

ICANN NextGen Program Improvements | Community Input Status Report

Working Draft | As of June 2020

Ref. #	Broad Category	Sub-Category	Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Proposed Approach	Organization/ Group	Community Consultation / Public Comment
1	(A) Outreach and Promotion	Outreach - stakeholder groups	Improve outreach for post-grads studying international business and related fields; improve outreach across other relevant fields (rather than a focus on GNSO NCSG and ALAC) for a broader exposure to all stakeholder groups	Resolved	ICANN Org will focus on outreach for post-graduates in a broad range of studies, including international business. ICANN Org will focus on wider outreach for students with the potential to become active in ICANN's policy work, with broader exposure and raised awareness across all stakeholder groups.	BC, IPC	Community Consultation
2	(B) Application	Application format	Allow for short video presentations to have a more diverse pool of applicants who can speak and present well. There could also be possibilities for more technically-minded students to showcase a project, such as source code or blueprints for hardware. Should create a balance between candidates from different sciences	Closed	ICANN Org will adapt the application to allow applicants to express themselves in different ways, reducing cultural barriers in the application system while respecting issues of biases and following best practices around data minimization. Application will allow to provide attachments on applicant's relevant work such as source code, blue-prints for hardware, research papers, etc.	RySG, BC	Community Consultation and Public Comment
3	(B) Application	Application questions	Identify undergraduate students, and graduate / doctoral students from ICANN meeting regions, underserved, underrepresented, and indigenous communities, as well as individuals with identified subjects of interest to ICANN discussions	Resolved	ICANN Org will allow space on the application for candidates to indicate whether they identify with these communities and to indicate what ICANN subjects interest them.	ALAC	Public Comment
4	(B) Application	Application questions	Make modifications to the application forms for both NextGeners and Ambassadors, as the current application questions for NextGeners presume quite significant knowledge of ICANN, so most applicants show good knowledge in Internet governance in general but not in ICANN, which results in low scoring	Resolved	ICANN Org will update the application forms to allow candidates to express their Internet governance and ICANN interests.	NCSG	Public Comment
5	(B) Application	Application questions	ICANN org will update the application form to allow for candidates to upload CVs and supporting documents, and provide information about community involvement. (As cover letters are not common in every region/country, so we will limit this to CVs and supporting documents.)	Resolved	ICANN org will update the application form to allow for candidates to upload CVs and supporting documents, and provide information about community involvement.	ALAC	Public Comment
6	(B) Application	Endorsement letters	RrSG noted its support for allowing applicants to upload to their application an endorsement letter from an ICANN group to address the previous recommendation that groups should be able to nominate candidates for the program. However, NSGC, youth4ig, and EM recommend not allowing for a letter of endorsement; they note that since the program is meant for newcomers, this process might give an unfair advantage to those who are already engaged in ICANN or have personal connections with ICANN community members. IPC notes concern that an absence of a letter of endorsement could inadvertently screen out qualified candidates and suggests the letter could come from a university lecturer; this would allow applicants to provide support to their application without having to navigate an ICANN community group.	Resolved	Applicants will have the an optional field to upload a letter of recommendation/endorsement from a scholar or ICANN group.	RrSG, NCSG, youth4ig, individual (EM), IPC	Public Comment
7	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria - year of studies	Prioritize candidates who are further advanced in their studies.	Closed	The program will remain open to students in general rather than to a specific year; Selection Committee members from the community will select applicants and can choose to change priorities as needed.	RySG	Community Consultation
8	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria - publication	For transparency reasons, we recommend that as soon as the 'Selection Committee' agrees on selection criteria, these are made public and are available by the opening of the application period.	Active	ICANN Org will update and make the selection criteria public.	RySG	Community Consultation and Public Comment
9	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria - type of student	Allow tertiary students; amend 'university students' to 'tertiary students,' reflecting the inclusion of further education students not studying at a university but still within the demographic of the NextGen program who seek to engage	Closed	ICANN Org will change 'university students' to 'undergraduate or postgraduate' students (under 30) in messaging to ensure it is clear that graduate/doctoral students are welcome.	youth4ig and an individual contributor (EM)	Public Comment

ICANN NextGen Program Improvements | Community Input Status Report

Working Draft | As of June 2020

Ref. #	Broad Category	Sub-Category	Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Proposed Approach	Organization/ Group	Community Consultation / Public Comment
10	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria - age	Reserve the program for graduate/doctoral students and remove the age-limit of 30 years old. RySG suggests removing the age limit of 30 and narrowing the criteria to limit participation to graduate and doctoral students, noting that the current criteria (university students between the ages of 18 and 30 and studying in the region where the ICANN Public Meeting takes place) is not clear. (ALAC suggests changing to those over 18.)	Closed	ICANN Org has a range of programs that are available for other age groups. ICANN conducted an age diversity and participation survey to explore perceptions of ageism, which highlighted the need for capacity-development opportunities for young participants (under 35) to improve age diversity and inclusive participation at ICANN. The age range will not change: the focus of the program is on younger generations and bringing youth to ICANN; older students and young professionals can participate in the Fellowship Program. ICANN Org will change 'university students' to 'undergraduate or postgraduate' students (under 30) in messaging to ensure it is clear that graduate/doctoral students are welcome.	ALAC, RySG	Community Consultation
11	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria - region	Leave a small quota (2-3 places) for the students coming from other regions than the one where an ICANN meeting is held, in order to give students from all regions the opportunity to get involved at any time rather than waiting until a meeting is held in their region. Remove regional limitations, particularly for more experienced individuals like PhD and Master's students.	Closed	As the program is regionally-based and has a small number of participants, ICANN Org encourages those who are interested in applying to a more recent meeting to pursue applying to the Fellowship Program.	ALAC, NCSG	Public Comment
12	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria - professionals rather than students	The program could also be open to graduates under 30 who are already in the workplace and at the start of their careers.	Closed	The program's focus is on students and the academic community; recent graduates or older students can pursue the ICANN Fellowship Program.	RrSG	Community Consultation
13	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria - stakeholder group	Select program participants with their potential for engagement in different SO/ACs in mind.	Resolved	ICANN Org proposes to add to the selection criteria a category for "potential for engagement" so that Selection Committee members evaluate applicants with future engagement in mind.	RrSG	Community Consultation
14	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria	Take special attention to ensure a wide scope is still left in the selection criteria for individuals to be selected even in areas where they have no previous Internet governance/ICANN experience	Resolved	ICANN Org will alter the application so that applicants can detail their interests and will ensure applicants can upload documents to show their interests in a wide variety of related subjects. It will be up to the Selection Committee to make a decision on weighing categories.	youth4ig	Public Comment
15	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria - number of times in program	ALAC recommends enabling those who are qualified and interested to be able to attend more than one meeting, thus benefiting from becoming more long-term and serious participants.	Closed	NextGenn participants are encouraged to apply to the Fellowship Program for continued involvement and participation.	ALAC	Public Comment
16	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria - nominations - and Selection committee	Provide groups with the opportunity to directly nominate candidates for the NextGen program. The existing staff-led selection committee could then make the final selection for each meeting, with the majority of places allocated to group nominated candidates and ensuring a cross section of participants. There is a longstanding issue with volunteer limited time within ICANN, so this would eliminate the need to find individuals from across the community to participate in the selection committee.	Resolved	ICANN Org will change the application to include a section where applicants can upload a letter of endorsement/recommendation from a community group. The existing Selection Committee is not staff-led; a poll has been conducted to see which community groups would be interested in nominating volunteers for involvement in the committee, and this poll informs the approach put out for public comment for a community-nominated Selection Committee.	RrSG	Community Consultation
17	(C) Selection Process	Selection criteria and process	Invite the whole community and former Selection Committee members to provide input when reviewing the NextGen selection criteria.	Closed	Each SO/AC/SG/C will have the opportunity to nominate a representative to provide feedback on criteria; each representative can gather feedback from their respective group so that all groups have the chance to weigh in on the criteria in an organized manner.	NCSG	Public Comment

ICANN NextGen Program Improvements | Community Input Status Report

Working Draft | As of June 2020

Ref. #	Broad Category	Sub-Category	Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Proposed Approach	Organization/ Group	Community Consultation / Public Comment
18	(C) Selection Process	Selection committee	The Selection Committee members should be selected in a manner similar to the Fellowship Program Selection Committee. For maximum efficiency, ICANN could consider combining these two programs for maximum efficiency, with perhaps a bifurcated Selection Committee. This would help to identify "serial" applicants, overlapping applications, etc. The rationale for this is that if engagement and onboarding is the goal, we want to ensure that SO/AC/SG/Cs are aware and active in the selection process so that they can evaluate candidates based on their current needs and priorities. To ensure representation of the broad range of (at times, conflicting) interests in the GNSO, a representative from each SG and C is needed. The IPC cannot speak on behalf of the entire GNSO as to its willingness to nominate a single representative for the SO, but does not believe that this is appropriate.	Resolved	ICANN Org will move forward with having a community-nominated Selection Committee (for a two-year period, in the same manner as the Fellowship Program). We will look into ways to only allow applicants to apply for one program per application cycle. ICANN Org proposes to have a Selection Committee that is community-nominated and that will be open to GNSO constituencies/groups	IPC	Community Consultation
19	(C) Selection Process	Selection committee	Having a single representative for the GNSO is not viable, and at the very least 3 people should be brought into the Committee to represent it, with both parts of the Non-Contracted Party House and one for the Contracted Party House having a voice. Supports ICANN Org's proposal to allow the community-nominated NextGen Selection Committee to have multiple representatives from the same SO (i.e. to allow representatives from different GNSO constituencies/groups, unlike the Fellowship Program Selection Committee, which only has one GNSO slot) .	Resolved	ICANN Org will move forward with having a community-nominated Selection Committee with multiple GNSO representatives	BC	Community Consultation, Public Comment
20	(C) Selection Process	Selection committee	Knowing this opinion will vary among ICANN community members, it would be worth considering taking a poll to ascertain who would be interested in participating at this level. If a broader cross section of Selection Committee members participates, this may facilitate a broader cross section of those approved to be a part of the NextGen. If the appointment of the Selection Committee members is supported, this opportunity should revolve to various SO/AC groups who are interested in participating. A final decision on identifying a member within the RySG would first need general discussion and then a call for interest. Interest may vary from the RySG membership based on what region is involved.	Resolved	ICANN Org has polled SOs/ACs/Cs/Gs to gauge their level of interest; the poll was open to GNSO constituencies/groups (unlike the Fellowship Selection Committee). The findings of the poll defined the approach that has been put out for public comment.	RySG	Community Consultation
21	(D) Pre-Meeting Preparation	Pre-Meeting Materials	Better introduce those eligible to participate in the NextGen@ICANN program with the high-level background of each ICANN community member organization. For example, provide those accepted applicants with information for their review (i.e., such as a link to the RySG website [and other community members websites/newsletters, etc.]) to assist in their being able to make a more informed decision and choices about various activities that take place at ICANN Public Meetings. A successful implementation/outcome of this objective might be a broader, yet more targeted, exposure from the academics considering various fields of opportunity within this industry.	Resolved	ICANN Org will ensure that the NextGen onboarding welcome email contains links to each SO/AC/C/G.	RySG	Community Consultation
22	(D) Pre-Meeting Preparation	Pre-Meeting Database	Focus on integrating these newcomers into the community. As it stands, neither the selectees nor community members have the tools to attempt to build more lasting relationships that can lead to active contributions to the policymaking process. An opt-out database of talents from the program should be created and made available ahead of meetings, so that those who want to be discoverable by the community can be reached and included.	Resolved	ICANN Org holds a mailing list of NextGen alumni who have opted in to receive information. Pre-meeting Statements of Interest (SOIs) will be made available (as is done for the Fellowship Program) so that the community is aware of participants' interest. ICANN Org can serve as a liaison for interested community members and NextGen participants who have opted in to receive information.	BC	Community Consultation
23	(D) Pre-Meeting Preparation	Pre-meeting information	Provide NextGen participants with an introduction to the ICANN ecosystem, working groups, and policy development processes (PDPs), as well as raising awareness and increasing the participation of NextGen participants in ICANN and regional engagement activities	Resolved	ICANN Org will ensure that pre-meeting materials introduce participants to these categories and that post-meeting materials remind them of regional engagement activities as well.	NCSG	Public Comment
24	(D) Pre-Meeting Preparation	Schedule planning	In addition to introducing more deliberate community engagement, general sessions, such as outreach sessions for SO/AC/SG/Cs should not be made mandatory sessions for participants. Further, as part of the preparation for the ICANN meeting, participants could engage with a Mentor/Ambassador to determine which sessions will be of most interest to attend, outside of community engagement activities. This would be instead of a fixed schedule for all participants and enable participants to engage in work that is relevant to their field of study.	Resolved	The NextGen community-outreach sessions are not mandatory but strongly encouraged; only the NextGen-specific sessions are mandatory. Community-appointed mentors will work with NextGeners to plan individualized schedules.	IPC	Community Consultation
25	(E) Mentoring	Community involvement	Enhance the Ambassador program with a mentor from interested SO/AC groups in the community. There is room to enhance the training ('training the trainer') and commitment aspects of the mentoring process. More extensive training should be required to be undertaken in the Learn platform, so that they have a sufficient degree of knowledge about both their role and the community's workings.	Resolved	ICANN Org will create a toolkit/handbook that explains why mentoring takes place; the handbook will leverage Fellowship materials to explain the purpose of mentorship; k; this will be updated regularly with feedback from community-appointed mentors. There will be required courses for mentors on ICANN Learn (including an upcoming course on Mentoring Best Practices, informed by primary research).	RySG, BC	Community Consultation

ICANN NextGen Program Improvements | Community Input Status Report

Working Draft | As of June 2020

Ref. #	Broad Category	Sub-Category	Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Proposed Approach	Organization/ Group	Community Consultation / Public Comment
26	(E) Mentoring	Community involvement / training	Doing something similar for the NextGen would be even less effective. Using the Fellowship as an example, most of the selectees need to be assigned to the GNSO and ALAC mentors to have proper guidance due to their backgrounds, leaving the other mentors either mismatched or with an inferior workload. In the NextGen's case, this sort of problem would only escalate, seeing as their backgrounds are much more homogenous. Using the Fellowship as an example, most of the selectees need to be assigned to the GNSO and ALAC mentors to have proper guidance due to their backgrounds, leaving the other mentors either mismatched or with an inferior workload. In the NextGen's case, this sort of problem would only escalate, seeing as their backgrounds are much more homogenous.	Resolved	ICANN Org will work on a toolkit/handbook that explains why mentoring takes place; the handbook will leverage Fellowship materials to explain the purpose of mentorship. There will be required courses for mentors on ICANN Learn (including an upcoming course on Mentoring Best Practices, informed by primary research). In contrast to the Fellowship Program, various SGs and Cs will be invited to nominate mentors, as well as RALOs.	BC	Community Consultation
27	(E) Mentoring	Community involvement	The Ambassador selection process should be altered so that the community identifies and nominates mentors with preference for previous NextGen participants who have become active participants in PDP, IRT, review team, etc work. In addition to Ambassadors, it would be worthwhile to consider seeking 'shadowing' opportunities of PDP, IRT, review team, etc leaders to provide participants with alternative perspectives and additional mentoring. The aim would be to bridge the gap between newcomer and (genuinely!) active participant. Ambassadors are often relative newcomers and finding their feet, so it is not always realistic for them to provide the mentoring active community members could provide.	Resolved	ICANN Org has polled SOs/ACs/Cs/Gs to gauge their level of interest, and the findings of the poll defined the approach that has been put out for public comment. Groups will be encouraged to consider active participants in ICANN's work as well as former NextGen participants. These community mentors will be empowered to connect their mentees with other community members for shadowing opportunities.	IPC	Community Consultation
28	(E) Mentoring	Community involvement	Yes, but to ensure representation of the broad range of (at times, conflicting) interests in the GNSO, a representative from each SG and C is needed. The IPC cannot speak on behalf of the entire GNSO as to its willingness to nominate a single representative for the SO, but does not believe that this is appropriate. IPC suggests that each SO and AC has the option of appointing a pool of mentors, from which mentors can be identified for each meeting depending on the interests of the NextGen participants for that meeting.	Resolved	ICANN Org has polled SOs/ACs/Cs/Gs to gauge their level of interest, allowing each SG and C to indicate interest; this poll has helped to define the approach that has gone out for public comment.	IPC	Community Consultation
29	(E) Mentoring	Specific suggestions	ALAC recommends utilizing At-Large subject matter experts who can provide feedback to the NextGen participants to enhance academia rigor via papers and research and provide them with a real experience of how the ICANN policy processes develops. They also suggest the following: that mentors should be selected based on similar criteria used for the Fellowship Program, and those chosen must be representative of the different AC/SOs; that ICANN Learn courses and community introduction webinars should cover theoretical knowledge prior to attending the meeting; and that sessions should also provide pointers to relevant communities and individuals.	Active	ALAC will be invited to appoint subject matter experts to come talk to NextGeners. They are also invited to nominate mentors, along with other SOs/ACs/SGs/Cs/RALOs. ICANN Learn courses for NextGeners and mentors will be revised as part of the review. Sessions will introduce NextGeners to a variety of community groups, and mentors will be empowered to help their mentees reach out to relevant individuals.	ALAC	Public Comment
30	(E) Mentoring	SOIs	Require SOIs for Mentor.	Active	ICANN Org will publish SOIs for mentors and NextGeners before the meeting.	NCSG	Public Comment
31	(E) Mentoring	Mentors vs ambassadors	NCSG recommends keeping Ambassadors in place as opposed to mentors, noting that mentors are usually well-recognized community members with personal agendas at the ICANN meetings, so mentoring might disrupt their work to provide quality guidance. However, youth4ig supports the move to mentors (rather than Ambassadors) but suggests the need for oversight in the selection process for safety reasons and suggests a prerequisite of ICANN Learn courses; this group stresses the need for mentors to be available to the NextGen participants during ICANN meetings. IPC does not support mentors being identified by SOs and ACs and instead suggests that each SO and AC appoint a pool of mentors from which mentors can be identified for each meeting depending on the interests of the NextGen participants.	Closed	Mentors will now be appointed by the community (by interested SOs/ACs/SGs/Cs); communities may choose to appoint program alumni and are encouraged to appoint active community members who have an interest in mentoring students.	NCSG, youth4ig, IPC	Public Comment
32	(F) On-Site Expectations	Focus of program	Focus on education and capacity building. We expect program participants to leave the ICANN meeting with a good understanding of ICANN's role and insight in the working of the ICANN multistakeholder model, and use this knowledge for their studies and later academic or professional work, or volunteer engagement in internet governance. This will contribute to the global awareness and understanding of ICANN's role and governance model. Recruiting and engaging new people is not the main goal of the NextGen@ICANN Program. Participating in the NextGen Program could be the start of a future active involvement in the ICANN community.	Resolved	The sessions that are recommended and the outreach opportunities and networking experiences introduce NextGeners to a variety of stakeholder groups; mentors will be required to help their mentees select sessions for an appropriately rounded schedule.	RySG	Community Consultation
33	(F) On-Site Expectations	Networking	Recruiting new active participants to broaden the ICANN community is not the objective of the NextGen@ICANN program. However, the program's detailed introduction to all aspects of the ICANN ecosystem and the working of the ICANN MSM can trigger the participants' interest to get further involved in a specific topic, group or discussion. The NextGen program should support these individuals in reaching out to the topic leads, group leadership or relevant staff.	Resolved	Community-appointed mentors will be responsible for helping NextGen mentees to reach out to relevant community members; ICANN Org will host mandatory NextGen sessions to introduce NextGen participants to the ICANN community, Board, and organization.	RySG	Community Consultation

ICANN NextGen Program Improvements | Community Input Status Report

Working Draft | As of June 2020

Ref. #	Broad Category	Sub-Category	Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Proposed Approach	Organization/ Group	Community Consultation / Public Comment
34	(F) On-Site Expectations	Introducing to community leaders	The sole objective of NextGen should be to attract students in relevant fields to becoming active participants in ICANN policy development. Successful implementation of this objective requires broadening the NextGen program content to introduce recipients to active policy development processes, community leaders (including PDP chairs and co-chairs), and substantive SG/C/SO/AC work. The NextGen program should not be a centrally-funded engagement opportunity for one or two SG/C/SO/ACs (in particular GNSO NCSG and ALAC), but should provide much broader exposure to all of the stakeholder groups and interests in the ICANN community. The NextGen Program should effectively onboard new members to actively and meaningfully contribute to ICANN policy development. More deliberate engagement with community members can occur through mailing list, social events, participation in the NextGen orientation and substantive program. It is essential that academics from a range of backgrounds and interest areas participate to ensure representativeness across SO/ACs and the full range of ICANN's mission.	Resolved	Community-appointed mentors will be responsible for helping NextGen mentees to reach out to relevant community members; ICANN Org will host mandatory NextGen sessions to introduce NextGen participants to the ICANN community, Board, and organization.	IPC	Community Consultation
35	(F) On-Site Expectations	Specific suggestions	The IPC would like to see more deliberate community engagement with participants in the NextGen Program. Some examples are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A social event with just community leaders and NextGen participants; • Have SG/C/SO/ACs more involved in the NextGen program (idea: invite SG/C/SO/ACs to relevant NextGen presentations, provide meet & greet opportunities to target particular SG/C/SO/ACs of interest to the student); • Have current ICANN Community members engage as mentors to NextGen participants; • Introduce a "shadowing" component to the Program (eg each participant is paired with a Community member for a day to observe what they do at an ICANN meeting); • Introduce NextGen participants to PDP, IRT, CCWG, review team leaders; • Provide PDP updates for beginners at NextGen sessions to introduce substantive ICANN work. In addition to introducing more deliberate community engagement, general sessions, such as outreach sessions for SO/AC/SG/Cs should not be made mandatory sessions for participants.	Active	ICANN org can host a Fellowship/NextGen joint social event with community leaders. Program staff will invite SO/AC/SG/C members to participate in the NextGen sessions, and will continue to invite them to NextGen presentations. Community-appointed mentors will be empowered to introduce their NextGen mentees to relevant community leaders and arrange shadowing opportunities and will be encouraged to engage mentees with a broad range of SOs/ACs.	IPC	Community Consultation
36	(F) On-Site Expectations	Wider introductions	Typically, NextGen organizers channel participants into either ALAC or NCSG, this is reflected in the NextGen Five-Year Survey where the majority of respondents reporting Community affiliation, leaving participants on their own if they wish to get involved outside of these SG/C/SO/ACs.	Active	In addition to addressing this concern in the program outreach, ICANN Org will also invite community groups to participate and network with NextGen participants and will empower community-appointed mentors to introduce NextGeners to a wide range of community groups.	IPC	Community Consultation
37	(F) On-Site Expectations	Specific suggestions	ALAC recommends more active participation of the NextGen participants in the community by way of direct involvement in policy work taking place in the community. In addition, the group proposes: creating open opportunities for NextGeners through shared sessions with Fellows at ICANN meetings; providing an opportunity for At-Large to engage with the NextGen group via the weekly schedule; and highlighting the academic work done by At-Large members in educational efforts such as the Schools of Internet Governance and academic research.	Active	ALAC will be invited to appoint subject matter experts to come talk to NextGeners. They are also invited to nominate mentors. NextGen will work on opportunities to create some shared sessions with the Fellows at the ICANN meetings allowing for more engagement and experience in the ICANN environment. ICANN Org will invite ALAC to join the NextGeners at the ICANN meetings during the weekly schedule.	ALAC	
38	(G) Post-Meeting Expectations	Follow-up and guidance	NextGeners interested in becoming actively involved in the ICANN community should be guided to other opportunities (e.g. the Fellowship Program) that can support them to attend more than one ICANN Public Meeting.	Resolved	ICANN Org will ensure that the Fellowship Program is actively promoted for NextGen participants.	RySG	Community Consultation
39	(G) Post-Meeting Expectations	Future opportunities	The NextGen@ICANN program should not provide support to alumni to allow them to attend additional meetings with the aim to get further involved in community discussion as there are other mechanisms in place, such as the Fellowship program or Community travel support.	Resolved	Mentors will now be appointed by the community (by interested SOs/ACs/SGs/Cs); communities may choose to appoint program alumni and are encouraged to appoint active community members who have an interest in mentoring students.	RySG	Community Consultation
40	(H) Metrics	KPIs	In line with our belief that engagement in policy development work is ultimately a key goal, alongside active participation in an ICANN Group, the RrSG would like to see a further breakdown in the "number of participants in PDPs or cross-community activities". This should specifically include the number of Working and Sub Groups they participate in (both within the wider ICANN Community as well as individual ICANN Groups) and the number of meetings attended.	Active	ICANN Org will work to gather these data through post-meeting surveys and alumni surveys.	RrSG	Community Consultation, Public Comment
41	(H) Metrics	Mapping	Alumni of the program act across the ICANN environment, with several having moved into the Fellowship program and built a basis for further engagement under that banner. There is, however, a distinct lack of mapping of these individuals, so it becomes difficult to both quantify the program's effectivity and engage with alumni that can potentially contribute to certain types of policy work, which would increase the benefits brought by the program. This data, as well as all Fellowship data, should be produced with an eye towards ODP, so that it can be later studied by independent researchers and incorporated into broader data concerning youth programs in Internet Governance.	Active	ICANN Org is looking into ways to track and measure engagement of NextGen program alumni.	BC	Community Consultation

ICANN NextGen Program Improvements | Community Input Status Report

Working Draft | As of June 2020

Ref. #	Broad Category	Sub-Category	Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Proposed Approach	Organization/ Group	Community Consultation / Public Comment
42	(H) Metrics	Need for metrics	Metrics should be used to evaluate the return on investment of this and any other outreach initiative. Implementation of this objective is easily tested by metrics tracking former NextGen members' subsequent involvement in a SG/C/SO/AC and membership in a PDP, IRT, specific review, etc.	Active	ICANN Org will work to gather these data through post-meeting surveys and alumni surveys.	IPC	Community Consultation
43	(I) Messaging	Unclear messaging	The goal and purpose of the program needs to be defined more accurately and consistently. Though the goals are clear, they are not well known and understood in the community, so more information should be provided about the community. The goals are valuable but currently engagement does not extend to all SOs/ACs. However, most community members, if asked, would not link the NextGen@ICANN program to its target group, university students (18-30) from the region where the ICANN meeting is taking place. The goal of the NextGen@ICANN Program, as stated above, is clear enough, although how well that is both known and understood within the community is not. More information should be provided about the program and its goals for this to be improved.	Active	ICANN Org will clarify messaging around the program's target group. ICANN Org will clarify messaging on the ICANN website regarding the goal and purpose of the program. ICANN Org will clarify messaging about the program goals and will work on implementing broader outreach at the pre-application stage and wider introductions to SOs/ACs at the pre-meeting and on-site stages.	RySG, RrSG	Community Consultation
44	(I) Messaging	Unclear goals	While the general goal seems clear enough, the BC has at times expressed uncertainty as to what the end goal of the program is. It is not clear if the selectees are intended to be observers of the ICANN process to further their research or if the community is expected to attempt to bring them into the policymaking process in a manner similar to the Fellows group. This ambiguity makes it difficult to ascertain how to best work together with the program.	Active	ICANN Org will clarify messaging about program goals.	BC	Community Consultation
45	(I) Messaging	Unclear goals	Currently the program goal is neither clear nor well understood. NextGen is known broadly as a general onboarding program; few GNSO Stakeholder Groups or Constituencies understand or see the potential benefits of the NextGen Program or link this initiative to the broader objectives of their SG/C. The objective of NextGen needs to be defined more clearly defined, with direct relevance to and support of the ICANN Strategic Plan. Program goals must then clearly and logically flow from this objective.	Active	ICANN Org will clarify messaging about program goals. See Final Proposal for NextGen Program Improvements.	IPC	Community Consultation
46	(I) Messaging	Suggestions for improvement	BC, NCSG, RySG, and RrSG suggest revising the proposed language describing the program's purpose and goals as follows: purpose and goals should not be mixed up with activities (RySG); purpose should be broader and deeper than the goals and give an overall sense of value (NCSG); goals should emphasize the importance of policy development processes (PDPs) (NCSG, RrSG); awareness raising should be extended to all types of higher education institutions (NCSG); the primary long-term goal of the program should not be the engagement of NextGenners in ICANN activities after completion of their studies (RySG); goals should not use excluding language to limit engagement after completion of studies (BC, RySG).	Active	ICANN Org will alter the messaging around the program to ensure that it applies to all types of higher education institutions, so that the purpose and goals are clear and distinct; and so that the long-term goals will not be limited to post-study involvement.	BC, NCSG, RySG, RrSG	Public Comment
47	(J) Differences from Fellowship Program	Program promotion	Look for synergies and ways to coordinate with initiatives focused on increasing participation, such as the Fellowship Program. The basic difference between the two programs is clear. However, there may be some level of confusion or unfamiliarity among community members. In particular, if a group has not had the occasion to work with either program. A suggestion to assist in reducing confusion might be to clearly announce various opportunities for both the NextGen@ICANN and Fellowship Program when announcing/promoting ICANN Public Meetings. When doing so, ICANN staff should describe the goal of both programs in a clear and unambiguous wording. The NextGen@ICANN and Fellowship Program serve a distinct purpose. However there is a lot of overlap and confusion. Clarifying the program's focus and purpose would help volunteers and organisations involved in administering and supporting them. This would increase efficiencies and allow for better coordination between programs.	Active	ICANN Org will prioritize clarifying the program's focus and purpose, particularly on the ICANN website (including updates to NextGen website which direct applicants who do not meet NextGen eligibility criteria to explore the Fellowship Program). ICANN Org will consider announcing both programs together in the future.	RySG	Community Consultation
48	(J) Differences from Fellowship Program	Name of program	Consider a name change and opt for a name that clearly links the program to its academic target group. In fact, 'next generation @ ICANN' fits too well as a description for what the Fellowship Program intends to achieve and might be one of the reasons why both programs get confused.	Closed	ICANN Org will take this into consideration, while emphasizing that changing the branding within the community is difficult. Messaging about the differences between the programs will hope to clarify this distinction.	RySG	Community Consultation and Public Comment
49	(J) Differences from Fellowship Program	Combining programs	For those who actually know about them in the first place, undoubtedly there is some confusion between the NextGen and Fellowship programs, notably on how they actually offer differing benefits or if they are effectively duplicate programs and therefore an inefficient use of ICANN budget. Both programs start by working with newcomers and aim to provide enough support and interaction to result in an individual's continued participation in ICANN. This is a desirable aim, but why two programs are required to reach it is not clear. Instead of looking to differentiate the two programs, ICANN should instead be looking at combining them and developing an improved single program that covers both students and people from "underserved" regions. Consider rolling these two programs together under shared leadership and ICANN Org portfolios to economise, develop synergies, share data and metrics, etc.	Active	ICANN Org is currently exploring synergies between the programs and has created a draft chart to explain the differences between the programs. Feedback on the chart (which is linked to on the public comment page) is welcomed, as ICANN Org will consider creating an infographic/visual to explain the differences/goals/activities/etc.	RrSG, IPC	Community Consultation

ICANN NextGen Program Improvements | Community Input Status Report

Working Draft | As of June 2020

Ref. #	Broad Category	Sub-Category	Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Proposed Approach	Organization/ Group	Community Consultation / Public Comment
50	(J) Differences from Fellowship Program	Program logo	Yes, although this problem has lessened with time. It is not uncommon to see references to "NextGen Fellows" around the ICANN environment, both by community members and selectees themselves. A better separation of the programs could be promoted by each having a different logo instead of just different names. Initially, the NextGen did have its own logo, which was eventually dropped due to undisclosed reasons. Adding a visual element to further this distinction would be helpful.	Active	ICANN Org will prioritize improving the messaging around the two programs. Note that ICANN doesn't use logos for its programs.	BC	Community Consultation
51	(J) Differences from Fellowship Program	Lack of clarity	There is unquestionably some confusion between the two programs. This could come from the NextGen Program not having a clear objective and then being associated with other onboarding programs. Applicants clearly misunderstand any distinction between the two programs, because overlaps in applications are not uncommon (ie, some applicants apply for both NextGen and Fellowship simultaneously). There are also a number of individuals who move from the NextGen Program into the Fellowship Program, which likely contributes to this conflation. Overall, both NextGen and Fellowship may appear as 'free tickets' to ICANN meetings with minimal or no active participation in ICANN policy development or other work expected in return.	Active	ICANN Org will clarify the goals and purpose of each program, both for community members and for program participants.	IPC	Community Consultation
52	(K) Program Objective	Program focus	The NextGen@ICANN program should maintain its focus on university and doctoral students. The program should provide information on ICANN's role and insight in the working of the ICANN ecosystem, knowledge that the alumni can further spread within their local academic and internet governance communities. As such the NextGen program contributes to increasing global awareness and support for the ICANN MSM and serves a clearly different purpose than the Fellowship program, which is focused on broadening participation in ICANN.	Active	ICANN Org will clarify program language accordingly.	RySG	Community Consultation
53	(K) Program Objective	Program focus	As we have noted above, the RrSG would prefer to see a single program to increase, broaden, and diversify ICANN participation. However, if NextGen is going to continue as a stand alone program then the objective of the NextGen@ICANN Program should be to broaden the medium- and long-term participation of young people in ICANN and seek to identify and develop future potential leaders within the community.	Active	ICANN Org will clarify program language accordingly.	RrSG	Community Consultation
54	(K) Program Objective	Program focus	The program needs to have a focus not only in bringing people in, but also in connecting them with the community. One meeting's time is not enough for the SO/ACs to pick up on talented people, unlike what happens with successful Fellows that get 3 shots at showing their skills to the community. Promoting a bridge between these youth and potential opportunities for them to make good use of their skillset in the ICANN environment should be an integral part of the program's objectives.	Resolved	ICANN Org will continue to make efforts to connect NextGeners with the community (particularly through community-appointed mentors) and to strengthen the links between the two programs.	BC	Community Consultation
55	(K) Program Objective	Program focus	The sole objective of NextGen should be to attract students in relevant fields to becoming active participants in ICANN policy development. Successful implementation of this objective requires broadening the NextGen program content to introduce recipients to active policy development processes, community leaders (including PDP chairs and co-chairs), and substantive SG/C/SO/AC work. The NextGen program should not be a centrally-funded engagement opportunity for one or two SG/C/SO/ACs (in particular GNSO NCSG and ALAC), but should provide much broader exposure to all of the stakeholder groups and interests in the ICANN community. The NextGen Program should effectively onboard new members to actively and meaningfully contribute to ICANN policy development. Implementation of this objective is easily tested by metrics tracking former NextGen members' subsequent involvement in a SG/C/SO/AC and membership in a PDP, IRT, specific review, etc.	Resolved	The program will continue to expose the NextGen to all communities as well as specific reviews during Newcomer day. (Note: this comment appears multiple times throughout this tracker, as it is relevant to multiple categories.)	IPC	Community Consultation
56	(L) Overall Assessment of Program		As the purpose of the NextGen@ICANN program is "providing opportunities to better understand ICANN and the internet ecosystem," we expect that the community indirectly benefits when NextGeners use this knowledge for their academic work and related activities and as such contribute to a global awareness and growing correct understanding of ICANN's role and the Internet ecosystem. We have witnessed how different initiatives at global and regional levels cross-pollinate (NextGen@ICANN, Fellowship Program, programs within the IG ecosystem of the RIRs and IGF, etc.), and we find that this strengthens the contributions from the students across the board as well as helps retain the young talent. Several have gone onto roles with more responsibility within industry organisations as well as started their own think tank initiatives. There is little known about the contributions from NextGeners to the Registries Stakeholder Group as a whole. Perhaps this may differ at the organization level of the membership.	Resolved	ICANN Org acknowledges the need for raising global awareness and understanding of ICANN's role in Internet ecosystem. Program staff will improve future surveys to better gauge the level of participation and involvement not only in ICANN, but in the broader Internet ecosystem as well.	RySG	Community Consultation
57	(L) Overall Assessment of Program		Within the RrSG, members are not particularly familiar with the NextGen program (nor the Fellowship program) or its benefits, since the program has historically had virtually no interaction with, or impact on, the RrSG. As is indicated in the NextGen 5 year Survey Report, no NextGen participants in this period have been affiliated with 1 the RrSG, nor the entire Contracted Party House. In fact, excluding ALAC, NCUC and to some extent NCSG, it appears a number of other ICANN groups also apparently have very little or no NextGen engagement, so the contributions of NextGen participants would appear to benefit only some parts of the community. Due to the above mentioned lack of interaction, the RrSG is not aware of any notable contributions from NextGen participants to our group.	Resolved	NextGeners can help raise awareness of the work of RrSG, even if not being able to directly participate in its work. If the RrSG were to nominate either a selection committee member or a mentor, this would further promote understanding and awareness of the work of RrSG beyond ICANN. Additionally, the group will be encouraged to interact with NextGeners by attending the NextGen sessions and networking events.	RrSG	Community Consultation

ICANN NextGen Program Improvements | Community Input Status Report

Working Draft | As of June 2020

Ref. #	Broad Category	Sub-Category	Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Proposed Approach	Organization/Group	Community Consultation / Public Comment