|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Charter Question #3** | What safeguards are to be put in place to ensure that the creation of the framework, as well as its execution and operation, respect the legal and fiduciary constraints that have been outlined in this memo? |
| **Initial Responses (summary – for full responses, see** [**here**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QN7zarCr2c-2BVv3pfa6Z5O10pDcgHSIQ5Q3CBdX2WE/edit)**)** | * Start by studying those safeguards in the context of the granting agency being implemented within ICANN. * At a minimum independent audit(s) * Safeguards depend of the legal mechanism(s) chosen for the establishment of the partnerships proposed to be explored under question 1 * Metrics to follow the results proposed by each project should be included * Easiest safeguards would be to make use of existing non-profit/charity organizations, preferably tax-exempt, that have a proven track-record already with respect to their legal and fiduciary behavior. Moreover, if the number of selected organizations is significant and well spread around the world, the risk of illegal or non-fiduciary behavior would probably balance out. |
| **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 a 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** | Based on Q1 and Q3, what is the “iterative process” like?  What would be the “expert advise” (those who know non-profit rules in California working with those who’s familiar with ICANN processes) to identify a proper mechanism that can reduce numbers of iterations. |
| **(External) Expertise required?** | Legal and fiduciary (see <https://community.icann.org/x/CbDRAw>) |