UPDATE & CONSULTATION ON
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures
Consensus Building on Recommendations

APPLICANT SUPPORT PROGRAM (v4)

Justine Chew
6 April 2020

Purpose & Structure of this Presentation

Structure	Purpose
Slides #3 - 6: Highlights the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group's (SubPro PDP WG) recommendations for At-Large response consensus building	This is what we will focus our consultation on, with the goal of building At-Large consensus on our reactions to the SubPro PDP WG recommendations
Slides #7 - 8 Backgrounder on the history and progression of the Applicant Support Program (ASP) prior to and post the 2012 application round	To support an element of capacity building for At-Large on this topic
Slide #9 - 10 A recap of ALAC's positions on this topic, expressed through the last public comment process on the SubPro PDP WG's Initial Report of 2018 See: ALAC Policy & Comments: [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12103]	To remind participants on our most recent official interventions on the topic
Slide #11 Picks up from the series of presentations made to CPWG on this topic, prior to availability of SubPro PDP WG recommendations See: SubPro Workspace [https://community.icann.org/x/6a_jBg]	A high level recap
Slides #12 – 25 Presents the SubPro PDP WG recommendations, implementation guidance, supporting rationale	Breaks down each of SubPro PDP WG recommendations and its impact on At-Large prior positions

For Consultation & Consensus Building

SubPro PDP WG recommendations

Affirmation #1 (Slide #12)

WG affirms Implementation Guidance B from 2007, "Application fees will be designed to ensure that adequate resources exist to cover the total cost to administer the new gTLD process. Application fees may differ for applicants ***that qualify for applicant support.***"

Recommendation #2 (Slides #13-14)

- As per 2012 round, fee reduction must be available for select applicants who meet evaluation criteria through the ASP.
- That ICANN continue to facilitate non-financial assistance including provision of pro-bono assistance to applicants in need.
- WG believes high-level goals and eligibility requirements for ASP remain appropriate, noting however that since ASP not limited to LD countries in 2012 round, it should continue to be open to applicants regardless of location as long as they meet other program criteria.
- Therefore, IG N be amended to "ICANN must retain the ASP, which includes fee reduction for eligible applicants and facilitate the provision of pro-bono non-financial assistance to applicants in need."

❖ CCT-RT Rec 31 "ICANN Org to coordinate the pro-bono assistance program".

Recommendation #3 (Slides #15-16)

Expand scope of financial support to ASP beneficiaries beyond application fee to also cover costs such as application writing fees, attorney fees related to application process

Additional Intervention

- Requirement that applicant must demonstrate how they would serve beneficiary target region or community, not merely general public interest benefit
- Any changes needed to the Applicant Financial Handbook re Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria?

Should financial assistance extend beyond the application process, for eg. to support for registry-level fees?

For Consultation & Consensus Building

SubPro PDP WG recommendations

Recommendation #4 (Slides #17-18)

ICANN improve outreach, awareness-raising, application evaluation, and program evaluation elements of the ASP, as proposed in the IG below

Implementation Guidance

- Outreach and awareness-raising activities should be delivered well in advance to application window opening, as longer lead times help to promote more widespread knowledge about the program. Such outreach and education should commence no later than the start of the Communication Period.
- A dedicated IRT be established / charged with developing implementation elements of ASP – giving regard to the JAS WG Final Report and 2012 implementation of ASP.
- Outreach efforts should not only target the Global South, but also "middle applicants" (those located in struggling regions that are further along in development compared to underserved or underdeveloped regions. Evaluation criteria in ASP must treat "middle applicants" similar to those benefiting LDCs, LLDCs, SIDS per UNDESA list
- Support PIRR rec 6.1.b, "Consider researching globally recognized procedures that could be adopted for implementing ASP"
- Have dedicated IRT should draw on experts with relevant knowledge, including from targeted regions, to develop appropriate program elements related to outreach, education and application evaluation. Regional experts may be particularly helpful in providing insight on the evaluation of business plans from different parts of the world.
- Dedicated IRT should seek advice from experts in the field to develop framework for analysis of metrics to evaluate success of ASP

❖ CCT-RT Rec 30, "Expand and improve outreach into the Global South."

❖ CCT-RT Rec 29, "Set objectives/metrics for application from the Global South."

For Consultation & Consensus Building

SubPro PDP WG recommendations (Cont'd)

Recommendation #5 (Slide #19)

Support PIRR rec 6.1.a, "Consider leveraging the same procedural practices used for other panels, incl. publication of process documents and documentation of rationale."

Recommendation #6 (Slide #20)

ICANN Org must develop plan for funding ASP, as proposed in IG below

Implementation Guidance

- ICANN Org should evaluate whether it can provide funds (per 2012) or whether additional funding is needed for the ASP in subsequent rounds
- ICANN Org should seek funding partners to help financially support the ASP as appropriate

Recommendation #7 (Slide #21)

- Unless the SARP reasonably believes there was willful gaming, applicants who are not awarded Applicant Support (whether "Qualified" or "Disqualified") must have the option to pay balance of full standard application fee and transfer to standard application process.
- Applicants must have limited period of time to provide any additional information necessary to convert theirs to a standard application, without causing unreasonable delay to other elements or other applicants eg in a contention set.

Recommendation #8 (Slide #22)

The Financial Assistance Handbook or its successor, subject to changes included in the above recommendations, must be incorporated into the AGB for subsequent rounds.

For Consultation & Consensus Building

New Issues, Omissions & Related Topics

New Issues (Slide #23)

1. Priority to successful ASP applicants – re dispersion of funds
2. Effect of Transfer on timing of ASP process

Omissions (Slide #24)

1. Priority in string contention for successful ASP applicant

Related Topics (Slide #24)

1. Dedicated Application Round for ASP potential applicants
2. Appeals against SARP determinations

Overarching CCT-RT recommendation (Slide #25)

1. WG notes this Rec, "Revisit the Applicant Financial Support Program" has puts forward the (above) recommendations to support improving ASP in subsequent procedures.

Additional Intervention
If expecting uptake to improve then more consideration ought to be given to have established approach

Additional Intervention
- We had proposed "that an applicant who qualifies for ASP should be given priority in any string contention set, and not be subjected to any further string contention resolution process"
- On what basis should successful ASP applicant be granted priority in string contention?

Additional Intervention
Should ASP potential applicants be singled out for a dedicated application round? Vis a vis other applicants eg. Geonames, .brands etc?

Additional Intervention?
Do we think enough headway has been made by SubPro PDP WG on this CCT-RT recommendation to improve the ASP for next round(s) based on ALL of their above to-date recommendations?

History of Applicant Support Program (ASP)

Pre 2012- Round

ICANN Board Resolution Mar 2010

- Requested "stakeholders to work through SOs/ACs to develop a sustainable approach to providing support to applicants requiring assistance in applying for and operation new gTLDs"

Joint Applicant Support WG

Joint SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS WG) Final Report 2011 [1] which ALAC endorsed

- JAS WG co-chartered by ALAC
- Financial & non-financial support to be offered to approved candidates
- Financial Support , incl:
  - Application fee reduction of US$47k, staggered payment
- Non-Financial Support, incl:
  - Assistance in preparing application
  - Facilitation of IPv6 compliance
  - Consulting, education on DNSSEC implementation
  - Outreach on Program
  - Logistical, translation, technical support
  - Est Registry Service Provider in regions
- Eligibility requirements – should serve public interest and meet a level of financial need and capability
- Evaluation of candidates
  - Before standard application review
  - Support Application Review Panel (SARP) composed of volunteers (ICANN community & outside experts)
  - US$5k deposit mandatory
  - Subject to Support Candidate Guide

2012 Round Implementation [2]

- Sought to increase global diversity and representation across regions within the new gTLD Program by minimizing any competitive disadvantage for those in developing economies
- Initiative developed seeking to serve the global public interest by ensuring worldwide accessibility to and competition within the new gTLD Program
- Covers Financial & Non-Financial support:
  - Access to pro bono services for startup gTLD registries – coordinated by ICANN Org - eg, acquiring equipment, establishing operations, hiring/training staff, providing customer service
  - Financial support – limited no. of qualifying applicants allowed reduced evaluation fee of US$47k from US$185k if pass evaluation by SARP (demonstrated financial need, provide public interest benefit and have necessary management and financial capabilities)
  - Applicant Support Fund of US$2 mil allocation by ICANN Board
- Applicants which did not meet eligibility criteria were not allowed to proceed altogether for fear of "gaming the system"

2012 Round Outcomes

- Insufficient awareness of ASP
- Only 3 applicants
  - 2 did not meet eligibility criteria and had their applications terminated
- Limited metrics to measure "success or failure"

[1] https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_26601/jas-final-report-13sep11-en.pdf

[2] https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/candidate-support

ASP: Fast Forward to the New gTLD SubPro PDP

Program Reviews Include, *inter alia*

- Final Issue Report Dec 2015[3]
  - Guidance to SubPro PDP WG on changes needed to New gTLD Program
  - 4.2.14: Support for Applicants from Developing Countries
- Revised Program Implementation Review Report (PIRR) January 2016 [4]
  - Examines effectiveness and efficiency of ICANN's implementation of New gTLD Program
  - Chapter 6: Applicant Support – ASP process
- Anecdotal conclusions drawn from external related study for reaching prospective applicants in the Global South and developing economies by AM Global [5]

[3] https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/2016-12/subsequent-procedures-final-issue-04dec15-en.pdf
[4] https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews/cct/implementation
[5] "New gTLDs and the Global South: Understanding Limited Global South Demand in the Most Recent new gTLD Round and Options Going Forward" by AM Global

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG [6]

A GNSO PDP WG chartered in Jan 2016

- To evaluate what changes or additions need to be made to GNSO Introduction of New gTLD policy recommendations of 8 August 2007 [7]
- Any changes to policy would affect future Program procedures for introducing additional gTLDs – does not impact on legacy TLDs or ccTLDs or delegated new gTLDs in general
- Work Track 2 considered, *inter alia*:
  - JAS WG Final Report
  - New gTLD Applicant Support page
  - Program Implementation Review Revised Report (PIRR)
  - "New gTLDs and the Global South" report by AM Global

[6] https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures
[7] https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/pdp-dec05-fr-parta-08aug07.htm

SubPro PDP WG Initial Report 2018 (IR) [8]

Published for public comment 3 Jul – 26 Sep 2018

- Seeks to obtain input on the work of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG in evaluating what changes or additions need to be made to existing new gTLD policy recommendations. The document includes materials from the full Working Group and four sub-teams within the Working Group, Work Tracks 1-4.
- NB. A report of all public comments received was produced by GNSO staff and subsequently analysed by sub-teams under the same PDP WG.

[8] https://www.icann.org/public-comments/gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-2018-07-03-en

At-Large Comments to the SubPro IR 2018 [9]

ALAC Statement AL-ALAC-ST-0918-03-01-EN of 3 Oct 2018 [10] has touched on:

- Eligibility / Eligibility Criteria
- Awareness / Outreach
- Type of Support: Financial & Non-Financial
- Support beyond application/evaluation to operation
- Sources of Funds for ASP, & Dispersion
- Evaluation of Applicants/Applications
- Priority in string contention for Successful ASP Applicant
- Effect of Rejection for ASP

Other prior input include [11]

- GNSO CC2 on New gTLD SubPro PDP, May 2017
- Interim Paper on CCWG on use of Name of Countries and Territories as TLDs, Apr 2017
- Request for Input – New gTLD SubPro, Jun 2016
- ALAC Corres on Study Group on Sensitive New gTLDs, Feb 2016
- New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report, Dec 2015
- Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD SubPro, Oct 2015
- ALAC Statement on Preliminary Support Implementation Program, Dec 2011 ..... etc

[9] https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12103
[10] is in line with past ALAC statements on ASP
[11] See: https://atlarge.icann.org/policy-summary

ASP: Exec Summary of AL-ALAC-ST-0918-03-01-EN

At-Large Comments to the Subsequent Procedures Initial Report 2018 [9]

Applicant Support Program

"The ALAC strongly advocates for Applicant Support to continue to be open to applicants whose applications are conceived to serve underserved regions and/or underserved communities regardless of their location, so long as they meet the other Applicant Support Program (ASP) criteria. Further, we believe that it is imperative that ICANN improves the global awareness of the ASP through effective means. The ALAC also advocates for all Applicant Support applicants who are found to have failed the criteria for the ASP to be allowed to decide if they wish to pursue or withdraw their application, with the grant of sufficient time to pay the balance of the full application fee amount unless the Support Application Review Panel (SARP) determines that an application has been the subject of wilful gaming. Terminating all applications determined as not meeting the criteria as was the case in the 2012 round is a disproportionate means of preventing gaming of the ASP."

Recap: ALAC STATEMENTS have touched on:

- Eligibility / Eligibility Criteria
- Awareness / Outreach
- Type of Support: Financial & Non-Financial
- Support beyond application/evaluation to operation
- Sources of Funds for ASP, & Dispersion
- Evaluation of Applicants/Applications
- Priority in string contention for Successful ASP Applicant
- Effect of Rejection for ASP

[9] https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12103

ASP: Positions from AL-ALAC-ST-0918-03-01-EN

Eligibility / Eligibility Criteria

- Open to all applicants whose applications are conceived to serve underserved regions and/or underserved communities regardless of location (beneficiary) so long as meet other criteria
  - Expanding traditional definition of "community applications", enable for-profit entities in underserved and underdeveloped economies to participate
- What should matter is the location of the region/community not the applicant
- Requiring demonstration of how applicant will serve beneficiary, not merely public interest
- Either make eligibility criteria less stringent or increase support to help applicants meet criteria
- Applying resources to identify and address barriers to applications

Awareness / Outreach

- Need for more outreach and improved awareness; some support for targeted outreach to communities in Global South, developing countries/regions or middle applicant prioritizing Native Peoples
- Applying resources to identify and address barriers
- Use of Metrics to measure success: diversity – application vs approval numbers outside US/Europe, geo spread, for IDN

Evaluation of Applicants/Applications

- Need for more realistic eligibility criteria in evaluating applicants
- Some support for dedicated round for applicants from developing countries and which proposes to benefit communities in developing countries or indigenous communities

Priority in String Contention

- Applicants who are subject to string contention resolution procedures and auctions are expected to have the financial wherewithal to see through the resolution procedure or participate in an auction as a last resort. Applicants who qualify for ASP are by default disadvantaged in this regard given their need to obtain Application Support in the first place. One this basis, propose that an applicant who qualifies for ASP should be given priority in any string contention set, and not be subjected to any further string contention resolution process.

Type of Support: Financial & Non-Financial, & Support beyond application/evaluation to operation, Sources of Funds for ASP, & Dispersion

- Tapping ccTLD operators to avail local consulting resources
- Needing more than USD 2 mil for next ASP
- Identifying additional funding partners
- Source of funds being (1) excess application fees from 2012 round and (2) Auction Proceeds; some support for (3) adding as an extra component to next round application fees
- Using points earn during evaluation to determine dispersion of funds if there are more applicants than funds
- Variable Fees only for ASP applicants
- *Retaining Pro Bono Services for gTLD Startup Registries for candidates seeking support*
- *Recognising ASP always intended to include IDN support*
- *Building capacity using Auction Proceeds*

Effect of Rejection

- Allowing applicants whose applications do not meet requirements of ASP to choose whether to withdraw or transfer those applications to standard application regime, with reasonable time give to pay balance application fee amount if choose to transfer
- Provided no willful gaming determined by Support Application Review Panel (SARP) during evaluation – willful gamers should be penalized via ban for specified period
- i.e. No automatic termination of applications which do not meet ASP criteria

Applicant Support Program (ASP): Consensus Building

Recap: ALAC STATEMENTS have touched on:

- Continuity
- Eligibility Criteria
- Awareness / Outreach
- Financial Support
- Non-Financial Support
- Priority in string contention
- Support beyond application/ evaluation to operation
- Effect of Rejection
- Sources of Funds for ASP, & Dispersion
- Evaluation of Applicants/ Applications

RELATED SubPro Areas/Topics include:

- Communications, Application Submission Periods
- Types of Applications, Community Applications
- Dedicated "Application Round"
- Variable Fees
- String contention resolution
- RSP – Pre-approved Registry Program

COMPETITION, CONSUMER CHOICE & TRUST (CCT) RECOMMENDATIONS *

- Rec. 32: Revisit the Applicant Financial Support Program (prerequisite for SubPro)
- Rec. 29: Set objectives/metrics for applications from the Global South (prerequisite for SubPro)
- Rec. 30: Expand and improve outreach into the Global South (prerequisite for ICANN Org)
- Rec. 31: ICANN Org to coordinate the *pro bono* assistance program (prerequisite for ICANN Org)

* https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-final-cct-recs-scorecard-01mar19-en.pdf

Impact of SubPro Recommendations * as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

For At-Large Consensus Building

CCT-RT Rec. 32

WG notes this Rec, "Revisit the Applicant Financial Support Program" has puts forward the following recommendations to support improving ASP in subsequent procedures.

- Revisit at the end of presentation

Affirmation #1 with modification:

WG affirms Implementation Guidance B from 2007, "Application fees will be designed to ensure that adequate resources exist to cover the total cost to administer the new gTLD process. Application fees may differ for applicants ***that qualify for applicant support.***"

WG's Rationale

- Supports general approach to application fees taken in 2012 round, and Implementation Guidance B, **supports maintaining a reduced application fee for ASP recipients**

Impact

- Applicants that qualify will enjoy reduced application fee.

Financial Support

Additional intervention

- Any concerns? What else needs to be done?

** From SubPro PDP WG, not limited to recommendations, but also affirmations and implementation guidance*

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #2

- As per 2012 round, **fee reduction must be available for select applicants who meet evaluation criteria through the ASP.**
- That **ICANN continue to facilitate non-financial assistance including provision of pro-bono assistance** to applicants in need.
- WG believes high-level goals and eligibility requirements for ASP remain appropriate, noting however that since ASP not limited to LD countries in 2012 round, it **should continue to be open to applicants regardless of location** as long as they meet other program criteria.
- Therefore, IG N be amended to **"ICANN must retain the ASP, which includes fee reduction for eligible applicants and facilitate the provision of pro-bono non-financial assistance to applicants in need."**

WG's Rationale

- Believes financial assistance should continue to be provided to eligible applicants in order "to serve the global public interest by ensuring worldwide accessibility to, and competition within, the new gTLD Program" per 2012 round.
- Believes high-level ASP eligibility requirements from 2012 remain appropriate – applicants must demonstrate financial need, provide public interest benefit, and possess necessary management and financial capabilities – and for ASP to remain open to applicants regardless of location

CCT-RT Rec. 31

WG notes this Rec, "ICANN Org to coordinate the pro-bono assistance program". Recommendation #2 provides guidance that this continues.

For At-Large Consensus Building

"The ALAC strongly advocates for Applicant Support to continue to be **open to applicants whose applications are conceived to serve underserved regions and/or underserved communities regardless of their location, so long as they meet the other Applicant Support Program (ASP) criteria**....."

Support for "retaining Pro Bono Services for gTLD Startup Registries for candidates seeking support"

Impact

- ASP will continue in subsequent procedures & be available to applicants which meet eligibility criteria, regardless of location
- Applicants that qualify will be enjoy financial support - reduced application fee and non-financial support – pro-bono assistance

Continuity | Eligibility | Financial Support | Non-Financial Support

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Extract of Recommendation #2

- WG **believes high-level goals and eligibility requirements for ASP remain appropriate**, noting however that since ASP not limited to LD countries in 2012 round, it should continue to be open to applicants regardless of location as long as they meet other program criteria.

WG's Rationale

- Believes **high-level ASP eligibility requirements from 2012 remain appropriate** – applicants **must demonstrate financial need**, **provide public interest benefit**, and **possess necessary management and financial capabilities** – and for ASP to remain open to applicants regardless of location

From the Financial Assistance Handbook 2012 *

Exclusions / Eligibility

Excluded from Financial Support if

- ❑ String applied for is intended to reference a trademark (names of communities or non-govt agencies possible if hold legal TM protection)
- ❑ Candidate is national or federal entity or entity controlled by nat/federal govt
- ❑ String applied for is a geoname per AGB

Evaluation

Scoring is done for:

- ❑ Public Interest Benefit: demonstrable benefit to public or suitable community groups inc. distinct cultural, linguistic, ethnic communities, or with a defined social need
- ❑ Financial Need: lacking sufficient fin resources to pay app fees or otherwise execute projects or not able to raise same through other means
- ❑ Financial Capabilities: ability to manage funds and execute project

For At-Large Consensus Building

Eligibility Criteria

Evaluation of Applicants/ Applications

Additional intervention

- Requirement that applicant must demonstrate how they would serve beneficiary target region or community, not merely general public interest benefit
- Any other concerns? What else needs to be done?

* https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/candidate-support/financial-assistance-handbook-11jan12-en.pdf

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #3

- Expand scope of financial support to ASP beneficiaries beyond application fee to also cover costs such as application writing fees, attorney fees related to application process.

WG's Rationale

- Recognizes costs of applying for a TLD extend beyond application fee and these additional costs could be uncertain and prohibitive for applicants with limited financial resources

Pending Issue

- Should financial assistance extend to support for registry-level fees?

For At-Large Consensus Building

Impact

- Financial support not limited to reduced application fee

Financial Support

Any concerns?

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Related to Recommendation #3

- Should financial assistance extend to support for registry-level fees?

SubPro Initial Report

- Q. 2.5.4.c.7 "Additionally, financial support should go beyond the application fee, such as including application writing fees, related attorney fees, and **ICANN registry-level fees**"
- Via PC, explicit support from Council of Europe, general support from ALAC and BC; explicit opposition from RySG

SubPro PDP WG Action

- To pose a question to this effect in Draft Final Report for community input

For At-Large Consensus Building

Arguments for YES

- ❑ Would give ASP registry a warranted, better chance in succeeding
- ❑ An ASP registry eligible for pro-bono assistance =! not sustainable/ secure
- ❑ Passing ASP evaluation = possess necessary mgt & financial capabilities
- ❑ How is subsidizing registry-level fees different to non-financial pro-bono services?
- ❑ ICANN should have interest in ASP registries succeeding beyond application process because serve public interest

Arguments for NO

- ❑ Conceptual difference between application support and registry support post delegation ie. Helps alleviate burden in raising funds for application process but should not allow ongoing subsidy for registries that aren't financially viable
- ❑ Non-financial pro-bono services not offered by ICANN
- ❑ Registries-ICANN talks about excess fees being applied to Ry fee reduction has been consistently pushed back, "Not ICANN's job to prop up registry that is failing"
- ❑ ASP should end at contracting

Support beyond application/ evaluation to operation

What should our response be?

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #4

- ICANN improve outreach, awareness-raising, application evaluation, and program evaluation elements of the ASP, as proposed in the IG below

Implementation Guidance

- Outreach and awareness-raising activities should be delivered well in advance to application window opening, as longer lead times help to promote more widespread knowledge about the program. Such outreach and education should commence no later than the start of the Communication Period.
- A dedicated IRT be established / charged with developing implementation elements of ASP – giving regard to the JAS WG Final Report and 2012 implementation of ASP.
- Outreach efforts should not only target the Global South, but also "middle applicants" (those located in struggling regions that are further along in development compared to underserved or underdeveloped regions. Evaluation criteria in ASP must treat "middle applicants" similar to those benefiting LDCs, LLDCs, SIDS per UNDESA list
- Support PIRR rec 6.1.b, "Consider researching globally recognized procedures that could be adopted for implementing ASP"

Implementation Guidance (Cont'd)

- Have dedicated IRT should draw on experts with relevant knowledge, including from targeted regions, to develop appropriate program elements related to outreach, education and application evaluation. Regional experts may be particularly helpful in providing insight on the evaluation of business plans from different parts of the world.
- Dedicated IRT should seek advice from experts in the field to develop framework for analysis of metrics to evaluate success of ASP, such as

Awareness & Education

- ❑ No. of outreach events & follow up
- ❑ Awareness level
- ❑ Level of interest expressed / no. considered applying
- ❑ No. of applicants
- ❑ Diversity of applicant pool – geo, IDNs
- ❑ No. of pro-bono service providers

Approval Rate

- ❑ No. of approved applicants

Success of Launched ASP gTLDs

- ❑ No. of registrants in "regional" TLDs
- ❑ No. of DN registered in "regional" new gTLDs compared to no. of internet users in such regions

WG's Rationale

- Need to exploit opportunities for improvement in outreach, awareness-raising, application evaluation, program evaluation elements of ASP, best done through a dedicated IRT
- Believes main factor in low uptake due to limited time to conduct outreach between finalization of ASP details – appl window launch

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #4 (Cont'd)

- ICANN improve outreach, awareness-raising, application evaluation, and program evaluation elements of the ASP, as proposed in the IG below

WG's Rationale (Cont'd)

- Notes AM Global Report – importance of timely and effective outreach and communications re New gTLD Program to better reach potential applicants in Global South and emerging markets – conclusion can be applied to ASP
- Considered ALAC Advice to Board of 2011 emphasizing importance of outreach in implementing ASP

CCT-RT Rec. 30

- WG notes this Rec, "Expand and improve outreach into the Global South."

- Believes "middle applicants" are an important potential target of ASP because better positioned to operate a TLD or in a market more ready for expansion but may still require some assistance – IRT to define "middle applicant"

WG's Rationale(Cont'd)

- Agrees with PIRR that globally recognized procedures eg from World Bank, could potentially be adapted for use in ASP – IRT to identify such procedures in implementation phase
- Important for dedicated IRT to consult relevant experts in implementing ASP to allow best practices, leveraging knowledge on target regions
- Dedicated IRT should work with experts to develop metrics to evaluate success of ASP

CCT-RT Rec. 29

- WG notes this Rec, "Set objectives/metrics for application from the Global South."

For At-Large Consensus Building

Impact

- Sufficient emphasis on improve outreach, awareness-raising, application evaluation, and program evaluation elements?
- To monitor work of dedicated IRT
- Any concerns?
- Are CCT-RT Recs 30 and 29 met?

Awareness / Outreach

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #5

- Support PIRR rec 6.1.a, "Consider leveraging the same procedural practices used for other panels, incl. publication of process documents and documentation of rationale."

WG's Rationale

- Agrees with PIRR conclusion that lessons learned from implementation of other evaluation panels, where applicable, to SARP

For At-Large Consensus Building

Impact

- Assists with transparency and predictability for applicants and community
- Documentation of rationale particularly assist with appeals process

Additional intervention

Any concerns?

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #6

- ICANN Org must develop plan for funding ASP, as proposed in IG below

Implementation Guidance

- ICANN Org should evaluate whether it can provide funds (per 2012) or whether additional funding is needed for the ASP in subsequent rounds
- ICANN Org should seek funding partners to help financially support the ASP as appropriate

WG's Rationale

- Need for clear plan for funding ASP
- ICANN needs to evaluate extent to which funds will be provided from ICANN Org budget and if additional funding is needed, additional funding sources

For At-Large Consensus Building

Sources of Funds for ASP

Impact

- Addresses need for more than USD 2 mil for next ASP?
- Push to identify additional funding partners?
- Defers question of source of funds being (1) excess application fees from 2012 round and (2) Auction Proceeds; some support for (3) adding as an extra component to next round application fees

Additional intervention

- What else could be done?
- Auction Proceeds not under purview of SubPro

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #7

- **Unless the SARP reasonably believes there was willful gaming**, applicants who are not awarded Applicant Support (whether "Qualified" or "Disqualified") **must have the option to pay balance of full standard application fee and transfer to standard application process.**
- Applicants must have limited period of time to provide any additional information necessary to convert theirs to a standard application, without causing unreasonable delay to other elements or other applicants eg in a contention set.

WG's Rationale

- A number of groups raised in PC concerns that candidates who were good match for the ASP may have been deterred to apply in 2012 because of "automatic termination if do not pass ASP evaluation" limitation
- Because of low update in 2012, beneficial to adjust rules to invite more prospective candidates in target groups – allowing opportunity to transfer to standard application is important equation to attract eligible applicants
- Re concerns on there being no penalties / mechanism to prevent gaming, no geographic limitations may lead to increased ASP applications, impact costs to process applications and to fund

WG's Rationale (Cont'd)

applicants, that **SARP be tasked to weed out willful gaming**

- Additional measures, like quick look mechanism, to help reduce gaming risk – further consideration needed in implementation phase

For At-Large Consensus Building

Impact

- Mirrors, in part, our comments of
  - Allowing applicants whose applications do not meet requirements of ASP to **choose whether to withdraw or transfer** those applications to standard application regime, with reasonable time give to pay balance application fee amount if choose to transfer
  - **Provided no willful gaming determined by Support Application Review Panel (SARP) during evaluation** – willful gamers should be penalized via ban for specified period
  - i.e. No automatic termination of applications which do not meet ASP criteria
- Question on gaming

Additional intervention

- **What else could be done?**

Effect of Rejection

Impact of SubPro Recommendations as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #8

- The Financial Assistance Handbook or its successor, subject to changes included in the above recommendations, must be incorporated into the AGB for subsequent rounds.

WG's Rationale

- In service of transparency and predictability, the Financial Assistance Handbook should be published as part of the AGB

For At-Large Consensus Building

Impact

- Updating of Financial Assistance Handbook
- Incorporation of Financial Assistance Handbook into AGB means has to be ready prior to and becomes part of AGB

Any concerns?

New Issues on ASP as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

For At-Large Consensus Building

❑ 1. Priority to successful ASP applicants

- WG did not come to a conclusion on whether to depart from 2012 approach in establishing priority between application if there were more qualified applicants than funds available – therefore did not recommend departure

Additional Intervention

- If expecting uptake to improve then more consideration ought to be given to have established approach
- We had suggested:
  - ❑ Using points earn during evaluation to determine dispersion of funds if there are more applicants than funds
  - ❑ Using "quota per region" approach

❑ 2. Effect of Transfer on timing of ASP process

- WG noted recommendation to allow unsuccessful ASP candidates to transfer to a standard application raises questions about timing of the ASP process relative to timing of overall application evaluation process
- Considered a proposal to address concerns about gaming associated with transfer but found that under that proposal, ASP applicant had no information to gain, and is therefore not in a position to game the system.

Any concerns?

Omissions & Related Topics on ASP as at 1 Apr 2020

For At-Large Consensus Building

Omissions

❑ 1. Priority in string contention

"Applicants who are subject to string contention resolution procedures and auctions are expected to have the financial wherewithal to see through the resolution procedure or participate in an auction as a last resort. Applicants who qualify for ASP are by default disadvantaged in this regard given their need to obtain Application Support in the first place. One this basis, propose that **an applicant who qualifies for ASP should be given priority in any string contention set, and not be subjected to any further string contention resolution process**."

- Did not receive support from others hence omitted
- Can we live without this?

Related Topics

❑ 1. Dedicated Application Round for ASP potential applicants

"Some support for dedicated round for applicants from developing countries and which proposes to benefit communities in developing countries or indigenous communities."

- Some support = no consensus
- To be revisited under "Applications Assessed in Rounds" topic

❑ 2. Appeals against SARP determinations

- To be considered under "Accountability Mechanism" topic

Overall CCT position on ASP as at 1 Apr 2020

SubPro PDP WG

CCT-RT Rec. 32

WG notes this Rec, "Revisit the Applicant Financial Support Program" has puts forward the (sic.) above recommendations to support improving ASP in subsequent procedures.

For At-Large Consensus Building

- Do we think enough headway has been made by SubPro PDP WG on this CCT-RT recommendation to improve the ASP for next round(s) based on their above to-date recommendations?