

<p><b>Charter Question #4</b></p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>Initial Responses</b> (summary – for full responses, see <a href="#">here</a>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Consider an approach similar to the European Commission Framework program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Come up with a strategic plan (i.e. the guidelines/mission, independent of the legal nature of the agency)</li> <li>○ Do several calls, e.g. every 6 months, each with one or a few given focus (e.g. content oriented, dns middleware), USD20M each, so 3 to 5 years of activity altogether (unless more auctions are coming in).</li> </ul> </li> <li>● This is a singular opportunity both in scope and in nature. While there may be other opportunities for ICANN to actively dispense money (for example, a lower budget and annual surplus should be the norm but.....), they are not currently part of the process and I have great fear of institutionalizing an “ICANN Charity”. The CCWG is looking at a singular event, which is auction excess in the first round of open applications ever. Any structure(s) the CCWG creates should naturally sunset. This informs both the setup and the rules for disbursement and productively simplifies both.</li> <li>● Although in principle agreement with previous comment, there are a lot of unknowns regarding future gTLDs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There <i>*may*</i> be another round or rounds;</li> <li>○ There <i>*may*</i> be auctions;</li> <li>○ Any such auctions <i>*may*</i> have their proceeds designated for uses similar to in the first round.</li> </ul> <p>All of these would be the result of GNSO PDP(s) and Board action, and are out of scope for us, regardless of whether we think any or all of this would be good (and I am not advocating any of this here). If all of those were to come to be, then the process the CCWG is developing <i>*may*</i> be applicable (again, a decision WAY out of our scope). Nothing that the CCWG does should REQUIRE that we must start all over again and re-invent this in such a situation.</p> </li> <li>● If the funds were to be allocated through partnerships that support the three communities that ICANN serves, across all regions, with a strong technical focus and directly/strongly aligned with ICANN’s mission having a medium/long term perspective should be desirable. To get it organized, in a way that the desirable impact can be reached, to give time for supported projects/organizations to deliver/reach their goals. To plan for a minimum of 10 years, should allow the opportunity for the dust of the current political/economic global changes to settle and properly address questions about stability.</li> <li>● Consider having 3 calls separated in time dividing the amount of money in the 3 groups as called out in ICANN’s mission: names, numbers and protocols/ standards.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important to realize that 'granting money to the right projects' could be a very time consuming effort, since this is not only 'granting money', but also 'selecting projects' and 'monitoring milestones and results'. To avoid that funds might be thrown in the dark, project-selection should be in-depth, and grants should better be limited to max 50 - 100 K\$ per project. Based upon an average project-grant of app 50 K\$ , there is clearly a lot of work to do: Assume the 230 M\$ is granted to app 25 organisations, then each individual sub-granting effort would be app 10 M\$ per organisation. Assuming each organisation can run app 4 to 6 Open Calls/year to select app 40 projects/year at avg 50 K\$/project: it would take 25 organisations 5 years to subgrant to whole fund. This is one of the reasons not to have the complete auction proceeds disbursed by just one (new) central ICANN organisation.</li> </ul>
<b>Order in which this question should be dealt with</b>	Question has been flagged as a gating question i.e. it needs to be addressed early on as it will likely determine the response to some of the other charter questions as well as determine which mechanism may be most suitable.
<b>Sub-questions or clarifications needed</b>	
<b>(External) Expertise required?</b>	