

<p>Charter Question #9</p>	<p>9. What is the governance framework that should be followed to guide distribution of the proceeds? The issues addressed by a governance framework could include (but does not have to be limited to):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What are the specific measures of success that should be reported upon? b. What are the criteria and mechanisms for measuring success and performance? c. What level of evaluation and reporting should be implemented to keep the community informed about how the funds are ultimately used?
<p>Initial Responses (summary – for full responses, see here)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reviewing committee with nominated positions (board, so/ac, vip) using the services of independent experts hired by the agency to evaluate the proposals (against the strategic objectives of each funding call). The evaluations should be as formal as possible, public, with grids of objective criteria, notes given over a numeric scale by the experts, with their rationales, etc. The agency would have to manage the formation and maintenance of the committee and the pool of experts used in each call (i.e. every 6 months, so a continuous activity) Note that I think this is part of the design phase, not the implementation phase. The CCWG should describe how the committee and the expert system should be dealt with regardless of whether a separate agency needs to be created or do it within ICANN. The case of partnering with an existing granting agency would limit us in that regard since they will want to use their existing committee and experts and what not. • Apart from reputation of the process and the containment of legal risks, success criteria cannot be defined until CCWG has agreed on a specific purpose for the funding. The transparency standards applied to this framework should be set at the highest level possible, including anything already existing within ICANN. Names, amount of funds allocated, purpose of projects, etc. must be disclosed. • Independent selection committees, working as volunteers. One part that is very difficult to manage is how applicants approach committee members and advisors to pledge for support. Mechanisms to avoid this should be put in place, so that proposals are assessed by their merits, solid technical knowledge and clear community benefit. Each project accepted should design and present its own set of indicators and measurements, as one project might be about “apples” and the other one about “oranges”, having a single set of measurements to define “success” will be misleading and lessons learned from the field might be lost, or technical information overlooked. Projects teams to be supported will benefit from community advisors/mentors (paid by the program to link it a feedback/reporting mechanism for community transparency) and have the opportunity to assess/adapt during the course of the implementation. Outcomes and outputs should be shared at ICANN meetings, with peer-review sessions/groups organized, to encourage knowledge transfer, community development and strengthen collaboration. If the session’s to share projects outcomes are about a project that “fail” but the reports and other projects outcomes are reviewed during such community session/process and discussed by the community, as it help others to learn from other’s “mistakes”. Then the project was a success :) is about closing the loop and

	<p>encouraging/fostering a strong community that supports each other and is committed to continuous improvement. If this is done through partnerships with existing organizations, the program will benefit from established tools and processes/facilities. That will not cover how a selection committee is formed and maintained, as the committee should be based on subject matter expertise. The more knowledgeable, experienced and well-regarded the selection committee members are, the stronger the process will be. A secretariat function that is neutral is key for deliberations to occur based in merit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowing the nomenclature of tenders and proposals by the general public would be a powerful tool of control oriented towards the obligation of result and to report any work carried out. There will be a follow-up evaluation in real time of all that is done. It will also be necessary to define a truly binding legal framework for organizations that will not engage in producing highly quantifiable and technically feasible results with respect to ICANN. It should also be about discrimination and consider working with organizations that have an important background with proven experience in the areas of intervention. • By making uses of existing organisations, the distribution of the auction proceeds would only be a ‘one-time event’ that hardly requires extra governance at ICANN.
Order in which this question should be dealt with	Charter question 2 would need to be addressed before tackling this question. Also dependent on mechanism chosen.
Sub-questions or clarifications needed	
(External) Expertise required?	Legal and fiduciary requirements. Audit requirements.