As you are aware, during its November 2022 meeting the GNSO Council adopted recommendation #3 of the Scoping Team's write up and is awaiting the feedback from ICANN org before deciding how to proceed. As part of that decision, the Council also requested Council leadership to reach out informally to Scoping Team members in an effort to better understand any issues encountered during the Scoping Team's work. The Council intends to use this feedback to help inform any future Council's review of the formation and instructions that is expected to take place before any further work is to be undertaken (if any).

To facilitate gathering this feedback, Council leadership, with the assistance of the staff support team, has put together this brief survey that all Scoping Team members are kindly requested to complete. Please note that you may remain anonymous when responding to this survey, meaning that you do not need to provide your name. If you choose to provide your name and/or email address, this will only be seen by staff administering this survey. Staff will only use this information to get in touch with you if there are any follow-up questions after the survey has been administered. After this survey is closed, the staff support team will produce a report summarizing the results, and the report will be shared with Council leadership. Based on their assessment of the results, they will provide recommendations to the GNSO Council as part of the review of the Scoping Team's formation and instructions. The report will include:

- Aggregated responses to all questions in which respondents select from a menu of choices or from a numerical scale.
- Full text of any narrative responses, such as comments or explanations of their numerical scores.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please send an email to: gnso-secs@icann.org, and the staff support team will endeavor to address them promptly.

This questionnaire is organized into six short sections and should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Some of the questions will ask you for an effectiveness rating (1-7 Scale), after which there will be an opportunity within each major section to add free-form text comments. You are encouraged to provide supplementary explanations or other supporting information that will help Council leadership understand and interpret your input. All of the questions asking for an effectiveness rating are optional. If you do not wish to respond to one of these questions, you can leave the slider at a value of zero, corresponding to "No Answer." Survey questions that are mandatory are marked with a red asterisk.

PAGE 2

Section 1 - Participant Identification

Before we get started with the first Section, the following questions allow you to provide identifying information.

- 1. Name [free text field optional]
- 2. Email Address [free text field optional]
- 3. Primary Organizational Affiliation [dropdown optional]
 - Business Constituency (GNSO)
 - Intellectual Property Constituency (GNSO)
 - Internet Services Provider Constituency (GNSO)
 - Non-Commercial Users Constituency (GNSO)

- Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency (GNSO)
- Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)
- Registry Stakeholder Group (GNSO)
- Registrar Stakeholder Group (GNSO)
- Nominating Committee appointee (GNSO)
- Nominating Committee appointee (other)
- At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
- At-Large Community
- Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)
- Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
- Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
- Address Supporting Organization (ASO)
- Country Code Supporting Organization (ccNSO)
- Other
- 4. If you selected "Other" for Primary Organizational Affiliation, please specify): [free text field]
- 5. Scoping Team Role* [dropdown]
 - Chair or Co-Chair
 - Vice Chair
 - Member
 - Alternate
 - Liaison
 - Other
- 6. If you selected "Other" for Scoping Team Role, please specify: [free text field]

In the next three sections, you will be asked to rate the EFFECTIVENESS (Scale 1-7) of several performance dimensions organized into Inputs, Processes, and Outputs; the scale interpretation will be provided appropriate to each element.

Council leadership understands that, when answering survey questions, it may seem challenging to assign a single numerical rating to any team dimension in which a broad spectrum of experiences occurred. You are asked to think about the <u>overall</u> effort and provide the most honest and accurate representation in your best judgment. Learning and process improvement are the goals, and there are no right or wrong answers. Recognizing that there may be important dynamics that simply cannot be captured in a single rating, you are encouraged to use the free-form comment box within each major section to provide supplementary explanations that will help Council Leadership understand and interpret your feedback.

PAGE 3

Section 2 – Inputs . . . includes the charter/mission, team members, tools, and resources Thinking about the <u>overall</u> EFFECTIVENESS of the Scoping Team's <u>Inputs</u>, how would you rate each of the following six elements on a scale where **1=Highly Ineffective** and **7=Highly Effective**:

Assessment Category	Rating
---------------------	--------

7. The Scoping Team instructions where: 1-Highly Ineffective means confusing, vague, ill-structured, unbounded, unrealistic (e.g., time, constraints), unachievable; and 7-Highly Effective means understandable, clear, well-structured, bounded, realistic (e.g., time, constraints), achievable	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer	
8. The Expertise of Scoping Team members where: 1-Highly Ineffective means that, collectively, team members did not possess an appropriate level of knowledge/skill to fulfill the mission; and 7-Highly Effective means that team members, collectively, were appropriately knowledgeable and skilled to accomplish the mission	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer	
9. The Representativeness of Scoping Team members where: 1-Highly Ineffective means narrow, skewed, selective, unbalanced; and 7-Highly Effective means broad, diverse, balanced	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer	
10. The Staff Support Resources (e.g., meeting support, guidelines, documentation, drafting) provided to and utilized by the WG where: 1-Highly Ineffective means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and 7-Highly Effective means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer	
11. Comments about the Scoping Team's Inputs (any additional feedback you want to provide in relation to the questions in this section. Especially if you rated any of the above questions with a score lower than 4, please provide suggestions for what changes should be considered to improve this score in the future):	(Free-form Text Box)	

PAGE 4

Section 3 – Processes . . . includes norms, operations, logistics, and decision-making

Thinking about the <u>overall</u> EFFECTIVENESS of the Scoping Team's <u>Processes</u>, how would you rate each of the following elements on a scale where **1=Highly Ineffective** and **7=Highly Effective**:

Assessment Category	Rating
12. The Scoping Team's Leadership where:	

1-Highly Ineffective means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and 7-Highly Effective means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer		
, , ,			
 13. The Council Liaison to the Scoping Team where: 1-Highly Ineffective means inappropriate, inadequate, untimely, not helpful/useful; and 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer		
7-Highly Effective means appropriate, adequate, timely, helpful/useful			
14. The Participation climate within the Scoping			
Team where: 1-Highly Ineffective means inhospitable, unilateral,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer		
frustrating, unproductive; and 7-Highly Effective means inviting, inclusive, accepting, respectful, productive			
15. The Behavior norm of Scoping Team members where:			
where: 1-Highly Ineffective means disruptive, argumentative, disrespectful, hostile, domineering; and 7-Highly Effective means accommodating,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer		
respectful, collaborative, consensus-building			
16. The Session/Meeting Planning (e.g., agendas) where:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer		
1-Highly Ineffective means disorganized, haphazard, unstructured, untimely notice; and 7-Highly Effective means organized, disciplined, structured, timely notice			
17. Comments about the Scoping Team's Processes (any additional feedback you want to provide in relation to the questions in this section. Especially if you rated any of the above questions with a score lower than 4, please provide suggestions for what changes should be considered to improve this score in the future):	(Free-form Text Box)		
18. Future Leadership – if/when the Scoping Team recommences its effort, what characteristics should the Council look for when selecting new leadership for this effort? As a reference, please see the original Expression of Interest: https://www.icann.org/en/announcements/details/expressions-of-interest-chair-of-registration-data-	(Free-form text box)		
accuracy-scoping-team-4-8-2021-en.			

PAGE 6

Section 5 - Personal Dimensions

As a result of having invested significant time and effort volunteering on a Working Group, your Chartering Organization is interested to learn about your own personal Engagement, Fulfillment, and Willingness-to-Serve in the future.

Assessment Category	Rating	
19. My <u>personal</u> Engagement in helping the Scoping Team accomplish its mission: 1-Participated Never ; and 7-Participated Extensively	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer	
20. My <u>personal</u> Fulfillment considering the time, energy, and work efforts I contributed to this Scoping Team: 1-Highly Unrewarding; and 7-Highly Rewarding	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer	
21. Assuming all other conditions are suitable (e.g., subject, interest, need, fit, availability), I assess my personal Willingness-to-Serve on a future ICANN Working Group as: 1-Extremely Unreceptive; and 7-Extremely Receptive	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Answer	
22. Comments about Personal Dimensions:	(Free-form Text Box)	

PAGE 5

Section 6 - Demographics

Your Chartering Organization has a few final questions that will assist in framing your experience with this Working Group.

23. How did you learn about the Scoping Team (Select any/all that apply)?*	 I was informed or invited by my SG/C or ICANN-affiliated organization I was contacted by an ICANN Staff member I was contacted by an individual seeking to recruit volunteers for the WG (e.g., GNSO Councilor, interim Chair) I learned about the WG through one of ICANN's websites (or Wikis) I learned about the WG from another organization external to ICANN A professional colleague or associate informed me about the WG Other
24. If you selected "Other" in the question above, please explain:	

25. Approximately how long have you been involved with ICANN?*	 Less than 1 year 1 - 2 years 2 - 4 years 4 - 6 years 6 - 8 years More than 8 years
26. Considering the most recent twelve months, approximately how many hours per week do you spend on ICANN-related activities on the average?*	 Less than 2 hours 2 - 5 hours 6 - 10 hours 11 - 15 hours 16 - 20 hours More than 20 hours
27. Please feel free to provide any additional feedback about your Scoping Team experience, any improvements that should be considered, or any other matter not covered elsewhere in this questionnaire.	(Free-form Text Box)