Chat transcript:

Nathalie Peregrine: (10/13/2016 09:47) Dear all, welcome to the webinar on new gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG Charter on the 13 October 2016

Eduardo Diaz - NARALO: (10:08) Can you provide links to these documents?

Marika Konings: (10:10) @Eduardo - I will post the slide deck now on the DT wiki space and get the link to you in a minute.

Ken Stubs: (10:38) Does the ICANN board allow voting or advocacy where a clear conflict exists?

Alan Greenberg: (10:36) @Ken, as were the DT members. But departing from the ICANN model of restricting WG participation seemed to go to a place where we also didn't want to go to.

Eduardo Diaz - NARALO: (10:16) Can you give an example of what will be considered a conflict of interest in the CCWG?

Marika Konings: (10:17) @Eduardo - further information in relation to conflict of interest declarations will follow later in the presentation so that may address your question.

Eduardo Diaz - NARALO: (10:17) @Marika: Ok. Thanks.

Kurt Pritz: (10:22) Q for end: Can the principles/constraints include measurement? I.e., can there be an a priori and after the fact measurement of return, NPV or payback? This need not always be quantitative but there should be a promised and measured return. The actual return should be taken into account in future requests. Finally (sorry for this long comment), and consistent with measurement, we could use the term "use" of funds, rather than "disbursement," which, to me connotes more of an unconditional grant or gift.

Marika Konings: (10:24) @Kurt - that is probably something for the CCWG to determine.

ken stubbs: (10:25) very concerned about overhead & feel that independent evaluators s/b hired by independent committee to evaluate proposals & measure admin costs.

Becky Burr: (10:25) @Kurt and Marika - any good program would build in measurement as Kurt suggests. Don't see how we could proceed without the ability to understand what has been accomplished

Asha Hemrajani: (10:25) @Kurt, excellent points and something we have considered in the drafting team. However, the exact details of how NPV/return should be measured (and your points are valid) here would be what the CCWG would convene to determine.

Marika Konings: (10:25) @Becky - exactly, and that is why it has been called out as a specific question for the CCWG to address.

Asha Hemrajani: (10:26) What the charter drafting team needs to do and has done is specify that the CCWG should address this.

Marika Konings: (10:26) @Ken - and the issue of overhead is also specifically called out. What is an appropriate level of overhead?

ken stubbs: (10:26) we have for the last 5-7 years had public commitments that $ would not be appropriated to ICANN, this was essential purpose for the model.

Kurt Pritz: (10:27) I'm not sure "ROI" is the real measure we are after though.

Asha Hemrajani: (10:27) ROI is an art and a science :-)

Becky Burr: (10:27) @Kurt and Marika - any good program would build in measurement as Kurt suggests. Don't see how we could proceed without the ability to understand what has been accomplished

Olof Nordling: (10:28) How many Chartering Organizations would need to sign up for a launch of the CCWG?

Olof Nordling: (10:28) Thanks Mark!}
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Asha Hemrajani: (10:38) @Ken agree with Alan in that we had quite a few strong debates on this but we had the concern that we could not openly restrict participation. Would like your views on this.

Becky Burr: (10:38) @Ken, no

Becky Burr: (10:39) but the WG won’t be deciding on applications.

Asha Hemrajani: (10:41) @Ken, the CCWG will decide on the process/framework and another group actually disburses the funds...

Marika Konings: (10:43) @Ken - any recommendations would go out for public comment and will need to be approved by Chartering Organizations, so there are a number of checks and balances in place that would hopefully prevent such ‘gaming’.

Asha Hemrajani: (10:43) @Ken, The Board would not do anything about the membership of the group. HOWEVER, the Board has an obligation to make sure that the decisions that it makes are free from conflict of interest.

Marika Konings: (10:43) and of course, the Board will need to sign off at the end of the day.

James Bladel: (10:43) @Ken's point - I'm hopeful that the CCWG looks at ways to spin this out of ICANN entirely (e.g. independent foundation / development fund/etc.)

Asha Hemrajani: (10:43) @jonathan, I cannot speak now, please could you read out my comment

Marika Konings: (10:43) also, a consensus call is never done solely on numbers, it would factor in affiliation / representation.

ken stubbs: (10:43) +1 James

Jonathan Robinson: (10:45) @Asha. Please repost comment so I know which one to read out / communicate

Jonathan Robinson: (10:45) repost

Asha Hemrajani: (10:46) Asha Hemrajani: @Ken. The Board would not do anything about the membership of the group. HOWEVER, the Board has an obligation to make sure that the decisions that it makes are free from conflict of interest.

Samantha Eisner: (10:47) @James, as the entity that the funds come from, there will always be some level of responsibility for ICANN to make sure that the funds are going to intended purposes. Of course, the disbursement mechanism could be independent from ICANN, but there would have to be some governance/reporting structure in place to report back to ICANN.

Asha Hemrajani: (10:48) comment above with reference to James and Ken's comments.

Samantha Eisner: (10:50) +1 Jonathan

Asha Hemrajani: (10:50) Yes Jonathan

James Bladel: (10:51) Thanks, Sam. Implementation details aside, the general idea is that there is arm's length between ICANN and the evaluation proposals / distribution of funds.

Erika Mann: (10:52) True independence, I doubt that even the board should administer this.

Becky Burr: (10:53) +1 Erika


Erika Mann: (10:54) Hi Jonathan, I had difficulties in joining but heard part of the discussion and are fully online now.

ken stubbs: (10:54) agree with erika, icann board doesn't administrate, principal function ther s/b evaluative

ken stubbs: (10:56) my comments related to board evaluating adherence to established guidelines. they have competence to deal with this

Asha Hemrajani: (10:57) @Ken yes that was my point - the board has the responsibility to oversee that guidelines are adhered to, that we are upholding our fiduciary responsibilities and that the conflict of interest principles are not violated.

Olga Cavalli - GAC: (10:58) Thanks Jonathan!

ken stubbs: (10:58) thx Jonathan


Markus Kummer: (10:58) Thanks, Jonathan -- good briefing. Bye all

Olga Cavalli - GAC: (10:58) bye

Becky Burr: (10:58) thanks all

Asha Hemrajani: (10:58) Thanks and bye!

Erika Mann: (10:58) Thanks Jonathan, team