

Please indicate your response to Guidance Recommendation 1:

Select 1

- Support Recommendation as written
- Support Recommendation intent with wording change
- Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- Do not support Recommendation
- No opinion

LIFE CYCLE ELEMENTS:

1. COMMUNICATIONS And OUTREACH/AWARENESS

Guidance 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-served and developing regions and countries.

Indicators of Success:

- *Quantitative: Conversion rates proportionate with industry standards for online campaigns and in-person events, with specific metrics and pre-agreed to be determined in consultation with ICANN org Communications and applicable contractor(s).*
- *Qualitative: Survey results about quality and clarity of information that are proportionate with industry standards, with specific metrics to be determined and pre-agreed in consultation with ICANN org Communications and applicable contractor(s).*

Data/Metrics to Measure Success: *Click-throughs, inquiries, registrations to get more information, etc.*

Qualitative Measurements: *Results of the surveys about the quality of the information provided – whether the recipient understood the information, made an informed decision to consider pursuing further or walk away.”*

Please indicate your response to Guidance Recommendation 2:

Select 1

- Support Recommendation as written
- Support Recommendation intent with wording change
- Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- Do not support Recommendation
- No opinion

2. "BUSINESS CASE" ALSO KNOWN AS APPLICANT UNDERSTANDING AND DETERMINING NEED/OPPORTUNITY AND DEVELOPING APPLICATION

Guidance Recommendation 2: *That the Applicant Support Program has cultivated pro bono services as well as ICANN-provided information and services to be available for supported applicants to inform their gTLD applications; that ICANN will communicate the availability of pro bono services and the parameters in which they are offered to potential supported applicants; 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 Applicant Support Program applicants that access pro bono services indicate moderate to high satisfaction with those pro bono services and information.*
- *Qualitative: A majority of Applicant Support Program applicants that are surveyed about quality and usefulness of services, such as pro bono services, 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/or assisting them through the application process."*

Please indicate your response to Guidance Recommendation 3:

Select 1

- Support Recommendation as written
- Support Recommendation intent with wording change
- Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- Do not support Recommendation
- No opinion

3. ICANN ORG SET UP OF APPLICANT SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR SUCCESS (IN OPERATIONAL TERMS)

Guidance Recommendation 3: *That the Applicant Support Program has the necessary resources to achieve its goals based on the GGP Guidance Recommendation Report. Indicators of Success:*

Qualitative: Survey results from event attendees, potential Applicant Support Program applicants, and actual Applicant Support Program applicants indicate a high degree of understanding about the Applicant Support Program 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 communications 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 quality, accessibility, and usefulness of the information and events provided about the Applicant Support Program.”*

Please indicate your response to Guidance Recommendation 4:

Select 1

- Support Recommendation as written
- Support Recommendation intent with wording change
- Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- Do not support Recommendation
- No opinion

4. APPLICATION SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION

Guidance Recommendation 4: *Make application materials and the application process timely and 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.*

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.*

Qualitative Measurements: *Results of surveys about whether the applicant was successful or made an informed decision not to submit an application (noting that survey response rates from entities that ultimately chose not to submit an application may be quite low and difficult to measure)."*

Please indicate your response to Guidance Recommendation 5:

Select 1

- Support Recommendation as written
- Support Recommendation intent with wording change
- Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- Do not support Recommendation
- No opinion

5. CONTRACTING/DELEGATION

Guidance Recommendation 5: *Of all successfully delegated gTLD applications, the goal is that a certain percentage of them should be from supported applicants.*

Indicators of Success: *No fewer than 10, or 0.5 percent (.005), of all successfully delegated gTLD applications were from supported applicants.*

Data/Metrics to Measure Success: *0.5 percent (.005) of successfully delegated gTLD applications are from supported applicants. Note that this percentage is not in relation to the number of strings applied for, rather the number of applications.”*

Please indicate your response to Guidance Recommendation 6:

Select 1

- Support Recommendation as written
- Support Recommendation intent with wording change
- Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- Do not support Recommendation
- No opinion

6. ONGOING OPERATIONS OF THE GTLD

Guidance 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 three years.

Implementation Guidance:

1. If supported applicants that were awarded a gTLD are not still in business as a registry operator after three years, ICANN org should investigate barriers/challenges that failed registry operators experienced to help inform future aspects of Applicant Support Program and/or other capacity development new registry program.

2. Following completion of a new gTLD round, ICANN org should collect data on the number of supported applications that resulted in a delegated TLD by region, and those that did not; track operations of those delegated TLDs for three years; and conduct of survey of the successful and unsuccessful supported applicants to determine which elements of the program they found useful or not.

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

Data/Metrics to Measure Success:

- The number of registrants of domain names registered in “regional” TLDs (e.g., TLDs focusing mainly on a local, limited market), keeping in mind that there are other barriers for registrants in developing countries to access domain names, such as inability to access online payment services and a lack of local registrars.
- The number of domain names registered in “regional” new gTLDs compared to the number of Internet users in such regions. These numbers could be compared with the same numbers for Internet users and “regional” new gTLDs in developed regions such as Europe and North America.”

Please indicate your response to Guidance Recommendation 7:

Select 1

- Support Recommendation as written
- Support Recommendation intent with wording change
- Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- Do not support Recommendation
- No opinion

“... the ODA does not address Task 6 per se, in that it envisions the availability of additional funding (not that there is inadequate funding) should such funding be needed (that is, via an additional budget allocation and/or sponsorship). In addressing Task 6, the WG might want to account for a scenario where additional funding is not available.”

Guidance Recommendation 7: *In the scenario that there is inadequate funding for all qualified applicants in the Applicant Support Program, the recommended methodology for allocating financial support should be for ICANN org to allocate limited funding by way of fee reduction equally across all qualified applicants, while not hindering the efficiency of the process. In this context the working group agreed to assume, for the sake of equity, that one application equaled one string. This recommendation is made in the context of no additional funding being made available. However, the group recommends that ICANN org give high priority to and make every effort to provide additional funding so that all successful applicants are supported.”*

Please indicate your response to Guidance Recommendation 8:

Select 1

- Support Recommendation as written
- Support Recommendation intent with wording change
- Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- Do not support Recommendation
- No opinion

“... In its deliberations the working group identified a number of disadvantages. Specifically, the working group noted that prioritization would put ICANN org in the unfortunate position of having to select some qualified applicants over others for more or less funding based on criteria that would likely be questioned as subjective. Furthermore, in order to be able to recommend this option the working group would have to reach agreement on which factors should result in prioritization; consider criteria to evaluate applications; and ICANN org would have to set up an evaluation structure to carry out prioritization. The working group did not address these steps.”

Guidance Recommendation 8: *To mitigate the risk that the allocation of support under the Applicant Support Program could be diluted to the point of being unhelpful, ICANN org should designate a minimum level of support each qualified applicant must receive, and develop a plan if funding drops below that level.”*

Please indicate your response to Guidance Recommendation 9:

Select 1

- Support Recommendation as written
- Support Recommendation intent with wording change
- Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- Do not support Recommendation
- No opinion

“... ICANN org GDS staff agreed that the guidance recommendation as currently written was helpful because it establishes that there is a purpose and a goal behind the allocation of support.”

Guidance Recommendation 9: ICANN org should develop a flexible, predictable, and responsive Applicant Support Program in order to communicate the results of evaluation process and allow applicants to know their range of support allocations as early as possible in a transparent manner.”

Other Comments and Submission

Are there any issues pertaining to Tasks 3, 4, 5, and/or 6 that the GGP Team has not considered? See the list of tasks on pages 3–4 of the [Initial Report](#).

Note issues not addressed by these tasks are out of scope of this GGP working group.

Other comments:

Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise pertaining to the Initial Report?

If applicable, please specify the section or page number in the [Initial Report](#) to which your comments refer.