EN

BEIJING – ICANN Reputational Survey Results
Wednesday, April 10, 2013 – 12:30 to 13:30
ICANN – Beijing, People's Republic of China

JIM TRENGROVE: That way we would have to let them know, we had also realized that we'd be introducing ICANN to many of them for the first time. And while those of us who work at ICANN have a pretty favorable opinion of ourselves, that's not universally shared, we understand that, and so we thought that it would be important that we establish a reputational baseline as ICANN makes this big expansion, a starting point of sorts. As our presence in the world expands and the new GTLDs grow we thought we needed an idea of what we are doing right, what we are doing wrong, where we need to improve and a reputational survey baseline would give us an idea of the areas in which we need to improve. And so we brought in Echo Research and this is Bob Tacus who we've been working with for about a year now and Bob and his firm Echo Research based in London has developed a survey series which begin with a qualitative analysis that began in Toronto and ended in December and then has been conducting a quantitative survey, more extensive survey, some of you may have talked with Bob or done the online survey, and it's going to be complete within the next couple of weeks but this is a pretty solid preview of where we are right now, and with that I am going to turn it over to Bob. He is going to do a presentation for all of this and then we can take some questions afterwards.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

BOB TACUS: Well, thank you Jim and good afternoon everybody. My name is Bob Tacus and as Jim mentioned, I am Executive Vice President of Echo Research and I just wanted to first off thank everybody for coming here today, anytime you get a 12 or 12.30 spot it is always difficult and it's so nice to see so many people in attendance today who want to learn more about the Reputation Audit. So as Jim mentioned what we are going to be seeing today is really the first cut, if you would, of our data on the reputation benchmark. We're going to be processing this over the next few weeks with the intent of having it completed by the end of the month. A little bit about Echo, we've been for the last quarter century, providing advice to companies with respect to research and reputation measurement. We have 700 staff working across 18 offices and we are registered experts in the field of image and reputation. You know when I was putting this presentation together I saw this quote and I thought it would be very relevant for this afternoons session and it says - The reputation of a 1000 years may be determined by the conduct of one hour. And we are going to be spending one hour together and I'd like to say that when you think of reputation it's not about one stakeholder, it's not about one department buts it's really a shared responsibility that each and every one of us has a role to play in driving the reputation of the organization forward. So what I would ask is when we are going through the slides today ask yourself what could I do to help move the reputation forward, what are the things that I need to do, because at the end of the day it is a shared responsibility. So, what I would like to now do is just cover off a little about the objectives and we have four major points that we want to cover. The first was to look at the Image and reputation of ICANN and this is really from the lens of both internal stakeholders and external stakeholders. The

second was to uncover perceptions among the management team with its ability to provide really operational excellence and also look at the views with respect to the multi-stakeholder organizations. As Jim mentioned the end game is really to be able to provide actionable KPIs that we could measure. So what this study is going to enable ICANN to do is create a baseline, so right now what you are seeing today is really the line in the sand, and from here we could come back in six, eight months and measure progress around these KPIs, and then lastly it's about really synthesizing all of this data and providing a set of recommendations and that's where we are at right now. So what you are going to see today is really the data that our team is going to be using to pull together a set of recommendations over the next few weeks. So how did we do it? Well we deployed our reputation audit model and the model is really based on three phases. The first phase is called identity and that's really looking at internal stakeholders and how they identify with the values of the organization. The second stage is the image so it's really about obtaining stakeholder image from an external perspective of how they view the organization. And then finally the influence phase and this is looking at media, this is looking at content to see what kind of content is really shaping and driving perceptions among both internal and external stakeholders. So to put it simply, we spoke with internal stakeholders, external stakeholders and then we analyzed the media. Next we apply this model to eight reputational drivers. We looked at operations and we bifurcated operations in respect to both core internet functions and more managerial type of internal management functions. Next we looked at image and the perception of image from both internal and external stake holders as well as the media. We looked at issues of trust, we looked at to the

degree the perceptions around the multi stakeholder mark, and we also looked at the ability in perception to the extent of organization of balancing stake holder interest. We also looked at internationalization and tested themes around perceptions around - Is ICANN a truly global organization or not. We also investigated key things around the new GTLD program and finally we looked at the communications. So as Jim mentioned we began the study in Toronto where we conducted in-depth interviews with fourteen key internal stakeholders. Now from them we moved on and spoke to external stake holders and these stake holders were drawn from a wide pool of thought leaders, academics, national and international entities, members of the technical communities, governments, they were drawn from a pool from Europe, LATAM, Africa, APAD and US and we got a total of 26 interviews. And these were conducted in December of last year. So in total we have forty interviews, both internal and external stake holders. Now from there the team synthesized all this data and presented it in mid actually late December. Now for some of you who might have been at ALAC this only presents some of the key findings from that study. Now that study or a body of work enabled us to create the survey instrument and the survey instrument was administered to internal stake holders online and we began that process in mid February through mid March. Members were sent invitations to the participants via email from the secretariats and the survey was made available in eight languages. We had a total of 128 completes and you could see the distribution both by region and by key internal stake holder group. Now in respect to the commercial side, what we did here is we looked at a pool of both applicants and non applicants and our goal here is to achieve a 100 in each one of the regions. And as you could see we had 327 right now and

that's why we are expecting to wrap this up over the next two weeks. So the purpose of today is the sample size is based on 327.

And then finally on the influence side, now again this is analyzing the media. Our team looked at 525 items. Now all the articles were read in the national language and the articles were read from July through November and you might ask why did you pick up that time period and we thought that there was so much media coverage over certain events during the summer that lined some of the results so we took a picture from July onwards to analyze and we put these articles through our rating system which is really a point system that we developed that captures issues such as tone messages, spokes people, uses of sources, headlines, visuals, prominence placement sites. All these issues are looked at in the score, so each article is read in that natural language, it's looked at a number of elements in its range. All the article standards are totaled and summarized and that provides a composite of relative total. So what did we find? Well this next chart I would like to make several observations.   First the good news, the good news is with respect to the multi stakeholders model, you could see that across the board its very favorable perceptions. And I should know that the blue tabs are internal stakeholders, the green tabs are external and the grey tabs are the media or the influence. Now going down the next four we see operations, image, trust and balancing stakeholder interests, so kind of as a neutral to unfavorable. So this certainly suggest is that there is more opportunity and more room for improvement and what we could also see is the alignment between both internal and external stakeholders so the perceptions around these dimensions about the inside and the out pretty much along. Well I'd like to turn your attention

to the bottom three so we looked at the notion of internationalization and here you could see both internal and external stakeholders have a relatively unfavorable perception. Now, I would submit now given the new organizational structures and the hubs spoke model that's going to be implemented that we would envision this to move over time. Again, we would have to keep in mind this is a snap short where things are as of today. Now turning to the new GTLD services, this is a new area where we see a gap and a gap between internal and external. So internally you think you are doing well, it's basically a neutral but from the externally stakeholders there is a relatively higher unfavorable perception. And then lastly, we look at communications, now communications with this regards when you see an unfavorable it doesn't mean that the communications itself is unfavorable, it's unfavorable with respect to stakeholder outreach, so the good news is people want to hear more, people want to be engaged more and I think this is a take away in this box. Then finally, what I would like to do is to draw your attention to the grey tabs, which is the influencer tabs. And if you take a look at them you could see where are they, and it's pretty much neutral, so what does that mean, it means that as an organization you don't have a lot of external or the content that's been published is neither favorable or unfavorable so what happens is when people look to the sources for opinions or to help shape their perceptions they are getting a neutral, so what happens to them they'd have fall to their own internal perceptions, so here's another opportunity if you could influence the influencer we would expect to see certainly a movement much more movement to the favorable category, so that's kind of a very high level over view, the next part of the presentation is really going to be looking at each one of these dimensions in more detail. Now

when we look at the multi stakeholder model we find that that is one of ICANNs greatest assets, and you could see both internal and external stakeholders believe that by quite a big margin and also looking at balancing stakeholder interest equally we see a divide between both internal and external stakeholders and you might ask - Why do you think so? And one thought we had is because basically on a commercial side if I believe I am getting treated equally I am probably thinking that everybody else is, and people on the internal stakeholders are typically close to the process and may have other perceptions and opinions. Now the other issue I want to focus on is the last one and that's the issue of transparency and here even though its below 50% we've seen in the discussions we had the majority of the stakeholders think things are getting better and those issues are turning around, so certainly what we would recommend is to continue in your messaging that when there is opportunities to demonstrate transparency to go do it because it is the internal and external community beliefs that it is tracking on a positive track. Now we look at media, we find that by and large media coverage around the issue is ICANN global organization and is a multi stakeholder model and does it work. You have tremendous support and tremendous favorable coverage around the stake holders. Now we asked the question to internal stake holders, now do you believe or how effective do you believe the SOAC structure is, and the good news is by and large you can see at least 61% came back and said yes it is very effective, so you see a lot of grey area, so the internal stake holders believe in the organization and its almost true, if I could draw your attention to the blue box its almost 2;1, its effective, so stake holders believe that model works. Now, when we turn to operations, as I mentioned earlier the bifurcations is into two parts, one is looking at operations with respect

to mission and the second part is looking at operations more in the part of business functions. Now with respect to internet mission overwhelmingly agree that ICANN delivery is going in that function and it's pretty much the same about the internal and external stakeholders. The same holds true for the last box we see the plan for scale and security continually again high marks. Where there is room for improvement is in the middle, the notion of being a steward in the public interest. Pretty much the same alignment between internal and external stakeholders but there could be a little bit more improvement to get it to that level but all in all high marks with respect to overall mission. Now, when we look at the operations we asked a number of questions, we asked questions around finance, we asked questions about program management, we asked questions about innovation, leadership indication, now the kind of company you want to work with and finally a summary of excellence in everything. Now there is two things, the first two is financially strong and manages services effectively received that's really in the path. And the rest are kind of below 50%. And I would like to draw your attention to the last graph here, in excellence in all its operations I think here is room for improvement but clearly as you are involving and putting the process in place and growing the organization now we would expect that to move in time, but that's and area and you could see that is pretty close in alignment between internal and external stakeholders. We certainly see that to come back in 6-8 months and see how that works. We also asked a question to internal stakeholders in respect to will be organization fulfill its mission from the ICANN 45 meeting in Toronto. And an overwhelming majority of you said yes. So its believing that what took place in Toronto will be implemented. So you as an organization believe

that's going to happen. Now we turn to image and reputation, we are going to see some credits and I would turn your attention to the blue boxes on the bottom. So, when you look at internal stakeholders and external stake holders you have credits and it is pretty closely aligned, 37% of the stake holders said that they would be critical about the organization about 40% of the external stake holders will be critical. But what I would submit is look at the beige box because here you have a lot of undecided voting if you look, we have 35% of the internal stake holders on neutral and you have 42% of the external stake holders also being neutral. So, here's a good opportunity for you to convert these into advocacy now by doing that you may feed some of the critics to into that camp but the good news here is the fact that you do have a significant amount of stakeholders who you could drive and help shake opinions and bring them into the advocacy camp. Now when we look at the media coverage I want to make two points, the first you could see the yellow which is neutral and this again ties back to what I mentioned earlier when we saw those grey boxes from the influencer side being neutral so we had 41% of the coverage not being positive not being negative, you have 38% of the coverage being favorable but of that 38% majority of it was coverage around the Toronto meeting understanding of the INF contract. And then the unfavorable coverage was pretty much centered around the new GTLD program but the good news here is overall if you look at the rating at the bottom and that's through that scoring methodology, I highlighted earlier the overall turnout is 51.8% so that means you are above the neutral in total and you are tracking a favorable or positive turnout. Now when we look at trust we are going to see that there is a very good platform to build off of, and trust and ethics we see are certainly higher among external stakeholders than

internal, and again I think that's probably that notion of you know if I am an external stakeholder I deal with the organization and it's about me, whereas internal stakeholders there is certainly more of a day to day integration and operation in that and I think the same is with ethics. So we look at ethics external stakeholders give 61% in terms of high standards, ethics and integrity. The good news certainly on the internal side you are over 52% that rates you high on the notion ethics. I think one thing that we saw in our conversations with internal stakeholders was this notion that the decision making process is sometimes viewed as closed so I think this is something for us to keep in mind that there is a perception out there that in some cases the decision making isn't really open which gets back to what we said earlier about transparency and accountability. So, again, driving those themes and messaging to shape that opinion and perception is not a close process and that is something that is to keep in mind. So, on the issue of balancing stakeholder interest I would like to draw your attention to two data points here. First is the blue box and the second is the orange box below, so the blue box is saying that 35% of the commercial business community doesn't know if the organization really understands its needs. So here's a great opportunity to really go out message and bring those stakeholders over. Now when we look at the internal stakeholders it's kind of split, so you have almost have half of the internal stake holders believe that you are doing just a fair job at understanding the needs of your own stake holders. So here's an opportunity to engage more to educate to really have more of an engagement with those stake holders. Now this next chart is not about giving everybody an eye chart here so what I want to do is break it down there's three things going on here, so we asked the question in

your opinion the degree to which internal stake holders are able to engage with the groups on the left so you look at the top four you get high marks on engaging with registries and registrars, US Government, commercial interest and the technical community. So those are on the top, so that's what the internal stake holders felt that the best engagement is with these groups. Now I turn your attention to the bottom, the bottom line here highlights the fact that with the general public you believe you are doing a poor job in terms of stakeholder engagement and the rest are kind of in the middles and that's engaging with the media that engaging with the NGOs, developing countries, academics and non US Government entities kind of a mix here, so you have the four on the top and then you the one that is very poor is the engagement with the public. Now in terms of internationalization, this as I mentioned earlier this is something as you roll out your new organization structure we would expect this to change, now think of this as two extremes, on one side is a truly global perception, is the organization view as truly global and on the other side of the spectrum is a very US centric and I think what is interesting here is both groups it's pretty close in terms of the perception of being a truly global organization and on the other hand it being a very US centric organization. What you have is this big chasm in the middle of people that really don't know - Is it Global, Is it US or Gee I don't know, and so here we would certainly just think that as the new organization structure gets rolled out these perceptions should change. Now we ask the first question, another question of internal stakeholders with respect to the degree to which ICANN is successful in developing regional strategy and here what we have seen is a pretty much a kind of a mixed bag where you have about 43% saying yes they strongly agree

and tend to agree with that. And then you have another 40% that tend to disagree and then another 7. So it's kind of the jury is still out in respect to the regional strategy success. Another question we asked is this whole notion about functioning under US law. Now here there is really nothing, it is very fragmented. We did not see one way or the other and you could see that in the data it is pretty much across the board in the lower mid 20s, and then finally we asked a question with respect to the ITU and is that a viable alternative to ICANN, and you could see a majority of 61% who said NO. Now, under the notion of global participation, very high marks across the board by both internal and external stakeholders, you could see 89% of the external stakeholders agree with that 82% of the internal stakeholders and you could see that again integrates global and regional responsibilities you know high marks by both the commercial and internal stakeholders. One thing I do want to mention with respect to the regional strategies is we heard this during our conversations, this is very important and we saw that in Toronto with the unveiling of the African strategy, a lot of the stakeholders are looking for regional. So as I was saying the notion of regional strategies and then being able to really engage stakeholders at a local level or regional level we heard that it is going to be very important, so it's the notion of think globally, but really act on a regional level and really engage as many stakeholders as you can, and this is something that we would really encourage because we have heard that time and time again from many stakeholders. I think the last one here is about government relations, and as you could see both internal and external stakeholders, believe that you are doing a good job in maintaining good government relations. Now when we come to the new GTLD services I am going to leave some of the quotes up that I

found from the in-depth discussion, just to provide some contacts, because you don't need me to tell you how important this program is. This has come through loud and clear through our discussions and you will see it in the following slides. So as a reputational driver this is very important and a very significant driver to the organization. Now what I am going to show you on a next slide is really a series of questions that we asked in respect to the management and operations of the new program. Now we asked it from both an internal perspective and the commercial perspective. And again it's not an I-Chart, so I am going to break it down. There are about 3 or 4 things going on here. So when you look at it from an internal perspective, the internal organization in relative terms is a harsher critic than the commercial stakeholders. I would like to point out one point on the internal side, and that's in respect to promotion. So overall promotion, promoting the program from an internal perspective receives high marks. Now what I would like to do is look at the commercial side, and I would like to draw your attention to the blue box that's under the dispute resolution process because I think here is an opportunity. You have 29% of the commercial stakeholders who don't know anything about it, so I think here is an opportunity to go out and really educate these stakeholders about what that particular element of the program is as well as just educating them about the program, because what you see is if you go down to the overall operational management of the program, you have three quarters who are saying that it's managed just fair or poor. Now one of the other points I would like to raise is - Why is that? And I think another driver of that is the last part here, which is the notion about transparency of the decision making process, so one thought we had is the fact that if stakeholders believe potentially that there might be a

lack of transparency, they might say well then it's not operating properly and that's one way. So what is that? Again, that notion of communicating transparency, communicating openness, communicating all that to these stakeholders is going to be critical because that's one way to help drive that and change that perception. The other one I just want to raise is if you look at the one above it, it is the balancing the interest of diverse groups, and we see that is very higher in the commercial sector. You might say well Bob, why do you think that, and I think it really comes down to you know if I am taken care of, I probably think everybody else is, so I think commercial interests are looking at it that way which is why we see a higher percentage of those stakeholders rating that at 43%. Now when we come down to communications, and this is what we saw in the beginning of the presentation, there are a few things going on here. Number 1, you look at third party generating, you have about 34% of the com is generated by third parties, but another 37% is generated by journalists, and you could see again in our scoring methodology you are pretty much at that neutral level, 50.6% and 49.4%, so it's really netting on the neutral. But when you look at corporate com, you see that the scoring here is 57.9% so you are in a favorable category and yet it is only used 25%, so the big diamond in the rough here is corporate com because it's about controlling the message, and you are only doing 25% of the time. Now you might ask well Bob, how does that rate in other industries, and we took that and we looked through our database and find that the industry average is typically 40% to 60%, so this is a big underutilized asset because what you want to be doing is you want to be out there controlling your story. It's not about spin, it's just about getting your message across, and I think if you do that, and to come

back and measure how that really influences all those other tabs that we saw in the beginning of the presentation, we would see movement toward the favorable side. Now this last question, I am not going to spend too much time on it. This is really about channels and how do stakeholders want to be engaged and what kind of channel do they find most appealing, and basically the way this breaks down is that internal stakeholders find direct contact most valuable, externals stakeholders find indirect contact more valuable, indirect contact meaning websites, webinars, whereas direct contacts are meetings and actual personal interaction. So what does all this really mean and you know there was some discussion this afternoon, it really does come down to stakeholder engagement, it's really about going out and leveraging successes, driving the conversation, addressing the negative perceptions and then taking action, taking action with clear values and principles, driving on relationships of mutual trust and respect, aligning everything to the demands of your biggest reputational asset which is the multi-stakeholder model and then really using that as a way to help shape the debate and really to be that beacon that supports the one world, one internet debate. Ladies and gentleman, I appreciate your time today, I can tell you that our firm is certainly honored to be part of this process and provide this information to ICANN, and I would be happy to take any questions or perspectives.

JIM TRENGROVE: Thank you Bob. We have go about 10 minutes before this session is supposed to end.

PARTICIPANT: Hi, I would be interested to know about your database of the other companies etc, whether the media coverage was coming out each time as almost exactly in the middle or neutral, do you find much variation with other companies or does it typically wind down neutral?

BOB TACUS: Well that's a great question, the question being about you know neutrality and coverage, and I think you know again what we see is when cooperate com engaged and active and we see that shifting the debate and providing a much more positive type of coverage and clearly if com is being used at a higher level, you are controlling the story, so that story typically should be in a more favorable perception, so that internal will pool other stakeholders, so if somebody is looking at corporate com with a third party, they are going to be picking that up, so there is kind of a multiplier effect as well.

MARILYN CADE: I wanted to make a comment about the use of a particular word to describe ICANN and ask a question about it. ICANN is not a company and one of the things that I think all of us are struggling with, and I worked a lot in the international environment related to internet governance, one of the things that I think a lot of us are struggling with is it is a very unique and new creature so to speak, and so I really like seeing the application of techniques that are tested and tried as you know I mentioned to you I worked for a major corporation, but I also was wondering if you think we may need to do more thinking about the uniqueness of the animal that ICANN is because it has elements of allocating a resource that needs to be shared, it is not a government, it

has a responsibility to act in the public interest in its decisions, it has the need to build a governance model, so it is a very wide and diverse set of roles that it needs to play, and looking at this and using measurement tools, I was just wondering looking ahead if you thought that we may need to be pioneering more in the kinds of things that we measure?

BOB TACUS: That's a great question, to answer it clearly the multi-stakeholder model is unique and we saw that just in terms of when we were developing the research and you know you look at internal and external stakeholders for example, and it is a unique model because I could be internal or I could be external depending upon where I sit, so I think the model is unique, but the model works and the model is a very strong reputational asset. The dimensions that we looked at are the 8 that we surveyed, are key critical reputational drivers and that's what we used as the basis of this study to say look from our experience these are typically the 8 that really drive and have an impact on reputation, and that's not to say that there should be additional work involved but these set of 8 will provide a very good baseline that we could then go measure, but you are correct it is a very unique organization. You are right, it isn't a company, it falls under that wayside government, wayside something company type of model.

MARILYN CADE: And just a follow-up, so asking a question about how we think we are doing with the US government, to me, I am a US citizen, but I work globally, so I would need to ask the question of how am I doing with the

EN

world's governments just as I needed to ask the question of how am I doing the world's users, would that be right?

BOB TACUS: Yeah, and I think what we saw was in respect to the US government it was a kind of, we asked a question - Does US law hinder ICANN ability? And it really didn't come out and it was kind of a fragmentation.

JIM TRENGROVE: Bob, thank you, and as Bob said, Echo is going to be completing this hopefully by the end of the month and corporate com's will be working with Echo to produce this in a digestible form and present it to the community as well. Thank you so much.

BOB TACUS: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]