A FULLY ACCOUNTABLE ORGANISATION:
PROPOSAL

Ensuring accountability and absolute transparency, performing at the best of one’s capacities by disinterested service: this is the organisation we need, realigning with the Auroville ideals.

Preliminaries
- The Auroville Foundation Act empowers the Residents to appoint its own committees. The selection process for the working groups is the RA’s exclusive responsibility; this is the specific object of this proposal – not the mandates, policies and generalities of the many working groups.
- To fulfil its specific mandate each working group demands distinct tasks that, complementary to each other, bind into a harmonious whole. Efficient functioning depends upon a properly selected working team. Goodwill is not enough; particular skills are needed, professionalism. Conversely, in the current system people selected without proper filtering are seldom held accountable, individually or as a group.

General framework
- The roles and responsibilities of each of the vacancies shall be defined by the working groups (with the participation of the AVC if needed) and published in detail in all available media (News and Notes, Auronet, mass mail, RAS mails).
- The nominees, whose names will be made public, shall be in the Register of Residents since at least four years. However, when special technical, financial or legal skills are required this term can be significantly reduced, to one year.
- The specific selection shall involve one working group at a time. Six weeks between two selection processes seems optimal. Since there are five Working Groups (as listed in PWG), and the WG members have to be renewed by one third each year, the selection processes could take place i.e. from September to March.
- One or two trainees, with no right of vote, can be selected. Youth’s participation is welcomed.

Evaluation team
The RAS should initiate the selection process at the appropriate time and be responsible for the correct implementation. The time-frame to submit nominations is two weeks (or as generally agreed).
- There is only one Evaluation Team, whose members are nominated for two years. This is a free service, with no maintenance reward, composed of volunteers of known probity and competence in the specific field of impartial judgement and evaluation of human qualities.
- The team of 7 members, not part of the working group in question, will be appointed at a general meeting; if too many volunteer the selection will happen by draw of lots. When general meetings are not possible due to unforeseen situations the names will be made public online and through the already specified media; the selection, in a four days span, will happen by voted priorities.
- The two years mandate will be reconfirmed at midterm. This reconfirmation is an internal process by the Evaluation team. If some members decide to resign, or are not reconfirmed by the group majority, then new members shall be nominated among the substitutes (those in excess during the selection process of the evaluation team.)
- The members will meet weekly, one day or two half days, according to need – and/or discuss online, particularly if meetings are restricted. The decision-making quorum is 5.
- A secretary will coordinate.

**Evaluating the nominees**
- The Evaluation Team will interview the nominees, ascertaining that their replies to the job description correspond to understanding of the assigned task as published by the respective working groups. Integrity, capability, accountability are indispensable qualities, in a spirit of transparent, disinterested service.
  - **Integrity**: honesty, loyalty, straightforwardness.
  - **Capability**: the right person is selected to fulfil a specific task, honouring the mandate of a working group that implies a well-defined list of roles, skills and responsibilities. These can be technical abilities and/or human capacities.
  - **Accountability**: the person pledges to take responsibility for his/her acts and to answer questions satisfactorily. His/her work and decisions will be submitted for feedback to the working group when and as required. In case of failure, his/her working group may request by a majority vote his/her replacement. If this is contested, the RA will decide. No one expelled can reapply for the next 10 years.

**Transparency of the selection process**
- Ethical or legal violations, infringement of Mother’s essential guidelines should be reported, by any member of the RA, by email or handwritten signed letter, to the evaluation team, who will then inform the applicant. If the person refuses the allegations the evaluation team will arrange a meeting where both are present, the applicant and the informer. If the decision of the evaluation committee is negative and the applicant refuses it, then the allegations will be published on the above media for public scrutiny. If proved true the applicant is disqualified; but if wrongly accused – this is a major difference with the previous screening processes – the calumniator will be punished accordingly to the seriousness of the offense, up to barring for a minimum two years and a maximum ten years from holding any public post. The calumniator’s name shall be published in the media already specified.

**Ratification**
- The people so selected, and whose names have been published on all available media, will be presented at a general meeting. If in an excessive number, the remaining others shall serve in an advisory capacity or as eventual substitutes. Since the process of selecting the final members is by draw of lots, the same draw by lots process will apply to the substitutes. If this is not applicable due to emergencies, then voting is the alternative.

**Provisos**
- No standing member of the working group in question shall participate in the selection process.
- The applicant will not have served in that working group more than twice in the last ten years.
- No members of the same family or close associates (known partnership associations, mutually exchanging favours) shall enrol in the same working group.
- When an issue concerning a member/family/associate is debated, that person will step aside.
NOTE. This proposal was debated in October 2019 at a general meeting (Bumikha Hall was packed), in view of a RAD resolution to be taken by the end of December. Now details have been added taking also into account lockdown restrictions, at that time unforeseen.