Please list what should not be the objective(s) / criteria for fund allocation, factoring in ICANN's mission and legal fiduciary constraints.

Funds should not be allocated to projects that would be normally be funded by ICANN as part of its obligations under ICANN's mission

- The objective should not be to fund projects that directly fulfill ICANN's mission, which is the role of ICANN itself.

- Funding should not be used for classic ICANN Operational funding (except through the reserve in limited circumstances),I think that we need to be as flexible as possible in matching projects to ICANN's mission.

- I would exclude everything that the DNS market or ICANN can solve and finance

Funds should not be allocated to projects that do not focus on the DNS

- Funds should not be allocated to projects that do not have a technical focus around Internet development. Although there are many worthy ideas, the funds should focus on the issues that are key to the Internet's infrastructure that other donors, development banks or governments might find impossible or extremely difficult to fund/support. Many donors work to support Internet for development initiatives, but very few have an understanding of the technical aspects around Internet infrastructure and operations. Funds should not go towards: - Commercial software/hardware development - Proprietary research and technology - Activities already funded as part of the ICANN budget

- The distinction should be between projects that serve the Internet (as with the one above) as opposed to use the Internet (online education, helping a not-for-profit expand their online presence).

- Proposals that promote the development of non-DNS related content

- Allocating ICANN funds to traditional hedge funds, fund of funds or venture funds for the pure purpose of revenue maximization at the expense of exploiting the poor and vulnerable or to maintain existing exclusionary cultures in profit maximizing entities: eg discrimination based on gender, race, religion or sexual orientation

Funds should not be allocated to projects that will not have an impact

- Potential impact needs to be assessed as the top criteria. Can the project achieve its goals? with this in mind, outreach to underserved or under-resourced is a fine goal, but if there is no likelihood that the project will result in a change, or will only serve to favor one dominant actor or stakeholder group, it should not be funded.

Funds should not be allocated to government applicants

- I think applications for funding from governments should not be included.

Funds should not be limited to short term projects

- It should not be based on the level of devolution to provide the funds, because if that were done, we would certainly exclude those in the south from the benefit of those funds. ICANN should not negotiate directly with the States and entrust the funds to them, since the more independent structures dealing with technical issues now think about the follow-up and the completion of projects, unlike the public, which may involve several coordinators Record time on the same project.

Funds should not be allocated to physical telecommunications infrastructure

- * not physical telecommunication infrastructure - although this is a real issue for developing countries

[Note - not sure if this response belongs under previous question?] 1) technical - be a research center recognized by authorities in their countries; to have any international reference; have members participating regularly in ICANN policy work focusing on technical issues; have a list of proved development regarding ICT field and commit spreading the knowledge once offering dedicated courses to the interested technical community. 2) not for profit organization providing capacity building to improve fingers to touch communities in developing areas to explain advantages and how to access. Demonstrate focus and knowledge in the DNS industry, be recognized by its government, demonstrate transparency of its activities and compliance with ICANN's own values.