

Charter Question #1	What framework (structure, process and/or partnership) should be designed and implemented to allow for the disbursement of new gTLD Auction Proceeds, taking into account the legal and fiduciary constraints outlined above as well as the existing memo on legal and fiduciary principles? As many details as possible should be provided, including any implementation guidance the CCWG may have in relation to the establishment of this framework as well as criteria for the selection / ranking of potential funding requests.
Initial Responses (summary – for full responses, see here)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize the time and costs to implement a funding agency – let’s try to do it first within ICANN e.g. create an “Office of DNS Auction Grant” which would have its own committee for funding review, staff management and report to the ICANN Board. Would need to confirm that this is possible for legal / tax reasons. • Form a foundation or trust which should be in a neutral country like Switzerland and have a council of experts in the assigned field. • A mechanism that allows staff (GSE dept for instance) to this as a project item and manage the funds based on the guidelines developed by this group should just do. • ICANN should partner with reputable organizations that have already the mechanisms in place to manage funds for Internet development instead of creating its own “office”. The partnerships should serve all the three communities that ICANN represents: domains, numbers and standards, looking for some sort of balance/equal access and making all possible efforts to cover every country, without letting US politics dictate where funding should/should not go. • The potential framework should be 'simple' to design and to implement to avoid unnecessary waste of overhead and time. This would lead to a preference to make use of existing non-profit/charity organisations around the globe that have structure, process and partnerships in place already to award funds.
Order in which this question should be dealt with	As suggested in the proposed approach for dealing with the charter question, following an initial review of all charter questions, the CCWG would compile a list of possible mechanisms that could be considered by the CCWG (assuming there is a finite list). For each of the identified mechanisms, a detailed description, including strength and weaknesses would be developed as well as Review from the perspective of legal, fiduciary and audit constraints. Based on the overall assessment, the CCWG would identify which mechanism(s) demonstrates most potential to meet CCWG expectations as well as conform with legal & fiduciary constraints and answer each charter question from the perspective of the identified mechanism(s). This will likely be an iterative process.
Sub-questions or clarifications needed	
(External) Expertise required?	Legal and fiduciary (see https://community.icann.org/x/CbDRAW)

