

Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP Working Group - Phase 1 Initial Report - Public Comment Input Form

This Public Comment forum seeks community feedback on the Phase 1 Initial Report published by the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group.

*** Required**

1. Email address *

>>> IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS >>> PLEASE READ BEFORE PROCEEDING >>>

Please submit your public comments via this form only

If you are unable to use Google forms, alternative arrangements can be made. Please contact policy-staff@icann.org for assistance.

You can review this entire form via its PDF and Word format

To facilitate off-line work, or for those who may not have access to the form, you can download a PDF or Word version of the form below:

- <INSERT PDF LINK>
- <INSERT WORD LINK>

There is no obligation to complete all sections within this form

Respond to as many or as few questions as desired. The only "mandatory" questions are those related to commenter's personal data in Section 1 and Section 2 of this form.

You may enter general comments in the last section (Section 11)

There is an opportunity to comment on the general content of this Initial Report and provide input that may not be tied to any specific items that the Working Group is seeking community input.

There is a limit of 2,000 characters (about 350-400 words) for each "comment box" question

In the event you reach the character limit, you may send an email to policy-staff@icann.org, and the Working Group Support Staff will assist you and manually enter your responses.

To stop and save your work for later, you MUST (to avoid losing your work):

1. Provide your email address above in order to receive a copy of your submitted responses;
2. Click "Submit" at the end of the Google Form (the last question on every page allows you to quickly jump to the end of the Google Form to submit);
3. After you click "Submit," you will receive an email to the above-provided email address; within the email, click the "Edit Response" button at top of the email;
4. After you click the "Edit Response" button, you will be directed to the Google Form to return and complete;
5. Repeat the above steps 2-4 every time you wish to quit the form and save your progress.

When the commenter hits the "Submit" button, all submitted comments will be displayed publicly via an automatically-generated Google Spreadsheet

Note: Email addresses provided by commenters will not be displayed.

The final date of the Public Comment forum is 23:59 UTC on 27 April 2020

This form will be closed by 23:59 UTC on 27 April 2020. Any comments received after that date/time will not be reviewed/discussed by the Working Group.

Other Important Instructions

- This is a standard format for collecting public comment. It seeks to:
 - Clearly link comments to specific sections of the Initial Report
 - Encourage commenters to provide reasoning or rationale for their opinions
 - Enable the sorting of comment so that the Working Group can more easily read all the comments on any one topic
- You can easily navigate from section to section in the form. There is a table of contents below so that you can “fast forward” to the desired section by hitting “next” at the bottom of each section.
- Since some of the preliminary recommendations and questions for community input are related, they are placed next to each other for easy reference. In addition, some of the questions for community input have been divided into multi-part questions so that feedback on these questions would be clear.
- Please click the link contained in the Google Form to read the details and context of each preliminary recommendation, community question, and individual proposal.
- Your comments should take into account scope of the PDP Working Group Phase 1 work as described by the Charter.
- It is important that your comments include rationale. The Working Group is interested in your reasoning so that the conclusions reached and the issues discussed by the team can be tested against the reasoning of others. This is much more helpful than comments that simply “agree” or “disagree”.
- Where applicable, you are encouraged to reference sections in the report for ease of the future review by the Working Group.

Table of Contents

Section 1: Email Address, Important Instructions, Table of Contents

Section 2: Consent & Authorization

Section 3: URS Preliminary Recommendations & Community Questions

Section 4: TMCH Preliminary Recommendation

Section 5: Sunrise Service Preliminary Recommendations & Community Questions

Section 6: Trademark Claims Service Preliminary Recommendations & Community Questions

Section 7: TM-PDDRP Preliminary Recommendation

Section 8: URS Individual Proposals (Non-Recommendations)

Section 9: TMCH Individual Proposals (Non-Recommendations)

Section 10: Overarching Charter Questions

Section 11: Other Comments & Submission

Section 2: Consent & Authorization

By submitting my personal data, I agree that my personal data will be processed in accordance with the ICANN Privacy Policy (<https://www.icann.org/privacy/policy>), and agree to abide by the website Terms of Service (<https://www.icann.org/privacy/tos>).

2. Please provide your name: *

3. Please provide your affiliation *

4. Are you providing input on behalf of another group (e.g., organization, company, government)? *

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes

☐ No

5. If yes, please explain:

Save Your Progress

6. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes

☐ No, I would like to continue to the next section

Section 3: URS Preliminary Recommendations & Community Questions

- This section seeks to obtain input on all the preliminary recommendations and questions related to the Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS).
- Related URS preliminary recommendations and questions are placed next to each other for easy reference.

URS Recommendation #1

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/byCJBw>

Note: URS Recommendation #1 has an associated URS Question #1 below.

7. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #1:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

8. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #1; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Question #1

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/cCaJBw>

Note: URS Question #1 is related to URS Recommendation #1.

9. URS Q1a. Should URS Rule 15(a) be amended to clarify that, where a Complaint has been updated with registration data provided to the Complainant by the URS Provider, there must be an option for the Determination to be published without the updated registration data?

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No opinion

☐ Other: _____

10. URS Q1b. If so, when, by whom, and how should this option be triggered?

11. URS Q1c. Are there any operational considerations that will need to also be addressed in triggering this option?

URS Recommendation #2

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/hCGJBw>

12. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #2:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

13. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #2; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Recommendation #3

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/hiGJBw>

14. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #3:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

15. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #3; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Recommendation #4

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/XyCJBw>

Note: URS Recommendation #4 has an associated URS Question #2 below.

16. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #4:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

17. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #4; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Question #2

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/XyCJBw>

Note: URS Question #2 is related to URS Recommendation #4.

18. URS Q2a. What compliance issues have Registries and Registrars discovered in URS processes, if any?

19. URS Q2b. Do you have suggestions for how to enhance compliance of URS Providers, Registries, and Registrars in the URS process?

URS Recommendation #5

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/cSCJBw>

Note: URS Recommendation #5 has an associated URS Question #3 below.

20. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #5:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

21. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #5; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Question #3

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/cSCJBw>

Note:

- The Working Group recommends that public comment be sought from Registry Operators.
- URS Question #3 is related to URS Recommendation #5

22. URS Q3a. Question to Registry Operators -- Have Registry Operator experienced any issues with respect to receiving notices from URS Providers?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Other: _____

23. URS Q3b. Question to Registry Operators -- Were these notices sent through appropriate channels?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Other: _____

24. URS Q3c. Question to Registry Operators -- Did the notices contain the correct information?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Other: _____

URS Recommendation #6

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/iCGJBw>

Note: URS Recommendation #6 has an associated URS Question #4 below.

25. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #6:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

26. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #6; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Question #4

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/iCGJBw>

Note: URS Question #4 is related to URS Recommendation #6.

27. URS Q4a. What content and format should these educational materials have?

28. URS Q4b. How should these educational materials be developed?

29. URS Q4c. Who should bear the cost for developing these educational materials?

30. URS Q4d. Should translations be provided?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

URS Recommendation #7

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/iiGJBw>

31. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #7:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

32. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #7; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Recommendation #8

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/jCGJBw>

Note: URS Recommendation #8 has an associated URS Question #5 below.

33. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #8:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

34. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #8; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Question #5

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/jCGJBw>

Note: URS Question #5 is related to URS Recommendation #8.

35. URS Q5. Should the Registry Requirement 10 be amended to include the possibility for another Registrar, which is different from the sponsoring Registrar but accredited by the same Registry, to be elected by the URS Complainant to renew the URS Suspended domain name, and to collect the Registrar renewal fee?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

URS Recommendation #9

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/jiGJBw>

36. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #9:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

37. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #9; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Recommendation #10

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/kCGJBw>

Note: URS Recommendation #10 has an associated URS Question #6 below.

38. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Recommendation #10:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

39. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Recommendation #10; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Question #6

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/kCGJBw>

Note: URS Question #6 is related to URS Recommendation #10.

40. URS Q6. Who has the responsibility for developing the uniform set of basic FAQs for URS Complainants and Respondents?

URS Question #7

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/dSCJBw>

41. URS Q7. What mechanism do you suggest that allows a URS Provider to efficiently check with other URS and UDRP Providers in order to ensure that a disputed domain name is not already subject to an open and active URS/UDRP proceeding?

URS Question #8

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/kiGJBw>

Note: The Working Group recommends that public comment be sought from Registry Operators.

42. URS Q8a. Question to Registry Operators -- What issues have you encountered with respect to implementing the HSTS-preloaded domain suspension remedy, if any?

43. URS Q8b. Question to Registry Operators -- What would need to be done to help resolve the issues you have encountered?

URS Question #9

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/ICGJBw>

44. URS Q9. Are the non-refundable, late Response fees paid by Respondent reasonable?

URS Question #10

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/liGJBw>

45. URS Q10a. Are penalties for Complainant or Respondent who abuses the URS process sufficient?

46. URS Q10b. If not, should they be expanded?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

47. URS Q10c. If they should be expanded, how?

Save Your Progress

48. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 4: TMCH
Preliminary
Recommendation

This section seeks to obtain input on the preliminary recommendation related to the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH)

TMCH Recommendation #1

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/mSGJBw>

49. Please choose one of the following responses for TMCH Recommendation #1:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

50. If you wish to (a) propose changes to TMCH Recommendation #1; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Save Your Progress

51. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 5: Sunrise Service Preliminary Recommendations & Community Questions

This section seeks to obtain input on all the preliminary recommendations and questions related to the Sunrise service offered through the TMCH.

Sunrise Recommendation #1

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/rSGJBw>

52. Please choose one of the following responses for Sunrise Recommendation #1:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

53. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Sunrise Recommendation #1; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Sunrise Recommendation #2

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/ryGJBw>

54. Please choose one of the following responses for Sunrise Recommendation #2:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

55. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Sunrise Recommendation #2; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Sunrise Recommendation #3

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/siGJBw>

56. Please choose one of the following responses for Sunrise Recommendation #3:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

57. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Sunrise Recommendation #3; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Sunrise Recommendation #4

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/tCGJBw>

58. Please choose one of the following responses for Sunrise Recommendation #4:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

59. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Sunrise Recommendation #4; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Sunrise Recommendation #5

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/tiGJBw>

60. Please choose one of the following responses for Sunrise Recommendation #5:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

61. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Sunrise Recommendation #5; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Sunrise Recommendation #6

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/uCGJBw>

62. Please choose one of the following responses for Sunrise Recommendation #6:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

63. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Sunrise Recommendation #6; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Sunrise Recommendation #7

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/uiGJBw>

64. Please choose one of the following responses for Sunrise Recommendation #7:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

65. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Sunrise Recommendation #7; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Sunrise Recommendation #8

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/vCGJBw>

66. Please choose one of the following responses for Sunrise Recommendation #8:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

67. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Sunrise Recommendation #8; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Sunrise Question #1

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/viGJBw>

68. Sunrise Q1. What remedy(ies) would you propose for any unintended effects of the Sunrise Period that you have identified in your public comment?

Sunrise Question #2

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/wCGJBw>

69. Sunrise Q2a. Have you identified abuses of the Sunrise Period?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Other: _____

70. Sunrise Q2b. To the extent that you have identified abuses of the Sunrise Period, if any, please describe them and specify any documentation to substantiate the identified abuses.

Sunrise Question #3

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/wiGJBw>

Note:

- The Working Group recommends that public comment be sought on questions #3a-d from Registry Operators.
- The Working Group asks Registry Operators to be specific about which program(s) (i.e., ALP , QLP , and/or LRP) they are referring in their responses to all questions and what the shortcomings of each of those mechanisms are.
- The Working Group also recommends that public comment be sought on question #3e from non-Registry Operators.

71. Sunrise Q3a-1. Question to Registry Operators -- If you did not attempt an ALP, QLP, or LRP, was the reason for not taking advantage of those programs related to how they integrate with Sunrise?

72. Sunrise Q3a-2. Question to Registry Operators -- Were you able to achieve your goals in a different way (such as by combining any or all of these programs)?

73. Sunrise Q3b-1. Question to Registry Operators -- If you did attempt an ALP, QLP, or LRP (or combination) but didn't successfully use any, was the reason you did not take advantage of those programs related to how they integrate with Sunrise?

74. Sunrise Q3b-2. Question to Registry Operators -- Were you able to achieve your goals in a different way? For instance, some Registry Operators may have used the QLP 100 (Section 3.2 of Registry Agreement Specification 5) (plus IDN variants) in combination with registry-reserved names to obtain the names they needed. Did you do this?

75. Sunrise Q3b-3. Question to Registry Operators -- If so, were you able to reserve or allocate all the names you needed to?

76. Sunrise Q3c-1. Question to Registry Operators -- If you used an ALP, QLP, or LRP (or combination), did you experience any unanticipated trouble with integrating the Sunrise Period into your launch?

77. Sunrise Q3c-2. Question to Registry Operators -- Specifically, were you able to allocate all of the names you needed to allocate under those programs before the Sunrise Period?

78. Sunrise Q3d-1. Question to Registry Operators -- For each issue you have identified in your responses to questions #3a-c, please also include a suggested mitigation path. What do you suggest the RPM Working Group consider to help alleviate the pain points and make those programs more useful and functional, while still respecting the trademark protection goals of the Sunrise Period?

79. Sunrise Q3d-2. Question to Registry Operators -- How important is it to make changes to these programs before another round of new gTLDs (that is, are these issues worth “holding up” another round for, or are the work-arounds tolerable)?

80. Sunrise Q3e. Question to Non-Registry Operators -- Did you experience struggles with the way ALP, QLP, or LRPs (or a combination) integrated with Sunrise, either as registrar, as a brand owner, or as a domain name registrant?

Sunrise Question #4

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/xCGJBw>

Note: The Working Group recommends that the following guidance be sought from Registry Operators.

81. Sunrise Q4a-1. Question to Registry Operators -- If you had/have a business model that was in some way restrained by the 100-name pre Sunrise limit for names registries can reserve under Section 3.2 of Registry Agreement Specification 5, or the practical problems with the ALP, please share your experience and suggested path to improvement.

82. Sunrise Q4a-2. Question to Registry Operators -- What was your work-around, if any? For instance, if you withheld names from registration (“reserved” names), how well did that work?

83. Sunrise Q4b-1. Question to Registry Operators -- If the Working Group were to identify specialized gTLDs as a key concern that required changes to the way the Sunrise Period operates, are there other TLDs, besides GeoTLDs that did or will encounter the same problem?

84. Sunrise Q4b-2. Question to Registry Operators -- What suggestions do you have for work-arounds or solutions that will not diminish the protections available from the Sunrise Period (balanced with the need to finish this work in a timely manner)?

85. Sunrise Q4c-1. Question to Registry Operators -- Did you initially intend (prior to the implementation of Sunrise rules in the original Applicant Guidebook) to offer a special Sunrise before the regular Sunrise that targeted local trademark owners?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Other: _____

86. Sunrise Q4c-2. Question to Registry Operators -- For instance, would the ability to offer a special “pre-Sunrise” Sunrise solve any problems?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

87. Sunrise Q4c-3. Question to Registry Operators -- If so, would you have validated the marks in some way?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

88. Sunrise Q4c-4. Question to Registry Operators -- How would you have resolved conflicts between trademark holders that got their domains during the first Sunrise and trademark holders who had an identical trademark in the TMCH that was registered prior to Sunrise?

Sunrise Question #5

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/xiGJBw>

Note: The Working Group recommends that public comment be sought from trademark holders who use non-English scripts/languages.

89. Sunrise Q5a. Question to trademark holders who use non-English scripts/languages -- Did you encounter any problems when you attempted to participate in Sunrise using non-English scripts/languages?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Other: _____

90. Sunrise Q5b. Question to trademark holders who use non-English scripts/languages -- If so, please describe problems you have encountered.

91. Sunrise Q5c. Question to trademark holders who use non-English scripts/languages -- Do you have suggestions on how to enable trademark holders who use non-English scripts/languages to effectively participate in Sunrise?

Save Your Progress

92. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 6: Trademark Claims Service Preliminary Recommendations & Community Questions

- This section seeks to obtain input on all the preliminary recommendations and questions related to the Trademark Claims service offered through the TMCH.
- Related Trademark Claims preliminary recommendations and questions are placed next to each other for easy reference.

Trademark Claims Recommendation #1

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/2yGJBw>

Note: Trademark Claims Recommendation #1 has an associated Trademark Claims Question #1 below.

93. Please choose one of the following responses for Trademark Claims

Recommendation #1:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

94. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Trademark Claims Recommendation #1; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Trademark Claims Question #1

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/2yGJBw>

Note: Trademark Claims Question #1 is related to Trademark Claims Recommendation #1.

95. Trademark Claims Q1a-1. Have you identified any inadequacies or shortcomings of the Claims Notice?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Other: _____

96. Trademark Claims Q1a-2. If so, what are they?

97. Trademark Claims Q1b. Do you have suggestions on how to improve the Claims Notice in order to address the inadequacies or shortcomings?

Trademark Claims Recommendation #2

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/3SGJBw>

98. Please choose one of the following responses for Trademark Claims Recommendation #2:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

99. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Trademark Claims Recommendation #2; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Trademark Claims Recommendation #3

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/3yGJBw>

100. Please choose one of the following responses for Trademark Claims Recommendation #3:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

101. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Trademark Claims Recommendation #3; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Trademark Claims Recommendation #4

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/4SGJBw>

Note: Trademark Claims Recommendation #4 has an associated Trademark Claims Question #2 below.

102. Please choose one of the following responses for Trademark Claims Recommendation #4:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

103. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Trademark Claims Recommendation #4; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Trademark Claims Recommendation #5

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/4yGJBw>

Note: Trademark Claims Recommendation #5 has an associated Trademark Claims Question #2 below.

104. Please choose one of the following responses for Trademark Claims Recommendation #5:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

105. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Trademark Claims Recommendation #5; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Trademark Claims Question #2

Please find the link to this Question and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/5yGJBw>

Note: Trademark Claims Question #2 is related to Trademark Claims Recommendations #4 & #5.

106. Trademark Claims Q2a. Is there a use case for exempting a gTLD that is approved in subsequent expansion rounds from the requirement of a mandatory Claims Period due to the particular nature of that gTLD? Such type of gTLD might include: (i) “highly regulated” TLDs that have stringent requirements for registering entities, on the order of .bank; and/or (ii) “Dot Brand” TLDs whose proposed registration model demonstrates that the use of a Trademark Claims Service is unnecessary.

107. Trademark Claims Q2b. If the Working Group recommends exemption language, what are the appropriate guardrails ICANN should use when granting the exception (e.g. Single-registrant? Highly-regulated or manually hand-registered domains? Something else?)?

Trademark Claims Recommendation #6

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/5SGJBw>

108. Please choose one of the following responses for Trademark Claims

Recommendation #6:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

109. If you wish to (a) propose changes to Trademark Claims Recommendation #6; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Save Your Progress

110. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No, I wish to continue to the next section

**Section 7: TM-
PDDRP Preliminary
Recommendation**

This section seeks to obtain input on the preliminary recommendation related to the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP).

TM-PDDRP Recommendation #1

Please find the link to this Recommendation and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/9SOJBw>

111. Please choose one of the following responses for TM-PDDPR Recommendation #1:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Recommendation as written
- ☐ Support Recommendation concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Recommendation
- ☐ No opinion

112. If you wish to (a) propose changes to TM-PDDRP Recommendation #1; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Save Your Progress

113. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 8: URS Individual Proposals (Non- Recommendations)

- This section seeks to obtain input on all the individual proposals related to the Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS). These proposals were submitted by individual working group members but did not rise to the level of becoming preliminary recommendations.
- Please note that some Individual Proposals contain associated questions that the Working Group specifically invites public comment.

URS Individual Proposal #1

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/6iGJBw>

114. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #1:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

115. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #1; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Individual Proposal #2

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/fSCJBw>

Note: The Working Group particularly seeks public comment from the Contracted Parties House with regard to this proposal

116. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #2:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

117. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #2; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Individual Proposal #3

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/7CGJBw>

118. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #3:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

119. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #3; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Individual Proposal #6

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/7iGJBw>

120. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #6:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

121. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #6; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Individual Proposal #11

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/8CGJBw>

Note: URS Individual Proposal #11 has specific questions below seeking public comment.

122. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #11:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

123. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #11; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

124. URS Individual Proposal #11 - Q1. Should the current Response Fee threshold of fifteen (15) domain names be lowered?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

125. URS Individual Proposal #11 - Q2. If so, what should be the new threshold?

URS Individual Proposal #13

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/fyCJBw>

Note: URS Individual Proposal #13 has a specific question below seeking public comment.

126. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #13:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

127. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #13; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

128. URS Individual Proposal #13 - Q1. How feasible would it be to enforce this Proposal should it be implemented?

URS Individual Proposal #15

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/8iGJBw>

Note: URS Individual Proposal #15 has specific questions below seeking public comment.

129. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #15:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

130. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #15; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

131. URS Individual Proposal #15 - Q1. Is the proposed definition of "repeat offender" in this Proposal appropriate?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

132. URS Individual Proposal #15 - Q2. Is the proposed definition of "high-volume cybersquatting" in this Proposal appropriate?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

133. URS Individual Proposal #15 - Q3. How feasible would it be to implement this Proposal?

URS Individual Proposal #16

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/9CGJBw>

Note: URS Individual Proposal #16 has a specific question below seeking public comment.

134. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #16:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

135. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #16; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

136. URS Individual Proposal #16 - Q1. How feasible would it be to implement this Proposal?

URS Individual Proposal #22

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/gSCJBw>

Note: URS Individual Proposal #22 has specific questions below seeking public comment.

137. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #22:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

138. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #22; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

139. URS Individual Proposal #22 - Q1. Is a "loser pays" model appropriate for the URS?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

140. URS Individual Proposal #22 - Q2. Please provide input on the definition of specific criteria mentioned in this Proposal (e.g., “repeat offender” over a defined time period, and “high-volume cybersquatting”).

141. URS Individual Proposal #22 - Q3. Please provide input on the specific item(s) that should be paid in a “loser pays” model (e.g., administrative fees, attorneys’ fees).

142. URS Individual Proposal #22 - Q4. Please provide input on the enforcement mechanism of the proposed “loser pays” model.

URS Individual Proposal #26

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/9iGJBw>

143. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #26:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

144. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #26; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Individual Proposal #27

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: https://community.icann.org/x/_CGJBw

145. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #27:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

146. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #27; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Individual Proposal #28

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: https://community.icann.org/x/_iGJBw

Note: URS Individual Proposal #28 has specific questions below seeking public comment.

147. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #28:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

148. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #28; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

149. URS Individual Proposal #28 - Q1. Please provide input on the suggested elements of the proposed "Panelist Conflict of Interest Policy", should it be developed by the Working Group and applied to all URS Providers.

150. URS Individual Proposal #28 - Q2. Please list existing conflict of interest policies that can serve as examples for the proposed "Panelist Conflict of Interest Policy".

URS Individual Proposal #29

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/-CGJBw>

Note: URS Individual Proposal #29 has a specific question below seeking public comment.

151. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #29:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

152. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #29; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

153. URS Individual Proposal #29 - Q1. What are the cost and benefits of implementing the Proposal?

URS Individual Proposal #31

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/-iGJBw>

Note: URS Individual Proposal #31 stems from one of the general overarching Charter questions -- "General Overarching Charter Question #2: 2a. Should any of the New gTLD Program RPMs (such as the URS), like the UDRP, be Consensus Policies applicable to all gTLDs? 2b. If so, what are the transitional issues that would have to be dealt with as a consequence?"

Commenters have an opportunity to provide input on this general overarching Charter question in Section 10 of this form.

154. If you wish to provide (a) a response to URS Individual Proposal #31; and/or (b) a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Individual Proposal #33

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/ACKJBw>

Note: URS Individual Proposal #33 has a specific question below seeking public comment.

155. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #33:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

156. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #33; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

157. URS Individual Proposal #33 - Q1. What additional elements, if any, that need to be included to enhance ICANN's Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with URS Providers and enforce their compliance?

URS Individual Proposal #34

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/AiKJBw>

158. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #34:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

159. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #34; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

URS Individual Proposal #36

Please find link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/BCKJBw>

160. Please choose one of the following responses for URS Individual Proposal #36:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

161. If you wish to (a) propose changes to URS Individual Proposal #36; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Save Your Progress

162. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes

☐ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 9: TMCH Individual Proposals (Non- Recommendations)

- This section seeks to obtain input on all the individual proposals related to the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH). These proposals were submitted by individual working group members but did not rise to the level of becoming preliminary recommendations.

- Please note that some Individual Proposals contain associated questions that the Working Group specifically invites public comment.

TMCH Individual Proposal #1

Please find the link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/eCCJBw>

Note: TMCH Individual Proposal #1 has specific questions below seeking public comment.

163. Please choose one of the following responses for TMCH Individual Proposal #1:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

164. If you wish to (a) propose changes to TMCH Individual Proposal #1; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

165. TMCH Individual Proposal #1 - Q1. Should education about the TMCH and its services be provided?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No Opinion
- ☐ Other: _____

166. TMCH Individual Proposal #1 - Q2. If there should be education about the TMCH and its services, how and by whom should such education be provided?

TMCH Individual Proposal #2 (1 of 2 proposals concerning design marks)

Please find the link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/eyCJBw>

Note: TMCH Individual Proposals #2 & #3 have a specific question seeking public comment below.

167. Please choose one of the following responses for TMCH Individual Proposal #2:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

168. If you wish to (a) propose changes to TMCH Individual Proposal #2; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

TMCH Individual Proposal #3 (2 of 2 proposals concerning design marks)

Please find the link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/eyCJBw>

Note: TMCH Individual Proposals #2 & #3 have a specific question seeking public comment below.

169. Please choose one of the following responses for TMCH Individual Proposal #3:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

170. If you wish to (a) propose changes to TMCH Individual Proposal #3; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

171. TMCH Individual Proposals #2 & #3 - Q1. Do you have suggestions for ways to reconcile TMCH Individual Proposals #2 and #3?

TMCH Individual Proposal #4 (1 of 2 proposals concerning geographical indications)

Please find the link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/CSKJBw>

Note: TMCH Individual Proposals #4 & #5 have a specific question seeking public comment below.

172. Please choose one of the following responses for TMCH Individual Proposal #4:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

173. If you wish to (a) propose changes to TMCH Individual Proposal #4; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

TMCH Individual Proposal #5 (2 of 2 proposals concerning geographical indications)

Please find the link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/CSKJBw>

Note: TMCH Individual Proposals #4 & #5 have a specific question seeking public comment below.

174. Please choose one of the following responses for TMCH Individual Proposal #5:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

175. If you wish to (a) propose changes to TMCH Individual Proposal #5; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

176. TMCH Individual Proposals #4 & #5 - Q1. Do you have suggestions for ways to reconcile TMCH Individual Proposals #4 and #5?

TMCH Individual Proposal #6

Please find the link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/CyKJBw>

177. Please choose one of the following responses for TMCH Individual Proposal #6:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

178. If you wish to (a) propose changes to TMCH Individual Proposal #6; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

TMCH Individual Proposal #7

Please find the link to this Individual Proposal and its context here: <https://community.icann.org/x/DiKJBw>

179. Please choose one of the following responses for TMCH Individual Proposal #7:

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Support Proposal as written
- ☐ Support Proposal concept with minor change
- ☐ Significant change required
- ☐ Do not support Proposal
- ☐ No opinion

180. If you wish to (a) propose changes to TMCH Individual Proposal #7; and/or (b) provide a rationale for your response, please do so here.

Save Your Progress

181. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes

☐ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 10: Overarching Charter Questions

- The Working Group's Charter includes several general, overarching questions as well as a number of additional questions that the Working Group is expected to address at the conclusion of Phase 1 or Phase 2 of its work, as appropriate.
- The Working Group invites community input on three (3) general and three (3) additional overarching Charter questions, which may help inform the Working Group's overall work toward the Final Report.

182. General Overarching Charter #Q1. Do the RPMs collectively fulfil the objectives for their creation, namely “to provide trademark holders with either preventative or curative protections against cybersquatting and other abusive uses of their legally-recognized trademarks? In other words, have all the RPMs, in the aggregate, been sufficient to meet their objectives or do new or additional mechanisms, or changes to existing RPMs, need to be developed?

183. General Overarching Charter #Q2a. Should any of the New gTLD Program RPMs (such as the URS), like the UDRP, be Consensus Policies applicable to all gTLDs?

184. General Overarching Charter #Q2b. If so, what are the transitional issues that would have to be dealt with as a consequence?

185. General Overarching Charter #Q3a. Will changes to one RPM need to be offset by concomitant changes to the others?

186. General Overarching Charter #Q3b. If so, to what extent?

187. Additional Overarching Charter #Q1. Do the RPMs adequately address issues of registrant protection (such as freedom of expression and fair use)?

188. Additional Overarching Charter #Q2. Is the recent and strong ICANN work seeking to understand and incorporate Human Rights into the policy considerations of ICANN relevant to the UDRP or any of the RPMs?

189. Additional Overarching Charter #Q3. How can costs be lowered so end users can easily access RPMs?

Save Your Progress

190. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes

☐ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 11: Other Comments & Submission

191. Are there any additional recommendations that you believe the Working Group should consider making? If yes, please provide details below.

192. Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise pertaining to the Initial Report? If yes, please enter your comments here. If applicable, please specify the section or page number in the Initial Report to which your comments refer.

Save Your Progress

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms