

19 March 2019

Dear Mr. Wood,

Thank you for your letter of 1 February concerning the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP). Your letter has been posted at <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/wood-to-chalaby-01feb19-en.pdf>.

As you know, the GNSO Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPM) in All gTLDs Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group plans to review the UDRP in Phase Two of its process, to include consideration of potential issues included in the group's [charter](#). This activity occurs according to the multistakeholder process for policymaking as specified in ICANN's Bylaws. The substance of the review, including identifying priority issues and possible solutions, is executed by the working group and overseen by the GNSO Council in its Bylaws-mandated role as manager of GNSO PDPs. The role of the ICANN organization in this process is to provide logistical and subject matter support.

ICANN org understands and supports the need for quality data and informed decision-making in policy development. I understand that the RPM PDP Working Group has already noted this need as part of its Phase One discussions. To that end, my team is gathering and aggregating available data into a status report, which we anticipate being able to provide to the GNSO Council during the second calendar quarter of this year. This report may be useful to the working group as a reference or as a base point to request additional analysis. For reference, many of the data points noted in your letter, such as case volume, domain volume, and registrar noncompliance issues, already exist or are being collected now (see for example <https://features.icann.org/compliance/dashboard/report-list>; <https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/cct/metrics>). Other data points, such as default cases, settlements, and cost information, are not readily available at this time. We will explore the potential availability of these in terms of working with providers going forward.

The GNSO's Data and Metrics for Policy Making (DMPM) Framework is also available, allowing the working group to determine whether certain data is needed and can be obtained based on a procedural request with the appropriate cost-benefit analysis. As you know, the RPM PDP Working Group was the first GNSO group to use this process and as a result, ICANN org engaged the Analysis Group to perform a series of surveys relating to the Sunrise Registrations and Trademark Claims RPMs.

We also support measures to ensure that expertise of those engaged in UDRP procedures on a daily basis is incorporated into the working group policy discussions, into public comment fora, and other opportunities during which such input may be gathered. To the extent that affected

stakeholders are not available to participate in the working group, we expect that the working group will proactively perform outreach to ensure that the needed perspectives are taken into account in its deliberations. The GNSO's [Working Group Guidelines](#) authorize Working Group Chair(s) to invite specific expertise into the working group and working groups to request briefings and information from subject matter experts.

We hope that these activities collectively meet the objectives stated in your letter. Should the working group wish to propose other options by which ICANN org can help support Phase Two of its PDP, we remain open for such dialogue.

Thank you again for writing and for your participation in the ICANN multistakeholder model. We look forward to working with you to ensure thorough and informed deliberations and policy outcomes.

Best regards,



Cyrus K. Namazi
Senior Vice-President, Global Domains Division