

| Issue  | Discussion | Volunteer |
|--|------------|-----------|
| <p>In looking at your recommendation 3 where you're proposing the 4 member panel comprising the Ombudsman complaints office ripped from the impaired community and the board member, I guess I have an instinctive tendency to resist setting up more bureaucratic processes and panels and entities so I guess what -- just to help my understanding I'm wondering if you could give what sort of issue that might have to go to an entity like that that couldn't be say dealt with the Ombudsman himself or by the complaints office itself in isolation.</p> <p>Surely they as professionals can interact on such issues without having to be seen as a panel as such.</p> |            |           |
| <p>But does your report on dealing with staff does it get to contractors as staff do all the recommendations apply or.</p>   |            |           |
| <p>over the past felt that staff over stepped their bounds in a process that ultimately lead to a board approval of something based on that staff action where the groups filed request for reconsideration to no good affect. So thinking about what would I like if something like that arose in the future that I feel more independent and objective and have enforcement</p>  |            |           |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>capabilities and I'm sorry to say I don't see that here. I see a four member panels that's noted elsewhere that has no new powers. It's a discussion group and the members of the Ombudsman who are not formally staff is described as independent but none the less paid by ICANN the complaints officer that's who a staff member of ICANN. Representative of empower community which is the one possibly independence person where at least a person more sensitive to community concerns than others on this panel and the board member and my experience in watching board in these situations is that the board tends to be protective of staff. I don't get a real -- there's a lot of other things in this recommendation I think are good ideas and useful and may get out ahead and present conflicts but when there's a real conflict between the community and staff have either over step boundary or failed to -- their authority. I don't get a real good feeling this panel is going to provide anything other than a discussion that's identify bye bias to backing the staff.</p> |  |  |
| <p>that the goal of which is to make ICANN more accountability would be evaluating whether existing mechanisms for holding staff accountable and intervening effectively when staff act in a nonaccountable way would be evaluating whether the</p>  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>present avenues were sufficient and if not what could be put in place that would be more effective.</p>   |  |  |
| <p>It's this whole issue which I think comes to the core of a lot of complaint is staff performance tied to community performance and should it be. I mean I think that's the bottom line for a lot of things and particularly when you hear staff pressuring community leaders to get done by a certain thing. That creates a lot of the anxiety.</p> <p>I suspected that 8 and 9 were exactly as you said. Attempt to address the issue but I would still advocate for not supplying it to actually put in a way that doesn't violate privacy. You don't need individuals you just need information. You adopt need to tie it to a group or person but just general information that provided with that in my opinion. I would also say I come from an organization where staff support is evaluated and the issues I support I get an evaluation on. It can be done and ICANN be done without violating. I would be happy to share those questions.</p> |  |  |
| <p>Define a safe space where Board, Organization &amp; Community can speak about the issues so that Board caucus can determine whether the issues</p>  | <p>From Board WS2 Caucus</p> <p>It is assumed a safe space would be a closed and confidential space. Can that work in WS2.</p> |  |

|   |                              |  |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| <p>are imagined, individual or they are systemic as claimed by the group.</p>   |                              |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1, clarity on the issue of a “safe zone”, is needed including in the context of 1(a) whether the newly-established <u>Complaints Office</u> 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.</li> </ul> | <p>From Board WS2 Caucus</p> |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>  | <p>From Board WS2 Caucus</p> |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>   | <p>From Board WS2 Caucus</p> |  |

|  |                              |  |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| <p>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.</p>   |                              |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>   | <p>From Board WS2 Caucus</p> |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> | <p>From Board WS2 Caucus</p> |  |

|  |                       |  |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li></ul> | From Board WS2 Caucus |  |
|--|-----------------------|--|



