Public Comment Review Tool

Public Comment Categories – Table of Contents

Initial Report Sections 1-4

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Comments address the following sections of the Initial Report: 1. Executive Summary 2. Objective and Next Steps and 4. Summary of Deliberations. Overview of Comments: Board comments on these sections of the Initial Report elaborate on the Board's position regarding issues addressed in the report, provide guidance on next steps and future work, reiterate advice previously provided by the Board, and seek clarification on specific items contained in the report.				
1.	**SECTION 1.4 "DELIBERATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS"** The Board is not prepared to identify a preference regarding the mechanism for administering the auction proceeds program at this stage in the process. As stated by the CCWG-AP, this is an evolving process and the public comments will further shape and define the mechanisms, along with additional work by the CCWG. We remain committed to use of the principles set out in our letter of 30 May 2018 to evaluate the CCWG's eventual recommendations. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html	ICANN Board	None CCWG to consider re-reviewing principles set out in Board letter of 30 May to review against CCWG's eventual recommendation.	Concerns **Proposed CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided and commits to re-reviewing the principles set out in the Board letter of 30 May against the CCWG's final recommendation. **Action Taken:** None at this moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	**SECTION 2 "OBJECTIVE AND NEXT STEPS"** If the report changes significantly as a result of Public Comment, the Board would encourage a second period of Public Comment to make sure that the community and beyond have opportunities to comment on any material changes to the approach and options set forth in this draft before submission to the Chartering Organizations for adoption. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html	ICANN Board	CCWG to consider whether second public comment period is required if material changes are made to the approach and options set forth.	Concerns **Proposed CCWG Response:** The CCWG will consider whether a second public comment period is required, following a determination whether material changes are made to the approach and options set forth in the Initial Report. For example, a material change could be re-evaluating option C, i.e. ICANN foundation. **Action Taken:** None at this moment

				[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	**SECTION 4.2 "OBJECTIVE OF FUND ALLOCATION"** As mentioned in previous Board and org communications with the CCWG-AP, the use of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds must be consistent with ICANN's Mission as set out by the ICANN Bylaws, that is "to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems." The Board welcomes the Initial Report's references to this requirement. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html	ICANN Board	None CCWG to ensure that Final Report also confirms that the use of new gTLD Auction Proceeds must be consistent with ICANN's Mission as set out by the ICANN Bylaws.	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciated the input provided and is committed to ensuring that the use of new gTLD Auction Proceeds is consistent with ICANN's Mission as set out in the ICANN Bylaws. **Action Taken:** None [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	**SECTION 4.3 "CRITERIA"** The Board would like clarity on how the CCWG-AP is recommending these criteria be used in evaluation purposes. In relation to the "cost-effective" considerations – also mentioned in Section 4.5 "Ranking Mechanisms" as one of the CCWG's most important criteria – the Board would like to offer the following input for consideration: At the CCWG's ICANN63 session, one participant in the session asked the following question: "It's just one question but I'm hoping that the group [has considered] which one of these models would keep the grant making process out of the realm of request for reconsideration when a grant is made, independent review panel when a grant is made based on - in other words when a grant is made just making sure that it sticks and is not disputed by every other party in ICANN who was looking for those same moneys. I'd like to know which one of these models avoids that problem." As noted in Barcelona, the Board believes that the ICANN accountability mechanisms (including the Ombuds, Reconsideration, and Independent Review), which are designed to ensure that ICANN remains accountable to its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, should not, as a general	ICANN Board	CCWG to clarify how the criteria outlined in section 4.3 are to be used in evaluation purposes. CCWG to consider recommending that a specific application appeals process be built into the eventual application review mechanism. As with other grant making programs, the appeals program could be limited in scope to abuses of the process only and timebound. This would give applicants an opportunity to challenge for procedural faults without implicating ICANN's Reconsideration or Independent Review Process CCWG to consider recommendation on a Bylaws change specifically carving out individual funding decisions from the Bylaws provided	Concerns **CCWG Response:** To be discussed **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	rule, be used as appeals mechanisms for individual unsuccessful applicants for auction proceeds. We note, however, that many grant-making processes do have specific and efficient appeals process available to applicants in the event that they wish to challenge an individual decision on a grant. We strongly encourage the CCWG-AP to consider recommending that a specific application appeals process be built into the eventual application review mechanism. As with other grant making programs, the appeals program could be limited in scope to abuses of the process only and timebound. This would give applicants an opportunity to challenge for procedural faults without implicating ICANN's Reconsideration or Independent Review Process – neither of which are purpose built, and each of which can be costly and time consuming for all involved. Further, the Board would welcome a recommendation from the CCWG on a Bylaws change specifically carving out individual funding decisions from the Bylaws provided accountability mechanisms of Reconsideration and Independent Review, similar to other existing exclusions. This is not to suggest that the entire auction proceeds program should be exempt from broader potential accountability challenges. The ICANN Board is committed to and accepts that it is important for ICANN to remain accountable to its Bylaws and Articles. In approving any mechanism for evaluating grant applications (e.g., an independent panel) or administering the program, and whatever level of oversight ICANN will retain over such mechanisms, ICANN will have taken several acts that could give rise to uses of ICANN's established accountability mechanisms, from the initial selection of the model, to the oversight of the annual funding of tranches. If mismanagement occurs (or is alleged to occur) within the mechanism, that too could give rise to the use of an accountability mechanism for ICANN's failure to exercise proper oversight. Indeed, these are the type of disputes that we should want to bring through ICANN's existing accountability mechanisms.		accountability mechanisms of Reconsideration and Independent Review, similar to other existing exclusions.	

	This ties to the Board's principle on the "Preservation of Resources…" and "Effective and Efficient Process…" as communicated in the Board's 30 May 2018 letter which outlined defined principles the Board will use in evaluating eventual recommendations. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html			
5.	**SECTION 4.4 "INPUT PROVIDED BY THE ICANN BOARD"** The Board appreciates the inclusion of the principles in the CCWG-AP's report. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html	ICANN Board	None	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided. **Action Taken: None at this moment** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
6.	**SECTION 4.5 "RANKING MECHANISMS"** See above Section 4.3 for related commentary. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html	ICANN Board	None	Concerns **CCWG Response:** See CCWG response in relation to section 4.3. **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

Response to Charter Question #1/Preliminary Recommendation #1/ Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #1

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #1: What framework (structure, process and/or partnership) should be designed and implemented to allow for the disbursement of new gTLD Auction Proceeds, taking into account the legal and fiduciary constraints outlined above as well as the existing memo on legal and fiduciary principles? As many details as possible should be provided, including any implementation guidance the CCWG may have in relation to the establishment of this framework as well as criteria for the selection / ranking of potential funding requests. Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #1: The CCWG recommends that either mechanism A (A new ICANN Proceeds Allocation Department is created as part of ICANN Org dedicated to grant solicitation, implementation and evaluation) or mechanism B (A new ICANN Proceeds Allocation Department is created as part of ICANN Org which would work in collaboration with an existing charitable organization(s)) is designed and implemented to allow for the disbursement of new gTLD Auction Proceeds. In addition to options A and B above, the CCWG welcomes community input on mechanism C, under which an ICANN Foundation is established. Mechanism C involves creation of a new charitable structure separate from ICANN which would be responsible for solicitation and evaluation of proposals, and the disbursement of the funds but which will be required to adhere to the principles/ICANN core mission in its purpose and allocation of auction proceeds as grants and to maintain a close oversight relationship by ICANN. Based on the input received in response to the public comment period on this report and further deliberations by the CCWG taking into account these public comments, the CCWG may make changes to this recommendation in the Final Report. For example, the CCWG may be in a position to further narrow down its recommendation and identify a single preferred mechanism. Alternately, if after reviewing and deliberating on input received through public comment, the CCWG does not reach agreement on a single preferred mechanism it could recommend multiple options to the ICANN Board for further consideration. The ICANN Board will make a final decision on the path forward leveraging the CCWG's recommendations and work. Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #1: The input provided in response to this charter question is expected to help inform the implementation of the mechanism that is ultimately selected. **Overview of Comments:** Different views were expressed with respect to the mechanisms presented in response to Charter Question #1. No responses advocated for Mechanism D. A number of responses favor Mechanisms B and C, with some comments supporting Mechanism A. Commenters provided considerations for further discussion if an ICANN Department is created to support fund allocation.			
1.	The selection of one of these mechanisms must depends on the cost-benefit analysis and in addition to determining which of them would imply greater transformations and the	José Alberto Barrueto Rodríguez	CCWG to consider conducting cost-benefit analysis to determine which mechanism	New Idea (note, some of this work was undertaken in the analysis provided by Sarah Berg)

	estimation which of them would have a better result of efficiency and effectivenes, including in the number of criteria identified by the CCWG. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000023.html		would be most efficient and effective, in addition to meeting the CCWG criteria. Leadership recommendation: Consider whether further work should be undertaken on the cost-benefit analysis for the different options.	**CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	My understanding is that CCWG-AP aim is for comments to focus more on the recommended mechanism options, I believe option C needs much more examination, I will advise that Option B should be priorities. In reviewing the mechanisms, option B and C seem to be the most independent approach, while still consistent with ICANN core mission, they avoid opportunities for too much internal influence by members of the community. In as much as the Board has a fiducial responsibility, either option will limit the demands on the ICANN Board, who are not elected/appointed as experts on development grants, but to ensure the ICANN core mission is fulfilled. Managing a grants award/oversight/evaluation program would increasingly result in demands for unique skills on ICANN staff. I think Staff and Board need to be focused on the core mission and activities. An external independent manger approach would protect ICANN from other kinds of liability as well as limits the time demands on staff and Board. . . . . .I think it would be more efficient to place the management of the funds in the hands of experts that understand the process, procedures and risks associated with such program. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document]	Mary Uduma	CCWG to consider examining option C in further detail, but with option B remaining the priority. Leadership recommendation: - Define process on how to re-evaluate mechanism A, B and C: - Main concern: ensure sufficient operational independence while supporting the mission/bylaws, - Request further input from ICANN Org (and maybe Board) to be able to distinguish clearer between B and C, - Request written input from S0s/ACs to get their input concerning this topic.	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000025.html			
3.	Of the two preferred mechanisms, the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency (ISPCP) would support mechanism A, with the following conditions: ● Review of applications for funding to be reviewed by a panel of experts from the ICANN community – one panel member from each of the SO/ACs who did not participate in the Working Group (WG) . There must be new faces, and we should not carry over ex-WG participants. The ICANN Board must also designate two members for this panel. The Review Panel is to receive support from relevant ICANN Org staff. Once program is launched and applications begin to arrive, the Review Panel members receive a monthly stipend to ensure time dedication and fair compensation for their time. ● A professional Project Manager should be assigned by ICANN (with approval of the review panel members) to oversee the implementation of awarded funded initiatives and lead the ICANN Org department dedicated to the administration of allocating funding. ● The ISPCP considers this proposed arrangement as one that preserves all proceedings within the ICANN environment, and avoids the complexities of working with an outside entity. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000029.html	ISPCP	CCWG to consider enhancing option A with review of applications for funding to be reviewed by a panel of experts from the ICANN community and a professional project manager to be assigned by ICANN. (ISPCP would support mechanism A) Leadership Recommendation: -Discuss option on how to set-up community oversight: Potential options: Option I) (ISPCP): -Review, evaluation of application done by a panel ICANN community (review panel receives financial support and is supported by ICANN ORG, -Implementation is overseen by a professional project manager (assignment approved by review panel). -Check:: The Leadership Team believes that this option might only work in coordination with Mechanism A). Option II)	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

			-Independent application evaluation, review and implementation process , -BUT: Community advisory committee, -Community evaluation process after 2 years to check whether the whole process is functioning or whether changes are needed. The Leadership believes that this option can be implemented in supporting Mechanism A, B and C.	
4.	**Recommendation 1:** While Mechanism One could be seen as the most convenient choice for the distribution of auction proceeds for community use from the ICANN perspective, we have a concern that ICANN's administration of these funds could create a conflict of interest when funds that are earmarked for philanthropic purposes could possibly be used to support ICANN activities, where budgets exceed their original expectation. Our main concern is that Mechanism One may make it easier for ICANN Org to request additional funds from Auction Proceeds to cover Operating Expenses or additional money for the Reserve fund if sufficient constraints are not in place. Although the ICANN Board has already been decided that a fixed amount of the money from the Auction Proceeds fund will be used towards the Reserve Fund, we are more comfortable with this knowledge that the rest of the money needed to replenish the reserves is coming from savings made by ICANN Org. This issue sets off other alarms for us, however, since they are not related to auction proceeds, they will not be discussed here. . . . . . We are in agreement with the ICANN Board that there is a strong need to have an independent selection process. As such, we cannot support Mechanism One as it currently exists. We believe that Mechanism One is not the appropriate choice as it could result in a conflict of interest	Judith Hellerstein and Maureen Hilyard	CCWG to consider concerns expressed in relation to mechanism A (conflict of interest, ability for ICANN Org to request additional funds) CCWG to consider a hybrid model of Mechanism B that retains the cost-efficiencies offered by the ICANN Board for governance and payments by ICANN's Finance Section, alongside the establishment of a separate independent structure (either within or outside of ICANN) to cover the tasks related to applications and contractual relationships with ICANN Leadership recommendation: - Define more clearly 'independence' and 'cost efficiency' constraints to understand whether A, B or C	New Idea Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	for ICANN to be the manager and distributor of Auction Proceeds funds. Without an independent authority, ICANN auctions could be construed as a mechanism purposely created to provide income for ICANN and that it could encourage potential abuse within any subsequent round/s of new gTLDs. We suggest a hybrid model of Mechanism Two that retains the cost-efficiencies offered by the ICANN Board for governance and payments by ICANN's Finance Section, alongside the establishment of a separate independent structure (either within or outside of ICANN) to cover the tasks related to applications and contractual relationships with ICANN. Following the criteria, goals and objectives set by this CCWG, this separate but autonomous operation would be formed to more objectively and legally attend to the receipt of global applications as well as to make the decisions related to project selections and the allocation of funds. We believe that once contractual, monitoring and evaluation arrangements are formalized, projects could then be passed to the ICANN Board for endorsement so that assigned payments could be made by ICANN Finance. This model would allow the ICANN Board and Org to maintain their fiduciary and governance roles and also allow the ICANN Board to retain some level of control of key processes. ICANN has had experience of a similar "external" mechanism, and we believe is better informed about establishing this new hybrid model for this activity, based on lessons learned of this earlier process. This new organisation would be time-framed and could have its own contracted personnel to manage the administration as well as to monitor projects that are assigned - completely outside of ICANN's mandated responsibilities. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document]		mechanism cannot support these key principles. -Evaluate whether a Hybrid Model of Mechanism B is worth exploring and whether such a model will support 'independency' and 'cost-efficiency' better. -Check whether a stronger - as currently defined - Board 'control' intervention model is needed.	

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000027.html			
5.	**Recommendation 1**: After many discussions among ALAC Members and Participants to the CCWG: Auction Proceeds, the ALAC remains divided about the best mechanism to choose. The poll conducted among the At-Large members and participants highlighted that a plurality of people preferred Mechanism A, or a variant of it, over the other mechanisms, with Mechanism B finishing a strong second. If Mechanism B is chosen, the ALAC recommends that any external organization working with ICANN will publish a conflict of interest policy that clearly addresses all the elements of the funding process, follow proper procedures on accountability and transparency, and be in accordance to its obligations with ICANN. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000041.html	ALAC	If Mechanism B is chosen, the ALAC recommends that any external organization working with ICANN will publish a conflict of interest policy that clearly addresses all the elements of the funding process, follow proper procedures on accountability and transparency, and be in accordance to its obligations with ICANN. (ALAC remains divided about the best mechanism to choose) Leadership recommendation: -Check whether 'conflict of interest' for potential third-party operators need to be strengthened beyond the current recommendations.	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
6.	The RrSG does not support the CCWG-preferred mechanisms (either A or B) as set forth in Recommendation #1 and offers specific comments regarding the following proposed mechanisms and other Preliminary CCWG Recommendations. **Community Involvement** The role of the community in the disposition of new gTLD proceeds is only implied in this document and is a significant missing element. We strongly believe that a representative group from the ICANN community should be the group responsible for reviewing and approving grants under this	RrSG	CCWG to consider ICANN community involvement and responsibility in relation to reviewing and approving grants as well as follow-up review of the program. CCWG to consider limiting role of ICANN Org to oversight of the grant-making process. (RrSG does not support mechanisms A or B, would prefer mechanism C)	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	program and should also play a significant role in the follow-up review of the program. Further, the role of ICANN Org in any of the approaches should be limited to oversight of the grant-making process in order to ensure compliance with laws and with ICANN's mission. Our view on which of mechanism A-D should be employed is fully informed by the above belief and our comments below, preferring mechanism C should be read in that light. Mechanism A could be structured to accommodate the appropriate role of the community, but it would create more risk of ICANN Org controlling, rather than overseeing, the process. **Proposed Mechanism A-D** **1. Mechanism A (Internal ICANN Department) and Mechanism B (ICANN + External Organization)** Both Mechanisms A and B would require the creation of a new department within ICANN Org to perform work that is clearly outside the scope of ICANN Org's mission. ICANN's mission is clear: "to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems." The RrSG fails to see how grant management falls within that mission. Further, ICANN Org's expertise does not lend itself to grant management. While the CCWG points to ICANN Staff's ability to support public relations, external content, audit, legal, and investment activities, the RrSG suggests that this may be a significant assumption in at least some areas, as the (for example) legal and investment issues ICANN Org must address today are substantially different from that of a grant funding organization. The synergies that could be created by using Mechanism A or B in no way override the fact that these activities are not within ICANN Org's mission.		Leadership recommendation: -Define a process to allow community engagement in reviewing and approving grants and in evaluating the process. Please check whether point 3) is capturing potential options. -Check as well if ICANN Org mode of interventions is limited - in all mechanism - to the 'grant making process in order to ensure compliance with laws and with ICANN's mission." - Check: Can separate governance be ensured for all mechanism or only for few? "The very separate mission of this grant management work requires separate governance." - Check: is an ICANN independent funding structure it making easier to shut- down the operation in the future? "Additionally, given the temporary nature of the auction proceeds, having a separate structure will make closing down the structure a simpler process."	

	The RrSG would also like to point out that ICANN Org's current mission requires significant work effort from the ICANN Board, ICANN Org, and the entire ICANN community - a work effort that is already strained to maximum capacity and requires continued focus. For these reasons, the RrSG strongly discourages the selection of either of these mechanisms. **2. Mechanism C (ICANN Foundation)** While Mechanism C would involve creation of a new charitable structure separate from ICANN and additional upfront costs, this option, above all others, most lends itself to protections against self-dealing and will ensure measures are taken to avoid conflict of interest. The very separate mission of this grant management work requires separate governance. Additionally, given the temporary nature of the auction proceeds, having a separate structure will make closing down the structure a more simple process. For example, part of the structure of this separate entity could be that employees are contracted for X period of time and must have expertise in Y. Employees of the new structure should not be current or prior ICANN employees. As a result, the RrSG recommends the selection of Mechanism C. **3. Mechanism D (External Entity)** Mechanism D is not a viable option if the required entity is not readily available. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html			
7.	**Comment regarding Selection of Mechanism(s)** The BC strongly prefers a mechanism that is external to ICANN for allocation/distribution/oversight of the projects funded by auction proceeds. We recognize that Options 2 or 3 would involve oversight by ICANN's Board and an	BC	CCWG to consider extensive exploration of mechanisms B and C. Both should be equally explored in sufficient detail to understand and clarify risks and opportunities to ICANN.	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	adequate opportunity for an advisory capacity drawn from the ICANN community and independent experts. We do not support Mechanism 1, which calls for establishing a new department within ICANN. This mechanism raises numerous concerns, including: the lack of expertise in existing staff; proposed use of existing ICANN resources to take on tasks in addition to their day to day accountability to ICANN org; potential perceptions that ICANN org, ICANN Board, or ICANN community members could influence the selection and oversight of projects that need to be fully independent from such influence; and under Option 1 all grants will appear on ICANN's tax returns, adding to the complexity and potentially contributing to questions about ICANN's not for profit status. We do not believe that full exploration of risks, including reputational risks, have been explored. Sunsetting of a mechanism is inherent in all options, raising questions about ICANN adding staff with the considerable benefits of salary/benefits, and then having to either repurpose them into ICANN, or provide exit benefits. Projects are often multi-year in nature, so do not fit into ICANN's fairly structured financial reporting as a not for profit public benefit corporation. The BC is concerned that an internal mechanism within ICANN is both a diversion from the Board and key staff core activities and responsibilities and also adds additional requirements of expertise that are not central to ICANN's core mission. We therefore support extensive exploration of Options 2 and 3. Both should be equally explored in sufficient detail to		(BC does not support mechanism A) Leadership Team notes: - The topics raised by BC are overlapping with ISPC (point 3) and RrSG (point 6).	

	understand and clarify risks and opportunities to ICANN. To date, sufficient examination of these two options has not been undertaken. Focusing on only these two options will enable a more informed examination of issues, risks, and implications. We do not support further exploration of Mechanism 4. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html			
8.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #1** The NCSG supports Mechanism C, as an independent ICANN Foundation with its own Board of Directors would be more accountable than the other proposed Mechanisms. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html	NCSG	None (Support for mechanism C)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided, and notes the support for mechanism C. **Action Taken:** None at this moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
9.	Recommendation # 1: Of the two mechanisms preferred by the CCWG, only Mechanism B affords the opportunity for ICANN to separate the process of awarding funds from (1) internal conflicts of interest with stakeholder groups and (2) ICANN appeal mechanisms that would normally apply to a decision to award funds such as Request for Reconsideration and Independent Review Panel. In order for ICANN to be seen as an effective organization in the world community, it must separate itself from accusations of bias toward stakeholders, especially those which provide operating income to the organization. If an award is potentially going to be made to any ICANN stakeholder group member, that award must be independently evaluated in order to be respected in the ICANN community and in the world telecommunications community. While suggestions of an independent Panel are helpful, these would not remedy the appearance of conflict if an award is made to a member of a stakeholder group or constituency when ICANN staff itself is involved in administering applications and grants of funds. Therefore, the only means of ensuring that grants may safely be awarded to a member	Anne Aikman-Scalese	None (Support for mechanism B)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided, and notes the support for mechanism B. The CCWG is committed to ensuring that the use of new gTLD Auction Proceeds is consistent with ICANN's Mission as set out in the ICANN Bylaws. ICANN has a proven commitment to accountability and transparency in all of its practices. **Action Taken:** None at this moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	of a stakeholder group would be to place the grant-making process outside the ICANN organization. Further, the ICANN organization does not have professional staff in the grantmaking arena and staff is therefore exposed to numerous pitfalls in rules, regulations, and best practices standards applicable to such organizations. Thus, placing the grant-making inside the ICANN organization not only poses a risk of diverting ICANN from its Mission as stated in the ByLaws, but also exposes the organization to additional risk of claims and liability. Mechanism B is thus the preferred mechanism and a contractual agreement with a third party with professional and legal expertise in administering grants should afford additional safety to ICANN from (a) legal claims, (b) professional blunders of inexperienced staff, (c) formal filings for Requests for Reconsideration and Independent Review Panels and (d) claims from the wider world telecommunications community of impropriety in grant-making or the appearance of impropriety. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html			
10.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #1** The CCWG's Preliminary Recommendation #1 presents three potential structures. We think that the structure that is chosen should reflect the goal of promoting transparency and accountability. If a division is created within ICANN, the principles of accountability that were expressed in the recommendations of the Initial Report should be incorporated to ensure that the operations and decisions of the division are fully transparent and consistent with the principles set forth by the CCWG. Additionally, any organization that coordinates the distribution of funds should not be limited to charitable organizations. It is impossible to determine at this point whether the best organization to fulfill the goal were a non-charitable organization. An unincorporated committee	RySG	CCWG to give further consideration to which mechanism best reflects the goal of promoting transparency and accountability. CCWG to consider whether distribution of funds should be limited to charitable organizations or whether there are also other types of organizations, such as, for example, an unincorporated committee, which could perform this function. Leadership recommends:	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	might be formed from stakeholders to direct the best use of the funds, and unduly restricting the use of the funds could lead to inefficient use of the funds in the future. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000036.html		-Check how "goal of promoting transparency and accountability" criteria can get enhanced beyond the language captured in the current set of recommendations. -Check: is there support to enhance the current set of recommendations to allow non-charitable organizations to join forces with ICANN ORG? -Check: Could 'an unincorporated committee, might be formed from stakeholders," become a partner to ICANN Org? (Mechanism B) - Legal check needed!	

Response to Charter Question #7

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #7: Should ICANN oversee the solicitation and evaluation of proposals, or delegate to or coordinate with another entity, including, for example, a foundation created for this purpose? **Overview of Comments:** Some of the comments in this section emphasize the importance of independence in the evaluation of grant proposals. Other comments focus on the role of the ICANN community. Of the comments focused on the ICANN community, some support a mechanism in which community representatives directly evaluate applications, while others favor an advisory or oversight role for the community.				
1.	The Board will not be making determinations on preferences with respect to mechanism(s) for evaluating grant applications (e.g., an independent panel) and/or administering the program at this time; however, echoing the discussion at the ICANN62 session with the community, the Board would like to highlight its previous communications on the use of an independent panel as a means of best practices for evaluating applications: 30 May 2018: *"We also suggest that the CCWG-AP might wish to consider the importance of independence in evaluations, such as through the use of an independent panel."* 5 October 2018: *"Regarding the evaluation of the applications, the Board notes that an independent panel is an important aspect that should be considered in the CCWG's recommendations. This panel should be independent and should have appropriate conflict of interest protections built in, in support of the fiduciary duties of ICANN's directors and officers. The independent panel would assess applications and decide which applications will be successful in securing funding for that year's tranche. The independent character of the panel would need to be defined and proper controls will need to be put in place to guide the work of the panel (see below for some considerations). The panel's recommendations would be provided to the ICANN Board for approval of the slate of successful applicants for that year, and the approved slate would then be provided to the*	ICANN Board	CCWG to re-review previous Board communications on the use of an independent panel as a means of best practices for evaluating applications. Leadership recommendation: -Check: How shall "independence of panel" be defined? (while the Board has the right for approval of the slate of successful applicants) -Check: Are the comments made by other SO/AC support such Board understanding of 'independence' or not? - Check: can a "community driven panel model" even ensure sufficient independence?	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	persons/entity responsible for distribution. As previously communicated, the Board will not be taking decisions on individual applications but will instead focus its consideration of the slate on whether the rules of the process were followed by the independent panel. The principles supporting the independent panel should also include consistency over time (i.e., the composition of the panel should always include some panelists of the previous year to build on their experience); and cost-effectiveness (i.e., to focus on the use of auction proceeds to support desired activities and goals, as opposed to administrative costs).” See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html		-Check: how shall “consistency over time” be defined for the panel work?	
2.	We, the authors of this comment, share the same concerns as the ICANN Board in that the lack of an independent panel or organization to select the applicants who will receive monetary awards, could put these awards at risk and delay the whole program. *We strongly agree and support the response from the ICANN Board regarding the evaluation of the applications. As the Board rightfully notes, “an independent panel is an important aspect that should be considered in the CCWG’s recommendations …. The independent panel would assess applications and decide which applications will be successful in securing funding for that year’s tranche. The independent character of the panel would need to be defined and proper controls will need to be put in place to guide the work of the panel.”* See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000027.html	Judith Hellerstein and Maureen Hilyard	CCWG to consider independent panel or organization to select / review applications. Leadership recommendation Covered in point 1)	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	. . . While suggestions of an independent Panel are helpful, these would not remedy the appearance of conflict if an award is made to a member of a stakeholder group or constituency when ICANN staff itself is involved in administering applications and grants of funds. Therefore, the only means of ensuring that grants may safely be awarded to a member of a stakeholder group would be to place the grant-making process outside the ICANN organization. . .	Anne-Aikman Scalese	CCWG to consider possible conflict of interest or appearance thereof if ICANN Org is involved in administering applications and grants of funds. Leadership recommendation -topic already covered	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html			
4.	Additionally, the BC supports requirements in allocation of the Auction Proceeds that include: 1. A mechanism that provides a fully independent process, which might include a panel of evaluators, or advisors to the independent panel of evaluators 2. operates independent of ICANN, with such independence maintained through rigorous controls or structural means 3. understand that its staff must have required expertise in grants award/management, be knowledgeable, and of well-regarded reputation, and be able to work well with an advisory committee drawn from the ICANN community 4. understand that ICANN's continuing status as a nonprofit public benefit corporation may be reliant on its independence . . . . . . 6. Provide reasonable compensation for members of the entity for time and/or expenses associated with services provided for management of the Fund. Other examples exist where an honorarium plus reasonable expenses are provided, helping to ensure stronger independence of the Advisory entity members. 7. focus on the requirement that it be a single-purpose entity that strives to eliminate any actual or perceived conflicts of interest [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html	BC	CCWG to consider requirements in allocation of the auction proceeds put forward (fully independent process, operates independent of ICANN, staff with required expertise, ICANN's status as nonprofit corporation, reasonable compensation, focus on single-purpose entity, role of ICANN Board/Org, composition) Leadership recommendation -Notes most topics are already covered in other comments. -Check: The Board clearly indicated they don't want to intervene in the allocation process. Do we really want to recommend that the Board gets involved? "8. deliberate as to whether the ICANN Board or ICANN org should have any role in determining or guiding or influencing the allocation of the proceeds and management of the funds." -Check: Do we need to define the number, or shall we not leave this to the next phase (implementation) to decide upon? "9. be composed of at least seven, but no more than	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

			fifteen members, seeking to ensure required expertise and sufficient understanding of the varied kinds of proposals and their applicability but also to enable the inclusion of external expertise as well as community members." -Question: what is "reasonable compensation" for the evaluation panelists / members, and provided by whom – or is this an implementation question?	
5.	**Need for the CCWG to ensure the role of the community** We view the CCWG charter as necessarily dealing with who should be reviewing grants and who should be choosing which projects to fund. As noted above, this is implied, but not express, in the initial report. **We feel strongly that this should be the ICANN community.** This is a significant omission in the initial report. We believe this should either be made clear in a subsequent draft or, if there is not clarity on this point, then the existing CCWG should reconstitute for a brief period, we suggest no less than three and no more than six months, to settle this matter. It is the most important element of the whole project in our view. . . **. . . Community Involvement** The role of the community in the disposition of new gTLD proceeds is only implied in this document and is a significant missing element. We strongly believe that a representative group from the ICANN community should be the group responsible for reviewing and approving grants under this program and should also play a significant role in the follow-up review of the program.	RrSG	CCWG to consider ICANN community to review grants and make decisions about grant awards. CCWG to consider the role of ICANN Org in any of the approaches should be limited to oversight of the grant-making process in order to ensure compliance with laws and with ICANN's mission. Leadership recommendation Topic is already covered in other comments	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	Further, the role of ICANN Org in any of the approaches should be limited to oversight of the grant-making process in order to ensure compliance with laws and with ICANN's mission. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html			
6.	Proposals should be reviewed by multiple qualified individuals, representing different stakeholder groups and backgrounds, for example, making up a diverse, multistakeholder Grant Review Committee. Such a Committee could have access to appropriate and effective training to support its work and fill any gap in term of expertise. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html	NCSG	CCWG to consider having proposals reviewed by individuals representing different stakeholder groups. Leadership recommendation - Notes: Topic is in principle already covered	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
7.	Of the two preferred mechanisms, the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency (ISPCP) would support mechanism A, with the following conditions: ● Review of applications for funding to be reviewed by a panel of experts from the ICANN community – one panel member from each of the SO/ACs who did not participate in the Working Group (WG) . There must be new faces, and we should not carry over ex-WG participants. The ICANN Board must also designate two members for this panel. The Review Panel is to receive support from relevant ICANN Org staff. Once program is launched and applications begin to arrive, the Review Panel members receive a monthly stipend to ensure time dedication and fair compensation for their time. . .	ISPCP	CCWG to consider review of applications for funding by panel of experts from the ICANN community. Leadership recommendation Notes: topic is already covered in other comments	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000029.html			
6.	Regardless of which mechanism is chosen, civil society must play a key role in all steps of the design and implementation process of disbursing funds. Access Now promotes an inclusive and multi-stakeholder approach to developing public policy for the internet. We therefore believe that the new mechanism should support broad and open participation in internet policymaking fora and convenings, consistent with ICANN's mission. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000037.html	Access Now	CCWG to consider having civil society play a key role in all steps of the design and implementation process of disbursing funds.	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
7.	In addition, considering the external approach in options B or C, I suggest the establishment of an advisory committee from the community with term limits, it could be two year terms/with one renewal of one year, thus, creating opportunities that bring understanding and expertise from the ICANN community, at the same time avoiding any kind of risks that would put ICANN's not for profit status at risk. Guidelines would be established that are consistent with the core values of ICANN in support of the Independent Fund Management Approach. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000025.html	Mary Uduma	CCWG to consider establishment of advisory committee from the community. Leadership recommendation -Notes: topic already covered in principle, -Check: in case a community advisory committee is established, clear rules, time limitations and guidelines need to be established. Question: Is this something this group should do or should this be left to the next phase (implementation)?	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
8.	Additionally, the BC supports requirements in allocation of the Auction Proceeds that include: . . . . . . 5. If an advisory entity is established, it should be primarily composed of members with circumscribed interest in, or affiliation with ICANN outside of this role. Much stronger	BC	CCWG to consider, if an advisory entity is established, that it should be primarily composed of members with circumscribed interest in, or affiliation with ICANN outside	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:**

	safeguards would be needed than what is reflected in ICANN's present Statement of Interest (SOI) approach. In addition, an advisory entity should include external experts from the grants/management community. . . . . . 10. Allow, as needed, use of expert advisors in relevant areas, which may be in the evaluation of certain kinds of projects. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html		of this role. Also, as needed, consider use of expert advisors in relevant areas, which may be in the evaluation of certain kinds of projects.	[**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

Response to Charter Question #2/Preliminary Recommendation #2/Preliminary Recommendation #3/ Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #2

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #2: As part of this framework, what will be the limitations of fund allocation, factoring in that the funds need to be used in line with ICANN's mission while at the same time recognising the diversity of communities that ICANN serves? This should include recommendations on how to assess whether the proposed use is aligned with ICANN's Mission. Furthermore consideration is expected to be given to what safeguards, if any, need to be in place. Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #2: The CCWG agreed that specific objectives of new gTLD Auction Proceeds fund allocation are: ● Benefit the development, distribution, evolution and structures/projects that support the Internet's unique identifier systems; ● Benefit capacity building and underserved populations, and; ● Benefit the open and interoperable Internet24 New gTLD Auction Proceeds are expected to be allocated in a manner consistent with ICANN's mission. Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #3: The implementation of the selected fund allocation mechanism should include safeguards described in the response to charter question 2. Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #2: The CCWG recommends that the Guidance for proposal review and Selection (see Annex C) and list of example projects (see Annex D) are considered during the implementation process. **Overview of Comments:** A number of comments support the objectives described in Preliminary Recommendation #2 as well as safeguards listed in Preliminary Recommendation #3. Several comments suggested refining language regarding objectives and limitations in relation to ICANN's Mission. Some comments identified potential limitations that they believe should be avoided.			
1.	**Recommendation 2:** The ALAC is supportive of Recommendation 2 as it is written, as the recommendation itself speaks to the guidelines from the preamble which members and participants spent many hours writing and discussing. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000041.html	ALAC	None (supportive of recommendation 2)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided and notes the support for recommendation #2. **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

2.	The RrSG generally supports Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #2, but with the qualifiers addressed below regarding Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #8. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html	RrSG	None (supportive of recommendation #2, with qualifiers re. recommendation #8)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided and notes the support for recommendation #2. **Action Taken: None at the moment** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	Recommendation # 2: The specific objectives of fund allocation are laudable, but may be overly broad in light of ICANN's Mission. Care should be taken to revise the objectives to be defined in a manner which is restricted by ICANN's Mission and these guidelines should be communicated to an independent third party selected in a bidding process to be conducted by ICANN staff to select a supremely qualified and experienced third party provider pursuant to Mechanism B. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html	Anne Aikman-Scalese	CCWG to consider whether the objectives are overly broad in light of ICANN's mission.	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciated the input provided and is committed to ensuring that the use of new gTLD Auction Proceeds is consistent with ICANN's Mission as set out in the ICANN Bylaws. The CCWG will consider whether a second public comment period is required, following a determination whether material changes are made to the approach and options - including the objectives - set forth in the Initial Report. **Action Taken: None at the moment** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #2** In Recommendation #2, the CCWG recommends that the auction funds be used to "Benefit the development, distribution, evolution and structures/projects that support the Internet's unique identifier systems," to "Benefit capacity building and underserved populations," and to "Benefit the open and interoperable Internet." The CCWG, in the initial report, stated that ICANN supporting an education campaign of the various options and uses of the DNS is a "Noble Cause." However, the CCWG expressed desire to further investigate whether this use of the Auction Funds would be consistent with the ICANN Mission and Bylaws. Currently, ICANN is engaging in an effort to promote Universal Acceptance by educating developers, registrants and end users about new gTLDs, including internationalized domain names, and the interoperability of all domain names. The RySG believes that	RySG	CCWG to consider whether work around Universal Acceptance falls within and supports ICANN's Mission. Leadership recommendation -Check: whether UA efforts fall within ICANNs mission and can therefore be supported? -Question: Does a ICANN-sponsored project (using ICANN operational budget) also eligible for applying the fund with same objectives?	Concerns **WG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	the work around Universal Acceptance falls within and supports ICANN's mission of promoting the "openness, interoperability, [and] resilience" of the Domain Name System, per Section 1.1(a)(i) of the ICANN Bylaws. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000036.html			
5.	Preliminary Recommendation #2 outlines the specific objectives of the allocation. The Board encourages the Working Group to review and potentially strengthen the language regarding use of funds in furtherance/consistent with ICANN's Mission to ensure that it is clearly understood that this is a mandatory and not an aspirational requirement. This also applies to the requirement that the proceeds should not be used for ICANN operational costs (see Charter Question #10 below). In relation to the specific objectives outlined in Recommendation #2, the Board encourages further refining of the objectives in relation to ICANN's Mission . . . . . . Charter Question #2 (Preliminary Recommendation #2) Echoing feedback for Section 4.2, Preliminary Recommendation #2 outlines the specific objectives of the allocation; however, language states that the allocation is "expected" to be consistent with the Mission. The Board would encourage the review of this particular language to ensure that this is understood to be a mandatory – and not merely aspirational – requirement. When it comes to the CCWG-AP's development of specific recommendations for how the legal and fiduciary constraints should be implemented, the eventual mechanism(s) used for evaluating grant applications (and/or administering the program) cannot be limited by the CCWG-AP's interpretation of how some of these regulatory requirements can be met. For example, the mechanism must be able to introduce proper controls even if such controls go beyond the recommended implementation steps, such as the ability to make sure that the recipient organization may properly receive funds under the regulatory framework; or referring to best practices in	ICANN Board	CCWG to review and potentially strengthen the language regarding use of funds in furtherance / consistent with ICANN's Mission to ensure that it is clearly understood that this is a mandatory requirement. Leadership recommendation -Check: "The Board encourages the Working Group to review and potentially strengthen the language regarding use of funds in furtherance/consistent with ICANN's Mission to ensure that it is clearly understood that this is a mandatory and not an aspirational requirement."	Concerns **WG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	identifying self-dealing or private benefit concerns that are broader than what the CCWG-AP envisioned. There may also be different tests for political or lobbying activities that are more appropriate to be followed, though the CCWG-AP's recognition of these important limitations is welcomed. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html			
6.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #2** The NCSG broadly supports the identified objectives for the allocation of funds but would like to see specific examples of projects that the Cross-Community Working Group envisions could be funded in support of this mission. We note that the ICANN Board in its letter dated 31 January 2018 indicated that many of the projects that had at first been listed as examples are, in the opinion of the Board, "perhaps not a good use of funds." If following this and other inputs, the CCWG's thinking has evolved, we would appreciate seeing concrete examples of projects that could be supported with auction proceeds. The NCSG sees particular value in well-administered capacity building programs that are carefully aligned with the objectives and mission identified within this recommendation. Finally, we have carefully reviewed Annex C (Guidance for Proposal Review and Selection) and the NCSG would like to express our support for a diverse and inclusive grant review process. Proposals should be reviewed by multiple qualified individuals, representing different stakeholder groups and backgrounds, for example, making up a diverse, multistakeholder Grant Review Committee. Such a Committee could have access to appropriate and effective training to support its work and fill any gap in term of expertise. The NCSG agrees with the draft conclusions of the CCWG in Annex D (Example Projects). **Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #3**	NCSG	CCWG to consider specific examples of projects that could be funded in support of ICANN's mission. Furthermore, CCWG to consider encouraging increased reporting requirements of grantees. Leadership recommendation -Check: "we would appreciate seeing concrete examples of projects that could be supported with auction proceeds. The NCSG sees particular value in well-administered capacity building programs that are carefully aligned with the objectives and mission identified within this recommendation." -Check: in case a community driven project evaluation process is established, the following shall be taken into consideration " NCSG would like to express our support for a	Concerns **WG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	The NCSG supports all mentioned safeguards and encourages increased reporting requirements of grantees. . . [staff note: text from the original comment following the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html		diverse and inclusive grant review process." -Check: recommendation for increased 'reporting requirements' should be setup in the next CCWG AP phase. -	
7.	**Recommendation 3:** The ALAC is supportive of this recommendation as it describes how accountable the process will be. The ALAC is in support of creating an accountable and transparent fund allocation mechanism that would include all the safeguards described in the response to charter question 2. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000041.html	ALAC	None (supportive of recommendation #3)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided and commits to adhere to the accountability and transparency principles in all of its practices. **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
8.	The RrSG supports Preliminary CCWG Recommendations # 3, 4, 6, 9, and 10. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html	RrSG	None (supportive of recommendation #3, 4, 6, 9 and 10)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided. **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
9.	**The purpose of a grant/application must be in service of ICANN's mission and core principles** The BC believes that the guiding principles related to the Auction Proceeds should be consistent with ICANN's Mission Statement and its remit and core values. The objectives and outcomes of the projects funded under any mechanism should be consistent with ICANN's pursuit of an Internet that is stable, secure, resilient, scalable, and standards-based. The	BC	CCWG to consider ICANN's existence within a larger Internet Ecosystem and to not disallow projects because they are collaborative with other entities. Leadership recommendation	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	BC supports this and also notes that ICANN's existence within a larger Internet Ecosystem must be taken into account. The BC believes that in achieving this guideline, adequate transparency and accountability regarding the investment and disbursement of funds should be accomplished through regular public reporting, regardless of what mechanism is finally selected for the distribution of the Auction Funds for projects considered within scope . . . . . . **Recommendations:** Projects should not be disallowed or not accepted because they are "collaborative" with ICANN, ISOC, RIRs, IEEE, NRIs or any other entity that meets the criteria. . . . . . We also understand that funding requests cannot be submitted by individuals, but must come from a legal entity who can accept the required accountability for performance of the proposal. We agree that safeguards will be required to ensure neutrality of all proposals submitted. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html		-Check: how to integrate 'regular public reporting' in the whole funding process.	
10.	Recommendation #3 and # 4: Support See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html	Anne Aikman-Scalese	None (supportive of recommendation #3 and 4.	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided. **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

Response to Charter Question #3/ Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #3

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #3: What safeguards are to be put in place to ensure that the creation of the framework, as well as its execution and operation, respect the legal and fiduciary constraints that have been outlined in this memo? Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #3: Due concern needs to be given to ensuring that the required safeguards are in place as outlined in response to this question. Should mechanism B be selected, the additional safeguards outlined in the response to this charter question need to be factored in. **Overview of Comments:** Responses express support for the listing of safeguard considerations and suggest additional points to consider as the list of safeguards is refined.				
1.	Charter Question #3 and related implementation guidance The Board welcomes the listing of safeguard considerations and also recommends the inclusion of the Board's language from previous CCWG meetings and its letter of 5 October 2018 as an important step in the Board's fiduciary duties: *"As previously communicated, the Board will not be taking decisions on individual applications but will instead focus its consideration of the slate on whether the rules of the process were followed by the independent panel."* See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html	ICANN Board	CCWG to consider inclusion of Board's language from previous CCWG meetings and its letter of 5 Oct 2018. Leadership recommendation -Accept	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	We note that mechanisms A and B are being focused on by the Cross-Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds (CCWG-AP) as preferred options for the operational organization that will undertake management of the Auction Proceeds initiative. Whichever is selected, we would recommend the following be taken into account: ● Extreme care should be taken to ensure adequate oversight is in place, and to ensure that ICANN's fiduciary, tax and legal status are preserved.	ISPCP	CCWG to consider if sufficient care has been taken to ensure adequate oversight is in place and ensure that ICANN's reputation is not put at risk by requiring very thorough due diligence to be performed. Leadership recommendation	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	● The implementation of the program and subsequent disbursement of funds is conducted in such a manner that ICANN's reputation is not put at risk. This would require very thorough due diligence to be performed on all recipients of auction funds. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000029.html		-Check: add 'reputational risk' to our checklist as an important factor in designing the final mechanism.	

Response to Charter Question #5/Preliminary Recommendation #4/Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #5

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #5: What conflict of interest provisions and procedures need to be put in place as part of this framework for fund allocations? Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #4: Robust conflict of interest provisions must be developed and put in place, regardless of which mechanism is ultimately selected. Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #5: The provisions outlined in response to this charter question should at a minimum be considered for inclusion in the conflict of interest requirements that are expected to be developed during the implementation phase. In the case of mechanism B, there will need to be clearly defined roles and responsibilities incumbent upon both ICANN and the other organization, and an agreement in place about how these roles are carried out operationally. The external organization would need to have appropriate conflict of interest policies and practices in place for the elements of the program it manages. In addition, ICANN will maintain oversight to ensure that legal and fiduciary obligations are met. **Overview of Comments:** Responses generally support the provisions outlined in response to Charter Question #5 and the related recommendation and guidance for the Implementation Phase.				
1.	Charter Question #5 The Board recognizes the efforts of the CCWG-AP to address conflict of interest concerns in an eventual mechanism(s) for evaluating grant applications and/or administering the program. The Board emphasizes that all decisions relating to the use of auction proceeds must be undertaken with a transparent understanding of the motivations of those participating in the recommendations. The ICANN Board thanks the CCWG-AP for its attention to disclosure of interests of those participating in the process and encourages all participants to maintain up-to- date disclosures. We thank the CCWG-AP for highlighting the conflict of interest concerns and recognizing the need to address these issues at every step in the process. The mechanism should aspire to uphold avoidance of conflict of interest at every phase as one of its primary principles.	ICANN Board	CCWG to ensure that mechanism recommended upholds avoidance of conflict of interest at every phase as one of its primary principles.	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html			
2.	**Recommendation 4:** The ALAC agrees with the CCWG Auction Proceeds report in Recommendation 4 that states that robust conflict of interest provisions must be developed and put in place, regardless of which mechanism is ultimately selected. The ALAC is a strong believer in this recommendation, as it is one of the reasons that concern the ALAC with the possible choice of Mechanism A in Recommendation 1. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000041.html	ALAC	None (supportive of recommendation #4)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided and notes the support for robust conflict of interest provisions. **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	The RrSG supports Preliminary CCWG Recommendations # 3, 4, 6, 9, and 10. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html	RrSG	None (supportive of recommendation #4)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	We also support the importance of a well-defined and implementable "conflict of interest" tests for decisions influenced by ICANN org, or ICANN community, including the Board. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html	BC	None (supportive of recommendation #4)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided and notes the support for robust conflict of interest provisions. **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
5.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #4** The NCSG agrees that extensive measures should be taken to address real or perceived conflicts of interest. Moreover, the NCSG strongly endorses the notion that increased reporting and transparency of the mechanism will lead to a decreased likelihood of an illegitimate use of grant funds by the grantor and grantees. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html	NCSG	None (supportive of recommendation #4)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided and notes the support for robust conflict of interest provisions, with a commitment to accountability and transparency in all of its practices. **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

6.	Recommendation #3 and # 4: Support See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html	Anne Aikman-Scalese	None (supportive of recommendation #4)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

Response to Charter Question #9/Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #9

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #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): 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? Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #9: The response provided to this charter question should guide the development of the governance framework during the implementation phase. **Overview of Comments:** The Board clarifies requirements in relation to the governance framework and suggest additional elements to explicitly include in the response to Charter Question #9. Other comments stress the importance of effective oversight, evaluation, auditing, and reporting in the creation of a governance framework.				
1.	Charter Question #9 In relation to mechanism(s) for evaluating grant applications and/or administering the program, the Board welcomes the reference made to fiduciary requirements. It may be useful to note that the audit requirements described in the initial report, which are a useful information added to the recommendations, do not apply specifically to the disbursement of auction proceeds on a standalone basis, but apply to all ICANN's activities, including the disbursement of auction proceeds if and when it occurs. As such, the disbursement of auction proceeds needs, like all ICANN's activities, to meet the requirements that any independent financial audit evaluates to ensure that: - activities are carried out in pursuit of the organization's mission; - activities are lawful; - activities are documented, recorded, and reported as per regulatory and bylaw requirements. The above applies also to Mechanism C, should it be considered, since the disbursement of the auction proceeds to a foundation is a "transaction" or "activity" that is, in itself, subject to the same governance requirements.	ICANN Board	CCWG to take note of the fact that audit requirements described in the Initial Report do not apply specifically to the disbursement of auction proceeds on a standalone basis, but apply to all ICANN's activities, including the disbursement of auction proceeds if and when it occurs. As such, the disbursement of auction proceeds needs, like all ICANN's activities, to meet the requirements that any independent financial audit evaluates. Consider if any updates are required to reflect this. CCWG to consider to also include explicitly the consideration of the risks associated with the	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	The Board welcomes the inclusion of consideration for risks in the proposal, as this is an integral part of the fiduciary duties of the Board (specifically the "duty of care"). The evaluation of risks associated with applications and grants is helpful. The Board would strongly suggest, as it will itself need to do, to also include explicitly the consideration of the risks associated with the mechanism(s) selected for evaluating grant applications and/or administering the program itself, such as the risk that decisions to allocate or not grants to applicants are challenged, or the risk that funds allocated to applicants are misused. Mitigation considerations could also feature in guidance to the implementation team. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html		mechanism(s) selected for evaluating grant applications and/or administering the program itself, such as the risk that decisions to allocate or not grants to applicants are challenged, or the risk that funds allocated to applicants are misused. Mitigation considerations could also feature in guidance to the implementation team. **Leadership recommendation** -Check: Risk evaluation needed: "The Board would strongly suggest, as it will itself need to do, to also include explicitly the consideration of the risks associated with the mechanism(s) selected for evaluating grant applications and/or administering the program itself, such as the risk that decisions to allocate or not grants to applicants are challenged, or the risk that funds allocated to applicants are misused." -Check: Include in Implementation Team Guidance: "Mitigation considerations could also feature in guidance to the implementation team."	
2.	Extreme due diligence must be undertaken with every applicant approved for funding, no matter how small the grant may be. Similarly, all funded projects must be closely audited until completion and verification of results. ICANN may wish to	ISPCP	CCWG to consider importance of due oversight of all allocated funds and reporting mechanisms once a project ends.	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:**

	consider evaluation methods to be used for all funded projects thereby ensuring goals for each project were met . . . We also would stress the importance of due oversight of all allocated funds and reporting mechanisms once a project ends, no matter how small the grant may be. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000029.html			[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	Additionally, the BC supports requirements in allocation of the Auction Proceeds that include: . . . . . . 11. Include funding needed to ensure a highly respected external audit provider which is separate from ICANN's required audit 12. Maintain a regularized feedback mechanism to the ICANN community, the ICANN Board and ensure effective communications reports with essential and regularized reporting [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html	BC	CCWG to consider including funding needed to ensure a highly respected external audit provider, maintaining a regularized feedback mechanism to the ICANN Community, the ICANN Board and ensure effective communication reports Leadership recommendation: -Check: Clarification needed for external auditing requirements for the newly established mechanism.	New Idea (Note that CCWG has discussed previously that a separate entity would be responsible for carrying out the audit, and not the ICANN Org audit firm. Maybe this should be further clarified in the report? **WG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	. . . We encourage using best practices and standardized reporting formats utilized by other highly regarded organizations and foundations. These reports should be made public and stored in a public web archive managed by ICANN org or a delegated independent agent, depending upon the structure of the Mechanism chosen to disperse the auction proceeds. This would increase the likelihood of learning from the successes and failures of grants, as well as provide an end in itself for researchers wishing to study the impact of at least $233.5 million in charitable spending related to ICANN's mission. [staff note: text from the original comment before the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html	NCSG	CCWG to consider encourage using best practices and standardized reporting formats utilized by other highly regarded organizations and foundations. These reports should be made publicly available. Leadership recommendation -Check: best practice models for reporting formats to be taken from already established models	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

Response to Charter Question #10/Preliminary Recommendation #5

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #10: To what extent (and, if so, how) could ICANN, the Organization or a constituent part thereof, be the beneficiary of some of the auction funds? Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #5: The CCWG has not yet come to agreement on whether ICANN Org or a constituent part thereof should be a beneficiary of some of the auction proceeds and as such would welcome input on this question during the public comment period so that an informed decision can be made. **Overview of Comments:** Some comments oppose ICANN, the Organization or a constituent part thereof being the beneficiary of auction funds. Other comments point to specific groups that should be eligible to receive funds and the conditions under which this should be possible. ICANN Board comments clarify points raised in the Board letter previously sent to the CCWG on this topic. While Charter Question #10 does not explicitly address the issue of Board allocation of auction proceeds to replenish the ICANN reserve fund, two comments provide input on this issue.				
1.	A percentage or proportional allocation system could be established for each of the ICANN constituent part SO/AC beneficiary of some of the auction proceeds. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000023.html	José Alberto Barrueto Rodríguez	CCWG to consider whether a percentage or proportional allocation system could be established for each ICANN SO/AC. Leadership recommendation -Check: whether a basked model for assigning a certain percentage to SO/AC shall get established? -Check: with ICANN ORG legal and Board whether this would be possible?	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	We support that projects may be developed and submitted by ICANN constituencies and AC/SOs, but not from AC/SOs who are directly affiliated with ICANN.	BC	CCWG to consider support for projects to be developed and submitted by ICANN constituencies and AC/SOs, but	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:**

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html		not from AC/SOs who are directly affiliated with ICANN. [CCWG to consider asking for a clarification as it is not clear which AC/SOs are not directly affiliated with ICANN?]	[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #5** The NCSG notes that no decision has been reached by the Cross-Community Working Group on whether any funds should go to ICANN org or a constituent part. On this matter, the NCSG feels strongly that ICANN org should not receive any of the auction proceeds, as these funds were supposed to be sequestered for charitable purposes. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html	NCSG	CCWG to consider position that ICANN Org should not receive any of the auction proceeds.	Concerns **WG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	**Recommendation 5:** Because these funds were originally set up for philanthropic purposes, the ALAC believes strongly that At-Large Structures (ALSes) and Individual members should be able to apply for funds provided they follow the established process for all applicants. Projects that facilitate capacity building in the regions and that assist the work of At-Large members should be encouraged and supported. ICANN Org, Registries and Registrars, and Advisory Committees/Supporting Organizations (ACs/SOs) should not be able to apply. The proceeds from past auctions were meant to be used for capacity building activities that enhance ICANN's mission and core principles and are consistent with an "open and interoperable Internet". The concept of "open and interoperable Internet" can be described from many angles: technological, business, political, social and cultural, and may have different meanings in different communities. Projects are expected to advance work related to open access, future-oriented developments, innovation and open standards, for the benefit of the Internet community. The ALAC does not think that additional funds besides	ALAC	CCWG to consider whether At-Large Structures (ALSes) and Individual members should be able to apply for funds. Leadership recommendation -Check: whether this is legally even possible	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	those that the ICANN Board has mentioned should be taken out of the Auction Proceeds fund, as this goes against the ideas that led to the creation of the fund and this Cross Community Working Group. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000041.html			
5.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #5** While the CCWG has not yet come to agreement on whether ICANN Org or a constituent part thereof should be a beneficiary of some of the auction proceeds, the RrSG strongly discourages the CCWG from allowing use of any auction proceeds for ICANN Org or a constituent part thereof. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html	RrSG	CCWG to consider not allowing use of any auction proceeds for ICANN Org or a constituent part thereof. Leadership recommendation Check:in conflict with ALAC (point 4)= point needs to be clarified	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
6.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #5** The NCSG notes that no decision has been reached by the Cross-Community Working Group on whether any funds should go to ICANN org or a constituent part. On this matter, the NCSG feels strongly that ICANN org should not receive any of the auction proceeds, as these funds were supposed to be sequestered for charitable purposes. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html	NCSG	CCWG to consider that ICANN Org should not receive any of the auction proceeds.	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
7.	Recommendation #5: If Mechanism B is selected, Recommendation 3 and 4 are much easier to accomplish and it would be much easier for a member of an ICANN stakeholder or constituency group to apply for and qualify for an allocation of funds. Failure to place the grantmaking function outside of ICANN org will automatically restrict the ability of such applicants to receive grants due to apparent conflicts of interest and should be strictly avoided.	Anne Aikman-Scalese	CCWG to consider whether failure to place the grantmaking function outside of ICANN org will automatically restrict the ability of such applicants to receive grants due to apparent conflicts of interest and should be strictly avoided.	Concerns **WG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html			
8.	Charter Question #10 The Board recognizes that the CCWG did not have time to review the Board's 5 October 2018 letter ahead of its report in response to the CCWG's request for input and hopes it is useful for editing the next iteration of the report. In CCWG mailing list discussions and at ICANN63, Members asked for clarification on the Board's October 2018 letter referenced in the CCWG's Initial Report. Becky Burr provided additional information at ICANN63, noting that: ● The Board and org do not currently foresee a situation where it would need to apply for the proceeds. That being said, it is important to note that ICANN maintains legal and fiduciary responsibility over the funds. ICANN's directors and officers have a duty to protect the organization ensure that it meets its legal obligations, including through the use of available resources. ● In the event of an unavoidable need, the Board and the org would have a fiduciary obligation to use available resources to meet the org's obligations and this could include – depending on the situation – the auction proceeds. ● Regarding SO/AC's applying for proceeds: SO/AC structures that are not legal entities in their own right, independent of the multistakeholder ICANN structure, would be unable to apply for proceeds as they likely do not meet due diligence requirements. This was identified early on in the Drafting Team's work by the Legal and Financial Considerations Memo (June 2016). ● This would not preclude consideration of applications from SO/AC structures that are also established legal entities outside the multistakeholder model provided that: the request does not include an activity or project that is or should be covered by ICANN's operational budget; conflict of interest considerations are met, including but not limited to ensuring that those	ICANN Board	CCWG to further consider ICANN Board's letter of 5 October 2018 as well as additional clarifications provided during ICANN63. Leadership recommendation -Evaluate and discuss letter asap	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	applying are not part of the evaluation process; and all other application criteria are met. We hope that this information in relation to the Board letter is useful but are happy to provide more information through the Board Liaisons during the CCWG's future work, if needed. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html			
9.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #5** According to the CCWG, "[t]he CCWG has not yet come to agreement on whether ICANN Org or a constituent part thereof should be a beneficiary of some of the auction proceeds and as such would welcome input on this question during the public comment period so that an informed decision can be made." As we have previously stated, use of the Auction Funds to replenish the Reserve Fund or for general ICANN purposes should be done as a result of community consensus: *[S]hould it be determined by the CWG Auction Proceeds process that such a use of Auction Funds is permissible AND there be a community consensus determination through this comment process on replenishment that there is a requirement for Reserve Fund top-up beyond that provided for by regular, annual contributions from ICANN Org, then the use of 3/3 Auction Funds in this context may be appropriate as a supplement to the regular, annual contributions from ICANN Org.* If the CCWG determines that there is community consensus for using a portion of the Auction Proceeds to replenish the Reserve Fund, we strongly urge the CCWG to tie strong and definite conditions of fiscal responsibility and frugality to the disbursement. These limitations should be that: 1. ICANN must rescope projects and develop a budget within its current means (this may mean cutting programs, heads, and bloat that has crept in - the reserve fund should be to	RySG	CCWG to consider whether any further consideration needs to be given to replenishment of reserve fund by auction proceeds (or whether that question has become obsolete as a result of recent board action).	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	support a lean, frugal organization through an emergency, not to fund special projects). 2. ICANN must live within that budget, because the disbursement is not recurring. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000036.html			
10.	BC Comment regarding one-time contribution toward ICANN's Reserve Fund: In general we do not support use of Auction Proceeds for ICANN's day to day operational budget. However, the BC believes that the community and ICANN will be best served by using a portion of the auction proceeds to replenish ICANN's reserves for depletion related to the IANA transition. The BC previously submitted comments of general support to such use of some of the existing Auction Funds, in Apr-2018 and Nov-2017. The amount of available auction funds is quite considerable and may yet be augmented by additional auctions still pending from this gTLD round. We support that the majority of the auction funds should be directed toward activities that are not replacing ICANN's day to day operational expenses, but we do support that projects submitted for Auction Funds can be similar as long as they are in tandem and congruent with ICANN's vision, mission and core values. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html	BC	CCWG to consider whether any further consideration needs to be given to replenishment of reserve fund by auction proceeds (or whether that question has become obsolete as a result of recent board action).	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

Response to Charter Question #4/Preliminary Recommendation #6/Preliminary Recommendation #7

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #4: What aspects should be considered to define a timeframe, if any, for the funds allocation mechanism to operate as well as the disbursements of funds? E.g. The timeframe for the operation of this new mechanism may provide the opportunity for long term support, or for funding to be released in tranches linked to milestone achievements, single or multiple disbursements. Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #6: The mechanism must be implemented to enable the disbursement of the funds in an effective and judicious manner without creating a perpetual mechanism (i.e. not being focused on preservation of capital). Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #7: Funding should be allocated in tranches over period of years. Tranches may be used to fund large grants over a period of years or to support projects that could be funded in a shorter period. **Overview of Comments:** Some comments express support for Recommendations #6 and #7. Other comments provide additional considerations and suggestions with respect to allocation of funds in tranches. One comment suggests a potential benefit to designing the mechanism in a way that allows the fund operate in perpetuity.				
1.	**Recommendations 6 & 7:** The ALAC is in support of Recommendations 6 & 7 and the correct mechanism and procedures for establishing the size of the tranches, and for how many years. The ALAC is in favor to allocate money according to the time of the project. If there is a collection of projects that will not take a long time to complete, they should go in one tranche while other projects that would take longer can go in a different tranche. comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000041.html	ALAC	None (supportive of recommendation)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	The RrSG supports Preliminary CCWG Recommendations # 3, 4, 6, 9, and 10. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html	RrSG	None (supportive of recommendation)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	Recommendation # 6: Agree, however, please note that Subsequent Procedures is waiting to see what is recommended	Anne Aikman-Scalese	None (supportive of recommendation)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided

	and adopted by the Board in relation to Auction Proceeds since the Mechanism chosen could affect policy recommendations related to dealing with Auction Proceeds in the next and any subsequent (or continuous ongoing) rounds. comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html			**Action Taken:** None for the moment [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #6** The NCSG understands the rationale behind the preservation of capital not being an aim of the mechanism. In so far as the mechanism can distribute funds responsibly and in alignment with the aforementioned objectives, there should be no effort to preserve the mechanism. In principle, we do not disagree with the mechanism having a sunset date of no more than 10 years from the date of transfer of the last tranche. However, we see there is a potential benefit to having an organization set up in perpetuity fund to advance activities in support of ICANN's mission funded with interests or returns. **Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #7** The NCSG appreciates this creation of an oversight and accountability mechanism but feels that great specificity is needed. For example, a public review should be conducted of the mechanism after each quarter of the funds have been allocated. This would require that the mechanism remain transparent and accountable at different stages of the process, with time to be corrected. Detailed financial and budgetary reports should be submitted by the mechanism with sufficient time for community review at regular intervals. This would allow the community to advise the Board on whether or not to transfer subsequent tranches. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html	NCSG	CCWG to consider potential benefit to having an organization set up in perpetuity (note that there is no disagreement with the mechanism having a sunset date). Leadership recommendation Check: Whether we want to foresee a provision that would allow an open-ended mechanism model to continue. We believe in principle there's no need for this because if the situation arises in the future that the CCWG/SO/AC/ICANN ORG/Board consider that this option should be available, it's easy to do it. Currently we have to consider that it's in contradiction to our CCWG goals	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
5.	The Board welcomes Preliminary Recommendation #6 and #7 on effective and judicious implementation and distribution of proceeds in tranches.	ICANN Board	None (recommendations #6 and #7 are welcomed)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html			**Action Taken:** None for the moment [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
6.	As recommended by the ICANN Board, funds should be allocated in tranches, and not all at once. . . The ISPCP also expresses support for the Board preference calling for the funds to be disbursed in tranches, and not all at a go. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000029.html	ISPCP	None (supportive of recommendation)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
7.	Recommendation # 7: Agree but the "mix" of such grants according to tranches should be determined by a professional grant-making organization with experience in the grant-making field. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html	Anne Aikman-Scalese	CCWG to consider in relation to recommendation #7 that mix of such grants should be determined by a professional grant-making organization.	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
8.	. . . Lastly, we think that the CCWG should be implemented in such a way that permits continued and efficient allocation of funds that become available in the future. This would support ICANN's commitment to transparency and consistency. One way that ICANN could achieve this objective is setting up an independent entity to manage these funds, and future funds, with a transparent charter. Additionally, another way ICANN could achieve this would be to transparently determine how auction proceeds would be allocated prior to the auction. [staff note: text from the original comment before the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000036.html	RySG	CCWG to consider implementation that permits continued and efficient allocation of funds that become available in the future, for example by setting up an independent entity to manage these funds or transparently determining how auction proceeds would be allocated prior to the auction. Leadership recommendation This idea goes against our original goal (identify a mechanism for one-off funding model). Insofar we should not extend our goal but, if supported by the CCWG AP, we can propose	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

			to re-evaluate this option after one two review cycles and after one understands better how successful the selected mechanism is.	

Response to Charter Question #6/Preliminary Recommendation #8/Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #6

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #6: Should any priority or preference be given to organizations from developing economies, projects implemented in such regions and/or under represented groups? Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #8: One of the objectives for new gTLD Auction Proceeds fund allocation is that it allows the support of projects that support capacity building and underserved populations. Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #6: During the implementation phase further consideration needs to be given to how this objective can be achieved, also in conjunction with the other objectives that have been recommended by the CCWG. **Overview of Comments:** Some comments support Preliminary Recommendation #8, while other comments provide additional considerations for the CCWG to take into account in reviewing and refining this recommendation.				
1.	**Recommendation 8:** The ALAC is a strong supporter and believer that capacity building, especially for underserved populations, that focuses on building up knowledge and engagement about ICANN is at the heart of what these funds were set aside for. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000041.html	ALAC	None (supportive of recommendation)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #8 The NCSG endorses this recommendation. Of the three different options (p. 27) the NCSG appreciates the suggestion of focusing on projects consistent with ICANN's mission that support underserved populations and would like to suggest that priority should be placed on projects which are being led by individuals from and residing within those areas. Projects which involve partnerships, knowledge sharing, and resource transfers to underserved areas should be preferred over projects proposed by single actors intending to support 'others'. We would also see	NCSG	None (supportive of recommendation)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	there being value in a limited number of funded scholarships and post-doctoral fellowships in furtherance of activities consistent with ICANN's mission. Those scholarships and fellowship should be limited to research described in annex D example #16. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html			
3.	Recommendation # 8: Agree. In this regard, the 2012 round produced very few results in relation to Applicant Support. Accordingly, the CCWG should step back and take a serious look at the role of Applicant Support in ICANN's Mission and develop specific guidelines for a third party in Mechanism B that will in fact promote assistance to underserved applicants needing financial support. Failure to address this glaring concern will open ICANN to substantial criticism in the wider world telecommunications community. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html	Anne Aikman-Scalese	CCWG to consider reviewing the role of Applicant Support in ICANN's Mission and develop specific guidelines for a third party in Mechanism B. Leadership recommendation Check: a) shall this be done at al, in this phase or the next phase, the implementation phase? b) include in 'Implementation Guidelines" in case we come to the conclusion to do the drafting in the Implementation Phase.	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	Charter Question #6 (diversity items) The CCWG may wish to consider adding language for the implementation team on examining how best to support applications from diverse backgrounds. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html	ICANN Board	CCWG to consider adding language for the implementation team on how best to support applications from diverse backgrounds. Leadership recommendation: Check: see point 3) above	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
5.	Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #8 While we understand and support the notion of capacity building and supporting underserved populations, we do not feel it is appropriate for ICANN Org or a constituent part to make determinations regarding which underserved populations are in need, or where they think capacity building is needed. Rather, representatives	RrSG	CCWG to consider whether it is appropriate for ICANN Org or a constituent part to make determinations regarding which underserved populations are in	Concerns **WG Response:** **Action Taken:**

	of underserved populations should approach the ICANN Foundation regarding a request for funds and/or the need for capacity building. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html		need or where capacity building is needed. Leadership recommendation Check: see point 3) above	[**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

Response to Charter Question #8/Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #8

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #8: What aspects should be considered to determine an appropriate level of overhead that supports the principles outlined in this charter? Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #8: ICANN and any partnering organizations are to design a cost-effective model that ensures an appropriate proportion of the funds are available for distribution to fund recipients. ICANN and any partnering organizations are to follow industry best practices, where appropriate and applicable. To the extent possible in light of program objectives and requirements, the principle of simplicity should apply. **Overview of Comments**: One comment suggests that additional detail should be added to Guidance for the Implementation Phase and proposes specific elements to consider. A second comment refers to input provided by the ICANN Board on Accountability Mechanism considerations.				
1.	Charter Question #8 (overhead) The Board welcomes the CCWG's recommendations on cost-effective use of resources, best practices, and simplicity, and refers to the input above in Section 4.3 on Accountability Mechanism considerations in support of this. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html	ICANN Board	None (recommendation is welcomed)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken: none for the moment.** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	The NCSG generally agrees with the guidance offered for the Implementation Phase and we have addressed many of these issues in our comments above. However, we consider the guidance offered for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #8 (appropriate level of overhead) to be too vague. Specifically, the "principle of simplicity" is an abstract notion. Instead, the chosen mechanism's operating budget should be capped at 10% of the total amount of the auction proceeds (or 10% of the tranche allocated to the mechanism at any one time). This measure is meant to prevent exorbitant overhead costs is necessary, even though we fully understand that doing good does come at a cost. The mechanism chosen to allocate auction proceeds will not face the traditional costs associated with non-profit marketing, fundraising or promotion. Therefore, a cap on overhead spending should be imposed.	NCSG	CCWG to consider being less vague in relation to the Implementation Guidance in relation to charter question #8 – chosen mecanim s operating budget should b capped at 10%. Leadership recommendation Check: whether we like to recommend a precise cap for the operating budget.	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html			

Response to Charter Question #11/Preliminary Recommendation #9/Preliminary Recommendation #10/Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #11

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Charter Question #11: Should a review mechanism be put in place to address possible adjustments to the framework following the completion of the CCWGs work and implementation of the framework should changes occur that affect the original recommendations (for example, changes to legal and fiduciary requirements and/or changes to ICANN's mission)? Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #9: As a standard element of program operations, an internal review of the mechanism should take place at regular intervals to identify areas for improvement and allow for minor adjustments in program management and operations. Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #10: There should be a process to evaluate whether the program is effectively serving the identified goals and whether allocation of funds is having the intended impact. Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #11: The response provided to this charter question should guide the development of the review framework during the implementation phase. **Overview of comments:** A number of comments offer support for Preliminary Recommendations #9 and #10. One commenter urges stronger language and associated measures in relation to these recommendations.				
1.	The ALAC is also in support of Recommendations 9 & 10 which follow proper procedures on accountability and transparency which the ALAC feels should be at the core of all discussions. **Recommendation 9:** As a standard element of program operations, an internal review of the mechanism should take place at regular intervals to identify areas for improvement and allow for minor adjustments in program management and operations. **Recommendation 10:** Focuses on the metrics of evaluating how successful the program has been and these metrics are extremely important for all to ensure that regardless of the mechanism chosen the program has effectively met its identified	ALAC	None (supportive of recommendations)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	goals and that the allocation of funds had or is having the intended impact. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000041.html			
2.	The RrSG supports Preliminary CCWG Recommendations # 3, 4, 6, 9, and 10. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html	RrSG	None (supportive of recommendations)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #9** The NCSG would like to see stronger language from the Cross-Community Working Group in response to Charter Question #11 on the role of the ICANN community. While an internal and external review are important and should be included, we encourage strong participation from the community in the review. The statement "a role for the ICANN community in the review process should be considered" is too vague and leaves the decision to include the community open-ended (p. 29). Both internal and external reviews should be made available for public comment at regular intervals. As stated above, community review should have strong weight prior to the decision to transfer additional tranches of funding to the mechanism. **Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #10** The NCSG would like to see stronger procedures for monitoring and evaluation proposed by the Cross-Community Working Group. This will ensure that the governance structure is accountable and transparent. By providing public access to proposals, mid-project reports, 3 and final impact assessments of each project, universities and other researchers would be able to provide feedback on the effective use of grants. This information would be useful to ICANN and many other organizations working toward similar goals. Additionally,	NCSG	CCWG to consider including stronger language in response to charter question #11 concerning the role of the ICANN community as well as stronger procedures for monitoring and evaluation. Leadership recommendation - Clarify role of Community (see previously made Leadership recommendations) (#9) _ Check: Whether this should be done in this phase or the next, the implementation phase (#10)	Concerns **WG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	external monitoring and evaluation assessments should be conducted by a third party for independent, professional review. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html			
4.	Recommendations # 9 and # 10: Agree. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html	Anne Aikman-Scalese	None (supportive of recommendations)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
5.	**Preliminary CCWG Recommendations #9 & #10** Recommendations #9 and #10 propose that there should be a review mechanism during and after the auction funds have been allocated and used. Measurement goes to the heart of transparency and accountability, and we strongly believe that mechanisms should be put in place to grade and ensure that the auction funds are having the strongest possible impact. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000036.html	RySG	None (supportive of recommendations)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
7.	**SECTION 5.4 "REVIEW"** The Board is supportive of the importance the CCWG has placed on reviewing the mechanism(s) for evaluating grant applications and/or administering the program, the program overall, and the impact. The Board notes that if a review indicates a need for fundamental changes to the mechanism or the purposes of the use of funds, those would be significant changes for which additional community input would be required. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html	ICANN Board	CCWG to consider clarifying that if a review indicates a need for fundamental changes to the mechanism or the purposes of the use of funds, those would be significant changes for which additional community input would be required Leadership recommendation -Integrate language that recommends requesting community input after a	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

			proposed significant change after a review. Significant may need to get defined!	
8.	For continuous stability of the Internet as relate to business, we encourage particularly recommendation #10, "There should be a process to evaluate whether the program is effectively serving the identified goals and whether allocation of funds is having the intended impact." See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html	BC	None (supportive of recommendations)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciated the input provided **Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

Annex C – Guidance for Proposal Review and Selection

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Annex C offers overarching guidance for the review and selection of projects to which auction proceeds may be allocated. **Overview of Comments:** Comments from the ICANN Board reiterate and elaborate on and concerns and requests for clarification regarding Annex C. Additional comments are generally supportive of the approach taken in Annex C.				
1.	The Board refers back to its communication to the CCWG in January 2018 on both the Objectives and Annex C- Guidance for proposal review and selection document (previously "Preamble"). The Board is concerned that the content in Annex C creates potential inconsistencies with the Objectives and ICANN's Mission and therefore could result in confusion during application and selection and may result in challenges against the selection process. For example: ● Annex C states that, while the Mission will set the "key parameters" for the application and selection process, the "broader Internet context" should be taken into consideration and that, "in addition" to the ICANN Mission, the proceeds "shall be used to support projects that are consistent with an 'open and interoperable Internet'." As the Board previously noted (in its January 2018 letter), items that benefit the 'open and interoperable Internet' may exceed the scope of the ICANN Mission. The Board encourages the CCWG to review this language and reduce the potential for confusing applicants on how to structure grant requests. As the Board noted in its September 2017 communication, the Board "is responsible for assuring that the organization stays within mission and does not have the ability to apply the mission in a broader interpretation here than it could for general operations. If the CCWG is dissatisfied with the restrictions that the enumerated mission statement places on the outcomes of the CCWG's work, that is a fundamental question for the ICANN community to resolve, as the ICANN Board is holding the organization to the mission that the ICANN	ICANN Board	CCWG to reconsider Board's communication from January 2018 re. Objectives and Annex C to address potential inconsistencies with the Objectives and ICANN's mission. Leadership recommendation -Check: "The Board is concerned that the content in Annex C creates potential inconsistencies with the Objectives and ICANN's Mission and therefore could result in confusion during application and selection and may result in challenges against the selection process." -Check: "The Board is concerned that the content in Annex C creates potential inconsistencies with the Objectives and ICANN's Mission and therefore could result in confusion during application and selection and may result in challenges against the selection process."	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	community developed through the Enhancing ICANN Accountability process." ● The Board would appreciate further clarity The Board is concerned that the content in Annex C creates potential inconsistencies with the Objectives and ICANN's Mission and therefore could result in confusion during application and selection and may result in challenges against the selection process.Must all guidelines be met for each application? The Board's January 2018 letter also asked if "an applicant (must) meet each of the Proposed Objectives, or any one plus consistency with ICANN's Mission? Is there any prioritization of the objectives?" ● What are "Projects supportive of ICANN's communities' activities" and how is this assessment determined, particularly in relation to regular work of SO/AC/SG/RALOs already covered by ICANN's operational budget? . . . . . . In addition to the previously mentioned feedback above, particularly on the limitation of the funds to support ICANN's Mission, the Board would like to offer the following considerations: The Board notes that there are two guidelines offered in Annex C that have the ability to be interpreted as directing the use of the Auction Proceeds funds for ICANN's ongoing operations. Those are: #4: "Projects addressing diversity, participation and inclusion should strive to deepen informed engagement and participation from developing countries, under-represented communities and all stakeholders."; and #5: "Projects supportive of ICANN's communities' activities are encouraged." The Board asks for clarification on whether these guidelines are intended to modify the principle that the auction proceeds should not be used to contribute to ICANN's ordinary operations. The current formulation of these guidelines could leave open the possibility that applications support such on-going operations as they relate to engagement and participation in ICANN's policy development process.		-Check language: The Board asks for clarification on whether these guidelines are intended to modify the principle that the auction proceeds should not be used to contribute to ICANN's ordinary operations	

	[staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000024.html			
2.	**Projects supportive of ICANN's communities' activities are encouraged.** The BC notes that the Board recently questioned such projects. The BC strongly supports such uses, recognizing that thousands of hours of committed work and engagement from ICANN stakeholders are essential to support ICANN's mission and to also address threats and risks to ICANN's legitimacy in the external Internet ecosystem. We agree that funding of such projects should not replace ICANN's own responsibilities to fund ICANN general operations. However, we think that the Board's statements regarding Annex C, #4 and 5 are overly cautious and ignore the benefits of community engagement support. The BC believes that participation of ICANN's communities in ICANN itself, and in the broader global Internet ecosystem will continue to broaden and deepen the informed contribution and engagement of ICANN's communities in support of ICANN's mission and core values. We also strongly support projects that address awareness; capacity building and participation opportunities that exceed the ICANN "operational" budget. Thus, we suggest that projects funded via the Auction proceeds can be augmentative and parallel to similar ICANN funded initiatives. They may even be collaborative. It is important that Auction Fund projects not be disallowed just because ICANN funds a limited version of a similar project. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html	BC	CCWG to consider whether Board's statements regarding Annex C, #4 and #5 are overly cautious and ignore the benefits of community engagement support. Leadership recommendation -Clarify: a) whether such the application of projects from the ICANN community shall be allowed, b)if yes, language and project role and scope for projects triggered/requested from communities may have to be clarified.	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	Finally, we have carefully reviewed Annex C (Guidance for Proposal Review and Selection) and the NCSG would like to express our support for a diverse and inclusive grant review process.	NCSG	None (supportive of Annex C)	Support **CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html			**Action Taken:** None for the moment [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

Annex D - Example Projects

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: Comments in this section address the list of example projects included in Annex D in the Initial report and/or propose additional examples for consideration. **Overview of Comments:** Some comments offer feedback on specific example projects listed in Annex D. One comment offers general support for the approach taken in Annex D. Another comments suggests additional example projects for inclusion in this Annex.				
1.	In the November 16, 2017 meeting, the CCWG raised two important questions regarding use of the Auction Funds to support a Global Awareness Campaign. 1) Would such partial allocation be within the scope of the ICANN Mission & Bylaws; and 2) would such an awareness campaign be consistent with ICANN's integrity. According to the Initial Report, the following clarifications were specifically requested. ● A Global Awareness Campaign was categorized as "Examples to be further considered by CCWG – certain parts may be consistent while others may not." (Initial Report). ● "*A legal investigation is needed, whether [a Global Awareness Campaign] is within scope of ICANN's mission and Bylaws. (Initial Report). ● Are we violating ICANN's integrity? (Initial Report). *a. **Allocation of a portion of the Auction Funds to support a Global Awareness Campaign is clearly not outside the scope of ICANN's Mission/Bylaws because the ICANN board already approved a gTLD awareness campaign in 2011 that was to target the Domain Industry, Registrants, and Consumers.* There is no question that an education campaign about the gTLDs and the nature of the DNS falls squarely within ICANN's Mission under the Bylaws. In fact, the ICANN board has already approved a gTLD Global Awareness Campaign, "On 20 June 2011, ICANN's Board approved a program that will add to familiar top-level domains such as .com, .org, and .net, the possibility of having almost any word in any language as a top-level domain. This massive	Jonathan Frost, .Club Domains, LLC	CCWG to further consider whether a new gTLD Global Awareness Campaign would be in scope of ICANN's mission and consistent with ICANN's integrity in light of arguments provided by commenter. Leadership recommendation -Check: Whether we want to recommend a basket approach for specific projects that relate specific goals (for example: infrastructure, educational purposes). If we would do something like this, then a 'Global Awareness Campaign' related project could target the specific 'Educational' basket and, dependent on project evaluation such a project would then go forward or not. The Check-list approach could be another approach that helps create competition and innovation.	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	expansion of the number of possible domain names calls for an equally significant communications campaign to raise global awareness about the program. " The 2011 Global Awareness Campaign provided for consumers to be targeted for awareness of the gTLDs. "[N]ew domains must first be available before end-users can reap the benefits. It is the entities that apply for and implement new gTLDs that will pass on the benefits to the end-user" (Emphasis Added, Page 3, 2011 Global Awareness Campaign). Moreover, the board expected that the "consumers and end users" would be targeted after the new gTLDs became available. It is unclear why ICANN has not followed through on the board directive to initiate a Global Awareness Campaign aimed at consumers and end-users, but this is an opportunity to follow through. Additionally, the 2011 Global Awareness Campaign envisioned a "Coordinated campaign incorporating TV, radio, print and online advertising elements, customized by region. Initial advertising targets: international business TV, newspapers and websites, Google ads. Develop an energetic, bright, attention-getting teaser campaign – both in video and print form – that piques interest and directs people to the new gTLD website." (Page 4, 2011 Global Awareness Campaign). The 2011 Campaign was in alignment with the CCWG recommendation that any awareness campaign be neutral, so as to maintain ICANN's integrity. "Recognizing our role as stewards, not advocates, we will be neutral, presenting all sides of the issue while still promoting the great work done by all who participated in crafting the program." (Page 2, 2011 Global Awareness Campaign). Additionally, the existence of the 2011 Global Awareness Campaign serves to answer the CCWG's question of whether an awareness campaign would be compatible with ICANN's integrity. *b. **The Transcript of the November 16, 2017 CCWG Meeting indicated that the Global Awareness Campaign would			

	remain in play, although the Initial Report was ambiguous, and sometimes contradictory.* The CCWG Initial Report unfortunately omitted the support from the contracted parties house of the GNSO. In response to concerns which were posed from the business constituency and the ALAC, it was noted that "I have a hard time understanding why [the Global Awareness Campaign] would not be included in the mission when we're talking about an awareness campaign or perhaps a new round in developing areas to apply [for] a top-level domain when the Applicant Guidebook which is the source of this funding actually uses that as an example for potential uses. So while we may or may not agree that that's a good use[,] I don't see how we could agree that it's not an acceptable use under the mission of ICANN. Thank you." To which the moderator responded: "Agree. That's why we are not deleting it but we're putting it with a comment on the right column to the very end or we keep it where it is." (CCWG Meeting Transcript from November 16, 2017). Thus, the CCWG transcript indicated that proposal 12 was to remain in play, with a clarification request about whether a Global Awareness Campaign would be within ICANN's mission. Based on the fact that a Global Awareness Campaign supports ICANN's mission of Global Acceptance & supporting the interoperability and openness of the DNS, and the ICANN board has already approved a Global Awareness Campaign in 2011, the CCWG's mission concerns should be answered affirmatively, that the use of the Auction funds is squarely within ICANN's mission and the plain language of the ICANN Bylaws. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000003.html			
2.	We note that the ICANN Board in its letter dated 31 January 2018 indicated that many of the projects that had at first been listed as examples are, in the opinion of the Board, "perhaps not a good use of funds." If following this and other inputs, the CCWG's thinking has evolved, we would appreciate seeing concrete examples of projects that could be supported with auction proceeds. The NCSG sees particular value in well-	NCSG	CCWG to consider asking input from the ICANN Board on concrete examples of projects that could be supported with auction proceeds. Leadership recommendation	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	administered capacity building programs that are carefully aligned with the objectives and mission identified within this recommendation. . . The NCSG agrees with the draft conclusions of the CCWG in Annex D (Example Projects). [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html		- Check: whether the project example Annex shall get updated	
3.	In addition to the work being undertaken around Universal Acceptance, a majority of RySG members also support the use of auction funds to promote universal awareness of all domain name extensions via an educational campaign, such as that outlined in "Example Project 12" (in the initial report is listed as "Previous #12"). The RySG would like to point the CCWG-AP to the comments submitted by individual RySG members and other community members, which indicate that such a Global Awareness education campaign would enhance trust in the broad array of options in the DNS, foster competition, promote Universal Acceptance and the interoperability of the DNS. Should such a campaign be recommended by the CCWG, we would recommend that contracted work in furtherance of a Global Awareness campaign be put out to RFP, with a minimum of three bidders. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000036.html	RySG	CCWG to further consider whether a new gTLD Global Awareness Campaign would be in scope of ICANN's mission and consistent with ICANN's integrity in light of arguments provided by commenter. Leadership recommendation See Point 1)	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	**Examples of the kind of projects for which Auction funds might be used:** The BC appreciates ANNEX D and the examples it offers. We add further examples of projects that we consider within the scope of ICANN's core mission: 1. A new project to improve universal acceptance of addresses using new gTLDs, particularly in new scripts and languages. A non-profit group outside of ICANN could manage this project to improve universal acceptance and could accept funds from the Auction proceeds.	BC	CCWG to consider additional examples provided by commenter. Leadership recommendation -Review the proposed examples	Concerns **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	2. A new project to support DNSSEC deployment globally, and to promote deployment of DNSSEC to combat DNS hacks. This could also be tied to improving readiness for KSK Rollover in the future. A non-profit group outside of ICANN could manage this project and accept funds from the Auction proceeds. 3. A new project to contribute to improving the resilience of the root server system so that it will be more resistant to denial of service attacks. A non-profit group outside of ICANN could manage this project and accept funds from the Auction proceeds 4. Support of technical training for ISPs, IXPs, communication providers and companies and NGOs that are building or operating community networks and thus are relevant providers of DNS services, but may be very new to this role – projects could be provided by existing entities in the ICANN community, such as RIRs, or NICs, or other qualified entities, but also NGOs. Academic institutions. 5. Projects advancing work related to future-oriented developments, innovation and open standards for the benefit of the Internet community that are relevant to ICANN's core mission. 6. Projects addressing diversity, participation and inclusion should strive to deepen informed awareness, engagement and participation from developing countries, under-represented communities and all stakeholders. 7. Initiatives (e.g. IGFSA or other initiatives) committed to expanding global opportunities for multi-stakeholder forums for the enrichment of engagement on broader Internet Governance Issues that complement ICANN mission for the promotion of a stable, secure and resilient Internet. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html			

Proposals for Funding Allocation

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: This section includes specific proposals for the use of auction funds. **Overview of Comments:** A number of comments favor using a portion of funds to support a global awareness campaign. Other comments suggest using some of the funds to support Universal Acceptance. Additional proposals suggest using funds for privacy and security capacity building, bridging the digital gap, accessibility and inclusion of persons with disabilities, gender equality and enhance the use of ICT for empowerment of women and girls, child online protection, and green ICT.				
1.	To increase the awareness of new TLDs is a win-win-win-win for ICANN, registries, registrars, and end-users. In person marketing at trade-shows would make a material difference. I propose ICANN purchases booth space and allowed registries and registrars to volunteer to staff it. Two or three trade-shows a month would make a ripple effect. Please chose a variety of industries and choose conferences with 1,000+ attendees. I am certain that registries would volunteer to staff these booths. We certainly would. In fact, most of this would be organized by Volunteers from the community. I propose that 50% of the auction funds be used for awareness campaigns. Ideal this would be an endowment fund, where 100% of the money is invested and the fund would earn interest on the original money, it would retain the first 3% for deprecation, then any funds after this point would be allocated on the outreach campaigns budget. After 30 years, the funds would have grown and this campaign can come to a conclusion. The endowment fund can choose the next stage of philanthropic use that aligns with ICANN's mission. Had ICANN started this in 2015, the excess interest would have funded a lot of good outreach by now. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000000.html	Jay Westerdal, Top Level Spectrum, Inc.	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation -Check Similar proposal as #1/Annex D/Jonathan Frost -Check Whether an endowment fund for such a purpose is recommendable	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	We propose that ICANN should earmark a portion—15% of the total auction funds—to support an education campaign to promote Universal Awareness of the uses of the Domain Name System and all TLDs in general. The Board-Approved 2011 Global	Jonathan Frost, .Club Domains, LLC Supported by:	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:**

	Awareness Campaign[2] <#_ftn2> can be extended and used as a model (see II a. below). This has the advantage of ensuring that the plan is within the scope of ICANN's mission, bylaws and tax status, and builds on the work done by the previous group. See full comment and detailed proposal: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000003.html	● Radix (Shweta Asher) ● .GLOBAL (Su Wu) ● Arto Isokoski (TLD Registry Limited) ● Dominion Registries (Jim Schrand) ● Minds + Machines Group Limited (Sheri Falcon) ● Uniregistry (Vaughn Liley) ● Peter LaMantia (authenticweb.com) ● Top level design (Raymond King) ● Donuts (Chrystal Ondo) ● Domain Name Association (Jothan Frakes) ● GMO Registry (Hiro Tsukahara) ● Neustar (Donna Austin) ● ZDNS (Sophia Feng) ● Knock Knock WHOIS There (.BLOG) (Erica Varlese) ● Nominet (Nick Wenban-Smith)	use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation -Check Identical proposal to #1/Annex D/Jonathan Frost	[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

3.	As the .Best CEO, I strongly believe that a substantive portion of those auction funds should be used to support the ngtlds industry with a global awareness campaign. Indeed, a Global Awareness Campaign on NgTLDs addressing consumer can have a real great impact on the community. 6 years after the ngtld program and 1st round, we still need to educate the community. So that, I totally support the specific proposal that would allow 15% of the Auction Funds to be allocated over three years to fund the hiring of an agency to prepare and execute a global awareness campaign. Of course, the RFP to engage an agency, and management of the agency, would be handled by a steering committee comprised of qualified members of the ICANN community. Also, I think that another part of the funds could also to be set to advertize all ngtlds (on demand) at ICANN summit First (On demand all ngtlds should be able to get a free booth at all ICANN SUMMIT). I think also that ICANN should promote the ngtld program through external consumer web summits like websummit in Lisbon, ... I was shocked and surprised that attending the websummit 2018 this year in Lisbon, only the .com and the .best was participating at the event. The community "still" need education on the ngtld program even before focusing on a new round. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000002.html	Cyril FREMONT, .BEST	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation -Check Similar proposal to #1/Annex D/Jonathan Frost -Check Whether fund mechanism can be used for gTLD advertisement (internally and externally) and coverage of ICANN related booth costs.	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	Create a fund for a "Commissar" of internet. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000012.html	Ben Deschenes	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations.	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
5.	Donuts believes ICANN org should commit these funds to efforts that will make a truly lasting impact on the DNS. Global awareness and additional commitment to the Universal	Crystal Ondo, Donuts INC	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the	New Idea **CCWG Response:**

	Acceptance efforts will enhance and further strengthen the security and stability of the DNS by promoting the interoperability of the DNS for all domains and registrants. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000013.html		use of auction funds, noting scope limitations.	**Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
6.	The Domain Name Association ("The DNA") is a non-profit global business association that represents the interests of the domain name industry. Its members are groups, businesses, and individuals involved in the provision, support, and sale of domain names. This includes such organizations as domain name registries, registrars, resellers, and registry service providers, as well as those with an interest in internet naming and innovation with domain names. Our members contribute annually to be members, and volunteer time towards creating resources to aid in general awareness and education about the new namespace of 2018 and the future. We often perform outreach to help educate the audiences of people that are not those with existing awareness, and we are presented with magnificent campaigns that could aid in helping to remedy the awareness gap. Even the most pragmatic of these initiatives have prices that are beyond the reach of our modestly run, member-funded organization. The proposed awareness campaign outlined by .CLUB is completely aligned with the core mission of The Domain Name Association, which is, "Highlight the use, potential and benefits of domains and DNS and a vibrant, robust, and trusted domain name system while fostering innovation, sustainable growth and utilization in the marketplace." Within our mission, we work to spread awareness, in responsible and constructive ways, engaging the public and responding to inquiries and questions. We educate and evangelize healthy use of domains in a the many ways that they enable the Internet to properly function.	Jothan Frakes, Domain Name Association	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation Similar idea as #1/Annex D/ -Mentions in particular: "There is a large gap in awareness of the evolution to the naming system." The DNA is developing educational resources and campaigns to prepare users for … success of domains and top-level domains. These efforts are constantly measured against budgetary constraints, and pragmatically hobble those efforts to match the available budget out of necessity."	New Idea **WG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	The one most challenging obstacle to our mission is that in order to reach the public who can most benefit from awareness of domains - those outside the typical ICANN or domain/hosting conference - is available funding to support it. We also get distracted by helping to educate on what ICANN is and is not with the general public, and work to aid in misconceptions that are perpetuated by certain quarters within the ICANN community who seem generally averse to market expansion and namespace growth. The DNA's first priority is to educate Internet users around the world about the benefits of domain names, DNS, and top-level domains (TLDs). This is not limited in any way to the new gTLDs - this is general awareness of gTLDs, ccTLDs, and new TLDs released through ICANN's New gTLD Program, such as GeoTLDs, Brand TLDs, Verified TLDs, and an expanded number of generic top level domains. The general Internet user is barely aware of ICANN, much less that their namespace landscape is constantly evolving and changing, and research shows that Internet users are often unaware of these changes or how to best engage with existing and new gTLDs. We are working together within TheDNA to develop educational resources and campaigns to prepare users for these changes and support the success of domains and top-level domains. These efforts are constantly measured against budgetary constraints, and pragmatically hobble those efforts to match the available budget out of necessity. There is a large gap in awareness of the evolution to the naming system. This began in 2013 as the domain name system started to expand at the root system. Since that time, individual companies in the registry and registrar businesses have spent money to market their individual TLDs. While this works to help spread awareness as individual initiatives, they are entirely focused on the for-profit activities of specific TLDs or companies.			

	This can provide some modest benefit to overall awareness of the current namespace, but there needs to be awareness campaigns that support the healthy use and adoption of domain names in general. TheDNA has stepped up in the span since to fill a rather large void in neutral awareness about the positive benefits of domain names, the changes in the namespace and advantages of healthy domain name use and activities. We have made some modest gains in spreading awareness, but the industry needs a larger infusion of capital towards reaching users to ensure the security, stability and inter-operability of the DNS. "Digitalization" of the world is happening at a growing pace, and domain names are part of that important story. The DNA wants to help spread awareness of the benefits of using domain names across the various places that these crucial identifiers can aid in users finding what they are looking for, quickly. We are encouraged that there can be some attention and resourcing made available to helping to address awareness of domain names, as this is the opportunity to promote healthy and functional use of domain names within the awareness efforts, and positively impact the industry and beyond. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000014.html			
7.	gTLDs are currently largely unknown to the general public. Given the fact that a Global Awareness Campaign has already been approved by the ICANN Board, the .LOVE registry strongly supports the allocation of at least 25% of the gTLD auction proceeds being committed to an Awareness Campaign. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000018.html	Evatt Merchant, .LOVE	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation Similar as #1/Annex D/	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
8.	Domain names are numerical identifiers, similar to serial numbers, allowing you to find your way around the Internet. The	Clément Genty	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that	New Idea **CCWG Response:**

	monetization of domain names has led registries to increase their sales volume, while removing the numerical benchmarks of sectoral sub-domains. If this is not to be judged, the international population must be made aware of the need to use the domain name system intelligently to find their way around. Indeed, 57% of young women aged 15 to 30 use the Internet for health issues and more generally, 80% of women aged 15 to 30 find information on the Internet credible. At a time of widespread Internet use, it is necessary to set up benchmarks to help Internet users find their way around, even if ICANN remains a private organization. To this end, I suggest raising awareness among young people in middle and high schools, setting up C2I-type training sessions as exists in France and strengthening communication around the importance of sectoral sub-domains. ICANN could grow out of the openness of the ngtld by funding doctoral or post-doctoral contracts in order to have a vision that goes beyond the economic spectrum to which it is accustomed. Finally, support for small territories to have an Internet extension would be an interesting approach (.BL,.MF,.SS, ...) See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000021.html		have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation Similar to #1/Annex D -Variation: to offer educational awareness outreach exercises to young people	**Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
9.	The core values of ICANN, as described In the bylaws are to be found at [https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article1] and are cited below. As someone who follows the CCWG-AP, I must speak as an individual and also someone who is informed but recognizes that understanding ICANN is quite complicated. My comments call on the CCWG-AP and the ICANN Board to fully respect the bylaws, the principles and the importance of bringing informed and committed participants from developing countries.	Suada Hadzovic	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation Check: whether the current examples shall be extended to cover the following areas:	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	The Core Values of ICANN to me, as I read them, indicate that funding for bringing informed and interested participants from developing countries reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet will advance ICANN's acceptance. Thus, such initiatives deserve funding by the Auction Funds as only one additional example to be accepted. Bearing in mind that Internet is only as powerful as it is accessible and safe, a portion of Auction Funds should be used for bridging the digital gap, accessibility and inclusion of persons with disabilities, gender equality and enhance the use of ICT for empowerment of women and girls, child online protection, green ICT and many other human and environment protection-oriented initiatives toward One world - One Internet. This may seem to be outside the scope of ICANN, but we do ask that CCWG-AP and ICANN Board understands that it is inclusion that matters and will strengthen ICANN for its next 20 years. I speak as an individual user -- regardless of what other role I may hold, as the most important voice has to be the informed users of the Internet. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000022.html		- participants from developing countries reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity ... - a portion of Auction Funds should be used for: -bridging the digital gap, accessibility and inclusion of persons with disabilities, gender equality and enhance the use of ICT for empowerment of women and girls, child online protection, green ICT and many other human and environment protection-oriented initiatives toward One world - One Internet … Check: whether a basket approach is appropriate in segmenting the need for particular groups/topics is recommendable.	
10.	The listed possible funding projects and programs are welcome, however, high priority should be given to projects and programs, while ensuring ICANN's Mission, that will promote general awareness which will include neutral promotion of ccTLDs, legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs that are not documented as having high incidents of fraud and consumer abuse. Awareness of DNS business is still very low. General awareness of ICANN and its Mission is also still low in developing countries. However, the good news is that platforms like IGF NRIs have been bringing ICANN to stakeholders in the underrepresented regions. While Security, stability of the internet is paramount to ICANN and its Mission, the security and privacy of users of the Internet,	Mary Uduma	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation Similar to #1/Annex D Check: Whether the inclusion of ccTLDs/legacy gTLD in a potential awareness project is helpful	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	inclusivity and diversity of ICANN participants should also be prioritised. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000025.html			
11.	The .ART Domain Registry joins other commenters and supports the .club proposal that ICANN should use a small but significant percentage of auction funds, say 15% of the total, to raise awareness about the utility, economy, reliability and safety of domain names as a way to establish a permanent, recognizable and technically competent internet presence. ICANN's core values call on us to, "[w}here feasible and appropriate, depend on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment in the DNS market," and "introduc[e] and promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial to the public interest as identified through the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process." What are market mechanisms that promote competition? The first is to design the market place (e.g., the registrar accreditation program and the new gTLD program), then make your audience aware that the market exists. ICANN has spent 20 years developing the domain market place yet the extent and level of recognition is low. The new generation of internet users are not familiar with the utility of domains (as opposed to gmail addresses, apps and social media)? Even as the new gTLD program was launched, critics said, "why bother?" because domains were evidently passé. ICANN developed and launched a staggeringly complex program, 14 years in the making, to increase competition and choice for consumers and then, somewhat incomprehensively, acted in a way to bar its success by refusing to provide notice of its existence. With regard to promoting competition in the registration of domain names, the community instructed the ICANN Board and the Board instructed ICANN to launch an awareness campaign in 2011: to provide global notice of the upcoming (at that time) new gTLD program. The effort failed due to lack of funding as	.ART Domain Registry	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation Similar to #1/Annex D Adds a new argument (creating competition) in allowing potential projects that target awareness projects to be seen as falling within ICANN's mission and would therefore be eligable to apply for funding: "What are market mechanisms that promote competition? The first is to design the market place (e.g., the registrar accreditation program and the new gTLD program), then make your audience aware that the market exists	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	ICANN had yet to receive over $370,000,000 in application fees and a similar amount in auction funds. ICANN now has the wherewithal to carry out the Board mandate of 2011. It is late, but not too late to provide for the planned-for support for the use of domains. If not ICANN, then who is to take this up? What other organization has the reach, funding and core values to promote the awareness of domains? Are we not proud of what we do and our involvement to make "unique identifiers" a reliable, safe, useful tool for navigating the internet? Others promote social media platforms and apps as a way to participate on line. But don't we (as part of ICANN) believe that domains have a unique value, where participants can safeguard their data, establish an air of technical competency, and create a permanent on-line space? If we are not for domains, what are we doing here? It seems that one either wants to promote the uptake and use of domains or wants them to die. This community spends its energies in critical self-assessment in attempting to make the DNS the perfect online environment. One can rightfully believe that our multi-stakeholder model uniquely considers market issues from all viewpoints and has policy development tools and safeguards far superior to those in other online regimes such as apps and social media. It is ok for us to be proud of our work: the market we have developed and the value that domains provide. These achievements also give rise to a public interest duty to inform the global internet-using community of the space we have created because if there is not awareness, it will fade away. Another ICANN core value is that it operates, "at a speed that is responsive to the needs of the global Internet community." With the authority provided by its Bylaws and the actions of its community, ICANN should now finish this last task associated with its 20-year build of the domain marketplace and promote awareness of its existence and value. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000033.html			

12.	Whilst it is premature to think about the recipients of the Fund, we think it is important to ensure that the framework is attuned to the needs of global society who are working to to "help ensure a stable, secure and unified global Internet." We have deep experience in bringing together diverse stakeholders through our RightsCon Summit Series: our previous event, RightsCon Toronto, hosted 2,520 registered participants from 118 countries and more than 700 organizations from civil society, the private sector, and the public sector, while our upcoming event, RightsCon Tunis, is poised to bring together as many as 2,000 technologists, engineers, civil society activists, human rights defenders, business leaders, general counsels, entrepreneurs, policy makers, government decision makers, and more. We would be pleased to facilitate a mechanism that incorporates or engages with RightsCon and our global community of stakeholders that is essential to ICANN's work. We would also like to use this time to encourage ICANN to use the funds generated to support privacy and security capacity-building efforts. As an organization that works to extend and defend human rights online, and to protect the digital security of at risk communities through our 24/7 Digital Security Helpline, we have first-hand experience with the ways in which digital security attacks can dramatically impact the privacy, safety, security, and rights of users at risk around the world, and can lead to harassment, surveillance, censorship, violence, detainment, torture, and even death. The Helpline has received more than 4,000 unique requests for support from civil society activists, organizations, human rights defenders, and independent journalists in 133 distinct countries. The Helpline has further observed that digital security threats and attacks are growing more sophisticated, pervasive, and dangerous. Additional resources from ICANN to support privacy and digital security capacity-building efforts within civil society are timely, impactful, and absolutely vital to the sustainability, safety, and security of civil society at large. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000037.html	Access Now	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation Check: whether all/some examples mentioned here, shall be added to the list of examples.	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

13.	We support the detailed proposal submitted by .Club Domains, LLC and are in favor of using 15%, at a minimum, of the total auction funds to support a Global Awareness Campaign as detailed in the .Club comment. Adoption and user-awareness are the biggest obstacles to the competition and diversity in the domain industry that ICANN is mandated to oversee. For ICANN to resist an effort to expand consumer awareness for any reason would be an abdication of its important role in securing and promoting the future of the DNS. We also think the focus of the campaign should be on new TLDs, or TLDs introduced since the sponsored round, since legacy options do not suffer from issues of consumer awareness and the revenue in question was generated during the *new *TLD program. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000040.html	Top Level Design	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation Similar to #1/Annex D	New Idea **WG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
14.	Currently, ICANN is engaging in an effort to promote Universal Acceptance by educating developers, registrants and end users about new gTLDs, including internationalized domain names, and the interoperability of all domain names. The RySG believes that the work around Universal Acceptance falls within and supports ICANN's mission of promoting the "openness, interoperability, [and] resilience" of the Domain Name System, per Section 1.1(a)(i) of the ICANN Bylaws. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000037.html	RySG	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation Similar to #1/Annex D	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
15.	5. In lieu of the contracted parties' proposed "money grab" above and all other third parties' already proposed, or yet to come, "money grabs," ICANN should instead end this entire repulsive and tawdry "money grab" stampede, and announce it will set aside ALL of the auction proceeds for the benefit domain name registrants who have, indirectly, provided these funds, by: a) ICANN conducting continuous worldwide "awareness campaigns" to warn all domain name registrants, all prospective registrants, and all other consumers, about the *new gTLDs* "failing to work as expected on the internet	John Poole	CCWG to consider how to deal with specific proposals that have been put forward for the use of auction funds, noting scope limitations. Leadership recommendation -none	New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	<http://www.circleid.com/posts/20140207_more_problems_crop_up_universal_acceptance_of_top_level_domains/>" and the* lack of consumer protection in new gTLDs *against price gouging, exorbitant price increases, and total lack of price caps and controls, unlike the market dominant gTLD .COM domain names; b) setting up a restitution fund for consumers (registrants) worldwide who have claims as a result of the aforementioned "consumer fraud;" c) funding research, and continuously publishing the results via notices on the "home" and "landing" pages of all ICANN-accredited registrars, ICANN.org, and newgTLDs.icann.org,, ranking all new gTLDs by "usability,"* i.e.,*testing all new gTLDs in comparison against gTLD .COM, to determine the extent to which each new gTLD "fails to work as expected on the internet <http://www.circleid.com/posts/20140207_more_problems_crop_up_universal_acceptance_of_top_level_domains/>", along with wholesale pricing information and other pricing disclosures already mentioned, so that ALL consumers (registrants) can make "informed decisions" in deciding whether, or which, gTLD to select, in registering a domain name; d) funding ALL of the continuous data collection and surveys recommended in the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT) Final Report & Recommendations <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cct-final-recs-2018-10-08-en>, and other continuous data collection and surveys as may be appropriate. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000032.html		- all of AP shall be used for awareness campaign(s) to warn about the use of gTLDs	

General Comments

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
Section Summary: This section includes high-level comments that do not address any particular element of the Initial Report. **Overview of Comments:** Comments express appreciation for the CCWG's work and provide context for the comments included in other sections of this summary document. One comment expresses opposition to the use of auctions in the New gTLD Program				
1.	On behalf of the GNSO Council, one of the chartering organizations, I would like to thank the CCWG on Auction Proceeds for its Initial Report and efforts to date. The GNSO Council will not provide substantive input at this stage but has encouraged its Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to provide direct input on the Initial Report and its recommendations. The GNSO Council looks forward to receiving the Final Report for its consideration in due time. comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000026.html	GNSO Council	None	**CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided to date and looks forward to additional input once the Final Report has been published. **Action Taken:** None [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Initial Report of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group. The ALAC Members have been following this issue closely and have discussed these issues internally prior to the issuance of this report. The ALAC discussed each of these mechanisms among the participants and members of the working group, and came up with the following: [staff note: specific points of feedback are included elsewhere in the relevant tables] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000041.html	ALAC	None	**CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** None [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
3.	On 8-Oct-2018, ICANN's New gTLD Auction Proceeds Initial Report was posted for public comment, with one extension to 11-Dec-2018. The BC welcomes the progress being made by the CCWG-AP in the examination of mechanisms for disbursement of the existing	BC	None	**CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** none

	auction funds, and the suggested examples for the use of the proceeds of the auction funds. . . . . . The report by the CCWG-AP is comprehensive and the result of extensive discussions within the CCWGAP. We endorse many of the recommendations. As the public comment process closes, we also will review all comments submitted and consider the views of the BC in the CCWG-AP going forward. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000031.html			[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	1. I find ICANN's whole scheme of auctioning off new gTLDs to the "highest bidder" repugnant and a violation of the principles set out by Jon Postel in RFC 1591 and the advice given to ICANN by the U.S. Department of Justice Antitrust Division in December, 2008 (attached to a letter to ICANN from NTIA <https://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/icann_081218.pdf>): "... These designated authorities are trustees for the delegated *[top-level] domain, and have a duty to serve the community. The designated manager is the trustee of the top-level domain for ... the global Internet community. Concerns about "rights" and "ownership" of domains are inappropriate. It is appropriate to be concerned about "responsibilities" and "service" to the community .... Significantly interested parties in the domain should agree that the designated manager is the appropriate party... it is also appropriate for interested parties to have some voice in selecting the designated manager ..."--Jon Postel, March, 1994, RFC 1591 <https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1591.txt>. "... The [U.S. Department of Justice Antitrust] Division makes two specific recommendations. First ICANN's general approach to new gTLDs should be revised to give greater consideration to consumer [registrant] interests … Second, the RFP process and proposed registry agreement should include provisions that would enable ICANN to constrain new*	John Poole	Leadership recommendation Check: " I have read with interest other comments submitted by certain "contracted parties" advocating ICANN allocate the auction proceeds for a worldwide marketing campaign a/k/a "awareness campaign" for the benefit of "contracted parties" who have discovered that many consumers (registrants) don't want their "garbage extensions" that "fail to work as expected on the internet," "break stuff," and are totally untrustworthy as they have no maximum price increase caps or schedules. Should ICANN succumb to this "money grab" by "contracted parties," I will enjoy petitioning, along with	Concerns Divergence Support New Idea **CCWG Response:** **Action Taken:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	registry operators from exercising market power. In particular, ICANN should establish competitive mechanisms for authorizing new gTLDs and renewals of gTLD registry agreements whereby prospective gTLD operators would compete for gTLDs by proposing registry terms – including maximum fee schedules – that would provide consumer [registrant] benefits."--U.S. Department of Justice Antitrust Division, Dec 3, 2008 <*https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3zjyRMTBSc7UzViS0stOWhQR3c/view?usp=sharing*> 2. Auctions (both "private" and "ICANN last resort") have corrupted ICANN and the processes for developing new gTLDs--*"it's all about the money"*--and increase costs that new gTLD registry operators can only recoup by charging registrants far more money for new gTLD domain name registrations and renewals than necessary had ICANN followed RFC1591 and the advice of the U.S. Department of Justice Antitrust Division cited above. In effect, consumers (domain name registrants) are bearing, directly and indirectly, the entire costs of *ICANN's ill-conceived, horribly implemented <https://www.domainmondo.com/2014/09/icann-insiders-on-new-gtlds-mistakes.html>,*and* corrupt program for new gTLDs*. 3. Adding insult to injury,* ICANN* and its "contracted parties" have engaged in "*consumer* (registrant) *fraud*" by failing to warn registrants worldwide of *new gTLDs* "failing to work as expected on the internet" <http://www.circleid.com/posts/20140207_more_problems_crop_up_universal_acceptance_of_top_level_domains/> of which ICANN and its Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) have been well aware since 2003. Further, ICANN has failed to inform and warn domain name registrants worldwide that *unlike the market dominant legacy gTLD .COM*, which has price controls, *new gTLDs, by design*, come with no price controls and any of ICANN's monopoly new gTLD registry operators can (and have <https://onlinedomain.com/2017/03/08/domain-name-news/frank-schilling-just-killed-new-gtld-domain-name-program-warning/>) increase pricing of registration and renewal fees (by 3000% or more), from year to year.		others, the U.S. government's Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the California State Attorney General, and other governmental authorities, for revocation of ICANN's nonprofit, IRC 501(c)(3) status, and the imposition of other statutory penalties and remedies.”	

	4. I have read with interest other comments submitted by certain "contracted parties" advocating ICANN allocate the auction proceeds for a worldwide marketing campaign a/k/a "awareness campaign" for the benefit of "contracted parties" who have discovered that many consumers (registrants) don't want their "garbage extensions" that "fail to work as expected on the internet," "break stuff," and are totally untrustworthy as they have no maximum price increase caps or schedules. Should ICANN succumb to this "money grab" by "contracted parties," I will enjoy petitioning, along with others, the U.S. government's Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the California State Attorney General, and other governmental authorities, for revocation of ICANN's nonprofit, IRC 501(c)(3) status, and the imposition of other statutory penalties and remedies. . . . . . 6. Disclosure: I have neither monetary claims nor pecuniary interests (individually or otherwise) related to providing any of the services suggested above. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000032.html			
5.	The Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group (NCSG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the initial report of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group published 8 October 2018 as it works towards finalizing the recommendations that will appear in its final report. See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html	NCSG	None	**CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** none [**COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED**] – [Instruction of what was done.]
6.	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Preliminary Recommendations of the Initial Report of the Cross-Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds. I was present at the presentation at ICANN 63 and appreciated hearing about all the work that has gone into developing this report. . .	Anne Aikman-Scalese	None	**CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** none

	. . . It should be noted that other activities in the community such as the EPDP on the Temporary Specification and the Subsequent Procedures Working Group as well as several ongoing Reviews have drawn attention away from the very important topic of Auction Proceeds. In this regard, a second public comment period is appropriate after the CCWG has completed the next phase of its work. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. My comments are my own and are not made on behalf of the firm. [staff note: text from the original comment contained between the ellipses is included elsewhere in this summary document] See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html			[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
7.	The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Initial Report of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group. We appreciate the CCWG's core values of efficiency, frugality, and transparency and support the majority of the recommendations as they tend to promote a common-sense, fair approach toward utilizing the vast resource of auction proceeds. We hope our comments will help the CCWG propose the best path forward toward achieving its goals. . . See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000036.html	RySG	None	**CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** none [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
8.	This comment is made in my personal capacity as an experienced community member of ICANN. I have been in GAC and ccNSO and currently also in At Large since I no more represent my country in GAC. I have been President of NIRA, the Registry Mangers of .ngccTLD and do understand the challenges faced by the developing countries regarding knowledge of the DNS business I wish to acknowledge the great work done by CCWG-AP in putting out this Initial Report. I wish to commend the members and participants for their commitments in seeing the work done so far. The Initial Report is very much comprehensive, and it is great that the public is asked to comment on the report.	Mary Uduma	None	**CCWG Response:** The CCWG appreciates the input provided **Action Taken:** none [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000025.html			