# #29

# Proposal for URS Policy and Operational Recommendations

***IMPORTANT***

- *This form is used by RPM Working Group members to submit proposals for URS policy and operational recommendations. Please submit to ariel.liang@icann.org.*
- ***Proposals submitted not using the required form will not be in order and will not be discussed.***
- ***One individual form must contain only one proposal for one recommendation.***
- *Answer to every text field is required and mandatory(*).*
- *As soon as practical after receiving the submissions, staff will forward the proposals to the Working Group email list.*
- *The final date for submission of member proposals is **COB on Friday, 31 August 2018. Any proposal received after that date will not be in order and will not be discussed.***

## I. General Questions

### *1. Proponent's Full Name

*If this proposal is developed by more than one WG member, please write the full names of all proponents involved*

George Kirikos_____

### *2. What type of URS recommendation are you proposing?

_X__ Policy

___ Operational Fix

___ Other (please specify: _____)

### *3. 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.*

All URS (and UDRP) decisions shall be published in a standardized machine-readable XML format, to complement existing formats of decisions.

NB: This topic can be deferred to Phase 2 of our work, since it applies to both the URS and the UDRP. I sought clarification on the RPM PDP mailing list on August 26, 2018 as to whether these topics should be held back, but no answer has been provided as of the time of this submission. See:

https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2018-August/003245.html

## II. Justification Statement

***IMPORTANT***

- Must be no more than **250 words** in length for each of two sections below.
- Should state the operational or policy rationale for the proposal.
- Should cite any evidence in support of it. Such evidence may be information developed by the Sub Teams or documented in other sources.

### *4. What is your rationale for the proposal? (250 words max)

1. It is consistent with ICANN's recently announced Open Data Strategy:

https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-org-s-open-data-strategy

2. It lowers the cost of academic research, by making it much easier to access and manipulate the data within decisions.

3. It improves transparency, and thus accountability, of the procedures.

4. It makes future evidence-based reviews of the policies easier, since the raw data can be accessed at much lower cost than at present.

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

Besides the obvious fact that standard machine-readable formats are easier for computer programs to access, Alex Noonan (Rebecca Tushnet's research assistant) spoke to this issue when I asked about it on May 9, 2018. See page 21 of the transcript at: https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/transcript-rpm-review-09may18-en.pdf

"So XML would have been incredible. Berry did a great job pulling a lot of these fields for us so some of them were easily scrapeable, but there are some that are important that weren't. So it took a lot of time to paste in the representative information. The country information, that kind of stuff is interesting. Like I would have expected a lot of these to be coming from China but as a matter of fact a lot of them were coming from the United States. That kind of stuff was valuable but really hard to get. On average it took me approximately six minutes to code each one of these and because the decisions are so short, a good bit of that was copying and pasting of stuff. That actually wasn't academic work. So I think in the end it was like - it was a substantive effort but XML would have been incredible and made it so much easier."

## III. Pertinent Questions

- *The proposal must address the following three questions*
- *Can be no more than **250 words** in length for each of two sections below.*

### *6. 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 discussed by the working on January 17, 2018, see pages 22-23 of transcript at:

https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/transcript-rpm-review-17jan18-en.pdf

and in the Adobe Connect chat transcript of that same meeting archived at:

https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2018-January/002700.html (pp. 3-5 of PDF)

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

Sub Teams did not collect any data pertinent to this issue.

### *8. 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)

Already addressed above.