#3 1

COMPLETE

Collector:	Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started:	Thursday, August 30, 2018 7:57:01 AM
Last Modified:	Thursday, August 30, 2018 8:08:47 AM
Time Spent:	00:11:45

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.

David McAuley

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.

For the sole purpose of assuring that this subject is included in the Initial Report for the solicitation of public comment, I am proposing that the WG put out for Public Comment the issue of whether the URS should become an ICANN Consensus Policy.

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

On behalf of Verisign, I am proposing that the WG put out for Public Comment the issue of whether the URS should become an ICANN Consensus Policy. Verisign believes that it is the appropriate time for this matter to be discussed in the Public Comment forum on the WG's Initial Report. Sub-team developed data indicates that URS in practice has proven viable, efficacious, and fit-for-purpose as a rapid remedy for clear-cut instances of protected mark abuse. We believe that inviting public input will be valuable, indeed essential, in informing the RPM PDP WG in its future work.

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

Data and analysis developed by the URS Practitioners, Providers, and Data sub-teams, Professor Tushnet's data/analysis project, and the general RPM PDP WG discussions to date have indicated that, while some URS operational adjustments are advisable, the time is right to invite public comment on this matter. Further, we have seen no reports in the domain industry press indicating any abuse of the URS.

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

This issue has so far not been specifically addressed by the WG or Sub Teams. However, data developed by the Sub Teams indicates that the URS is a valued supplement to the UDRP, is targeting clearly infringing domains, is not being abused by complainants, and provides meaningful due process and appeals opportunities to domain name registrants.

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 RPM PDP Charter addresses potential issues for consideration in this PDP, and asks: "Should any of the New gTLD Program RPMs (such as the URS), like the UDRP, be Consensus Policies applicable to all gTLDs, and if so what are the transitional issues that would have to be dealt with as a consequence?" Moreover, the Charter goes on to indicate that the first Initial Report should highlight any issues or recommendations that the WG considers relevant to possible work in Phase Two. The public comment received on this proposal can inform the WG on the question of whether a final decision on this matter should occur in Phase 1 or 2.

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)

N/A