Questions for the CCWG to answer with draft responses

1. Would it be preferable if the CCWG recommends one single mechanism in its Initial Report or should all mechanisms be represented with a ranking indicating preferences and/or pros and cons identified?

   Response drafted by staff to summarize CCWG input: CCWG members have expressed support for ranking the mechanisms in order of preference. Some support was also expressed for eliminating mechanism 4. This issue will be discussed further.

2. At this point, is any additional work needed on the CCWG in defining goals and objectives the fund should support? [Charter Question 5] Note that the CCWG has already completed a significant amount of work in this regard:

   a. Preamble
   [https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/84217993/Preamble%20-%2022%20May.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1527001321000&api=v2]
   b. List of examples
   [https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/84217993/Updated%20list%20of%20examples%20-%2022%20May%202018.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1527001265000&api=v2]
   c. Preliminary Agreement B
   (https://community.icann.org/display/CWGONGAP/Charter+Question+Templates):
      ▪ Specific objectives of new gTLD Auction Proceeds fund allocation are:
         1. Benefit the development, distribution, evolution and structures/projects that support the Internet's unique identifier systems;
         2. Benefit capacity building and underserved populations, and;
         3. Benefit the Open Internet. [Note, the definition of Open Internet is subject to a separate conversation]
      ▪ New gTLD Auction Proceeds are expected to be allocated in a manner consistent with ICANN's mission.

   Response drafted by staff to summarize CCWG input: The CCWG does not think that additional work is needed with respect to goals and objectives at this time. One CCWG member expressed that the goals and objectives should include a goal of allowing grants to recipients in different countries.

3. What does success look like for this program? Are there any metrics that should be tracked and reported upon on a regular basis (possibly as part of the regular review of the mechanism)?

   Response drafted by staff to summarize CCWG input: Different sets of metrics may be appropriate for different stages of the granting mechanism's lifecycle. As the mechanism is set up, metrics may be used to evaluate if the organization has the necessary expertise and capacity to complete the work within its mandate. During the call for grant applications, metrics may be established to determine if the application process is clear, easy to use, and accessible to the target audience(s). During the evaluation of applications, metrics may assist with evaluating whether there is a sufficient number of high quality grant recipients that fit with program objectives. In evaluating the success of grant recipient's work, metrics for

measuring success will vary based on the size and nature of the grants provided, as well as the length of the grant's implementation period. Regardless of the specific nature of the grant, measures of success will likely include 1. Whether the deliverables match the objectives presented in the application and 2. Whether the project is completed on time and within budget.

4. Define principles to determine an appropriate level of overhead. Is the answer different for different mechanisms? [Charter Question 8] [See https://community.icann.org/display/CWGONGAP/Charter+Question+Templates?preview=/64084540/66072541/CCWG%20Charter%20Question%208%20-%20Template%20-%20upd%2029%20May%202017.docx for different perspectives on this topic.]

    Response drafted by staff to summarize CCWG input: The CCWG is not yet recommending principles at this time. The CCWG will revisit this issue as it narrows the list of possible mechanisms.