

GGP Applicant Support

Update to CPWG 25 Jan 2023

ODA update on Applicant Support – 1 – Aaron Hickmann

Followed up on questions asked during his last session with the group

Pro Bono Resources in 2012

A total of 24 entities were available to 2012 applicants. Among the group, the following services were provided:

- Technical assistance including back-end support for Critical Functions: 17
- Application creation/authoring: 17
- Legal Services: 10
- Support for IDN Implementation: 9
- Marketing and communications: 10
- Operations and Consulting: 16

Further information:

<https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/candidate-support/non-financial-support>

- Wide range of Pro Bono services offered in the public interest – the whole idea behind the ASP
- You had to qualify for applicant support to qualify for Pro Bono services (this condition has now been removed, much more flexible)
- In 2012, only 3 applicants qualified according to the criteria at the time (public interest objective, LDC, financial need) (more directed now to “struggling applicants with financial need – not targeted regions)
- Unsure of how applicants were informed about the availability of these services
- There were no MOUs signed and the services were purely voluntary therefore, no obligation for anyone to report back who may have used those services.
- No record of what value any services provided to successful (or unsuccessful) applicants
- Need to track the usage of these services What measures can be used to demonstrate success?

ODA update on Applicant Support – 2 – Aaron Hickmann

Followed up on questions asked during his last session with the group

ASP: ICANN org Analysis

- **Rec 17.2** calls for ICANN org to expand "the scope of financial support provided to [...] beneficiaries beyond the application fee to also cover costs such as application writing fees and attorney fees related to the application process."
 - As noted in the [Board's comments on the Draft Final Report](#), **expanding financial support to cover fees that ICANN org does not charge does not seem feasible or appropriate** to implement.
 - "In considering other ways to follow the intent of Recommendation 17.2 and expand the scope of financial support, [in the ODA] ICANN org suggests that this may be accomplished through a **reduction in other ICANN fees**."
- In the ODA, ICANN org suggests to:
 - Work collaboratively with a sub-committee of the IRT focused on ASP to **explore ways to follow the intent of expanding the scope of ASP** (Rec 17.2), taking into account research on other "globally recognized procedures" (IG 17.7)
 - Recognizing the GGP efforts will not conclude in time to be included in the ODA, ICANN org's analysis and proposed design of the ASP is based upon:
 - the SubPro Final Report Outputs,
 - the GNSO Council's responses to policy questions, and
 - ICANN org's assumptions related to the Outputs.

- **Rec 17.2: expand the scope of financial support beyond application fees...** cover such costs as application writing fees and attorney fees related to the application process
- Board noted that application writing and attorney fees are not charged by ICANN therefore may not be not appropriate to implement.
- ODA suggests that **in keeping with the intent of expanding the scope of ASP** - a reduction in other ICANN fees (e.g annual fees) for a few years to smooth the way towards viability for some applicants
- Org to work with IRT to explore ways to follow the spirit of the recommendation with more research into what is best practice in other organisations offering similar approaches (Rec17.2)
- **There is a need to track that usage and utilisation as helpful data to contribute towards assessing measures of success in the area of financial support.**

ODA update on Applicant Support – 3 – Aaron Hickmann

Followed up on questions asked during his last session with the group

Summary of ICANN org analysis

- The Applicant Support Program application submission period (for support requests only, not collecting gTLD application information) **should be opened 18 months prior** to the opening of the new gTLD round in order to:
 - provide more time for applicants to develop applications and work with pro bono providers.
 - if an applicant does not qualify for support, notify them before the application system opens gives them time to request alternative support from potential funders.
 - give org time to judge how many applicants are requesting support.
 - give the org time to conclude its funding plan (i.e., demonstrating higher demand may yield additional funding).
- It is still worth noting that a reduced application fee may be a significant amount of money for some applicants.

Would the ODA be updated as a result of the GGP?

- No. Because GGP had not started when the ODA was produced, a lot of current GGP thinking is not included. The ODA will only be updated if the Board directs them to do so
- However, (1) the GGP draft report will first go to public comment and then (2) the GGP final Recommendations report will go to the GNSO Council for the Council's further consideration. The intent is for the GGP recommendations to help inform the implementation of the applicant portion of the implementation review of the PDP.
- GGP was directed to Section 9 of GGP Manual [Annex A-2 of the ICANN Bylaws](#) which details the process by which the (3) GNSO Council and Org will develop the final Recommendations Report to the Board.