

GNSO Review Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

Introduction to the GNSO Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

Welcome to the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment!

This brief survey is additional to and complements the initial GNSO 360 questionnaire, which asked questions about the GNSO as a whole, the GNSO Council, and the GNSO's Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies.

The purpose of this brief Supplementary Assessment is to seek your views on a specific GNSO Working Group. You will be asked which Working Group your responses are in reference to. If you wish to provide feedback on more than one Working Group, please complete this brief survey once for each Working Group you are providing feedback on.

The GNSO 360 Assessments, including this Supplementary 360 Assessment, have been formulated and implemented by the Independent Examiner, Westlake Governance. The data collected via this survey will be summarised and analysed by Westlake and used as an input into the overall GNSO Review.

Some questions are mandatory and some are optional. Mandatory questions are marked with an asterisk (*).

Many questions provide a text field for your comments. Most of these fields are limited to 600 characters. If you wish to provide more input than will fit into the field, please note it in the final comment section or email Westlake Governance at gnsoreview@westlakegovernance.com.

1. Westlake will maintain your confidentiality. We will not identify you in material we quote or share with the GNSO and staff unless you grant us specific permission by ticking the box below.

I consent to being identified by name as the author of my feedback

GNSO Review Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

About you

Be sure to click NEXT in order to save your responses. Please provide your name and affiliation when submitting your response, as required by ICANN's [Expected Standards of Behavior and Public Comment Rules and Procedures](#).

*2. Your name and contact address:

Name:

Email Address:

3. Please give your affiliation (i.e. a company or non-profit group that you are member of that is relevant to your interest in the Working Group), if any:

GNSO Review Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

*4. Which GNSO Working Group are you commenting on in this survey?

NOTE: If you wish to provide feedback on more than one Working Group, please complete this brief survey once for each Working Group you are providing feedback on.

- Completed (2012-2014) Non-PDP Joint DNS Security and Stability Analysis
- Completed (2011-2013) Non-PDP Fake Renewal Notices Drafting Team
- Completed (2011-2013) Non-PDP Study Group on Use of Names for Countries and Territories
- Completed (2011-2013) Non-PDP WHOIS Survey Requirements
- Completed (2008-2013) PDP Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery
- Completed (2012-2012) Non-PDP: Uniformity of Contracts to Address Registration Abuse
- Completed (2011-2012) Non-PDP: Protection of Red Cross/IOC Names in New gTLDs
- Completed (2011-2012) Non PDP: Consumer Trust
- Completed (2008-2012) Non-PDP: GNSO Improvements
- Completed (2009-2012) Non-PDP: SSAC GNSO IRD
- Completed (2010-2011) Non-PDP: Joint SO/AC on New gTLD Applicant Support
- Completed (2010-2011) Non-PDP: Recommendation 6
- Completed (2009-2011) Non-PDP: Registration Abuse Policies
- Completed (2008-2011) PDP: Fast Flux
- Completed (2009-2010) Non-PDP: Affirmation of Commitments
- Completed (2009-2010) Non-PDP: Special Trademark Issues
- Completed (2009-2010) PDP: Vertical Integration
- Completed (2008-2009) PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Development Process – Part A
- Completed (2009-2009) Non-PDP: Trademark Protections – Implementation Recommendation Team
- Active PDP: IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms
- Active PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy-B
- Active PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy-C
- Active PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy-D
- Active PDP: gTLD Registration Data Services
- Active PDP: Locking of a Domain Name
- Active PDP: Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs
- Active PDP: Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues
- Active PDP: 'Thick' Whois
- Active PDP: Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information

GNSO Review Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

Other (please specify)

GNSO Review Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

Questions about this Working Group

Be sure to click NEXT in order to save your responses.

*5. Working Group participation:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable
This Working Group welcomes and includes all interested stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group has an appropriate balance of views and affiliations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group has informed and constructive discussions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group achieves consensus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The volunteer workload for this Working Group is reasonable and does not cause overload	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please expand if you wish:

*6. Working Group support:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable
This Working Group has sufficient secretariat staff support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group has sufficient technical staff support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please expand if you wish:

GNSO Review Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

*7. Working Group meetings:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable
This Working Group is well chaired	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group is effective in planning and prioritising its agenda items	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group's meetings and conference calls are of appropriate frequency and length	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and wikis)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group's documentation, transcripts, and recordings are published in a timely manner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group's Action Items and follow up work are well-managed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please expand if you wish:

GNSO Review Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

*8. Policy Development Process (PDP):

(If the Working Group has no PDP or has not completed its PDP, please mark "Not Applicable" as your response to the relevant statements)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable
This Working Group's Charter provides adequate guidance for the Working Group to carry out its tasks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group's reports are thorough in addressing the charter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group incorporates community feedback well	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group's outputs are delivered in a timely manner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This Working Group's final report addresses and reflects appropriately all input and opinions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please expand if you wish:

GNSO Review Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

Finally, some general questions about the Working Group

Be sure to click NEXT in order to save your responses.

***9. Overall, how effective do you think this Working Group is in accomplishing its charter?**

***10. How do you believe this Working Group is seen by other parts of ICANN, including other parts of the GNSO?**

11. Please add any further comments you would like to make about this Working Group

Thank you

The team at Westlake Governance thanks you for completing the questionnaire.

If you would like to expand on any of your answers, or send us supplementary information, please send email to gnsoreview@westlakegovernance.com.

When you leave this page, your browser will be redirected to the GNSO Review home page.