GGP – CPWG consultation

Applicant Support Programme

Maureen Hilyard, Sarah Kiden

10 May 2023

Recommendation 1: Increase awareness of the Applicant Support Program of the next round of gTLD applications among those who may need and could qualify for support.

Implementation Guidance: Target potential applicants from the not-for-profit sector, social enterprises and/or community organizations from ~~under-developed, under-represented or~~ <mark>under-served and developing regions and countries.</mark>

Indicators of Success:
Quantitative: Conversion rates proportionate with industry standards for online campaigns and in-person events, in consultation with ICANN org Communications and applicable contractor(s).

etc etc

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

- QUALIFYING CRITERIA

•<mark>**UNDERSERVED**</mark> – using the GAC definition but restricting it to
" Does not have a well developed DNS and/or associated industry or economy; and/or has low awareness ~~within its government~~ of ICANN, ICANN's role and functions, and policy processes and the way that these policies affect it.
*Would also include under-developed and under-represented communities eg indigenous groups

<mark>Also suggested was the addition from the GAC definition"</mark>
"focuses on regions under-served by the DNS industry, and least developed economies and small island developing states. A particular focus is on under-served economies/countries from the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) regions." Referencing to Global South, there are communities that are under-represented and under-served; it's a geographic limitation rather than a socioeconomic one.

<mark>* DEVELOPING</mark> – using the UN definition

Recommendation 2: That the Applicant Support Program has cultivated <mark>PRO BONO</mark> services as well as ICANN provided information and services [**add language suggested by Mike re: "communicating" – see transcript**] to be available for supported applicants to inform their gTLD applications and that supported applicants report that they found the information and services offered by pro bono providers to be useful.

Indicators of Success:

Quantitative: A majority of supported applicants that access pro bono services indicate moderate to high satisfaction with those pro bono services and information.
Qualitative: A majority of supported applicants that are surveyed about quality and usefulness of services, such as pro bono, indicate how and why those services were useful to their application.

Data/Metrics to Measure Success: A majority of respondents that are surveyed about pro bono services indicated that the services and information that they received was useful to informing their gTLD application and/ assisting them through the application process.

Qualitative Measurements: Results of the surveys about the quality and usefulness of services, such as pro bono – whether the applicant was successful or made an informed decision to walk away (noting that survey response rates from entities that chose not to participate may be quite low and difficult to measure).

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

* Importance of COMMUNICATION on website and other communication tools that clearly detail about
- **where** people can get information from
- **What** they need to know about the service providers and the services that are on offer
- So that they can make their own informed decisions about who they choose to use for advice

- ICANN will not be involved in the matching of applicants and providers

Recommendation 3: That the Applicant Support Program has the <mark>necessary resources</mark> to achieve its goals based on the GGP Recommendations Guidance Report.

Indicators of Success:

Qualitative: Survey results from event attendees, potential ASP applicants, and actual ASP applicants indicate a high degree of understanding about the ASP and the gTLD Program application requirements.

Data/Metrics to Measure Success: "mentions", the quality of the coverage (e.g., reach, correct messaging, positive tone, appropriate outlet), and the geographic distribution of the coverage. Additional <mark>communications</mark> metrics that can be considered include social media statistics, website traffic, and event attendance (physical and online), inquiries, event registrations indicate awareness and have cultivated interest among potential applicants to get more information about the Applicant Support Program.

Qualitative Measurements: Results of the [ongoing] surveys about the <mark>quality, accessibility, and usefulness</mark> of the information and events provided about the Applicant Support Program.

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

- <mark>COMMUNICATIONS</mark> – how and where potential applicants can find information – very important

- <mark>ONGOING SURVEYS AND ASSESSMENTS</mark> – at different points there will be assessments to ensure that applicants are getting the support they need

- <mark>QUALITY, ACESSIBILITY AND USEFULNESS</mark> – and that the information is what they need to know

Recommendation 4: Make application materials and the application process timely accessible to diverse potential applicants, with the aim of facilitating successful applications in the Applicant Support Program among those who may need and could qualify for support.

[Add Implementation Guidance on ICANN Learn module? Re: Maureen's comment – What would be most helpful to articulate are the learning objectives and learning outcomes. That will help Org determine what resources to deploy.]

Indicators of Success:

ICANN Learn module/survey results show that a majority of applicants had a strong understanding of the application requirements and evaluation process.

Data/Metrics to Measure Success: Percentage of applicants that applied that indicated via survey or ICANN Learn module that they had a strong understanding of the ASP application requirements and evaluation process

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

- AN ICANN LEARN COURSE FOR THE APPLICANT SUPPORT PROCESS

- It was suggested that for those who qualify for ASP, then they should first complete the ICANN Learn course "How to run a Registry/Registrar"

- The proposed ASP course should follow the guidelines of the recommendations so that they have a strong understanding what the key criteria that ASP applicants must adhere to and understand
- Definitions - Developing and underserved regions/countries
- Definitions - public interest

Recommendation 5: Of all successfully delegated gTLD applicants, the goal is <mark>that 0.5 percent (.005)</mark> of them were supported applicants

Indicators of Success:
<mark>5 percent (.05)</mark> of all successfully delegated gTLD applicants were supported applicants.

Data/Metrics to Measure Success: 5 percent of successfully delegated gTLD applications are supported applicants. Note that this percentage is in relation to the number of strings applied for, or the number of applicants..

Key DISCUSSION POINT

CONFUSION BY THE NON-MATHEMATICIANS OF OUR GROUP

DECISION – WE WOULD STICK TO A NUMBER

That is, no less that 10 successful applicants
(i.e. 0.5% of 2000 total applicants)

Recommendation 6: ICANN org to investigate the extent to which supported applicants that were awarded a gTLD are still in business as a registry operator after ~~two~~ three years.

Implementation Guidance:
If supported applicants that were awarded a gTLD are *not* still in business as a registry operator after two years**, ICANN org to investigate barriers/challenges that failed ROs experienced** to help inform future aspects of ASP and/or other capacity development new registry program.

Indicators of Success:
Number of supported applications that result in a delegated TLD and track operations over a designated time period, for example ~~two~~ three years.

etc etc

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

- **There was not issue** with the change of timeframe for applicants to be able to show that they remain as a viable business from two to three years

- The discussion **did raise the need for ON-GOING monitoring** of those supported applicants who had successfully gained a domain through the applicant process

- It was suggested that perhaps successful supported applicants should be retained by a **MENTOR** from within the ICANN system to provide **ONGOING support** which was raised in Recommendation 3.

- **It was felt that finding out after two years that a RO had failed, defeated the whole purpose of ASP** – and that in order for it to be successful, the assessments, monitoring and support should be ONGOING