**“Revised” URS Individual Proposal 3**

Currently, URS Individual Proposal #3 states:

Revise URS Policy Paragraph 10 to reflect the following new provisions:

10.3 There shall be an option for a successful or unsuccessful Complainant to extend the registration period for one additional year at commercial rates.

10.5 Notwithstanding any locking of a domain name pursuant to Paragraph 4.1 and notwithstanding the suspension of domain name pursuant to Paragraph 10.2, a registrant shall be entitled to renew a subject domain name registration and the Registry shall permit same in accordance with its usual commercial rates for a period of up to one year.

The proposal is apparently intended to address a concern that a domain name registration could expire following a URS Determination but before the URS Appeal period ends, undermining the possible Appeal process. As a reminder, the URS Appeal period is 14 days following the date on which a Default or Final Determination is issued (see URS Procedure Paragraph 12.4). Thus, there could be a scenario in which a URS Respondent loses and the domain is concurrently suspended, the registration is due to expire within the subsequent 14-day period, and the prevailing Complainant declines to extend the suspension period as permitted under URS Procedure Paragraph 10.3 and the registration expires. Alternatively, there could be a scenario in which a losing Complainant is considering filing a URS Appeal, but the registration comes due for renewal within the 14 day period and the prevailing Respondent decides not to renew the registration and it expires before the losing Complainant can file a URS Appeal. In such cases, any potential URS Appeal that might have been filed by the losing Respondent or losing Complainant, respectively, could be mooted because the domain name is no longer registered.

However, in practice this scenario likely does not require a Working Group recommendation to address, because, per ICANN Rules, an expired domain name enters into a 30-day redemption period during which it can be restored by the registry/registrar. Further, the existing URS Technical Requirements provide: “Registrar Requirement 2: Registrar MUST follow the normal domain name lifecycle for a URS Locked domain name. If the domain name registrant elects to renew, elected to auto-renew or restore the domain name registration, Registrar MAY accept such renewal and/or restoration (if the Registry Operator implements RGP).” There is a similar corresponding requirement for registry operators (see URS Technical Requirements, Registry Requirement 9).

Thus, because the domain name can be redeemed in order to preserve the status quo for the duration of a URS Appeal, we can likely eliminate URS Individual Proposal 3.