At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: ***An Example***

Justine Chew

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG)

Wednesday, 18 December 2019
19:00 UTC

AT-LARGE's SUBSEQUENT PROCEDURES SCORECARD EXAMPLE

Topic/Area:	**APPLICANT SUPPORT PROGRAM**		Priority Level:	**HIGH**	Rank:
Related:	Global South/Middle Applicant outreach, Nature of support				
CCT-RT Rec:	✓ 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)				
SubPro PDP WG Policy Goals:	• 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.				
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?		Is this acceptable? If not, why so?		What else needs to be broached & with whom?	
1. No objection to ASP continuing		Yes			
2. Policy changes needed to increase chances of ASP succeeding		Yes, lends to CCT-RT Rec's. 32, 30			
What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?		Is this acceptable? If not, why so?		What else needs to be broached & with whom?	
3. ASP to continue, should: • Be open to applicants regardless of their location as long as they meet program criteria – ie eligibility		Yes		• Applicant must demonstrate how they would serve target region or community	
• Target Global South & "Middle Applicant" (ie still struggling regions which may not be underserved or underdeveloped)		Yes		• Definition of "Global South", or agreement on how to describe underserved or underrepresented regions	Work with ICANN Org
• 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.			

What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be broached & with whom?	
• Extend financial support beyond subsidy on application fees	Yes, financial support towards items like application writing fees, related attorney fees, ICANN registry-level fees are useful. Is in addition to pro bono assistance program per CCT-RT Rec. 31		
• Consider number of successful applicants as a measure of success	Yes, but this is only one possible measure.	• Need a clear set of metrics	
4. No automatic termination of applications which do not meet ASP criteria	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 give to pay balance application fee amount if choose to transfer.		
PENDING ISSUES:			
5. Metrics framework for measuring success	Yes, necessary; lends to CCT-RT Rec. 29		
6. Dealing with risk of gaming	Yes, necessary task.	• Expanding SARP's evaluation methodology to include determination of "gaming" • Broad agreement on penalty to be applied on gamers	
7. Method for selecting recipients if number of successful applicants exceeds funds allocated			
What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What needs to be advocated and to whom?	
8. Priority for successful ASP applicant in string contention			
Position:			