

## RECOMMENDATION 16

The EPDP Team also recommends that the GNSO Council instructs the review of all RPMs PDP WG to consider, as part of its deliberations, whether there is a need to update existing requirements to clarify that a complainant must only be required to insert the publicly-available RDDS data for the domain name(s) at issue in its initial complaint. The EPDP Team also recommends the GNSO Council to instruct the RPMs PDP WG to consider whether upon receiving updated RDDS data (if any), the complainant must be given the opportunity to file an amended complaint containing the updated respondent information.

***Disclaimer:** This overview has been developed to facilitate the EPDP Team's consideration of the concerns expressed and possible updates to the recommendations. However, this does not replace the EPDP Team's obligation to review all input received in full and to indicate if any concerns in this overview have inadvertently been mischaracterized.*

### Noted Concerns

Concern	Corresponding PCRT Comment #	Further Discussion Required?
Support purpose, but in order to make more impactful and efficient use of dispute resolution procedures, and to confirm infringement, it would be far better to have pre-filing access to the data.	2, 3, 6 (BC, Microsoft, IPC)	Yes/No
Clarification of the existing policies is needed to enable the Complainant to comply with such policies and the Provider to manage domain name disputes adequately and consistently.	4, 5 (MSFD, Forum)	Yes/No
Currently there is no URS policy provision which enables the Complainant to amend the URS Complaint after its submission.	5, 8 (Forum, INTA)	Yes/No