

Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding

ICANN Fellowship Program Application Process Review																			
Publication Date:	26 August 2016																		
Prepared By:	Janice Douma Lange, DPRD Fellowship and Newcomer Engagement Manager																		
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Public Comment Proceeding</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Open Date:</td> <td>14 June 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Close Date:</td> <td>29 July 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff Report Due Date:</td> <td>29 August 2016</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Public Comment Proceeding		Open Date:	14 June 2016	Close Date:	29 July 2016	Staff Report Due Date:	29 August 2016	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Important Information Links</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Announcement</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Public Comment Proceeding</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">View Comments Submitted</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Important Information Links		Announcement		Public Comment Proceeding		View Comments Submitted	
Public Comment Proceeding																			
Open Date:	14 June 2016																		
Close Date:	29 July 2016																		
Staff Report Due Date:	29 August 2016																		
Important Information Links																			
Announcement																			
Public Comment Proceeding																			
View Comments Submitted																			
Staff Contact:	Janice Douma Lange	Email:	janice.lange@icann.org																
Section I: General Overview and Next Steps																			
<p>The review of the existing Fellowship Program Application system and related processes received many insightful comments and suggestions, focused on the following themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusiveness for more individuals from all countries, sectors, and gender while recognizing underserved and underrepresented entities and communities • Maintaining diversity in terms of gender, sector, region, and experience in assessment process • Caution in who gets priority based on sector and need <p>The next steps will be to incorporate some of the applicable suggestions/modifications in time for the ICANN58 Application launch on 9 September; other appropriate recommendations that require more time will be reflected in the ICANN59 Application launch while other comments may require further discussion and analysis.</p>																			
Section II: Contributors																			

At the time this report was prepared, a total of 21 community submissions had been posted to the forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
ALAC	At Large Staff	ALAC
REGISTRIES STAKEHOLDER GROUP	Stephane Van Gelder	RySG
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CONSTITUENCY	Greg Shatan	IPC
NON COMMERCIAL STAKEHOLDER GROUP	Matthew Shears	NCSG
BUSINESS CONSTITUENCY	Steve DelBianco	BC

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Nadira Alaraj		NA
Wen Zhai		WZ
Eduardo Diaz		ED
Agustina Callegari / Adela Goberna		AC / AD
Zuan Zhang (Peter Green)		ZZ
Paul Muchene		PM
Glenn McKnight		GM
Loris Taylor	Native Public Media "NPM"	LT
Rob McMahon	First Mile Connectivity Consortium "FMCC"	RM
Brice Abba		BA
Judith Hellerstein		JH
Amrita Choudhury		AC
Stanley Osao		SO
Eve Edelson		EE
Miguel Ignacio Estrada		ME
Ayden Ferdeline		AF

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section intends to summarize broadly and comprehensively the comments submitted to this public comment proceeding but does not address every specific position stated by each contributor. The preparer recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the

summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

The overall consensus from the comments was that the suggested modifications “are both necessary and appropriate and that these improvements were developed to reflect the voices of the ICANN communities” (RySG) It was noted that the “previous, economically deterministic view in assessing eligibility was problematic, as there was never a direct correlation between a country being classed high-income by the World Bank and a Fellow coming from such a background. The other flaw was in the data set. ICANN was relying on data self-reported by sovereign states to the World Bank. This was a thorny situation because it was always unclear what repercussions there were for countries which intentionally or unintentionally reported inaccurate information” (AF). Along with the overwhelming approval were some notes of caution “if by accepting applications from all nations would dilute the participation from the traditionally underrepresented regions” (WZ) and whether the World Bank / SIDN lists should be replaced by another globally accepted independent source to lessen the possibility of bias in the assessment process. While Staff recognizes that the role of the Selection committee will be more complex due to the introduction of a variety of new factors that need to be taken into consideration in lieu of the developing nation list, it should be recognized that the Fellowship application and review process has always relied on the experience and expertise of a rotating diverse committee of global community volunteers beyond the filter of the World Bank list, to make unbiased assessments and proposed selections based on the strength of the application. A recommendation about the Selection Committee has been noted: to focus more on sector representation than regional representation amongst committee members as well as mirroring the term length of other community leadership roles; both suggestions are being strongly considered.

An interesting note was made about the difference between assessing new Applicants vs Program Alumni, reinforcing the need to ask more of those who have been through the program “giving priority to alumni who can state specific objectives for the meeting they are applying and demonstrate their involvement in activities within ICANN’s Multistakeholder community and/or significant engagement and/or global Internet governance work, seems to be the correct way to acknowledge their work and also a way to harvest the program investments and invest again for that results to grow”.(ME – program alumni). This concept of “return on investment” is important to the Fellowship program and its continued success in building capacity in the Multistakeholder community; Staff continues to work on developing more effective questions to address this within the application, which will then be aligned to the assessment criteria.

There were some concerns raised related to: clarity of criteria, from an applicant, community member and Selection committee perspective, giving priority to those applicants within the region that the Meeting is taking place (as it takes away from the global aspect of outreach and opportunity), priority given to those from ccTLD, Gov’t, or Business focused applicants – all important to address in wanting to continue to bring more diversity to the Fellowship selection process and final candidates. Regarding regional priority – this is agreed and will be implemented immediately. Regarding priority to those in one of the above mentioned sectors: as each sector represents part of the Multistakeholder makeup that ICANN utilizes to perform its mission, it is important to be all inclusive and not exclusive but do appreciate the optic that priority may be given to one over the others hence this wording of priority in sector will be omitted. Lastly is the concern regarding clarity of criteria; Staff will make this a top priority to better define and represent in both application and assessment process, all of which will be made available and transparent in the coming weeks on the ICANN Fellowship Webpage as Program documents are updated and posted.

Staff would like to encourage a continuation of this overall discussion on the Fellowship Program beyond the Public Comment exercise. Efforts will be made to find face to face time

at the ICANN Meetings with each Community through its Leadership and/or Outreach and Engagement committees and please continue to provide feedback by emailing fellowships@icann.org.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section intends to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments submitted along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

Continued analysis of comments and responses not able to be immediately addressed in the next 2 upcoming application launch periods will occur over the next few months.