|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group Submitting Request:** | UDRP & URS Review |
| **Request Date:** | 30 April 2015 |
| **Policy or Issue being explored:** | An Issue Report reviewing all rights protection mechanisms (current and developed for the New gTLD Program) including the UDRP and URS was requested by the GNSO Council. |
| **Issue to be solved:** | In preparation for the Issue Report, macro level stats will be required to understand the state of curative rights protection mechanism for the UDRP and URS. |
| **Report Requirements:** | 1. Acquire total amount (in favor of complainant, in favor of respondent, withdraws, Reverse Domain Name Hijacking) of UDRPs and URSs filed within a determined period 2. Acquire UDRP transfer complaints submitted to ICANN within a defined period 3. Acquire other IP and TM industry data as necessary |
| **Responsible Team(s) or Data Source:** | 1. Publicly available data submitted to ICANN via Registry Operator monthly reports 2. ICANN Contractual Compliance complaint intake system 3. Sample(s) of Registrar data from registrations systems aggregated through third party provider 4. Sample(s) of Registrar data from intake complaint systems aggregated through third party provider |
| **Expected Delivery Date:** | TBD |
| **Resource Estimation:** | TBD |
| **Budget Considerations:** | None   1. WIPO, NAF, ADNDRC providers have volunteers to provide the necessary data based on requirements 2. ICANN Contractual Compliance will submit complaint intake data as required |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group Submitting Request:** | IRTP Review Team |
| **Request Date:** | 01 December 2015 |
| **Policy or Issue being explored:** | Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy – Post Consensus Policy Implementation  **Recommendation #17**. The WG recommends that, once all IRTP recommendations are implemented (incl. IRTP-D, and remaining elements from IRTP-C), the GNSO Council, together with ICANN staff, should convene a panel to collect, discuss, and analyze relevant data to determine whether these enhancements have improved the IRTP process and dispute mechanisms, and identify possible remaining shortcomings.  **Recommendation #18**. The Working Group recommends that contracted parties and ICANN should start to gather data and other relevant information that will help inform a future IRTP review team in its efforts, especially with regard to those issues listed in the Observations (4.2.7.1) above. |
| **Issue to be solved:** | Determine if the IRTP-B thru IRTP-D Consensus Policies enhanced and/or improved the transfer process.  Such a review could include, but not be limited to:   * The number of uncompleted transfers, both before completed as well as abandoned transfers, collected per Registrar by the registry or ICANN; * The stages in the transfer process at which transfers are abandoned, where an abandoned transfers mean any number of uncompleted transfers that are not followed by at least one completed transfer, collected per Registrar by the registry or ICANN; * The number of incidents or communications where registrars are contacted by registrants for transfer support; * The number of incidents or communications there that registrars worked informally with other registrars to request or to effect a transfer reversal; * The number of incidents or communications related to disputes between registrars. * The number of incidents or communications related to complaints or disputes involving a change of registrant * The number of times that they experience a registrant who's claiming that their domain name has been hijacked that is not related to an account compromise * The % use of the ClientTransferProhibited status by Registrars, collected per Registrar by the registry or ICANN; * The number of complaints ICANN Contractual Compliance or Registrars receive about the 60-day transfer lock, the ClientTransferProhibited or the FOA. * The period of time between the occurrence of an alleged non-compliant transfer and the launch of the TDRP process – including those incidents where no dispute was launched or the dispute was rejected due to the expiration of the statute of limitations. |
| **Report Requirements:** | 1. Acquire total amount of transfers before and after policy implementation 2. Acquire transfer complaints submitted to ICANN before and after policy implementation 3. Acquire successful, abandoned, and failed transfer data from Registrars at the various stages of the transfer process (aggregated) 4. Acquire incident information related to transfers from Registrars (aggregated) |
| **Responsible Team(s) or Data Source:** | 1. Publicly available data submitted to ICANN via Registry Operator monthly reports 2. ICANN Contractual Compliance complaint intake system 3. Sample(s) of Registrar data from registrations systems aggregated through third party provider 4. Sample(s) of Registrar data from intake complaint systems aggregated through third party provider |
| **Expected Delivery Date:** | TBD |
| **Resource Estimation:** | TBD |
| **Budget Considerations:** | TBD   1. Data supplied by ICANN will not require additional budget allocation 2. Third party provider to aggregate Registrar data will be required; RFP to be announced |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group Submitting Request:** | Subsequent Round PDP |
| **Request Date:** | 31 December 2015 |
| **Policy or Issue being explored:** | Review of gTLD Registry Agreement in terms of Registry Operator compliance to provisions |
| **Issue to be solved:** | * TBD |
| **Report Requirements:** | 1. Acquire Registry Operator Audit data (aggregated) and structure to include macro level results |
| **Responsible Team(s) or Data Source:** | 1. ICANN Contractual Compliance Audit systems and reporting |
| **Expected Delivery Date:** | TBD |
| **Resource Estimation:** | TBD |
| **Budget Considerations:** | TBD   1. Data supplied by ICANN will not require additional budget allocation |