

At-Large Workspace: Proposed Updates to Existing Rights Protection Mechanisms Documentation

| Public Comment Close | Statement Name | Status | Assigned Working Group | Assignee (s) | Call for Comments Open | Call for Comments Close | Vote Open | Vote Close | Date of Submission | Staff Contact and Email |
|----------------------|---|--------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| 03 October 2023 | Proposed Updates to Existing Rights Protection Mechanisms Documentation | NO STATEMENT | CPWG | | | | | | | antonietta.mangiacott@icann.org |

Hide the information below, please click [here](#) >>

In January 2021, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) [approved](#) the [Final Report](#) from the first phase of a Policy Development Process (PDP) on a Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs). Phase 1 focused on reviewing all the RPMs and associated structures and procedures applicable to gTLDs launched under the 2012 New gTLD Program. The RPMs were created to mitigate potential risks and costs to rights holders that could arise in the expansion of the new gTLD namespace, and to help create efficiencies for registries and registrars among gTLD launches. These RPMs are: the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution [Procedure](#) (TM-PDDRP); Sunrise and Trademark Claims [services](#) offered through the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH); and the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) dispute resolution [procedure](#).

On 16 January 2022, the ICANN Board [adopted](#) all thirty-five (35) final Phase 1 PDP recommendations from PDP Working Group's Phase 1 [Final Report](#) and directed a tiered approach for the work based on timing, staffing, and resourcing needed for implementation of the recommendations. In adopting the recommendations, the Board [noted](#) that implementation of the recommendations could be divided into several categories. These implementation categories are:

1. **Recommendations that call for updates to existing operational practices or documentation concerning the RPMs where no substantial resources are required for implementation** - a total number of sixteen (16) recommendations;
2. **Recommendations to maintain the status quo (i.e. maintaining the Phase 1 RPMs as implemented for the 2012 New gTLD Program)** - a total number of nine (9) recommendations;
3. **Recommendations that require substantial resourcing, and involvement of multiple stakeholders to implement** - a total number of six (6) recommendations; and
4. **Recommendations affecting subsequent round(s) of new gTLDs** - a total number of four (4) recommendations.

The [Implementation Review Team](#) (IRT) is assisting ICANN org in implementing the recommendations in the first and third implementation categories identified above. Implementation of the remaining recommendations from the Phase 1 Final Report will be integrated into the implementation work related to the subsequent round of new gTLDs.

Next Steps

ICANN org will prepare a Public Comment Summary and Analysis Report at the conclusion of the comment period. ICANN org will review the comments received in collaboration with the IRT to determine whether any further changes need to be made to the RPM procedural documents as a result of the input received.

Supporting Information

This additional information from ICANN org provides more context for this Public Comment Proceeding and may help you review the proposals for input and publish a submission.

FINAL VERSION SUBMITTED (IF RATIFIED)

The final version to be submitted, if the draft is ratified, will be placed here by upon completion of the vote.

FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC

The final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC will be placed here before the vote is to begin.

DRAFT SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION

The first draft submitted will be placed here before the call for comments begins. The Draft should be preceded by the name of the person submitting the draft and the date/time. If, during the discussion, the draft is revised, the older version(S) should be left in place and the new version along with a header line identifying the drafter and date/time should be placed above the older version(s), separated by a Horizontal Rule (available + Insert More Content control).