**LIST OF QUESTIONS ON TM-PDDRP (from RPM Review Working Group call of 8 June 2016)**

1. FOR THE WORKING GROUP IN CONDUCTING ITS REVIEW:

* Is there a policy-based need to address the goal of the TM-PDDRP?
* Is it broad enough to cover abuses that were not anticipated when it was developed? Alternatively, do we still need it?
* There is an overarching Charter question as to whether the RPMs collectively fulfill the objectives for which they were developed. In this context, are there some policies/procedures that should be carried across all mechanisms (assuming applicability) e.g. costs/fees for the prevailing party? Should the standards in the TM-PDDRP be changed to address the full range of conduct that may appropriately be sanctioned by this process?
* Even if we made no changes to the TM-PDDRP, is there any burden to it remaining available for use should an appropriate case arise? Or would changes make it more useful?
* Given how much it costs to become a registry operator, is it too easy to bring a TM-PDDRP action?
* There have been questions raised around TMCH/sunrise practices, and certain registries charging fees that were considered disproportionately high for trademark owners. Is there any relation between the sunrise registration fees for trademark owners, in particular registries, to the conduct of the registry operator itself that would be relevant to think about in the post-delegation context?
* Would adding mediation to the PDDRP be advisable?

1. QUESTIONS TO BE SENT TO THE PROVIDERS FOR FEEDBACK:

* What reasons might there be for the TM-PDDRP to have not been used to date?
* Is there any ongoing cost to them in having this procedure available if it is not used?
* Have they received any feedback from trademark owners or Registry Operators as to potential problems or other considerations in relation to using the TM-PDDRP?
* Have they received any enquiries from potential complainants who nevertheless decided not to proceed, in particular as to the standards to be applied?
* How ready are the Providers in the event that a Complaint is filed?
* Have the Providers identified potential Panelists? (Note: at least one seems to have)
* Would adding mediation to the Procedure be advisable?
* What other feedback do the Providers have at this stage, given that the TM-PDDRP has not been used and that the first New gTLD was delegated in October 2013?

1. ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS:

* WG should also seek feedback from panelists/arbitrators, especially those who have been trained in the PDDRP or who have extensive experience with similar administrative proceedings or arbitration