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Agenda

- URS update
- Trademark Clearinghouse implementation status
- Handling excess funds
- Update on financial support/JAS for new gTLD applications
- Timelines and ICANN readiness
URS: Current Status

- Implementation work indicates that 300-500 USD cost target may not be met.

- Additional work and study needed to attain fee goal while preserving safeguards of the system.
URS Goals

- Registrant protection
- Rapid, cost-effective system for rights holders
- Addresses the most clear-cut cases of infringement
- Complement the UDRP
Issues for Discussion

• What are cost drivers for the URS; can costs be reduced without sacrifice of goals?

• Can safeguards for registrants be achieved in more cost effective way

• What is the proper process/venue to identify changes to URS?
Trademark Clearinghouse

- Engaged provider team of Deloitte, IBM, CHIP
- Collected community input on key implementation issues November 2011-May 2012
- Released draft implementation model April 2012

http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse
Key Design Principles

- Limit data exposure
- Avoid single point of failure in domain name registration
- Minimize the number of parties that interact for RPMs
- Closeness – parties interact with those closest in the chain
- Compatibility with community-developed framework in AGB
Trademark Clearinghouse: Going Forward

- Currently refining technical requirements with providers
- Developing EPP extensions (Registry-Registrar interface)
- Clearinghouse-Registry interface engineering mailing list
- Staged code releases and testing scheduled starting in July

Launch targeted for October 2012
New gTLD fund excesses

Program built on cost recovery principle, but surplus possible:

- Unused risk contingency funds
- Lower than expected processing costs
- An over-allocation of historical development repayment funds, and/or
- Auction fees, if any

Significant community interaction expected, staff to make recommendation to Board on process.
Support Applicant Review Panel (SARP)

- 80 applications from 47 countries
  - 18 Africa
  - 23 Asia Pacific
  - 11 Africa
  - 11 Latin America/Caribbean

- Diversity in experience: operating in developing countries, domain name industry, public interest, small business, registry management, financial expertise, awarding grants

- Five-member panel to be convened
Applicant Support Timeline

• Jan – May 2012
  Support Applications received

• Jun - Jul 2012
  Select, build, and train SARP

• Aug – Sep 2012
  SARP Evaluates Support Applications

• Oct 2012
  Notice of results to applicants
Timelines

• Initial evaluation begins 12 Jul

• Schedule:
  – Batches in 5 months each
  – Early projection: all applications in 15 months

• Objection period: 7 months for all applications

• Comments in first 60 days sent to evaluators
ICANN Readiness

• Provisional evaluations occurring
• Cross-firm reviews
• High and improving consistency across evaluation firms
• Panels fully staffed
Evaluation categories and firms

• Financial and technical:
  – Ernst & Young
  – KPMG and
  – JAS Advisors

• Geographic names:
  – The Economist Intelligence Unit
  – Interconnect Communications (w/ UCL)

• String similarity:
  – Interconnect Communications (w/ UCL)
  – Interisle

• DNS stability: Interisle

• Community priority evaluation:
  – The Economist Intelligence Unit
  – Interconnect Communications (w/ UCL)
Objections & Dispute Resolution

• MOUs executed with dispute resolution service providers
  – ICC
  – WIPO
  – ICDR

• Independent objector: Prof. Alain Pellet

• Auctions: Power Auctions
Thank you
Questions