

Hello. I have a few points to contribute to your DRS consultation.

Regarding the fees charged, I agree that a small upfront fee (say £50 - £100) would deter people from feeling that they have nothing to lose and so might as well raise a complaint. People should be required to put their money where their mouths are. I'm not so sure about forcing the losing party to pay for the decision, as there would seem to be no way to enforce it if the respondent loses. Forcing the respondent to pay in advance with a refund if they win could be used abusively, and there's no way to force the respondent to pay after the decision.

My experience of the DRS was that the fee for a decision was high enough to put it out of my reach. The respondent was aware that we are a small non-profit organisation and so he simply refused to budge, knowing that we couldn't afford the decision fee. Perhaps there needs to be some system so that registered charities, private individuals or sole traders can pay a little less and for-profit organisations pay a little more.

Under the heading of "Abusive registrations", I agree with each of the suggestions made, but it needs to be made clear what constitutes a "likelihood" of confusion.

One further comment. The DRS policy states that a registration must have been abusive at the time the domain was registered. In our case, a domain very similar to our own was bought by a domain name dealer who was probably, at the time, unaware of our existence. He became aware at a later date and began plagiarising our content, presumably to gain advertising revenue. According to the rules as they stand, it wasn't clear to me that the registration counted as officially "abusive" since the respondent didn't buy the domain with the intent of targeting us. It was only his subsequent use of the domain once he realised that he could exploit us that we considered abusive. This might need to be clarified in the policy.

Hope these comments are helpful to you.

Barney.