

14:01:23 From Hong-Fu(Tom) Meng to Everyone:

There's a typhoon outside Taiwan, so apologize ahead if I disappear due to signal loss

14:01:58 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

Replying to "There's a typhoon outside Taiwan, so apologize ahe...":
Stay safe Hong-Fu!

14:02:14 From Hong-Fu(Tom) Meng to Everyone:

Replying to "There's a typhoon outside Taiwan, so apologize ahe...":
Will do, thank you Anne!

14:02:18 From Renate De Wulf - ICANN Org to Everyone:

Hello, my name is Renate and I will be monitoring this chat room.

As requested verbally, please rename your sign-in name with your full name. If you do not use your full name, you may be removed from this session.

Please note that chat sessions are being archived and are governed by ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/expected-standards-2016-06-28-en> and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/community-anti-harassment-policy-2017-03-24-en>

14:02:18 From Jared Erwin - ICANN Org to Everyone:

151

14:02:29 From Renate De Wulf - ICANN Org to Everyone:

Meeting page: <https://icann-community.atlassian.net/wiki/x/AYCOEw>

14:05:45 From Jim Prendergast to Everyone:

very pensive

14:06:38 From Juan Manuel Rojas to Everyone:

is not permitted to have Observers here ?

14:07:29 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

@Juan - its an open group, so I believe as long as an SOI has been submitted, all are welcome

14:10:24 From Lars Hoffmann - ICANN org to Everyone:

Jeff is right. It's an open call, but we ask everyone who is on these calls, especially when speaking to submit an SOI, and introduce themselves in case they have not signed up as members.

14:11:17 From Juan Manuel Rojas to Everyone:

Replying to "@Juan - its an open group, so I believe as long as...":

Thanks Jeff. One NCSG member was refused to join in this meeting today. Maybe because is just asking to be a member. She sent the request just a few hour ago.

14:12:17 From Renate De Wulf - ICANN Org to Everyone:

@Juan Manuel Rojas - I will check the registration for the SubPro IRT and add her to the member list

14:12:30 From Renate De Wulf - ICANN Org to Everyone:

If she wants to join the call now, I will let her in. My apologies

14:13:30 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

2A - delete "be" in bullets

14:13:31 From Jim Prendergast to Everyone:

local and global in scope threw me too.

14:14:41 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

Replying to "2A - delete "be" in bullets":

+1

14:18:15 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

linguistic and cultural

14:18:20 From Jim Prendergast to Everyone:

I understand it because ive been steeped in this but outsides may have a question so having a canned response ready may be helpful for you

14:18:33 From Renate De Wulf - ICANN Org to Everyone:

Hello @Michaela Shapiro - you are welcome to join the SubPro IRT call. But you will need to register and fill in the document found here: <https://forms.gle/p8YbceR4dzjuVz8q9>. You will also need to create a SOI if you haven't already got one. Thank you

14:19:37 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

This is pretty standard in RFPs....all goes to ability to scale.

14:21:01 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Exactly Avri+1

14:22:29 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Could we get the link for this doc?

14:22:48 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

<https://icann-community.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/SPIR/pages/328105985/2025-08-12+SubPro+IRT+Meeting+151#:~:text=CPE%20RFP%20Vendor-,Selection,-Criteria.pdf>

14:23:35 From avri doria to Everyone:

2 level of concern:

they should know how to do the evaluations. Be used to the pressures and vicissitudes of dealing with the public in such complicated applications

- but need to be flexible at identifying, hiring, and training specialists

14:24:02 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

This needs to go out soon.

14:24:31 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

End of the week is good, thanks

14:24:32 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

I have comment/questions, but its about things I do not see in what we were provided.

14:24:37 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

I will wait to raise those

14:26:29 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

I am afraid that if we add more requirements, we may not have anyone that meets the requirements.

14:28:28 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Kept hand up to continue express ongoing concern.

14:28:54 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Agreed

14:29:19 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

again, you dont want to limit your pool of applicants

14:29:30 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Candidates with the preferred expertise as close as what we need will be at an advantage

14:29:48 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

I don't think it's "should", but just "preferably".

14:30:22 From Elaine Pruis- Verisign to Everyone:

“Eventually”?

14:30:26 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

I agree with Jared here....ICANN will have to educate the providers/panelists....

14:31:17 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

and that the providers need to find ways to get the expertise.

14:31:23 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

I meant external community experts (not consultants)

14:31:37 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

Replying to "I meant external community experts (not consultant...":

+1

14:31:41 From avri doria to Everyone:

Especially since they are judging degree of community. they SHOULD know something about communities.

14:31:59 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

I think we promised more.

14:32:28 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Which appears consistent with the comments above...

14:32:48 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

They may well have to bring on an expert to evaluate certain communities, especially for cultural or linguistic communities.

14:34:50 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

4A 1st bullet talks about A panelusing consistent judgment in evaluations

14:35:01 From avri doria to Everyone:

the difference I am trying to show, is that they have to understand communities as communities - what it means to be a community and how they differ and work. information about a specific kind of community they can find layer. But if they do not understand how to work with and understand communities they will fail to live up to the expectation built up by this process.

14:35:45 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

+1

14:36:06 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

+1 Jeff

14:36:13 From Michael Karakash - ICANN Org to Everyone:

Yes, we are explicit about consistency in the full RFP (to the point Jeff is making)

14:36:30 From avri doria to Everyone:

Replying to "the difference I am trying to show, is that they h...":

the pool should be limited to those who know how to work with communities and understand their dynamic. you do not pick that up in a weekend's training.

14:36:51 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

@Michael Karakash - ICANN Org Do you have that language?

14:37:34 From Jim Prendergast to Everyone:
Quality Control vendor is an interesting concept.

14:37:57 From Phil Buckingham to Everyone:
Agreed

14:38:10 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:
@Jim - they had that the last time (at least for the technical)

14:39:02 From avri doria to Everyone:
Replying to "the difference I am trying to show, is that they h...":
the kinds of communities they have experience with is less important. that can be trained in those who already have the concept of community.

14:41:41 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
must propose methodology to establish appropriate panels and to review panel decisions for consistency

14:42:18 From Michael Karakash - ICANN Org to Everyone:
Replying to "@Michael Karakash - ICANN Org Do you have that lan...":
Thanks Anne, as Jared noted, we may be able to show some additional language if time permits

14:42:52 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:
1. The ALAC has concerns about the sufficiency of community expertise in panels that evaluate new gTLD community applications. (SubPro Final Report,

14:42:57 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:
Footnote 242)

14:44:35 From Jim Prendergast to Everyone:
If I recall correctly - the interaction between the panels and ICANN was a major focus of at least one IRP proceeding.

14:44:47 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:
@Jim - very much so

14:45:04 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:
and we have to review the CPE study report.

14:49:20 From Justine Chew to Everyone:
4B talks about a second panel for dealing with evaluation challenges - this presupposes more than 1 panel.

14:52:07 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
and letters of opposition (as well as support)

14:54:11 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:
In light of the tight timeframe, can we see edits by Thursday - and have a short time to discuss on Thurs?

14:54:13 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
@ Please specifically include letters of opposition to be evaluated as well

14:55:17 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
SHOULD would be a good way to express this

14:55:33 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:
comments

14:56:31 From Justine Chew to Everyone:
it currently says "with NEW panelists"

14:57:30 From Justine Chew to Everyone:
Was there something about choice of panelist numbers

14:59:33 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
SHOULD constitute a new panel

15:00:40 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
the same panel will NEVER overturn its original decision so the new panel SHOULD be different.

15:00:56 From Michael Karakash - ICANN Org to Everyone:

@Justine Chew On the April 15 call there was a comment made about a CPE evaluator that is chosen should have the ability to hire an new panelist for a challenge

Maybe that's what you're remembering?

15:00:57 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Ah. My point about applicants being able to chose the number of panelists applies to Objections - Recommendation 31.10

15:01:49 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Panelist(s) could be conflicted out too.

15:02:05 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

Pricing must include pricing for a challenge evaluation

15:03:08 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

When is the RFP expected to go out for public comment please?

15:04:19 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

I .think that sounds right Jared

15:04:20 From Michaela Shapiro to Renate De Wulf - ICANN Org (direct message):

Hi Renate! I've completed the form and will set up an SOI as soon as possible (I'm currently waiting on my request for a wiki account)

15:04:29 From Michaela Shapiro to Renate De Wulf - ICANN Org (direct message):

Apologies for any confusion, and thank you for your understanding!

15:04:59 From Renate De Wulf - ICANN Org to Michaela Shapiro (direct message):

Thank you Michaela, and welcome to the SubPro IRT. I will reach out to you via email soon

15:05:19 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Got it, thanks for clearing that up.

15:06:55 From Michaela Shapiro to Renate De Wulf - ICANN Org (direct message):

Looking forward to it!

15:07:10 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

It's ALAC not GAC

15:10:59 From Juan Manuel Rojas to Everyone:

May we have the working doc on these inputs? It is available?

15:11:45 From Elisa Busetto - ICANN Org to Everyone:

We will publish the document with all input once we have gone through all the comments

15:12:38 From Juan Manuel Rojas to Everyone:

So we won't have access to Excel document this time?

15:12:46 From Elisa Busetto - ICANN Org to Everyone:

Replying to "It's ALAC not GAC":

Sorry Justine!

15:12:55 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:

Replying to "We will publish the document with all input once w...":

Do you mean we as in sub-pro or we as in staff??

15:13:28 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Implementation Guidance 31.7: Consideration should be given to whether there were barriers to filing a formal objection in the 2012 round, and if so, whether those barriers can and should be reduced in subsequent procedures. Specifically, the Working Group suggests further consideration of the time required to file a formal objection, the expertise required, and limited awareness of the opportunity to file.

15:13:32 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Final Report

15:14:18 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

The problem is that the soonest one can be delegated is 18 months from the application window closing date. That time period is way too long already...adding another 2 months is too much.

15:14:55 From Elisa Busetto - ICANN Org to Everyone:

Replying to "We will publish the document with all input once w..":
We as staff will publish the document including all input received and responses

15:16:13 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

Replying to "We will publish the document with all input once w..":
From the close of the application window it is 18 months....15 months from reveal
day

15:16:41 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

90 days was always marked []

15:16:51 From Lars Hoffmann - ICANN org to Everyone:

That is fair, Justine.

15:17:43 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

It's one thing if the IRT did in fact settle on it. It's something else entirely if it was left
as undecided.

15:19:31 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:

Replying to "We will publish the document with all input once w..":
Elisa, thanks. Do you know roughly how long that will be?

15:19:32 From avri doria to Everyone:

are you saying that the shortest path with a vanilla application is 18 months?

15:20:11 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

I said the soonest is 18 months.....

15:20:22 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

Yes Avri

15:21:15 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

Shortest path is 18 months for an application that is in the first batch. no problems
with evaluations, no challenges, no contention....

15:21:40 From avri doria to Everyone:

Replying to "Shortest path is 18 months for an application that..":
ah ok a lucky vanilla application.

15:21:45 From Phil Buckingham to Everyone:

yes estimate is 500 TLDs delegated by 30 June 2027 2000 by 30 June 2030 see 2.3.1
500 each year

15:22:28 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Two extra months would be best.

15:22:38 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

One month additional would help considerably.

15:22:40 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

I can review my timeline, but 18 months is what I keep getting to.

15:22:47 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Key factor for whom?

15:22:57 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Participation is our goal, right?

15:22:57 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

Are we talking about the difference between 104 and 135 days? Is it a one month difference?

15:23:06 From Juan Manuel Rojas to Everyone:

+1 @Kathy Kleiman

15:23:25 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

One month would make a lot of difference

15:23:45 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

@Kathy - yes, one month makes a difference to both sides....

15:24:17 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

Exactly - why not go for the middle ground?

15:24:20 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Two months would be the best.

15:24:45 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:

I agree that a list discussion is better for this

15:24:47 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

Then you should find where we can reduce time.

15:25:46 From Katrin Ohlmer to Everyone:

I think if we would ask the community we would get a huge bandwidth of positions on how long the period should be. In the interest of time I would prefer to keep the current wording.

15:25:50 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

It wouldn't be just for ALAC, @Anne Aikman-Scalese

15:26:05 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

Exactly - I was just talking about their ASIK

15:26:06 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:

I don't think anyone is suggesting that Jeff

15:26:16 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

@Chris - Anne said that

15:26:21 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

I didn't mean just for ALAC.

15:26:50 From Phil Buckingham to Everyone:

The only knock on effect would be any contention set involving CPEs would be delayed . An extra 2 months would have little impact

15:27:03 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

MY point was that if you extend time in one area, then you need to reduce time in other areas.

15:27:06 From Elaine Pruis- Verisign to Everyone:

Let's not add any more time. We're all going to have to prioritize work and meet hard deadlines through this process

15:27:22 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

I dont believe any time should be added, so no need to reduce other time

15:28:37 From Sophie Hey to Everyone:

That's fine. Thanks for the response Elisa

15:29:35 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

I think we should recognize that the ALAC process is different in terms of regional agreement.

15:30:16 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:

Lars and ICANN tram...a general question - we currently have topics listed for sub-pro calls through to 4 Sept. When will we know when the rest of the topics will be set for discussion? For example, the RySG made some particular comments re Appendix 1 and so it would be beneficial to know when this topic will be the subject of a discussion.

15:30:33 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Looks good - tx!

15:32:40 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Replying to "I think we should recognize that the ALAC process ...":

The ALAC is committing to a 3-tier bottom-up process. It is extremely challenging for ALAC to meet the 90-day (or even 104-day) period. It is unfair to the At-Large to be hampered by a time-consuming process. If we do not get an extension of time, can we revisit the ALAC process that was committed to then?

15:32:44 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

HOw will they know...

15:32:55 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

And what do you expect from the dispute provider?

15:33:34 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

30 days

15:33:45 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

this is new discussion...

15:34:20 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

30-day cooling off period is mentioned isn't it?

15:35:16 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

Agreed

15:35:30 From Juan Manuel Rojas to Everyone:

Agree

15:35:49 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:

absolutely agreed

15:37:35 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

It is stopped during the period...but if it takes 30 days to request the cooling off period, then there is 30 days of costs from the dispute provider.

15:40:49 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

When both parties agree and submit their agreement in writing to the DRSP, the 30 days starts.

15:41:39 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

Why prevent a later agreement to accomplish a settlement?

15:42:27 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Replying to "Why prevent a later agreement to accomplish a sett...":

So long as cost implications are clear

15:43:20 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

Nothing ever prevents settlement...but you are still responsible for paying the costs.

15:44:23 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

All we are saying is that the parties need to have information on the costs to put that into their settlement.

15:46:24 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Insert a link to what "Parties with standing" means

15:47:00 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
What about just referring to "Objectors"?

15:47:24 From Susan Payne to Everyone:
it's not open to the "general public". it's open to those who have standing

15:48:01 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:
the use of general public is misleading

15:48:42 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:
but Kathy it's not true...it is misleading to say the 'general public'...

15:48:45 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
Parties who have grounds to object will have the opportunity etc etc

15:49:25 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
Suggest "Parties who have grounds to object"

15:49:34 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:
no we haven't

15:49:47 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:
Chris you are a Western European lawyer

15:50:24 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
Limited Public Interest Objection is a bit different on the standing issue.

15:51:07 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:
Kathy...just for clarity...I am a recovering lawyer...

15:51:11 From Juan Manuel Rojas to Everyone:
What is the misleading to say 'general public' shouldn't be open to anyone?

15:51:25 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:
Replying to "Kathy...just for clarity...I am a recovering lawyer...":
LOL ... but still...

15:51:47 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:

Replying to "Kathy...just for clarity...I am a recovering lawyer...":
Kathy...just for clarity...I am a recovering lawyer...
And I have relapsed after recovery to become a lawyer again.

15:53:24 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:
Members of the Public with Standing

15:53:38 From Kathy Kleiman to Everyone:
seems to cover both pases

15:55:40 From Juan Manuel Rojas to Everyone:
@Kathy Kleiman Agree.. It would be a good approach!

15:56:44 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
Flowchart would be good. AGB to have a link to that?

15:56:50 From Jeffrey Neuman to Everyone:
I think ICANN should do a graphic novel premised on the AGB

15:57:04 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:
Replying to "I think ICANN should do a graphic novel premised o...":
snore

15:57:17 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:
Replying to "I think ICANN should do a graphic novel premised o...":
Manga!!!

15:57:37 From Sophie Hey to Everyone:
Replying to "I think ICANN should do a graphic novel premised o...":
No I want a flowchart of all the flowcharts!!

15:58:13 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:
Lars and ICANN team...a general question - we currently have topics listed for sub-pro calls through to 4 Sept. When will we know when the rest of the topics will be set for discussion? For example, the RySG made some particular comments re Appendix 1 and so it would be beneficial to know when this topic will be the subject of a discussion.

15:58:57 From Chris Disspain to Everyone:

thanks Lars...brilliant

15:59:09 From Juan Manuel Rojas to Everyone:

What about 'General Public with standing'...

15:59:14 From Michaela Shapiro to Everyone:

Hi all, I recognize I'm new to the working group. But from a quick skim of the version of the AGB that was shared for the consultation, the term "general public" was used throughout the document (in 15 places, including in the objections and appeals section, etc.) in which case my sense is that it shouldn't be an issue to keep that original language? Is there something specific to the usage in that section that members of the SubPro can cite as a reason to change this wording?

16:00:02 From Elisa Busetto - ICANN Org to Everyone:

Redlines are here: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1_cw93DdDlp_G-jwZLLyOsV-P215jdxv-

16:00:10 From Anne Aikman-Scalese to Everyone:

@Michaela - you may want to read the Objections sections

16:00:23 From Michaela Shapiro to Everyone:

Replying to "@Michaela - you may want to read the Objections se...":

I have! Thank you for the suggestion though

16:00:33 From Michaela Shapiro to Everyone:

Replying to "@Michaela - you may want to read the Objections se...":

I provided input to the NCSG's contribution for that section 😊

16:00:38 From Katrin Ohlmer to Everyone:

Thank you!

16:00:39 From Phil Buckingham to Everyone:

thanks Lars