

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, August 29, 2018 9:15:57 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, August 29, 2018 9:39:57 AM
Time Spent: 00:23:59

Page 1

Q1 Proponent's Full Name* If this proposal is jointly developed by more than one Working Group member, please write the full names of all proponents involved.

Maxim Alzoba

Q2 What type of URS recommendation are you proposing? **Operational Fix**

Q3 What URS recommendation are you proposing?* Please be succinct as well as substantially specific and not general in nature.* One proposal for one recommendation only.

Legal requirements should be moved from the technical document "URS High Level Technical Requirements for Registries and Registrars"

this bit
 "4. Registry-Registrar Agreement:
 * The Registry Operator MUST specify in the Registry-Registrar Agreement for the Registry Operator's TLD that the Registrar MUST accept and process payments for the renewal of a domain name by a URS Complainant in cases where the URS Complainant prevailed.
 * The Registry Operator MUST specify in the Registry-Registrar Agreement for the Registry Operator's TLD that the Registrar MUST NOT renew a domain name to a URS Complainant who prevailed for longer than one year (if allowed by the maximum validity period of the TLD)."

to another document (URS Procedure or URS Rules) or to leave the text, but to rename

"URS High Level Technical Requirements for Registries and Registrars" into "URS High Level Requirements for Registries and Registrars" and on ICANN's page <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/urs> to change it's name from "URS Technical Requirements 1.0" to "URS Registrars and Registries Requirements 1.0"

Q4 What is your rationale for the proposal? (250 words max)

The reason to ask it - to avoid confusion among Registries and Registrars, usually Engineers read technical documents and legal teams read Rules and Procedures, and here we see a legal requirement to include particular text into Registry-Registrar Agreement.

This change will simplify process of understanding of the URS implementation for new Registries and Registrars, and lower workload for ICANN Compliance/Legal Depts without significant changes.

Q5 What evidence do you have in support of your proposal? Please detail the source of your evidence. (250 words max)

As a Registry we had to response to an ICANN B2B case where we had to add a particular addendum to the Registry-Registrar Agreement (nobody expected legal requirements in a document called "technical") with the text required by part 4 of "URS High Level Technical Requirements for Registries and Registrars"

Q6 Where and how has this issue been addressed (or not) by the Working Group or the Sub Teams to date? (250 words max)

it was noted during the meetings (including F2F in Abu Dhabi).

Q7 Does the data collected and reviewed by the Sub Teams show a need to address this issue and develop recommendations accordingly? (250 words max)

I am not sure that the SubTeams were working on this particular topic.

Q8 If not already addressed above, on the basis of what information, gathered from what source or Sub Team, is this proposal based, if any? Please provide details. (250 words max)

I think we need not to forget this change to be done.
