Criteria	Mechanism #1 - new ICANN proceeds Allocation Department within ICANN	ICANN Proceeds Allication	Mechanism #3: A new structure would be created e.g. ICANN Foundation	Mechanism #4: An established entity/entities (e.g. foundation or fund) are used
Efficiency & Effectiveness	2.64	3.07	2.22	2.44
Cost-efficency	2.73	3.13	1.89	2.56
Least expensive	2.87	2.81	1.89	2.73
Easiest to sunset	3	2.85	1.79	2.86
Easiest to set up	3.07	2.79	1.6	2.93
Best equipped to meet legal and fiduciary requirements	3.27	2.62	2.36	2.23
Best enable ICANN stakeholder engagement	3	2.47	2.93	1.93
Most efficient means for fund allocation	2.89	2.93	2.19	2.53
Least administratively complex	2.87	2.38	2	3
Best means for oversight	3.08	2.79	2.67	1.93
Most transparent and accountable	2.83	2.5	2.5	2.57
Best equipped to operate and execute globally				
distributed projects	2.14	3	2.44	2.87
Best balance of control between ICANN and				
independence of fund allocation	2.2	2.73	2.56	2.69
Total Score	36.59	36.07	29.04	33.27

30135 30107 25104 35127

Criteria that should be weighted differently

Role of community members

Least expensive to run

Meeting legal and fiduciary requirements

Best equipped to operate and execute globally distributed projects

Most transparency and accountability

Best balance of control between ICANN and independence of fund allocation

Other criteria that should be ranked for

Multistakeholder must be take into account more than just with a question.

ability to identify and work with opportunities closest to supporting the mission and the Open Internet

placing the mechanism within ICANN will result in many community members assuming that they have "rights" to oversee the new mechanism, or that they can unofficially lobby

the staff or the Board

**Ethical aspects** 

Effectiveness of fund allocation and project selection in service of ICANN's stated goals for Auction proceeds

How long the overall process will take.

Response rate

11 Members (out of 28) 8 Participants (out of 46) 39%

17%