CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 – Guidelines for a Design Team

Definition

A Design Team is a small group of qualified[1] people formed around a highly specific issue, with a clear deliverable and with a time limited schedule that is part of the critical path[2]. **Design Teams may only be created on the pre-agreed topics for WS2.**

Life Cycle of a Design Team

The following is a description of the work plan and process for the life cycle of a Design Team:

Defining the issue: the issue should be communicated in less than one page in the *Request for a CCWG Design Team* (see template below). The issue should be relevant, clear, specific, and critical to the success of the overall project.

Creating the Design Team: the co-Chairs will oversee the creation of all Design Teams, with input from the CCWG-Accountability. Once agreed, the Design Team will be assigned a unique Design Team number. A register of Design Teams and related issues will be kept by support staff and publicly available on the Wiki.

Relationship to CCWG-Accountability

A Design Team should deliver work in a short period [2 weeks or less] according to the set mandate and will be dissolved after delivery of work product. Results of a Design Team need to be approved by the CCWG-Accountability prior to integration into the evolving Work Stream 2 report. Key points about the relationship to the CCWG-Accountability:

- The output of a Design Team is input to the CCWG-Accountability, not a final document. Such a document must not be considered as more important than any other input to the CCWG-Accountability.
- For a work product to be considered by the CCWG-Accountability the Design Team must publish it to the CCWG-Accountability list at least 24 hours prior to the meeting being held.
- Failure of a Design Team to deliver will affect the overall project schedule.
- Each Design Team must provide regular reports on the larger WS2 calls.

Composition

The proposal for a Design Team must include:

- A lead participant responsible for delivering the work product to the CCWG-Accountability.
- A maximum of 10 participants, all of whom must be part of the CCWG-Accountability and have updated Statements of Interest (SOIs).

---

[1] "Qualified" was defined in the CWG-Stewardship as the combination of relevant expertise and commitment to time required.

[2] The term Design Team comes from the IETF and more information on this can be found at http://www.ietf.org/iesg/statement/design-team.html

The Design Team Lead is responsible for coordinating the work, updating the CCWG-Accountability at its weekly meetings and most importantly delivering the results.

Work Methods

Each Design Team will be assigned a mailing list for its discussions. Only members of the Design Team will be allowed to post to the list but the archives of the list will be public. It is expected that most of the work can be carried out via the mailing list and online document editing.

There will be limited support for Design Teams unless otherwise arranged. Teleconferences and a virtual meeting room will be available, but must be scheduled with staff in advance and are subject to availability.

Staff may be able to offer writing and research support but this has to be pre-arranged.

If the Design Team encounters an issue that will make it impossible to work to the agreed time, this must be communicated to the co-Chairs promptly. Issues will be logged into the CCWG-Accountability Design Team status list.

The Co-Chairs will make a determination of how many DTs can be in operational simultaneously. It is the expectation that no more than three DTs will be in operation at the same time. If one DT completes its work, the Chairs will review which DTs are in the funnel and should proceed next (by priority).

Design Team Template

[Work Stream 2 element] – [Title]
Background / Current State
[Describe the current state and any relevant background information – this can be extracted from Annex 12 of the Work Stream 1 report]
Existing work areas/documentation, if any
[Identify the areas and/or documentation that may already exist on this topic within ICANN. Also must answer, "Can this issue be addressed as part of another initiative or project?" and provide rationale for answer]
Work plan for the Design Team, Timeframe, Resources
[Prepare a work plan for the DT, including a list the issues for DT work, timeframe for the work to take place of each issue, and resources required, if any]
Proposed Design Team Composition/Expertise
[List interested members and/or expertise-types needed; highlight name of lead if available]

For example:

Item #3 – Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee accountability
Background / Current State
As the community's power is enhanced, legitimate concerns have arisen regarding the accountability of the community (organized as SOs and ACs) in using new Community Powers, i.e., "who watches the watcher." The CCWG-Accountability reviewed existing accountability mechanisms for SOs and ACs as well as governance documents. Analysis revealed that mechanisms are limited in quantity and scope. Having reviewed and inventoried the existing mechanisms related to SO and AC accountability, it is clear that current mechanisms need to be enhanced in light of the new responsibilities associated with the Empowered Community. The CCWG-Accountability recommends the following. **As part of Work Stream 2:** - Include the subject of SO and AC accountability as part of the work on the Accountability and Transparency Review process. - Evaluate the proposed "Mutual Accountability Roundtable" to assess viability and, if viable, undertake the necessary actions to implement it. - Propose a detailed working plan on enhancing SO and AC accountability as part of Work Stream 2. - Assess whether the IRP would also be applicable to SO and AC activities.
Existing work areas/documentation, if any
Can this issue be addressed as part of another initiative or project? The organizational reviews could be the incubator for these goals, since they would need to be integrated into each SO/AC according to its procedures. In addition, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee would work on issues related to SO/AC accountability.
Work plan for the Design Team, Timeframe, Resources

- Expand scope of Accountability and Transparency Review (specifically ATRT3) to include the subject of SO/AC accountability. The ATRT3 is expected to start in January 2017, but there may be a way for the CCWG to make recommendations in advance of ATRT3.
- To evaluate the concept of a Mutual Accountability Roundtable, it may be necessary to have the Advisors' input, since they suggested the idea initially. The timeframe of this issue will depend on Advisors' availability.
- The detailed working plan to enhance SO/AC accountability could be a list of principles, goals, or best practices for the Organizational Reviews to integrate. Organizational Reviews are ongoing, so the earlier this can be put together, the better.
- To assess whether the IRP would be would also be applicable to SO and AC activities, the DT would need to work with the IRP Implementation Group and may choose to delegate this assessment to that group entirely, based on their expertise.

Proposed Design Team Composition/Expertise

- Lead: TBD
- Individuals who have served/are serving on Organizational Review groups.
- Advisors
- IRP Implementation Group liaison