**De :** owner-council@gnso.icann.org [mailto:owner-council@gnso.icann.org] **De la part de** Marika

Koninas

Envoyé: mardi 6 novembre 2012 13:15

À : council@gnso.icann.org

Objet: [council] FW: URS update

Forwarded on behalf of Olof Nordling

Dear Councillors,

Thank you first of all for a constructive discussion in Toronto on the next steps in URS implementation and for considering setting up a drafting team to address practicalities in that regard. The URS session in Toronto happened to partly overlap with your GNSO wrap-up session, making it impossible for you to attend the entire URS session, but the recording and presentations are available at <a href="http://toronto45.icann.org/node/34325">http://toronto45.icann.org/node/34325</a> for your information.

As you may be aware, the session turned out quite interesting overall, with a late addition of a verbal presentation from Intersponsive stating that they would be able to act as URS provider for the target fee, albeit with some minor adjustments of the process as drafted. On that note, also NAF responded that they could meet the target fee, provided reasonable adjustments could be done regarding a) the number of domain names to be handled under one complaint (for the same fee) and b) the language requirements (now open-ended) for the notifications to registrants. You may also find parts of the NAF presentation particularly interesting as it raises some very pointed questions – here is a direct link to that presentation: <a href="http://toronto45.icann.org/meetings/toronto2012/presentation-urs-naf-suggestions-18oct12-en.pdf">http://toronto45.icann.org/meetings/toronto2012/presentation-urs-naf-suggestions-18oct12-en.pdf</a>

Since Toronto, we held a Q&A conference call on 23 October with prospective respondents to the URS RFI. This was attended by five prospective respondents and from staff side we made it clear that crucial aspects were to state whether the respondent could stay within the target fee for URS complaints and to clearly indicate any deviations from the URS text deemed necessary to achieve that. The questions and answers from that call are now available here <a href="http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/urs/rfi-faqs">http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/urs/rfi-faqs</a>, in addition to a web page for recent URS developments at <a href="http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/urs">http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/urs</a>.

The deadline for responses to the URS RFI is 20 November and it seems that we can indeed hope for interesting responses. I consider it very likely, though, that the responses will call for some adjustments of the URS text as currently drafted (inter alia on items a) and b) mentioned above). This raises the question to what extent proposed adjustments would constitute policy changes or merely interpretations/transformations to practical URS rules. As you know, I have pleaded for a drafting team set up by the GNSO to address such adjustments. I am at your disposal for an early start right now of such work regarding known proposed adjustments like the two mentioned above, if you so wish, or alternatively when we have the responses to the RFI around 20 November.

I look forward to your comments and any questions you may have – and to working together on this in the near future.

Very best regards

**Olof Nordling**