

# WT2 (2010)

## 1. Who should receive support?

Key to making a support program work is the choice of recipients who might receive support. The Team agreed that this initial round would serve as a learning experience for the community, as a number of issues – demand, the amount and type of support resources available, and other issues – became apparent. However, given the desire to get the program working quickly as part of this next gTLD round which may start soon, Working Team 2 recommended that the initial focus in this first round of new applicants should be on finding a relatively limited, easily identifiable, and non-controversial set of potential applicants. This approach, described as a “walk before we try to run” approach, is not designed to include policy for every potential applicant, but only to help move the community forward as we learn.

Based on these criteria, the Working Team recommended the following:

### a. Q: Who should be first in line for support?

A: For the initial/pilot phase, the Working Team recommends targeting support to ethnic and linguistic communities (e.g. the Hausa community, Quechua speakers, Tamil speakers). These potential applicants have the benefits of being relatively well defined as groups, and pass the test of being generally non-controversial. Such communities already have a history of recognition at ICANN and facilitating community on the web is one of ICANN's core values. However, this does not mean that ONLY ethnic and linguistic groups would be eligible, but rather that these groups should be considered first if there is adequate interest given that they are considered a positive good for the internet community and most closely fit the criteria.

### b. Q: Can only applicants structured as NGOs receive support?

A: No. While many groups receiving support might be structured as NGOs, applicants would not need to be non-profits, and could change their status over time in keeping with changing business and sustainability models. Some might start as non-profits but morph into hybrids or for-profits and others might be appropriate for-profit or hybrid applicants. It was agreed that the key issues in determining support such as contribution to the community, need, sustainability and the ability to reach underserved groups could potentially be achieved by applicants in a number of different organizational and juridical forms.

### c. Q: Should there be a regional preference for support?

A: While there are groups in most regions that might merit support, given limited resources and the particular challenges faced in Emerging Markets, the Working Team recommended giving some preference to applicants geographically located in Emerging Markets/Developing countries and in languages whose presence on the web is limited, with some extra preference given to historically disadvantaged areas such as Africa where the new gTLD process is believed to be the most challenging.

### d. Q: Are there some groups for whom support was deemed inappropriate at this time?

A: Yes. The Working Team agreed that some groups are not recommended for support at this point, specifically :

- Applicants that don't need the support/have ample financing
- Applicants that are brands/groups that should be self-supporting companies
- Applicants that are geographic names (such as .Paris and others)
- Purely Government/parastatal applicants (though applicants with some Government support might be eligible)
- Applicants whose business model doesn't demonstrate sustainability

## 2. What kinds of support might be offered?

The group recommended a number of different kinds of support that could be valuable for potential applicants, support which falls relatively neatly into three categories:

### a. Logistical, outreach and fee Support in the Application Process

- Translation of relevant documents – a major concern noted by non-English speaking group members, who noted the extra time and effort needed to work in English
- Logistical and technical help with the application process – including legal and filing support that are expensive and in short supply in most Emerging Markets nations
- Awareness/outreach efforts – to make more people in underserved markets are aware of the gTLD process and what they can do to participate in the gTLD process
- Fee reduction/subsidization and/or some sort of phased-in payment for deserving applicants – this discussion builds off of the work of Working Team 1, and includes two key ideas:
  - o That deserving applicants might receive some reduced pricing in general
  - o That some sort of phasing for payment might be appropriate, enabling selected applicants to effectively “pay as they go” for the application process rather than having all funds assembled up front

### b. Technical Support for Applicants in operating or qualifying to operate a gTLD

- Infrastructure – providing IPv6 compatible hardware and networks as needed
- Education/consulting – to help with DNSSEC implementation
- Possible technical waivers or “step ups” – allowing applicants to build their capabilities rather than needing to demonstrate full capacity before applying (as appropriate)
- Lower cost and/or shared back end registry services

### c. Support for Build-out in Underserved Languages and IDNs for new gTLDs

- Price discounts to incentivize gTLD build-out in scripts which currently have a limited presence on the web, as a way to bolster multilingual, multi-script content and limit the digital divide
- Incentivizing an expansion of IDN content through “Bundled pricing” – enabling applicants willing to build out in numerous scripts at once to get a “bundled price”, making it economically viable to get more scripts on the web
- Clear tests to prevent gaming and ensure that support reaches its targets