

## ICANN Webinar on Uniform Rapid Suspension Entries from the Comments & Feedback pod

03 October 2012

1. Amy Repp: are these slides available anywhere in pdf format?
2. Philip Corwin: Making URS model changes based on price considerations before pricing has been market-tested via RFI responses seems like putting cart before the horse. Is ICANN proactively making expert arbitration providers beyond existing ranks of UDRP providers aware of RFI to encourage broadest possible range of responses?
3. Philip Corwin: Also, STI-RT recommended that URS providers under standard contract. Does ICANN intend to develop a binding and enforceable contract for URS providers, whether sole vendor or multiple providers?
4. Elaine Pruis - M+M: how about letting the registry operator decide if it is a clear cut violation of the registry policy. if the complainant doesn't like it the decision then go to UDRP
5. Philip Sheppard: If there is a conflict of interest in existing UDRP providers providing URS should they be excluded from an RFP?
6. d: In UDRP, panels can consist of 1 or 3 people
7. IP Rota: Philip Corwin: Absence of response in short time period allowed should not lead to automatic presumption that registrant has valid rights and that domain is clear cut infringement -- those determinations require human review. < Our model supports his view as well :)
8. Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman: Could you please share the deep, deep concern for #1: I wrote it in CircleID on 8/17: I urge the community not to spend another minute rehashing the "automatic default" scenario. Automatic default, to some, particularly respondents, still represent a dramatic change of substantive rights. One side will argue (again) that

14 days is enough to respond and the defaulter should lose automatically. The other side will argue (again) that due process is violated with only 14 days to respond, especially as New gTLDs reach out to people and entities around the world who don't speak English as a first (or second) language. Let's avoid repeating this debate — we've come too far and we're doing too well.

9. IPRota: please ignore the above comment

10. Nick: Is it true that when a Mark is registered in the TMCH then its a clear-cut case?

11. Gideon (DotConnectAfrica): On the automation, for the use of interfaces and email, should there be the problems that were experienced like the TAS , how does ICANN plan to deal with alternatively,

12. Kristina Rosette: Support #1. Don't support restricting URS to marks in Clearinghouse, but do support tiered fee structure where mark is in TC already. Strongly oppose #3. Support #4 - in theory - but need to make sure that those cost savings approaches actually save costs.

13. Kristine Dorrain: @Kurt: the current URS says complainants can prove use by submitting use validation from the TMCH (Doesn't mention a direct connection)

14. Kathy Kleiman: @Olof, with \$350 million in New gTLD fees, why would we want volunteers?

15. Kathy Kleiman: What about the ICANN subsidy for the first few years -- suggested in Prague.

16. Kathy Kleiman: Kurt, perhaps it is the cost of setting up the system that you are spreading across the system.. +1 Alan

17. Evan Leibovitch: I am very disappointed that this webinar did not examine the procedure for soliciting service providers which led to the current situation. I would suggest that we should be focusing on procurement and financing rather than reopening the consensus policy

18. Rubens Kuhl: UDRP review is like "Fight Club". You don't talk about it.

19. Frank Michlick (DomainCocoon): Could you answer the question from Philip Corwin asked in the chat: Philip Corwin: Asking for 3rd time --DOES ICANN INTEND TO PLACE URS PROVIDERS UNDER CONTRACT PER STI-RT RECOMMENDATION??

20. Rubens Kuhl: Please disregard the last comment.

21. Gabriela Szlak: Gabriela Szlak: One question regarding RFI. Should potential providers take into account these community suggestions? (I am not on the phone could you please read my question) Thank you!!!