

Issues & Solutions Table

[This table](#) builds on the [Issues Analysis Table](#)

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.

Solutions - collection of possible solution to the issues

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	Possible Solution space
1. No forum in which community participants can safely raise and work through concerns about staff accountability or performance. (SA WG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion for a forum like this has not been made before? Fear that given staff role in relation to contracted parties, criticism may lead to repercussions - that is where "safely raise" comes from 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add this role to the ombuds function. <u>Role would exclude Human Resources accountability or performance as those are outside the the ombuds role.</u> Ask ICANN senior executive leadership and ICANN Board to each nominate a person to be the point person on this, so that issues can be raised in confidence. [Logic: shows leadership commitment to dealing with issues if these are serious.] Document and publish management structure so that

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri, 12 pt, Complex
Script Font: Calibri, 12 pt

As of 08 May 2017 @ 17h00 UTC

			<p>any issues that might otherwise develop into more serious problems can be raised and resolved early with the line manager involved? [Logic: if people know who to talk to, and feel able to talk openly, much can be solved easily and quickly.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain how the community can use the Complaints Officer role in this (not confident this would work, since it is unclear whether CO would be appropriately able to respond/resolve given their role's limited span of control.) • <u>Possibly part of a 360 review process that includes the community</u> • <u>Having a potentially tri- party, and a third person elected by the community to review issues that are brought up, whether it would be in some form of disciplinary or to review issues that happened either in the community or that involves one of the three, which would also offer the option of one of the three recusing if there is any type of conflict of interest</u>
<p>2. Staff (excluding the Policy staff) are seen as crossing the line from policy "implementation" to policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff concern with ensuring that policy frameworks are implementable / consistent could lead to "problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact on relationships between policy implementation staff and community participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization and Community to review and refine existing implementation team

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri, 12 pt, Complex Script Font: Calibri, 12 pt

<p>“development / decision” and there is no way to address that. (SA WG)</p>	<p>solving” that is interpreted as “crossing the line”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Staff sees implementation of policy as solely their responsibility as opposed to the responsibility of all parties required to implement the policies. As stated in Registry Letter to Staff (Should include link), the registries and registrars have made themselves available to assist in those matters where implementation is dependent on their actions. • <i>Is part of this concern rooted in the issue of disbanding the policy teams prior to implementation and then not having a clear mechanism for reconvening for guidance during implementation? I do sense that even informal offers to collaborate put staff at risk of “not following stated policy” or “acting independent of community-approved processes.”</i> • <i>New processes in gTLD world? Implementation Review Teams now exist, and may help with resolving this issue. Ref: https://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/policy-implementation-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf; however ICANN staff have been reluctant to use this process. We believe that ICANN staff views this new consensus policy to imply that an implementation team of</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict between community and organisation • ICANN staff do not operate registries or registrars and therefore the impact of a staff only proposal can lead to unrealistic implementation mechanisms or those with a number of negative unintended consequences. • 	<p>methodology (... as part of ATRT3? As part of a regularly scheduled review?) [Logic: use existing processes if possible.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at relevant PDP processes to see if expectations on the delineation and relationship/interaction between development and implementation of policy are clear and whether the clarity is understood the same way by community structures and organization staff. [Logic: if there unclear documented expectations or conflicting norms, clarifying this & better aligning expectations could be helpful.] • <u>having a potentially tri- party, and a third person elected by the community to review issues that are brought up, whether it would be in some form of disciplinary or to review issues that happened either in the community or that involves one of the three, which would also offer the option of one of the three recusing if there is any type of conflict of interest</u>
--	--	---	--

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri, 12 pt, Complex Script Font: Calibri, 12 pt

	<p><i>the GNSO can be available if they request it, but they do not view this as a mandatory process.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>New GNSO expedited PDP provides for how to resolve such concerns as well.</i> • <i>Historic PDP processes may still be facing this challenge.</i> • <i>I know that this issue is recognized amongst the Org, and the operating standards and process flows work are looking to further clarify and operationalize the ways to resolve these types of issues.</i> 		
<p>3. 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)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertain - no specific examples provided by the sub-group. Two historic examples of slow staff responses to information needs cited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If validated, a perception by the community of ICANN staff being focused on other matters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask ICANN's Chief Executive to reflect on this and give a response to the CCWG and to the SOAC leadership on this topic at ICANN 60 in October 2017. [Logic: culture in the organization is ultimately the responsibility of the CE, and it could be valuable for a broader cross-section of the community to understand Göran's take on these matters.]
<p>4. There's no institutionalised route for community feedback to be included in staff performance and accountability systems. (SA WG) [connected with Issue 1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • The idea of presenting specific staff member feedback seems to run counter to the focus of these issues at a functional and not individual staff level. Is the concern here that there is no mechanism for providing input or for staff soliciting input on the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a step in staff reviews that includes interviews with relevant community members for managers to gain feedback and be able to take that into account in their general review of performance.. • Establish norms or expectations for staff in dealing with community members (including discussion w community SOAC leadership in developing these or

	<p>effectiveness of the Org at a functional level?</p>		<p>signaling they already exist?). [Logic: if these norms are in place and known, or developed, they help shape common expectations, and when performance is meeting expectations it is unlikely to be seen as problematic.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organize an annual open community survey where the Organization seeks feedback on its overall performance and the performance of specific functions. [Logic: this could function as a tool aimed at helping the organization "do our work better every year".] Possibly part of a 360 review process that includes the community having a potentially tri- party, and a third person elected by the community to review issues that are brought up, whether it would be in some form of disciplinary or to review issues that happened either in the community or that involves one of the three, which would also offer the option of one of the three recusing if there is any type of conflict of interest
<p>5. Staff may not be consistently meeting ICANN's accountability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertain - unclear expectations? Resource constraints? Difference of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate consideration of public comments in consultation processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create/strengthen process, recommended in ATRT2, of

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri, 12 pt, Complex Script Font: Calibri, 12 pt

<p>commitments in the way they summarize and substantively respond to recommendations or concerns expressed in public comments submitted by community members. (10 Mar F2F)</p>	<p>view about requirements?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Check against ATRT2 review recommendation - a method to ask commenters to comment back on the summary and ask for clarifications, corrections etc. Reference: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-recommendations-31dec13-en.pdf (Recommendation 7.2) ● independent of Avri's comment, i think there is quite a bit of variance in how not just different dept's in the Org, but also in how different Community groups leading the work, choose to handle addressing response to public comment. 		<p>allowing a verification & correction of comment reports and synthesis statements. [Logic: there are already community-agreed recommendations that could solve this issue.]</p>
<p>6. No clear forum in which staff can safely raise and work through concerns about community members behavior or performance. (ICANN Org)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Staff members have noted a similar concern about not having clear guidelines for raising concerns with community members they interact with, and also fear retaliation if issues or concerns are raised. ● <i>Could be out of scope for the Staff Accountability work, but is a reasonable topic for future discussion in the ICANN system.</i> ● <i>Or could be in scope as the mirror image of issue #1 and a solution may require solving both..</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Environment could feel hostile to staff ● Staff could become distrustful and overly cautious in its work ● Staff may decide to leave 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Add this role to the ombuds function ● [Logic: there are already community-agreed recommendations that could solve this issue.] ● <u>the Complaints Office</u>, that is now being established, has indicated that its scope includes staff being able to raise issues to that office for issues staff might have with community members. ● <u>Possibly part of a 360 review process that includes the community</u>
<p>7. Concern about the compensation scheme including but not limited to at-risk bonus paid to staff. Specifically whether they may be policy related, or may relate to determining the completion target dates for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The concern is that this may constitute an exogenous inducement, similar to those that the community must list in their SOI (Statements of Interest), without being known by community participants.. ● Staff members often are in the position 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributes to uncertainty and doubt, possibly affecting trust. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a vehicle similar to the community SOI statements for staff members that documents the types of incentives given to employees. ● Describe the remuneration system's principles and

Commented [1]: _Accepted suggestion_

community work, or other aspects of community activities within ICANN.	to recommend paths and possible solutions to the community members they work with. If there are incentives that may affect the recommendation they are making without those incentives being transparent, staff suggestions may be treated with suspicion.		document whether this sort of incentive is in place. [Logic: provides transparency as to whether it is in place or not.] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this is in place, consider developing an approach of appropriate disclosure where compensation might interact with community processes. (Not sure this would work or be appropriate – may step too far into management prerogatives. There is only an issue if the goals are at odds with those of the relevant community groupings.) [Logic: if there are incentives that affect these processes in the way set out, disclosure is required to give everyone confidence about the interests being pursued.] •
8. When concerns about a particular incident or experience related to staff accountability (or performance?) are raised, the response by ICANN managers has sometimes been to set the concerns aside and not respond. [raised on call 13 April]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent approach to dealing with feedback among ICANN managers • Organisational culture not supportive of addressing concerns when raised? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could contribute to people not raising issues • Could contribute to concerns about staff accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish mechanism for tracking concerns and response. Perhaps this can be included in complaint officer function.
9. Appropriate methods for addressing requests that may exceed allocated bandwidth, resources, budget, etc. [raised on call 13 April]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear decisions about priorities between competing requests for community support • Allocation of resources internally not understood by the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insecurity in the community about what can be done and what approach to take when some additional service is needed. • Undue pressure on staff to take on tasks beyond those assigned by their management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a clear and shared prioritization and capacity document for relevant community-facing parts of the Organization. [Logic: this will help everyone understand the real workload of community work, understand priorities and get people thinking about what is

			most important to be done.]
--	--	--	-----------------------------

This document: <<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gESe7JibXmE5I90uSYV0VJII1yZuMe7niol6PDIFTMM/edit?usp=sharing>>

