

# Report of Public Comments

<b>Title:</b>	<b>.MOBI Cross-Ownership Removal Request</b>		
<b>Publication Date:</b>	26 September 2013		
<b>Prepared By:</b>	Karla Valente		
<b>Comment &amp; Reply Periods:</b>		<b>Important Information Links</b>	
Open Date:	26 July 2013		
Close Date:	8 September 2013		
Time (UTC):	23:59		
<b>Staff Contact:</b>	Karla Valente	<b>Email:</b>	Karla.valente@icann.org
<b>Section I: General Overview and Next Steps</b>			
Following the closure of the public comment period and the publication of this report of public comments, the next step will be for the ICANN to consider the proposal and the related public comment.			
<b>Section II: Contributors</b>			
<b>Section III: Summary of Comments</b>			
<i>General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).</i>			
<b>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</b>			
ICANN received one comments during the .mobi cross-ownership removal public comment. IPC recommends that ICANN amend the terms of the agreement to “conform as closely as possible to the Proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement and at a minimum, further amendments must include: (i) the Registry Code of Conduct (as finalized in the New gTLD Registry Agreement); (ii) thick Whois (to the extent not already applicable); and (iii) the text of Section 2.8 of the New gTLD Registry Agreement (concerning rights protection mechanisms) and paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Specification 7 referenced therein. With regard to this last amendment, compliance with the PDDRP, RDDRP, and URS should apply to, and consent to them should be required in the registration agreements for, all new second-level registrations and all second-level registrations renewed on or after the effective date of the amendment of the existing gTLD registry amendment.” <i>IPC (16 August 2013)</i>			
<b>Section IV: Analysis of Comments</b>			
<i>General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments</i>			

*received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.*

ICANN takes note of the comment raised during the .mobi cross-ownership removal public comment. The request will be considered by ICANN and the result will be made public.

The cross-ownership removal does not include a requirement to comply with the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) rights protection mechanism (RPMs). This RPM has so far only been approved in the context of new gTLDs. The URS is new and requires a "ramp-up" period before it is able to absorb the full workload of the entire gTLD namespace. Additionally, registrants have procured domain names in existing gTLDs with an understanding of the landscape of existing RPMs. New RPMs affect registrants, as well as registries and registrars. They should be introduced in existing gTLDs after a bottom-up community discussion.

The registry agreed to adopt a code of conduct that closely aligns with the new gTLD agreement.