

Subject: Survey results
Date: 11 May 2018
From: Erika Mann
To: Maarten Botterman, Becky Burr

Dear Maarten, dear Becky –

I believe you're having a Board discussion over the weekend about the current status of the CCWG AP discussions and about decisions that have to be taken soon. The following link <https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-DFSFDH79L/> shows the outcome of our recent survey concerning the four mechanism. As you can see from the survey, members/participants that participated in the survey currently favor either an ICANN in-house model or a joint mechanism, ICANN with another entity - having said this, the outcome only indicates a trend and shouldn't be seen - at this stage - as indicating more.

The CCWG AP leadership team is very interested in receiving your opinion about the most ideal mechanism and about other topics, please see below. We would appreciate it if you could give us an indication about the Boards thinking - if possible - already at our next call on Thursday, May 15th. We fully understand if this is not possible.

Topics that may need your input:

- During our discussion on Thursday, May 9th, it became clear that we may need to decide on two scenarios on how to build consensus ahead of the recommendations we have to prepare for the public comment period very soon.
 - We could either decide to recommend only two mechanism as the by the CCWG AP most favored mechanism for the public comment,
 - or, we could keep all four mechanism on the table and wait until after the public comment period to receive more clarity about how the broader public will comment on these four mechanism.
- The discussion on Thursday, May 9th, showed as well, that the currently least favored model, an ICANN foundation, might be seen in a less favorable light because members/participants are worried about the money involved in creating a new entity and are worried about creating an entity that has to be executed after the auctions proceeds are 'dispersed'. Foundation models are quite flexible - based on the legal environment -and can be adjusted to different circumstances relatively easily. For example, an ICANN foundation could profit from ICANN resources (finance, HR department, re-allocation of people) and can be either out-phased one day or its purpose can change - if in the future one would want to keep a foundation alive. I've created three relatively big foundations(they're all still alive) and I've seen many models evolving over the years where a cooperation model between a firm and a foundation works quite well. The beauty about a foundation is that one can use company resources but can keep valuable independence as well. It may sound as I'm favoring this model but I'm only explaining the case because I believe we may need to explain the

advantages/disadvantages of this particular mechanism better. I'm neutral and I believe that all four mechanism can work.

- Lastly, we discussed as well whether we should ask a professional advisor to review these four models and to give us an indication how much the setup of these mechanism would cost, how long it would take to be up and running, how many people would have to be hired, ideal location of entity and defining the sunseting phase (relevant in particular if we would favor an ICANN in-house model because, depending on labor laws, ICANN may have to keep personal that will have to be hired).

The leadership team recommended to have a more informed debate about these topics after members/participants will have another chance to do the survey. Deadline is next week Wednesday, May 15th, for the survey and our next CCWG AP call is on May 16th.

To facilitate review and discussion, Marika created the attached snapshot overview.

Warmest regards,
Erika

Erika Mann
Co-chair CCWG Auction Proceeds

Criteria	Mechanism #1 - new ICANN proceeds Allocation Department within ICANN	Mechanism #2: A new ICANN Proceeds Allocation 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-efficiency	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%