# Other Comments - Are there any other issues the CCWG should consider and/or input you want to provide in relation to this question?

* The group should take an interest in the imbalance that currently exists between the north and the south in terms of DNS. Beyond the allocation of funds, it will be necessary to ensure that the south does not undergo reforms once again because we generally have governments that do not at all integrate digital policies into their programs and elsewhere In decision-making, very few representatives of the South can raise issues related to the domain name in Africa. The group should take into account the context and level of development of the digital tool in general in Africa
* We will need to have a flexible vetting and then verification process geared to the magnitude of the grant. I think a WIDE range of grant sizes is highly desirable thus needed scaled support processes.
* My biggest concern is that we might think in too narrow terms about ICANNs mission and that such a narrow interpretation might limit the willingness to support really fascinating DNS supporting projects. Second, we need to discuss the risk level we recommend as acceptable. Without such willingness to accept a certain risk level, more risky projects might not get supported.
* A detailed understanding of the funding landscape for Internet development (ICT4D) is important. Although the new gTLD auction proceeds are a large amount of money, there are other donors and funds supporting other areas. Therefore, the CCWG, should decide what sort of themes/issues and areas no other donors/funders will support or are paying much attention to, and are key for the future of the Internet. If investment is to be done in areas where other donors are already investing, then the group should consider allocating funds to support collaboration for field building.
* The benefits of focusing some allocation towards developing more informed end-user communities within currently under-served regions, would far outweigh the risks related to the harm that could be done not only to the internet but also to people who lack the power of essential knowledge and understanding about the impacts of their access and use of the internet.
* Premature at this stage as far as I am concerned. DIscussion on these points at the face to face meeting in Joburg might help mature my thinking.
* The narrow interpretation of ICANN's mission which has been vital in allowing ICANN to flourish should not unnecessarily constrain this exercise.
* I think we should consider that the constraints of use of the auction benefits go "by design" beyond the ICANN mission proper. These funds were put aside from the beginning for use outside of the ICANN regular budget, which is already there to cover the implementation of the mission. Instead we should take as limitation the official ICANN Commitment expressed in the ByLaws : "Preserve and enhance the administration of the DNS and the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS and the Internet;" which has a de facto extended scope with its "and the Internet".