Supplement to Report from WS2 Staff Accountability -
This doc:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Vqz7RDHgazhZflVyv5tzAbtQfgLACqV-wGD7xPX9-w8/edit?usp=sharing

Table of Contents

Supplement to Report of the WS2 Staff Accountability Subgroup

Introduction

This document is the product of the Work Stream 2 Staff Accountability subgroup. The group conducted its work in line with the mandate set out in the Work Stream 1 report (see Annex X).

This [Supplement](#) to the [Report](#) includes a record of the work done by the WS2 SubGroup on Staff Accountability. This supplement can be used to further understand what went into the definition of issues and recommendations in in the Report. This supplement has not undergone any consensus determination on its content.

I. Subgroup process

The group was initiated with the intent of working cooperatively with ICANN Organisation staff members. The intent had been to try and include members of the staff in the group as peer participants. For a number of possible reasons, this was not possible. It became necessary to find an alternate path. While it took a while to get going, a means of doing cooperative work with senior staff was arrived at in discussion with a member of the MSSI staff. The organisation provided a set of documents pertaining to staff performance and accountability, set up several discussions between the co-chairs of the subgroup and senior staff, and provided a staff member to act as participant and informal liaison.

After going through several attempts based on the original charter, the subgroup obtained permission from the full WS2 group to modify its work methods to gather specific issues that had been experienced by various members of the community and then extrapolate them into general issues that would benefit from solution.

During the discussions on the issues, various possible solutions emerged from the members of the group. These were developed and mapped against the issues.

Scope

In Recommendation #12 of the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 report, there are two areas of work identified:

- *The CCWG-Accountability work with ICANN to develop a document that clearly describes the role of ICANN staff vis-à-vis the ICANN Board and the ICANN community.*

This document should include a general description of the powers vested in ICANN staff by the ICANN Board of Directors that need, and do not need, approval of the ICANN Board of Directors.

● *The CCWG-Accountability work with ICANN to consider a Code of Conduct, transparency criteria, training, and key performance indicators to be followed by staff in relation to their interactions with all stakeholders, establish regular independent (internal and community) surveys and audits to track progress and identify areas that need improvement, and establish appropriate processes to escalate issues that enable both community and staff members to raise issues. This work should be linked closely with the Ombudsman enhancement item of Work Stream 2.*

II. Documentation received from ICANN organisation

ICANN has corporate policy on several areas. The Staff Accountability subgroup received copies of the following policies on 4 Feb 2017.

- Anonymous Hotline Policy v2 Oct 2016
  Purpose: The organisation is committed to the highest possible standards of ethical, moral and legal business conduct. organisation policies, including those entitled "Open Door," "Prohibition of Harassment," and "Fraud," provide employees, contractors and consultants (collectively for purposes of this policy only, employees, contractors and consultants shall be referred to as "staff members") with procedures for reporting work-related concerns.

- Confidentiality v2.1 Oct 2016
  Purpose: To define ICANN's policy for maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive and proprietary information of ICANN and of third parties that is in ICANN's possession. ICANN shall generally operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness as appropriate under the given circumstances. As a staff member, it is important to realize that ICANN possesses confidential and proprietary information regarding the conduct of its business that must remain confidential. Additionally, ICANN possesses proprietary and confidential information of third parties that rely on ICANN to keep such information confidential.

- Conflict of Interest Policy Staff v4 Oct 2016
  Purpose: To define ICANN's policy for staff members regarding conflicts of interest and the protection of ICANN's interests.
  A conflict of interest may exist when a staff member is involved in an activity or has a personal interest that might interfere with the staff member's objectivity in performing ICANN duties and responsibilities. Any such activities or personal interests or activities are prohibited unless formally approved in writing.

- Employee Conduct and Work rules V2.0
  Purpose: To define the Company's rules of conduct (work rules) in order to ensure the efficient and orderly operation of the business and to protect the rights and safety of all employees.

- Equal Employment v2
  Purpose: To define the Company's policy for the equal opportunity and treatment of employees and applicants with regard to employment.

- Fraud v2
  Purpose: To establish guidelines for detecting and reporting any defalcation, misappropriation or other irregularities inappropriate to the normal operation of Company business.

- Open Door v2
  Purpose: ICANN has an Open Door policy that encourages employee participation in decisions affecting them and their daily professional responsibilities. Employees who have job-related concerns or complaints are encouraged to discuss them with their immediate supervisor or any other management representative with whom they feel comfortable to do so. ICANN believes that employee concerns are best addressed through this kind of informal and open communication. Ordinarily, employees should raise their concerns and/or complaints through the following procedure.

- Outside Business Activities v2.1 Oct 2016
  Purpose: To define ICANN's policy concerning staff members who own or operate a business and/or engage in other employment or engagement (including contracting or consulting work), whether paid or unpaid, while actively working with ICANN (collectively referred to as Outside Business Activities). ICANN desires to ensure that Outside Business Activities do not adversely affect a staff member's performance of his or her duties for ICANN, create conflicts of interest, scheduling problems, distractions, and other problems that could negatively impact ICANN's interests. Because of these concerns, Outside Business Activities, are generally discouraged (except for part time staff).

- Prohibition of Harassment v4 April 2016
  Purpose: To define ICANN's policy against unlawful harassment in the workplace.
  ICANN is committed to providing a work environment that is free of unlawful harassment. Workplace harassment violates ICANN's policy and is prohibited by various laws such as Title VII of the federal Civil Rights Act and state Fair Employment and Housing Act in the United States, and similar laws in other Countries.

- Performance Management Overview May 2017

  The Performance management overview is a slide deck that covers the following topics:
  - Goal Setting
  - Performance Behaviors

- Evaluation of Goals and Behaviors

Code of conduct

Employee Conduct and Work rules

This 3 page document contains 30 rules that "could result in disciplinary action, ranging from oral and/or written warnings to suspension and/or termination of employment." these rules refer to the workplace, relation to superior, relationship with of staff members and general behavior. They make no mention so relations with community member or of a mulitstakeholder ethic in work behavior.

The ICANN Standards of expected behavior

The Standards of expected behavior is defined as holding for all ICANN participants, including staff. The Standards are defined as:

> *"Those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process, including Board, staff and all those involved in Supporting organisation and Advisory Committee councils[1]*
>
> - ***Act** in accordance with ICANN's Bylaws. In particular, participants undertake to act within the mission of ICANN and in the spirit of the values contained in the Bylaws.*
> - ***Adhere** to ICANN's conflict of interest policies.*
> - ***Treat** all members of the ICANN community equally, irrespective of nationality, gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or beliefs, disability, age, or sexual orientation; members of the ICANN community should treat each other with civility both face to face and online.*
> - ***Act** in a reasonable, objective and informed manner when participating in policy development and decision-making processes. This includes regularly attending all scheduled meetings and exercising independent judgment based solely on what is in the overall best interest of Internet users and the stability and security of the Internet's system of unique identifiers,*

---

[1] https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/expected-standards-2012-05-15-en

irrespective of personal interests and the interests of the entity to which an individual might owe their appointment.

- *Listen to the views of all stakeholders when considering policy issues. ICANN is a unique multi-stakeholder environment. Those who take part in the ICANN process must acknowledge the importance of all stakeholders and seek to understand their points of view.*

- *Work to build consensus with other stakeholders in order to find solutions to the issues that fall within the areas of ICANN's responsibility. The ICANN model is based on a bottom-up, consensus driven approach to policy development. Those who take part in the ICANN process must take responsibility for ensuring the success of the model by trying to build consensus with other participants.*

- *Facilitate transparency and openness when participating in policy development and decision-making processes.*

- *Support the maintenance of robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that policy development and decision-making processes will reflect the public interest and be accountable to all stakeholders.*

- *Conduct themselves in accordance with ICANN policies.*

- *Protect the organisation's assets and ensure their efficient and effective use.*

- *Act fairly and in good faith with other participants in the ICANN process.*

- *Promote ethical and responsible behavior. Ethics and integrity are essential, and ICANN expects all stakeholders to behave in a responsible and principled way.*

It should be noted that while including the staff in the obligations, it does not differentiate among staff, board and other stakeholders, referring instead to "all stakeholders"[2] in the process.

Transparency criteria

In terms of internal staff documents, most are only available with special request/permission or through the DIDP process. The guideline on document transparency are currently the responsibility of the WS2 Transparency Subteam.

---

[2] This begs the question of whether the term stakeholders includes staff or not. Opinion is divided on this issue.

Another concern with Staff accountability concerns safe whistleblowing by ICANN employees. ICANN provides its employees with an Anonymous Hotline. The Anonymous Hotline Policy is being reviewed in the Transparency Subteam. An outside review is being commissioned. Once the result of that are published, this subteam should review them and decide whether anything further is required on the subject in regards to Staff Accountability.

Training

> *During onboarding, staff is also provided with information on all aspects of the organisation, including the roles of the Board and the community. ICANN's strategic plans and the kpi's associated with the plans, in addition accountability and transparency obligations are covered generally during the onboarding, and then any which may specifically apply to a staff person's responsibilities will be explained by their managers and/or addressed in regular department meetings. Additional training is periodically provided on the best practices in many areas, such as managing people, interpersonal communication and facilitation.[3]*

KPIs re staff relationships with stakeholders

ICANN maintains a dashboard for KPIs[4]. These do not cover the issue of staff relationship with stakeholders, though the relationships are an integral part of meeting the goals. Possibly relevant are the KPI 5.2 Promote ethics, transparency and accountability across the ICANN community, and 5.3 Empower current and new stakeholders to fully participate in ICANN activities

Independent surveys and audits

III. Escalation processes (incl Ombudsman, Complaints Officer)

Currently the Ombudsman can be brought into any issue where a stakeholder has concerns a situation where they have been treated unfairly. The Ombudsman can rcommend action, but at this time has no enforcement powers. A sperate group in WS2 is currently working on new

---

[3] Responses
[4] https://www.icann.org/progress

definition of Ombudsman scope. The current scope does not permit issues to be brought to the Ombudsman office by

At this point there are still more questions about the role and powers of the new Complaint Officer position than explanations, though the job posting[5] offers some indications.

Job Description

The Complaints Officer will be responsible for receiving, investigating, responding, resolving, and reporting on all complaints about the ICANN's organisation's effectiveness.. The position will serve as a dedicated resource to track, analyze, and report on the resolution of such complaints in order to assist in continuous improvement of ICANN as it performs its mission.

Key Responsibilities

- *Responsible for receiving, investigating and responding to complaints about ICANN's effectiveness as an organisation, and will be responsible for all complaints systems and mechanisms across the ICANN organisation.*
- *Coordinate with ICANN's other complaint-handling mechanisms to minimize any duplication or gaps, and ensure that all complaints are being handled across ICANN's functions..*
- *Develop and implement policies and ensure continuous improvement for the handling of complaint mechanisms across the ICANN organisation.*
- *Ensure that complaints and particularly those of community members regarding systemic issues concerning the effectiveness of the organisation are heard, reviewed, analyzed and resolved as appropriate.*
- *The Complaints Officer will attempt to resolve complaints about the organisation's performance using methods including fact-gathering, analysis, investigations, informal mediation, shuttle diplomacy, other dispute resolution mechanisms where appropriate, and will make recommendations for further organisation, Board or community consideration.*
- *Ensure that the process for making complaints is easy to access and understand, particularly for members of community that may require additional assistance or different approaches such as people with culturally diverse backgrounds.*

---

[5] From Complaints Officer job Description
https://chj.tbe.taleo.net/chj06/ats/careers/v2/viewRequisition;jsessionid=F8649222198C7014FE6159E816
31E5F6?org=ICANN&cws=37&rid=1082

- *Manage the complainants' expectations by explaining the complaint handling process, what the organisation can and cannot do, the timeframes for dealing with the complaints and when they might expect a response.*
- *Ensure responses and outcomes of complaints are recorded, filed and reported to management and monitor implementation of remedies and actions to improve practices.*
- *Analyze complaints to identify recurring issues and trends and report these to management to assist with organisation's continued efforts in improving its effectiveness.*
- *Keep information relating to complaints confidential as needed, while acting in an open transparent and accountable manner.*
- *Deal with complaints in an equitable, objective and fair manner.*

IV. Worksheet on analysing the issues

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)	● 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	● 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	● Add this role to the ombuds function. Role would exclude **Human Resources accountability or performance as those are outside the ombuds role.** ● 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 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.] ● 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.] ● 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**
2. Staff (excluding the Policy 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,	● Negative impact on relationships between policy implementation staff and community participants ● Conflict between community and organisation ● ICANN staff do not operate registries or registrars and therefore the impact	● organisation and Community to review and refine existing implementation team methodology (… as part of ATRT3? As part of a regularly scheduled review?) [Logic: use existing processes if possible.] ● Look at relevant PDP processes to see if

	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. ● 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."* ● *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*	of a staff only proposal can lead to unrealistic implementation mechanisms or those with a number of negative unintended consequences. ●	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 organisation staff. [Logic: if there unclear documented expectations or conflicting norms, clarifying this & better aligning expectations could be helpful.] ● **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**

	process. We believe that ICANN staff views this new consensus policy to imply that an implementation team of the GNSO can be available if they request it, but they do not view this as a mandatory process. ● *New GNSO expedited PDP provides for how to resolve such concerns as well.* ● *Historic PDP processes may still be facing this challenge.* ● *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.		
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)	● Uncertain - no specific examples provided by the sub-group. Two historic examples of slow staff responses to information needs cited.	● If validated, a perception by the community of ICANN staff being focused on other matters	● 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 organisation 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.]
4. There's no institutionalised route for community feedback to be included in staff performance and accountability systems.	● Not requested or proposed in the past ● Traditional line of management approach has not sought feedback outside the organisation ● Possibility that community	● No formal way for community experience of performance and accountability to be taken into account by the organisation ->	● Include a step in staff reviews that includes interviews with relevant community members for managers to gain feedback and be able

(SA WG) [connected with Issue 1]	input might be unconstructive or negative ● The idea of presenting specific 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 effectiveness of the Org at a functional level?	lower confidence in the organisation than otherwise ● Risk of a lack of "voice" on the part of those outside the organisation	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 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.] ● Organize an annual open community survey where the organisation seeks feedback on its overall performance and the performance of specific functions. [Logic: this could function as a tool aimed at helping the organisation "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
5. 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? ● **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.	● Inadequate consideration of public comments in consultation processes	● Create/strengthen process, recommended in ATRT2, of allowing a verification & correction of comment reports and synthesis statements. [Logic: there are already community-agreed recommendations that could solve this issue.]
6. No clear forum in which staff can safely raise and work through concerns about community members behavior or	● 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	● Environment could feel hostile to staff ● Staff could become distrustful and overly cautious in its work ● Staff may decide to leave	● Add this role to the ombuds function ● [Logic: there are already community-agreed recommendations that could solve this issue.]

performance. (ICANN Org)	concerns are raised. • *Could be out of scope for the Staff Accountability work, but is a reasonable topic for future discussion in the ICANN system.* • *Or could be in scope as the mirror image of issue #1 and a solution may require solving both..*		• the Complaints Office, 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. • Possibly part of a 360 review process that includes the community • Tri & quad
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 community work, or other aspects of community activities within ICANN.	• 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 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.	• Contributes to uncertainty and doubt, possibly affecting trust.	• 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 document whether this sort of incentive is in place. [Logic: provides transparency as to whether it is in place or not.] • 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]	● Inconsistent approach to dealing with feedback among ICANN managers ● Organisational culture not supportive of addressing concerns when raised?	● Could contribute to people not raising issues ● Could contribute to concerns about staff accountability	● 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]	● Unclear decisions about priorities between competing requests for community support ● Allocation of resources internally not understood by the community.	● 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.	● Develop a clear and shared prioritization and capacity document for relevant community-facing parts of the organisation. [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.]

V. Staff Accountability Processes

A second part of the process included comparing the existing Staff Accountability mechanisms to the set of issues defined as systemic.

The following table outlines existing or in-development staff-accountability mechanisms and how they relate to the issues identified by the subgroup.

Mechanism	Purpose / Scope	Related Issues	Thoughts and ideas on adjustments these mechanisms might make to further address identified issues.
Ombudsman	The ICANN Ombudsman is independent, impartial and neutral. The Ombudsman's function is to act as an informal dispute resolution office for the ICANN community, who may wish to lodge a complaint about ICANN staff, board or problems in supporting organisations. The purpose of the office is to ensure that the members of the ICANN community have been treated fairly. The Ombudsman is impartial and will attempt to resolve complaints about unfair treatment, using techniques like mediation, shuttle diplomacy and if needed, formal investigation. The Ombudsman is not an advocate for you, but will investigate without taking sides in a dispute. The process is informal, and flexible. Information on how to contact the Ombudsman is on icann.org.	1, 2, 3	

Complaints Office	**The Complaints Office handles complaints regarding the ICANN organisation that don't fall into an existing complaints mechanism. This may include complaints about how a request has been handled, a process that appears to be broken, insufficient handling of an issue, or something that may be an indication of a systemic issue, among other things.** **Information on how to contact the Ombudsman is on icann.org.**	**1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8**	
ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior	**To provide a common framework of understanding regarding expected behavior for those who take part in ICANN's multistakeholder process, including Board, staff, and all those involved in Supporting organisation and Advisory Committee councils. Also provides a basis for articulating areas of concern between individuals when expectations are not being met.** **ICANN's expected standards of behavior are available on icann.org.**	**1,**	

The individual who is the topic of the complaint or concern	Every individual in the ICANN community, and everyone within ICANN organisation, is empowered to engage, in a respectful manner, persons who they feel may have interacted with them in a way counter to expected standards of behavior to address the concern directly.	1,	
Manager of the staff person or department associated with the complaint or concern	Every individual in the ICANN community, is empowered to engage, in a respectful manner, the manager of the person or department they feel may have interacted with them in a way counter to expected standards of behavior to address the concern. Staff are also free to raise concerns to their manager. A management organisation chart is available on icann.org for identification of managers and departments.	1, 2, 5, 6, 9	

Executive team member responsible for the department associated with the complaint or concern	**Every individual in the ICANN community, is empowered to engage, in a respectful manner, the manager of the person or department they feel may have interacted with them in a way counter to expected standards of behavior to address the concern. Staff are also free to raise concerns to their manager.** **ICANN organisation's management, led by the CEO, is responsible for managing all staff members' adherence to policies. The policies themselves set out reporting chains, and investigatory processes that are each followed. There are multiple ways to ensure adherence and it is through the management chain, and well-established Human Resource practices, that potential violations from the policies are reported and investigated.** **A management organisation chart is available on icann.org for identification of managers and departments.**	**1, 2, 5, 6, 9**	
ICANN CEO	**The ICANN CEO is responsible at the overall level for the ICANN organisation staff member's accountability.**	**1, 2, 3,**	

Performance Management process	ICANN organisation has a formal performance management system for evaluating staff. Staff are evaluated twice a year in the May and November timeframes.	4, 7,	· We might recommend language be included in performance manager guidelines encouraging managers of staff who regularly engage with community members solicit input from appropriate community members as part of the manager's evaluation process. · We might recommend that a regular communication, timed with the bi-annual review timeframes, go out to the community through an appropriate vehicle to remind community members that they are free to provide input on ICANN organisation staff performance. · We might recommend ICANN organisation submit a survey asking for input on organisation performance at the functional level, to provide additional input for consideration in department leadership-level staff evaluations · We might recommend ICANN organisation publish materials describing the performance management system used to ensure staff

			accountability and performance.
Active policies related to ICANN organisation staff behavior and accountability	**ICANN has several policies regarding staff performance and accountability, including:** · **Anonymous Hotline** · **Confidentiality** · **Conflict of Interest** · **Employee Conduct & Work Rules** · **Equal Employment** · **Fraud** · **Open Door** · **Outside Business Interests** · **Prohibition of Workplace Harassment** · **Staff Remuneration** **The organisation has also determined that this content should be broadly available, in the spirit of transparency, and will be posted on www.icann.org**		

Currently Under Development: Process Mapping and corresponding Process Manuals; Operating Standards **Efforts to map out and document at an operational level the processes that involve community and the organisation, including Reviews, PDPs, Advice and Board Correspondence, and Empowered Community Powers.**	**The purpose of these efforts include:** · **Clearly articulate processes as defined by the Bylaws, or other officially adopted documents, or common/historical practice.** · **Improve understanding and alignment regarding role-clarity and procedure throughout the process.** · **Enable the community to identify, as necessary, areas of ambiguity or confusion, and determine what if any efforts the community should take to address potential risk areas.** · **Improve adoption of known community best practices** · **Improve accessibility and engagement by new members to the ICANN community**	**1, 2, 5**	

VI. Annex X: Mandate of the Staff Accountability subteam from WS1

14 In general, management and staff work for the benefit of the community and in line with ICANN's purpose and Mission. While it is obvious that they report to and are held accountable by the ICANN Board and the President and CEO, the purpose of their accountability is the same as that of the organisation:

> *Complying with ICANN's rules and processes.*

> *Complying with applicable Bylaws.*

> *Achieving certain levels of performance, as well as security.*

> *Making their decisions for the benefit of the community and not in the interest of a particular stakeholder or set of stakeholders or ICANN the organisation alone.*

15 Having reviewed and inventoried the existing mechanisms related to staff accountability, areas for improvement include clarifying expectations from staff, as well as establishing appropriate redress mechanisms. The CCWG-Accountability recommends as part of its Work Stream 2:

> *The CCWG-Accountability work with ICANN to develop a document that clearly describes the role of ICANN staff vis-à-vis the ICANN Board and the ICANN community. This document should include a general description of the powers vested in ICANN staff by the ICANN Board of Directors that need, and do not need, approval of the ICANN Board of Directors.*

> *The CCWG-Accountability work with ICANN to consider a Code of Conduct, transparency criteria, training, and key performance indicators to be followed by staff in relation to their interactions with all stakeholders, establish regular independent (internal and community) surveys and audits to track progress and identify areas that need improvement, and establish appropriate processes to escalate issues that enable both community and staff members to raise issues. This work should be linked closely with the Ombudsman enhancement item of Work Stream 2.*