

## **Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting**

### **gTLD Update meeting**

**Sunday 7 April 2013 at 15:00 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#apr>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Jonathan Robinson: If I could have an indication from the back when we're ready to start the recording, that would be great, and I'd welcome Christine.

Man: For the transcript, this will be the GNSO working session gTLD.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. Good afternoon everyone. I would like to welcome you to this next session. This is the gTLD update from Christine Willett of ICANN staff. Christine is playing a pivotal role in supervising elements of the execution of the new gTLD program, and I'm sure she's perfectly capable of introducing herself to you.

So without further adieu, I'll welcome Christine to the GNSO Council Meeting and hand over to her for a presentation followed by Q&A.

Thanks Christine.

Christina Willett: Thank you, Jonathan.

Can I be heard? I think I can be heard.

Thank you so much for having me here today. I appreciate the time. I'm going to give you an update on the new gTLD program - a status update. I apologize in advance to those of you who listened to the Webinar. We had about 200 people on our Webinar two weeks ago. So if some of this content is repetitive, I apologize. However, there is new content as well, so we've got some new information we'll be covering today.

I want to start by talking about what's gone on since the last face-to-face meeting in Toronto, which I actually wasn't at. So - however, my team and I have been working diligently to deliver on the commitments that were made in the Toronto meeting for the next phases of the program.

So we're going to talk about timeline, the application processing, and the initial evaluation work that's been ongoing. We'll also briefly touch on objections and the dispute resolution process; although I am not leading the effort on negotiating registry/registrar agreements, talk about that, and also a brief update on pre-delegation testing and the pilot that just completed.

Then, I'd like to speak to operational readiness for the new gTLD program. I heard some questions for Fahd to that effect. And then, I'll be speaking specifically of both what I'm calling a rights protection mechanism as well as our operational support mechanism. So that's my agenda for this session.

Since the Toronto meeting in October a lots happened. We've reopened the (TAS) system. Gave applicants access to their application data. So we were also able to begin issuing clarifying questions, or CQs. That started in a small way in November and more in earnest in January.

We held that little prioritization draw in December, which was a focus for the team for quite a number of weeks. We issued CQs on a regular basis. Everything from posting pics to publishing initial evaluation results. So it's been a busy six months.

Actually, this week I've now been with ICANN six months. You know, it was a milestone for me.

Here's a timeline. This is the timeline - program timeline that's currently on the new gTLD Web site. I'm making more of an effort and working with the communications team to get a readable, visible understandable timeline published and out there. And as things change, as they do with regularity, we are working to update this timeline.

In terms of application processing, which has really been the focus of my team for some number of months, we've been in the midst of initial evaluation. The other aspect in the last month that many of you have been aware of is the objection process that's occurred, and then a slight look ahead to what we'll be doing for the transition to delegation.

The program started with 1930 applications. To date, and if you go to the Web site you can see that 39 of those applications have been withdrawn leaving us with 1891 active applications. We have also announced that one application - one string failed the string similarity panel and two of the applications failed the applicant support panel, which essentially, those two efforts will both take those strings out of the application process.

So we've been releasing application - initial evaluation results on a weekly basis. As of this past Friday, my team has issued results through the first 108 prioritized applications. 93 total (unintelligible) results all passing at this time.

I wanted to mention why - clearly there are 15 results that have not been published. That's for a variety of reasons. One because those applications have - may have pending change requests.

Two, because in a few cases we had a few panels issue late clarifying questions. Not that the applicants are late in responding to their questions, but we had late clarifying questions released. Or, because as part of our

administrative (unintelligible) results, we have gone back to the applicants in outreach mode and we are asking applicants for - to submit missing information that the panel did not consider or was not available to the panel to consider during their initial evaluation.

So it's for those reasons that these - specifically, these 15 applications haven't received their IE results yet.

The initial evaluation report. Identify which applications are passing, whether applications are recommended for extended evaluation. The reports are quite comprehensive. We - having - we're including quite a lot of detailed information about the results and the scoring; with the exception we are not publishing any confidential information for the applicants. So even if it is an application that is not passing initial evaluation, anything confidential for Questions 30 through 50 are not going to be reflected on that report.

The IE reports are available and the applicants are notified through the (TAS) system, and then within minutes, the public reports are posted on the Web site - on the microsite listed there.

As of this Friday, these are the statistics. I've been reporting these statistics on a monthly basis through the Webinar. You'll see significant progress. We have many more applications pending CQ response and post-CQ - in post-CQ evaluation. So we're seeing regular and continuous progress as these applications move through the cycle.

Objections and disputes. I reported in the last Webinar that 274 objections were submitted. To date, the dispute resolution service providers have validated 220 of those objections. There are still clearly objections that are with the (DRSP)'s and going through that initial evaluation - validation phase. Excuse me.

The guidebook called for a seven day - a one week administrative review period. The (DRSP)'s asked for an extension to that. We granted them an additional seven days for their review. So, we are now at 220 objections which have been validated. 33 for string confusion, 69 for legal rights objections, 23 for limited public interest objections, and 94 for community objections.

The objections that comply with the AGB will be posted on their Web site, which I believe all of these 220 now are on the (DSRP) Web site. ICANN will be issuing an announcement once all of the notifications are sent to applicants. We're anticipating that for this coming Friday, April 12th.

Once the applicants receive the notification - the formal notification from the (DRSP)'s, the 30-day window for response to the objections will begin. So the applicants then have 30 days to respond to the objection and to submit their fees. If the applicant either doesn't file their fees or did not respond, then the objector will prevail by default.

So there's - the objection and dispute resolution page in the microsite is being updated frequently. As we get more information - any time that there is - we find that we're getting questions, we're trying to update the microsite to provide the best information possible so that's available to everyone.

As some of you are aware I'm sure, the independent objector filed 24 objections. 11 of those were for limited public interest, 13 of those were for the grounds on the community objection listed there.

Talking about the registry agreement and public interest commitments. ICANN published the revised registry agreement on February 5 and solicited applicants to submit their public interest commitments, or as they're now calling it, the PIC spec, by March 5. We received a total of 506 PIC specs and posted those to the microsite. There is a download - PDF download that you can run to download all of those at once, except that it does generate about

100 megabyte file, so it's difficult, but you can get them all at once if you so wish.

I don't know if Fahd or others discussed the agreement. I'm not part of the ongoing agreement negotiation, but I know that the team is working diligently with the negotiators both from the registry and the registrar sides and that those are ongoing. And what I've heard this week is that much progress has been made.

There was an updated registry agreement posted on the 2nd of April, and that I believe the team is working with and is out for public review and discussion during these meetings this week.

We're anticipating that an agreement will be accepted and reached on the registry agreement, and that either asked during this meeting here or shortly thereafter, the ICANN Board will formalize and accept that revised registry agreement so that we can move on to the contracting phase of the program.

So applicants that are eligible for contracting, meaning that they have passed initial evaluation, they don't have any objection, and they are not subject to GAC advice, nor are they in string contention. So if the application doesn't fall into any of those categories, then they will be able to proceed to the contracting phase.

We've actually done quite a bit of work internally to document a process around contracting that there's an exchange of documents that's going to be necessary, and I've listed just a few of the documents that they anticipate needing to exchange. We're looking at - it's very much of an escrow process. That there is going to be an exchange in materials.

So not - you know, not just the continued operating instrument or letter of credit in many cases. Will be exchange of contact information, obtaining

cross-ownership declaration, and looking for the applicant to indicate whether they're going to accept the standard or base agreement, as it's being called.

I think it's probably understood that by accepting the standard registry agreement, applicants will be able to proceed more quickly through the contracting process and moved to pre-delegation. And that negotiation beyond the standard registry agreement will take them to a different process to work with the ICANN legal team to negotiate that agreement.

Beyond contracting, pre-delegation testing. We have concluded our pre-delegation testing pilot. We actually accepted 12 pilot participants. We had 80 applicants - sorry, 140 applications volunteer to participate in the pre-delegation testing pilot and 80 individual applicants representing 12 registry service providers.

We determined to make the best use of the testing timeframe. We selected one pilot participant application from each of those registry service providers, and those are listed here.

The pilot completed this Friday, past Friday, April 5. After selecting those 12, actually only 9 of the applicants were able to participate. But that was significant and we had a lot of good feedback and - that we're going to take back to our partner. (Unintelligible) is the provider doing the pre-delegation testing with us. And we're working with them to revise the testing procedures to make the testing procedures better and the tools better, and to make the process as streamlined as possible.

So the lessons learned are going to be captured, and we're looking to a continuous improvement effort here to make this pre-delegation testing, which we anticipate doing for the next couple of years, as smooth and seamless as possible for everyone.

In terms of documents and materials that have been published about pre-delegation testing, the test specifications for the pilot were published on the 20 of March along with instructions and templates for data input on March 15. We're anticipating that the pre-delegation test user guide will be published on April 17th. So again, those lessons learned will be incorporated and that document will be published.

There is a pre-delegation testing session on Wednesday afternoon, I believe, that I would encourage folks to attend. It's very much going to be a workshop type session. Our vender (unintelligible) is going to be there. We'll be talking through a number of detailed technical issues around the pre-validation testing, so I'd encourage applicants to participate in that session.

Now moving on to the new gTLD operational readiness. This slide Fahd presented in the Webinar two weeks ago, and we've adopted it internally very much as a way to show there are layers to the new gTLD operational readiness, certainly starting with the stability and security layer. But there's also many steps we're following. We have many bricks in - that we're building upon as we move towards new gTLD operational readiness.

The application. (Unintelligible) status of those have been posted and published. The prior organization drive complete. Initial evaluation is ongoing and we're releasing results on a weekly basis.

We anticipate the registry agreement being finalized shortly so we can move to contracting. And once that's done, we'll be able to move to the pre-delegation testing phase with our first applicant.

As we prepare for delegation - as the IANA team gets ready for delegation, they have enhanced their (unintelligible) management system. And, that system has completed UAT - user acceptance testing, and is anticipated to be complete and ready by May 1. We're looking at an operational date and to use the system to delegate new gTLDs as early as June 1.



Trademark clearinghouse. The verification system. The online trademark verification system went live on the 26 of March. We anticipate the sunrise functionality of the trademark clearinghouse to be operational by July, so we could see the first sunrise in July with the first claim period to start a month later.

URS. The first provider contract was signed in February I believe and we are on track for the URS to be operational in July. Again, (unintelligible) the first TLD could be in a sunrise period.

And then we get to what we're now calling operational support mechanisms, the (EBRO) and (RSLA) monitoring tools. We've announced the three (EBRO) providers, and we're anticipating that at least the first provider for the (EBRO) service will be operational by August and in place by the time the first new gTLD is operational.

We're also looking at layering in SLA monitoring tools which we don't have today, and also anticipate those being operational by August.

Jonathan Robinson: Christine, this is a pretty critical slide, and I know the Council is concerned about issues of operational readiness and wanted to talk with Fahd about that, and probably you're as well qualified as anyone to talk.

So I just thought we might pause a moment if there are any specific questions in and around this slide or if people would prefer to hold off to the end?

Does anyone have a question they'd like to raise on - at this point while we just take a moment?

Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Anne Aikman-Scalese with IPC.

My question relates to final submission guidelines in connection with the TMCH, because submission guidelines, there were some published a couple of weeks ago, and I think they did not reflect - I'm looking for the current submission guideline that includes the abused names specifically - guidelines.

Christina Willett: Sure. That is regarding the abused names that were part of the enhancements to the TMCH. Let me follow-up and get back to you on a date for that. I think that we're still discussing the implementation of the enhancements to the TMCH.

Jonathan Robinson: (Christina)?

Christina Willett: I just have a quick question as to when you anticipate when we're going to be hearing about what the final - URS filing fee is going to be? The URS filing fee.

I mean you know, the mechanism that was recommended was kind of an ideal filing fee of \$300 to \$500. And, it's my understanding that that - whatever that fee is going to be hasn't been released yet, and I wasn't sure as to when that will happen.

Christine Willett: So I think that that is understood. There will be a slide on your (unintelligible) content on that, so let me address that on that slide.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible).

Man: Thank you, Christine.

For some applicants/registries, their agreement will include requesting the exemption for the Code of Conduct. And if they do, have you started to

design the process by which you would ascertain their eligibility for that exemption as well as any subjective means of figuring out the third condition, which relates to the public interest?

Christina Willett: (Show you) the process around eligibility for that would be invoked during the contracting phase. And my team will not be - although we will be administering that process, we're not going to be doing the negotiation, so that's something that our legal group will administer working with our registry services team.

In terms of the ability to invoke that, I think that there are a few considerations that the Board is still looking at. And, I think we anticipate GAC advice may bring some clarity to eligibility for such exceptions, so we'll be following whatever guidance we get from the Board and from the GAC on that eligibility.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I have a question on behalf of a remote constituent from (Jasmine Omar) from (Aria) registry services. The question is does the July date for the TMCH refer to the date the TMCH will be available for testing?

Christina Willett: So the TMCH will be available for testing either in late June or early July I think timeframe, and - for integration testing. However, we are also - I'm preempting my slides. So we are also anticipating having our first sunrise - a test sunrise, if you will, with the dot Jobs TLD that's already been delegated. That was announced this past week. So there will be a first sunrise in the June timeframe is what we're anticipating now.

So certainly, there would be time for integration testing in that late June, early July timeframe.

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. Hi Christine. Nice to meet you in person. Welcome to the ICANN world.

Something's not clicking with me. If the trademark clearinghouse is not going to be available for integration testing by registries and registrars until July, how can the first sunrise period be offered in July? What am I missing there?

Christina Willett: So there - the first sunrise, which you may be aware of, the dot Job, is right now - we're tentatively looking at a June timeframe. So, there would certainly be time for integration testing prior to that.

We are allowing for - we are building into the timeline time for each registry service provider to integrate to the trademark clearinghouse before - and actually, we're looking to get that done for each registry service provider before their first sunrise is scheduled.

Chuck Gomes: So - Chuck Gomes again. So if I'm understanding correctly, in the July target for the first sunrise, it's not new gTLD sunrise necessarily, but it would be the dot Jobs sunrise?

Christina Willett: We're still anticipating that we could have a sunrise in July absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: So even if the ability for testing doesn't happen until July, you're expecting a very short testing period. Is that what you're saying?

Christina Willett: Well, we anticipate that the integration specifications will come out well in advance. And we certainly anticipate that we will need a few weeks - two or more weeks to allow the registry service providers to perform that testing, and that is being built into the IBM timeline for the project.

Jonathan Robinson: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Just - hi Christine.

Christina Willett: Hi, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: To follow-up on that point, you just said that you'd allow integration testing before the first sunrise. I mean, we'd need a little better than that. We don't know in our - as a registry services provider for a number of applications, and there's a few of us, we need to do integration testing and build our systems immediately. We're not going to know necessarily when our first client's sunrise is definitely going to begin. But, that doesn't mean we don't need to test in June or July.

And one thing I would caution, because I - there seems to be a very - when you have pilot programs, ICANN takes and - I hate even this term, but it's a very ICANN-centered view of testing in pilots.

What I mean to say is that when you have a pilot program, it's only a pilot program for you - for ICANN and for your vendors. It's never a pilot program for us. So NeuStar participated in the pilot - the clarifying questions. We submitted answers to ICANN and never got any feedback on any of those answers. None. None of the applicants did.

On the pilot for the pre-delegation testing, never got any feedback from the tester. The only feedback is - it's amazing because again, it's kind of ICANN-centric. It's a survey comes out; you want feedback from us on how your systems are, but you never give feedback to us on how we did or what they - we may or may not be doing right in your system to make sure that we can pass the testing for our clients.

And when asked - when I asked a question several times, both during the pilot for the clarifying questions and for the pilot for the pre-delegation, I asked the same question and got the same answer. Can the people that have participated actually get feedback so that we can prepare us and others for

this? The answer is, “No, you can’t. It wouldn’t be fair to everybody else,” which I think is again the very ICANN-centric view.

What I'm glad to hear you say is that every registry, (unintelligible), or services provider that applied got to participate, so there should be no reason at all why we shouldn’t be getting a call like everybody else in the next week or so from the testers to say what we did wrong, what we did right or we’re going to have to do the next time to prepare our customers.

So, I want the same - when we do - sorry, last point. It’s just a follow-up. When we do that for the testing for the TMCH, I don’t want a pilot. I want actual true testing with feedback in both directions, and I want that promise today.

Christina Willett: So...

Jeff Neuman: I need it for my developers.

Christina Willett: So it - let me respond. So the CQ pilot I was not here for. I think that the clarifying questions pilot was unique and I think it would be challenging in that situation, because we were trying to keep a level playing field, to have given applicants who participated in the clarifying questions pilot feedback on the merit of their responses. I think really would have presented some disparities and lack of equity across applicants.

So I think for the clarifying questions pilot, I can certainly appreciate your perspective and the desire, but I understand why the program team - giving feedback on the clarifying question responses wasn’t practical.

From a - the pre-delegation pilot, I know that my team asked me, “Can we share feedback with the pre-delegation testing participants?” and I said yes. So I actually expect that you should - you may not be getting as a final, formal report, but I think it’s very reasonable. Your expectation of getting feedback

from the pre-delegation testing pilot or the nine - for the nine RFPs that - and applicants that did participate, getting feedback from the pre-delegation testing pilot's very reasonable.

Jeff Neuman: Just to respond. I have an email from your support team that says, "No." And then I also - when we tried to talk to the provider (SE), they said, "We can't talk to you. Talk to ICANN," and then ICANN said no.

Christina Willett: I'm...

Jeff Neuman: So it's - I (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Christina Willett: No. I'm happy - I'm glad you brought it to my attention. I will address that with the team. It's a very reasonable request. Very reasonable.

In terms of pilot testing, I did not mean to say that the dot Jobs (online) will be a pilot. It will be a first. It will be a pilot in that it will be the first sunrise using the trademark clearinghouse, but it will be a real sunrise. It won't be a test.

The RFP for dot Job will need to actually test - do an integration test and integrate to the trademark clearinghouse before that sunrise process/period can occur. And as a general principle, the sequence of events is such that we expect the RFP at least once to integrate and test with the trademark clearinghouse.

Once that integration test is successful - completed and successful, then the first sunrise will be able to be scheduled and - but we won't be scheduling the sunrise until the RFP has been tested with the trademark clearinghouse.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Christine. I think this is helpful. I hope you don't mind to carrying on this Q&A. It's very - and I suspected this whole issue of gTLD operational readiness is very high on people's minds.

So I've got Ching, Yoav, Mason, and myself - Ching, please.

Ching Chiao: Thanks, Jonathan and hi Christina. (Unintelligible).

Just like everyone else, thanks for making the time here. Actually one quick question and one comment. The quick question is that for the TMCH operational issue, should we direct that question to the ICANN team or simply to the team in Deloitte, or aka (Chip)? I mean, the reason that I'm asking is that people inside this room, they know that - whom to talk to.

But outside this room, I mean to believe it or not, there are many brand owners who are still confused about throwing in - our trademark info into a domain name called [www.trademark-clearinghouse.com](http://www.trademark-clearinghouse.com). They do not have that kind of confidence to see it as part of ICANN. They see as a separate entity.

So - but anyway the question is should they direct the operational questions to here in ICANN or...

Christina Willett: So I would say if there are specific questions or issues about the verification system and submission of marks to the trademark clearinghouse, definitely Deloitte has an email address and they may have set up a toll free number to accept questions and they are getting a lot of questions around submission of marks. So the first tier would be to go to Deloitte.

If you're not getting resolution in a timely manner - now I'm going to say this and I going to ask you know for some reasonable - whether it's timeliness, and not 24 hours. But if you're not getting response in a reasonable amount



of time, then I would definitely say that the new gTLD team will accept those questions and do our best to look into them and research and respond.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. I've got Yoav, Mason, and myself.

Yoav Keren: Yes. Hi Christine. Thank you also.

So my question is what is exactly the timeline between now and April 23rd? So Fahd just said that we're not rushing anything and the agreements will be done when they're done. But as I understand, there is a Board meeting scheduled for April 20 to approve the RAA and RA.

So what are you going to - you know, how does it fit? And then, what is going to happen on April 23rd?

Christina Willett: So that's - that event is really Fahd and (Sally)'s event that they're leading on April 23rd. You're right. I am also aware of the April 20 Board meeting, and hopefully the registry and registrar agreement will be resolved and we'll be able to say that we have a firm registry agreement and RAA in place that we can begin to execute.

You know, there are a number of steps as I mentioned. Contract execution isn't simply signing the agreement. There's a number of documents that need to be exchanged. Could that be accomplished by April 23rd? Maybe. But there is a process and there are several steps to go through.

Again, it's dependent on GAC advice. It's dependent on the objections and - so could we be signing agreements on April 23rd? Possibly. But, we'll be following the standard process for contracting and exchanging the documents, finalizing letters of credit, getting all of the documents we need signed - in place before we execute the agreement.

Jonathan Robinson: Mason?

Mason Cole: Thank you.

Christine, I had a question on your slide here about contracting. So it looks like there's plenty of - in the pipeline between now and when new TLDs will start floating into the marketplace. It looks like there could be a pinch in that pipeline around the issue of contracting. Because if a large number of applicants decide that they want to negotiate, then the - as you I think correctly point out, it'll take additional time.

Is there other capacity being built on staff to handle the contracting phase if that becomes necessary?

Christina Willett: Yes. There is additional bandwidth being built. I don't know if anybody from the legal team is here, but the legal team is supplementing and augmenting their staff to address the anticipated demand for that. Not only are they augmenting their staff internally, but they also have plans for outsourced additional resources.

Jonathan Robinson: Christina, I've got myself in the queue now.

I've got two questions. One relating to I guess wearing my hat as a registries councilor and thinking about the registry's issue. I mean some of it has been touched on before, but it certainly - I would encourage you on behalf of the registries to be as clear as possible about the sequencing of the execution in and around the rollout of the trademark clearinghouse.

And this relates to when and if you'll have a specification for the interface? When and if you'll have a test environment? When and if you know you expect the live environment to go live and so on? That typical kind of software. I mean there's a couple of issues.

I think there's a presumption which some others touched on that the speed with which integration and software development can take place in some medium, some large organizations. Some with many other priorities. I mean, it's very important that that is provided in that correct sequence.

An analogous point was - or a related point was I thought I heard you say that in having this sort of pilot with dot Jobs, you're going to essentially permit integration by one registry service provider ahead of others. And that strikes me as somewhat surprising that you wouldn't release a specification and test environment that was more universally available to the registry service providers across-the-board, notwithstanding whether or not you ultimately go live with a TLD from one - you know, underpinned by one registry service provider.

So I do have a second question, but that's all in and around the (unintelligible) - the sort of test and launch of the TMCH interface.

Let me say the other point, because it's directly connected. And the other point is in and around the trademark clearinghouse. And I think I understand why ICANN chose to make this split between the technical function of IBM and the validation/verification provision that Deloitte does.

And just for the fullness of disclosure, I think most people know that I've been assisting Deloitte with some elements of their work. But nevertheless, I don't think it's widely known and understood in the industry - you know, in the broader community how that exists and who to go to with questions of integration or testing, or...

You know, I think that there is now as a consequence of that no sort of single interface, which is why people say, "Well, shouldn't we come to ICANN?" And I think that's their - sort of a marketing or a customer service challenge that ICANN needs to grapple with and somehow resolve.

So those are my two points that - and essentially questions as well. Thanks Christine.

Christina Willett: Thank you, Jonathan.

I spent much of my career building systems, large scale systems and doing integration, so I certainly appreciate that. Systems integration is non-trivial and that it requires time, planning, implementation work. So the point that registries with many competing pressures and multiple projects will need time to support this.

Karen Lentz is going to be leading a session on Thursday on trademark clearinghouse that both Deloitte and IBM will be present for. So we'll be able to go much more in-depth at that session.

But in terms of making a test environment and testing acceptable to one registry service provider and not others, the intention - you know, the intention is sort of a double-edged sword. If we try to keep a level playing field and we make things even for everyone.

There's you know some parties that would like a different method and they you know seek preference. If we give preference, even from just a sheer timing perspective, that could also be criticized.

The intention is not to ultimately give preference to anyone, but it's to keep pace with the anticipated - with the existing delegation. So the registry service providers who will be supporting delegated TLDs; that is the intended sequence that the RFPs will be given testing preferences to the TMCH. So that is the sequence behind it.

Now I'm sure we can go into this in much more detail on Thursday, but I don't believe that all 30+ registry service providers could be supported in testing at the same time by IBM.

From a support - in order to support that testing and give feedback, there's going to be a limitation. So again, that is why they're going to focus on testing with the registry service providers in the sequence with which those TLDs are delegated.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. I know I've got - I must say I think I understand your rationale. I'm not sure that it's - Jeff, if you wanted to respond, but I do have (Christina) waiting as well if you would respond (unintelligible)...

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Just to respond to that. About 12 years ago I think I asked the same question when we were launching dot Biz. I didn't want to have all the registrars come into my system and test at the same time, and I was told no, I had to allow all the registrars in. So I think we're going to tell you the same thing. Let all the registries in.

IBM's a big company. They can do it. It's a testing environment. It would not be fair to allow one registry to do a testing, get your feedback from that one registry service provider and not the others, especially if tweaks are going to be made. Because, none of us can - it would not be fair to only allow us in after you've fully tested and gone live with another registry, because the answer your guys will come back to us and say is, "We can't modify our systems because we already have them in place and it's already live."

So I urge you. 30 companies is nothing compared to the hundreds we had to put into operational testing. And every registry going forward, if they're going to have hundreds of registrars do it, they're going to have to allow operational testing for all the registrars at the same time.

I totally understand your rationale, but if we have to live with it; I think you guys can live with 30. And I'll tell IBM that as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jeff. Sounds like we'll be - may pick this up again on Thursday.  
But (Christina)?

Christina Willett: And thanks very much.

I just want to reinforce what Jonathan was saying in terms of clarifying and communicating the distinction operationally between IBM and Deloitte, because quite candidly, I was on the IRT and I'm not even clear as to who does what or how to do it. So if that's true for the folks who really have been living and breathing this, I think that's very true for folks who are just learning about it.

And not to be alarmist, but I guess one thing I'd like to talk to a little bit about, not necessarily here, but you know obviously for this sunrise test for dot Jobs to be valid, there has to be kind of a realistically significant number of sunrise registrations. And without - I don't think that's an accurate assumption. I'm not sure that there's a real demand in the trademark community for dot Jobs sunrise registrations right now given that everybody's saving their registration budget for new gTLDs.

So I guess the point I would just think about is how - at what point are you going to have to kind of put dummy records into the clearinghouse to make sure that you have something that can work for purposes of having a valid test?

Hopefully it won't happen, but I think it's just something that you need to be prepared to do in the event that there simply isn't enough demand for dot Jobs sunrise registrations for the test to have any validity.

Christine Willett: So I understand the point you're making in terms of volume. I don't have a current count on the registered marks in the trademark clearinghouse as of this moment. I expect by June we will have quite a few marks registered in the trademark clearinghouse by the June timeframe for the dot Jobs sunrise.

But what you said and what Jonathan said in terms of providing the community more clarity on what is Deloitte doing? What is IBM doing? What is the role so that the concerns also about the trademarkclearinghouse.com system is understood? So we can definitely work on communications around that and look to cover that in the Thursday session.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Jeff, and then I think we should let Christine move on through the rest of her presentation. I've helped to hijack it at this point; although, I think that these are important and substantial questions. Thanks Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: So, on the clearinghouse, since a number of us are trying to get our systems ready. Is there any kind of reporting that the clearinghouse is going to do on a regular basis as far as - I don't want to know what marks are in there. I'm not asking for any - but numbers would be helpful.

You know, there are X number of marks in the clearinghouse. Things like that that would help us as registry service providers and registrars frankly to just try to prepare for the type of volumes that we're looking at.

So is there any kind of reports or reporting function that you all are contemplating for that?

Christina Willett: I know that operationally Deloitte has committed to providing operational status reports to ICANN. With that in mind - the number of marks usage statistics. I can certainly look into getting that information and providing something as part of the monthly update. So I will take that request.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, let's let you move on, Christine, in the interest of getting through the material you've got for us. Thank you.

Christina Willett: So I think we've covered trademark clearinghouse.

I'm - previously, I want to distinguish - I think there's been previously a little lack of clarity between what I'm calling now right protection mechanisms and operational support mechanisms. So rights protection - and I'm sure I'll - there could be a debate on this, but I'm considering trademark clearinghouse, the URS, and our post-delegation dispute resolution mechanisms as being rights protection mechanisms.

So we've covered trademark clearinghouse. The service has launched. Yesterday, we published a draft of the rights protection mechanism requirements document that's posted out on the new gTLD microsite, the trademark clearinghouse page. I understand we've already gotten some feedback on that.

The agreement - the Deloitte agreement as well as two agreements for IBM we anticipating publishing any day now frankly. I don't have a date on that, but I expect it could be within the next week, possibly two. Just a matter of priorities. The legal team's been a little busy with the RAA and registry negotiation.

And, I've already spoken to the July date for sunrise capability being operational in August for the claims capability being operational.

URS. The National Arbitration Forum was announced as the first URS provider. This month, we anticipate they'll - we will be publishing the supplementary rule from NAF this month. And we hope to be able to announce one or more of the supplementary additional providers for the URS service this month.

And then over the course of the coming months, April, May, June, more information will be forth coming about the exact details of the integration between the URS and the registry service providers. The interface, the validation, the announcement page, expectation.



And for the July - by July, we anticipate that the URS systems will be operational and the first URS provider, NAF, will be doing a demonstration in - at our meeting in Durbin in July.

We anticipate that there will need to be a step added for each new gTLD to verify each registry's operational readiness for URS. Again, we're - now where this test fits in, in the overall timeline, I - we have not yet ascertained that. But we'll just need to verify that every new gTLD is prepared to support the URS service.

Post-delegation dispute resolution processes. There are three of them, and the guidebook called out the registry restrictions and trademark post-delegation mechanisms. And with the (unintelligible) specifications, we've now added the public interest commitments post-delegation dispute process.

The PIC-DRP spec has been published last month, and GAC anticipates that we'll be issuing RFPs in the next coming months for two select providers for the PD-DRP. I don't have any specific date here, but our expectation is that the post-delegation dispute mechanisms will be in place by the time the first new gTLD is operational.

Now what I'm calling operational support mechanisms. Data escrow, SLA monitoring, the centralized m data access, and EBERO.

So the data escrow specification's already been published, so I'm going to move on to SLA monitoring.

ICANN is engaged with a partner, Zabbix, to develop and implement the registry monitoring platform. The tool we will have monitoring those across all ICANN regions, and we anticipate the SLA monitoring tools, at least one, will be available in August, which will support full DNS testing as well as Whois and EPP tested using standard TCP ports.

Release 2 will be coming in the October timeframe, which will be the full EPP testing, the full Whois testing, as well as the full correlation testing. I don't know more details on this. I will admit that right now. So, I would encourage us - I don't believe there are sessions specifically on SLA monitoring this week, but if you have specific questions about that let me know and I can get someone to follow-up with you about this.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) - it wouldn't surprise - Jeff, it wouldn't surprise me if you did have a question, but...

Jeff Neuman: No. I was just saying if we can actually have the vendor on - and maybe in a registry call where the registry - the NTAG so that we can get to a more comfort level. Because frankly, none of us have that comfort level at this point that ICANN or a vendor has the ability to do that kind of monitoring that is in the guidebook right now.

So I think setting up or just saying from the outright, let's get them on the phone at our next call to go through it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Jeff. That's a really good point. I'll jump in there because as you know, and I'm wearing my sort of registry hat again here. I mean, we had Deloitte present to the registry stakeholder group and that was very effective.

But really who we need to talk to is IBM, so that's another vendor we'd love to hear from in the registry stakeholder group. I'm sure the registrars may well have the same view. But certainly, representing registries as a councilor, that's something which we'd like to do.

Christina Willett: So I'm - I think that's perfectly reasonable. We'll get that planned.

I'm viewing SLA monitoring to only operational support mechanisms as enhancing ICANN's ability to support registries. These are tools we don't have today and we have 23 upgrading TLDs. So I think that these are

enhancements that the guidebook has called out, so this is not on that critical path to delegation or even new gTLD operations.

So since we do have operational TLDs, I think that still with this August timeline, we anticipate having an SLA monitoring tool there, but it's not a dependency for delegating...

Jonathan Robinson: Actually, Christine, that highlights a very good point, and maybe that's something others would be interested in seeing then. If it is possible to segment the timeline to go live into items on the critical path and items not, that may well be.

Because it's clear you've committed to some items, but you don't see them as a necessary condition to going live. And so, I think that might be very helpful for - as a slide or some form of communication. And you're probably going to tell me you've already done...

Christina Willett: Well, it's minimally depicted on the BRIC slide for new gTLD operational readiness. There's a line between URS and EBERO. So we're looking at TMCH, URS, those are on the critical path to the first new gTLD being operational; whereas EBERO and SLA monitoring, (CB), (DAP), et cetera, those would be operational enhancements which would not be on the critical path.

Jonathan Robinson: Got a question from Liz.

Liz Williams: Yes. It's a question from the (unintelligible). It's actually on the idea - subject of the trademark clearinghouse. Just very briefly, Christine, could you please confirm that the TMCH will be able to accept IBM-related TM's. And the question was from Liz Williams.

Christina Willett: Yes.

So I think that all was also brought up with Fahd, but yes. The trademark clearinghouse supports a variety of marks, including in non-(unintelligible).

Liz Williams: Okay. So I mean, the live issue there is not so much - as I have understood it from our discussions today, it is not so much the issue of handlings IDNs but handling variants. But let's not reopen that now. That's - let's - but we are aware that that's a stake that's been placed in the sand and we do need to put - let's not reopen that discussion now.

Christina Willett: So...

Jonathan Robinson: And there's one more question and then we will let you keep going.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese with Lewis and Roca, also with IPC, but I'm not asking this question in relation to IPC. It's a comment in my individual capacity about the public interest commitment dispute resolution procedure.

And I gathered that at some point it was determined that that dispute resolution procedure was a matter of implementation and not a policy. And I'm wondering how it came about? And I'm somewhat concerned that it's really a process whereby the expert panel makes a recommendation to the ICANN Board, which the ICANN Board can then either follow or not follow.

And it strikes me that with 506 public interest commitments having been already made, and the possibly of future public interest commitments being made as discussions continue with the GAC, I'm curious about how it was determined how this dispute resolution procedure should be adopted in this kind of timeframe with the substantive provisions?

Christina Willett: So I think it's clear to everyone that I'm clearly on the implementation side of the house, so that determination - the concept of the PIC-DRP was brought forward with the February 5 publication of the revised registry agreement and

the PIC specification. And the PIC-DRP was called for. And the PIC-DRP was then published and I believe we are seeking feedback on the procedure.

So I don't know that there was a formal process there, but I'm happy to take that back and discuss that with the team.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I think we're done with the questions, and let's let you move on to (unintelligible).

Christina Willett: I just have a couple more slides.

So we talked about SLA monitoring and we'll be looking for more information on that and a call with the vendor to give - provide you with more information.

In terms of the centralized data access. It's to address requests from zone data consumers, law enforcement, et cetera. In support - we're developing a tool in support of the model that was put forth by the community of registry operators and security experts.

We're looking at a new model for zone file access that we'll be able to scale with a larger of gTLDs that will be available. And the intention is that we're looking to provide a tool that will provide a single, centralized point of access. And that it will provide the user with data in a standardized format, even if the new registry was keeping it in different formats.

So we're looking at a June launch date on the centralized zone data access program there.

EBERO. We announced last week that three EBERO providers have been selected and work is ongoing with those providers. We anticipate having at least the first provider active and in place by August. We are in the process of finalizing agreements, so we will be contracting with them.

There will be a process workshop to go over just the specifics of the EBERO implementation and we'll be finalizing the details around that process implementation in - I believe its late-April now. And then there will be extensive testing and simulation before any one EBERO provider is considered live. That provider - each provider will go through a simulated back-end process.

So each provider will go through that. We anticipate staggering the agreements so that there is continual support for these EBERO providers and we'll be addressing that through the contracting process as well.

Finally, I just - in addition to this session, thank you for letting me speak with you, I will be having a new gTLD program staff session tomorrow afternoon. There will also be following my session, Jeff Moss will be leading a panel discussion on new gTLD stability - security, stability, and resiliency. There will be a meeting as well - a session on Monday afternoon on the registry agreement and the 2013 RAA.

On Wednesday we've got two sessions upcoming if you're interested in much more detail about the IDN variants and on pre-delegation testing. And the pre-delegation testing session, as I mentioned, will have our dot SE vendor there to answer questions and take questions and take questions.

And then the Thursday session on the trademark clearinghouse. So I'd encourage all interested parties to attend those sessions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much, Christine. Thanks for taking the time to address the Council and talk us through the issues. I know Chuck is waiting to ask something, and I - that's all I have at the moment.

Wendy?

Chuck Gomes: I (unintelligible) Wendy.

Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. On the centralized zone file access target of June, does that allow for registry interface testing in that because all obviously the registries will be providing data (unintelligible).

Christina Willett: Yes. Yes. Thank you, Chuck. Yes, it does.

So you're absolutely right. I mean, I'm hearing you loud and clear that we need to make sure that all of our timelines and all of our plans allow for adequate testing by the registry to support these tools, and we're rolling out a lot of them, so most definitely.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much, Christine.

Sorry, Wendy. Apologies. (Unintelligible).

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. Glad to get in just under the wire with a question on the PIC-DRP and whether there are any cost estimates for that dispute resolution?

Christina Willett: I don't have cost estimates on that at the moment. In fact I have to admit I'm not even versed on any previous cost estimates for the other two post-delegation dispute mechanisms. So that's something I don't have the information on, but let me do some research.

Clearly, there's a new discussion that needs to go on about the PIC-DRP. We haven't even finalized RFPs for these services. So we will be publishing RFPs to seek providers on these services.

Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Sounds like we're all set.

Thank you very much, Christine. Good to meet you and good to see you here, and thank you for updating the Council.

Just a note for Councilors, we have one more final session this afternoon. I know it's been a long day and that is our update from the (unintelligible). So thanks again, Christine, and I think we'll - let's take just a minute before Olof comes and sets up. Thanks very much.

Christina Willett: Thank you. Thank you so much for having me.

END