

---

TORONTO – IANA Business Excellence Workshop  
Thursday, October 18, 2012 – 09:00 to 10:30  
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

LEO VIGODA: I'm presenting today with [Claus Ratamakka], who is from KRBE. Claus is a consultant we've been working with since 2009 on the IANA Business Excellence Activity.

We're going to talk a little bit about the model that we have been going through and then we're going to talk about the activities and results. Anyone who wants to speak, we're going to have a discussion. We're looking for your input on basically what we're doing and so on so I'm going to hand over to Claus who is going to kick us off.

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]: Thank you, good morning from my side. Welcome to this workshop. I'm really happy that you're here, at 8:30 when the room was still quite empty; I had the thought that the biggest threat for us was probably that wonderful event last night up the CN Tower. How many of you have been here? Most of you. Brave people. I left at 9:45 PM in order to be up and awake here, so, I know that it went much longer, it was really good.

I assume you are all interested in business excellence, otherwise you wouldn't be here. As Lee already said, we want this to be a workshop, an interactive session. Please speak up if there are any questions or if there is something you want to add or comment on.

---

*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.*

---

This is what the overview is of what we intend to do this morning; we have an hour and half. If we just run through the presentation we'll be done in 30 minutes, so it's not that we're going to speak here forever. This is really going to be something where we want to engage in a discussion with you.

As Leo mentioned I've been working with the IANA team since 2009 so we've doing this business excellence activity for the last three years now. I do believe and I've heard that from others that the first results to be seen and what I'd like you to get acquainted with is the fundamental model we're working on which is called the EFQM Model or also the EFQM Methodology.

May I just ask quickly, who of have heard about EFQM before? Does this acronym ring a bell? Elise, yes? You're from the UK right? EFQM is very prominent; EFQM stands for European Foundation for Quality Management. It is one, I deliberately say that it's one model, it's one methodology to base your business excellence activities on. There are a couple of others; one of them is Malcolm Baldrige. Who of you have heard of Malcolm Baldrige? Okay, several hands went up.

There's also Deming; very prominent in Japan. It was originally started by an American professor in Japan early in the 50's. EFQM and Malcolm Baldrige they both were developed at about the same time in the mid to late 80's. By the way, Malcolm Baldrige at the time was the Secretary of Commerce in the Reagan administration; he's the one who started that. EFQM was started by several international large corporations.



---

What is EFQM about? There are eight fundamental concepts of excellence. They are written here and I hope they can be read from the back. These eight fundamental concepts of excellence are: imbed it in a way that is not primary to the other; they all have the same value. There is no prioritization in these concepts; they are all of equal importance. That is very important to understand.

Out of these fundamental concepts of excellence come a model with nine criteria and we'll see those later. Those nine criteria consist of five so-called enabling criteria; they enable an organization on their way to excellence and then there are four results criteria. We'll look at that a little later.

I just want to say a few words about these eight fundamental concepts of excellence. Starting at the top, although there is no order, there is no one concept that is more important than the other. Adding value for customers; what does that mean? It basically means that an organization on its way to excellence should always be aware of the fact that everything you do should be somehow associated with adding value for the customers. That means you have to know your customer and your customer groups; you have to know what their expectations are. That is a very important part of it.

You must anticipate the expectations and you have to come up with a strategy that meets the expectations of the customers. If you are not adding value for your customers, eventually you will be out of business. It's as simple as that.

Looking at the next one; sustaining outstanding results. The important part here is the sustaining. Having good results of something, yes we all



---

thrive for that, we all try to achieve that, but business excellence is not about optimizing quarter financial results. It's about outstanding results in a sustainable way and that has a short-term, a mid-term, and a long-term perspective.

The other important thing is that the results have to be outstanding results with regard to all stakeholders. Organizations do not only have one stakeholder group; there are customers, there is the community, there are the people in the organization, in the ICANN world, there are all these constituencies. All of these are stakeholders that sometimes might have even conflicting interests. The business excellence approach allows you to combine and to develop a strategy even out of conflicting interests. That is a very important part of it.

Succeeding through the talent of people means that you have to ensure that the people you have on board; the employees in your organization; that you use their talent, that you train or educate them, that you deal with them in a way that they are capable of meeting the stakeholders expectations of meeting the strategic objectives that the organization has. You care for your people and that's a very important part of it. Employees, people are one stakeholder group in an organization. A very important one; they are at least as important as the customers because the customers won't get any service if there are no people working for the organization.

Manage with agility; that is a concept that describes that you have to have a management system in place that allows you to be adaptive to necessary changes. It allows you to be ready when the environment changes. I think we are all aware of the fact that in this particular



---

scenario, we're working, ICANN is working, IANA is working, and that this is a scenario that is rapidly changing. Managing with agility has to ensure that you are really capable of managing this change.

Leading with visual inspiration and integrity; this is a concept that directly reflects to one of the criteria that we're going to see later on. The criterion is leadership. The business excellence model requires the leaders of the organization to act as role models. They have to be capable of developing appropriate strategies and policies together with the stakeholders to deploy that in strategic objectives and discuss that with their employees. All of that happens in a way that the leaders are inspiring, that they work in a way of integrity so that everyone sees that they mean what they say and that it's not only lip service that they deliver. This is a very important aspect as well.

Harnessing creativity and innovation; once again, has a lot to do with managing change. You have to be creative and you have to be innovative if you want to be ready for the future. However, there is one important aspect. Business excellence with regard to innovation does not mean that you do innovation just for the purpose of doing something new. Everything that you do in the innovative part actually means the value that it gives to you and how it helps you serve better by using innovative technology. You never use something just because it is there. It is always related again to the value something adds for the customer.

Developing organizational capability; once again, this has a lot to do with the change management, setting up the organization, getting it structured in a way that you can service your customers appropriately,



that the people can work, the people are cared for; all these are things that relate to this concept of developing the organizational capability.

Last one that I'm going to talk about but no way least; creating a sustainable future. Sustainable future means that we care; not only for the organization but for the global environment around us. That it is a very important aspect. It's not only about the very one organization, it's about the environment, it's about the global community that's being served, and especially in the situation that ICANN is in, and if you look at who IANA provides services to, this is the world. That is what creating a sustainable future wants to represent. Next slide please Leo.

The included outcomes are, and that is another fundamental aspect in regard to the business excellence based on EFQM is you always, for everything that you do, for the strategy that you have, or for the vision that you want to achieve for the operation that you have, you define what exactly what it is you want to do. You define planned results. Then, you have to find a systematic approach. You have to deploy that approach and then you want to make sure it's also stable and that the approach is being measured. You compare these measurements against the results that you intended to have and then you start assessing them and refining them.

There is this kind of circle of planning and developing an approach, deploying this approach, assessing the results, and refining the approach in order to become better. It has a lot to do with areas of improvement; continuing improvement. This circle that we described here, everything has to be systematic, not necessarily ad hoc, but of course every one of us has got feelings every now and then, we need to



---

do that. You need to try and find a systematic way of sharing your feelings and if it's something you want to follow on. This is usually possible. It has a lot to do with managing by fact figures rather than just saying that you feel like you should do it a certain way. Everything that you do should be sustainable and by doing that you develop a framework for improvement. This framework for improvement is something that we can run through and will be executed and you will definitely see, if you do this the right way, the results to improve.

I have spoken about the eight fundamental concepts; and I told you that there are all together nine criteria in the EFQM model. This is the model as it is presented by the EFQM, if you look at it from left to right it starts with leadership; I already mentioned that. There are people, strategy, partnerships, resources, and processes. These are the five so-called enabling criteria.

For each of the criteria, it defined what excellent organizations are supposed to be achieving on these criteria. There's one thing that I want to make very clear; EFQM is a model. It does not tell you how to run an organization. No way. It does not tell you how to do things, it only tells you how you see whether the things you do actually fulfill the criteria of this model.

Then there are the results criteria; customer results. Very important. When you measure what you deliver for your customers, when you ask the customers for feedback, they will give you a result where you can see whether you meet your strategic objective, whether you met what you have defined in your vision and mission. Then there are people results; very similar. They can be achieved by employee surveys. There

are also society results, how you are perceived as an organization in society. How do you use this information in order to manage your organization?

Last but not least, there is key results. This model going from left to right has the enabling criteria then the results criteria. If you measure the results you go back to the enabling criteria and you have the process and creativity. This is basically the assessment and the refinement.

This is the last slide that I'm going to talk about. This shows where we have achieved from the assessments that we have undertaken since 2010, we have had three self-assessments already within the IANA Team, the fourth one is scheduled for January 2013. These are the four criteria where we have made the biggest progress. You measure that, you get scores in the assessments.

One of them is leadership, then definitely with processes, products and services, then with customer results and key results. This does not mean that we're done. This excellence is not a project where you ever get to an end. It's a mindset; it's a culture in an organization. This is just what I wanted to share with you about the basics of the model; the general idea of business excellence based on the EFQM model. Leo will take over and talk to you about what exactly we achieved in particular with regard to customer results because we did a customer survey for the first time earlier this year.

LEO VIGODA:

Thank you very much. I am going to talk a little bit about processes and stakeholder engagement as well as reviewing and refining in this





section. In this slide here, we've got two important things. On my left, your right, we have got an example of one of the process flow diagrams that we developed. This one is the escalation process basically the "I want to make a complaint" process. This example comes from our proposal that went into the requested proposals from NTIA. It has been published on the NTIA website; you can go and download it.

You can basically go and look through most of the processes that we use on a regular basis. You can see that this one has nice pretty colors and it looks really good. The ones we use on a day-to-day basis aren't prettied up like that. The important thing is that we have used a very standard methodology with swim lanes, standard flow charting, every single box has a description, it goes through the steps of what we are going to be doing, which documents to refer to, and all of that is very highly structured. That's the what we do.

This is here is what we want to achieve. This is an extract from our key performance indicator results and targets. In this example we're looking at the key performance indicator, targets for root DNSsec key management. As targets, they're very easy to summarize. Basically we decided that our target was that we had to be perfect for everything. There is no 95% pass mark on this. We have a clearly defined target, for instance, complete the ceremony no later than 33 days prior to the signature expiration and it's either a pass or a fail. I obviously selected this one because everything has green dots on the word pass and we have been real sticklers for process with the root DNSsec key management.



Also here we've got the obtained certification by undergoing the annual 3<sup>rd</sup> party audit and that was retained. We had our certification renewed on the 27<sup>th</sup> of January and so this is a result which we have achieved and as an implementation of the model that Claus has described and we're doing it not just because it's good for us but because it's obviously good for everyone. We made an attempt to measure how satisfied our customers and stakeholders are with what we're doing. Earlier this year during April I believe, we conducted a customer satisfaction survey.

In this satisfaction survey, we did have it available as a click through from our website but we also sent an invitation to 957 email addresses; some of which we know were expanded internal mailing lists. We think we reached about 1,000 people and they came from TLD operators, ITF leadership including [R seal] offers because of course we work with every single [R seal] offer as part of the protocol parameter measurement process. The [RALs] and the group DNS server operators and this is who responded, you can see overwhelmingly it was people from the ccTLD community but also the ITF leadership responded quite significantly. Something like half or more of our work has to do with protocol parameters management so, you know, it's what you'd expect when we had good input from those two groups. We have input from everyone that we targeted.

We also had in the other category some people who had just clicked through from the website, sometimes they had gone to one of the example website, found us, and wanted to leave feedback. Of course, they are internet users and we want to hear from them as well. This next bit is we asked the people who completed our survey how important it to them the aspects of our services is. So, things like staff



---

courtesy; how important is it? If you go and look, this is most important and red is very important. People didn't rate staff courtesy as particularly important to them but we actually think we should always be polite to the people who we deal with. We rate it quite highly ourselves but we can understand why people didn't rate staff courtesy so highly. We actually made this a bit of a forced choice. You could only rate one thing as the most important and another thing as the next important and so on.

The thing that people said was the most important, and we do agree, is registry accuracy. We're a little bit surprised that some people said it was the least important thing. It's a big wide world and people can have all sorts of opinions but clearly we have had good input from our customers. They think the accuracy of the registrars that we operate is the most important thing. The other things that they think are really important that we totally agree with are request speed and process clarity. We are completely there, we agree, we have got to have an efficient service. Frankly, if our processes aren't clear to you then we're not going to have an efficient service. We're taking this on board and these are areas that we are working on.

If we move on to the next slide, we've got the satisfaction levels. In order to get to the unsatisfied and very unsatisfied, you have to go way beyond 80%, so basically we do have good levels. I would like to say excellent levels of satisfaction, they're not good enough because they're not 100% and we would like 100% for everything. That's something we need to move forward to in the future but for staff courtesy, request speed, registry accuracy, process clarity, and documentation quality, we



---

have pretty good levels of satisfaction from all the people who completed our survey.

Now, we've been putting down here a number of people who participated. We know that we reached about 1,000 people with invitations. We hoped to get between a 10-15% response rate but we actually got something like a 23-24% response rate. That's good because we exceeded our target. It shows that the services that we provide are actually important to our customers and that we are grateful for providing input to us on what's important to them and how good we are so that we know where to focus our efforts at improvement. As Claus has said this is something where we have to systematically improve, we have to look for areas where we are strong and areas that need improvement in order to work out where we need to focus our attention and to get the best benefit for our customers and indirect users of our services.

We have a new survey coming up. We were very happy to be awarded the IANA contract again earlier this year. It started on the 1<sup>st</sup> of October. The new IANA contract has a contract requirement for us to do a customer satisfaction survey every year. If we go and look at the next slide, we can go and look at the requirements for that customer satisfaction survey. It has to be annual, we have to collaborate with NTIA in developing the survey, and most importantly, it has to be consistent with the performance standards for each of the IANA functions. We have to develop performance standards with you, our customers over the next few months and we then have to reflect those performance standards in the customer satisfaction survey that we're going to be doing every year.



We also have to have a feedback session for each of the IANA functions. If we actually go back a couple of slides and go back to the one where we looked at the distribution of people who contributed to the survey, you can see here we allow multiple designations. It's entirely possible that you could work for TLD operator and also be a part of the IESG leadership. You might be on the IAB or the IESG. You might be an author of an RFC; you might have other roles as well. It's entirely possible that in the future you could operate one kind of ccTLD and also provide and back end services for other kinds of TLDs as well.

We said just go and select all the groups that you fit into so that we have an idea of where the responses are coming from. What we didn't do is we didn't collate. This person identified as coming from a ccTLD and gave these responses and we certainly didn't, it was an anonymous survey so we didn't go and say, "Lesley says that we're not very good." We didn't do that. One of the things that we have to do is, in the contract requirement for the annual customer satisfaction survey is we have to maintain anonymity so we have to do some sort of segmentation.

If we can go forward to the slide where we're looking at the requirements. We have to have feedback from each IANA function but we have learned as ICANN that long surveys don't go down very well with people. They don't want to dedicate 45 minutes telling us how good or bad we are. They want something that's relatively quick. This survey that we did at the start of the year took people on average between three and five minutes I would guess. That's not such an inconvenience.



---

Also, people do not want to give out their contact information. On the other hand, we have to have feedback for each IANA function; that means we need to target the questions so that if you are IETF leadership you don't get asked: "How do you think the root zone management process is?" It's not the process that you deal with so we have to have some kind of segmentation. We want to maintain anonymity.

If we move on to the next slide, this is the requirements that we have. We want to be able to some statistical assessment on the TLD operators and say this and the [RALs] say that. Then we would know how well we are doing at each of those different things and we would know where to target our improvement efforts.

Our thoughts are in order to maintain an anonymity, what we should do is engage a third party contractor and that third party contractor should have a requirement that they only provide us the bulk statistical data and they don't provide us with the individual responses. We would pretty much get the same results that we would be publishing to the rest of the world. We would not know which [RAL] said this, which TLD said that, and which of the ISG said something else. It would only be some graphs showing how good or how bad you are and that would be it.

We also have an idea of when we should be doing this. We're looking to do this sometime towards the end of the second quarter; maybe in the third quarter next year. That's roughly when we did the last survey and we'd be interested in your feedback when that is. We have to do this every year, it's a contract requirement. We don't get to change the



---

periodicity to 18 months or two years. Louie, you wanted to make a comment?

LOUIE LEE:

Well, considering that there is a large number of other category respondents, did you have a freeform text box for self-descriptions where you can find out the next time what new category to add?

LEO VIGODA:

Yes we did have that in the survey that we conducted earlier this year. People could self-describe. We have to do something that segments so that we have group appropriate questions. I think we would probably want to have a sort of non-specific survey of some kind where we can go and just say, “If you are an internet user, what do you think?” Because although we have direct customers, we also have indirect customers; derived customers. We have, say the [RALs] as customers but they have ISPs as customers. Those ISPs go and use our services; they look at our registries for all sorts of things. What they think is really important to us.

We know that people said registry accuracy was the most important thing. I think it’s important that we don’t just target the direct users who ask for registrations. I think it’s important that we have something that’s non-specific or generic and is available to internet users at large so they can go and give us their input to tell us what’s important to them.

Moving on, we’ve got some future plans. If we go onto the next slide, we’re looking for non-statistical stakeholder input. We were very happy as I said to be awarded the IANA Functions Contract. As part of the



---

IANA Functions Contract, we have to produce a number of deliverables over the six to nine months from the contract start date. These include things like developing user instructions, developing documents describing the origin and implementation of polices, talking about developing performance standards.

In the past week we have had very clear ideas internally of what our performance standards should be. We've developed processes, our CPIs, we've developed targets and measurements. We haven't had the freedom to go and consult with each of the individual customer groups and reach agreements on the performance standards required for the contracted IANA Functions.

We want your input. We're really happy that we've got these contract requirements because these are the sorts of things that we've wanted to do for quite some time. We want to get your input. We're going to be having some consultation sessions. They'll start with us describing the sort of thing that sounds like a good basis for whether it's the user instructions or the performance standards. Us presenting that and having an opportunity for discussion.

We're thinking of doing that as a webinar. Basically you would be welcome to come into offices but these have to happen very soon and people tend to make their travel plans well in advance. We're going to making those available as webinars. We're also going to be using the old ICANN standard; the public comment period. After the consultation sessions, which will be webinars, we will develop documents as an output from that. We'll publish the document and it will go through public comment period. If there are public comments which say





---

multiple different things, there will be an opportunity for a reply period and then depending on the comments we get, we will either go through the process again or we will just go and come up with the final thing and seek approval for that to be published.

We need your input so that we can get it right. We think we have a good idea, but we want you to guide us. Without your guidance, it's never going to be quite perfect.

If we move on, this is the bit where I'm hoping to turn off the microphone and listen to you. I have a pen, I have a pad, and I want to take notes. Of course I'm also happy to answer questions, but I'm hoping I'm going to do a lot less talking and if you're customers, whether you're a direct customer who regularly uses our services or someone who just looks at our registries, please tell us what you really think.

Maybe I should start by asking a question. Specifically on the customer satisfaction survey, I described our proposal for how we think it might work and where we have a third party contractor who just gives us the statistical results, not the raw input. We have some targeting questions for each of the different customer services that we offer.

If people could provide input on their own experiences with this kind of thing, what is best practice, what kind of survey they would be interested in providing input to, that would be a really good place to start and it would be nice to broaden the discussion to more general, we've been doing something like this as well and we found all of that would be really good over the next 40 minutes or so.



MARTIN BOYLE:

I'm Martin Boyle from Nominet. For a survey that is based on customer satisfaction with a service, I found it a little bit odd to widen the survey group to people who have not used the service. I'm not sure I really got the understanding from your presentation as to why you thought that was appropriate. It would seem to me that it would be the group you go to every year, the group you've given service to during that year and therefore it's a very clear group and people got an interest in responding to the survey. Did I just miss something as you were talking?

LEO VIGODA:

Thank you, and that's a very good question. We do have direct customers so organizations like Nominet are obviously a direct customer of root management. We also have, you might call them derived customers or just joint customers who are people that go and use the registries that we publish. They're not the organizations that have their records in the roots own or request blocks of address space, but they're the people who go and look up what's in the IANA who-is data base for the TLD registration or they go and look at an IP address registry or they might be software developers who make use of protocol perimeter registries so that they can get their software right. They don't have any kind of direct business relationship with us but they definitely use our services.

To some extent, we both share those customers because they're also your customers. Although you, as an organization, are receiving the direct benefit, the only reason that you and we are working together is



---

for this other group. We're looking for this other group to go and tell us if we're doing well or if they want improvements in the registries that we publish rather than the process that we have for maintaining those registries. I hope that explains.

LOUIE LEE:

Hi this is Louie. If at some point you're able to correlate the type of users, with the answers you might find that the third party customers or the derived customers might be the ones who are answering where staff courtesy is not so important to them. They're not the ones engaging IANA directly.

LEO VIGODA:

I think you could be right. They probably don't have any interaction with staff so there isn't a need for staff courtesy; they're just looking at a webpage or something. The reason we put it in there is because we think staff courtesy is important. We certainly don't want to treat our customers with any disrespect.

ELISE GERICH:

Elise Gerich, IANA; ICANN. Because we have a lot of different organizations represented, will you have different quality management programs in house and what model might you be using, if you're willing to share, out of curiosity?

LEO VIGODA:

Yes, Lesley please.



LESLEY COWLEY:

Well I never said I was unhappy with IANA service, by the way, if anyone got that impression. So, we use the FQM, we also have ISO, and we (inaudible) quality to death. I was just going to make a point on surveys because I think there's an evolution of surveys. I was one of the people who did complete the survey; I found it quite basic. Also, as I have not used IANA recently, it wasn't quite so relevant.

At Nominet we do no end of customer surveys as well. We do an annual survey, we do some in-depth conversations with our customers, and we also do something which might be appropriate for IANA which is kind of post transaction survey. At the point when you just used the service, how was it for you? That's when the information is most fresh and when you are more able to form and give that valuable feedback as a customer.

ELISE GERICH:

Thanks Lesley. Anybody else?

MATHIEU WEILL:

Mathieu Weill from AFNIC. We also use EFQM, we use customer satisfaction surveys basically based on the registrars at this stage but also internal surveys about staff satisfaction surveys. One thing we find useful in those, and I'll offer it as a suggestion, is in the survey leaving the respondent as anonymous as basis is okay but we insert in our surveys the option for the respondent to say, if we want to have an in-depth conversation with you would you be okay. That creates a lot of



---

interesting feedbacks and enables from direct engagement after the survey.

LEO VIGODA: How many people that answer the survey are willing to provide this information for ongoing conversation?

MATHIEU WEILL: For our registrars it's large (inaudible) respondents.

LEO VIGODA: Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. Anybody else want to volunteer if they do any quality management or other kinds of gathering information from your customer base?

LEO VIGODA: I would like to make a brief comment to Lesley. Yes, we are absolutely aware that survey we did was really basic but we thought it was far more important to get started with the survey at least instead of waiting another six months or so and have someone develop a very complex intricate survey that would probably last much, much longer for people to answer and already it was let's get going, let's get out to the community that IANA would like to get feedback from, the customers. We're well aware that room for improvement in regard to the detailed

---

level of the survey and with regard to the overall survey topic. Any other questions? Yes, Louie, please.

LOUIE LEE:

I have a comment or question that's unrelated to Lesley's question so I can wait if anybody else wants to have input on that. Alright, if there's nobody else, to follow on what Lesley was saying, if you're using a service and then it's fresh in your mind, then you answer a survey; like there would be a link at the very top of the page where it related to a service that might say, "Was this registry accurate?" Then have a quick three to four question survey, "Who are you?" "What kind of user are you?" and "Was this registry accurate?" Maybe even as an ongoing thing, but I don't know if there's room in the framework to allow for ongoing trending type surveys where you can look back at the last six months to see if there's a trend.

LEO VIGODA:

I like the idea about having a "Contact Us" link at the top of registries saying if there's an inaccuracy to please report it and then provide where to report it. I think that's a really good idea. I also like the idea of having a post-transaction survey where as our ticketing system marks something as a result it sends a message saying, "Can you please complete a short survey on how satisfied you were?" Those are great things and definitely will take these suggestions away to see how we can implement them. Thank you very much.

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]:

There was a question from Wilfried?

WILFRIED WOEBER:

This is just, not a content thing but more of a logistics. In particular, was this idea of post-transaction queries, we are customers of one globalized (inaudible) which tends to use that mechanism. I just want to give the feedback that if you do that too regularly you're just annoying people and you won't get any information back because everybody just learns to just click it away. Just as a customer with experience, for the record, other people might have a completely other mind with regard to that.

To the mechanics, I was not partied to this previous question here, but these customer surveys tend to be pretty popular these days, from all the different quarters and the ends of the environment. What I would really like to see and that's usually the determining factor for me personally, would I just go into it or would I just click it away, if I can do a dry run.

I really don't want to start filling in, or answering the questions or the first of two or three pages to only then find out for the rest of the ten that it's completely useless because it does not apply to me. Just as a suggestion for the mechanics, if it is possible, just provide a means to just click through all of the pages or the questions and then if I decide it's worthwhile then I can really answer it. I will devote the time to do it professionally.

LEO VIGODA:

Wilfried, I think you are absolutely right. People who are answering a survey based on a particular customer relationship don't want questions



that don't apply to that particular customer relationship. I think we should perhaps ask for input on what sort of time period do people see as acceptable for dedicating to a customer survey.

One of the reasons we made the survey that we did in April so basic is because there was a report ICANN published into another survey ICANN did some months beforehand and it had particularly low response. Two of the factors that were identified in the low response were firstly, that it required you provide contact information and secondly, it took something from 30-45 minutes to complete.

We thought well, a half hour to forty minutes is very long, let's try to make it short as possible and make it anonymous. We did get a lot of responses but maybe we did go a little too far in making it very basic. We will be willing to ask more questions because if we ask more questions, we can have more useful input. How long would people be willing to dedicate; is ten minutes or 15 minutes a good amount?

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]:

If I can add one more question, how often do you want to reply to a survey? The point Wilfried just made is very valid; I would assume that you do not want to receive a customer satisfaction survey from IANA every month. Our ways of channeling that, for example, is that after a particular transaction you could randomly choose 10% of such transactions. So these two criteria; how long with the particular survey and how often. I think that would be very helpful for us to understand your perception of that. Yes please, Louie.





---

LEO VIGODA: I may suggest that for just asking a very short survey to a ticket response, to ticket transaction, if you want to incorporate just a few questions into the bottom of the email that says, “Your ticket is closed, these were the closing comments,” and under that just have a few questions in web form that they can just fill out and answer back about that ticket. Having a separate email that alerts you to a survey on every ticket that you close is fairly annoying, actually.

LEO VIGODA: For every survey you would be willing to checkmark a few boxes?

LOUIE LEE: Yeah, just a few at the end of that ticket because it relates to a certain topic. If there’s a way to categorize your ticket for the type of transactions resolved then that will allow you to customize the survey.

LEO VIGODA: Thank you. Other opinions? Lesley please.

LESLEY COWLEY: How long, for me, I lose interest after ten minutes. So anything longer than that is just too long, unless it’s something I feel really, really strongly about and have the opportunity to provide lots and lots of information on. I was just going to make a point around a reward for surveys; so in the ccNSO we have struggled sometimes to get meeting surveys filled in.



Generally the behavior is that if you're happy with the meeting you don't fill in the survey. If you're unhappy with the meeting you have a strong desire to fill this in and make your feelings known. Just recently, because if you don't have sufficient surveys you don't really get enough, it's not very informative. We started giving out gadgets; nothing to serious, but just something to reward people for doing the survey.

I'm not suggesting that ICANN pays or anything like that but when you do they survey you get something back. It's a good way of encouraging responses if you are concerned about getting a certain number of responses to give validity to the surveys.

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]: That's a very interesting idea. Get like a free registry change or something like that.

LEO VIGODA: To be fair, all registry changes are free.

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]: I know, I tried to make a joke, I'm sorry. Wilfried has another question.

WILFRIED WOEBER: Just about the question of what amount of time would be appropriate, and for me, individually it depends on whether I considered the survey useful. If there is sort of a clear indication that submitting my information is going to improve the interaction then I would even be willing to spend 30 minutes or maybe 40. If there is really something



which is going to improve the relationship, if it's just this general, "Do you feel happy? Rate from one to four." I think even five minutes is too much. This directory relates to this capability of really getting a good understanding of what the set of questions are for the full set.

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]: Basically what you're saying is a structured survey dedicated to the target group is important that you'd be willing to spend more time on it. Thank you. Yes, Elise.

ELISE GERICH: I do have a follow up question for particularly Mathieu and Lesley, but I think it's the rest of the room that I'd to hear what you think about it. Both of you mentioned that you do more in-depth interviews or conversations with people and I was curious, two things. One, do you have people from within your organization having those conversations or do you have a third party having the conversation and for those who didn't say you'd do this type of thing, how welcome are you to having in-depth conversations about on a topic about service and quality of service? I guess the first two go to Mathieu and Lesley, and then I'm curious as to how the rest of the room thinks.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you Elise. We do follow up in-depth conversations that are handled by customer service staff internally so that we get the feedback directly. They know each other and there's supposed to be a trust relationship already between the customer and that person so it's more useful. We also do our customer surveys by online forms and phone



---

calls. Before that we also collect some feedback that goes beyond just filling in forms and we gather a lot of (inaudible); that's an extremely good source of information as well.

LESLEY COWLEY:

We have a customer service team as well that have on going conversations but generally we do try to use external companies because sometimes there's concern about providing feedback directly and you don't necessarily get to hear the real feedback, you get, "Oh of course I'm happy." That's actually not what you're looking for; you're looking for something a bit more informative. The use of external companies also enables us to benchmark and I think that's something we haven't really covered. There isn't another IANA that you can benchmark with; we don't have another .UK but we are able to benchmark with other customer service organizations. For example, the use of external consultant can enable them to have other benchmark information to see how you compare, which is good.

ELISE GERICH:

Thank you, if I'm going to be so bold as to go around the table and maybe if I could start with Patricio, would you be willing to have a conversation on a survey instead of just a paper survey, if we were to call you and have someone talk to you about the service IANA provides.

PATRICIO POBLETE:

Yes, I actually think that could be feasible. Of course, the conversation would be most productive with the people that directly interact in this



---

case with IANA which is part of our technical team. I think that would be a good way to do it.

ELISE GERICH: Okay thank you. Wilfried, you're up next.

WILFRIED WOEBER: In general, as I said, I don't have too many interactions with IANA directly, but on a more general basis, I would definitely be able to do an in-depth analysis, provided that the people doing it, whether it's the internal customer relations function or an external party, if those people actually do understand their own side of the game and the customers end. I had two experiences during the last six months where external people in a different environment were trying to do that and it was really annoying because it was more like educating them about the problem space than providing useful answers.

ELISE GERICH: Thank you. Hartmut.

HARTMUT GLASER: It's not my business in Brazil to be working [as this] alias so probably some other from Brazil will answer it for the (inaudible) can help us later.

ELISE GERICH: Thank you. Martin.



---

MARTIN BOYLE: Similar response here, it wouldn't be me who is using IANA services so I wouldn't even know where to start for the answer.

ELISE GERICH: Maybe I should ask people to raise their hands if they're the right people to interview or if you're volunteering people instead of asking everyone. Yes Lesley?

LESLEY COWLEY: Yes I would be willing to have a conversation but the questions would have to be specific to my interactions with IANA. I don't want to answer general questions; I want to be specific.

ELISE GERICH: Thanks everybody.

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]: Anyone not sitting in front of a microphone that would like to add something or as it was suggested someone from Brazil?

ELISE GERICH: I think we exhausted that topic, thank you. I do have one other kind of question and we talked about—

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]: Now he would like to—



---

ELISE GERICH: Frederico, thank you.

FREDERICO NEVES: I would be one of the great people that have complained about IANA in the past but not lately so, regarding TLD services, the services that you have been providing in the last few years, are just good enough. Anyway regarding the surveys and the customer satisfaction, I don't have that much to add in this situation that you are talking about.

LEO VIGODA: Hopefully we can turn just good enough into excellent in the future.

FREDERICO NEVES: Hopefully.

ELISE GERICH: Thank you. My next question is that we've done self-assessments on the EFQM model and I just wondered if any of the rest of you here do self-assessments of your own organizations and do you follow a specific model other than EFQM?

WILFRIED WOEBER: The IT Department of Vienna University was going through an exercise a couple of weeks ago and I was only almost not involved but I read through the results. There were two observations from my end. The first one was how you word the questions or the way you word the

investigation topic has a very strong influence on the results. Unless you succeed in making that really neutral, you tend to get a too favorable result, let's put it that way.

The second observation was there was a support function by a third party and when the raw data was accumulated to draw conclusions. I read the documents and I scratched my head a couple of times, if you look at the raw data that was presented in a graphic way, and then the conclusion is drawn from that; it didn't seem to fit. If you condense that thing down to the management level, you may lose quite a bit of real substance in that. I think it was a useful exercise to do it in our organization. I'm less happy with the results because I don't feel they are correct.

ELISE GERICH: Did they have a specific model or was this just an outside consultant that led you through it?

WILFRIED WOEBER: Not that I'm aware of that it was based on a formal framework. I simply don't know.

ELISE GERICH: Anyone else done this? Leo spoke about it briefly and I'm going to chime in because the self-assessment I thought was kind of weird. I didn't know the first time we did it what to expect. The EFQM model, I don't know if you've done it yet with self-assessment but it is very structured; it has a framework. We have about eight people that





participate and Leo spends an awful amount of time writing the document that we all have to review and that's the basis for our self-assessment and the frame work that's used. The documents tend to be upwards of 70 pages or so.

The only thing you're allowed to rate yourself on when you do the self-assessment is what you've actually documented in the self-assessment document. The first time I participated which was two and half years ago, we didn't do so well. Partially it's because we were sitting around and we'd say, "Yeah we do that and we should get points for that," and then we said, "Oh but we didn't write it down, we don't have it documented, it's just in somebody's head around the table."

Every year it's helped us focus on areas where we have institutional knowledge but if all of us were to get run over by a truck, it would be gone. I think the self-assessment in that framework has been very useful for us and Mathieu you've mentioned you've done it too; maybe you can comment.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Indeed, it's very structured. This is a very useful exercise for everyone around the management team; for instance, to understand why they're doing such things and how it fits into global organization vision instead of just, "My job is to do this." If what was said is really true, I suggest, the power of this model is that it's not prescriptive, it's not saying you should do this, it's just asking open questions about, "Do you have something that does this?" Is it consistently applied, do you document it and how, and is there any improvement room for this. This is very



---

useful in terms of having the whole group understanding the next steps on various aspects.

LEO VIGODA:

I agree, I think the involvement in the self-assessment has been really useful for us in integrating and tightening up the linkages between and three relatively separate services within the EN department which became four services, we're talking about contracted services here, with the introduction of root DNSSEC. We have a bunch of services and I think we were less integrated and now we are more integrated. We found the self-assessment mechanism a useful way of stealing good ideas from each other. If Michelle's doing a particular thing in protocol parameters and I think that it's good, I can go and take that idea and use it when I'm working with the [RALs]and so on.

It is a particularly useful methodology for us which I think has tightened up and helped us improve the services that we offered over the last two or so years in particular. We're coming up in January to our fourth self-assessment but I think the first two were working out how to do it and the third one was "Ah-ha! Now we're here!" It takes a little dedication. Now we're coming up for the fourth one, I think we are making some real improvements in putting the systems in place for insuring that we are good at identifying specific areas for making improvements and then getting those improvements made.

A really important part of doing that is of course working out what it is that's really important to our customers. That's one of the reasons that

we're here and it's important that we find out what is most important to you. One of the things that we don't want to do is we don't want to concentrate on improving areas that are less important to you. Getting a list of top priorities from this room and obviously more broadly from people who aren't here, what we're going to be doing is follow up sessions, I arranged one next week with someone who can't be in the room.

This is an important aspect of getting some sort of scoring for where we should be focusing our efforts. That's something I'm looking forward to because so far we've been putting in place foundations and fundamentals and now I think we're at a position where we can start to make improvements that are going to produce some real noticeable benefits to the people that we deal with.

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]: Yes, [Elisias], please.

[Elisias]: Question, I know that this is a bit out of scope for this session but it's great to hear IANA talk about EFQM and so on. Where does this fit into ICANN's quality strategy because I think you can end up with an island of EFQM whereas the EFQM is an organizational model. Where does this all link up at an organizational level?

ELISE GERICH: We received sort of a pilot for moving it into the broader ICANN and this is something ICANN is looking at. I believe the IT team is now. We're



---

doing it in a staggered fashion even though it should be an overall organizational strategy but we've had some changes in management over the years; the last three. We were the pilot and now I think our success or perception of success or non-success, or whatever is something to be leveraged by the rest of the organization.

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]:

Thank you, I wanted to make a quick comment on what you had said earlier, [Elisias]. It is really a lot of work if you start with EFQM and if you're doing self-assessments for the very first time I'm sure you've all experienced that. By the way, the EFQM model is something that is continuously being developed by the EFQM, actually the aid from the fundamental concepts that I just demonstrated to you in the presentation earlier are from the 2013 model which was actually only published one week ago.

This is brand new and it's not completely new in what it means, but he EFQM that these kinds of assessments are very tedious and require a lot of work and they do accept also other forms of self-assessments based on a so-called enabler map. However, it is my personal experience and true belief that if you start with something like that it is really a good idea to force the organization to write down what they're doing in a document like that but there are also other ways to continuing on the road to excellence once you have done that and once that you've been into that a while. I just wanted to make sure this is something that everyone takes home. Thank you.



---

LEO VIGODA: We're drawing towards the end of our 90 minutes and one of the things I'm aware of, I don't actually come to ICANN meetings on a particularly regularly basis. We did a session about this at the start of our process in Seoul, which was about ten meeting ago I think. For me, that was two meetings ago; but for almost everyone in the room that was ten meetings ago. That's obviously awhile back and now we're at ICANN 45 and would a session like this be welcome again in a future meeting and if so, what sort of periodicity would be useful to people? Or is a session like this not as useful and would people prefer to find out about what we're doing and contribute through some other mechanism like a webinar or something else?

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]: Yes [Kreisein].

[KREISEIN]: Thank you Leo. First of all, thank you for organizing this session. In my view, suggestions can be very useful, interesting for us is IANA stakeholders. We can also benefit from exchanges of experience, that's always good. I think a yearly basis would be fine for this kind of discussion to happen because we need to see what has improved or changed in between the sessions. I would suggest spending a little time on what has actually changed and in what it can benefit the framework has brought to IANA in the last period and what are the expected changes for the upcoming period. I think that would be extremely useful to have a few examples that show that it's not only about a process but also about the results.

---

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]:           Anyone else? Yes please.

MALE:                               Well I happened to be in the Seoul session a while ago. I think this one was vastly more useful than the first one just because everyone has learned that is (inaudible). The results of personal development things here that back there in Seoul it was not sort of an issue close to my daily work; it's going to be such an issue soon so I really liked this exchange of ideas and also the opportunity to give feedback on the customer feeling my end. I think I will very much like to see it again in about one to one and half years from now.

[CLAUS RATAMAKKA]:           Thank you. Anybody else?

LEO VIGODA:                       Thank you very much. I expect a lot of people in this room speak to people who aren't in this room but might be interested in providing us input and you'll notice that because we really wanted this to be a discussion, we didn't think it would be highly effective to have remote participation because typing your input is very difficult if you're going to be providing experiences.

What I have arranged for someone who can't be in this room next week is to go through a similar process with them face to face. I would be very happy to organize this sort of thing either face to face or one on one with either an individual or a group over the internet in the future.



---

IF you speak to people who are interested in this you can either introduce them to me or me to them. That would be really good because we thought 20-30 people would be good for this discussion, but clearly we have significantly more people who are interested in this.

If I can make a request of you; if you speak to colleagues and partners can be providing us useful input then I would be grateful if you can hook them up with us. I have business cards if anyone wants to contact me. Thank you very much and I really appreciate the input.

I promised I was going to be taking notes and I've taken a whole bunch of notes. I've got good ideas for improvements which next week I'm going to sit down with people and see how we can implement them and make things better. It was nice to have no complaints; good enough; but we want to turn that into really excellent. Thank you very much; this is helpful for getting us from good enough to excellent.

[End of Transcript]

