

Initial inputs on issues articulated in the CCWG-Accountability's draft recommendations regarding Staff Accountability.

Some board members that participate in the WS2 Accountability Board Caucus group discussed the current version of the draft document and agreed on this additional feedback on the staff accountability recommendations in their current form. Please note this isn't a board action: instead these are inputs agreed by some participants to continue engagement in the work of the subgroup.

As shared during the ICANN59 face-to-face CCWG-Accountability meeting, a general observation is that some of the issues have limited supporting examples. Because of this, it is very difficult to assess what specifically are the issues the subgroup is trying to solve, and whether the issues are systemic. Without that understanding it is difficult to share in the subgroup's conclusions that all of the issues outlined in the report are of a systemic nature or represent a demonstrated pattern of behavior, versus isolated or more sporadic occurrences. Similarly, it is difficult to determine whether the recommendations are designed to solve those issues.

As also shared during the face-to-face meeting, here are some observations in relation to the issues section:

- Issue 1, clarity on the issue of a “safe zone”, is needed including in the context of 1(a) whether the newly-established Complaints Office serves this role. In relation to 1(b), staff reporting of concerns is an internal HR-related matter. However, there is an important issue here for the community in relation to community (including SO/AC) accountability. Input is welcome on how ICANN can coordinate with the community to make sure that misbehavior towards staff is identified and treated appropriately within the community.
- Issue 3, “[T]he overall culture of the ICANN Organization is less focused on supporting the community's work ... than it should be,” clarification of specific examples would be helpful to determine whether these are isolated cases or systemic.
- Issue 4, which states there is “no institutionalized route for community feedback to be included in staff performance and accountability systems,” feedback related to the Organization's accountability should go to the organization, and the Complaints Office is the most appropriate mechanism through which these concerns can be expressed. This

issue is an example of an issue posed without explanation of what is trying to be solved for.

- Issue 5, which states “[s]taff may not be consistently meeting ICANN’s accountability commitments in a way they summarize and substantively respond to recommendations...,” it is unclear what this means and clarification and specific examples are needed. Clarification is needed whether the subgroup is implying, for example, that staff are misrepresenting facts or manipulating responses.
- Issue 6, which states “[t]here are concerns about the compensation scheme...”: Departmental or individual goals are not tied to any specific policy outcome or the timing of reaching any conclusion of process. Further, departmental or individual goals are aligned with ICANN’s mission, goals or objectives. Concerns that a decision taken by the Organization staff member may be based on a conflicting incentive should be brought to their manager or the Complaints Office.
- Issue 8, it is unclear whether this is staff accountability or whether it is requesting a different process for the organization when there are these types of requests. Clarification would be helpful here as to the context of the issue.

If the subgroup has ideas of how more specificity can be developed and further conversations needed with parts of the ICANN organization or the Board, please let us know.

Regards,

George Sadowsky, Board Liaison to the Staff Accountability subgroup  
Akinori Maemura, Board Liaison to the Staff Accountability subgroup



