

SO/AC Accountability

Lightning Talk

Steve DelBianco

Several of our Stress Tests cited SO/AC Accountability

ST 31 looked at *Rogue Voting* response

Two from Larry Strickling at NTIA:

- ST 33 on *internal capture* by AC/SO member(s)
- ST 34 on *excluding new entrants* from AC/SO

ST 33 & 34 relied on two mechanisms:

1. A disenfranchised AC/SO member could challenge a Board decision to follow that advice/policy, via Reconsideration or IRP vs. *“open, transparent bottom-up, multistakeholder processes”*
2. Periodic Organizational Reviews of AC/SOs:
 - (ii) whether any change in structure or operations is desirable *to improve its effectiveness*
 - (iii) whether that SO, council, or AC *is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations*

SO/AC Accountability in WS2 Bylaw

1. Include the subject of SO/AC accountability in ATRT
2. Evaluate “Mutual Accountability Roundtable” idea
3. Propose detailed plan on enhancing SO / AC accountability as part of WS2
4. Assess whether the IRP would also be applicable to SO and AC activities

Proposed Approach

- SO/AC outreach to their target community is measured by *effort* and not just by *results*
- SO/AC is accountable to the stakeholders *who decide that it is worthwhile to participate and assert their views*
- Effectiveness of AC/SO policies in *servicing the targeted community* is more important than whether an AC/SO decision was made with full participation of all conceivable stakeholders