**1 March 2023 ICANN76 Prep Week SubPro Webinar Q&A**

*The SubPro ODP Team received questions during the webinar, some of which were answered live, and some of which went unanswered due to time constraints. Responses to questions raised during the webinar have been grouped by topic below, with some repeated questions that were combined and some answers that were expanded upon with clarifications not addressed during the webinars. Questions are grouped and ordered alphabetically by subject. Further inquiries can be directed to subpro-odp@icann.org.*

## Finance

**Q: How much more money will you be requesting from the Board to complete the ODA process?**

A: The Board is planning to provide a set of decisions within the whole package pertaining to SubPro, including approving a number of the recommendations, while others will remain pending. Implementation would proceed for those approved recommendations and an overall project plan for implementation would be produced using the ODA as a basis. Along with the Board decision will come funding to carry out implementation work over the next few months, including Project Plan development and continued support for the Board in their consideration of the remaining recommendations. We're not sharing the amount that's being put in front of the Board at the moment, because the Board has not yet voted on it. What will be put in front of the Board is the amount of expected costs over the next few months only, not the entirety of the implementation plan.

## Implementation

**Q: Org had posed the question, "What should we do if we want to change implementation guidance?" Please clarify the approach you will be taking.**

A: The question the ODP team asked the Council was "Is our understanding correct that the description of Implementation Guidance in the Final Report and in response to Question Sets 1 and 4 applies in such cases as mentioned above, meaning that implementation guidance remains a strong recommendation, rather than a requirement, in all cases?" See Question Set 6.

The Council agreed with ICANN org's understanding that  "if something cannot be implemented exactly as specified in Implementation Guidance, the org would be expected to describe its efforts and rationale for such cases, and to work with the IRT to implement an alternative in line with the purpose behind the recommended action."

We will work with IRT to determine the best way to use the guidance provided.

## Next Steps

**Q: How can we preview the actions the Board is planning to take on SubPro issues in Cancun?  Is this document available now for public view?**

A: The materials that were shared with the GNSO can be found on the mailing list at this link. https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/council/2023-February/026554.html
Note that these are draft documents created for discussion purposes and are still subject to change.

## Prioritization

**Q: Regarding prioritization, did ICANN fully discard the much simpler, fairer, faster and cheaper logic of sorting by TLD string Unicode code point in descending order, or a similar principle? If yes, why?**

A: Recommendation 19.3 provided the formula that was recommended by the working group. It does allow for prioritization of IDN applications, and we intend to follow that recommendation.

## RSP Pre-Evaluation

**Q: Why would it be so difficult to pre-evaluate RSPs when ICANN has this process in place today when (if) there is an assignment of an existing registry to a new provider. In other words, isnt the RSP Pre-evaluation just an extension of what already is in place?**

**In other words, isnt the RSP Pre-evaluation just an extension of what already is in place?**

A: An RSP change for a registry operator is not actually the same process. Registry system testing does occur, but the technical evaluation does not if gTLDs are already operating at the RSP.

The 2012 processes will be used as a basis for creating the RSP Pre-Evaluation processes. As mentioned, technology has evolved since the 2012 round (such as including RDAP) and thus needs to be updated. Recommendation 27.2 requires all questions to be changed to pass/fail rather than the point system used in 2012. Recommendation 27.14 also requires that the technical evaluation incorporate capacity

evaluations (number of TLDs and expected registrations).

**Q: ICANN can use the largely defined processes and costs from their existing Material Subcontracting Arrangement (MSA) Change documentation when implementing this program.**

**It seems like ICANN has already done this, and this should be one of the lowest hanging fruits that they could just kind of hit out of the park. I think in some of the stuff that was discussed with the board, they were talking about having this done, or having guidance by ICANN78. Could you, perhaps, elaborate on what your current best thinking is on when you will be able to, if you will launch and wrap this program up, to begin accepting applications?**

A: ICANN org did not identify RSP Pre-Evaluation as a high risk area. There's a lot for us to use that we're currently doing and have done in the past. It's simply work that needs to be done, in conjunction with the IRT, which will take some time. The goal for the RSP Pre-Evaluation program is to provide it early enough for RSPs to apply and get evaluated, and for applicants to engage with those Pre-approved RSPs, so that everyone can move forward with their applications.

**Q: Back in 2012, the ICANN's TAS (TLD Application System) was traumatic and wasteful even before the infamous "glitch" leading to its shutdown on the last day of the original application window. The TAS should not be revived. Instead, ICANN should draw inspiration from the IETF's XML2RFC, allowing a standard format for a single file containing all that needs to be submitted for an application. The same type of process can be used for ICANN technical provider pre-approval. Version tracking systems are now ubiquitous and can be handled by the authors themselves. The author of https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7991.html , Paul Hoffman, even happens to work for ICANN, and many ICANN staff are experts. Has any thought gone into that aspect of the process yet?**

A: ICANN does not intend to revive the original TAS system. Our Engineering and Information Technology team is actively assessing several different platforms on which we would build systems economically and with a higher quality standard for the end users.

With respect to XML2RFC, ICANN is not currently exploring templating solutions for those applicants that desire to submit multiple applications more efficiently. ICANN does recognize, however, the need for improving the end user's experience in the next round and is actively exploring opportunities to improve the efficiency, clarity and ease to complete.

## Timeline

**Q: When portions of the Subpro Final report are approved by the Board, will an IRT be instituted to go along with that?**

A: ICANN Org will start the implementation, and the call for IRT members will occur soon after the Board resolution, who will begin work on the Applicant Guidebook.

**Q: Has the Org put together a critical path with timelines for completion project by project . Working forward from ICANN 76 ,  Mid 2024 would seem to be the very very earliest that the Application Window would open ??  What is much more realistic date does the Org think**

A: The org is working at the Board's request to create a timeline that would include the anticipated date to be able to open for application submission. The delivery of this timeline will be guided by the expected Board resolution.