



GGP – CPWG consultation

Applicant Support Metrics as Indicators of Success
Tasks 3-4-5

Maureen Hilyard, Sarah Kiden

Evaluation Components, Descriptions & ASP Example

Evaluation Component	Description	Example (Applicant Support, ASP)
Goal	What is the aim? What is the desired outcome?	To widen and deepen the applicant pool to increase the number of qualified, diverse applicants to the program.
Indicator	What would indicate the goal has been achieved? How will you know when it is achieved?	<p>The number of applicants that qualify for support is $\geq 0.5\%$ of total gTLD applications in the next round.</p> <p>>60% of supported applicants from countries classified as emerging, developing, or least developed economies.</p> <p>>50% of supported applicants from civil society, social enterprise, and/or community organizations</p>
Data source (metric)	What data/information should be collected and analyzed to determine if the goal was met?	Registration and demographic information from participants in outreach and engagement efforts and from ASP and gTLD applicants

Evaluation Components, Descriptions & ASP Example

Evaluation Component	Description	Example (Applicant Support, ASP)
Goal	What is the aim? What is the desired outcome?	To widen and deepen the applicant pool to increase the number of qualified, diverse applicants to the program.
Indicator	What would indicate the goal has been achieved? How will you know when it is achieved?	<p>The number of applicants that qualify for support is $\geq 0.5\%$ of total gTLD applications in the next round.</p> <p>>60% of supported applicants from countries classified as emerging, developing, or least developed economies.</p> <p>>50% of supported applicants from civil society, social enterprise, and/or community organizations</p>
Data source (metric)	What data/information should be collected and analyzed to determine if the goal was met?	Registration and demographic information from participants in outreach and engagement efforts and from ASP and gTLD applicants

Questions & Comments that have arisen in our discussions about the sample guidance given by the ODA team.

Goal is from SubPro document so stays as is.

Indicators of success should address both qualitative measures as well as these quantitative metrics re: ASP Support.

1. What other quantitative metrics can be addressed? (emerging, etc - later discussion)
2. What examples of qualitative metrics relating to ASP applicants?

How do we collect information about those who use the proposed portal or pro bono services - not collected in the previous round? (Register first?)

Questions to consider to inform Goal-Development

1. What future desired result(s) are we seeking to achieve with the Applicant Support Programme?
2. Taking into account different aspects of the programme (e.g. pro bono services, application fee reduction, auction bid credit/multiplier), what are the goals related to each of these?
- ~~3. If you were evaluating Applicant Support in a few years, how would you describe a successful programme? How would you describe and unsuccessful programme?~~

LIFE CYCLE ELEMENTS:

1. OUTREACH/AWARENESS

GOAL: That potential applicants from under-developed, **under-represented** and developing regions should be a priority target of events, communication channels, and publications.

Approach: While not excluding any regional events, ICANN org should prioritize targeting **communication and outreach activities towards** potential applicants from **under-developed and developing regions**, ~~over regions that are already well represented, through events, communications channels, and publications~~ and **take into account the specificities in each region/country**.

Indicators of Success: That the majority of events, communications channels, and publications are targeted to supported applicants from under-developed, **under-represented** and developing regions.

Data/Metrics to Measure Success: Percentage of events, communications channels, and publications targeted to supported applicants from under-developed, **under-represented** and developing regions.

Recent comments on the first GOAL: That potential applicants from under-developed, under-represented and developing regions should be a priority target of events, communication channels, and publications.

I suggest to replace the concept of "under-developed" by "developing". Within the UN system, the distinction between "Developed regions" and "Developing regions" was introduced to the Standard country/area codes for statistical use (known as M49-<https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/>). These groupings were intended solely for statistics /not a judgement about stage of development.

Also I suggest not only the inclusive target of "applicants from developing regions" for outreach but also, I recommend to add: -"applicants from different developing and under-represented regions", which will reflect the goal of getting a more equally geographical distribution, and -"taking into account the specificities of each regional and national contexts and circumstances and technological development (GAC)

We should align our definition of **underdeveloped region** (and also **under-represented** though this may not necessarily be regional such as IDN groups or small island developing states which were also recognised by SubPro) **with the GAC definition of "under-developed"**.

An under-developed region is defined from the ICANN perspective, that is, it does not have a well developed DNS and/or associated industry or economy; and/or its government has low awareness of ICANN, ICANN's role and functions, and policy processes and the way that these policies affect it.

This definition would clearly identify that the need for applicant support would not necessarily be an economic need, but it must also align with the purpose of funding for application support - to enhance the development of the internet and its DNS. (ALAC with agreement from GAC)

"Under-represented" should be used to identify under-represented communities existing perhaps within developed regions such as minority indigenous groups . Thus the need for a glossary insert to define and explain the inclusion of these categories as specific and eligible for ASP.

Therefore the GOAL should read "**.. potential applicants from underdeveloped and developing regions, and those from under-represented communities from any region, should be a priority target for events..etc.**" (ALAC)

The jury is still out on this suggestion but definitions are an imperative

Future desired results

- Qualitative and quantitative data is collected about all activities that are undertaken during the whole application process (to assess later on about what worked or didn't work and to look at continuous improvement)
- That specific information about the Applicant Support Programme is clearly outlined, and all criteria are clearly defined, so that, from the outset, interested applicants can clearly identify if they qualify for the programme or not
- That all applicants get all the information they will need in order to make a successful application - via a variety of approaches
 - ASP Portal
 - Outreach events - in person group events - of a size and format that will also enable Q&A (IRT organised? GSE support? RALO participation?),
 - Remote participation activities - webinars, zoom meetings on particular issues
 - Written information, brochures (in various languages and lots of visuals/infographics)
 - Helpline – 24x7 once the applications open for a set time, for any queries to be responded to (volunteers rotate around the regions to meet regional needs)
 - Q&A Fact sheet - to store queries and responses (with queries categorised by topic); accessible on the portal
 - **Any more ideas???**
 - What worked? What wasn't successful? Why?