Issues Analysis Table

This table is to help understand the issues of Staff Accountability experienced by participants in the ICANN system. By identifying issues, understanding the things that contribute to those issues, and the impact the issues are having, we can build the evidence and information base for our work. Subsequently, once the problems are clear, we can work on proposed solutions.

The columns should be used as follows:

Issue - What is the problem? These should be matters that can be addressed by some change of process or culture - not individual performance concerns.
Contributions - what factors, processes, situations, cultural matters or other things might be causing the issue or making it hard to resolve?
Impacts - what is the impact of the issue? Try and describe who the impact is on and what the impact is, where possible.

This Staff Accountability process is about improving the processes and culture associated with staff accountability. It is not appropriate to identify individuals or to identify specific incidents in this table. The co-rapporteurs will delete any material of this sort which they observe.

Issue	Contributions to the issue	Impact/s
No forum in which people can safely raise and work through concerns about staff accountability or performance. (SA WG)	- Suggestion not made before? - Fear that given staff role in relation to contracted parties, criticism may lead to repercussions - that is where "safely raise" comes from	- Unexpressed concerns with performance mean potentially useful feedback does not reach the performance management system - ICANN organisation may feel unresponsive to community concerns not expressed due to fears
Staff are seen as crossing the line from policy "implementation" to policy "development / decision" and there is no way to address that. (SA WG)	- Staff concern with ensuring that policy frameworks are implementable / consistent could lead to "problem solving" that is interpreted as "crossing the line" - Policy development process does not adequately document policy to an implementable state, leading staff implementation being seen as policy development - No process to reconcile policy implementation processes with development processes, leading to disagreements not being resolved	- Negative impact on relationships between policy implementation staff and community participants - Conflict between community and organisation

Issue	Contributions to the issue	Impacts
There are concerns that the overall culture of the ICANN staff is less focused on supporting the community's work in policy development than it should be. (SA WG)	● Uncertain	● If validated, a perception by the community of ICANN staff being focused on other matters
There's no institutionalised route for community feedback to be included in staff performance and accountability systems. (SA WG)	● Not requested or proposed in the past ● Traditional line of management approach has not sought feedback outside the organisation ● Possibility that community input might be unconstructive or negative	● No formal way for community experience of performance and accountability to be taken into account by the organisation -> lower confidence in the organisation than otherwise ● Risk of a lack of "voice" on the part of those outside the organisation
Staff may not be consistently meeting ICANN's accountability commitments in the way they summarize and substantively respond to recommendations or concerns expressed in public comments submitted by community members. (10 Mar F2F)	● Uncertain - unclear expectations? Resource constraints? Difference of view about requirements?	● Inadequate consideration of public comments in consultation processes
	●	●
	●	●
	●	●