

# Registries Stakeholder Group Statement



## GNSO Guidance Process Applicant Support Guidance Recommendation Initial Report

Date statement submitted<sup>1</sup>: 8 September 2023

Reference url:

<https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/gnso-guidance-process-applicant-support-guidance-recommendation-initial-report-31-07-2023>

### Background<sup>2</sup>

The [GNSO Guidance Process Team \(GGP Team\)](#) is seeking input on its nine (9) preliminary Guidance Recommendations:

- six (6) Guidance Recommendations pertaining to GGP Tasks 3, 4, and 5 relating to the identification and prioritization of metrics for the Applicant Support Program, including indicators of success, and
- three (3) Guidance Recommendations pertaining to Task 6 relating to financing the program when qualified applicants exceed allocated funds.

The SubPro Final Report described the creation of a dedicated IRT charged “with developing implementation elements of the Applicant Support Program” including 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.

The GNSO Council determined that the provision of guidance is best accomplished via the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) and approved the [GGP Initiation Request](#) to provide additional guidance to support the eventual implementation efforts relating to the Applicant Support Program. The GGP Team began its work in November 2022, following its [work plan and timeline](#).

### Documents

- [GNSO Guidance Process Applicant Support Guidance Recommendation Initial Report](#)

### Related RySG comments

- [RySG comment on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report](#) (Sept 2020) *Topic 17: Applicant Support*
- [CPH comment GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Final Outputs for ICANNBoard Consideration](#) (June 2021)

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a copy of the text submitted via the ICANN Public comment platform.

<sup>2</sup> Background: intended to give a brief context for the comment and to highlight what is most relevant for RO's in the subject document – it is not a summary of the subject document.

## Registries Stakeholder Group Comment

### Preliminary Guidance Recommendations Relating to Tasks 3, 4, and 5

**Guidance Recommendation 1** *Please refer to page 11 of the Initial Report.*

- Support Recommendation as written

**Guidance Recommendation 2** *Please refer to page 14 of the Initial Report.*

- Support Recommendation as written

**Guidance Recommendation 3** *Please refer to page 16 of the Initial Report.*

- Support Recommendation as written

**Guidance Recommendation 4** *Please refer to page 17 of the Initial Report.*

- Support Recommendation as written

**Guidance Recommendation 5** *Please refer to pages 18–19 of the Initial Report.*

- Support Recommendation as written

**Guidance Recommendation 6** *Please refer to page 20 of the Initial Report.*

- Support Recommendation as written

### Preliminary Guidance Recommendations Relating to Task 6

**Guidance Recommendation 7** *Please refer to page 23 of the Initial Report.*

- Support Recommendation as written

**Guidance Recommendation 8** *Please refer to page 24 of the Initial Report.*

- Support Recommendation as written

**Guidance Recommendation 9.** *Please refer to page 25 of the Initial Report.*

- Support Recommendation as written

### 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. If yes, please provide details below.**

-

### Other Comments

While RySG supports all GGP recommendations as written, we believe the report does not give all implementation guidance that ICANN Org will need to structure the Applicant Support Program in a more effective way compared to the 2012 program. Charter questions/tasks were all answered, but whether additional tasks or a vehicle other than a GGP could have delivered a suitable outcome, will be up to the GNSO Council to assess in its continuous management of the policy process. For now, we strongly suggest this item gets into the SubPro IRT agenda sooner rather than later, since this program is in the critical path of subsequent procedures. We also believe that bringing outside expertise to help in the program implementation could increase its likelihood of success, for a definition of success that the GGP established.

---

*Summary of Submission:*

*While RySG supports all GGP recommendations as written, we believe the report does not give all implementation guidance that ICANN Org will need to structure the Applicant Support Program in a more effective way compared to the 2012 program. Charter questions/tasks were all answered, but whether additional tasks or a vehicle other than a GGP could have delivered a suitable outcome, will be up to the GNSO Council to assess in its continuous management of the policy process. For now, we strongly suggest this item gets into the SubPro IRT agenda sooner rather than later, since this program is in the critical path of subsequent procedures. We also believe that bringing outside expertise to help in the program implementation could increase its likelihood of success, for a definition of success that the GGP established.*