| **#** | **Who / Affiliation** | **General Direction (supportive of the mechanism or not) / Suggested Changes** | **Concerns/ considerations/ rationale/ new issues** | **CWG-Stewardship Response (which may include new information as a result of the continued discussions) / Recommended action** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **125.** | AFNIC | Supportive – suggestions on budget management | Afnic agrees the proposed structure (PTI) as a new legal entity that is an affiliate to ICANN answers to the need of structural and operational separation.  In order to make sure that PTI will have the budgetary means to perform its duty, we however recommend that the funds allocated through the ICANN budget (and validated by the community as stated in the document) should be granted to PTI on a multi annual basis, and not year by year. It would allow PTI management and board to be fully responsible, and not to rely each year on the budget allocated by ICANN.  As the budget allocated to PTI will of course be of the upmost importance for this entity to fulfill its duty, Afnic recommends that an independent financial audit should be performed every year before the accounts approval by PTI board, and that this audit should be also sent to CSC for information, including a transparent stocktaking of all contracts passed between PTI and ICANN during the year, and their amount.  Furthermore, we recommend that it should be stated that PTI General Manager should have full authority on PTI staff. | ***CWG-Stewardship appreciates your feedback and will factor this into its subsequent deliberations.***  ***Action: CWG-Stewardship (DT-O) to consider suggestions for budgetary management within PTI.*** |
| **283.** | ISPCP | Supportive but makes suggestion re: costs | One important criterion for the potential transition to a successor IFO should be the cost estimate for this successor IFO. E.g. in the FY16 operational budget plan ICANN expects a $ 2.3 M budget for the IANA department operations. Successor IFO cost estimates should be benchmarked against this figure. | ***CWG-Stewardship appreciates your feedback and will factor this into its subsequent deliberations.***  ***Action: CWG-Stewardship (DT-L/DT-O) to address suggestion on budget/costs.*** |
| **316.** | CRISP Team | Does not oppose but notes a different approach to the budget in the Numbers community | \* Budget of the IANA Operations  - We observe a difference in the approach between what is proposed by the CWG-Stewardship and the Numbers community, but we do not observe any material issues of incompatibility at this point.  - The current draft of our SLA defines cost-based fees for the RIRs to pay to the IFO. If this proposed fee structure is adopted, we do not observe the need to provide detailed input on the budget on the IANA operations, as the RIRs will be paying a fee with a fixed maximum amount and it is incumbent on the IFO to manage its funds appropriately to successfully meet its contractual obligations. At the same time, we do not observe issues for the ICANN community to have more powers to provide input on the budget, given it will have no discretion regarding, and not make decisions about, the contracted fees for the IANA Numbering Services defined in the SLA. | ***The CWG-Stewardship appreciates your feedback and will factor this into its subsequent deliberations.***  ***Action: CWG-Stewardship (DT-O) to consider the different approach taken by numbers community and assess whether or not this affects the CWG-Stewardship recommendations on IANA Budget.*** |
| **317.** | InternetNZ | Suggestions concerning operations process | a) The IANA Functions Budget should indeed be rendered transparent, with resourcing supplied by ICANN.  b) The CWG-Stewardship could consider the InternetNZ experience. The analogy would operate as follows:  a. ICANN’s annual setting of expectations for PTI would include its views about the level of resources required to operate in the coming year.  b. The PTI Board would respond to the expectations set by ICANN for its year’s operation and the SLE framework it is operating in, and propose (with full transparency) its annual Operating Budget as part of its annual operating plan. It would have to explain any significant variations from the expectations ICANN had set.  c. ICANN would approve and then fund that Operating Budget, from general ICANN resources and contributions (as IANA is funded today).  d. Concerns about the cost of the IANA Functions Operator would be addressed by the IANA Functions Review | ***The CWG-Stewardship appreciates your feedback and will factor this into its subsequent deliberations.***  ***Action: CWG-Stewardship (DT-O) to consider the operations process suggested.*** |
| **319.** | CCWG-Accountability Co-Chairs | Supportive but needs further details | The CCWG Accountability initial proposals address this requirement directly in Section 5.2, which introduces a new power for the community to "consider strategic & operating plans and budgets after they are approved by the Board (but before they come into effect) and reject them based on perceived inconsistency with the purpose, Mission and role set out in ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws, the global public interest, the needs of ICANN stakeholders, financial stability or other matters of concern to the community."    Due to the proposed creation of the Post Transition IANA organization, the CWG will need to develop a proposed process for the IANA-specific budget review. It could be made a component of the bigger review. The CCWG Accountability is available for further coordination between the two groups on that aspect. | ***The CWG-Stewardship appreciates your feedback and will factor this into its subsequent deliberations.***  ***Action: CWG-Stewardship (DT-O) to provide CCWG-Accountability with further detail on process for IANA-specific budget review.*** |