**Topics for which briefings should be foreseen at the outset of deliberations**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **By whom** | **Notes** |
| Legal and fiduciary constraints | Samantha Eisner, Deputy General Counsel, ICANN |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**List of prospective individuals / organizations that could provide input and expertise at the outset of the CCWG deliberations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name Organisation & Contact** | **Description** | **Notes** | **Suggested by** |
| **Arabella Advisors** / Gwen Walden, Senior Managing Director | Arabella Advisors was founded in 2005 to provide strategic guidance for effective philanthropy. Since then, we’ve evolved into a mission-driven, [Certified B Corporation](https://www.bcorporation.net/) that has helped hundreds of clients representing more than $100 billion in assets increase their philanthropic impact. (see <https://www.arabellaadvisors.com> for further details) |  | ICANN Staff |
| **Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors** / Nick Hodges  Chief Operating Officer | Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors has helped major private foundations, public sector agencies and nonprofit institutions design, implement and monitor high impact, large-scale grant initiatives. Institutions that are launching a new grant program or implementing temporary programs find these services particularly useful, because partnering with us is an  expedient and effective way to quickly gain both content and process expertise prior to  committing long-term institutional resources. Others find it useful when trying to gain deeper access into community-based organizations and issues, when expanding geographical  reach, or when requiring cultural competency for minority or international constituencies. (see <http://www.rockpa.org>) |  | ICANN Staff |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Comments / input from CCWG members & participants**

Comment from Nasrat Khalid: The few models that is in work for disbursement of funds in the development sector that could be looked at could be for instance, the donor model where the acting organisation only puts and follows procedures for their clients (which in this case would actually be the beneficiary too) in order to disburse... or, another model could be that of building a trust fund that has a very minimal operational cost which can drive different projects concurrent to each other. The trust fund also could tackle the doubt with the ratio of auctions that may or may not happen in the future as it could provide a controlled flow of disbursement.

Comment from Mathieu Weill: Within our community, organizations such as ISOC, W3C, but also a number of ccTLDs have set up internal processes or sometimes Trust or Foundations to allocate funds. That is the case for my organization, Afnic. Many have been interviewed before this group even started, but they should certainly be part of our “list”.

Comment from Sylvia Cadena: I would like to ask if it is possible to get assistance a list of the existing financial mechanisms in the US that will not jeopardize ICANN tax status, which is one of the important aspects of the charter that we need to work around. As there are different mechanisms in every country, and not all the people in this group might be familiar with those, then it is important that we have some input about what is available that might be a good fit, to start a conversation with some solid basis. All mechanisms will have pros and cons and it will be good to be able to make an informed recommendation to the board.