FEEDBACK ON ATRT SURVEY

From: Berkman Center's ICANN Review Team

To: Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT)

Date: August 28, 2010

Re: Request for Feedback on ATRT Survey to the community

I. Introduction

During the last ATRT conference call, the RT requested that the Berkman Center review the proposed survey format for the ICANN community. As discussed, we shared the draft survey with colleagues who are Research Statisticians; after a review of the document, they provided the following feedback and suggestions for improvements.

1. **Inclusion of an Introductory Page**
   a. Include a cover page or an email that briefly outlines the survey and includes how long it will take respondents to complete it.
   b. In general, ensure that questions on similar topics are grouped together.

2. **Format**
   a. (Perhaps this will not be an issue in the final distribution of the survey)
   b. The fonts change every so often—the font, style, and size should all be consistent before wide distribution.
   c. Make sure that a question does not start on one page and end on the next pages

3. **Re: First set of questions (e.g. strongly agree – to disagree)**:
   a. Add a "not applicable" or "don't know category" to distinguish from Neutral responses.
   b. What does "Select all" mean for these questions?
   c. Consider putting the questions first and then the answer options. (This goes for the other set of questions below using a similar format).

4. **Re: Second set of questions (asking for respondents to rate questions from very good to very poor).**
   a. An alternative would be to make them into positive statements and ask if the respondents agree with the statement (the same format as the first set of questions).

       i. For instance, with the GAC's interaction with the Board, the statement is "GAC interaction well with the Board." This can be changed to the 'GAC interacts well with the Board' and just have 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neutral, 2=disagree, and 1=strongly disagree (this is the same scale that you use for the first set of questions).

      ii. The <u>strongly agree to strongly disagree scale</u> can be better for two reasons: (1) instead of looking at numbers, the respondent can see what the numbers represent, and (2) the scale remains consistent throughout the survey.

      iii. This scale can easily be used for the following sections--(1) rate ICANN Board of Directors' governance, (2) GAC and its interaction with the Board, (3) Process by which ICANN receives public input, and (4) ICANN decision making process and policy development.

5. **Re: Yes/No questions**.
   a. You may want to include a 'Don't Know' option unless you know for certain that the respondents taking the survey will be able to answer with certainty either yes or no.

6. **Additional Suggestions**
   a. **Re: Rate ICANN questions**: If you choose to stay with the <u>very good to very poor scale</u>, list the answer options in the matrix (i.e. very good, good….poor, very poor), instead of the numbers. [the survey respondent should have to do as little work as possible]
   b. **Re: the first "Can you identify" question**: You ask about both accountability and transparency in this question. If these are different concepts, which it seems that they are given that you break them out in the questions below, you may want to only ask about accountability here. That is, you would start with the two questions on accountability and then move to the two questions on transparency.
      i. Minor Note: The way this is worded, the respondent is only answering "yes" if they can remember a "specific" example. If they cannot remember a specific example, they are likely to skip the question
   c. **Re: the "GAC and its interaction"** question: Again, use actual question options (You may also think about adding a "don't know option" to these as well. This goes for the question above that uses this answer format. (And for the question below)
   d. **Re: "Can you recommend steps needed to ensure"** question: Can you think of a better way to word this? It's a big confusing (and lengthy).