

#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, September 06, 2018 7:10:58 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, September 06, 2018 7:14:13 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:14

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.

Marie Pattullo (AIM - European Brands Association)

Q2 What type of URS recommendation are you proposing? **Policy**

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.

That the losing Respondent cannot re-register the same domain name once it is no longer suspended.

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

Where a Respondent loses the URS case relating to a specific string, it should not be permitted to simply re-register that name once it is no longer suspended. This would help to prevent gaming of the system and unnecessary cluttering of the providers' workload with spurious or vexatious cases.

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

Super Consolidated URS Topics Table, F(2)/Practitioners Sub-Team: "in some cases, a losing Respondent is able to re-register a domain once it becomes available"; "after the lock, the cybersquatters just renew the domain name".

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

Super Consolidated URS Topics Table, F(2)/Practitioners Sub-Team: "in some cases, a losing Respondent is able to re-register a domain once it becomes available"; "after the lock, the cybersquatters just renew the domain name".

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)

The Practitioners Sub-Team (quoted above) considered the issue and but the recommendation goes only to a technical/operational, rather than this policy, fix. However, the Documents Sub-Team's draft policy recommendation is that "the question of adequacy and scope of remedies be deliberated among the full WG".

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)

See above.
