and outreach support to help boost constituency membership. Please indicate, in your view, the relative order of usefulness for each resource area listed below.					
			Scale			
Number of respondents: 29 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 96.7						
Rank	**Category**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1	Paid advertising (e.g. magazine, newspaper, television)	15	5	4	4	1
	Percentage of votes	52%	17%	14%	14%	3%
1	Conference and trade show speaking opportunities	2	10	3	7	6
	Percentage of votes	7%	36%	11%	25%	21%
1	Partnering with professional and trade associations	2	7	6	6	8
	Percentage of votes	7%	24%	21%	21%	28%
1	Briefings for industry leaders, analysts, and other influential persons	2	7	5	8	6
	Percentage of votes	7%	25%	18%	29%	21%
1	Press releases	7	4	7	4	6
	Percentage of votes	25%	14%	25%	14%	21%
1	Articles published in international trade publications	3	9	1	9	6
	Percentage of votes	11%	32%	4%	32%	21%
1	Networking	0	8	1	8	12
	Percentage of votes	0%	28%	3%	28%	41%
1	Promotional materials	3	13	2	4	7
	Percentage of votes	10%	45%	7%	14%	24%
1	ICANN support for constituency members to do the above	0	0	0	1	1
	Percentage of votes	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%

	4.6 To help make constituency and policy development information easy to find/access, it has been recommended that each constituency website should contain common headings and design features.		
Number of respondents: 28 · Group size: 30 · Percentage voted: 93.3		**28**	
Rank	**Category**	**Votes**	**%**
1	Yes	20	71%
2	No	6	21%
3	No Opinion	2	7%
4	Neither	0	0%