

Questions / Approach for addressing input received on Charter Question #6 / Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #6

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?

OVERARCHING QUESTION:

As a result of the input provided during the public comment period, should the CCWG reconsider its recommendation that:

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.

If yes, why?

If no, why not?

If it is not possible to make this determination at this stage, what input, or information would be necessary to make this determination?

Comment #3 (Anne Aikman-Scalese)	
Suggestion from Commenter	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 all, 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.
CCWG Team discussion / agreement	<u>CCWG observed concern about inclusion and possible exclusion. Who can benefit from the project, vs where the proposal comes from? It was noted that guidance could be provided on encouraging certain topics or regions? Some suggested that the wording could be altered to make sure that</u>

	<p><u>deserving projects that may not be in what are considered underserved regions are not disregarded? Some noted that the comment might be more about mechanism B (ICANN+external org). The fear might be that an external org would not have a clear sense for what orgs are close to ICANN and supporting its mission?</u></p> <p><u>Possible CCWG Agreement: Consider modifying implementation guidance to also focus on ensuring that applications are received from diverse geographic regions and communities? [to be further considered during upcoming meeting]</u></p>
--	--

Comment #4 (ICANN Board)	
Suggestion from Commenter	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
CCWG Team discussion / agreement	<u>See previous comment</u>

Comment #5 (RrSG)	
Suggestion from Commenter	CCWG to consider whether it is appropriate for ICANN Org or a constituent part to make determinations regarding which underserved populations are in need or where capacity building is needed.
Leadership recommendation	Check: see point 3) above
CCWG Team discussion / agreement	



Response to Charter Question #6/ 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
<p>Section Summary:</p> <p><u>Charter Question #6:</u> Should any priority or preference be given to organizations from developing economies, projects implemented in such regions and/or under represented groups?</p> <p><u>Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #8:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Guidance for the Implementation Phase in relation to charter question #6:</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>				
1.	<p>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</p>	ALAC	None (supportive of recommendation)	<p>Support</p> <p>CCWG Response: The CCWG appreciates the input provided</p> <p>Action Taken: None for the moment</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
2.	<p>Preliminary CCWG Recommendation #8</p> <p>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</p>	NCSG	None (supportive of recommendation)	<p>Support</p> <p>CCWG Response: The CCWG appreciates the input provided</p>

	<p>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 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.</p> <p>See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000034.html</p>			<p>Action Taken: None for the moment</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
3.	<p>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.</p> <p>See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000035.html</p>	Anne Aikman-Scalese	<p>CCWG to consider reviewing the role of Applicant Support in ICANN's Mission and develop specific guidelines for a third party in Mechanism B.</p> <p>Leadership recommendation</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>New Idea</p> <p>CCWG Response:</p> <p>Action Taken:</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
4.	<p><u>Charter Question #6 (diversity items)</u> 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</p>	ICANN Board	<p>CCWG to consider adding language for the implementation team on how best to support applications from diverse backgrounds.</p> <p>Leadership recommendation:</p>	<p>New Idea</p> <p>CCWG Response:</p> <p>Action Taken:</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>

			Check: see point 3) above	
5.	<p>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 of underserved populations should approach the ICANN Foundation regarding a request for funds and/or the need for capacity building.</p> <p>See full comment: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-08oct18/2018q4/000030.html</p>	RrSG	<p>CCWG to consider whether it is appropriate for ICANN Org or a constituent part to make determinations regarding which underserved populations are in need or where capacity building is needed.</p> <p>Leadership recommendation</p> <p>Check: see point 3) above</p>	<p>Concerns</p> <p>WG Response:</p> <p>Action Taken:</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>