Q1 Name

Answered: 15   Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	Sylvia Cadena	7/13/2017 3:36 PM
2	Ching Chiao	7/13/2017 3:05 PM
3	Alan Greenberg	7/12/2017 11:04 PM
4	Dietmar Stefitz	7/12/2017 8:03 PM
5	Carolina Caeiro	7/12/2017 6:24 PM
6	Nadira Al-Araj	7/12/2017 1:40 PM
7	Daniel Dardailler	7/12/2017 11:26 AM
8	Tony Harris	7/7/2017 10:21 PM
9	elliot noss	7/7/2017 9:28 AM
10	Olga Cavalli	7/6/2017 11:03 PM
11	John Levine	7/6/2017 7:02 PM
12	Wale Bakare	7/6/2017 4:49 PM
13	Vanda Scartezini	7/6/2017 4:21 PM
14	Seun Ojedeji	7/6/2017 10:10 AM
15	MAUREEN HILYARD	7/6/2017 9:47 AM

Q2 Are you a member or participant? (note, this survey is not for observer. If you want to change your status to participant, please contact gnso-secs@icann.org)

Answered: 15   Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Member	**80.00%**	12
Participant	**20.00%**	3
Total		**15**

Q3 What aspects should be considered to define a timeframe, if any, for the funds allocation mechanism to operate?

Answered: 15   Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
This is a one-off exercise - after disbursement of funds, the mechanism should cease to exist (recognizing that disbursement may take a considerable amount of time)	**46.67%**	7
Noting the size of the funds, it should be possible through investment of funds and potential new sources of revenue to create a long lasting mechanism.	**46.67%**	7
I have no strong preference for any of the options outlined above, as long as the legal and fiduciary requirements are met.	**0.00%**	0
None of the above. I use the comment box to outline my response to this question.	**6.67%**	1
Total		**15**

#	Comment box (in addition to providing an alternative response, you may also use this comment box to expand on one of the other responses)	Date
1	As long as there's ICANN-hosted auction, this CCWG-AP mechanism can be utilized. This initial work (that we are doing right now) involves more in setting up the mechanism itself. For possible future proceeds received, the established mechanism should be used so no duplicated works needed. The "mechanism" itself should be within ICANN. The outcome / result of the mechanism maybe within or outside of ICANN depending on the Board's decision. Either case a long-lasting mechanism is needed. If the community decided the one-off solution, it could be a long-lasting one-off period (i.e. 5 ~ 10 years) .	7/13/2017 3:05 PM
2	Although this is a one-of exercise, it may well be possible that other funds matierialize and ICANN may, after due deliberation, decide to use the same process for these new funds.	7/12/2017 11:04 PM
3	I think we should look at this distribution of funds as a one-time exercise. As other colleagues have highlighted, this will be lengthy process. I think Marc Gauw's calculations of how long it would take to give away the funding was interesting attempt to estimate how long it could take -- he indicated we would be looking at roughly 5 years--. Nonetheless, I think that investing the funds (assuming we will give it out in tranches) is a must; beyond distributing the funding we must ensure we make an efficient use of the resources available. Investing may extend the life of the mechanism established a little, but we would still be looking at a one-time-exercise.	7/12/2017 6:24 PM

4	The disbursement of fund could run into cycles based on an average life cycle of large / medium scale size projects. The timeframe of the whole Auction proceed will be based on a forecast to the depletion of the fund.	7/12/2017 1:40 PM
5	* there will not be a similar outcome from subsequent new gTLD rounds, if any * the one-off nature of the exercise allows for more flexibility in relation to mission	7/7/2017 9:28 AM
6	ICANN needs to give away this money and then pay attention to its real job. The last thing it needs is to mission creep its way into becoming a foundation.	7/6/2017 7:02 PM
7	Certain part of the funds can be invested to generate more funds so as to enable more projects to be served and to make the program a continuous initiative. However if this will affect the status of ICANN as a not-for-profit then I'd say it's not worth it.	7/6/2017 10:10 AM
8	I would like to retain the original intent that this is a one-off exercise and that the mechanism should cease once the funds are depleted. If there is a decision to invest funds in order to create a long-lasting mechanism, much of the funds will be used up in long term administration and will diminish the funds that could be used for "doing good things" within the context of the ICANN mission.	7/6/2017 9:47 AM

Q4 What aspects should be considered to define a timeframe, if any, for the disbursements of funds? E.g. The timeframe for the operation of this new mechanism may provide the opportunity for long term support.

Answered: 15   Skipped: 0

Answer Choices		Responses	
The focus of the disbursements of funds should be on supporting long term projects.		6.67%	1
The focus of the disbursements of funds should be on supporting short term projects		13.33%	2
The focus of the disbursements of funds should not give any specific preference to the duration of the projects		53.33%	8
I have no strong preference for any of the options outlined above, as long as the legal and fiduciary requirements are met.		20.00%	3
None of the above. I use the comment box to outline my response to this question.		6.67%	1
Total			**15**

#	Comment box (in addition to providing an alternative response, you may also use this comment box to expand on one of the other responses)	Date
1	I believe there should be a combination of both long-term and short-term projects.	7/12/2017 11:04 PM
2	Here I am assuming we will distribute funds through existing entities. I think that to see seizable contributions and long term impact we should support long-term projects, that is to say, these existing entities should have strategic plans that seek to generate medium to long term changes. These entities may support shorter-term projects that as a whole contribute to a larger objective. Hope this makes sense!	7/12/2017 6:24 PM
3	The disbursements of fund shout accommodate different size of funds particularly the global nature of beneficiaries. Example: same project might cost different based if applicant from LDC or developed countries.	7/12/2017 1:40 PM
4	* LT projects are a good idea BUT the support received should be in the nature of building a platform for a LT project rather than ongoing support	7/7/2017 9:28 AM

5	Long term projects are OK so long as the terms of the grants are set up front, and ICANN doesn't have to go back and renegotiate.	7/6/2017 7:02 PM
6	focus shall be on projects quality and adherence to ICANN's mission, size and duration is secondary even if we can put some limit shall not be mandatory	7/6/2017 4:21 PM
7	I selected the closest but I will have loved to select both short and long term. I think the focus should encourage both projects. However a minimum time frame should still be defined; a short time frame can be minimum of 3 months with maximum (long time frame) up to 3 years	7/6/2017 10:10 AM
8	Disbursement of funds should be allocated on the merits of the project regardless of duration, but keeping to the criteria that are set for the allocation of funds.	7/6/2017 9:47 AM

Q5 What aspects should be considered to define a timeframe, if any, for the disbursements of funds? E.g. for funding to be released in tranches linked to milestone achievements, single or multiple disbursements.

Answered: 15   Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Funding should preferably be released in tranches linked to milestone achievements	**53.33%**	8
Funding should preferably be released in a single disbursement	**20.00%**	3
I have no strong preference for any of the options outlined above, as long as the legal and fiduciary requirements are met.	**13.33%**	2
None of the above. I use the comment box to outline my response to this question.	**13.33%**	2
Total		**15**

#	Comment box (in addition to providing an alternative response, you may also use this comment box to expand on one of the other responses)	Date
1	It will have to be a combination of the first two. major (ie large $) projects over multiple years will need to be done in tranches, but that will not make any sense for smaller projects.	7/12/2017 11:04 PM
2	Single disbursements are a lot easier. If there are projects that cannot possibly be done in a single tranche, look for an organization with expertise in the field to hold and disburse the money, rather than trying to invent our own.	7/6/2017 7:02 PM
3	this is key point in my view to facilitate the cash flow and the and the control of project evolution; also, define a clear commitment with the results.	7/6/2017 4:21 PM
4	It is always prudent not to release all funds for a project at a go. Certain milestone should trigger release of more funds. However the milestones trigger should not be too much hence it may be time consuming to follow-up with. I will suggest just 2 milestone for short timeframe projects and up to 5 milestone for longer timeframe projects.	7/6/2017 10:10 AM
5	I would prefer that single disbursements be released for short term projects (less than a year or two); long term projects (over several years) should be released according to milestone achievements .	7/6/2017 9:47 AM