

**QUESTIONS RELATING TO DATA NEEDS – FOR THE URS PROVIDERS SUB TEAM**

Prepared for the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Working Group URS Documents Sub Team by ICANN staff (updated 4 March 2018)

Topic - Filing a Complaint under the URS:

- Request statistics from URS Providers about pass/fail rates for administrative review of complaints filed

Topic – Notice of a URS Complaint:

- Seek input from URS Providers about the processes they have in place for sending notices, and for dealing with non-delivery issues

Topic – Response (including Duration and Response Fee):

- Obtain feedback from URS Providers regarding experiences in getting the disputed domain name(s) locked

Topic – Remedies:

- Obtain feedback from URS Providers regarding implementation of the suspension remedy

Topic – Cost Allocation Model:

- Obtain feedback from URS Providers on filing fees received. The feedback should help the Working Group in its consideration of a “loser pays” model

Topic – Languages:

- Obtain feedback from URS Providers as to whether there have been any difficulties or issues with the current language requirements, and on what they are doing to implement the current requirements

Topic – Education, Training, Evaluation:

- Obtain information from URS Providers about the training they provide, and seek their views about whether and how their processes should be evaluated

**Deleted: 27 February**

**Deleted:** - further specific guidance to be developed by Documents Sub Team

**Deleted:** (in addition to review of cases where a Response was filed, and seeking feedback from registry operators about Provider communications regarding locking of domains) ... [1]

**Formatted:** Font:(Default) +Theme Body (Calibri), 12 pt

**Formatted**

**Deleted:** (but cases where a Respondent prevailed to be reviewed)

**Deleted:** (in addition to Practitioner views and review of additional literature, e.g. IRT, STI, INTA, CCT Review Team reports) - further specific guidance to be developed by Documents Sub Team

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

**Deleted:** Topic - Appeal: ... [2]

**Formatted:** Normal, No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Underline

**Formatted:** Normal, No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Underline

**Formatted:** Underline

**Formatted:** Font:(Default) +Theme Body (Calibri), 12 pt

**Formatted:** Normal, No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Underline

**Deleted:** (but 14 cases that were appealed and those that went through de novo review to be reviewed)

**Formatted:** Font:(Default) +Theme Body (Calibri), 12 pt

**Page 1: [1] Deleted**

**Mary Wong**

**3/4/18 5:19:00 PM**

(in addition to review of cases where a Response was filed, and seeking feedback from registry operators about Provider communications regarding locking of domains)

Topic – Standard of Proof & Scope of Defenses:

No specific suggestion for URS Providers

**Page 1: [2] Deleted**

**Mary Wong**

**3/4/18 5:26:00 PM**

Topic - Appeal:

No specific suggestion for URS Providers