

At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: Applicant Support Program (ASP)

CPWG SubPro Small Team

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call
Wednesday, 29 January 2020, 19:00 UTC



APPLICATION SUBMISSION

Topic/Area:	[16] APPLICANT SUPPORT PROGRAM (ASP)			Priority:	HIGH	Settled On:	
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global South/Middle Applicant outreach – <i>Communication [2.4.2]</i> • Nature of support – use of funds, beyond funds, funding source • Criteria – Metrics • Accountability Mechanism – appeal against SARP evaluation determination • Contention set resolution involving ASP Applicants • Support – Accreditation Programs [2.2.6] • Application Fees [2.5.1] & Variable Fees [2.5.2] 						
Key Issues:	<p>The ASP for the 2012 application round offered USD2mil in financial support but yielded only 3 ASP applicants. None of the 3 ASP applicants were found to have met the selection criteria, and as a result their applications were terminated. In hindsight, the selection criteria standard was said to have been set too high, driven primarily by overwhelming caution against risk of ‘gaming’.</p> <p>Three other issues which arise are to do with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrics for measuring success of ASP Program; • <i>Appeals process to SARP determinations (which did not exist before); and</i> • <i>If successful ASP applicants should receive priority in contention sets (and under what circumstances)</i> 						
Policy Goals:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase “success” of program, using a set of metrics – awareness/outreach, total EOIs, total applicants, total ASP “grantees” etc • Provide financial support and services to certain qualified applicants in order to serve the above goals. • Ensure that information about the program and participation in the program is accessible to the target audience. 						
Assigned CCT-RT Rec’s:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 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) 						
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SubPro PDP WG Application Submission_Summary Document, 7 January 2020 • 02. SubPro Applicant Support Update to CPWG, 31 July 2019 						
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?</u>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done & by/with whom?				
1. No objection to ASP continuing, and should	The continuation of ASP in SubPro which will:						

a) Be open to applicants regardless of their location as long as they meet program criteria – ie eligibility	a) Be open to applicants regardless of their location as long as they meet program criteria	Yes	Advocate to SubPro for IRT to include requirement that applicant must demonstrate how they would serve target region or community
b) Target Global South & “Middle Applicant” (ie still struggling regions which may not be underserved or underdeveloped)	b) Target Global South & “Middle Applicant	Yes	Work with ICANN Org on definition of “Global South”, or agreement on how to describe underserved or underrepresented regions
c) Employ longer lead times to create awareness, draw on regional experts, leverage tools & expertise to evaluate applicant business cases	c) Employ longer lead times to create awareness, draw on regional experts, leverage tools & expertise to evaluate applicant business cases	Yes, outreach was very poor for 2012 round.	
d) Extend financial support beyond subsidy on application fees	d) Extend financial support towards expenses like application writing fees, related attorney fees, ICANN registry-level fees	Yes, this is useful and is in addition to pro bono assistance program per CCT-RT Rec. 31	
e) Consider number of successful applicants as a measure of success	e) Consider number of successful applicants as a measure of success	Yes, but this is only one possible measure.	
2. Policy changes needed to increase chances of ASP succeeding	Unclear	Yes, lends to CCT-RT Rec’s. 32, 30	
3. No automatic termination of applications which do not meet ASP criteria	ASP applicants who fail to meet requirements to be given a choice to move to a standard application	Yes, we advocated strongly for this. Unsuccessful ASP applicants should be allowed to choose either withdraw or transfer to standard application regime, with reasonable	

		time given to pay balance application fee amount if choose to transfer.	
4. SARP evaluations ought to be appealable	SARP evaluations to be part of new Accountability Framework	Yes	Monitor cost of filing, losing appeals
5. ASP vis a vis fees regime	Successful ASP candidates will be eligible for reduced application fee.	Yes	
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?</u>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
6. No consensus for priority to successful ASP applicant in string contention	Priority for successful ASP applicant in string contention	Thoughts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geoname string application from the same jurisdiction? 	
<u>PENDING ISSUES:</u>	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
7. Metrics framework for measuring success			Yes, necessary; lends to CCT-RT Rec. 29; but what other metrics to apply? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of ASP applicants Number of successful ASP applicants
8. Dealing with risk of gaming			Yes, necessary to inquire with SubPro WG after: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding SARP's evaluation methodology to include determination of gaming Broad agreement on penalty to be applied
9. Method for selecting recipients if applicants exceeds funds allocated			Thoughts?

10. Source of ASP funding			Thoughts? Other than partial excess of application fees.
Position:			

DRAFT