
CCWG-STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY SUBGROUP
Wednesday, August 02, 2017 - 19:00 to 20:00

>> AVRI: Hello, Jordan. Still waiting to see if we hit our somebody needs to mute so that I'm not echoing. And I think it's you, George. Thank you, George. Okay. This is Avri speaking. I think we've got enough people to start the meeting. Do we? We've got Jordan who is a member, we've got Patrick, who's a member, we've got Greg, we've got George, we've got Barry and we've got Alan. So please can we start the recording.

[This meeting is now being recorded]

>> AVRI: Thank you and thank you all for joining. This is the WS2 staff accountability meeting of 2, August, 19:00UTC. I believe it's our 24th meeting. First thing I'll do is go through the agenda, see if any more people join up and then get into it. So, first part of the agenda is going through this stuff. Second part are the issues. We basically have oh, it says broad comments. It should be board comments regarding draft recommendation. Sorry about the typo. Then there's comments from the face to face session. What I did was I extracted the material relevant to staff accountability and put it into a file that's there and I highlighted all the sections that looked like they were comments. And then if we get there, next steps. And I personally see this as probably a two-meeting agenda but we'll see what goes on. Then the agenda includes the document update to which there has been no change. There are some action items that we need to go through that came up in our previous discussion on the debrief. Schedule update needs to be looked at. And then there's the updated meeting schedule. So, are there any issues or comments on the agenda, any changes I should make? Okay. Then

Note: The following is the output resulting from the RTT (Real-Time Transcription also known as CART) of a teleconference call and/or session conducted 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.

we'll go with that agenda. The next thing is on attendance, if there's anybody here that's just on the phone, please say something.

>> Jordan.

>> AVRI: Okay. Thank you, Jordan. Otherwise the attendance will be taken from the Adobe room. I do see Jordan listed in the Adobe room. Next, we have apologies from her. And finally wanted to remind people about their SOI check. If your material conditions in regard to ICANN change you're asked to update your SOI and speak of it at the meeting. Has anybody's SOI changed since our last meeting? Okay. Nope. In which case, we shall go on. Thank you. Just please remember to do that should you need to. Okay. In which case, I would like to go to the comments that George sent us. We can did I send a PDF of those comments? I did. So, George, I'm wondering what I was thinking of doing is giving you a chance to introduce if you would like and then basically walking through bullet by bullet giving you a chance to talk to it and then giving others a chance to ask clarifying questions, discuss what have you. Does that seem like a workable way to do it to you?

>> GEORGE: Yeah, that's reasonable. But I think that there's probably some overarching comments that set the theme for the discussion. Go ahead.

>> AVRI: So, yeah, so please. In which case go ahead and start with your overarching theme comments. Thank you.

>> GEORGE: Okay. Thanks. First of all, let me know by the way if I'm too loud or too faint on the chat. I think there's an overarching issue here. But first let me say that these comments come from a subset of board caucus on WS2, what we've done on the board is to have probably

about half of the board, I don't know the exact number of people who are involved in WS2 in one way or another or want to be involved in it and they form what we call a board caucus and we meet and we look at what the various working groups are doing and we look for issues that maybe we can help with, et cetera. So, a group of the board caucus got together and prepared the notes that I sent to you last night and that you circulated to the members of the working group. The overarching theme is what we understand that there is a perception of a problem. That doesn't mean there isn't a problem but there's certainly a perception of a problem which varies according to whom says something and is seen as potentially serious in some areas, not so serious in others. But we don't know we don't have a good sense of the extent of that problem and the nature of that problem. And as a result of that it's very difficult if not impossible to look at the recommendations and say this solves the problem when we don't really understand what the problem is. The recommendations are not light weight, they're not extraordinarily heavy weight but they could be significant. For example, simply defining an agreement, a formal agreement between staff and community is probably an exercise in governance that is major and will lead to more work by lawyers and more governance people than anything else. So, the board, at least the caucus feels, how can we commit to agreeing with or questioning a set of recommendations in detail when we don't know what the problem is to be solved. And there's a conundrum here. Because you have said and I think I understand why you've said it, that there are lots of issues that have been reported. So, you know that people are having problems. But, you don't want to display any of them for fear of either invading privacy or starting arguments on specific issues or both. You have your reasons for not wanting to open your kimono to let us take a look to see exactly what area hearing so we can get a sense for the problem set and characterize it ourselves. But without that don't know

what to do and I want to repeat the offer I made at the plenary in Johannesburg and that was you define a safe space so that we can jointly look at these problems, so that we can understand them and get a sense of their structure and as a result be able to say things about the recommendations that make sense to us based upon our better knowledge of what that problem space is. So, that's the major thrust in this and I think that you'll find the bullets echo that, most of them in one way or another. That is, we need to know more. And what I fear is that exchanging pieces of paper or discussion lists in open sessions like this one is not going to work because you don't want to do it and we understand why you don't want to do it. But that it won't help solve the problem no matter how much we try to do it using this methodology. So, we would really would like to consider the possibility of having a session with which we are in a safe space and we can discuss, understand, categorize, structure problems and figure out how best to deal with them and the extent to which the recommendations you make address them squarely. Thanks. That's the overarching issue. And I think I raised this to some extent in the last working group meeting I was part of and I certainly I tried to raise it in this way in the plenary session. This is a fuller explanation than in the past. Is it helpful? What do you think?

>> AVRI: Hey, this is Avri speaking. I would like to give people a chance to comment on that. I have to admit there may be people that don't quite understand expressions like open our kimono. I do believe those items were discussed. There were even comments sent at least one of the letters to the board. So, I must admit I'm not sure what you mean about giving you more information and I guess I would also ask what do you mean by a safe space. But I've got Klaus with his hand up. So please, Klaus.

>> KLAUS: Thank you very much and sorry that I'm late to the meeting but after reading the letter this morning I made an appointment with my legal counsel to discuss what was legal to say or not and we've been strongly advised not to put anything on the table because these are legal. I still think some of the issues used, mentioned in the letter are perfectly valuable and we will have to find ways to discuss it and to answer it. But I just want to remind you to one of the reasons I put [Indiscernible] in the last meeting if we could actually generate something like an accountability check list which basically community and staff could go through every issue and actually look at and say if we do that, if we do that, if we plan to do it, if we do it right or if we do it wrong, that might be some way forward. I sent an email with a rudimentary draft to Avri and I would just say put that forward as a possible solution. Thank you very much.

>> AVRI: Okay. Thank you, Klaus. And I apologize that it was slow to respond on it. I responded only during my prep time for this meeting today and certainly am willing to, you know, put those points that you listed in a drive document for all to see if you're comfortable doing that. I wasn't sure that you were comfortable doing that. So, I have delayed doing so. But my response to you was too late. One question I would have for you is the issue if I understand it and I do want to go through the issues one by one. The issue as I understood it was that our causes, our issues were not accepted and thus I'm not sure how the check list which is a solution would deal with the issue of our issues not being credible to the board. Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN: Thanks Avri. Can you hear me?

>> AVRI: Yes, I can. Thank you.

>> JORDAN: Thanks. I'm a participant in this group and I was once a co rapporteur and now unfortunately I'm a cochair. These comments are just as a participant of this group and I've got a couple to make. First of all, George, thank you for getting the input through to us. It's helpful to kind of get something in writing other than verbally and have a chance to think about it. The second point I would make I guess is that it seems to me the approach to the group has taken is in some cases a problem solving one, kind of responding to specific historical incidents and in some cases it's been a normative one, issues have been identified but also kind of picture of what it feels like at staff accountability, the support ICANN looks like and that's where I see the more sort of process adjusting recommendations coming from. For example, one of the ones about including community feedback rigorously and staff performance management. I don't know if we have problems that have driven that but it just seems to me anyway in the drafting work as an example of something that would be good practice for a community facing organization. So, my fear is that it almost feels like there's a hang up on the evidencing point. Like if there's no problem to fix that is not accepted by examining shared evidence that it is a problem, then we're not going to consider the solution. And I think that's a working method that has a lot of merit to it but it doesn't allow for comprehensive input from the community through the CCWG process on what we would like this to look at. So, I guess that's something to have a bit of a think and ponder about. I don't think anyone is saying this group can't work like that. I don't know that our written reports reads like that was what we were trying to do. That might be part of the issue. Maybe an update needs to say that more bluntly as well as trying to address specific challenges. We were trying to cast forward to what a great thing would look like from a general organization like ICANN aspires to be. And the third point I guess I just want to make is way back in Copenhagen Avri and I wanted to have an

upfront quiet discussion with the ICANN management and relevant level to cocreate a set of recommendations that everyone could live with. And I just have to express my disappointment that the organization hasn't been interested in doing that. Instead it's that people have done this to be a threatening and unwelcome process and that's disappointing because I don't think that's the intention. We tried that almost a year ago and for it to come up again, it isn't a problem because it needs to be part of the framework. What would be preferable would be for this sort of set of changes to be almost generally agrees. These are nice hygiene improvements and result in specific problems we know about, let's get on with it as part of the building the ICANN we want to see in the future. That's kind of my general comments. Thanks, Avri.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Jordan. This is Avri again. Alan, you're next. Thank you.

>> ALAN: Thank you. I would like to expand a little bit on some of the things Jordan was saying. There are some classes of things we can identify that are very specific and very generic. You know, if I send an email to ICANN staff I shouldn't be 3 weeks later still waiting to find out did they receive it or not. I should get an answer back within a day, two days, whatever a reasonable expectation is, at least saying it's received and we'll get back to you in 2 weeks or whatever the thing is. So, some of these we can be very specific. But, I think the real core issue is there is clearly a level of dissatisfaction in the volunteer community that we are not getting the level of service or the level of respect, whatever the applicable thing is, from ICANN staff. Now, either our expectations are really out of line in which case we need to make sure that what our expectations should be or there are some adjustments that need to be made. And I think all this group can really do is suggest some nominal changes that seem to make sense and then a commitment from ICANN both the board and senior management to keep on talking about this and working through these issues. I don't think we're going to have the

definitive answer in this working group. At least not as long as I want. I don't want to be a part of this working group long enough to get to the definitive answer but I think we need to fix the issues that we can identify moderately quickly and Jordan mentioned one of them, participation in staff reviews. When we've mentioned that to senior management we get a visceral reaction saying they report to staff, they can't report to volunteers. And we've never asked for them to report to volunteers. We just want to be able to input into the process. So, I think some of them can be addressed quickly. Some are really going to be long term endeavors that we simply need a commitment from ICANN that they are interested in understanding what the issues are and then remedying them as we can, you know, analyze them well enough to see what the generic pattern is as opposed to fixing the one management issue that we can identify in each case, performance issue. Yeah, I think the safe space is interesting. It's only going to get anecdotal type things but those may be generalizable to put solutions in place. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Alan. Avri, again. In terms of the safe spacey still wonder why would the safe space be one that didn't have the same retaliatory dangers that was speaking in the group earlier or such had. I'll be interested to hear that. Alan is that a new hand again and Jordan is that a new hand or is that a remnant?

>> ALAN: It's Alan I was going to answer the question you just asked.

>> AVRI: Thank you, please, Alan.

>> AVRI: I think, you know, whether I will be more open in any given group depends on how much I trust the individuals in that group and can rely on them number 1 not going in immediately and asking the person why did you do that to Alan and number 2, understanding

that these are anecdotal and we're not trying to fix the problem that happened 3 months ago but we're trying to make sure they don't happen on a regular basis again. So, it's going to be really a matter of trust among the people and how well the ICANN board staff people that participate can generate a feeling of trust among the people to allow people to open up a little bit more. Very, very subjective.

>> AVRI: Thank you. Thank you. Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN: Yeah, thanks Avri. This is a new hand. So, on that why would a safe space be safer. I think it's about confidence building. I guess I'm lucky I have no compliance obligations from another contracted party and my experience has been exemplary, the support we've had through this accountability process has been amazing pretty much all the way through and any issues have been overworked, not through anything else. I think building that trust where there are gaps is about the transparency of processes here. So, it's hard to say and George I don't think this would be helpful for you but one of the issues is sometimes the community lacks trust in some parts of the ICANN organization and to resolve that sort of hygiene process improvements and these are the recommendations. Would we then get into a discussion about well what's the evidence to that? How do we know there's a trust problem blah blah blah? So, I hope that gives more context for what I said before.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Jordan. This is Avri again. Yes. And I want to reiterate that personally I don't have any issues with staff and pretty much what I believe I've been carrying is the evidence that was put in our mailing list in early meetings. So just to indicate that on a personal level other than the fact that it's been really hard to get people to have permission to participate in this group, um, I certainly haven't had any issue with staff in quite a number of

years. Okay. I see no new hands on that and perhaps it would be good to walk through now yes, George. Oh, okay. I was going to ask George to walk through these specifically. I see his hand up. George, please.

>> GEORGE: Thank you. I want to go back to some of the things that have been brought up by I think by Jordan and Alan. And I think it's a pretty positive conversation so far. Jordan, you said what you were August for was an upfront quiet discussion with ICANN management and disappointment that hasn't been done. In effect that's what I think I'm suggesting. I'm calling it a discussion in a safe space whether it's management or combination of management, board or even management, board, outsiders, I don't know. It's the discussion which will help us identify and categorize the problem space. Here are some issues. We know I'm a board member and I've been told by somebody who is not a board member that we on the board don't understand how the difference between the way we're treated and the way the staff and the community members are. I'm sure there's a difference. And I think the staff treats us too well in fact. They're very attentive to our demands and I wish they treated us more like equals rather than a superior level of life form which I think they sometimes do. So, I'm aware that we are not likely to pick up the same vibes as the community members are. And that's okay. But we need to that's probably one of the reasons we need to look at evidence that is brought by community members because we are not affected by those behaviors. Let me give you an example of a couple of questions, large questions that define the space. Are the problems that are being had clustered, in other words are they in one department? Are they with respect to one substantive area or a few substantive areas or are they random, all over the place? It makes a big difference how we deal with problems like that depending on which of those two alternatives should be the case. Are they systemic, are they random? That's really

important and we don't have a good sense of that. Are they particular individuals who are involved? We don't have a good sense of that. The fixes or the different kinds of problems are different. Let's see, Alan you said, I think you characterized the situation fairly well. You said well I don't want to have to wait 3 weeks for a response. Okay, that's fair. And so maybe something like accountability check list has some place in the various remedies to whatever problems we find. Accountability is not a service level agreement and a service level agreement would include a lot more including presumably penalties. So maybe the accountability is something that should be considered but it's not going to solve the problems. The problems are endemic in the structure or resource load or people or subject. Accountability check lists are just going to be checked off and there will be an argument whether the check should be made or not. Alan, you said let's see you said it's a matter of trust whether you would open the [Indiscernible] which you would open up and opening up the kimono means sharing things that are more particular to the argument, being more frank, being more open, showing more evidence. I guess that's a cultural reference.

>> CHERYL: Cheryl, here. I think we all know what it means. It's that certainly it's Australian journals suggest not be used and I would agree. Thank you.

>> GEORGE: Alan, you mentioned the issue of trust. And I agree with you. You're going to say things that are more relevant to the situation the more you trust the people with whom you're talking. And I agree with that and therefore that's what I mentioned in Johannesburg. If you want a safe space to talk about the problems and define the space you define the safe space. Who do you want? Presumably you want somebody from ICANN staff, management, you may want somebody from the board but it's a matter of individuals. Why don't you suggest how

that safe space should be defined? So, let's see... I think that's all I've got that I remember being relevant to the discussion. Do you want to respond to any of that?

>> AVRI: Thank you, George. Let me say if anyone does I do want to repeat something that Jordan said is that we did indeed at the beginning we've tried twice. Once we just invited with the CEO's permission staff members to join this group. That was a failure. Then we negotiated certain conversations with Patrick who was sort of given to us as sort of a representative and instead of ending up with joint discussions with senior staff, Jordan and I did each have discussions with some of the staff but never the whole group and the other thing I did want to mention is that in addition to the issues listed in the report, you know, there were certain letters sent, some of which are copies of letters that had been sent to the board and that's the one that led to the recommendation on SLAs and such. So, I think there was a lot of what you're asking for in terms of the safe space, we did try to define it and we failed twice. So, I'm not sure what we do now. But that's okay. I think no other hands came up

>> JORDAN: Avri. Sorry this is Jordan. I was away from my computer so I didn't raise my hand. Can I raise my hand?

>> AVRI: Jordan, go ahead. >> JORDAN: I just want to add on that point about the safe space thing is there's an interlock here, cultural stuff, governance expectations, of a kind of I hate to use the word but a political commitment on the organization's part to really demonstrate that it wants to be accountable. And the people who can make who can be useful interlockers, people you talk about it with, the board senior leadership and the executives, that's who needs to be participating. I am a chief Executive and I know if people started to engage with staff that worked for me, that staff accountability to our community, I

would be a little bit confused but nervous about it and possibly angry about it because it's like hang on, I'm the guy [Indiscernible] it's been clear he feels responsible for his staff and looking after them. So, it's going to be any kind of open discussion, he needs to be part of it.

>> GEORGE: Good point. Thank you and I appreciate that. So, with regard to the the two initiatives that failed. The first one was an open invitation to staff I gather to join the group. And I think that I don't know what that would have resulted in if staff members had taken you up on it. I don't know why they did, why they didn't. Maybe they were told not to. Maybe they were encouraged and didn't have the time. That's in the past. But one thing I think would have locked a meaningful dialogue there is that it would have been out in the open. And it's very difficult as you know and you've decided not to talk about details, if staff came in and talked about details it would probably be worse and they would be reluctant to. They would probably not want to so I'm not sure if that would have caused anything to happen in the way of resolving what I think is one of the major fundamental issues here. So, suppose you were to ask again to say, look we want to have a conversation in a safe space. We want to convince you these problems are real and we want to explore with you, whoever the you are in this safe space, we want to explore with you what the problems are and what their structure is. Are they random? Are they concentrated? Are they behavioral? Are they structural? What are they? Are they psychological? Whatever. And just so that we can get a good handle on how to eliminate them and put into place mechanisms that make sure that they don't recur. Suppose you were to do that. I'm not making suggestions as a board member. I can't because I don't know the board hasn't agreed on this but I would argue as an individual that would be a very productive thing to do under the current circumstances.

>> AVRI: Thank you, George. And this is Avri speaking. And I should remember to say that always because otherwise it doesn't show up in the captioning. They don't necessarily recognize our voices and put it in. So, I need to ask all of us to put our names in the first couple words of what we utter. And, one of the things that I'm going to be doing and you'll see if you look at the table that I put out is for each of the items to get someone in the group to volunteer to work on presenting a solution to it and I'm sure that your proposal of some way to have a safe space, including Jordan's recommendation that a safe space would need to include the CEO, you know, be looked at and be discussed. So now seeing no more hands I would like to walk through each of your issues and I don't know whether you want to speak to them or you would just like me to read them into the record and then ask for hands. I'm willing to go either way.

>> GEORGE: Avri, this is George. And what I suggest is that you go through them point by point. I don't think I want to speak to them because I think the major issue is the one we've been talking about and these are mostly corollaries. So, if I'm right then you can address questions to them, we have staff on the call who can answer some of them, I can answer some of them. And, we can go on. But I would rather do it that way.

>> AVRI: Thank you, George. So, I will read them point by point and then I'll stop and see if there are any comments, questions, answers, what have you. Issue 1. Clarity on the issue of a safe zone. If needed including in the context of 1A whether the newly established complaint office serves this role. In relation to 1B 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. So that was bullet 1 and I wonder if anybody has questions, clarifications, comments on that. I see Jordan has to leave the Adobe room. Sorry. So, okay, I will ask a clarifying question. Staff reporting of concerns is an internal human resources related matter. So, if I understand correctly if a staff member has problems with a community member, they go to human resources for it. Is that what it's stating? And that there's no and then what happens? You know, I'm curious.

>> GEORGE: I don't think I can tell you. This is George again. Human resources obviously has a part to play in all concerns regarding individuals. Patrick or Teresa do you want to comment

>> AVRI: Patrick has his hand up.

>> PATRICK: Yeah, this is Patrick. I can clarify as best as I can. But you're correct in that if for example I feel like I'm a victim of a violation of professional standards or our behaviors of standards as the community has defined them by responsibility in that case would be then to alert my manager just as I would if I was in any organization having any kind of an issue and then from there it's my manager's responsibility to alert HR and HR is the internal place where we're able to identify if there are patterns and trends, et cetera and HR has its appropriate protocols and procedures it works through up through that group including the senior most HR manager and the CEO. So, we have those internal mechanisms on that side. So that's not necessarily an issue of concern for this group. However, it might be in part of the area of the recommendations that the group is thinking through as far as just the general increasing awareness and understanding of what systems are in place as more of a transparency issue as opposed to creating a new net mechanism.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Patrick. And thank you for explaining that Pat. I think there was also a desire to be able to solve problems before they had necessarily escalated all the way to the CEO through the board and then back down to the community. So, I think that was one of the reasons for suggestions of finding easier paths. But thank you for explaining that path. Does anyone else have a comment? Okay. Seeing no others... I will go to reading the second bullet which relates to issue 3. The 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. I believe that in some of the evidence we had seen that it was more than one or two isolated impressions and such but it's a good question. Would anybody like to comment on it?

>> JORDAN: I would, Jordan here.

>> AVRI: Please, Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thanks. I think this is one of the ones where there's like a chicken and egg situation about validating the concern and this is one of the issues to which the recommendation about increasing the kind of analysis surveys and so on would really help. Because that would provide some over time and evidence base whether this is a real concern or not. So that's where the sort of if we can't validate the issue, some of our recommendations are designed to validate or not validate an issue over time. It may be that there is a perfectly great culture and that the complaints are anticipated and asking the community and admonishing the responses over time.

>> AVRI: Thank you. George, please.

>> GEORGE: Yeah, thanks. This is George. Yeah, Jordan I think I agree with most of what you said. And I want to stress that our push back on this which is it's not push back as much as it is concern, we want to push back on the recommendations because we don't understand the problem, we are not we're not pushing against the community. The board and I believe the staff has the sense that they want ICANN to be a success. We would like to have nothing better than a completely harmonious set of relationships between all parties. Although I suspect that's not possible given human nature. But we want to do it we want to get there as close to that as we can and our visceral dialogue is meant to what we believe is to get to a result where we can have a much better situation working together. We could have said I suppose we could have said well let the recommendations stay, we're not going to look at the problem. That in our view would not have been responsible and it would have led to a worst result overall. So, these discussion that is we're having, the fact that the board caucus group, the WS2 caucus group, excuse me, is concerned about this and I'm concerned about it and speaking here should be taken as evidence that we want to have a good result from this entire discussion and we want to work with you to receive it. Thanks.

>> AVRI: Thank you, George. With that would anybody else like to comment on this bullet before I move on? Okay. Thank you for the time check. Okay. The next one was issue 4 which states, there is no institutionalized route for community feedback to be included in staff performance and accountability system. Feedback related to the organization's accountability should go to the organization and the complaint 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. End of point. I want to add a couple comments on this. This is Avri. First of all, one of the issues that had been brought up

had to do with performance and it had to do with sort of the equivalent of the community's SOI's. There was a certain amount of concern, again, it can only be a concern. There's been no substantiated facts that perhaps some of the performance factors that people were judged on were based on reaching certain conclusions, reaching conclusions within a certain amount of time, et cetera. So that was one thing. The other thing was and if you look at the staff performance handbook that HR chief gave, it actually includes community opinion, community point of view in that review. It calls it out. So, really what this was doing was saying there are concerns. People want to say good stuff. They want to say worrisome stuff. They want to understand what the motivations are. Because, quite frequently we get excellent recommendations from staff members on how to solve the problems we're facing in the community, how to deal with a particular issue, how to get something done. And those are excellent and we want to trust them. But then there are people that worry about the source sometimes of those recommendations. So being able to have a conversation with the managers of people during their twice yearly review cycle would be a useful thing and that was the thinking that came from that, the staff document on performance reviews is within our set of reference documents and in fact it was indeed referred to in the discussion. So, just wanted to give that background on that question. Yes, please, Alan.

>> ALAN: Thank you. This is one I really don't understand. We throw an around the expression 360 reviews in ICANN and sometimes they're 360 and sometimes they're 270 and times 180. We use the term 360 and it covers a whole set of different types of evaluation processes. But the terminology means we should be getting input from all who have input into the performance of this person. In a business environment that often means your managers and the people who work for you. In other environments it means your customers. You know, how

do you evaluate a sales representative without getting any feedback at all from the people they're dealing with? And I don't understand the resistance to wanting to get input from the people that in many cases are literally being served by these staff. And how can you evaluate them without asking that question? Now how much weight you put to the answers and how much, you know, you raise your eyebrows at the comments, that's a different issue. But not even wanting the input I just find so so at variance with the concept of an open organization and the desire to serve the community. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Alan.

>> JORDAN: Avri can I put

>> AVRI: Yes, Jordan. Okay. So, I've got George, Patrick and then Jordan.

>> Okay.

>> AVRI: George.

>> GEORGE: I think I'll let Patrick go first.

>> AVRI: Okay. Thank you, Patrick.

>> PATRICK: Thanks, Jordan this is Patrick. I want to make an observation here. As one of the other I think overarching tension points on this topic in particular and I think we discussed this back in Copenhagen as well is when accountability is at the individual employee level versus the department or service level where management and leadership would take accountability for those things. And I think feedback is good and there are the mechanisms that have been articulated by the complaint's office or CEO or any other number of mechanisms. I think the

place we're getting a little bit of tension and potential push back is where we're blurring the lines between I'm dissatisfied with the accountability of the service from X department versus so and so isn't treating me right and I would like to lodge a complaint or weigh in on that and something that is much more formal and official AKA, a performance review. So, I just put that to the group to be mindful of this as we continue to work through these areas of where we've decided staff accountability is really organization accountability versus, you know, the inverse where we talk about SO/AC accountability that's not really necessarily as charged as if we were to phrase that as volunteer community member accountability where you get a little more personal and the natural instincts tend to rise up. Thanks.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Patrick. George, is it okay if I go to Jordan then Alan then come back to you or would you like to speak now?

>> GEORGE: Absolutely. Absolutely. Put me at the end.

>> AVRI: Okay, thank you. So, I have Jordan now.

>> JORDAN: Avri. Sorry about the noise. This is Jordan here. I'm on a bus now. Might hear rattling or engine noise. The point I was going to make about this one is I don't want to have to go to the complaint's office to give praise to a staff member [Indiscernible] performance review. Like I think the ICANN document as Avri mentioned already implies this is done. This recommendation may end up being nothing more than publicizing the facts that, you know, the organization intends to get feedback from people who are outside the direct set of staff lines and that would be to everyone's benefit. The weighting of those comments, someone who is a known community difficulty provides difficult feedback, that will be taken into account in the appropriate way. You know, eyes will be rolled and things will move on. But it's

just I really don't understand the idea of the complaint's office being the right response for saying the feedback in the review is the wrong response. I really want to say thank you to Patrick for the example he raised as well because there's no way that any of this should be allowed to turn into a holding individuals accountable for the performance as a whole. We need to make sure that doesn't happen. Thanks.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Jordan. Alan, please.

>> ALAN: Thank you. Yeah, this recommendation as I see it is not about holding the group accountable. It's simply making sure that the people who are in a position to make decisions have access to all the information they need to make that decision. So, that's part number 1. There's a lot of things that I could say about people that are negative that do not rise to the level of me filing a complaint. You know, a huge disparity. And as Jordan pointed out sometimes we might want to say something good. I've written on occasion letters praising employees but I don't take the time to do it very often. It doesn't happen every day and yet there are lots of people who I think on, you know, deserve that level of feedback to be incorporated into their process. And lastly, service may be a commitment of the organization but it's delivered by individuals. And we use the word anecdotal when we were talking about the safe space and it's very much an issue here also. This is really about making sure that people understand what is going on when they're judging their employees and the managers are the ones who have to do that and I'll add one more thing that's relevant to this, it's not quite the same issue. In ICANN people get a significant part of their salary based on performance in certain areas. We don't know what that what they are being paid for. You know, I've had questions in my area and at large that I really want to know what someone is being compensated for because when staff are supporting one activity well or not supporting

another activity they may have a financial reason for doing that and not knowing that adds a whole level of blur to this process. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Alan. Patrick, your hand is still up but I'm assuming that's a remnant. If not, please. And George, you took your hand down. I assume you did not have anything you wanted to add? No, you do? Please, go ahead.

>> I have a hard stop at 4:00 and you need to finish the meeting.

>> AVRI: Thank you. We'll be continuing this at our next meeting. So, I think I'm going to recommend that we stop here after issue 4. Our next meeting is oh, I have it here. It's in the agenda. It's the ninth of August. And then after the ninth of August I'm going to be away on both a retreat with an employer with APC and going to a friend's wedding. So, I won't be able to do a meeting for the rest of the month and the next meeting would be the 30th of August. I have put all of the bullets from the I suppose I should call it the board caucus, um, notes to us in the table and I sent you all the table. I put a comment in there on volunteer. And what I'm basically asking, especially since I'm now a solely rapporteur, though I constantly think of Jordan as sort of a shadow co rapporteur, at least until we find another one, um, that basically that people take up the issues and I also included the issues from the record of the ICANN discussion, that if people would take one or two of these issues and perhaps group them and sort of do an analysis of how we can deal with them. Now, we do have the one recommendation for some sort of quiet space meeting or safe space meeting I guess it wouldn't necessarily be a quiet space. But a safe space meeting. Which we need to look at further. So, I'll add that to the list. But if people can sort of help by sort of picking up some of these issues and developing them a little and doing more work on them and at our next

meeting we'll continue through these bullets and into the ones that were picked up in the conversation so that hopefully we can re do the document in such a way that it will be allowed to be called the first reading and we have some chance of completing our work on what is becoming an ever stricter schedule. So, with that I don't know that anybody else had a quick bit of any other business that needed to get in. If not, and I hear nothing, I see nothing, I thank you all for this meeting, for attending, for participating and I'll talk to you in a week. Bye bye.

>> Thanks everyone. Bye.

>> Bye everyone.

[meeting concluded]