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Agenda

1. EOI status update
2. Resolving outstanding issues
3. Completing the Applicant Guidebook
Expression of Interest & Pre-Registration Process (EOI)
EOI / pre-registration process

- To serve the public interest by facilitating the launch of the New gTLD Program in a secure, stable, well-organised and efficient manner

- Benefits
  - Ascertaining number of first round applications
  - Identifying instances of possible string contention
  - Identifying areas of potential objection
  - Informing the economic benefits / risks discussion
  - Identifying unanticipated issues, providing flexibility
  - Hastening launch of the new gTLD program by answering or raising issues before the decision to launch is made
EOI Model

- Draft model posted for comment in December after public comment period

- Full analysis of all public comment received has been posted

- Explanatory memorandum posted to inform discussion at this meeting:
  - Objectives of the EOI
  - Proposed EOI model
  - Outline of costs
  - Prerequisites and timeline
Key elements of the proposed model

- Mandatory for eligibility in the first gTLD application round
  - Voluntary EOI: substantial cost / no value

- A deposit of US $55,000 required.
  - Discourage speculation / tied to gTLD fee structure

- Deposit non-refundable, unless round not launched
  - Bright line rule / settle issues before launching

- Participant and string information will be made public
  - Transparency / inform operational readiness & objections

- A fully executed communications campaign, to promote global awareness
  - Will not work to disadvantage various groups

- No evaluations will occur
Pre-requisites to EOI

- Publish draft version 4 of Guidebook
- Resolution required for:
  - Trademark RPMs
  - Three-character issue
  - Vertical integration
- Full communications campaign executed
- Operationally ready to conduct process
Resolving Outstanding Issues
Trademark Protection

- Solutions for this set of issues are virtually complete:
  - GNSO completed its deliverable to consider Trademark Clearinghouse and URS mechanisms
  - STI reached unanimous consensus in most areas, rough consensus in others
  - New versions of Trademark Clearinghouse and URS are posted based on STI work
  - New version of Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP) posted based on public comment and discussion
Proposed RPMs

REGISTRY LIFECYCLE

PRE-LAUNCH → LAUNCH → ONGOING OPERATIONS

IP CLEARINGHOUSE

IP CLAIMS → SUNRISE

PROPOSED RPMs

URS → POST-DELEGATION PROCESS

THICK WHOIS → UDRP

ICANN
Trademark (IP) Clearinghouse

- A single database of authenticated registered trademarks and authenticated unregistered marks

- Two functions:
  - validate trademarks
  - provide data for pre-launch IP claims or sunrise services

- Replaces need for:
  - Trademark holders to register in many databases as TLDs are launched
  - Registries to develop IP Claims and Sunrise processes

- Operated by third-party license or agreement with ICANN
Trademark Clearinghouse: STI Recommendation

- Mandatory: Sunrise or TM Claims Services
- What marks are in Clearinghouse: Court-validated, and nationally & multi-nationally registered text marks
- What marks must registries honor: Registered marks with substantive review and court validated marks
- Provider contracted with ICANN
- Clearinghouse may offer ancillary services
- One database - regional authentication
- Costs borne by parties using services
Differences between Posted & STI Model (based on Public Comment)

- **GNSO-STI:** Registry has discretion to honor marks registered in jurisdictions without substantive review
  
  Proposal: Registry must honor marks these marks if validated by Clearinghouse or Courts

- **GNSO-STI:** Clearinghouse may provide ancillary services without TM holder permission
  
  Proposal: TM holder has discretion to allow license for ancillary services
Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS)

- Rapid relief to trademark holders for the most clear-cut cases of infringement
- Cheaper, faster and higher burden of proof than UDRP
- Filing fee set by URS provider
- Expected fee in range of $300
- Results only in suspension, not transfer of name
URS: STI Recommendations

- Mandatory
- Contains examples of and defenses to bad faith
- De novo review (appeal) available at any time
- Examiners trained and certified
- Examiners rotated within provider
- URS disallowed if contestable genuine issue
- One-year ban after two abusive complaints
URS: Differences between posted - STI Model

- Legal term of art:
  
  GNSO-STI: Bad Faith “Safe Harbors”
  Proposal: Bad Faith “Defenses”

- GNSO-STI: De Novo review at any time
  
  Proposal: De Novo review two years from determination
Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure

- PDDRP provides a forum to address allegations of infringement after a new gTLD is delegated
- Revisions are based on public discussions and comment
  - Quick look process to screen out frivolous cases
  - Complaint may be based on top-level or second-level activity – either requires affirmative conduct by registry operator
  - All cases proceed to determination on the merits
  - Complainant pays up front, registry operator pays if loses case
  - Panel recommends from among graduated enforcement measures
Malicious Conduct

- Set of modifications completed for draft version 3 of Applicant Guidebook

- Remaining areas being completed by two advisory groups:
  - Zone File Access Advisory Group
  - High Security Top Level Domain Advisory Group
Zone File Access

- Working group proposed solutions to enhance access to zone file information in an environment with many gTLDs

- Paper released including:
  - discussion of issues
  - consideration of 4 possible models
  - cost model
Zone File Access: 4 Models

- Enhanced bi-lateral model: standardizes essential elements of relationships between registries and consumers
- Repository model: third party collects zone files from registries and distributes them to zone file consumers
- Proxy model: third party acts as an intermediary for standardized authorization; data is delivered via secure proxy connections to the registry
- Clearinghouse model: credentials and authorization maintained by intermediary; data delivered over secure connections between consumer and registry.
High Security Zone TLD Initiative

- Concept paper published with Applicant Guidebook draft v3
- High Security Zone TLD Advisory Group continuing development
- Outlines a voluntary, structured approach to improve overall security of domain names registered in participating TLDs
- Introduces self-certification “Report card” concept
Economic Study

- Greg Rosston (Stanford) and Michael Katz (Berkeley) retained

- Three phase study – second phase (after Nairobi) will:
  - perform empirical analysis to estimate cost of defensive registrations,
  - develop metric to assess overall expected benefits / costs
  - develop a process to assess whether net economic consumer harm might result from individual applications.

- Third phase might be to develop mechanisms to enhance benefits of new gTLDs
Root Zone Scaling

- Root zone scaling study completed; reports anticipated from SSAC and RSSAC

- Models created and published for different delegation rate scenarios for application volumes:
  - below expected
  - expected
  - above expected
  - significantly above expected
Delegation projections

Rate of change (Q1 2011 - Q2 2014)

- Low activity: 108/yr
- Expected Activity: 215/yr
- High Activity: 241/yr
- Extremely High: 263/yr

IDN Fast Track

Board Approval

First gTLD Delegation

End 1st round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2 09</th>
<th>Q3 09</th>
<th>Q4 09</th>
<th>Q1 10</th>
<th>Q2 10</th>
<th>Q3 10</th>
<th>Q4 10</th>
<th>Q1 11</th>
<th>Q2 11</th>
<th>Q3 11</th>
<th>Q4 11</th>
<th>Q1 12</th>
<th>Q2 12</th>
<th>Q3 12</th>
<th>Q4 12</th>
<th>Q1 13</th>
<th>Q2 13</th>
<th>Q3 13</th>
<th>Q4 13</th>
<th>Q1 14</th>
<th>Q2 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 Apps per round</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Apps per round</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 Apps per round (batch)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Apps per round (batch)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maximum Delegation Rate

Rate of change (Q1 2011 - Q2 2014)

- Low activity: 108/yr
- Expected Activity: 215/yr
- High Activity: 241/yr
- Extremely High: 263/yr
- Maximum*: 917/yr

*Reflects max gTLD processing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of TLDs</th>
<th>Q2 09</th>
<th>Q3 09</th>
<th>Q4 09</th>
<th>Q1 10</th>
<th>Q2 10</th>
<th>Q3 10</th>
<th>Q4 10</th>
<th>Q1 11</th>
<th>Q2 11</th>
<th>Q3 11</th>
<th>Q4 11</th>
<th>Q1 12</th>
<th>Q2 12</th>
<th>Q3 12</th>
<th>Q4 12</th>
<th>Q1 13</th>
<th>Q2 13</th>
<th>Q3 13</th>
<th>Q4 13</th>
<th>Q1 14</th>
<th>Q2 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 Apps per round</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Apps per round</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 Apps per round (batch)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Apps per round (batch)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 applications</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2129</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>2619</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>3310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completing the Applicant Guidebook
Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure

- RRDRP: Provides a forum to address allegations that a community-based gTLD registry operator is not enforcing restrictions stated in the terms of the gTLD registry agreement
- Revised based on public comment
  - All cases proceed to determination on the merits
  - Panel recommends from among graduated enforcement measures
IDN 3-Character Requirement

- New guidebook text published based on IDN Implementation WG’s recommendations
- Relaxes the 3-character rule for gTLD strings in some cases
- Minimum string length for certain IDN gTLD strings is established to be two characters:
  - subject to restrictions on two-character strings that would be likely to cause visual confusion in certain areas
  - no allowance for one-character TLD strings in any script, pending consideration by the GNSO and ccNSO
IDN Variants

- New guidebook text published based on Implementation WG’s recommendations
- Allows for future delegation of variant TLDs pending development and testing of a mechanism
  - Testing to occur of DNAME, BNAME, others
- Conditions to be fulfilled prior to delegation of variant TLDs
  - Evaluation, fees, contract terms to be determined
- Proposed approach:
  - Collect IDN tables from applicants
  - Collect list of variants from applicants
  - No variant TLDs delegated until mechanism is tested and adopted
Benchmarking of Registry Operations

- Survey of industry data on registry operations undertaken to assist implementation of new gTLD evaluation criteria and procedures
- Study performed by KPMG on ICANN’s behalf, including:
  - analysis of public industry information
  - collection of data through a survey of existing registry operators
- Objective to identify benchmarks based on registry financial and operational data, as a reference point for the review of new gTLD applications.
Registry Agreement: Vertical Integration

- New model to be proposed based on:
  - Debates in Seoul
  - Consultation held in January 2010
  - Ongoing study

- Additionally, the Board and community members will be discussing the issue in Nairobi

- GNSO PDP on vertical integration is proceeding in parallel
Registry Agreement: Amendment Process

- Process for future amendments to new gTLD registry agreements still under discussion

- Explanatory memo outlines several possible models, including a model recently proposed by the GNSO’s Registry Stakeholder Group
  - RySG model based on periodic good faith discussions, with amendments binding only if each registry operator individually agrees.

- Comment sought on RySG proposal and other possible models
Thank You