

2023-05-01 Applicant Support GGP - Meeting #11

The call for the Applicant Support GGP team will take place on **Monday, 01 May 2023 at 15:00 UTC for 60 minutes.**

For other places see: <https://tinyurl.com/mrjunyhp>

PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Continued Discussion of Goals and Metrics Relating to Tasks 3, 4, 5 -- Draft Suggested Revision (60 min)

Clean: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Ahkm59-2wCjyjdOIR0k17LKMh6EwJ2QGfYgyChEYjNg/edit?usp=sharing> [docs.google.com] (for discussion – set to comment)

Redline: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DZ0wng7k71QraQCXRRJLLxfICdnhnVFfnZODkNK5sf4E/edit?usp=sharing> [docs.google.com] (for reference -- set to view only)

3.AOB

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

PARTICIPATION

Attendance

Apologies: Lawrence Olawale-Roberts

RECORDINGS

Audio Recording

Zoom Recording (including audio, visual, rough transcript and chat)

GNSO transcripts are located on the [GNSO Calendar](#)

Notes/ Action Items

ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK: WG members to review the revised clean version of the working document dated 01 May 2023 at: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bU_QTPqYKvwOp0I90sHLigCNmTE8YkvrX59FIPeTjQ/edit?usp=sharing. The focus should be on sections 5 and 6, but if members have comments on earlier sections they should highlight them in an email to the WG list, rather than in comments in the document.

Notes:

1. Welcome

2. Continued Discussion of Goals and Metrics Relating to Tasks 3, 4, 5 -- Draft Suggested Revision (60 min)

Clean: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Ahkm59-2wCjyjdOIR0k17LKMh6EwJ2QGfYgyChEYjNg/edit?usp=sharing> [docs.google.com] (for discussion – set to comment)

Redline: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DZ0wng7k71QraQCXRRJLLxfICdnhnVFfnZODkNK5sf4E/edit?usp=sharing> [docs.google.com] (for reference -- set to view only)

1. Outreach/Awareness – Recommendation 1:

Comment from Gabriela Mattausch: *Is it possible to include public sector?*

Discussion:

- Gabriela: I was wondering if the public sector could be included in the targeting of potential applicants, because in many developing countries that is the manager of the ccTLD. And these are.
- Mike: So you're talking about government entities getting support.
- Gabriela: Yes, that's right.
- Mike: Yeah. I'm not sure that this is what we're after.
- Olga: I think that it may be the case that an applicant could be an organization from the Government.
- Maureen: It might not be the governments themselves. There may be some kind of entity that might need might need support. It depends on the definition of under-developed. What we are using to define those categories.
- Rafik: Concern that it is quite broad – will we be able to put some limit even in the context of developing countries, government or entity, state-owned entity or linked to state, they still have some resources or a way to get resources.
- Mike: Maybe just one clarification. I think people keep getting confused about this. We're not excluding anybody by indicating target applicants.

Comment from Gabriella re: "under-developed": *I suggest to use the UN standard for statistical use: "developing regions and countries" (<https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/#n2>).*

Discussion:

- Mike: This ties in with some of the comments from Roz, that is, we need to agree to a single definition or set of definitions and stick with them.
- Olga: Using the UN definition gives us a good background for having that text in the document. If not, any other participant could challenge that.
- Mike: The suggestion then is adding "under-served", I think that's been largely agreed.
- Maureen: Just as long as everybody knows what the criteria are for.
- Mike: Here we are talking about outreach and awareness, not criteria for support. It is useful to get these elements resolved upfront because they will be used when it comes to qualification as well.
- Kristy, ICANN org: Another way of thinking about this, per Mike's comment, is, "what would the GGP consider success for outreach and awareness raising for ASP?" Recognizing that that outreach and awareness will need some focus on audiences, in addition to general global awareness raising.
- Gabriela: Regarding the spirit of this program, we should bear in mind that the intention is to get as many as applicants as possible. The concept of developing countries is broader and more inclusive than underserved regions.
- Mike: Homework for the next call --- see whether the UN definition can work as the suggested definition

Comment from Roz: *Can industry standards be defined in this context? Would need to know what that looks like/what specific metric that will be measured against if we are going to sign up to it.*

Discussion:

- Kristy, ICANN org: We could ask our Communications team for help with how they typically measure this.
- Paul: Do we have any expertise in online campaigns? If not, wouldn't we just be guessing?
- Kristy: Yeah, I think both we could ask global communications, and, as most of you are probably aware, we also have a contract with Mayo for general awareness raising and the campaign for the next round, including the applicant support program. So I think both of those can be good resources here to get some input on how to frame this metric appropriately for the context.
- Mike: And I think we're a little bit of a tightrope over here. I think we need a little more detail, but we also don't want to constrain ourselves by putting in too much detail, which would hamstring potentially the development of the program.
- Kristy: It's a framing rather than a prescription, perhaps.

Comment from Roz re: Qualitative Measurements: *Could we be more specific here - "written survey results" or something to indicate that the surveys should provide boxes for written feedback/input.*

Discussion:

- Mike: We've said there must be surveys. Can we be more specific about the type of survey? I don't think we need to put in there that there's got to be boxes for written feedback. I think you can do it very well through a variety of mechanisms. But maybe again, we can frame that with a little bit more particularity.
- Kristy, ICANN org: Typically a qualitative survey measurement would be more open ended questions/comments so I think that's reflected in the fact that this is looking at qualitative results

2. Business Case – Recommendation 2:

Comment from Roz: Re: suggestion to add text: *"and other resources as deemed required." to capture the initial intent of the sentence, suggesting that helpful resources might go beyond pro-bono services.*

Discussion:

- Mike: I get your point about pro bono services. Other resources as deemed required: I don't like words like deemed because somebody has to do the deeming.
- Kristy, ICANN org: What I'm seeing here is kind of the broader fostering understanding among applicants about what the opportunity is, and making sure that they're making an informed decision about whether and how to apply, of which a part of that in terms of the resources available would be pro bono services. But the other piece of that, may be other resources that ICANN org provides. So, for example, you know, we talked about a portal of resources. There was even discussion around like training, or ICANN Learn modules that the Applicant Support people go through. And so maybe the surveys are also a measure of how well those resources landed, how understandable and accessible those were. So, the applicants could make an informed decision in their application process in addition to the pro bono services.
- Mike: I think we need to revise the language slightly that its cultivated pro bono services as well as ICANN provided information and services.

Comment from Roz re: Metrics: *I still think we need a metric on conversation rates here, per the language above "Conversion rates of applicants who applied or determined that an application was not appropriate for them"*

Discussion:

- Mike: I don't think that conversion rates is the correct metric. I personally think that that is a degree of satisfaction with that element of the program, which doesn't necessarily translate into specific conversion rates of applicants who applied. You know success is also taking something through the journey, and they decide not to apply because they realize they don't have a compelling business case.

3. ICANN org set up of ASP for success – Recommendation 3: No comments.

4. Application Submission and Evaluation – Recommendation 4:

Comment from Roz re: "Facilitate successful applications in the Applicant Support Program among those who may need and could qualify for support." *I think it's important to keep this language - we want to facilitate successful applications among those who may need/could qualify for support, as that's the end aim/goal of this programme.*

Discussion:

- Kristy, ICANN org: We want to be careful that we're maintaining the fidelity of the evaluation process for applications for support. And so to we will do everything we can to help support applicants to that process to help that give them the resources and tools that they need so that they have every chance of success, and then making that information as accessible as we can to diverse applicants. And you know, at the end of the day, once they submit their applications and they go to the Support Applicant Review panel, which is an independent evaluator, we can't tip the scales in terms of whether that application is successful, they either meet the criteria or they don't. There will be a mechanism for limited challenger appeals if they do not qualify, and they want to appeal that decision. But we can't, as ICANN org intervene and tip the scales to make sure that they are successful. So that's the clarification that we're seeking here.
- Mike: I would suggest that we add similar language back, but at the end of the sentence. I think we need to say with the AIM of facilitating successful applications amongst those who may need and could qualify for support. So I completely agree with you. We we're not suggesting in any way that I should put its finger on the scale for any supported application, but I'm saying making the application, materials and the application process accessible with a clear objective in mind to get more successful applications from those who need support through the process.
- Kristy: That seems like a helpful clarification.

Next Meeting: Start at section 5, recommendation 5.