

Work Stream 2 Project on **SO/AC Accountability**

First reading of draft recommendations

10-Mar-2017

The mandate for **SO/AC Accountability**

1. “review and develop ... recommendations on SO/AC accountability, including improved processes for **accountability**, **transparency**, and **participation** that are helpful to prevent capture”
2. Evaluate **Mutual Accountability Roundtable**
3. Assess whether the **IRP** would also be applicable to SO/AC activities

Track 1: Reviews & Recommendations

- Looked at ACs, SOs, and GNSO subgroups
- All responded to our questions (thank you!)
- We recommend **Best Practices** in these areas:
 - Accountability *to designated community*
 - Transparency *to everyone*
 - Participation by members
 - Outreach to designated community *not yet participating*
 - Updates to policies & procedures

Track 1: Selected Recommendations

- **Accountability:** SO/AC/Subgroups should **publish an annual report** on what they have done during the prior year to improve accountability, transparency, and participation, describing where they might have fallen short, and any plans for future improvements.
- **Transparency:** Meetings and calls of SO/ACs and subgroups **should normally be open to public observation**. When a meeting is determined to be *members-only*, that should be explained publicly, giving specific reasons for holding a closed meeting.
- **Participation:** Where membership must be applied for, there should be a **process of appeal when application for membership is rejected**.
- **Outreach:** Each AC/SO/Subgroup should have a **strategy for outreach** to parts of their targeted community that may not be significantly participating at the time.
- **Updates to policies and procedures:** Internal reviews of policies and procedures **should not be prolonged for more than 1 year**, and temporary measures should be considered if the review extends longer.

Track 2: Evaluate **Mutual Accountability Roundtable** and implement, if viable

“The idea of mutual accountability is that multiple actors are accountable to each other”

CCWG Advisor Willie Currie, May-2015

Our recommendation:

- Each AC/SO is accountable **to its designated community** – not to other ACs or SOs.
- Sharing of best practices among AC/SOs is beneficial and can be done informally.
- **No need** to implement new processes for a Mutual Accountability Roundtable

Track 3: Should the IRP also be applicable **to AC and SO activities?**

Our recommendation:

- The IRP **would not** be applicable to SO & AC activities, as it is now described in the Bylaws.
- While the IRP **could** be made applicable by amending bylaws significantly,
- the IRP **should not** be made applicable to SO & AC activities, because it is complex and expensive, and there are easier alternative ways to challenge an AC or SO action or inaction.