



FY13 Business Case Data Sheet

Project Name: URS (Uniform Rapid Suspension) Budget Amount: \$ 170000

<b>Business Owner</b>	Tim Cole					
<b>Executive Sponsor</b>	Kurt Pritz					
<b>Project Manager</b>	Anand Mishra					
<b>Est. Completion Date</b>	6/30/13					
<b>Strategic Plan Alignment</b>	Competition, consumer trust and consumer choice					
<b>FY13 Priorities Alignment</b>	2. Launch New gTLD Program					
<b>Goal</b>	Have URS program in place and providers contracted and onboard by June 2013.					
<b>Objectives</b>	At present there is a significant gap between the features specified for the URS procedure and the desired cost. In order to bridge this gap we will hold 2 summit sessions to reconfigure the URS to arrive at a lower cost model (one session in FY12 and one in FY13). We will conduct a process to develop and finalize URS Model in consultation with current UDRP providers and community members; Conduct RFP based on URS Model and select URS providers					
<b>Scope</b>	<p>The scope of the project is to develop a URS Model (including administrative procedures and rules) and to select URS dispute resolution providers. The following work will be required to accomplish this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Determine the makeup of a group to meet in a summit of UDRP provider representatives and community members;</li> <li>2. Conduct 2 summit sessions in Geneva (one in FY12 and one in FY13) to consider the challenges for implementation and propose a model for community consideration;</li> <li>3. Based on the outcome of those consultations draft a proposed set of procedures and rules to govern the URS process;</li> <li>4. Conduct formal RFP for URS providers;</li> <li>5. Approve and publish list of approved providers.</li> </ol>					
<b>Assumptions</b>	Sufficient consensus can be reached to develop a workable model.					
<b>Dependencies</b>	Indicate other departments' involvement and note the resources required: Legal, Policy, external consultants (facilitator and writing consultants)					
<b>Risks</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Insufficient interest is expressed in supporting the working group to propose a model</li> <li>2 Resources are limited and cannot support the process</li> <li>3 Consensus can not be reached on final model</li> </ol>					
<b>Key Milestones &amp; Resources</b>	<b>Resources (FY13 only)</b>					
	<b>Description</b>	<b>Internal FTE</b>	<b>Travel</b>	<b>Prof Services</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Capital</b>
	1 Initial summit announced and members solicited (FY12)	0.15				
	2 Working group established (FY12)	0.25				
	3 Two sessions held with professional facilitator and writing specialist (FY12 7 FY13)	0.5	70000	40000		
	4 Drafts are written and reviewed by participants	0.2		40000		
	5 Working group agrees on model	0.5		20000		
	6 Formal RFP conducted	0.25				
	7 Model and Providers Announced	0.15				
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>70000</b>	<b>100000</b>			<b>170000</b>

**Subject:** URS

**Date:** Thursday, April 12, 2012 6:35:19 PM Central European Summer Time

**From:** Wilbers, Erik Contact Information

**To:** Kurt Pritz <kurt.pritz@icann.org>

**CC:** Beckham, Brian Contact Information , Roache-Turner, David

R d d

Dear Kurt,

I hope all is well on your end and that you have had a chance to enjoy an Easter break. As promised, we now come back to the subject of your brief recent call.

Frankly, the development of this file does not inspire confidence on WIPO's part in our hosting a URS session at this stage.

Starting with the blueprint offered three years ago (under the term 'ESM') through the observations submitted in response to various URS drafts (such as the detailed operational listing in WIPO's letter of December 2, 2010), WIPO's experience-based suggestions for a fair and workable URS structure have been well known throughout the deliberations that have begotten the URS as adopted by the Board.

Thus, it would seem unlikely that these stakeholders would now feel able to commit to the rather fundamental changes we believe to be in everyone's interest - notably a shift to the proposed respondent-default basis without panel, subject to appropriate safeguards. We would consider an express prior commitment to such a shift, including the requisite Board support, as a pre-condition to a fruitful meeting on the URS.

Meanwhile, we very much appreciate your having reached out to us.

Best for now, also from Brian and David.

Erik

World Intellectual Property Organization Disclaimer:

This electronic message may contain privileged, confidential and copyright protected information. If you have received this e-mail by mistake, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail and all its attachments. Please ensure all e-mail attachments are scanned for viruses prior to opening or using.

**Subject:** Re: Budget community call: question on URS

**Date:** Saturday, May 12, 2012 1:38:14 AM Central European Summer Time

**From:** Tim Cole <Tim.Cole@icann.org>

**To:** Karen Lentz <karen.lentz@icann.org>, Janice Douma Lange <janice.lange@icann.org>

Guilty as charged. After reviewing the original business case document today, I realized that what went into the Budget came directly from what I wrote. But I never knew it would go into the published budget document or I might have raise my hand. Everything was moving so fast those days. I'm sorry it created such a mess with the GNSO.

Tim Cole  
Chief Registrar Liaison  
ICANN

Our new address as of 18 June 2012:  
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300  
Playa Vista, CA 90094-2536

One World. One Internet.

On 5/11/12 4:32 PM, "Karen Lentz" <[karen.lentz@icann.org](mailto:karen.lentz@icann.org)> wrote:

Hi Janice,

The paragraph under the Professional Services section is something I assumed came from Kurt as it was not in what I wrote, but now I see maybe it was just taken from the business case document.

FYI, see Kurt's response to the GNSO on this topic here:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/mailing-lists/archives/council/msg13030.html>

If we can have one meeting to go through multiple budget issues pertaining to Kurt's items, this would be the best way to resolve.

Thanks  
Karen

-----Original Message-----

From: Janice Douma Lange  
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2012 3:03 PM  
To: Karen Lentz  
Cc: Tim Cole  
Subject: FW: Budget community call: question on URS

See below as to where this started: the information is the content in draft FY13 plan now Attached is business case as well just in case any modifications need to be made

Thanks and if you want to wait til Tim is back next week, no problem but I just want to make sure Kurt doesn't forget or slip away.....

-----Original Message-----

From: Xavier J. Calvez

Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2012 9:03 AM

To: Kurt Pritz; Tim Cole

Cc: Janice Douma Lange; Aba Diakite; Maya S. Reynolds

Subject: Budget community call: question on URS

Kurt, Tim,

Steve Metalitz requested a contact to inquire on the URS project that appear in the budget document (see below the paragraph on URS extracted from page 59 of the presentation). First time he is hearing about it and wanted to know more.

Who should we refer him to?

Uniform Rapid Suspension

(URS) – \$175K

At present there is a significant gap between the features specified for the URS procedure and the desired cost. In order to bridge this gap we will: hold two summit sessions to reconfigure the URS to arrive at a lower cost model (one session in FY12 budget and another in this FY13 plan), conduct a process to develop and finalize URS Model in consultation with current UDRP providers and community members; and conduct RFP based on URS Model and select URS providers. The goal is have a URS program in place and providers contracted and onboard by June 2013.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Xavier

Xavier Calvez

ICANN – Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

CFO

Office: +1 (310) 301-5838

Cell: +1 (805) 312-0052

E-fax: +1 (310) 957-2348

4676 Admiralty Way, Suite 330

Marina Del Rey, CA 90292