

# **GAC Capacity Development Project Evaluation Report**

Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)

4 December 2018



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|            |   |           |
|------------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b>   | <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2</b>   | <b>INTRODUCTION</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>2.1</b> | <b>DEFINING CAPACITY BUILDING</b>                               | <b>5</b>  |
| 2.1.1      | ICANN'S DEFINITION  | 6         |
| 2.1.2      | OTHER DEFINITIONS   | 6         |
| <b>2.2</b> | <b>PURPOSE OF THE UNDERSERVED REGIONS WORKING GROUP (USRWG)</b> | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>2.3</b> | <b>TERMS OF REFERENCE AND GAC COMMUNIQUÉ</b>                    | <b>6</b>  |
| 2.3.1      | TERMS OF REFERENCE  | 7         |
| 2.3.2      | GAC COMMUNIQUÉS   | 7         |
| <b>3</b>   | <b>CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE USRWG</b>             | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>3.1</b> | <b>REGIONAL STRATEGIES</b>                                      | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>3.2</b> | <b>ACTIVITIES OF THE USRWG</b>                                  | <b>10</b> |
| 3.2.1      | AFRICA  | 10        |
| 3.2.2      | PACIFIC   | 12        |
| 3.2.3      | MIDDLE EAST   | 13        |
| 3.2.4      | ASIA  | 13        |
| 3.2.5      | LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN                                 | 13        |
| <b>4</b>   | <b>EVALUATION</b>   | <b>15</b> |
| <b>4.1</b> | <b>METHODOLOGY</b>  | <b>15</b> |
| 4.1.1      | EVALUATION CRITERIA   | 15        |
| 4.1.2      | DATA ANALYSIS   | 16        |
| 4.1.3      | FINAL EVALUATION  | 16        |
| <b>5</b>   | <b>FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEYS</b>                                | <b>18</b> |
| <b>5.1</b> | <b>WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS</b>                                    | <b>18</b> |
| <b>5.2</b> | <b>OVERALL FINDINGS</b>   | <b>18</b> |
| 5.2.1      | TOPICS OF INTEREST  | 18        |
| 5.2.2      | BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION                                       | 19        |
| 5.2.3      | FUTURE CAPACITY-DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES                       | 19        |
| 5.2.4      | WORKSHOP SATISFACTION   | 20        |
| 5.2.5      | IMPACT ON PARTICIPANTS  | 20        |
| 5.2.6      | FUTURE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT SUGGESTIONS                         | 21        |
| 5.2.7      | OVERVIEW  | 23        |
| <b>5.3</b> | <b>FINDINGS RE THE EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>                      | <b>23</b> |
| 5.3.1      | RELEVANCE   | 23        |
| 5.3.2      | EFFECTIVENESS   | 23        |
| 5.3.3      | EFFICIENCY  | 24        |
| 5.3.4      | IMPACT  | 24        |
| 5.3.5      | SUSTAINABILITY  | 24        |
| <b>5.4</b> | <b>FINDINGS FROM REGIONAL WORKSHOPS</b>                         | <b>24</b> |
| 5.4.1      | AFRICA  | 24        |

---

|            |   |                  |
|------------|---|------------------|
| 5.4.2      | PACIFIC .....                                 | 25               |
| 5.4.3      | MIDDLE EAST .....                             | 25               |
| 5.4.4      | ASIA .....                                    | 26               |
| 5.4.5      | LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....         | 26               |
| <b>5.5</b> | <b>LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION .....</b>    | <b>26</b>        |
| <b>6</b>   | <b><u>OUTCOMES AND OBSERVATIONS .....</u></b> | <b><u>28</u></b> |
| 6.1        | VERY POSITIVE OUTCOMES .....                  | 28               |
| 6.2        | MITIGATED OUTCOMES.....                       | 29               |
| 6.3        | RESOURCES .....                               | 29               |
| <b>7</b>   | <b><u>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</u></b>           | <b><u>31</u></b> |
| 7.1        | OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS .....                 | 31               |
| <b>8</b>   | <b><u>CONCLUSION .....</u></b>                | <b><u>32</u></b> |
| <b>9</b>   | <b><u>ANNEX.....</u></b>                      | <b><u>33</u></b> |
| A.         | ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....              | 33               |
| B.         | REGIONAL STRATEGIES .....                     | 34               |

---

# 1 Executive Summary

This report presents the findings and conclusions of an end-of-project evaluation for the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) capacity development project. This project was funded principally by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Funding support was also received from host Governments as well as regional and international organizations.

The project under evaluation was initiated in January 2017 to strengthen diversity and lower barriers to governments' participation in ICANN. Its primary objective was to increase active participation of GAC members from underserved regions (USR). The GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USR WG) consists of a large number of countries with varied local challenges. Consequently, a regional approach was adopted as it was determined that this would deliver the most appropriate content to the relevant GAC Representatives. Such an approach is not only aligned with that of ICANN at the regional and global level, it is also aimed at fostering collaboration and promoting sharing of ideas and actions amongst countries to achieve regional objectives.

The project design envisioned an 18-month period for implementing the desired activities. Regional workshops constituted the first phase of the project which concluded in June 2018; these were held in Africa, Australasia/Pacific, Asia, the Middle East, the Caribbean and Latin America.

In keeping with ICANN's regional strategies<sup>1</sup>, the methodology used sought to ensure efficient and effective resource allocation while enabling the capacity building initiative to focus on those areas with the greatest potential for regional co-operation and synergies. This also ensured that the project was regionally driven, informed by regional and local realities and priorities; leveraged existing regional resources and utilized an inclusive approach in addressing public policy issues.

In light of the above, the objective of this evaluation is to identify outcomes of the project, examine the effectiveness of the interventions and implementation, in general; and to determine the potential for sustaining some activities. The evaluation methodology involved a review of existing project documents including pre- and post-workshop surveys, workshop reports and GAC surveys.

The evaluation team has concluded that the project has achieved its primary objectives and has created a general environment of cooperation amongst various organizations. Over 240 government and law enforcement representatives<sup>2</sup> received training on various topics ranging from the global Internet governance ecosystem, understanding the ICANN ecosystem, policy development and decision-making processes to understanding the Domain Name Service (DNS), DNS abuse mitigation, WHOIS, and governments' roles in Country Code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs). Participants noted that one of the most valuable outcomes was the ability to network with stakeholders from industry, the technical community and civil society, in order to enhance their broader work. These collaborative networks have grown since the initiation of the project in 2017 and remain the most significant achievement of the project.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex B

<sup>2</sup> The workshops were open to both GAC and non GAC members. There were also participants from other stakeholder groups in several of the workshops.

---

The project has also enhanced the capacities of several GAC members from USRs, allowing them to become more active participants in discussions in which they can articulate their national positions on various issues such as the 2 letter code CCTLDs and their respective government's role in ccTLD matters; as well as volunteering for leadership positions in various GAC committees and working groups. The improvement of governments' participation within the GAC is not only based on know-how and ICANN/DNS related knowledge. Support at the high political level is necessary to increase active participation of many GAC members. This may be possible through delivering awareness about ICANN's role at the high political level.

The impact of governmental participation in the GAC, which include changes in political, economic, legislative, cultural, and social spheres, individual capacity development of participants, or of connecting GAC change at the output level, is more difficult to measure. The extent to which the project contributed to affecting changes in other areas such as high level political commitment, is also difficult to determine. Moreover, the high turn-over of GAC representatives (in March 2018, the GAC had over 90 new representatives on already existing national delegations) would also contribute to this conundrum. The lack of political support which is needed to maintain consistency underscores that significant outreach and awareness is still required at higher governmental levels to encourage support and continuity of representation within the GAC and broader support of ICANN, in general.

The knowledge gained in different areas was documented through the post-workshop surveys. Due to time constraints, an approach could not be elaborated to measure the extent to which knowledge and skills gained were used by the recipients; and how such capacity was implemented afterwards. There is a need to develop follow-up mechanisms to measure the impact of participation in subsequent phases of the project. Follow-up monitoring and documentation is particularly essential in the context of the capacity building workshops.

As we close the pilot phase of this project, sustainability has been identified as a critical success factor with respect to realising the broader ICANN objectives of "lowering barriers to participation and strengthening diversity." ICANN and the GAC need to take measures aimed at sustaining capacity development activities.

The most popular proposal and recommendation from GAC representatives is to ensure that there are up-to-date curricula on ICANN Learn addressing areas of interest to members of the USR WG, the wider GAC and to governments who are not necessarily members of the GAC.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Defining Capacity Building

The concept of capacity development gained prominence in the 1990s and has evolved over the past two decades from one that focuses on human resource development to a concept that encapsulates organizations' individuals and the wider society in which they function. There is recognition that sustainable capacity development is an endogenous process driven by those whose capacities are being developed and not by those providing support. The GAC capacity development initiative has been demand-driven, focusing on the needs of the participants and the outcomes.

---

## 2.1.1 ICANN's Definition

The ICANN organization's working group on capacity development defines capacity development at ICANN as “*objective-based learning activities that enable the community to increase knowledge, improve skills, and drive meaningful contributions that support the organization's mission.*” It is this definition that the Underserved Regions Working Group has applied when designing and conducting capacity building workshops in the different regions.

## 2.1.2 Other Definitions

Capacity Development has been defined by several entities. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) defines Capacity Development as “*the process through which individuals, organizations, and societies obtain, strengthen, and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time.*”<sup>3</sup>

The 2000 Cotonou agreement<sup>4</sup> defined capacity development as the process “*aiming to facilitate, in conjunction with the stakeholders, a consolidation of their capacities at an individual, organizational level to allow them to evolve and adapt to the new contextual requirements and fulfil their role within a governance structure.*”

Capacity building was identified by World Summit of the Information Society (WSIS, 2005) “*as one of the key public policy issues. The WSIS proposed that ‘capacity building’ is defined in relation to the experimental multistakeholder process, which leads to accumulation of intellectual capital, to development of relational infrastructure for the domain (epistemic community), and to emergence of common global consciousness*”<sup>5</sup>.

## 2.2 Purpose of the Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG)

The Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG) evolved from the GAC Working Group on Capacity Building and Outreach (CBOGW). The CBOGW was originally created with the aim of “*increasing the level of understanding and knowledge of new and current GAC members about the GAC, ICANN, and the multistakeholder model.*”<sup>6</sup> It was in March 2016, during the GAC face-to-face meeting in Marrakech, that CBOGW became the GAC's USRWG, after it was recognized that there was need for a working group with a broader focus.

Given that the different regions have distinct needs in capacity building and require different levels of engagement, the USRWG was established to address themes and topics that impact states from under-served regions. In practice, the GAC USRWG has been providing capacity building workshops to enable increased and meaningful participation by GAC members from regions underserved by the DNS industry, and to less developed economies and small island developing states.

## 2.3 Terms of Reference and GAC Communiqué

---

<sup>3</sup> UNDP

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/acp/03\\_01/pdf/mn3012634\\_en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/acp/03_01/pdf/mn3012634_en.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.itu.int/net/wsis/docs/geneva/official/poa.html>

<sup>6</sup> Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) Under-Served Regions Working Group

---

Following the acceptance of the ToRs, a face-to-face GAC meeting took place in Marrakech, where a draft work plan was developed according to an online survey of GAC members from under-served regions<sup>7</sup>. Determining the capacity development needs of these regions, a work plan was approved by the GAC during ICANN57 in Hyderabad, India<sup>8</sup> and further elaborated in the GAC Communiqués in Copenhagen at ICANN58 in Denmark in March 2017<sup>9</sup> and in Johannesburg at ICANN59 in South Africa in June 2017, as detailed below. The Terms of Reference developed by the GAC provide the mandate for the USRWG<sup>10</sup>.

## 2.3.1 Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the USR WG have been defined by the GAC<sup>11</sup> to “focus (...) on regions underserved by the DNS industry, and on least developed economies and small island developing states (...), with a particular focus on underserved economies/countries from the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) regions.”

It was mandated to “develop a range of support, advice and assistance mechanisms aimed at:

1. “Increasing the number and participation of GAC members from least developed economies and small island developing states.
2. Increasing the knowledge, understanding and capacity of GAC representatives from the least developed economies and small island developing states to enable them to engage with ICANN policy processes (and specifically the GAC) in order to:
  - Increase participation and engagement from underserved regions during future new gTLD rounds.
  - Encourage growth and development of the domain name industry (including registries and registrars) in regions currently under-served.”

The ToR acts as a living document, which “may be revised over time to incorporate lessons learned and evolving circumstances.”

## 2.3.2 GAC Communiqués

The GAC Communiqués represent the GAC’s advice to the Board. The Rationale for supporting the activities of the working group was in recognition of ICANN’s multistakeholder approach<sup>12</sup>

### 2.3.2.1 ICANN57 Hyderabad India Communiqué

The GAC Communiqué endorsed the work plan of the USRWG at ICANN57. It agreed that “there is a need to allocate sufficient resources to enable diversity and meaningful participation of underserved region stakeholders.” Furthermore, the Communiqué advised the ICANN Board to: “take required action to enable implementation of GAC Underserved Regions

---

<sup>7</sup> [https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Under-served+Regions+Working+Group?preview=/39944643/44663196/20170107\\_GAC%20USR%20WG%20Survey\\_commentsv3\\*.docx](https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Under-served+Regions+Working+Group?preview=/39944643/44663196/20170107_GAC%20USR%20WG%20Survey_commentsv3*.docx)

<sup>8</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann57-hyderabad-communication>

<sup>9</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann58-copenhagen-communication>

<sup>10</sup> ICANN 54, 56 and 57

<sup>11</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/working-group/gac-working-groups-on-under-served-regions#wq-rel-cont>

<sup>12</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann57-hyderabad-communication>

---

activities, including but not limited to capacity building and participation in ICANN policy processes.”<sup>13</sup>

### 2.3.2.2 ICANN58 Copenhagen, Denmark Communiqué<sup>14</sup>

Following ICANN57, the USRWG started its capacity building activities, and provided updates to the GAC in Copenhagen at ICANN58. It reported on its participation and progress in ongoing work areas addressing diverse issues, such as:

- ccTLD delegation and re-delegation
- “The new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP specifically Work Track 1 which is dealing with "Support for Applicants from Developing Countries"
- Work by the CCT Review on developing country issues.
- CCWG on New gTLD Auction Proceeds.
- CCWG Accountability WS2 subgroup on Diversity.”

### 2.3.2.3 ICANN59 Johannesburg, South Africa Communiqué<sup>15</sup>

ICANN59 Communiqué further updated the board on the activities of the GAC’s USRWG. In addition to continued collaboration with ICANN GE team and other departments in the organization of capacity development sessions, the Working Group also worked alongside GE and the DPRD teams to establish an evaluation framework.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann57-hyderabad-communication>

<sup>14</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann58-copenhagen-communication>

<sup>15</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann59-johannesburg-communication>



## 3 Capacity Development Activities of the USRWG

“The GAC's Under-served Regions Working Group focuses on regions under-served by the DNS industry, and on least developed economies and small island developing states.”<sup>16</sup> Since its inception,, the USRWG has organized and conducted eight workshops from January 2017 to June 2018. The Government Engagement (GE), the Global Stakeholder Engagement (GSE) and the Public Responsibility Support (PRS) teams have been assisting the Working Group in its activities. Together, they have developed process-related tools, including workshop planning and reporting templates, and pre- and post-workshop evaluation survey frameworks to ensure effectiveness and efficiency. An evaluation framework was also developed, and it was approved and endorsed by the GAC in October 2017 during ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi<sup>17</sup>.

### 3.1 Regional strategies

Regional Strategies have been developed for all of ICANN's regions by the ICANN organization in coordination with ICANN Community. In the context of the USRWG, the regional strategies most relevant are those of Africa, Pacific, the Middle East, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean. On 16th October 2014, the ICANN Board adopted a Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016 – 2020,<sup>18</sup> including the regional strategic plans, providing part of the budget for the USRWG.

| Regions                                | Strategic objectives          |   |   |  |   |
|--|-------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| <b>Africa</b>                          | DNS Stability and security    | Core operations including IANA            | Competition, consumer trust and consumer choice | Healthy governance ecosystem           |   |
| <b>Pacific</b>                         | Security and Stability        | The Domain Name Industry                  | Oceanic Region Internet Use                     | Internet Governance                    |   |
| <b>Middle East</b>                     | DNS Security and Stability    | Domain Name Industry                      | Internet Governance Ecosystem                   |  |   |
| <b>Asia</b>                            | Awareness Building            | Capacity Building                         | Language Localization                           | Increased Stakeholder Participation    | Facilitate Growth of Multistakeholder Model (MSM) |
| <b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b> | Sector and Geographic balance | Policy focus and meaningful participation | Healthy, stable and resilient unique identifier | DNS Innovation, competition and choice |   |

<sup>16</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/working-group/gac-working-groups-on-under-served-regions>

<sup>17</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/content/Migrated/icann60-abu-dhabi-communicue>

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en#2.c>

The strategic objectives identified for each region were found to be similar to the pre-workshop surveys that were conducted to assess the capacity development needs of the participants.

## 3.2 Activities of the USRWG

Host country selection was based on expressions of interest from the GAC representatives. Agenda setting was demand-driven, informed by pre-workshop surveys, which provided direction to the GE team working with the GAC USRWG leadership and members. The following workshops were completed during the period January 2017 to June 2018:

| Workshop  | Title or Theme  | Number of Participants | Dates         |
|---|---|------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Africa</b><br>Nairobi, Kenya                       | “Harnessing the Potential of the Africa GAC Members for better Participation in ICANN”          | 98                     | January 2017  |
| <b>Pacific</b><br>Nadi, Fiji                          | “Harnessing the Potential of the Pacific GAC Representatives for Better Participation in ICANN” | 22                     | April 2017    |
| <b>Africa</b><br>Johannesburg, South Africa           | Law Enforcement Capacity Building Workshop  | 26                     | June 2017     |
| <b>Middle East</b><br>Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates | Capacity Development Workshop for Middle East GAC Members                                       | 19                     | October 2017  |
| <b>Asia</b><br>Kathmandu, Nepal                       | GAC Underserved Regions Capacity Development Workshop for Asia GAC Representatives              | 20                     | February 2018 |
| <b>Caribbean</b><br>San Juan, Puerto Rico             | GAC Capacity Building Workshop  | 22                     | March 2018    |
| <b>Africa</b><br>Dakar, Senegal                       | Workshop held within the African Summit on the Internet   | 20                     | May 2018      |
| <b>Latin America</b><br>Panama                        | GAC Under-Served Regions Working Group Capacity Development Workshop for Latin America Region   | 19                     | June 2018     |

### 3.2.1 Africa

#### 3.2.1.1 Nairobi, Kenya - “Harnessing the Potential of the Africa GAC Members for better Participation in ICANN”

The workshop aimed to raise awareness and assist in building capacity of the African GAC representatives and governments on “how best to effectively participate and contribute to policy making at ICANN.” It highlighted active policy topics, and relevant GAC and cross-

---

community working groups that require the immediate attention and participation of GAC members. The workshop covered a range of topics, including:

- Understanding the ICANN Ecosystem
- Policy development process at ICANN
- ICANN Africa Strategy
- Overview New gTLDs and the Role of GAC
- Understanding ccTLD Re-delegation.
- Introduction to ICANN's mission and multistakeholder bottom-up policy development model
- Introduction to the GAC: role, organization and membership
- Introduction to the Public Safety Working Group (PSWG): mandate and work plan  
Definition of Abuse of the DNS that can be addressed through ICANN's processes and contracts
- Mitigation of DNS Abuse: the role and obligations of contracted parties
- Mitigation of DNS Abuse: the role and tools of ICANN's Security Stability and Resiliency Team
- How Law Enforcement agencies should engage with ICANN.

### 3.2.1.2 Johannesburg, South Africa – Law Enforcement Capacity Building Workshop

Building on the success of the first workshop held in Nairobi, a second law enforcement agencies capacity development workshop was held ahead of ICANN59 in Johannesburg, South Africa. The African Law Enforcement Capacity Building Workshop provided an opportunity to share experiences on issues of DNS abuse, security, stability and resiliency with the South African Police Services, African Heads of Cybercrime units, Regional Economic Communities, the African Union as well as other representatives from governments and industry. It also provided an opportunity to share experiences, best practices, and lessons learnt with other agencies from a wide range of countries during ICANN59 which took place the following week.

The workshop aimed to continue to raise awareness amongst the joining African law enforcement community on how to participate in ICANN and engage effectively in the GAC and ICANN policy making. It covered a range of topics:

- Introduction to ICANN's mission and multistakeholder bottom-up policy development model
- Introduction to the GAC: role, organization and membership  
Introduction to the PSWG: mandate and work plan
- Definition of Abuse of the DNS that can be addressed through ICANN's processes and contracts
- Mitigation of DNS Abuse: the role and obligations of contracted parties
- Mitigation of DNS Abuse: the role and tools of ICANN's Security Stability and Resiliency Team
- How Law Enforcement and consumer protection agencies should engage with ICANN
- Areas of collaboration with other stakeholders (industry, technical community, RIRs, among others)
- Discussion on WHOIS and related storage and retention of personal data;
- Potential implications of European Data Protection legislation (GDPR) and African Union Convention on Cyber Security and Personal Data Protection.

---

The underlying theme was to harness the potential of African governments for participation in the GAC and ICANN’s policy processes.

### 3.2.1.3 Dakar, Senegal – Workshop held within the African Summit on the Internet

ICANN held several workshops in the context of the African Summit on the Internet. This workshop was co-sponsored by the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie and introduced a prerequisite online course as preparation for every participant of the workshop, especially recipients of travel support to Dakar. The workshops addressed a wide-ranging set of issues which included:

- Awareness raising for the African governmental representatives to the GAC
- How to participate in ICANN and engage effectively in the GAC and ICANN policy making
- Understanding the ICANN Ecosystem
- Policy development process at ICANN and the promotion of Africa’s participation to ICANN’s work
- Critical active relevant policy topics in the African context such as the European Data Protection legislation (GDPR)
- Mitigation of DNS abuse risks
- The KSK rollover<sup>19</sup>

## 3.2.2 Pacific

### 3.2.2.1 Nadi, Fiji – “Harnessing the Potential of the Pacific GAC Representatives for Better Participation in ICANN”

The first capacity development workshop in the region focused on raising awareness and building capacity of Pacific GAC representatives and governments to effectively participate in and contribute to ICANN policy making processes.

The workshop discussed challenges specific to the Pacific region, such as inadequate Internet access, limited human resource and unreliable Internet, all of which can make participation in ICANN difficult. It also introduced current policy topics, and highlighted the various working groups within ICANN including relevant GAC and cross-community working groups that require attention and participation of GAC members. The workshop also sought feedback from the Pacific GAC representatives on how to better help them improve their regional footprint as well as within ICANN. The range of topics that were covered included:

- Introduction to the ICANN ecosystem
- Participation in ICANN’s policy development process
- Discussion on domain names (new generic top-level domains (gTLD), country-code top-level domains (ccTLDs), etc.) and role of GAC
- Security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS
- Internet Next steps for Pacific GAC representatives

---

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.icann.org/news/blog/participation-de-l-icann-a-l-edition-2018-du-sommet-africain-de-l-internet-ais>

---

## 3.2.3 Middle East

### 3.2.3.1 Abu Dhabi – Capacity Development Workshop for Middle East GAC Members

The first capacity development workshop for Middle East GAC Members was held during ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The workshop covered a wide array of topics including:

- Introduction to ICANN and its role and work in the region
- Role of ICANN in the global Internet Governance Ecosystem
- Update on ICANN Constituencies and cross community work at ICANN60<sup>20</sup>

## 3.2.4 Asia

### 3.2.4.1 Kathmandu, Nepal – GAC Underserved Regions Capacity Development Workshop for Asia GAC Representatives

The first capacity development workshop for Asia GAC members and representatives examined specific challenges to Asia, such as rapidly expanding rate of Internet users. It aimed to ensure adequate and secure Internet access, as well as address barriers to participation in ICANN include a lack of human resources and knowledge about the Domain Name System (DNS).

The workshop featured key ICANN policy topics and the relevant GAC and cross-community working groups, including:

- Understanding the ICANN ecosystem
- Understanding the Internet: names, numbers, protocol parameters
- Security, stability, and resiliency (SSR) of unique Internet identifiers
- ICANN policy development process.<sup>21</sup>

## 3.2.5 Latin America and the Caribbean

### 3.2.5.1 San Juan, Puerto Rico – GAC Capacity Building Workshop for the Caribbean

The first workshop for the Caribbean region was held during ICANN61, focusing on disaster recovery. It covered the following themes:

- Understanding DNS: how it works and the DNS chain of actors
- DNS Resiliency and recovery (Best Practices)
- DNS Resiliency and Recovery (Operational experiences.)<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> <https://icann60abudhabi2017.sched.com/event/CbHu/capacity-development-workshop-for-middle-east-gac-members>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2018-02-15-en>

<sup>22</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann61-gac-capacity-building-workshop>

---

### 3.2.5.2 Panama City, Panama - GAC Under-Served Regions Working Group Capacity Development Workshop for the Latin America Region

The first workshop for the Latin American region was held in Panama during ICANN61. The following topics were covered:

- The global Internet Governance Ecosystem: understanding the role of the Institutions involved (RIRs, IETF/ISOC, IGF) and the role of ICANN
- Understanding the ICANN Ecosystem, Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and their role
- Governments in ICANN: The role of the GAC; current issues being considered by the GAC and their relevance to Latin American context
- Understanding the ICANN Policy Development Process
- Current PDPs under consideration and the role of the GAC
- Personal Data Protection, GDPR and the current status of WHOIS
- Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR): DNS Abuse and Criminal Use, and DNSSEC
- CCTLDs current issues and the role of governments: role of GAC and ccNSO, delegation and transfer USRWG CCTLD FAQ
- Best practice and collaboration
- Key challenges faced by GAC members

---

## 4 Evaluation

To establish an evaluation framework for the capacity building workshops, the USR Working Group collaborated with the Government Engagement Department and the Development and Public Responsibility Department, as specified in the ICANN59 Communiqué.

Five criteria were developed for the framework to assess the results of the workshops: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The evaluation framework also analyzed multiple sources of data, including online surveys, focus group discussions and analysis of workshop documentation (pre and post-workshop surveys and reports).

### 4.1 Methodology

The evaluation of the capacity development activities was underpinned by three evaluation clusters that differentiated between process approach, implementation of the project, and the five criteria identified by the Evaluation Team: effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability. Each cluster of evaluation questions provided information for the assessment.

#### 4.1.1 Evaluation Criteria

For the purpose of the project evaluation each of the criteria has been defined as follows:

- 1) **Relevance:** the extent to which the project is suited to the priorities of the target group and intended beneficiaries.
- 2) **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the project attained its objectives. The issues that the evaluator examined are whether the project achieved its planned objectives and whether the scope was adequate.
- 3) **Efficiency:** the evaluation measured whether the project used the most efficient and least costly means to deliver the activities.
- 4) **Impact:** The evaluation examined the extent to which the project facilitated enhanced capacity in understanding ICANN and GAC work and whether the geographical coverage of the project was adequate.
- 5) **Sustainability:** Will the benefits of the project continue after the funding period has ended, was the project designed and implemented in such a way to ensure sustainability of its impact in developing enhanced capacity



## 4.1.2 Data Analysis

The evaluation team analyzed multiple sources of data:- GAC-wide online surveys at the beginning and end of the project; r-region-specific pre-workshop online questionnaires; and an analysis of the workshop surveys.

## 4.1.3 Final Evaluation

A group of questionnaires was used to guide the final evaluation of the project based on the evaluation criteria and ToRs. These questions were grouped into the following categories in terms of level and purpose: questions related to process, to outcome and to impact.

| Evaluation level and purpose                                 | Evaluation questions  |
|--|---|
| Attendance/members served<br><br>Efficiency<br><br>Relevance | How many GAC members, government representatives and other stakeholders benefited from this initiative?<br><br>How relevant were the workshops?<br><br>How satisfied were the participants?<br><br>What proportion of the target audience participated?<br><br>What activities were planned/implemented and how relevant were the activities?<br><br>To what extent were the objectives achieved?<br><br>Are members engaging and taking ownership?<br><br>What were the challenging factors and shortcomings?  |
| Knowledge acquired<br><br>Effectiveness<br><br>Efficiency    | What capacities were developed? (technical, policy, leadership skills, etc.)<br><br>To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?<br><br>How well was the project implemented?<br><br>How effective and appropriate was the project approach?<br><br>How well was beneficiaries' participation incorporated in the project cycle?<br><br>How did funding, staff, time and other resources contribute to or hinder the achievement of the results?<br><br>Were the outputs completed in specified time and allocated budget?<br><br>Were activities cost effective?<br><br>Were objectives achieved on time? |



|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>What alternatives were available, and which was the best of the alternatives chosen in implementing activities?</p>   |
| <p>Impact: achievement of wider effects</p> <p><i>This timing of the evaluation means that it is limited to short-term results of concrete activities. As a result, the tools used will not extend to evaluating what we believe are longer term changes at the impact level, which include but are not limited to change in the political, economic, legislative, cultural, and social spheres, on the people whose capacity is being developed or connecting GAC change at the output level.</i></p> | <p>Who were the direct and indirect/wider beneficiaries of the project?</p> <p>What would have happened to the beneficiaries if they had not received the program?</p> <p>What real difference has the project, or its activities made in the beneficiaries' engagement with the GAC and ICANN more broadly?</p> |
| <p>Likely continuation of project (Long term sustainability)</p>   | <p>What are the prospects for the benefits of the project being sustained after the first phase is over?</p> <p>Will the project benefits continue after completion of the project?</p>  |

---

## 5 Findings from the surveys

The findings overall were very positive. Meeting its objectives, the project saw improvements in the following areas:

- Understanding of ICANN and the work of the GAC
- Role of ICANN in the broader global Internet Governance space
- ICANN's policy development processes
- Capacity to participate in ICANN's processes
- Management of ccTLDs
- Greater intercountry and multistakeholder networking facilitation

### 5.1 Workshop Participants

A clear majority of the workshops participants-were members of the government stakeholder group (over 70%). A few identified as Academia, Civil society, and other – technical community.

When it came to past involvement at ICANN, 50% of participants indicated that they had been involved for over three years, though the profile of participants varied substantially by workshop. Almost 90% of participants expressed familiarity with the GAC. In the GAC-wide survey, 55% of participants had been involved for over three years and had attended five or more ICANN meetings.

### 5.2 Overall Findings

It was assessed that the project has met its objectives and added to the skills of approximately 240 representatives from governments and law enforcement agencies from under-served regions in ICANN's context.

#### 5.2.1 Topics of interest

Respondents to the surveys reported that enhanced knowledge about the DNS and the explanations of past policy discussions had been the most valuable to them. Understanding the relevance of ICANN to law enforcement was also ranked at high value among respondents. However, less than fifty percent of respondents felt that understanding the relevance of ICANN to their daily lives and to local businesses was valuable.

**Understanding the ICANN ecosystem** was ranked highly in both pre and post-workshop surveys. Specifically, the role of ICANN in the Internet Governance ecosystem and the structure of the multistakeholder model were found to be the most interesting. Respondents highlighted understanding the role of SOs and ACs, and the comparison between the different roles and responsibilities of the ICANN community, the ICANN organization and the ICANN Board. Also scoring high among participants were the role of the GAC, and ICANN's relationship with other organizations; and CANN's role in coordinating the Internet's unique identifier system.

---

**Decision making and policy development at ICANN** were also considered highly useful topics. In addition to the bottom-up policy development process, participants were most interested in ccTLDs, registries and registrants, new gTLDs and the domain registration process. IPv4 and IPv6 policies, as well as the UDRP **had** less traction.

**Technical skills and knowledge of the DNS and Security Stability and Resiliency** were found to be the most interesting for the participants of the workshops. However, among the GAC-wide survey participants, it was the WHOIS and Directory Services which gained the most attention. The Internet Protocol Addressing overview was mildly interesting to workshop participants, and the Unique identifiers and Cryptographic Key Management were the topics in which there was the least interest both from participants of the workshops and GAC-wide.

**Cybersecurity, DNS abuse and criminal use** were considered most interesting among workshop participants, closely followed by the DNSSEC and cybercrime as it relates to social media. The WHOIS databases, child protection online, the work of the GAC Public Safety Working Group and Cybercrimes relating to banking garnered the least amount of interest. On the other hand, GAC-wide participants thought that cybersecurity was the most important, along with the WHOIS and consumer protection.

Topics addressing **local and regional government issues** and **law enforcement** were found to be popular among both workshop participants and in the GAC-wide survey. Local content and business interests received less interest.

Overall, further topics that participants would be interested in were the ICANN ecosystem and gaining more technical skills.

## 5.2.2 Barriers to Participation

**Cost** was perceived to be the most significant barrier to participation for workshop attendees, followed by **connectivity** and **lack of local content**.

GAC-wide survey participants noted **financial barriers** and **lack of time** as the most significant barriers. They also identified the **complexity of issues** and **a lack of understanding of how to contribute meaningfully** as obstacles. Time zone barriers for remote participation were also rated somewhat highly for both workshop attendees and in the GAC-wide survey.

## 5.2.3 Future Capacity-Development Opportunities

Post-workshop surveys revealed **ICANN Learn courses** and **small regional meetings to address topics that will be covered at the next ICANN meeting** were identified as the most useful post-workshop support tools. There was mild interest in regular meetings of **focus groups** or local roundtables, videos of the sessions to watch later, as well as infographics or non-interactive documents for those with low-bandwidth. Mentoring programs were not found to be useful in post-workshop surveys, despite being highly rated as a need in the pre-workshop surveys.

**ICANN Learn courses, small regional meetings** and **ICANN presentations** were considered to be the most useful by GAC-wide survey participants. Webinars, video of the sessions to watch later, or presentations from local community members were considered to be mildly useful.

---

## 5.2.4 Workshop Satisfaction

**Satisfaction scores for the workshops were at 95% across workshops.** Overall, participants were satisfied with the length of the workshops, some wishing they had lasted longer. Instructors were also highly rated, with a satisfaction rating of 94%. ~~and~~ 97% agreed that the workshop had improved their knowledge of the subjects presented. Material and content were rated slightly less highly, with 86% percent of participants satisfied with the presented content, and 88% agreeing that the material was at the right level. Others thought that the material presented was either too advanced and difficult to understand or on the other hand, too basic.

## 5.2.5 Impact on participants

### 5.2.5.1 Effective participation

To increase the effectiveness of their participation, post-workshop survey respondents wished to gain more knowledge of **ICANN's policy development processes**, and the **ICANN ecosystem**, closely followed by **the multistakeholder model and more technical skills and knowledge**. Law enforcement and local issues were not considered as important.

In the GAC-wide survey, respondents thought that more knowledge of the **ICANN ecosystem** and of **Technical skills and knowledge** would increase their participation in ICANN. Further understanding the PDP, local issues and law enforcement topics were also considered important for effective participation. However, the GAC-wide survey indicated that there was minimal interest in gaining more knowledge about ICANN's multistakeholder model.

### 5.2.5.2 Attending more workshops

Post-workshop survey participants noted that more capacity-development workshops would allow them to **attend more ICANN Meetings** and **participate more actively in ICANN**. Furthermore, participants also noted that they would attend more workshops if **different topics were covered** or **the same ones at a more advanced level**. **This finding is an opportunity to create tracks with progressive levels of content that would provide a roadmap for developing expertise.**

### 5.2.5.3 Participation in ICANN

Participants in the workshops thought that the workshop had either a great impact (45.45%) or somewhat of an impact (27.27%) on their participation at ICANN. They reported that they better **understood the ICANN ecosystem and the relationship between the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees and their respective roles generally**, and that their **participation during ICANN meetings would increase**. These were followed in importance by an increased facility of identifying relevant issues and prioritizing them for attention and allocation of limited resources, as well as an improved understanding of many topics related to networks.

---

Aspects of the workshops that were considered to be the most valuable for increasing participation were understanding the **Policy Development Process (PDP), ICANN organization and management, and the current status and prognosis for dealing with policy issues**. These were followed in importance by the GAC's specific participation in the PDP and meeting new people working on similar issues. The DNS industry challengers and its ecosystem were considered the least valuable in terms of increased participation. However, not all participants felt that attending the workshops would lead participants to aspire to leadership positions in the ICANN community.

#### 5.2.5.4 Impact on work/job

When asked if the workshops had an impact on their daily work, most participants answered either yes (54.55%) or somewhat (27.27%). They **understood the role of ICANN and of the GAC, the Internet governance ecosystem and multistakeholder model of ICANN and innovating in Internet and ICT public policy at the Government level**, enabling them to **better appreciate current issues in ICANN and in Internet governance**. They also said that they gained knowledge in matters concerning network resilience, as well as being able to understand ICANN's PDP and being able to advise colleagues on national positions on some issues.

In terms of their daily work, respondents thought that better knowledge of **DNS Security, Internet governance, and understanding their own roles and duties within ICANN** were considered the most valuable. Furthermore, interaction between Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations within ICANN, and interaction with external international entities involved in the Internet Governance were also considered valuable for daily work. However, most participants did not rate highly the relevance of the workshop topics to their work, with only 36.36% finding them very relevant and useful, and 63.64% finding them only somewhat relevant and useful.

#### 5.2.6 Future capacity development suggestions

Participants were asked to provide feedback on the most positive aspects of the workshops, and to offer suggestions for improvements in future workshops.

##### 5.2.6.1 Replication in future workshops

Participants thought that training on **security and policy development** should definitely be replicated. They also thought highly of **face to face trainings**, and of inviting **ICANN leadership to share and explain** in easy ways the role of ICANN and the benefits to each party involved. Other aspects of workshops that should be replicated were inputs by persons directly leading or involved with the agenda issues, tutorials by the SSR team, and having seasoned GAC members help newer members to understand how to effectively communicate ICANN issues at the national level.

##### 5.2.6.2 Suggestions for future workshops

In offering suggestions for improving future workshops, respondents noted that the following actions would be helpful: advance provision of workshop materials to participants, longer

---

workshop;<sup>7</sup> highlight current issues in ICANN policy; discuss the role of NTIA, US DoC, IANA, PTI, and other related organizations; host other regional/local workshops;<sup>7</sup> and conduct pre-workshop surveys.

When asked for any other comments, survey participants requested: **programs about new gTLDs, GDPR, and DNS abuse in developing countries** with the support of GAC members; **regular regional meetings**, more discussion of legal and technical aspects, further explanation of the PDP process and procedures, the inclusion of security personnel, and the suggestion for all GAC members to participate in future workshops held during ICANN meetings to assist newcomers with their questions.

Other improvements suggested included: **holding workshops at other international or regional events**; and provision of **information about governance relevant to different sizes of organization and countries**. An increased **frequency of these workshops, with real ongoing topics** and the **continued efforts to customize certain elements of the workshop to suit the host region's need** were also considered to be potential improvement areas. It was also suggested that a comprehensive curriculum be developed and made available online for all GAC members and other government representatives to facilitate online training.

Workshop survey respondents also noted that having materials in French, English, and Arabic would be useful. GAC-wide survey respondents noted that English, Spanish, and other UN languages are of interest.

### 5.2.6.3 Further skills and knowledge

On further skills and knowledge that are still needed for increased effective participation in ICANN, respondents listed **understanding the processes of new gTLDs, auction proceeds, etc**, and that **hot topics should be shared and “advertised” to make members aware and have a “say.”** From a personal perspective, participants thought that further help with **time management and knowledge of how best to contribute to progress of relevant issues of interest** would be valuable to them. Lastly, participants would like to have more skills and knowledge about technical topics such as understanding how to mitigate DNS abuse, and about WHOIS and the GDPR, data protection, new gTLD program and the DNS ecosystem.

### 5.2.6.4 Mentoring

The workshop survey participants noted an interest in mentoring, and the GAC-wide survey therefore featured additional questions about the subject. About 70% of the GAC respondents would be interested in being mentored by a more experienced community member (64.11% yes and 5.88 maybe) and over 75% members would be interested in mentoring less experienced community members (41.18% yes and 35.29% maybe).

### 5.2.6.5 Expectations from future workshops

Participants were also asked what they hoped to gain from future capacity development efforts. Almost 90% of respondents thought that they could benefit from **understanding how to engage in/contribute effectively to ICANN**, and with over 70% wanting further **knowledge about the DNS and understanding the relevance of ICANN to law enforcement. This was** closely followed by **increased knowledge about the Internet ecosystem and related organizations**. Understanding the relevance of ICANN to daily work



---

or to local businesses, and explanations of past policy development discussions at ICANN were thought to be important for future efforts by only a little over 50% of participants.

## 5.2.7 Overview

**Overall, the evaluation team confirmed that the project has helped participants improve their understanding of ICANN and the work of the GAC.** Workshops were helpful in clarifying issues that are covered by ICANN, the role of ICANN in the broader global Internet governance space, technical issues related to the DNS, ICANN's policy development processes and management of country code top level domains, among other topics.

Attending the workshops helped participants learn how to approach discussions with various stakeholders. ICANN policy processes are compelling GAC members to adopt new norms and values, characteristic of the multistakeholder approach, and the workshops have been a good introduction in building capacity to participate in the ICANN processes.

The workshops also facilitated greater networking according to several participants. There was inter-country and multistakeholder sharing of experience during the workshops. Although the future impact of this knowledge sharing cannot be known by this evaluation due to its time limitation, it was considered to be significant by the participants.

## 5.3 Findings re the Evaluation Criteria

### 5.3.1 Relevance

The rationale for the project was provided by the pre-project GAC-wide online questionnaire, which revealed that the lack of active and meaningful participation by GAC members from under-served regions was due to a lack of understanding of ICANN, GAC, and policy related issues and processes.

The evaluation team examined whether the decisions to provide regional workshops were based on appropriate criteria, taking into account the needs of beneficiaries. The GAC-wide survey, which formed the basis of the activity and work-plan, provided the implementing team with data to design the project approach.

### 5.3.2 Effectiveness

The evaluation team found that the project had achieved its objectives. All beneficiaries stated that their awareness and skills had improved and that they better understood ICANN and the GAC. In addition, most beneficiaries said that they enjoyed sharing experiences with other GAC members as well as industry stakeholders. However, many of the beneficiaries had moved onto other postings in their governments. The knowledge gained was not always passed to the successor in the GAC. This suggests that the impact of the training at the individual level has not been fully incorporated into strengthening institutional capacity in a systematic and significant way.

Many institutions are involved with the GAC members and the governments in some of the areas covered, for example, country code top level domains and Regional Internet Registries. Therefore, any future capacity development project along these lines might consider

---

strengthening the link between individual and institutional capacity building as an explicit objective.

### 5.3.3 Efficiency

Local and regional resources were used when appropriate, and project schedules were met on time.

This project was mainly funded under the Government Engagement and Global Stakeholder Engagement department's budgets. Host governments as well as regional and international organizations also contributed towards the workshop costs. Whenever possible the workshops were held in conjunction with ICANN meetings or other regional meetings that had existing travel support or leveraged the proximity of a regional meeting to provide access for those that do not usually travel to an ICANN meeting.

### 5.3.4 Impact

The evaluation team heard only positive reactions about the project, but there has been no case to prove that at the institutional level capacity was significantly strengthened.

Workshop participants appreciated the workshops, but some wished it could have been focused more narrowly on their special topics. A further challenge is the high turn-over of GAC representatives.

### 5.3.5 Sustainability

Participants observed that the project requires a much broader approach (involving higher level officials and politicians) to ensure sustainability.

## 5.4 Findings from Regional Workshops

Experience suggests that one of the critical factors associated with effective capacity development projects is the accurate identification and analysis of capacity building needs. While GAC members from under-served regions share some similar local and global challenges, their individual capacity, national working environment, and the availability of resources, can greatly vary. It is therefore important for capacity development projects to consider these varying factors in the design phase of any initiative.

The GAC USRWG adapted regional strategic responses, taking into account ICANN's regional strategies.<sup>23</sup> For further focus on each region's specific needs, pre-workshop online surveys and focus group discussions were conducted prior to regional workshops and formed the basis of the workshop agenda and approach.

### 5.4.1 Africa

Three of the eight workshops were conducted in the African region. These included a regional workshop co-organized with the Kenyan government, a law enforcement themed workshop in

---

<sup>23</sup> See Annex B



---

coordination with the ICANN59 meeting in Johannesburg and a thematic event for the Francophone community co-located with the Africa Internet Summit 2018.

The immediate outcome of the first regional workshop was reported by the co-organizer, the Communications Authority of Kenya and the Kenyan Ministry of Information and Communications Technology. This was the first and largest of all the workshops and was divided into two distinct priorities; government engagement in ICANN and Internet Governance, and a narrower Law Enforcement agenda. The latter was developed with the Public Safety WG of the GAC but was open to all participants.

Participants rated the workshop highly (4 on a scale of 1 to 5) during evaluation related discussions at the end of the two workshops. In addition, some suggestions for improvements were provided, relating to ICANN policy work, and to relevant national policy processes among others. Internal workshop reporting also noted that participants found that the material presented would help them with various post-workshop work.

The thematic workshop held in Johannesburg for Law Enforcement Agencies was rated most highly of all (4.5 out of 5) but with some suggestions that presentations about ICANN's work should be put into context of the African region's situation in addressing cybercrime.

A thematic workshop for the francophone community in Africa co-organized with the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie (OIF) was held in Dakar, Senegal during the Africa Internet Summit 2018. This workshop introduced a pre-requisite course requirement to the capacity building workshops for the first time. Travel support recipients were required to complete an on-line ICANN Learn course before attending the event. The model worked to level the playing field by establishing that all participants started the program with a common understanding of the base materials. It was found that the prerequisite online course had greatly improved the efficiency of the workshop.

## 5.4.2 Pacific

The Pacific workshop was held in Nadi, Fiji in conjunction with the Asia Pacific Telecommunity (APT) meeting. This was the second workshop in the series and the first to co-locate with a regional event to specifically leverage existing attendance at a third-party meeting, as well as take advantage of potential travel support provided by the third-party hosts. 99% of Pacific GAC members were represented at this workshop.

Participants rated the workshop very highly (4 on the 1-5 scale). Comments from the questionnaires were generally positive, although several wished for a longer workshop with more tutorials on the DNS. There were also some concerns over whether their institution could apply some of the concepts learnt. They suggested organizing regional meetings that would help members from the Pacific Islands contribute to GAC policy processes without having to attend all ICANN/GAC face-to-face meetings, which they noted can be very resource intense and expensive. Some of these regional meetings could be held alongside other regional governmental events. Regional meetings to discuss relevant context-related topics prior to ICANN Meetings would therefore be very useful. These could be in the form of face-to-face regional meetings, or through online resources such as webinars.

## 5.4.3 Middle East

The Abu Dhabi workshop was rated highly, although it had the least number of participants and was held for the shortest time out of all the workshops.

---

Participants viewed the workshop as successful and reported it as a positive experience. A major issue emerging was the need to strengthen Middle Eastern participation at the GAC and in its processes.

#### 5.4.4 Asia

The Asia workshop held in Kathmandu was rated very highly by participants.

They strongly suggested the need to explore a more regional approach to capacity development by having ICANN provide capacity development sessions during some of the regional events such as the Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum (APriGF).

#### 5.4.5 Latin America and the Caribbean

The Caribbean workshop held in San Juan, focused on DNS disaster preparedness, resiliency and recovery, and grew out of the GAC's wish to address the devastating impact of hurricanes on Puerto Rico and to assist with the recovery. This interest drove the workshop design rather than a pre-workshop survey. The program provided technical training on resiliency and captured the best practices of those in the region.

The eighth and final capacity building workshop of this phase was held in Panama in conjunction with ICANN 62. Consistent with the demand driven engagement model the workshop was developed based on a pre-workshop survey of regional participants. The workshop ran for a full day before the start of ICANN 62. The agenda addressed the global Internet Governance ecosystem and the roles of the various institutions involved – ICANN, the RIRs, IETF/ISOC and the IGF; understanding the ICANN ecosystem and the roles of the SOs and ACs; the role of the governments in ICANN as well as current issues being considered by the GAC and the specific relevance to Latin America; understanding the ICANN PDP process and the current PDPs under consideration; Personal data protection and the GDPR as well as the current status of the WHOIS in that context. As in previous workshops there was a session on SSR, particularly DNS Abuse and criminal use and the role of DNSSEC. In addition, there was a session on ccTLDs issues and the role of governments including the role of the GAC and ccNSO, the delegation process and issues raised during redelegation and a presentation on the USRWG ccTLDs FAQ. This session provided a regional focus on best practices and collaboration and a review of the key challenges faced by GAC members.

Interest in continuing capacity building workshops was evident from the post workshop survey. Participants expressed interest in attending workshops of different topics but even more expressed an interest in workshops covering the same topics at a more advanced level. There was also interest in a regional approach to materials and small sessions or focus groups that might meet regularly in the region to discuss topics that would be covered in upcoming ICANN meetings so that participants have the opportunity to better prepare for participation.

### 5.5 Limitations of the evaluation

This evaluation largely confirms the positive outcomes of the project generated by the internal evaluation. Although some participants mentioned that the project could have been improved

---

to better support their specific needs, there has been no significant negative feedback from the beneficiaries.

It has not been possible to detect significant change at the impact level, which includes but is not limited to change in political, economic, legislative, cultural, and social spheres, on the people whose capacity was being developed or connecting GAC change at the output level and impact with the evaluation methodology used. Further evaluations would be required to assess the impact of the change.

---

## 6 Outcomes and observations

The workshops have been an overall success. With very positive feedback from participants, and a clear expectation of future workshops to take place in their regions at a more frequent rate

### 6.1 Very positive outcomes

**Regional strategies** developed within ICANN were very close to the demand-driven topics the workshops addressed. ICANN organization, and in particular the Global Stakeholders Engagement (GSE) and the Government Engagement (GE) teams, with the help of the ICANN community, had correctly assessed the needs of each of the underserved regions. The strategic objectives from their strategic plans were a **close match** to the topics that were eventually covered in the workshops. Reflecting on the both similar and very specific needs to each region, the workshops addressed topics that were both in the pre-workshop surveys and the regional strategic plans. Subjects such as the Internet Governance ecosystem and the multistakeholder model, DNS, Stability and Security, and policy focus for a more meaningful participation in ICANN were included in both strategic plans and the workshops. Furthermore, these were also the topics, among others, that participants asked to have additional workshops on.

The success of the workshops were ensured by the **pre-workshop surveys**, as they guaranteed a **demand-driven agenda**. In addition to fitting in with the regional strategies, the surveys helped participants be involved in the process from the design phase to the post-workshop evaluation and feedback on potential future workshops.

Despite the high turn-over of the GAC, almost 82% of participants in the workshops reported that they had had an **impact on their work**. ICANN and the GAC's purpose were better understood, as well as the Internet governance ecosystem and multistakeholder model of ICANN. Current ICANN and Internet governance issues were also better understood. Most participants gained knowledge in matters concerning network resilience, the PDP process, and their capacity to be able to provide advice on national positions from their own work perspective.

**ICANN Learn course materials** were regarded very positively by participants. Not only were they thought to be useful for pre and post-workshop participation, attendees expressed the desire to have them developed further, covering topics from the next ICANN meetings. Thus, these courses could be leveraged for providing capacity building opportunities, and GAC-specific curriculum could be developed.

Participants reported that the workshops provided them with an **opportunity to network** and develop contacts. In addition to meeting with their peers, they really appreciated when ICANN leadership directly provided them with their expertise.

Some of the workshops offered **prerequisite online material prior to the workshop** itself (Dakar, Senegal, and Panama City, Panama). These courses were used as preparation for every participant of the workshop, and in the case of the workshop in Dakar, they were especially important as ICANN offered travel support. Both the experience during the workshop and the feedback on these online courses were positive, as they provided a stronger foundation for participants in the workshops.

---

The **post-workshop surveys** also had a positive impact on the participants. They were asked to think on further topics that would be of interest to them, and they expressed needs ranging from additional more in-depth workshops on topics that had been covered, to new topics with a vision for the future.

## 6.2 Mitigated outcomes

Through the workshops surveys, it became apparent that the workshops alone did not seem to provide tools for **better engagement and effective contribution in ICANN** (88.24% of respondents in GAC-wide survey). Despite sessions on the subject, participants still seem to lack the skills or the tools to take part in the ICANN processes. Respondents reported that they felt that they still **lacked technical skills and knowledge** such as DNS, SSR, etc., and that they needed further sessions on **ICANN's ecosystem**, such as the PDP, the multistakeholder model, etc. (76.47% in both cases).

Participants were interested in ICANN's **relationship with other organizations**, such as the ITU, ISOC, IGF, IETF, RIRs (69%). This seems to suggest a need for additional information about ICANN's place in the Internet Governance ecosystem, as well as ICANN's specific multistakeholder model and how it fits in with their national Internet strategies. Instead of general clarifications, participants want to better understand the different roles and responsibilities between the ICANN community, the organization and the Board, and solicited a more in-depth explanation of the SOs and ACs, their key features, decision making processes, etc.

Concerning the **policy development process**, participants signaled that they would all be interested in the new gTLDs (100%) and in registries and registrars, as well as ccTLDs (87.5% in both cases). WHOIS and law enforcement topics also had a high interest, but this might be influenced by current hot topics such as the GDPR.

Overall, almost half of the respondents indicated they lacked **understanding of how to contribute meaningfully within ICANN** touched. This might be due to several factors, including a high turn-over of governmental delegates, cultural and language barriers and the complexity of the issues discussed. In addition, it was suggested that the impact of the training at the individual level has not been fully incorporated into strengthening institutional capacity in a systematic and significant way.

## 6.3 Resources

The approach to holding these workshops has been cost-effective both in conjunction with other regional and international organizations, such as Fiji, Nepal and Senegal as well as during ICANN Meetings.

In the case of the workshop in Fiji, travel costs were reduced as the session was organized in the margins of the APT's 10<sup>th</sup> Policy and Regulation Forum for the Pacific, and ICANN covered the cost of extra nights for participants already at the Forum.

In case of the workshops being held prior or during official ICANN meetings, the budget needed for the workshops was minimal. In addition to being able to take advantage of the presence of a wide range of speakers and presenters already taking part in the ICANN meeting, participants could apply their newly learned knowledge and skills directly in the

---

ICANN meeting. However, this might be seen to be offset by the fact that participants from the other regional workshops found them to be helpful outside the context of ICANN and took the opportunity to also network with experts and their peers in the region who might not always participate at ICANN meetings. In addition, the regional and thematic capacity building workshops provided an outreach vehicle to those governments not yet members of the GAC since the meeting was held in their region rather than requiring them to attend an ICANN meeting.

The eight workshops conducted in the pilot phase provided opportunities across all five ICANN regions and the demand driven nature of the engagement allowed workshop designs that reflected regional priorities and strategies.

---

# 7 Recommendations

## 7.1 Overall recommendations

These are the recommendations found in the evaluation report of the Department of Public Responsibility Support (DPRS):

- Workshop materials could be tailored to the level of experience of the group.
- To promote peer learning, the GAC Underserved Regions Group could provide opportunities for ICANN veterans to share their ICANN experience with newcomers.
- Provide further capacity-development materials on ICANN's structure and role as well as the processes by which policies are developed and decisions are made.
- It would be useful to provide materials aimed at a variety of levels when creating future learning materials.
- Leverage ICANN Learn to provide capacity development opportunities to GAC USR members. Consider developing GAC-specific ICANN Learn curriculum and/or mentoring programs and regional meetings prior to ICANN Meetings.
- Develop learning materials about policy development processes and the ICANN ecosystem. Provide materials covering new topics as well as the same topics at different levels.
- Consider offering a mentorship program. There is significant interest in being mentored by experienced community members; there is also some interest in acting as mentors.
- Consider working with the ICANN Learn team to develop online learning materials for a range of levels with a variety of materials.

---

## 8 Conclusion

From the findings and evaluation of the survey results and other material compiled by the Evaluation Team, it is apparent that regional strategies are very important in the context of GAC's capacity building activities, and in particular to the underserved regions. Closely reflecting each other, the regional strategic objectives and the design of the regional workshops both address issues that are highly relevant to each region.

Workshops have had very high success rates among participants across all regions. Pre and post-workshop surveys, alongside the regional strategies, have had a positive impact on both the workshop agendas and the participants' involvement throughout the process. The ICANN community, and the GAC in particular, have some shared and some specific needs across regions. Tailoring the workshops to address the identified regional needs has created a framework for high interest and success rates among participants.

Despite having a common core, the workshops addressed specific needs of each individual region. Locally designed, they harnessed regional participation and expertise for providing the best possible experience for participants.

Overall, the workshops had both a regional and a global focus. Addressing regional needs as well as shared global topics, the workshops were relevant to the participants' existing concerns, as well as supporting their participation in ICANN's processes, and thus, to global Internet Governance.



---

## 9 Annex

### A. Acronyms and Abbreviations

AC — Advisory Committee  
ALS – At Large Structure  
APT – Asia Pacific Telecommunity  
ccNSO — Country-Code Names Supporting Organization  
ccTLD — Country Code Top Level Domain  
DNS — Domain Name System  
DNSSEC – DNS Security Extensions  
GAC — Governmental Advisory Committee  
GE — Government Engagement  
GSE — Global Stakeholder Engagement  
gTLD — Generic Top-Level Domain  
IANA - Internet Assigned Numbers Authority  
ICANN — The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers  
IDNs — Internationalized Domain Names  
IETF – Internet Engineering Taskforce  
IGF – Internet Governance Forum  
IPv4 – Internet Protocol version 4  
IPv6 – Internet Protocol version 6  
ISOC – Internet Society  
ISP – Internet Service Provider  
ITU – International Telecommunications Union  
LEA – Law Enforcement Agency  
MSM – Multistakeholder Model  
PDP – Policy Development Process  
PRS — Public Responsibility Support, formerly Development and Public Responsibility (DPRD)  
RA — Registry Agreement  
RIR — Regional Internet Registry  
SO — Supporting Organization  
SSR — Security, Stability & Resiliency  
TLD — Top-level Domain  
UDRP – Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy  
USR — Under-Served Regions  
USRWG — Under-Served Regions Working Group  
WSIS — World Summit on the Information Society

## B.Regional Strategies

Africa

|                     | DNS Stability and Security  | Core operations including IANA   | Competition, consumer trust and consumer choice  | Healthy governance ecosystem  |
|---------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Strategic Objective | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strengthen ccTLD Development in Africa, Build Capacity in DNS technical operations and provide assistance and support as requested. Reference ICANN Strat Obj 1-1/2</li> <li>2. Enhance regional and international cooperation DNS stakeholders and Promote best practices of DNS operations Reference ICANN Strat Obj 1-2</li> <li>3. Promote adoption of DNSSEC Reference ICANN Strat Obj 1-3</li> <li>4. Enhance cooperation with CERTs for better handling of DNS related incidents. Reference ICANN Strat Obj 1-5</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regionalization of IANA operations in Africa. Reference Strat Obj 3/1-2-4-5</li> <li>2. Regionalization of other CORE ICANN operations in Africa. Reference Strat Obj 3/1-2-5-63-</li> <li>3. Effective communication / Outreach on ICANN operations including IANA Reference Strat Obj 3/4-5</li> <li>4. Promote Anycast Root-servers deployment in Africa Reference Strat Obj 3/3</li> </ol> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support and facilitate competition in Domain Name business.</li> <li>• Strengthen ccTLDs in Africa</li> <li>• Build business environment that favor customer trust and choice (Technology solution, Legal and regulation Framework).</li> <li>• Encourage resiliency of local DNS infrastructure (IXP, Copy of Root, Anycast DNS)</li> <li>• Deploy more root servers in Africa</li> <li>• Promote new gTLD registries, registrars</li> <li>• Introduce gTLDs in African languages and IDNs</li> <li>• Build African entrepreneurship programmes in the DNS area</li> <li>• Promote research and development to foster innovation in Internet related technologies and businesses</li> <li>• Promote strategic partnerships between global and local entrepreneurs in the DNS industry</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the multi-stakeholder model and platform in Africa at the government, civil society and private sector levels to enrich participation in ICANN constituencies.</li> <li>• Support capacity building and development of Internet governance in Africa</li> <li>• Support policy development process to create conducive environment for the internet economy in Africa</li> <li>• Ensure internationalization of ICANN using outreach programme.</li> <li>• Ensure physical presence in Africa to conduct outreach to help reflect ICANN's global image</li> <li>• Expand a Multi-Stakeholder platform to increase participation and engagement in collaboration with I* organizations and ICANN constituencies</li> <li>• Encourage Industry development by setting up an Internet foundation for DNS industry in developing countries (Africa)</li> </ul> |

Australasia/ Pacific Islands

|                     | Security and Stability   | The Domain Name Industry   | Oceanic Region Internet Use   | Internet Governance   |
|---------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Strategic Objective | <p>The core Internet infrastructure and people to support it in the region will be robust and well distributed ensuring a Safe, Secure and Resilient Internet infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deploy training program for technical people in the operation and management of secure and resilient Infrastructure</li> <li>• Deploy training program for national justice sector /LEA organizations</li> <li>• Deploy at least one root server mirror into the 27 ccTLD countries and territories</li> <li>• Get DNSSEC deployed into ccTLDs and local registrars and ISPs can do validation</li> <li>• Advocate for and support IPv6 adoption by ccTLDs and ISPs</li> </ul> | <p>There will be a robust and competitive Domain Name industry within the Australasia/Pacific region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create awareness of the new gTLDs and potential future rounds of new gTLD application</li> <li>• Create awareness of the Registrar/ Reseller business opportunities selling names for gTLDs and ccTLDs as added value services.</li> <li>• Facilitate best practice for ccTLD operations</li> <li>• Deploy training programs for national and regional media</li> </ul> | <p>Accessible, affordable, safe and well-informed Internet connectivity will be expanded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop benchmarks in infrastructure deployment technologies and costs</li> <li>• Support community training programs</li> <li>• Support Internet Safety activities</li> <li>• Deploy training programs for national and regional media</li> <li>• Encourage and support formation of local professional groups such as computer societies, etc. who can become ALSes for their community</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sectors of the community will be able to participate in discussions around Internet Governance</li> <li>• Identify local and regional issues in Internet Governance</li> <li>• Participate in national and regional Internet Governance Initiatives</li> <li>• Provide Training to Government Officials, Ministers and Journalist in Internet Governance topics</li> <li>• Foster attendance at Regional and Global IGFs</li> <li>• Explore ICANN (and other) Fellowship programs selection criteria for opportunities.</li> <li>• Support ICANN MSM via readouts post ICANN meetings</li> </ul> |

Middle East

|                     | DNS Security and Stability  | Domain Name Industry   | Internet Governance Ecosystem   |
|---------------------|---|--|---|
| Strategic Objective | <p>Develop relevant capacity, resources and Internet infrastructure in the region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build awareness and understanding of stakeholders for the importance of DNS security and stability</li> <li>• Strengthen technical know-how and capacity of stakeholders</li> <li>• Develop Internet infrastructure to strengthen DNS security and stability</li> <li>• Cooperate with law enforcement agencies (LEAs) for keeping the DNS secure and stable</li> </ul> | <p>Build the domain name industry in the region and strengthen the overall ecosystem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise awareness among relevant stakeholders of the domain name industry</li> <li>• Foster collaboration among TLD operators on exchanging best practices</li> <li>• Stimulate innovation and entrepreneurship in Internet related industries</li> </ul> | <p>Promote engagement with and participation of relevant stakeholders in relevant fora:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote multi-stakeholder Internet governance mechanisms</li> <li>• Foster healthier representation from the region in ICANN constituencies</li> <li>• Promote engagement from the Internet community in the region</li> </ul> |

Asia

|                     | Awareness Building   | Capacity Building  | Language Localization   | Increased Stakeholder Participation  |
|---------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Strategic Objective | <p>To raise the awareness of ICANN's presence, and the multistakeholder model of Internet Governance in the region</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participate in regional events related to ICANN and multistakeholder Internet Governance</li> <li>Establish communication channels.</li> </ul> | <p>To raise the capacity of stakeholders in the APAC region to increase understanding and participation in ICANN, and to contribute towards a more secure, stable and resilient Internet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support stakeholders in the DNS Industry (Registries and Registrars) through capacity building</li> <li>Provide capacity building for Technical community and Law Enforcement Agencies</li> <li>Participate in Public Policy Forums to increase Policy Makers' understanding of the DNS</li> <li>Establish APAC Webinars in the APAC time zone</li> <li>Support Internet Governance programmes/schools in region</li> </ul> | <p>To address language as a barrier to participation in ICANN.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a Language Localization Toolkit and drive adoption by local communities</li> <li>Collaborate with stakeholders as partners towards community-driven translation of ICANN materials</li> </ul> | <p>Proactively reach out to stakeholders to participate in ICANN's policy development processes and develop targeted programmes to increase stakeholder participation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target specific stakeholders on key issues of interest to them.</li> <li>Develop Engagement Programmes / Activities</li> </ul> |

Latin America and Caribbean

|                     | Sector and Geographic balance  | Policy focus and meaningful participation   | Healthy, stable and resilient unique identifier  | DNS Innovation, competition and choice   |
|---------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Strategic Objective | <p>1.1. Identify participation gaps on sector and geographic levels</p> <p>1.2. To bring new people and organizations from region in those sectors, Gap, into ICANN's Multistakeholder model</p> | <p>2.1. Establish programs to raise awareness and communicate on ICANN's PDPs</p> <p>2.2. Encourage and support regional stakeholder's participation policy development PDPs</p> <p>2.3. Supporting participation of regional stakeholders in SOs, ACs and working groups</p> | <p>3.1. Contributing to make the DNS secure and resilient in the LAC region</p> <p>3.2. Awareness Raising and Capacity Development</p> | <p>4.1. Raising awareness to business and entrepreneurship community about opportunities of the DNS Industry</p> <p>4.2. Build Capacity that empowers organizations from the LAX Region to become active participants in the DNS Industry</p> <p>4.3. Promote the multi-stakeholder model and platform in Africa at the government, civil society and private sector levels to enrich participation in ICANN constituencies.</p> |

