

At-Large Request for Input - Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs Workspace

Comment Close Date	Statement Name	Status	Assignee (s)	Call for Comments Open	Call for Comments Close	Vote Open	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email	Statement Number
2016/07/05	Request for Input - Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs	No Statement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	GNSO Secretariat gnsso-secs@icann.org	n/a

For information about this Public Comment, please click [here](#) >>

GNSO PDP Working Group on the Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs sent an email to the ALAC Chair Alan Greenberg to request ALAC's input on three specific questions.

==

Dear Alan,

We write as the Co-Chairs of the GNSO's Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group (WG).

As you may be aware, the GNSO Council recently initiated a [Policy Development Process](#) (PDP) on the [Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms](#) (RPMs) in all generic top-level domains (gTLDs). The relevant [Issue Report](#) can be found [here](#). As you know, RPMs are concerned with those policies and processes, developed in consultation with the ICANN community, which are aimed at combatting cyber-squatting and providing workable mechanisms for trademark owners to either prevent or remedy certain illegitimate uses of their trademarks in the DNS while giving domain owners a fair opportunity to defend their accused domains.

This has lead to the formation of this Working Group which, by its [Charter](#), has been tasked with assessing the effectiveness of the relevant RPMs and to study whether or not all the RPMs collectively fulfill the purposes for which they were created. A more detailed background is available online on the WG's [Wiki](#).

This work will be conducted in two phases. In Phase One (expected to run through January of 2018), the WG will study only:

- the Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures (PDDRs);
- the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) and the associated availability through the TMCH of Sunrise periods and the Trademark Claims notification service; and
- the Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS)

After completion of Phase One, the WG will move on to Phase Two in which it will study the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP).

To successfully complete our task we need as much input as possible from all interested persons and organizations. Please note that many specific questions have already been set out at page 5 of the Charter in list entitled "List Of Potential Issues For Consideration In This PDP" but there may be additional items which are specific to your work and which have not yet been listed. Please respond even if your concerns are included in the "List of Potential Issues". It is important that we all know not only the questions but the number of those who find them important. As part of its efforts to obtain broad input from the ICANN Community at an early stage of its deliberations, the Working Group would very much appreciate receiving your views and input. We invite you to respond particularly to the following questions:

Question 1:

What are your general views, concerns, and questions on the RPMs listed in Phase One?

Question 2:

What issues, concerning the Phase One RPMs are most relevant to your work and what do you feel it is essential that our WG be aware of or focus on as it proceeds in its tasks?

Finally, the WG is planning a data gathering effort aimed at the TMCH (relating to such issues as sunrise and trademark claims) and then at the URS.

Question 3:

What questions and specific data points would you advise the WG to pursue in this data gathering effort?

Any provision of input or information you or members of your respective communities may have (either on the charter questions or any other issue that may help inform our WG's deliberations) would be very welcome. Please send these to the GNSO Secretariat (gnsso-secs@icann.org) who will forward these to the WG.

If possible, please forward your comments to us **prior to ICANN56** but no later than 5 July 2016. Ideally we would like to consider community feedback during our face-to-face session in Helsinki. Please note, if the ALAC cannot submit by 5 July deadline, but you would like to contribute, please let us know when we can expect to receive your contribution so we can plan accordingly.

Your input will be very much appreciated.

With best regards,

Philip Corwin, J. Scott Evans & Kathy Kleiman (WG Co-Chairs)

Original PDF document that contains the above text



RPM Outreach Letter_ALAC.pdf

FINAL VERSION TO BE 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.

FIRST DRAFT SUBMITTED

The first draft submitted will be placed here before the call for comments begins.