


Q1 Name

Answered: 14 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	Sylvia Cadena	7/13/2017 3:40 PM
2	Ching Chiao	7/13/2017 3:10 PM
3	Seun Ojedeji	7/13/2017 10:33 AM
4	Alan Greenberg	7/12/2017 11:08 PM
5	Dietmar Stefitz	7/12/2017 8:05 PM
6	Carolina Caeiro	7/12/2017 6:29 PM
7	Nadira Al-Araj	7/12/2017 2:28 PM
8	Daniel Dardailler	7/12/2017 11:27 AM
9	Tony Harris	7/7/2017 10:24 PM
10	elliott noss	7/7/2017 9:33 AM
11	Olga Cavalli	7/6/2017 11:06 PM
12	John Levine	7/6/2017 7:06 PM
13	Vanda Scartezini	7/6/2017 4:39 PM
14	Maureen Hilyard	7/6/2017 10:00 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 gns0-secs@icann.org)


Answered: 14 Skipped: 0



Answer Choices	Responses
Member	71.43% 10
Participant	28.57% 4
Total	14

Q3 Should ICANN Org oversee the solicitation of proposals, or delegate to or coordinate with another entity, including, for example, a foundation created for this purpose?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 0




Answer Choices	Responses
Yes, ICANN Org should directly oversee the solicitation of proposals.	28.57% 4
No, ICANN Org should not directly oversee the solicitation of proposals but should delegate this responsibility to another entity that is to be created (noting that indirect oversight by ICANN will likely be required to meet legal and fiduciary requirements).	21.43% 3
No, ICANN Org should not directly oversee the solicitation of proposals but should delegate/co-ordinate this responsibility to an existing entity (noting that indirect oversight by ICANN will likely be required to meet legal and fiduciary requirements).	28.57% 4
I have no strong preference for any of the options outlined above, as long as the legal and fiduciary requirements are met.	7.14% 1
None of the above. I use the comment box to outline my response to this question.	14.29% 2
Total	14

#	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	Given ICANN's core mission, it would be a big burden for ICANN to run / oversee a charitable org . Outsourcing this to reputable orgs in the world not only reduce managerial risk, but also help reach out to those who are still unfamiliar with ICANN / Internet in general. I am sure there are countless charity orgs in the world that are willing to partner with ICANN and to utilize this financial resources.	7/13/2017 3:10 PM
2	I have no strong preference as long as legal and fiduciary requirements are meet and the option used is most effective both in cost and process.	7/13/2017 10:33 AM
3	My preference would be to use an existing agency, but if that is not possible, a new entity could be considered, but even then, we need to look for possibilities to outsource instead of inventing from scratch. I worry about doing it internally. This is NOT ICANN's core business.	7/12/2017 11:08 PM

4	Just for clarification, the text reads "an existing entity." I think it should not be just one entity but several existing entities with proven track record that can re-distribute funds and oversee project execution. We may need to have a body above these pool of existing entities that coordinates articulation between them, and joint efforts. Alternatively, work committees can be created for joint activities.	7/12/2017 6:29 PM
5	* for clarity, I think that ICANN Org should instantiate a sub-entity composed of community members. this feels like something in-between the first and second options. * a separate entity should be created but it should be composed of community members (and potentially be an opportunity to add new members to the community * our community has a fantastic breadth of skills and diversity of membership. an external entity will make adherence to mission much more difficult	7/7/2017 9:33 AM
6	In any case, if another entity is to be created, it should not be a bureaucratic and expensive organization. On the contrary it should be dynamic and efficient, working in coordination with ICANN.	7/6/2017 11:06 PM
7	Creating an ICANN foundation to give away this one-time money would be a serious misuse of ICANN's time and money, not to mention way outside its mission.	7/6/2017 7:06 PM
8	ICANN shall oversee the process, however, this does not mean that ICANN can not contract third part to control the implementation phase, more operational in order to control results for each approved project, demand payments etc..	7/6/2017 4:39 PM
9	As noted, ICANN should have indirect oversight that legal and fiduciary requirements are met, however, I would prefer that another entity (although maybe not as formal as a foundation) is delegated the responsibility of the solicitation of proposals and managing the distribution of funds.	7/6/2017 10:00 AM

Q4 Should ICANN Org oversee the evaluation of proposals, or delegate to or coordinate with another entity, including, for example, a foundation created for this purpose?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 0




Answer Choices	Responses
Yes, ICANN Org should directly oversee the evaluation of proposals.	35.71% 5
No, ICANN Org should not directly oversee the evaluation of proposals but should delegate this responsibility to another entity that is to be created (noting that indirect oversight by ICANN will likely be required to meet legal and fiduciary requirements).	28.57% 4
No, ICANN Org should not directly oversee the evaluation of proposals but should delegate/co-ordinate this responsibility to an existing entity (noting that indirect oversight by ICANN will likely be required to meet legal and fiduciary requirements).	14.29% 2
I have no strong preference for any of the options outlined above, as long as the legal and fiduciary requirements are met.	7.14% 1
None of the above. I use the comment box to outline my response to this question.	14.29% 2
Total	14

#	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	However they should do this based on kind of projects proposed; by engaging relevant part of the community with required expertise or other entities outside the ICANN community.	7/13/2017 10:33 AM
2	As for #3, I prefer an existing agency so we do not bear all of the overhead costs, but if that is not practicle, we could create something.	7/12/2017 11:08 PM
3	Here again, I am assuming we will distribute funds through existing entities. The evaluation of whose entities should be picked should be conducted by a third body composed of paid experts that are active in the ICANN community.	7/12/2017 6:29 PM
4	Asking outside experts for advice is fine, creating a foundation is not. (See above.)	7/6/2017 7:06 PM

5	Though I believe the implementation/ operational part shall be done by another entity, I am totally against to create an entity to do so, since this, in my view, is a waste of money that shall be applied on projects. My personal experience with Foundation is their administrative cost is too high to this operational phase. I am in favor to have a less expensive alternative.	7/6/2017 4:39 PM
6	As above, apart from overseeing that legal and fiduciary requirements are met, I think that ICANN Org should leave the evaluation of proposals to the separate entity that is created and delegated with that responsibility	7/6/2017 10:00 AM

Q5 Sub-question: Should ICANN the community be involved in the solicitation and evaluation of proposals?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 0



Answer Choices	Responses
Yes, ICANN community volunteers should be involved in the solicitation and evaluation of proposals	64.29% 9
No, ICANN community volunteers should not be involved in the solicitation and evaluation of proposals	7.14% 1
I have no strong preference for any of the options outlined above, as long as the legal and fiduciary requirements are met.	14.29% 2
None of the above. I use the comment box to outline my response to this question.	14.29% 2
Total	14

#	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 do think that some component of community involvement would be a good thing.	7/12/2017 11:08 PM
2	I think that we should have the ICANN community participate in evaluation, but we should not bring them on board as volunteers but rather through paid positions. Thinking more generally about overall accountability and follow-up with the larger ICANN community, presentations should be held at say ICANN events to show progress made and allow for the community to provide feedback.	7/12/2017 6:29 PM
3	* we are the experts in our subject matter and we should recognize that we have a vibrant community that is an appropriate and amazing resource	7/7/2017 9:33 AM
4	Volunteers from all the SO and AC should be involved in the solicitation and evaluation process.	7/6/2017 11:06 PM
5	If we can find community people who aren't conflicted, we should use them, but I expect there's a direct correlation between how well-informed and involved people are, and how likely they're connected to a potential grantee.	7/6/2017 7:06 PM
6	The community can be involved but the issue of conflict of interest, in this case, may be critical. The basic Californian principle that defines Col is too light to really avoid conflict around the world when we will talk about \$\$\$. To allow the community to be involved other Col with stronger rules shall be implemented.	7/6/2017 4:39 PM

7	I think that representatives of ICANN's volunteer community should be involved in the solicitation and evaluation of proposals, as representatives of the interests of, and ensuring that there is equitable distribution to, global end-users in both developed and developing/underserved communities.	7/6/2017 10:00 AM
---	--	-------------------