

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, September 06, 2018 4:23:10 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, September 06, 2018 4:38:51 PM
Time Spent: 00:15:40

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.

Claudio DiGangi

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.

The recommendation is to permit multiple unrelated complainants to bring a single complaint jointly against a single domain name registrant (or related registrants) who has registered multiple domain names, by deleting the following procedural element within Section 1.1.3 of the URS Procedure:

"One Complaint is acceptable for multiple related companies against one Registrant, but only if the companies complaining are related"

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

A single complaint against a single domain name registrant (or related registrants) should be permitted to be joined by multiple unrelated complainants. There is no practical difference between allowing a complaint based on trademarks that are owned by different, but related corporate entities, as permitted in Section 1.1.3 of the URS Procedure, and allowing a complaint based on trademarks owned by different, but unrelated entities, whose marks are similarly being abused by the same registrant.

Allowing multiple unrelated complainants to bring a single complaint jointly will enhance the utility of the URS by:

- reducing the cost burden on all parties, including Providers, by avoiding duplication and maintaining focus on the scope of the abuse to multiple trademarks by one respondent registrant.
 - streamlining the process, creating significant efficiencies, and enabling the suspension of multiple domain names abusing third-party rights.
-

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

Under the existing UDRP policy, unrelated trademark owners are able to bring a single complaint jointly against a single registrant to recover domains that have been abusively registered under a common occurrence or scheme. Once ownership of the trademark(s) is established, there is no reason why such a consolidated proceeding should not be permitted in the URS mechanism for the benefit of all parties.

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 not been specifically addressed by the WG or Sub Team to date.

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 Sub Teams did not collect relevant data on this 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)

The proposal is based on the WG's general analysis of the URS policy and procedures.
