Deleted: xx July

GNSO Guidance Process (GGP)[1] Initiation Request for Select New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Topics	
1. Name of Council Member/SG/C	This Initiation Request is submitted to the GNSO Council by TBD
2. Origin of issue (e.g. board request)	The New gTLD Subsequent Procedures (SubPro) Final Report envisioned some levels of substantive work taking place during the Implementation Review Team (IRT) phase of the work, after ICANN Board adoption of the recommendations. For instance, in Topic 17: Applicant Support[2], Implementation Guidance 17.5, the report suggests the creation of a dedicated IRT and it be charged "with developing implementation elements of the Applicant Support Program. In conducting its work, the Implementation Review Team should revisit the 2011 Final Report of the Joint Applicant Support Working Group as well as the 2012 implementation of the Applicant Support program." This dedicated IRT was to be charged with making substantive decisions on outreach activities and allocation of scarce resources (e.g., when there are more qualified applicants than available funds), among other activities. Sometime after the submission of the Final Report, some community members made informal requests to the ICANN staff and Board that formation of this "dedicated IRT" be pulled forward in time (i.e., before Board approval of the Final Report) with the rationale that: (1) it would ensure there was sufficient time to competently complete this complex task to design an effective Applicant Support Program; (2) since this was to be a dedicated team, the effort would not unnecessarily extend the effort of the traditional IRT; and (3) regardless of the timing of the Board approval, having developed an effective Applicant Support Program would be of benefit to ICANN. On 12 September 2021, the ICANN Board resolved[3] to initiate an Operational Design Phase (ODP). The ODP was officially launched at the beginning of 2022. The ODP Team, in reviewing the recommendations related to Topic 17, was concerned that the work recommended by SubPro was potentially out of scope of the role envisaged by an IRT, per

---

[1] See GNSO Operating Procedures Annex 5 – GNSO Guidance Process Manual, section 3: https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/annex-5-ggp-manual-24oct19-en.pdf

[2] See page 71 of the Final Report here: https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/final-report-newgtld-subsequent-procedures-pdp-02feb21-en.pdf

[3] See resolution here: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-09-12-en#1.a

	the PDP Manual and Consensus Policy Implementation Framework (CPIF).
	The Council responded[4], without opining on whether the work presented a scope issue, but rather, committed to providing guidance on select topics where additional substantive work was envisaged by the recommendations and implementation guidance contained in the Final Report.
	The Council has determined that the provision of guidance is best accomplished via the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP). This would accomplish the twin goals of pulling the work forward to avoid becoming the "tall pole" in the next round launch and providing sufficient time and the correct resources to devise an Applicant Support program that would expand the regional and language diversity of the new gTLD Program.
	The Council, in consultation with the ODP Team via its liaison, also understands that there are a select number of topics and Outputs where additional work may be necessary prior to the official Implementation phase.
3. Scope of the effort (detailed description of the issue or question that the GGP is expected to address)	**The following Outputs for Applicant Support are determined to require additional substantive deliberations per the SubPro Final Report. The relevant Outputs from the SubPro Final Report are referenced and are accompanied by specific tasks to be performed by the GGP and represent the specific scope of work.**
	Recommendation 17.3: The Working Group recommends that ICANN improve outreach, awareness-raising, application evaluation, and program evaluation elements of the Applicant Support Program, as well as usability of the Program, as proposed in the implementation guidance below.
	Implementation Guidance 17.5: A dedicated Implementation Review Team should be established and charged with developing implementation elements of the Applicant Support Program. In conducting its work, the Implementation Review Team should revisit the 2011 Final Report of the Joint Applicant Support Working Group as well as the 2012 implementation of the Applicant Support program.
	Tasks:

---

[4] Insert link when available.

- **Task 1 – Review the 2011 Final Report of the Joint Applicant Support Working Group and the 2012 implementation of the Applicant Support program in detail, to serve as resources for other Applicant Support related questions/tasks.**

Implementation Guidance 17.8: In implementing the Applicant Support Program for subsequent rounds, the dedicated Implementation Review Team should draw on experts with relevant knowledge, including from the targeted regions, to develop appropriate program elements related to outreach, education, business case development, and application evaluation. Regional experts may be particularly helpful in providing insight on the development of business plans from different parts of the world.

Tasks:
- **Task 2 – Working with ICANN org staff as appropriate, identify experts with expertise to aid in tasks 3, 4, and 5.**

Implementation Guidance 17.9: The dedicated Implementation Review Team should seek advice from experts in the field to develop an appropriate framework for analysis of metrics to evaluate the success of the Applicant Support Program. The Working Group identified a non-exhaustive list of potential data points to support further discussion in the implementation phase. The Working Group anticipates that the dedicated IRT will consider how these and other potential metrics may be prioritized:
- Awareness and Education:
  - number of outreach events and follow up communications with potential applicants
  - level of awareness about the New gTLD Program/Applicant Support Program
  - number of enquiries about the program/level of interest expressed/number that considered applying
  - number of applicants
    - first-time applicants versus repeat applicants
    - applicants submitting a single application versus portfolio applicants
    - applications based on pre-existing trademarks
  - diversity and distribution of the applicant pool: geographic diversity, languages, scripts
- Other Elements of Program Implementation:

3

- o number of ICANN staff members and contractors supporting the Applicant Support Program
- o number of service providers offering pro-bono assistance and value of assistance offered/provided
- o number of applicants accessing/using pro-bono assistance
- o number of approved applicants for financial assistance
- o number of applicants who received bid credits, multiplier, other and were successful in auction
- o the value of the bid credits, multiplier, other
- o number of applicants who withdrew from auction
- o number of applicants who entered in to a business combination or other forms of joint ventures
- o length of time before any change of ownership occurred
- Success of Launched gTLD:
  - o 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.
  - o 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.

Tasks:

- **Task 3 – Analyze the set of suggested metrics in Implementation Guidance 17.9 and propose which ones should be prioritized. The set of prioritized metrics is NOT limited to what is identified in 17.9**
- **Task 4 – Identify any other appropriate metrics and measures of success to help in identifying the necessary program elements and measuring program success after the fact. In identifying the suggested set of metrics, propose how data can be collected, how metrics they can be measured, who can collect the data, as well as what represents success.**

- **Task 5 – Consider, and to the extent feasible, suggest how the "outreach, education, business case development, and application evaluation" elements of the Applicant Support Program may be impacted by the identified metrics and measures of success. For example, based on the success metrics for Awareness and Education, this may impact the approach for performing outreach and education. To the extent feasible, suggest an approach to outreach, education, business case development, and application evaluation assistance.**

Implementation Guidance 17.10: The dedicated Implementation Review Team should consider how to allocate financial support in the case that available funding cannot provide fee reductions to all applicants that meet the scoring requirement threshold.

Tasks:
- **Task 6 - Recommend a methodology for allocating financial support where there is inadequate funding for all qualified applicants.**

For the above-described tasks, the Working Group should support its recommendations with its analysis of the costs and benefits of alternatives that resulted in the Working Group converging on recommendations.

Adding Additional Scope to this GGP

The Council recognizes that there may be additional topical areas that the SubPro Final Report and the ICANN Org ODP Team have identified where implementation may be assisted by additional work by the community. The Council, therefore reserves the right to add additional issues, topics or questions to this GGP via a vote of the Council (subject to the same threshold as initiating a GGP (i.e., an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House)).

In the event that the Council elects to add such additional topics to this GGP, it may do so under the same terms and conditions of this Initiation Request.

4. Proposed WG mechanism (e.g., WG, DT, individual volunteers)	This GGP will operate as a Working Group, which may initiate sub-teams if the need arises.
5. Method of operation, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines	This Working Group will follow the method of operation as detailed in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, with the additional provisions below. Working Group Structure: The Working Group will employ a "Representative + Observers" model, consisting of Members and Observers. The "Representative + Observers" model is chosen to enable the Working Group to conduct and conclude its work in an efficient/effective manner while allowing for inclusive community participation. As this GGP builds on the existing SubPro work and is intended to conclude in an expeditious manner, Members must either possess a level of expertise in previous deliberations and/or knowledge that may have been lacking during those initial deliberations. The table below indicates the maximum number of Members that groups may appoint.

Group	Members
RySG	1
RrSG	1
CSG	1
NCSG	1
ASO	1
ccNSO	1
ALAC	1
GAC	1
SSAC	1
RSSAC	1

Members shall be appointed by their organizations according to their own internal procedures.

Organizations are encouraged to appoint individuals with skills, knowledge and experience pertinent to forming an effective Applicant Support Program. Council will provide guidance on the aggregated skill set that is needed for the group (for example: grant and reviewing, regional DNS participation, DNS marketplace economics, cost-benefit analyses, TLD operations, DNS cyber-security, and TLD investment).

Once the Working Group has been formed and before the first meeting is held, Council leadership will provide the Working Group with a draft set of "success criteria" for the Working Group, which the Working Group will refine.

Members are expected to participate during the course of deliberations. Members are expected to represent the view of their appointing organization and may be called on to provide the official position of their appointing organization. Members will be responsible for participating in GGP consensus calls. Appointing organizations may replace their Member(s) at their discretion, but shall be responsible for ensuring that their Member(s) are appropriately prepared to contribute to the GGP without causing undue delays to the GGP's deliberations.

The Working Group has the flexibility/discretion to rely on **Subject Matter Experts** (SMEs) in specific fields to aid in deliberations for certain tasks. These SMEs will not be considered as Members as captured in the table above. The Working Group will inventory its skill set as well as the additional skills necessary for the team to succeed and use this analysis to recruit additional expertise from outside the ICANN community.

As this GGP is seeking to provide guidance to aid in the implementation of SubPro recommendations, ICANN Org's ODP Team shall be invited to actively participate in this GGP to provide advice and counsel to the Working Group regarding implementation issues that may arise from proposals suggested by Members of the GGP Team.

In addition, the GNSO Liaison to the ODP may serve as a non-voting member of the Working Group. The GNSO Liaison to the ODP may be subscribed to the mailing list and attend all meetings but is intended to serve as a resource for the Working Group to advise on issues discussed

	within the SubPro PDP. The GNSO Liaison to the ODP shall not advocate for or against any position taken by the Working Group. **Leadership Structure**: **One (1) Chair** The GNSO Council will appoint one (1) qualified, independent Chair (neutral, not counted as from the Working Group membership) for the Working Group. The GGP group may also appoint one or more vice chairs to assist the Chair when deemed necessary by the Chair. The vice chair(s) may either be from within the Working Group membership or may also be independent at the sole discretion of the Working Group.
6. Decision-making methodology for GGP mechanism, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines	The GNSO Working Group Guidelines apply in full and Consensus designations are therefore the responsibility of the Working Group Chair and are to be made in accordance with the consensus levels described in Section 3.6 of the Working Group Guidelines. Notably, due to the "Representative + Observers" model of this Working Group, consensus calls or decisions are limited to Members who may consult as appropriate with their respective appointing organizations. However, for the purpose of assessing consensus, groups that do not fulfill their maximum membership allowance should not be disadvantaged. The Working Group Chair shall ensure that all perspectives are appropriately taken into account in assessing Consensus designations on the final guidance and/or recommendations. For consensus building purposes, the Working Group Chair, Members, and GNSO Council Liaison are expected to review the Consensus Playbook which provides practical tools and best practices to bridge differences, break deadlocks, and find common ground within ICANN processes; potential training related to the Consensus Playbook may be provided for Working Group Leadership, Members, and the GNSO Council Liaison.

7. Desired completion date and rationale for this date	The Working Group is expected to deliver its work plan to the GNSO Council as its first deliverable, which should be consistent with the expectations of the WG. It is not the intent of this Working Group to delay any deliverables to the ICANN Board, including, but not limited to the Operational Design Assessment, or the start of the Implementation Review Team (IRT). It is the expectation of the GNSO Council that the GGP will conclude its work prior to SubPro IRT commencing its work on Applicant Support. In addition, the GNSO Council expressly acknowledges that the deliverables from this group may occur after the ICANN Board makes a decision on the Outputs from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Final Report and that the work from this GGP is NOT intended to delay the vote of the ICANN Board on such Outputs.

Deleted: xx July

Deleted: Steering

Deleted: Steering

9