

Questions / Approach for addressing Additional Comments received

The following comments were submitted in response to the question: Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise pertaining to the proposed Final Report?

OVERARCHING QUESTION:

As a result of input provided during the public comment period, are there any additional edits to the report that are necessary as a result of the below comments?

If yes, why?

If no, why not?

Comment #1 - RySG	
Suggestion from Commenter	The RySG would like to reiterate the following comment that it submitted in response to the CCWG's Initial Report: "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."
Leadership recommendation	- The final letter to the Chartering Organizations/Board accompanying the Report can include the RySG's input.
CCWG discussion / agreement	

Comment #2 - IPC	
Suggestion from Commenter	Regarding CCWG Recommendation #7 on page 5 of the proposed Final Report, the IPC agrees that grants should be final and should not be subject to being overturned via appeals mechanisms. Understanding that this will require a change to ICANN's Fundamental ByLaws, the IPC recommends that the language of Recommendation 7 be revised to clarify that the appeal mechanisms should not apply to applications for grants which are "approved" in addition to stating that they will not apply to a grant application that is "not approved". The concern is that persons other than grant applicants may have standing to object to making a particular grant, e.g. on Human Rights or other grounds contained in ICANN's ByLaws or Core Values. This risk may be higher where grant-making administration is maintained inside the ICANN organization as contemplated by Mechanism A. Finally, the IPC believes this Recommendation should be express in stating that nothing in the Recommendation is intended to modify the rights of the Empowered Community in relation to the overall Budget with respect to the proposed line item for Auction Proceeds grants. Separately, many thanks for all the hard work by this CCWG to date and especially to Leadership and ICANN staff.
Leadership recommendation	- Add to the Recommendation #7 a reference grants " approved" as well as "not approved." - ICANN Legal to provide clarification regarding Empowered Community. Possible next step after ICANN Legal provides input: Add text indicating there will be no impact on rights of the Empowered Community in relation to the Budget.
CCWG discussion / agreement	

Comment #3 - ALAC

Suggestion from Commenter	The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the second report on the gTLD Auction Proceeds. ALAC participants have been following this issue closely and have discussed these issues internally prior to the issuance of this report. We discussed each of these mechanisms among the participants and member of this working group resulting in the following positions.
Leadership recommendation	- No additional action needed.
CCWG discussion / agreement	

Comment #4 - ICANN Board	
Suggestion from Commenter	<p>The ICANN Board welcomes the Proposed Final Report of the Cross-Community Working Group on the New gTLD Auction Process and congratulates and commends the members and participants in this group, alongside the Co-Chairs Erika Mann and Ching Chiao, on their efforts to reach these final stages of its work.</p> <p>The Board appreciates the continued collaborative approach adopted throughout the CCWG's work. In the spirit of this collaboration, the Board welcomes the opportunity to participate again in this second round of Public Comment and offers the below input in response.</p> <p>As with the previous Public Comment submission, this review is not exhaustive, but is intended to provide some key considerations from the Board for the CCWG's review. As the Board Liaisons to the CCWG-AP, we will of course be available to expand on any of these items during upcoming CCWG-AP meetings, if considered useful by the group and its Co-Chairs.</p>
Leadership recommendation	- No additional action needed.
CCWG discussion / agreement	

Comment #5 - SSAC	
Suggestion from Commenter	<p>Background</p> <p>This Public Comment provides consensus comments from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Initial Report of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG).</p> <p>Per its role, the SSAC focuses on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. This includes operational matters (e.g., pertaining to the correct and reliable operation of the root zone publication system), administrative matters (e.g., pertaining to address allocation and Internet number assignment), and registration matters (e.g., pertaining to registry and registrar services). The SSAC engages in threat assessment and risk</p>

analysis of the Internet naming and address allocation services to assess where the principal threats to stability and security lie and advises the ICANN community accordingly. The SSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate.

Context

SSAC has a dual role in making these comments as both an Advisory Committee (AC) that has actively participated in the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG and as the AC chartered to advise the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN Community on matters of Security and Stability. The outcome and ultimate success of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds we believe will impact the ability for the ICANN Organization to support and promote its core commitment to preserve and enhance the administration of the Internet identifiers (not just the DNS but also IP addresses) and the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS in a fiscally responsible and accountable manner at a speed that is responsive to the needs of the global Internet community.

General Comments on the Report

The SSAC recognizes the considerable efforts of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG to provide guidance for a framework to disburse the funds generated from new TLD auctions. The SSAC does not object to any of the 12 recommendation in the report but feels that it is unfortunate that they were not able to be more specific, especially in regard to the exact mechanism to be employed. Nevertheless, the SSAC supports the finalization of this report following the Public Comment period so that the work of the CCWG can be concluded.

The SSAC has made comments in recent correspondence and consultations with the ICANN Board that have delved into process issues that have negatively impacted community-wide reviews and cross-community working groups. The SSAC notes that, based on observations of this CCWG provided periodically by the group along with inputs from our designated representatives who participated on it, the length of time taken for the CCWG to conduct its work is regrettable and many processes were not optimal and should not be repeated. This falls into the pattern of other volunteer work groups gathered from across the ICANN community that are driving issues like volunteer burn-out, ICANN Org overload, and recommendations that are not crisp and actionable. The SSAC will look to incorporate further details and examples of the issues identified in this particular CCWG in future comments on ICANN cross-community efforts of all

	<p>types that are currently being discussed within the ICANN community.</p> <p>Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that, following the completion and submission of the CCWG's report, the next step in the process be to have an outside expert with a demonstrated track-record in designing funding programs review the report, comment on its finding and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of a grant making process for the auction proceeds that implements grant making best practices. This step should be undertaken before the Board formally considers the CCWG's Final Report as its advice would assist the Board in its consideration of the CCWG recommendations.</p> <p>The SSAC wishes to thank the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG for the opportunity to comment on their report.</p>
Leadership recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggested modification from the leadership team, based on the SSAC's recommendation: Include in the Report that the Implementation Team should feel encouraged to work with experts in setting up the first phase of the project, if needed.
CCWG discussion / agreement	

Comment #6 - NCSG	
Suggestion from Commenter	NCSG would like to thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this discussion. We hope you will find our contributions and recommendations helpful and we are open to further discussions regarding the final report on the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG final report if needed.
Leadership recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No further action required.
CCWG discussion / agreement	

Additional Comments

#	Comment	Contributor	Type of change suggested by commenter / Possible action and/or question for CCWG	CCWG Response / Action Taken
<p>Section Summary: <u>Responses to Question:</u> Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise pertaining to the proposed Final Report?</p> <p><u>Overview of Comments:</u> Additional comments provided input on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring future availability of the mechanism • Suggested clarification of text regarding access to Accountability Mechanisms • Next steps following completion of the CCWG’s work 				
1.	The RySG would like to reiterate the following comment that it submitted in response to the CCWG’s Initial Report: “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.”	RySG	CCWG to confirm that RySG’s comments on the Initial Report have been taken into account. THEME: FUTURE AVAILABILITY OF THE MECHANISM	Concerns Proposed CCWG Response: Action Taken: None at this time [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
2.	Regarding CCWG Recommendation #7 on page 5 of the proposed Final Report, the IPC agrees that grants should be final and should not be subject to being overturned via appeals mechanisms. Understanding that this will require a change to ICANN’s Fundamental ByLaws, the IPC recommends that the language of Recommendation 7 be revised to clarify that the appeal mechanisms should not apply to applications for grants which are “approved” in addition to stating that they will not apply to a grant application that is “not approved”. The concern is that persons other than grant applicants may have standing to object to making a particular grant, e.g. on Human Rights or other grounds contained in ICANN’s ByLaws or Core Values. This risk may be higher where grant-making administration is maintained inside the ICANN organization as contemplated by Mechanism A. Finally, the	IPC	CCWG to consider suggested amendments to recommendation #7 regarding access to accountability mechanisms: - clarify that the appeal mechanisms should not apply to applications for grants which are “approved.” - state that nothing in the Recommendation is intended to modify the rights of the Empowered Community in relation to the overall Budget with respect to the proposed	Support Concerns New Idea Proposed CCWG Response: Action Taken: None at this time [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]

	IPC believes this Recommendation should be express in stating that nothing in the Recommendation is intended to modify the rights of the Empowered Community in relation to the overall Budget with respect to the proposed line item for Auction Proceeds grants. Separately, many thanks for all the hard work by this CCWG to date and especially to Leadership and ICANN staff.		line item for Auction Proceeds grants. THEME: ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS THEME: EMPOWERED COMMUNITY	
3.	The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the second report on the gTLD Auction Proceeds. ALAC participants have been following this issue closely and have discussed these issues internally prior to the issuance of this report. We discussed each of these mechanisms among the participants and member of this working group resulting in the following positions.	ALAC	No additional action needed.	Support Proposed CCWG Response: Action Taken: None at this time [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
4.	The ICANN Board welcomes the Proposed Final Report of the Cross-Community Working Group on the New gTLD Auction Process and congratulates and commends the members and participants in this group, alongside the Co-Chairs Erika Mann and Ching Chiao, on their efforts to reach these final stages of its work. The Board appreciates the continued collaborative approach adopted throughout the CCWG's work. In the spirit of this collaboration, the Board welcomes the opportunity to participate again in this second round of Public Comment and offers the below input in response. As with the previous Public Comment submission, this review is not exhaustive, but is intended to provide some key considerations from the Board for the CCWG's review. As the Board Liaisons to the CCWG-AP, we will of course be available to expand on any of these items during upcoming CCWG-AP meetings, if considered useful by the group and its Co-Chairs.	ICANN Board	No additional action needed.	Support Proposed CCWG Response: Action Taken: None at this time [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]
5.	Background This Public Comment provides consensus comments from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on	SSAC	CCWG to consider the following recommendation from the SSAC and determine if any edits to the Final Report	Concerns Proposed CCWG Response:

<p>the Initial Report of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG). Per its role, the SSAC focuses on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet’s naming and address allocation systems. This includes operational matters (e.g., pertaining to the correct and reliable operation of the root zone publication system), administrative matters (e.g., pertaining to address allocation and Internet number assignment), and registration matters (e.g., pertaining to registry and registrar services). The SSAC engages in threat assessment and risk analysis of the Internet naming and address allocation services to assess where the principal threats to stability and security lie and advises the ICANN community accordingly. The SSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate.</p> <p>Context</p> <p>SSAC has a dual role in making these comments as both an Advisory Committee (AC) that has actively participated in the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG and as the AC chartered to advise the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN Community on matters of Security and Stability. The outcome and ultimate success of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds we believe will impact the ability for the ICANN Organization to support and promote its core commitment to preserve and enhance the administration of the Internet identifiers (not just the DNS but also IP addresses) and the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS in a fiscally responsible and accountable manner at a speed that is responsive to the needs of the global Internet community.</p> <p>General Comments on the Report</p> <p>The SSAC recognizes the considerable efforts of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG to provide guidance for a framework to disburse the funds generated from new TLD auctions. The SSAC does not object to any of the 12 recommendation in the report but feels that it is unfortunate that they were not able</p>		<p>are appropriate in this regard: “ . . .following the completion and submission of the CCWG’s report, the next step in the process [should] be to have an outside expert with a demonstrated track-record in designing funding programs review the report, comment on its finding and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of a grant making process for the auction proceeds that implements grant making best practices.”</p>	<p>Action Taken: None at this time</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
---	--	---	---

	<p>to be more specific, especially in regard to the exact mechanism to be employed. Nevertheless, the SSAC supports the finalization of this report following the Public Comment period so that the work of the CCWG can be concluded.</p> <p>The SSAC has made comments in recent correspondence and consultations with the ICANN Board that have delved into process issues that have negatively impacted community-wide reviews and cross-community working groups. The SSAC notes that, based on observations of this CCWG provided periodically by the group along with inputs from our designated representatives who participated on it, the length of time taken for the CCWG to conduct its work is regrettable and many processes were not optimal and should not be repeated. This falls into the pattern of other volunteer work groups gathered from across the ICANN community that are driving issues like volunteer burn-out, ICANN Org overload, and recommendations that are not crisp and actionable. The SSAC will look to incorporate further details and examples of the issues identified in this particular CCWG in future comments on ICANN cross-community efforts of all types that are currently being discussed within the ICANN community.</p> <p>Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that, following the completion and submission of the CCWG’s report, the next step in the process be to have an outside expert with a demonstrated track-record in designing funding programs review the report, comment on its finding and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of a grant making process for the auction proceeds that implements grant making best practices. This step should be undertaken before the Board formally considers the CCWG’s Final Report as its advice would assist the Board in its consideration of the CCWG recommendations.</p> <p>The SSAC wishes to thank the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG for the opportunity to comment on their report.</p>			
6.	NCGS would like to thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this discussion. We hope you will find our	NCSG	No additional action needed.	Support

	contributions and recommendations helpful and we are open to further discussions regarding the final report on the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG final report if needed.			<p>Proposed CCWG Response:</p> <p>Action Taken: None at this time</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
--	---	--	--	---