

Financial Contributions of ccTLDs to ICANN

Report of the 2nd Financial Working
Group to the ccNSO Council

15 August 2025

Index

0. Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Review of Cost Model	6
3. Fact Finding and Consultations	9
A. Fact finding	9
a. Contributions over time	10
b. Contributions per region	11
c. Contributions per governance structure	13
d. Membership, non-membership	14
e. ccTLDs with agreements with ICANN	15
B. Consultations & Survey Highlights	16
a. Outcome ICANN82 Consultation	16
b. Summary of Survey Results	20
c. Outcome ICANN83 Consultation	27
C. Outcome July 2025 Webinar & Consultation	29
4. Review of Contribution Model	30
Principles	30
Banded Model	32
Contribution Model	33
Annexes	34
A. Proposed Financial Contribution Parameters	34
B. Survey results	37
C. Suggestions to Increase Contributions	39
D. Comparison 2013 and 2025 Contribution Model	42
Contribution Model from 2013	42
Contribution Model from 2025	42
Side by side comparison 2013 & 2025 Models	43
E. Summary Report Comments on 2nd Finance Working Group Final Draft Report	44
F. Documentation / References	45

0. Executive Summary

In December 2024, the ccNSO Council established a second Finance Working Group and tasked it with the following responsibilities:

- Review the 2013 value exchange model and related monetary model underpinning the current (2013) expected financial contribution to ICANN;
- Explore the discrepancy between the aggregate level of financial contributions by the ccTLDs and the total amount the ccTLD community considered to be reasonable to contribute to ICANN in 2013
- Explore and suggest ways to address the discrepancy between total contributed amount and expected amount.

The working group reviewed the value exchange model and financial underpinning (cost model). Based on the review, the cost model (formerly the “monetary model”) has been updated and the total expected contribution amount is USD \$ **3.6 million** (under the 2013 Guideline and first review it was: USD \$ 3.5 million¹)

To explore the discrepancy between the level of aggregate actual contributions and the level of contributions that is considered reasonable, the WG undertook an analysis of the evolution of the financial contributions of ccTLDs over time. First by reviewing available data and fact-finding, and secondly by consulting ccTLDs during a) ICANN82 in Seattle and ICANN83 in Prague, and b) a survey launched in May 2025. The major conclusion of the analysis is that, under the main principle of the voluntary nature of the financial contributions, a change in models will not make a substantial difference in closing the discrepancy in the levels of contribution. Based on the consultations the WG believes that a more segmented and personalized approach by ICANN to the ccTLDs could make that difference. In the view of the WG this approach should be based on the diverse characteristics of ccTLDs (such as size, operating environment, governance model, and budgeting cycles) and should emphasize both the value exchange between each ccTLD and ICANN and the core values, such as the IANA Naming Function services, that are important to ccTLDs.

Finally, based on the review of the cost model, the results of the fact finding, and the consultations, the WG reviewed both the principles and the band model of the current (2013) contribution guideline. The WG believes there is no need for substantive changes, however a refinement of both the principles and the contribution model is proposed. The principles have been updated and now include the call for ICANN to adopt a more segmented and personalized approach. With respect to the banded model, the WG believes the model should continue to be related to the number of domains under management and the lowest and highest (contribution) bands should remain the same (USD 500 to USD 225.000). However the WG proposes three (3) more bands in the lower end.

¹ <https://archive.icann.org/meetings/buenosaires2013/en/schedule/sun-finance/presentation-finance-final-17nov13-en.pdf>

1. Introduction

At its meeting in Istanbul (ICANN81), in November 2024, the ccNSO Council noted:

1. The [ccNSO Financial Guideline](#)², which was adopted in November 2013, needs to be reviewed at a minimum every 5 years. The first review was undertaken in November 2018, resulting in an improvement of the invoicing process.
2. The core principles of the Guideline as developed by the [former Finance WG](#)³, the underlying [value exchange model and related monetary model](#)⁴, and the discrepancy between the aggregate level of financial contributions by the ccTLDs and the total amount the ccTLD community considered to be reasonable to contribute in 2013 and in 2018.
3. The second review should be conducted by a working group in close collaboration and assisted by ICANN Finance, in line with the manner in which the former Finance WG operated.
4. This new group should inform and consult the ccTLD community at the ICANN meeting in Seattle (ICANN82) and make recommendations to the community and Council by ICANN83 in Prague.

To make this possible the following activities were suggested:

- The second finance working group should focus on reviewing the current value exchange model and related monetary model underpinning the current financial contribution guideline with the assumption that it will be confirmed. However, if deemed necessary because of important shortcoming(s) in the current model, the group should explore and suggest possible alternative models.
- Explore, review and propose various financial contributions models, including the current banded contribution model, to be considered by the community and Council.
- Explore and suggest ways to address the gap between the total actual contributions and the level considered reasonable, while maintaining the voluntary nature of those contributions.

In this report the second finance working group presents the results of its work. As requested the working group reviewed the value exchange model and financial underpinning (cost model). The results of this review are represented in section 2.

To explore whether other contribution models or an update of the current contribution would address the discrepancy between level of aggregate actual contributions and level of

² https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_42805/guidelines-ccTld-contributions-27nov13-en.pdf

³ <https://ccnso.icann.org/en/workinggroups/finance-wg.htm>

⁴ <https://archive.icann.org/meetings/buenosaires2013/en/schedule/sun-finance/presentation-finance-final-17nov13-en.pdf>

contributions that is considered reasonable, the WG undertook an analysis of the evolution of the financial contributions of ccTLDs over time, consulted ccTLDs during ICANN82 in Seattle, at ICANN83 in Prague at ICANN83 in Prague and through a survey. The results of this analysis are presented in section 3.

Finally, based on the results of the analysis, and the cost model, the WG reviewed the current contribution guideline, both the principles and the band model. The results are presented in section 4.

Based on this review, and taking into account the results of the analysis, the WG believes that under the basic principle that ccTLD contributions to ICANN are voluntary, a refinement of the contribution model may help close the gap between expected financial contributions and actual contributions. However, the WG also believes that additional actions are needed. The core of these suggested actions is a segmented outreach and engagement approach, based on the different characteristics of ccTLDs (size, operating environment, governance model, budgeting cycles, etc.), included in Annex C.

2. Review of Cost Model

In this section an overview is provided of the review of the value exchange between the ccTLDs and ICANN and the Costing model that was developed in 2013 underpinning the exchange model. The WG believes this is still a valid approach and the most appropriate way to assess the total financial contribution of ccTLDs.

Next, the financial impact of the costing model was evaluated by the Finance WG. The result of the evaluation are described below and reflect the most current information available to the WG⁵. Accordingly, the WG is of the view that the total expected contribution from the ccTLD community to ICANN is reasonable and reflects the roles of ICANN and ccTLDs.

Although the monetary figures reviewed from 2013 appear to remain at similar levels in the current analysis, this consistency does not reflect a lack of price changes over time. Rather, the apparent stability results from a revision of the model, which has been refined and tailored to include only the elements deemed specific for ccTLDs. Additionally, changes in the broader ecosystem have contributed to a redistribution of shared costs, further influencing the resulting figures. As a result, the revised model excludes certain components that were previously factored in and reflects a more accurate representation of the updated context and cost allocation.

#	Value Categories	Amount (in USD millions)	Notes
1	Specific Costs	\$ 1.1	Policy development and Secretariat Support Team, ccNSO Travel support.
2	Shared Costs	\$ 3.1	Activities and categories of costs that benefit ccTLDs and others in the ecosystem, directly benefiting from these activities.
3	Shared Costs (ccTLD Host In-Kind service)	(\$ 0.6)	An offset or reduction in the cost model as these services are a benefit to ICANN.
4	Global Costs	Considered mutually equivalent	ccTLDs strengthen ICANN's legitimacy, ICANN provides ccTLDs access to a global platform.
Total		\$ 3.6	

1. Specific Costs- \$1.1M

Specific costs directly relate to and support the ccTLDs . These costs include:

1. Policy Development Support Team
2. Secretariat Support Team

⁵ ICANN's FY 26 budget and cost estimates local hosts over the most recent ICANN meetings

3. ccNSO Travel Support (17 out of 219 slots of community travel to public meetings)
4. Overheads (15%, based on FY25 Budget). ICANN org services that support all programs but which are not directly attributable to a program or project. These services provide the infrastructure and support that any organization would need to run a company/business.

2. Shared Costs- \$3.1M

Shared costs represent activities and categories of costs that benefit ccTLDs and others in the ecosystem, directly benefiting from these activities. In the ccTLD Shared Cost Model, a portion of these costs are captured as the ccTLD Community are not the only entities benefiting from these activities.

1. Governance \$660K

- a. Includes Board support, NomCom, Ombudsman.
- b. These costs are projected to be \$5.3M in FY26.
- c. In the ccTLD Shared Cost Model, 12% of these costs are calculated to be related to as benefiting the ccNSO. The 12% is derived by calculating the number of voting Board members selected by the ccNSO (2) as a percentage of total Board members (16).

2. ICANN Meetings \$870K ([Link to ICANN Budget](#))⁶

- a. Includes venue, ICANN staff and Board traveling, external logistics/support, scribing. Excludes ICANN staff costs and also excludes “ccNSO travel support” included in section 1.
- b. These costs are projected to be \$13.6M in FY26.
- c. In the ccTLD Shared Cost Model, 6% of these costs are calculated as benefiting the ccTLD community. The 6% is derived by calculating the average ccNSO attendance at an ICANN meeting (125) as a percentage of total attendees (1,960).

3. IANA Naming Function \$1,155K

- a. IANA Naming Function ([Link to IANA budget](#))⁷. These costs are projected to be \$5.4M in FY26. The IANA budget consists of costs pertaining to the Names (~60%), Numbers (~15%), and Protocol Parameters (~25%). For the purposes of this exercise only the Naming Function costs have been used included in the ccTLD shared cost model
- b. In the ccTLD Shared Cost Model, 21% of the total IANA Naming Function costs are calculated as benefiting the ccNSO. The 21% is derived by calculating the number of ccTLDs (309) as a percentage of total TLDs (1,445).

⁶ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/adopted-icann-budget-fy2026-published-2025-en.pdf>

⁷ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/adopted-iana-op-plan-budget-fy2026-published-2025-en.pdf>

4. IDN \$420K ([Link to ICANN Operating Plan](#))⁸ (Functional Activity of Operating Plan contains information pertaining to ICANN's efforts on IDNs)

- a. Includes ICANN staff time and third-party IDN researchers and panelists.
- b. These costs are projected to be \$1.0M in FY26.
- c. In the ccTLD Shared Cost Model, 40% of these costs are calculated as benefiting the ccNSO. The 40% is derived by calculating the number of ccIDNs (61) as a percentage of total IDNs (151).

3. Shared Costs, ccTLD Host In-Kind Service Costs- (\$0.6M)

ccTLD Host In-Kind Service costs are an offset or reduction in the cost model as these services are a benefit to ICANN. These costs have been estimated based on feedback from members in the ccNSO. These costs vary by meeting and level of effort/support from the host country. This

is a challenging cost to estimate due to the difference by meeting. Further discussion with the ccNSO is needed on this topic. The suggestion is that we reach an understanding to approximate this cost as it is very dependent on circumstances which change by location and event.

4. Global Costs- Not Measured

Global costs are considered mutually equivalent. Global costs include items such as ICANN providing ccTLDs access to a global platform to conduct work while ccTLDs strengthen ICANN's legitimacy in the multistakeholder model.

⁸ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/adopted-icann-op-financial-plan-fy2026-2030-op-plan-fy2026-published-2025-en.pdf>

3. Fact Finding and Consultations

The WG was tasked to explore the discrepancy between the aggregate level of financial contributions by the ccTLDs and the total amount the ccTLD community considered to be reasonable to contribute to ICANN in 2013. To better understand how the ccTLD contributions to ICANN evolved since the 2013 ccNSO Guideline became effective, the WG initially undertook an preliminary analysis of contributions related to the diversity of the ccTLD community (sub-section A. Fact Finding below). In addition, the WG consulted the community during ICANN82 and ICANN83, and conducted a survey. The results of these consultations and the survey are included in sub-section B below. Finally, the WG asked the ccTLD community to provide feed-back and comments on its draft Final Report. The results of this public consultation are provided in sub- section C.

A. Fact finding

To gain a better understanding on how the ccTLD contributions to ICANN evolved since the 2013 ccNSO Guideline became effective, the WG analyzed the contributions related to the diversity of the ccTLD community. Specifically the WG looked at contributions:

- Over time as ccTLD community
- Per ICANN region
- Per (governance) category
- Per ccNSO Membership vs non - membership
- Per Agreement and Non-agreement

The WG believed that a focus on diversity was needed, to better understand whether the financial contributions of ccTLDs to ICANN reflected the diversity of the ccTLD community, irrespective of their size.

Based on this analysis, the WG found that a one-size-fits-all approach should not be recommended.


a. Contributions over time

Graph 1 below presents data on both the number of ccTLDs who contributed and the total amount collected during Fiscal Years 2016 through 2024. It is important to note that the composition of contributors was not consistent across the years; different ccTLDs participated in different fiscal periods.

In 2013, the ccTLD community expressed its support for the Cost Model, including both the total target amount of financial contributions (\$ 3.58 million) and the voluntary, banded structure for determining individual contributions. However, since that time, the community has not consistently met this financial commitment.

Graph 1 contributions over time

Contributions & #ccTLDs



b. Contributions per region

The graph 2.1 below illustrates the number of ccTLDs delegated in the IANA database by ICANN region, alongside the number of ccTLDs who made contributions - whether regularly or irregularly - during Fiscal Years 2016 through 2024.

There are 309 ccTLDs delegated in the IANA database, including IDN ccTLDs. 138 ccTLDs have contributed over time, equivalent to 44.7% of ccTLDs


Percentage of contributing ccTLDs over time:

- AF: 30%
- AP: 34.5%
- EU: 58.4%
- LAC: 61.8%
- NA: 85.7%


Graph 2.2 illustrates the number of IDN ccTLDs delegated in the IANA database by ICANN region. Note that the ICANN Bylaws Amendments in 2022 enabled IDN ccTLDs to become ccNSO members.

From 61 IDN ccTLDs delegated, 10 IDN ccTLDs have contributed over time, equivalent to 16.4% of IDN ccTLDs.

Graph 2.1 - Regional variance



Graph 2.2 - Regional variance IDN ccTLDs



c. Contributions per governance structure

Based on a high-level classification of governance structure of ccTLD Managers, the WG identified the following categories:


- Academia (public or private)
- Government/Regulator related
- Entity Contracted by Government
- Private (includes for profit, not for profit like foundations, other)

Graph 3 displays the total number of entities within each category, along with the number of entities that made contributions - whether on a regular or irregular basis - during Fiscal Years 2016 through 2024.

Percentage of contributing entities over time:

- Academia: 52.2%
- Government/Regulator: 34.7%
- Entity Contracted by Government: 66.7%
- Private: 47.4%

Graph 3 - Variance per governance structure




d. Membership, non-membership

Graph 4 illustrates the number of ccTLDs members and non-members of the ccNSO, alongside the number of ccTLDs who made contributions - whether regularly or irregularly - during Fiscal Years 2016 through 2024.

Percentage of contributing ccTLDs through time:

- ccNSO Members: 62.6%
- Non-members: 20.0%

Graph 4 - contributions ccNSO membership




e. ccTLDs with agreements with ICANN

Graph 5 illustrates the number of ccTLDs with agreements with ICANN, alongside the number of those ccTLDs with agreements who made contributions - whether regularly or irregularly - during Fiscal Years 2016 through 2024.

74.5% of ccTLDs with agreements contributed through time.

Graph 5 - ccTLD with agreements



B. Consultations & Survey Highlights

To gain a better understanding of the motivations of ccTLD Managers whether to contribute and the variance of their contribution over time, the WG consulted ccTLDs present in Seattle (ICANN82) and taking into account the results of this consultation, conducted a survey.


The WG is very aware that neither the outcome of the consultation, nor the results of the survey, are representative of the whole ccTLD community. For one, the number of non-contributors were underrepresented. However the WG does believe that the ICANN82 consultation and survey provided insights into the motivations of ccTLDs to voluntarily financially contribute to ICANN.

a. Outcome ICANN82 Consultation


The ICANN82 consultation was part of the Finance WG session in Seattle. The goal of the session was to inform the community on progress and seek initial feedback from the community present.

The consultation was conducted through a series of questions (open and structured), and a conversation about the outcome of the questions to gain better insight into the contribution behaviour of ccTLDs.

Graph 6 - Has your ccTLD made financial contributions to ICANN?



Graph 7 - Do you believe the shared cost financial model is still reasonable?



What are we missing - other reasons for your financial contributions?

Respondents highlighted a broad range of motivations for contributing financially to ICANN. Key themes included:

- **Support for ICANN's Mission and Values:** Many contributors expressed alignment with ICANN's mission, particularly in defending and promoting the multistakeholder model of Internet governance.
- **Shared Responsibility and Fairness:** Several emphasized a sense of responsibility to pay a fair share for services received and to contribute toward the sustainability of the ICANN ecosystem.
- **Community Engagement and Knowledge Exchange:** Contributions are seen as a way to support community-building, attend networking events, and exchange experiences among ccTLDs.
- **Capacity Building:** Support for initiatives benefiting smaller or developing ccTLDs was noted as a key driver.
- **Operational and Strategic Importance:** Some cited the importance of ICANN's role in DNS security, global interconnection, and providing a platform to stay informed about alternative TLDs.
- **Structural Suggestions:** One respondent proposed differentiated fee bands, including an option focused solely on the IANA contribution.

A minority of responses expressed skepticism or opposition, questioning the value of contributing or viewing the process as unproductive.


Why has your ccTLD changed its contribution over time?

Respondents cited a range of reasons for increasing, decreasing, or maintaining their contributions to ICANN, reflecting both positive engagement and areas of concern:

- **Increases Tied to Growth and Guideline Alignment:** Several ccTLDs reported increased contributions due to growth in domain registrations, which led them to move up a contribution band. Others noted increases as part of a general commitment to following ICANN's voluntary contribution guidelines and supporting the IANA functions.
- **Recognition of Value and Responsibility:** Some contributors cited a sense of fairness, responsibility, and long-term sustainability, aligning their contributions with the value of services received and the broader ICANN ecosystem.
- **Decreases Due to Internal and External Factors:** Other ccTLDs reported reductions in contributions. Reasons included organizational restructuring, limited resources, and inconsistent invoicing. A few noted that they decreased contributions due to dissatisfaction with ICANN's actions or behavior, particularly where there was a perceived lack of transparency or trust.
- **Evolving Trust and Reassessment:** Some respondents described a gradual increase in support as trust in ICANN improved over time, while others indicated their contributions would be reassessed annually, suggesting a cautious or conditional approach.
- **Neutral or Unclear:** A few respondents were unsure of the reasons for changes in contribution levels or cited changes without elaboration.

Overall, the data reflects a diversity of experiences and motivations, underscoring the importance of transparency, responsiveness, and continued dialogue between ICANN and the ccTLD community.

Graph 9 - Do you think the banded model is still fair?



What would you change about the contribution model?

Respondents offered varied perspectives on potential changes to the ICANN ccTLD contribution model, with suggestions ranging from structural adjustments to maintaining the status quo:


- **Support for Refinement and Fairness:** Several respondents proposed improvements to enhance fairness and proportionality, such as replacing bands with a per-registration model, introducing more bands, or implementing a sliding scale based on registration volume. A few suggested refining the band structure to achieve a more logical graduation between tiers.
- **Alternative Approaches:** Some contributors advocated for exploring multi-year commitments to improve financial stability, or evaluating whether a per-registration model based on upper band limits would generate more equitable and sufficient funding.
- **Critical Views:** A minority questioned the effectiveness of the voluntary model itself, noting persistent shortfalls and limited participation by the broader ccTLD community. One respondent suggested eliminating the model altogether.
- **Satisfaction with Current Model:** Several respondents expressed satisfaction, stating that no changes are needed or that the model is not the root issue.

Overall, the feedback reflects both a willingness to improve the model for greater fairness and sustainability, and an acknowledgment of its limitations, particularly in terms of voluntary participation.


b. Summary of Survey Results

To gain further insight and to support the initial findings of the consultation, the WG conducted a survey of the ccTLD community from 29 April to 13 May 2025. As stated the WG notes that the results are not representative. The private sector is over represented, as well as the ccTLDs from Europe, and those ccTLDs who already contribute and the ccTLD within the range of 60,000 to 1.2 million domain names under management. However, the WG believes that the results of the survey, and specifically the individual responses, provide insights into behaviour of ccTLDs with respect to their voluntary financial contribution to ICANN. These insights have been used to adjust the contribution model, and to make the additional recommendation to close the gap between ccNSO contribution model and ICANN's invoicing process.


Graph 10 - ICANN Geographical region



Graph 11 - Type of organisation




Graph 12 - Domains Under Management



The graph above supports the proposal to increase the number of voluntary contribution bands by introducing narrower thresholds. While these bands function primarily as guidelines, the working group believes that more granular representation tiers can serve as an incentive for ccTLDs to contribute.


Graph 13 - Resources used



It is clear that the most used resources are:


1. IANA automated services
2. ccNSO information resources
3. ICANN regional offices and liaison

Graph 14 - Participation in ccNSO/ICANN activities




Respondents are active participants in the ccNSO/ICANN ecosystem.

Graph 15 - Amount of people from a ccTLD that regularly participates in ccNSO/ICANN




Respondents are active participants in the ccNSO/ICANN ecosystem.

Graph16 - Average hours per month that ccTLD staff spend in ccNSO/ICANN matters




Respondents are active participants in the ccNSO/ICANN ecosystem.

Graph 17 - Financial contributions since 2013




The majority of respondents usually contribute financially to ICANN.


Graph 18 - Reasons for making a voluntary financial contribution




Graph 19 - Fairness of banded model



Graph 20 - Appropriateness for ICANN to follow up with ccTLDs



Graph 21 - Reasonability of the current value exchange model



Summary of Individual responses to survey

Survey participants expressed a wide range of views regarding how to improve the contribution process, but several strong themes emerged regarding the current ccTLD financial contribution model and its challenges:

1. Communication & Transparency
2. Individual Outreach & Tailored Engagement
3. Flexibility in Payment Options
4. Awareness & Education
5. Value, Efficiency & Trust
6. Voluntary Nature vs. Commitment
7. Historical Sensitivities

More details on the responses are provided in Annex B.

Summarized, the outcomes of the survey and responses indicate that while respondents appreciate ICANN's efforts to collect feedback and acknowledge the complexity of the issue, the path forward must involve:

- Better financial transparency,
- Tailored engagement and flexible contributions,
- A renewed emphasis on trust and value exchange, and
- Responsible, efficient budgeting to reassure the community.


The WG notes that there is a shared desire to preserve voluntary contributions, but only if they are seen as fair, transparent, and meaningfully tied to the value ICANN provides.

With respect to financial transparency and responsible, efficient budgeting to reassure the community, the WG will inform the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning committee (SOPC) of these outcomes. The SOPC is tasked with reviewing ICANN's plans on behalf of the ccNSO.


With respect to the tailored engagement and flexible contributions, and a renewed emphasis on trust and value exchange, the working group refers to its recommendation to ICANN to regularly and actively reach out to and engage with individual ccTLD Managers to inform them and seek among others financial contributions on the basis of this Guideline, and the suggested approach (see Annex C).

c. Outcome ICANN83 Consultation

Graph 22 - Reasonability of the current value exchange model




Graph 23 - Sense of the proposed changes to the guideline principles



The audience also mentioned the need for an editorial review of the proposed text, since some paragraphs could be interpreted differently from native and non native English speakers.

Graph 24 - Support for a refined banded model



Some participants mentioned that it was difficult to support an incomplete banded model [the voluntary contribution sum is missing from the majority of the bands presented].

Summary of written feedback on the Presented Band Model - What would you change?

- **Inflation Adjustment:** Several respondents noted that the band limits have not been updated since 2013 and recommended adjusting either the band thresholds or fee amounts to account for inflation.
- **Increased Granularity:** There were suggestions to introduce more bands and to consider incorporating factors such as ccTLD wholesale pricing for greater fairness and precision.
- **Fairness and Charging Principles:** Some proposed revisiting the underlying charging principles, including charging IDN ccTLDs differently and prioritizing fairness over the current structure.
- **Voting Mechanisms:** A review of voting methodologies was recommended, with suggestions to compare band-based voting with weighted voting models.
- **Stability and Caution:** A few respondents advised against immediate changes, suggesting regular reviews instead and cautioning against overcomplicating a model that is already functional.

C. Outcome July 2025 Webinar & Consultation

After finalizing its draft Final Report the working group did seek input and comments from the ccTLD community, specifically on the updated aid for ccTLD managers to determine their annual level of voluntary financial contribution to ICANN. The comment period ran from 15 July 2025 to 31 July 2025. The WG organized a webinar on Thursday, 17 July 2025 at 12:00 UTC to introduce the report (the [recording and slides are available](#)⁹).

The comments are captured on a [dedicated wiki page](#), and the summary of the feedback was made available on 7 August 2025, and is included in Annex E.

The WG considered the comments, and as a result an additional paragraph was added to section 4 Banded Model to provide an explanation why the WG did not pursue refining the highest band (> 5 million DUM).

9

<https://icann-community.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ccnsowkspc/pages/370212970/ccTLD+Comments+on+Second+Finance+WG+Draft+Final+Report>

4. Review of Contribution Model

The WG was also tasked to explore, review and propose various financial contributions models, including the current banded contribution model, to be considered by the community and Council.

Principles

After the review of the 2013 Guideline, and taking into account the results from the consultations at ICANN82 and ICANN83, plus the survey, the WG proposes the following principles:

1. ICANN and the ccNSO each re-confirm and recognize the value the ccTLD community and ICANN mutually bring to their relationship.
2. ICANN and the ccNSO each re-confirm the voluntary nature of the ccTLD financial contributions towards funding to cover ICANN's costs.
3. ICANN and the ccNSO re-confirm the Cost Model with specific, shared and global value categories. The model has been developed cooperatively, as the basis to attribute expenditures.
 - Specific Costs are ICANN's direct costs of providing and supporting exclusively the ccTLDs. Examples of this include the costs of the ccNSO secretariat and ccTLD specific PDPs.
 - Shared Costs are the proportion of ICANN's costs of providing and supporting activities which benefit both ccTLDs and others in the ICANN ecosystem. An example of this would be the costs of running the IANA functions covering both ccTLDs and gTLDs.
 - Global Costs are considered costs of supporting the multi-stakeholder model and are considered mutually equivalent. This category includes items such as ICANN providing ccTLDs access to a global platform to conduct work while ccTLDs strengthen ICANN's legitimacy in the multistakeholder model.
4. The ccNSO recommends that ICANN should be fairly compensated for both Specific Costs and Shared Costs. As in effect Global Costs cancel each other out, they should not be a factor in the voluntary financial contributions model. The ccNSO strongly believes that, at a minimum, ICANN should be compensated for its work in ensuring and supporting the global security and stability of the DNS, particularly for its policy making role related to the IANA Naming Function and the IANA Naming Services, which benefit all ccTLD Managers and ccTLD operations.
5. ICANN and the ccNSO recognize that ccTLDs function in a wide variety of operating environments using differing business and governance models

6. The ccNSO has developed the attached 'Contribution Model' for voluntary financial contributions to ICANN, which is based on the number of domain names under management by a ccTLD Manager. However, the level of financial contribution that any ccTLD Manager makes to ICANN should continue to be determined between ICANN and the individual ccTLD Manager.
7. Where a ccTLD Manager is responsible for managing more than one ccTLD, it will have the option of determining its voluntary financial contribution on the basis of either
 - the total domains under management, or
 - the sum of the voluntary financial contributions of the individual ccTLDs
8. Where a ccTLD agrees to initiate payment of its voluntary financial contribution or to an increase of its voluntary financial contribution, either as a result of the adoption of this document, or in time after reaching a higher band, the increases could be phased over a period of up to five years after reaching such a higher band.
9. ICANN and the ccNSO agree to an overall review of both the Cost and Contribution Models and its results, after a minimum period of five (5) years. They also agree to annually calculate ICANN's expenditures based on the Cost Model, and to compare that with the total level of voluntary financial contributions made by ccTLDs.
10. The ccNSO recognizes that the ccTLD Managers' voluntary financial contributions to ICANN is a matter between each individual ccTLD Manager and ICANN. ICANN is recommended to regularly and actively reach out to and engage with individual ccTLD Managers, informing them of this ccNSO approved "Parameters for Voluntary Financial Contributions of ccTLDs to ICANN" and to seek voluntary financial contributions in line with the Contribution Model.

The major proposed changes in comparison to the 2013 principles are:

- Stating explicitly the voluntary nature of the contribution (principle 2).
- The ccNSO recommendation to ccTLDs that ICANN should be reasonably compensated for its expenditures. Specifically, that ICANN should at a minimum be compensated for its work to ensure and support the security and stability of the DNS, particularly the policy making role pertaining to IANA Naming Function and the IANA Naming Services.
- Recognition that ccTLDs operate in a wide variety of environments.
- The ccNSO recommendation to ICANN to reach out and engage ccTLDs in the process and, among others, seek financial contributions. A possible suggested approach for outreach and engagement is included in Annex C.

Banded Model

In reviewing the 2013 contribution model the WG had to take into account the principle of the voluntary nature of the financial contributions and the expectation to recover costs on an ongoing basis.

Based on the community input received, while also taking into account the evolution of the DNS and the diversity of the ccTLD community, the WG believes that a banded contribution model related to the number of “domains under management” (DUM) is still the fairest approach on which to base the voluntary contributions. The WG recognizes that some members of the community may perceive this as a “tax”, but as already noted by the first Finance WG, the fundamental principles of value exchange, voluntary nature of contribution, and self-selection clearly contradict such a claim.

In addition, the WG proposes introducing more bands in the lower ends of the DUMs. Initially an additional upper band was considered and presented. However, after reviewing both the proposed bands and proposed contributions, the working group concluded that modifying the upper bands was not going to make a major impact overall, taking into account that the upper level of contribution from 2013 and the proposed upper level of contributions would remain the same. Hence, the additional upper band was dropped and not proposed.

Under the 2013 model seven (7) bands were introduced (Band 2013 A-G). The WG proposes a more refined approach by introducing three (3) additional bands, and adjusting the ranges accordingly.

From the feedback received it was mentioned on several occasions that the relative difference between band G and F, from 0-50K DUM to 50 k-250K was too big: this is a jump from \$500 to \$ 10,000, or a twenty (20) fold increase. Therefore, a more gradual increase of the bands in this area was considered the best course of action. Additionally, to allow for a smoother transition between bands a redistribution of the limits of the bands is also presented.

Band 2013	Band 2025	Domains Under Management 2013	Domains Under Management 2025
A	A	> 5M	> 5M
B	B	2.5M to 5M	2.5M to 5M
C	C	1M to 2.5M	1.2M to 2.5M
D	D	500K to 1M	600K to 1.2M
E	E	250K to 500K	300K to 600K
F	F	50K to 250K	150K to 300K
	G		75K to 150K
	H		30K to 75K
	I		10K to 30K
G	J	0 to 50K	0 to 10K

Contribution Model

To allocate a voluntary contribution to the new bands the WG analyzed several scenarios. The WG agreed that the upper and lower contribution bands would remain the same: respectively \$225,000 and \$500. This view was generally supported during the consultation at ICANN83.

Further, building on the refinement of the bands in the lower end of DUMs, with a more gradual increase in contribution in the related bands, and a smoother transition between the rest of the bands, the following distribution is proposed:

Band	Domains Under Management	Suggested Voluntary Contribution
A	Over 5,000,000	\$ 225,000
B	2,500,001 to 5,000,000	\$ 150,000
C	1,200,001 to 2,500,000	\$ 75,000
D	600,001 to 1,200,000	\$ 35,000
E	300,001 to 600,000	\$ 15,000
F	150,001 to 300,000	\$ 10,000
G	75,001 to 150,000	\$ 5,000
H	30,001 to 75,000	\$ 2,500
I	10,001 to 30,000	\$ 1,000
J	0 to 10,000	\$ 500

In Annex D you will find a comparison of the 2013 Contribution Model and the 2025 Contribution Model.

Annexes

A. Proposed Financial Contribution Parameters

Parameters for Voluntary Financial Contributions of ccTLDs to ICANN

Version 2 (draft)

Date of review members: TBC

Date of adoption by the ccNSO Council: TBC

Introduction

This document sets out the Principles and a voluntary financial Contribution Model developed by the ccNSO Second Finance Working Group¹⁰. It reaffirms the mutual value of the relationship between the ccTLD community and ICANN, and the voluntary nature of ccTLD financial contributions to ICANN.

The document reflects a collaboratively developed Cost Model that distinguishes between specific, shared, and global costs, and serves as the basis for the calculation of ICANN's costs which are attributable to ICANN's activities for ccTLDs. It also introduces a Contribution Model that accounts for the diversity of ccTLD operating environments, offering flexibility in determining voluntary financial contribution levels.

These principles and the model reflect a shared commitment to transparency, fairness, and continued cooperation, while respecting the autonomy of individual ccTLD Managers.

Principles

1. ICANN and the ccNSO each re-confirm and recognize the value the ccTLD community and ICANN mutually bring to their relationship.
2. ICANN and the ccNSO each re-confirm the voluntary nature of the ccTLD financial contributions towards funding to cover ICANN's costs.
3. ICANN and the ccNSO re-confirm the Cost Model with specific, shared and global value categories. The model has been developed cooperatively, as the basis to attribute expenditures.
 - Specific Costs are ICANN's direct costs of providing and supporting exclusively the ccTLDs. Examples of this include the costs of the ccNSO secretariat and ccTLD specific PDPs.

¹⁰ [Include link to final report when approved and published]

- Shared Costs are the proportion of ICANN's costs of providing and supporting activities which benefit both ccTLDs and others in the ICANN ecosystem. An example of this would be the costs of running the IANA functions covering both ccTLDs and gTLDs.
 - Global Costs are considered costs of supporting the multi-stakeholder model and are considered mutually equivalent. This category includes items such as ICANN providing ccTLDs access to a global platform to conduct work while ccTLDs strengthen ICANN's legitimacy in the multistakeholder model.
4. The ccNSO recommends that ICANN should be fairly compensated for both Specific Costs and Shared Costs. As in effect Global Costs cancel each other out, they should not be a factor in the voluntary financial contributions model. The ccNSO strongly believes that, at a minimum, ICANN should be compensated for its work in ensuring and supporting the global security and stability of the DNS, particularly for its policy making role related to the IANA Naming Function and the IANA Naming Services, which benefit all ccTLD Managers and ccTLD operations.
 5. ICANN and the ccNSO recognize that ccTLDs function in a wide variety of operating environments using differing business and governance models
 6. The ccNSO has developed the attached 'Contribution Model' for voluntary financial contributions to ICANN, which is based on the number of domain names under management by a ccTLD Manager. However, the level of financial contribution that any ccTLD Manager makes to ICANN should continue to be determined between ICANN and the individual ccTLD Manager.
 7. Where a ccTLD Manager is responsible for managing more than one ccTLD, it will have the option of determining its voluntary financial contribution on the basis of either
 - the total domains under management, or
 - the sum of the voluntary financial contributions of the individual ccTLDs
 8. Where a ccTLD agrees to initiate payment of its voluntary financial contribution or to an increase of its voluntary financial contribution, either as a result of the adoption of this document, or in time after reaching a higher band, the increases could be phased over a period of up to five years after reaching such a higher band.
 9. ICANN and the ccNSO agree to an overall review of both the Cost and Contribution Models and its results, after a minimum period of five (5) years. They also agree to annually calculate ICANN's expenditures based on the Cost Model, and to compare that with the total level of voluntary financial contributions made by ccTLDs.
 10. The ccNSO recognizes that the ccTLD Managers' voluntary financial contributions to ICANN is a matter between each individual ccTLD Manager and ICANN. ICANN is recommended to regularly and actively reach out to and engage with individual ccTLD

Managers, informing them of this ccNSO approved “Parameters for Voluntary Financial Contributions of ccTLDs to ICANN” and to seek voluntary financial contributions in line with the Contribution Model.

Contribution Model

The following bands represent suggested amounts for a voluntary financial contribution. A ccTLD Manager may choose to contribute guided by this Contribution Model, based on what is considered appropriate.

Band	Domains Under Management	Suggested Voluntary Contribution
A	Over 5,000,000	\$ 225,000
B	2,500,001 to 5,000,000	\$ 150,000
C	1,200,001 to 2,500,000	\$ 75,000
D	600,001 to 1,200,000	\$ 35,000
E	300,001 to 600,000	\$ 15,000
F	150,001 to 300,000	\$ 10,000
G	75,001 to 150,000	\$ 5,000
H	30,001 to 75,000	\$ 2,500
I	10,001 to 30,000	\$ 1,000
J	0 to 10,000	\$ 500

B. Survey results

Summary of individual free text responses

1. Communication & Transparency

There is broad consensus that ICANN must improve how it communicates the use and value of ccTLD contributions. Respondents emphasized the need for:

- Regular, detailed financial reporting to show how funds are used and the impact of contributions.
- Annual sessions to review progress toward funding goals and discuss member satisfaction.
- Clearer articulation of value — both in terms of services provided (e.g., IANA naming function, root zone management) and the reciprocal benefit of ccTLD involvement in global internet governance.

2. Individual Outreach & Tailored Engagement

Many respondents stressed the importance of direct engagement with individual ccTLDs, recognizing that each operates under different legal, financial, and national conditions. Suggestions include:

- Personalized conversations to understand why some ccTLDs don't contribute.
- Outreach campaigns, especially in regions with low participation.
- Stronger collaboration with regional organizations and local governments.

3. Flexibility in Payment Options

There is significant support for more adaptable payment structures, including:

- Tiered or hybrid models based on size, capacity, or local conditions.
- Instalment-based or phased payments.
- Multi-year or standing contribution agreements for better budgeting.
- Recognition or incentives for consistent contributors (e.g., speaking opportunities, acknowledgments).

4. Awareness & Education

Several responses highlighted the need to raise awareness about the cost model, especially among new or non-contributing members. Recommendations include:

- Discussing the model at onboarding sessions (e.g., ccNSO Welcome Sessions).
- Sending explanatory messages alongside billing communications.
- Hosting regional webinars or forums to revisit the purpose and background of the model.

5. Value, Efficiency & Trust

A recurring concern was the perceived inefficiency and lack of cost-effectiveness at ICANN. Some believe the current \$3.5M target includes significant waste, arguing that essential ccTLD services (especially those provided by IANA) could be delivered for substantially less — around \$1.5M — and that too much is spent on governance and staffing. This has led to:

- Scepticism about the need for contributions at current levels.
- Calls to reduce ICANN's budget, increase accountability, and demonstrate more efficient use of funds.

6. Voluntary Nature vs. Commitment

Several respondents emphasized that the issue is not the model itself, but inconsistent follow-through by some ccTLDs. There is concern about “free riding,” and suggestions that simply redesigning the cost model won’t solve the core problem:

- Instead, ICANN should focus on rebuilding commitment, trust, and a shared sense of responsibility.
- Some asked whether it’s time to consider mandatory contributions, while others warned against revisiting a “pay-to-play” dynamic that damaged relationships in the past.

7. Historical Sensitivities

A few responses referenced past tensions, particularly a controversial push in 2010 for mandatory payment models that caused backlash. There is clear caution against repeating this approach. Future efforts must be community-driven, respectful, and transparent.

C. Suggestions to Increase Contributions

The WG suggests a strategic, multi-pronged plan to encourage the different kind of organizations that manage a ccTLD to make voluntary, annual contributions to ICANN, based on the tiered contribution ranges. This plan uses outreach, transparency, social incentives, prestige, and relationship building—but avoids coercion or legal obligation.

Suggestion: “Global Partnering” closing the gap between Guideline and Invoice

A campaign-based initiative emphasizing collective responsibility and leadership to close the gap between model and actuals

Core Principles

- **Voluntary & Transparent:** Contributions are voluntary, but publicly acknowledged.
- **Tiered Contributions:** Based on domain names under management as this is key indicator for size of organization size (e.g., small, medium, large) by revenue, staff size, interactions with ICANN.
- **Recognition, Not Coercion:** Use positive incentives like prestige, influence, and visibility.
- **Multi-Channel Engagement:** Outreach is diversified and personalized, using personal, digital, institutional channels
- **Engagement by Segment**

STRATEGY BY ORGANIZATION TYPE / SEGMENT

- **Government-Related Organizations**
Examples: National agencies, governmental departments.
Tactics:
 1. **Outreach:**
 - o High-level letters from leadership.
 - o Combine with personalized approach (GSE team, lever for additional engagement)
 - o Engagement during (inter)national forums (GAC, Regional events, national events like IGF) .
 - o Align as much as possible with budget cycles ccTLDs (segmented approach)
 2. **Public Accountability:**
 - o Annual “Scorecard” published. per ccTLDs, per membership ccNSO
 - o Highlight contributing vs. non-contributing countries/regions
 3. **Data-Based Appeal:**
 - o List ccTLD contributions. **Media Pressure:**

- o Soft name-and-shame: regional comparisons, “gap maps” of contributors vs. non-contributors.
- **Private Companies: If segmented approach**
Examples: private for profit corporations, not-for profit corporations, Foundations etc.
Tactics:
 1. **Value Proposition:**
 - o Show return on contribution: reputation benefits for ccTLD.
 - o Show material available, testimonials
 2. **Peer Pressure:**
 - o showing contribution by peers.
- **Academic Institutions: If segmented approach**
Examples: Public Universities, Private Universities
Tactics:
 1. **Academic Recognition:**
 - o Highlight universities in annual “Global Knowledge Champions” report.
 2. **Publicity & Rankings:**
 - o Voluntary contributions factored into a “Global Engagement Index” for institutions.
 - o Encourage media coverage

INFRASTRUCTURE & SUPPORTING ELEMENTS

Contribution Model [Based on 2025 data]

Band	Domains Under Management	Suggested Voluntary Contribution	Approx. Number of ccTLDs in band	Segment		
				G	A	P
A	Over 5,000,000	\$ 225,000	6			
B	2,500,001 to 5,000,000	\$ 150,000	9			
C	1,200,001 to 2,500,000	\$ 75,000	15			
D	600,001 to 1,200,000	\$ 35,000	10			
E	300,001 to 600,000	\$ 15,000	10			
F	150,001 to 300,000	\$ 10,000	11			
G	75,001 to 150,000	\$ 5,000	19			
H	30,001 to 75,000	\$ 2,500	21			
I	10,001 to 30,000	\$ 1,000	36			
J	0 to 10,000	\$ 500	172			

G - Government related fraction of ccTLD Managers in band

A - Academia related fraction of ccTLD Managers in Band

P - Private entities fraction of ccTLD Managers in Band

- For profit
- Non for profit

Tools and Tactics

- **Outreach Kit:** Brochures, pitch decks, and testimonials
- **Personalized Approach:** Signed by the organization's director.
- **Ambassador Network:** Influential figures as volunteer peer persuaders.
- **Media Campaign:** "Join the League" – featuring contributors.
- **Online Platform:** Shows real-time contribution leaderboard and impact stories.
- Allow - to extent feasible - diverse payment methods (currency, terms etc)

Relationship Management:

- **Key Account Officers:** GSE (ICANN staff) assigned by region to manage relationships and follow up annually.
- **Annual Renewal Campaign:** with and impact updates.
- **Align with Budget cycles of categories**
- **Feedback Loops:** ccTLDs can propose new focus areas or pilot projects.

Monitoring & Soft Accountability

- **Dashboard of Contributions:** Live and publicly accessible.
- **Progress Tracker:** "Impact per Contributor" visualizations.
- **"Not Yet Contributing" List:** Visible on website, but framed constructively.
- **Reputation Nudges:** Annual newsletters with "Top Movers" and "Silent Partners."

Success Metrics

1. Year-over-year increase in total contributions.
2. Diversity of contributing organizations: in size, membership of the ccNSO, governance model
3. Media mentions of partnership or recognition tiers.

D. Comparison 2013 and 2025 Contribution Model

Contribution Model from 2013

Band	Domains Under Management	Suggested Voluntary Contribution	Approx. Number of ccTLDs	Approx. voluntary Contribution
A	> 5M	\$ 225,000	5	\$ 1,125,000.00
B	2.5M to 5M	\$ 150,000	8	\$ 1,200,000.00
C	1M to 2.5M	\$ 75,000	13	\$ 975,000.00
D	500K to 1M	\$ 25,000	11	\$ 275,000.00
E	250K to 500K	\$ 15,000	9	\$ 135,000.00
F	50K to 250K	\$ 10,000	26	\$ 260,000.00
G	0 to 50K	\$ 500	183	\$ 92,000.00
TOTAL			255	\$ 4,061,500.00

Contribution Model from 2025

The cells highlighted show the suggested changes to the 2013 contribution model.

Band	Domains Under Management	Suggested Voluntary Contribution	Approx. Number ccTLDs	Approx. voluntary Contribution
A	> 5M	\$225,000.00	6	\$1,350,000.00
B	2.5M to 5M	\$150,000.00	9	\$1,350,000.00
C	1.2M to 2.5M	\$75,000.00	15	\$1,125,000.00
D	600K to 1.2M	\$35,000.00	10	\$350,000.00
E	300K to 600K	\$15,000.00	10	\$150,000.00
F	150K to 300K	\$10,000.00	11	\$110,000.00
G	75K to 150K	\$5,000.00	19	\$95,000.00
H	30K to 75K	\$2,500.00	21	\$52,500.00
I	10K to 30K	\$1,000.00	36	\$36,000.00
J	0 to 10K	\$500.00	172	\$86,000.00
TOTALS			306	\$4,704,500.00

Side by side comparison 2013 & 2025 Models

Band 2013	Band 2025	Domains Under Management	Domains Under Management	Suggested Voluntary Contribution	Suggested Voluntary Contribution	Approx. Number ccTLDs	Approx. Number ccTLDs	Approx. voluntary Contribution	Approx. voluntary Contribution
A	A	> 5M	> 5M	\$225,000.00	\$225,000.00	5	6	\$1,125,000.00	\$1,350,000.00
B	B	2.5M to 5M	2.5M to 5M	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	8	9	\$1,200,000.00	\$1,350,000.00
C	C	1M to 2.5M	1.2M to 2.5M	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00	13	15	\$975,000.00	\$1,125,000.00
D	D	500K to 1M	600K to 1.2M	\$25,000.00	\$35,000.00	11	10	\$275,000.00	\$350,000.00
E	E	250K to 500K	300K to 600K	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	9	10	\$135,000.00	\$150,000.00
F	F	50K to 250K	150K to 300K	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	26	11	\$260,000.00	\$110,000.00
	G		75K to 150K		\$5,000.00		19		\$95,000.00
	H		30K to 75K		\$2,500.00		21		\$52,500.00
	I		10K to 30K		\$1,000.00		36		\$36,000.00
G	J	0 to 50K	0 to 10K	\$500.00	\$500.00	183	172	\$91,500.00	\$86,000.00
TOTALS						255	306	\$4,061,500.00	\$4,704,500.00

E. Summary Report | Comments on 2nd Finance Working Group Final Draft Report

Comment Period and Background information

The comment period ran from 15 July 2025 to 31 July 2025. The ccTLD community was informed by email.

The WG organized a webinar on Thursday, 17 July 2025 at 12:00 UTC to introduce the report (the [recording and slides are available](#)).

The comments are captured on a dedicated wiki page¹¹

Comments received

The WG received the following comments:

Name	Affiliation	Date
Roelof Meijer	SIDN	Jul 16, 2025
Hank Nussbacher	ISOC-IL	Jul 21, 2025
Josh Tabish	CIRA	Jul 31, 2025

Summary of Comments

Roelof Meijer, on behalf of SIDN, supported the work and recommendations of the WG. He did raise that the report was not consistent with what is defined as band A. In earlier versions of the model it was defined as > 10 million DUM, and final draft as > 5 million DUM.

Hank Nussbacher, raised that ISOC-IL had always paid its share of the financial contribution to ICANN, until such time when ICANN was not able to update the Public Suffix List.

Josh Tabish, on behalf of CIRA, expressed support by CIRA of the goal of ensuring a fair and equitable financial contribution model for voluntary ccTLD contributions to ICANN. CIRA agrees with the conclusions and recommendations included in the draft Final Report. Specifically, CIRA supports the proposed refinements to the principles in Section 4, including the recommendation

¹¹

<https://icann-community.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ccnsowkspc/pages/370212970/ccTLD+Comments+on+Second+Finance+WG+Draft+Final+Report>

that ICANN adopt a more segmented and personalized approach when seeking voluntary contributions from individual ccTLDs.

Analysis of Comments

The WG welcomes the support expressed by SIDN and CIRA, specifically for the refinements of the principles and the more segmented and personalized approach to seek voluntary contributions from individual ccTLDs.

With respect to the comment from ISOC-IL the WG notes that it is not mandated to deal with the substance of the matter. However, the WG appreciates that ISOC-IL shared its reasons for changing its final contributions to ICANN, and considers the issue raised in the submission a case in point for the segmented and personalized approach to seek voluntary contributions from individual ccTLDs.

Regarding the observation that the final report was not consistent with respect to the definition of band A. The WG added an additional paragraph to section 4 Banded Model of the Report to provide an explanation why the WG did not pursue refining the highest band (> 5 million DUM).

Next steps

The WG has updated its draft Final Report, which will be submitted to the ccNSO Council for its consideration. If adopted the WG considers its tasks completed.

F. Documentation / References

- ccTLD Shared Cost Model - Updated figures April 2025:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PF7RDAVq_k4s9hglP5Ok85FcqFhfpNgE/view?usp=drive_link
- Financial Contributions of ccTLDs to ICANN - Report of the Financial Working Group to the ccNSO Council November 2013:
<https://archive.icann.org/meetings/buenosaires2013/en/schedule/sun-finance/presentation-finance-final-17nov13-en.pdf>