Criteria	Mechanism #1 - new ICANN proceeds Allocation Department within ICANN	Mechanism #2: A new ICANN Proceeds Allication Department is created as part of ICANN Org which would work in collaboration with an existing charitable organization(s)	Mechanism #3: A new structure would be created e.g. ICANN Foundation	Mechanism #4: An established entity/entities (e.g. foundation or fund) are used
Efficiency & Effectiveness	2.64	3.07	2.22	2.44
Cost-efficency	2.73	3.13	1.89	2.56
Least expensive	2.87	2.81	1.89	2.73
Easiest to sunset	3	2.85	1.79	2.86
Easiest to set up	3.07	2.79	1.6	2.93
Best equipped to meet legal and fiduciary requirements	3.27	2.62	2.36	2.23
Best enable ICANN stakeholder engagement	3	2.47	2.93	1.93
Most efficient means for fund allocation	2.89	2.93	2.19	2.53
Least administratively complex	2.87	2.38	2	3
Best means for oversight	3.08	2.79	2.67	1.93
Most transparent and accountable	2.83	2.5	2.5	2.57
Best equipped to operate and execute globally distributed projects	2.14	3	2.44	2.87
Best balance of control between ICANN and independence of fund allocation	2.2	2.73	2.56	2.69
Total Score	**36.59**	**36.07**	**29.04**	**33.27**

Criteria that should be weighted differently

Role of community members
Least expensive to run
Meeting legal and fiduciary requirements
Best equipped to operate and execute globally distributed projects
Most transparency and accountability
Best balance of control between ICANN and independence of fund allocation

Other criteria that should be ranked for

Multistakeholder must be take into account more than just with a question.
ability to identify and work with opportunities closest to supporting the mission and the Open Internet
placing the mechanism within ICANN will result in many community members assuming
that they have "rights" to oversee the new mechanism, or that they can unofficially lobby
the staff or the Board
Ethical aspects
Effectiveness of fund allocation and project selection in service of ICANN's stated goals for Auction proceeds
How long the overall process will take.

Response rate

11 Members (out of 28)	39%
8 Participants (out of 46)	17%