

Staff Accountability Background and Update

Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability

ICANN 58: Copenhagen, Denmark

Avri Doria and Jordan Carter

10 March 2017

What we'll talk about today

- Our task as specified in WorkStream 1
- The work we have done so far
- The challenges we face
- The need for a better working method with ICANN
- The need to re-scope our work
- Some examples of issues identified so far

Our task: “Staff Accountability”

- Established in Work Stream 1 as an area of further work
- To work with ICANN on two main areas
 - Document role of staff compared with Board and community (incl delegated and non-delegated powers)
 - Consider a range of improvements to HR processes and feedback loops
- Implicitly, the intent of the work is to improve relationships between staff and community through better process and greater clarity.

What we have done so far

- We developed a work plan
- We discussed these topics
- We asked ICANN for information
- We considered the info ICANN provided
- We have begun to draft documents
 - A – on the relationships and roles
 - B – on the processes

The challenge...

- The formal specification of our work leaves the implicit aim a little bit opaque
- In particular, we haven't explicitly been tasked to
 - actually identify specific problems or concerns
 - Identify mechanisms to address those problems/concerns
- As a result, the work done to date feels removed from what would be most useful.
- It has also been a dreadfully slow process to ask for and get information
- “Working with ICANN” hasn't worked.

A better working method

- “Working with ICANN” is something different to “ICANN supporting a WG”
- Implies Staff (?Board?) who can offer views and make commitments being involved directly in the process of exploration, problem ID and solution generation
- Can ICANN manage this?
- Can the Staff Accountability group manage this?

Does the CCWG endorse this approach?

A re-scope of our work

Consistent with the intent of the WS1 report, can we be re-tasked to:

- Document or summarise the status quo
- Identify problems or concerns with staff accountability
- Propose mechanisms to address those concerns
- Do all this clearly in the scope of “Staff Accountability”

Does the CCWG endorse this approach?

Some examples of issues/problems...

- Lack of a forum in which staff or community can safely raise and work through issues raised abt staff accountability or performance
- Staff perceived as crossing the line from policy **implementation** to **development or decision**
- Culture of the staff in respect of focusing on supporting community role in policy development
- Lack of formalised inclusion of community feedback in staff performance assessment

Thanks!

Co-Rapporteurs

Avri Doria: avri@apc.org

Jordan Carter: jordan@internetnz.net.nz

Wiki homepage:

<https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/Staff+Accountability>