

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
Communications					
URS Rules 2(c)	<p>Obtain information from the Providers about how Examiners are selected and what background they have.</p>	<p>All communications with URS Parties, Registries, and Registrars are conducted electronically (i.e., email); fax or letter types of postal mail are not provided.</p> <p>Privacy/Proxy As an additional safeguard and a design process, the relevant office of ADNDRC would request the Registry Operator to identify the true identity of the Respondent.</p> <p>Based on its experiences dealing with the UDRP cases, this method is an additional safeguards to ensure that the Respondent receives the notice, as long as some information is correct.</p>	<p>Registry Email sent with Complaint requesting verification and lock</p> <p>Registrar - Email sent attaching notice and Complaint</p> <p>Respondent (commencement of the case) - Email containing notice (translated if necessary) Complaint and link to online portal for filing Response - Notice sent by fax and mail</p> <p>Complainant All communications via email</p> <p>Other Methods Accept phone calls from any parties in the process to answer procedural questions if necessary. A case coordinator is assigned to each case and will reply either via email or phone call.</p> <p>Privacy/Proxy - Some Registrars will provide Respondent information – if so, the notice and Complaint are sent to the contact information provided by the Registrar - In the event that a Registrar cannot provide that information, which is not typical, FORUM proceeds with the information that it has</p>	<p>Registries and Registrars - By e-mail to the e-mail address(es) made available by ICANN</p> <p>Complainant By e-mail to the e-mail address provided in the Complaint (Complainant itself or authorized representative)</p> <p>Respondent - Notice of Complaint and Notice of Default by e-mail, courier and fax (if any) to all email addresses, postal mail and facsimile addresses shown in Whois confirmed by the Registry and to any e-mail addresses provided by the Complainant in the Complaint - Other communications: by email</p> <p>Privacy/Proxy - If the Registrar is not communicating any underlying information regarding the Registrant, MFSD just proceeds using the information available in WHOIS.</p>	

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
	<p>In Providers' Supplemental Rules, are there reasonable ways of communicating?</p>	<p>Supplemental Rules: Article 3. Communications 1. Any submission that may or is required to be made to the Centre pursuant to the Procedure, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules shall be made electronically via the Internet in accordance with the Guidelines for URS Submission (the "Guidelines") which can be found at https://www.adndrc.org/urs/guide. 2. Any communications to the Examiner by either Party shall be made through the Relevant Office of the Centre which the Complainant has selected to administer the proceedings. 3. Communication between the Examiner and the Parties shall be coordinated through the Case Administrator.</p>	<p>Supplemental Rules: 3. Communications All communications must be directed to the FORUM and not to the Examiner.</p>	<p>Supplemental Rules: 3. Submissions Complaint, Response, Appeal, Response to an Appeal, request of extension to file Response, request of challenge of the Examiner, request of termination, request of suspension or withdrawal or any other communications shall be submitted to MFSD (and not to the Examiner) through MFSD's online dispute management platform https://urs.mfsd.it by using the relevant online model form(s) or by sending the same (except for Complaint) by e-mail to urs@mfsd.it. Submissions shall be accompanied by the payment of the relevant filing fee as set out in paragraph 17 of these Supplemental Rules. Complaint, Response, Appeal, Response to an Appeal, request of extension to file Response, request of challenge of the Examiner, request of termination, request of suspension or withdrawal or any other communications shall contain all elements, attestations and statements specified in URS Procedure, URS Rules and these Supplemental Rules. Submitted Complaint shall not be amended at any time. Complaint shall respect the 500-word limit specified in paragraph 1.2.7 of the URS Procedure. Response shall respect the 2500-word limit set forth in paragraph 5.4 of URS Procedure. Parties shall annex adequate evidence to support their assertions and claims. The file formats of the annexes may be the following: .pdf, .doc, .smd (for Trademark Clearinghouse proof of use), .jpg, .tif, .rtf, .xls, .htm/html. No individual file may exceed 16MB and the overall files annexed by a party per dispute may not exceed 64MB.</p>	
<p>URS Rules 2(a)(i) URS Procedure 4.3 ADNDRC Supplemental Rules 3</p>	<p>How is ADNDRC not in breach of the URS Rules Clause 2(a)(i) and Procedure Clause 4.3 in relying SOLELY on email as the mode for issuing a Notice of Complaint?</p>	<p>ADNDRC has basically accommodated this under Article 3 of the supplemental rules. In order to implement the URS procedure, everything shall be made electronically via the Internet in accordance with guidelines for URS submission. The system has been designed in a way that has ensured the compliance.</p>			
<p>URS Rules 2(f)(i)(ii)(iii)</p>	<p>What percentage of communications were done in ways rather than electronically/via the Internet?</p>				
<p>URS Rules 2(g)</p>	<p>Do the Providers conform with the communications timeline in accordance with this provision?</p>				
<p>URS Technical Requirements - Registry Requirement 5</p>	<p>Have the Providers received notifications from Registry Operators via email regarding the completion of URS actions on a domain name?</p>				
<p>URS Technical Requirements - Registry Requirement 6</p>	<p>Have the Providers received notification via email from Registry Operators if a URS Locked or URS Suspended domain name has been either deleted or purged?</p>				
<p>URS Technical Requirements - Registry Requirement 7</p>	<p>Have the Providers received information from ICANN with regard to the point of contact of the Back End Registry Operator (BERO) appointed by Registry Operators?</p>				
<p>The Complaint</p>					

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
URS Rules 3 (a), 3(b)(i)-(x) FORUM Supplemental Rules 4(b)	Do the Providers accept Complaints that don't contain all the elements required? Please provide your online forms for complaint filing.	No -- ADNDRC conducts Administrative Reviews in accordance with URS Rules 3. The Complainant is required to fill in necessary information as required by the online portal, for example, the name, address, basic contact information etc. The Provider then conducts the Administrative Review in accordance with URS Procedure and Rules. For any case that filed but is not in the scope of URS, the Provider will notify the submitting party to withdraw the case.	No -- A Complaint will not be accepted at the time of filing for a lack of any of required information per URS Rules 3	No	
	Do the Providers ask additional information beyond what is required in the URS Rules?				
	Have the Providers encountered any issues when dealing with Registrants from EU nations whose WHOIS info is needed for URS proceedings?				
URS Rules 3(b)(v) FORUM Supplemental Rules 4(a)(i) MFSD Supplemental Rules 3	How does the FORUM handle the submission (through its online complaint filing site) of a relevant SMD proof of use from the TMCH which is expressly provided for in the URS Rules clause 3 (b)(v)? An SMD is typically a file with the extension .smd and such format is not expressly provided for under the FORUM's Annex A. As comparison, MFSD's Supplemental Rules Clause 3 expressly specifies acceptance of .smd file as an annex. Does ADNDRC's electronic complaint form (Form C_URS) also allow the uploading of .smd files as MFSD?				
URS Procedure 1.2.6.3	What other circumstances -- not included in the non-exclusive list in this provision -- have the Providers seen that the domain was registered and is being used in bad faith?				
URS Procedure 1.2.7	Has any Complainant expressed any difficulty with regard to the 500 words limit?		Yes -- Forum has received feedback on the word limitation from the Complainants. It is not enough.	No	
URS Rules 3(g)	Do the Providers check whether a domain case is already subject to an open and active URS or UDRP proceeding? If so, how do they find out? Do the Providers check court cases in the event a Respondent doesn't respond?			During the Administrative Review, the designated case manager would check whether the disputed domain name is part of an open and active URS or UDRP case.	
URS Procedure 1.1.3	Have the Providers accepted a Complaint that multiple related companies were against one Registrant? Have the Providers accepted a Complaint that was against multiple related Registrants?				
URS Rule 3(c), 3(d)	How many Complaints listed fifteen or more disputed domain names registered by the same Registrant?				
URS Rules 3(h) FORUM Supplemental Rules 4(c)	How will the rules pertaining to privacy or proxy services be affected if full access to WHOIS data is no longer available due to GDPR implementation?				
Fees					
Q from Documents Sub Team	Obtain feedback from the Providers on filing fees received. The feedback should help the Working Group in its consideration of a "loser pays" model				
URS Procedure 2.2	Among the Complaints that each listed fifteen or more disputed domain names registered by the same Registrant, how many Respondents paid the Response Fee?				
Administrative Review					
URS Procedure 3.2	Has there been any issue with regard to meeting the two (2) business days requirement of conducting the Administrative Review?	No - the Administrative Review of all cases has been conducted within two business days after acknowledging receipt of the Complaint		No - MFSD carries out Administrative Review within two business days as requested by the rules	

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
URS Procedure 3.4	How many Complaints have been found non-compliant?	More than 2 cases Complaints contended for legacy TLDs (e.g., .com, .cn) to which URS does not apply. Many of these cases' determination was listed as "withdrawn" on the ADNDRC website (7 cases - as of 06 March 2018). They actually failed the Administrative Review and were dismissed as they were not URS applicable.	17 cases Cases likely dismissed for nonpayment; FORUM would check the reasons if it becomes a formal question.	3 cases Complaints contended for domain names (.com) to which URS proceeding does not apply	
Notice of Complaint and Locking of Domain					
Q from Documents Sub Team URS Procedure 4.1 URS Technical Requirements - Registry Requirement 2	Obtain feedback from the Providers regarding experiences in getting the disputed domain name (s) locked. Have the Providers experienced any difficulties having the URS Lock activated within 24 hours after sending the request to Registry Operators?				
URS Procedure 4.2	Is there a way to know whether a Registrant has received the hard and electronic copy of the Notice of Complaint, and confirmed receipt?				
URS Rules 2(c)	Have the Providers received any notification of delayed communications?				
URS Rules 2(j)	Have the Providers received any notification of non-delivery of communications? If Respondents did not receive notifications the first time, how could they report on the bounce back?	ADNDRC has not received any Complaint regarding not receiving notice.			
URS Rules 4(c)	Are the Providers following this provision of rules?				
URS Technical Requirements - Registrar Requirement 2	What does "a normal domain name lifecycle" mean?				
The Response					
URS Rules 5(a) (iii)	Have Examiners received Responses alleging any abusive Complaint? If so, how did Examiners act in those cases?	ADNDRC/HKIAC has never got any Response alleging any abusive Complaint			
URS Rules 5(a) (v)	Is the statement included in the Providers' forms?				
URS Procedure 5.3 URS Rules 5(e)	Have the Providers received any request for extension of time to respond? If so, how often has the Respondent asked for an extension? Was the request received after Default (14 Calendar Days), or after Determination (no more than 30 Calendar Days)? What are considered "exceptional cases"?				
URS Rules 5(f)	Have the Providers received affirmative claims for relief by the Respondent for reasons beyond an abusive Complaint?				
URS Rules 5(g)	Have the Providers conducted a compliance check for a Respondent for factors beyond the two items stated in the provision? Who determines whether a Response is non-compliant – the Provider or the Examiner?	Beyond any superficial formatting and non-compliance issue that is up to the Provider to flag out, the Examiner reviews and determines whether a Response is non-compliant.			
URS Rules 5(i)	How many Responses were determined non-compliant? How many Responses were filed but with fees not paid? Can the Providers identify any case in which a Response was determined non-compliant for reasons other than the payment of the fee?				
URS Procedure 5.1, 5.2	Is the deadline for filing Responses long enough? Have the Providers received any late Responses?				

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
	What are the fees associated with these late Responses?	Supplemental Rules: Article 14. Fees Re-examination Fees (paid by Respondent, if applicable, non-refundable) - 1 to 5 domain names: US \$180 - 6 to 14 domain names: US \$200 - 15 to 29 domain names: US \$225 - 30 domain names or more: To be determined by the Relevant Office of ADNDRC	Supplemental Rules: 18. Fees (U.S. Dollars) Re-examination Fee (more than 30 days late) \$200 (paid by Respondent, non-refundable) Re-examination Extension Fee \$100 (paid by Respondent, non-refundable)	Supplemental Rules: 17. Fees and Payment Re-examination Fees (If applicable, non-refundable), paid by the Respondent who is natural person/sole proprietorship/public body/non-profit entity - 1-15 domain names: 175 Euros - 16-50 domain names: 200 Euros - 50 domain names or more: To be decided with MFSD Re-examination Fees (If applicable, non-refundable), paid by the Respondent who is partnership/corporation/public company/private limited/limited liability company - 1-15 domain names: 190 Euros - 16-50 domain names: 225 Euros - 50 domain names or more: To be decided with MFSD	
URS Procedure 5.4	Is there a reasonable balance of the word limits for the Complaint (500 words) and the Response (2,500 words)?		FORUM has received feedback on the word limitation from both the Complainants and Respondents. It is not enough.		
URS Procedure 5.7	Have the Providers received Responses that contain facts refuting the claim of bad faith registration by setting out any other circumstances not included in this provision? Is the list of circumstances exhaustive?				
URS procedure 5.9	What percentage of URS cases contain elements of domain investing?				
FORUM Supplemental Rules 5(d)	What is the purpose of this provision? Have Examiners received requests for separate hearings from the multiple Respondents in the same URS proceeding?				
ICANN61 Presentation	What other anecdotal feedback have the Providers received from Respondents?	ADNDRC has six out of the 33 cases that Respondents have filed a Response. ADNDRC has not received their feedback after the proceeding is complete.	FORUM has received relatively few Responses. FORUM has received correspondence from Respondents where the Respondent ultimately did not file a Response as they did not know how to proceed. FORUM would provide assistance and re-forward the email that contains the link to the portal. The correspondence with Respondents is not included in the file. There are general Complaints regarding online filing portal.	There is only one Response filed in the URS disputes handled by MFSD. It was submitted within the 14 day Response period. No other Respondent has contacted MFSD with any feedback, so MFSD has not received any questions either informally or by email.	
Stay of the Administrative Proceeding					
FORUM Supplemental Rules 7(a)(b)(c)	Have the Providers received joint requests for a Stay of the Administrative Proceeding? If so, was the case reinstated or dismissed as a result of the Stay? Have the Providers received any requests for a Stay post appointment of the Examiner?				
Examiner					
URS Rules 6(a)	Obtain information from the Providers about how Examiners are selected and what background they have.	ADNDRC as established a URS panel specifically dealing with URS cases. Selection preference is given to experiences in IP, arbitration, domain name disputes, IT, and other relevant areas of law. Most Examiners join the panel by applications, but ADNDRC also identifies experts and specialists in the area and invite them to apply.	Selection preference is given to Examiners with IP or internet law, arbitration and other domain name dispute experience. Most of the current URS Examiners have been empaneled since the beginning, or at least within the first six months, of the URS program; they have had at least several years of URS experience. Among the US Examiners, not all judges necessarily have Internet IP background and expertise as part of their practice, but they certainly have experience with intellectual property cases. Through the training that they're provided with, they would have an adequate basis to decide domain name disputes.	Examiners are selected among professionals of multiple jurisdictions, with different language skills, and experienced in cross-border IP disputes, ADR proceedings, and in particular domain disputes (gTLDs – UDRP, ccTLDs, .eu, etc.).	

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
	Obtain information from the Providers on the training they provide for the Examiners.	ADNDRC provides examination guidelines to URS Examiners. In addition to that, ADNDRC also organizes annual training programs to keep Examiners informed of recent case trends, new laws at point, and other relevant practice trends. ADNDRC has a lot of training materials available on its website for the Examiners.	All Examiners have received a descriptive PowerPoint Presentation and Webinar training with the Director. In-person domain name dispute training is offered annually	MFSD organizes regular online (webinars) and face-to-face (workshops) training sessions for the Examiners. More information: https://urs.mfsd.it/news-events	
	Seek Providers' views about whether and how their processes and practices pertaining to Examiners' selection and training should be evaluated.				
	Have the Providers maintained and made public available the list of URS Examiners and their qualifications?	Qualifications of 19 out of 180 Examiners are <u>not</u> publicly available (As of 22 Feb 2018)	Qualifications of 2 out of 122 Examiners are <u>not</u> publicly available (As of 22 Feb 2018)	Qualifications of all 23 Examiners are publicly available (As of 22 Feb 2018)	https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/79436564/URS%20Rules%206a.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1519357143000&api=v2
	Why the qualifications of some Examiners are not published (ADNDRC, FORUM)?	ADNDRC Examiners' Bio or CVs are on the ADNDRC website. Its case managers also from time to time remind Examiners to update their CVs. ADNDRC sometimes asks Examiners to provide the most updated CVs before proceeding with the appointment.	FORUM staff would conduct search for all CVs/Bio and notify the Director if any is missing.	All 23 Examiners' Bio are on the MFSD website.	
URS Rules 6(b) MoU 2b(v) FORUM Supplemental Rules 10(a), 10(b), 10(c)	What is the conflict of interest policy established by each Provider? Do the Providers make the Examiners aware of their needs to be impartial and independent?	Supplemental Rules: Article 8. Impartiality and Independence of Examiner 1. The Examiner shall be and remain at all times wholly impartial and independent, and shall not act as advocate for any Party during the URS proceedings. 2. Prior to the appointment of any proposed Examiner, the Examiner shall declare in writing to the Parties and the Relevant Office of the Centre any circumstances which are likely to create an impression of bias or prevent a prompt resolution of the dispute between the Parties. If, at any stage during the URS proceeding, new circumstances arise that could give rise to justifiable doubt as to the impartiality or independence of the Examiner, the Examiner shall promptly disclose such circumstances to the Provider. In such event, the Provider shall have the discretion to appoint a substitute Examiner. 3. Except by consent of the Parties, no person shall serve as an Examiner in any dispute in which that person has any interest, which, if a Party knew of it, might lead him/her to think that the Examiner might be biased.	Supplemental Rules: 10. Impartiality and Independence (b) A Examiner will be disqualified if circumstances exist that create a conflict of interest or cause the Examiner to be unfair and biased, including but not limited to the following: (i) The Examiner has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts; (ii) The Examiner has served as an attorney to any party or the Examiner has been associated with an attorney who has represented a party during that association; (iii) The Examiner, individually or as a fiduciary, or the Examiner's spouse or minor child residing in the Examiner's household, has a direct financial interest in a matter before the Examiner; (iv) The Examiner or the Examiner's spouse, or a person within the third degree of relationship to either of them, or the spouse of such a person: (1) Is a party to the proceeding, or an officer, director, or trustee of a Party; or (2) Is acting as a lawyer or representative in the proceeding.		
	How does an Examiner confirm his/her impartiality and independence?	In accordance with ADNDRC Supplemental Rules, any appointed Examiner is required to disclose any ground giving rise to justifiable doubt of the independence/impartiality of an Examiner before the appointment, in writing to the Complaint intake ADNDRC office and the Parties.	Supplemental Rules: 10. Impartiality and Independence (a) All FORUM Examiners will take an oath to be neutral and independent.		
	Can FORUM provide a copy of the oath taken by the Examiners for being neutral and independent? Is the oath signed by the Examiners?				
	Do all three Providers undertake independent inquiries to adequately satisfy themselves as to the impartiality and independence of their Examiners? Or do they merely rely on the oath or declaration made by each Examiner?				
	Has any Examiner voluntarily disclose the conflict of interest? If not, what happened? If so, did the Examiner disclose this before and/or during the case proceeding?	If any ground is discovered that gives rise to justifiable doubt of the independence/impartiality of an Examiner after the appointment/during the case proceeding, the Examiner is required to disclose to the Complaint intake ADNDRC office and the parties immediately.			

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
	Does the Respondent have the ability/opportunity to point to the conflict of interest/bias from an Examiner? Can they do so in their Responses?	Yes -- Since ADNDRC requires its Examiners to disclose any potential conflict before the appointment, the Respondent has an opportunity to point to any potential conflict of interest and object to the appointment after an appointment is made. In that case, usually ADNDRC will switch to appoint another independent/impartial panelist.	Yes -- FORUM sends out an email to both URS Parties, indicating that an Examiner has been appointed and it's the responsibility of the Party to go to the portal and check the resume of that Examiner on the FORUM website. Supplemental Rules: 10. Impartiality and Independence (c) A party may challenge the selection of a Examiner, provided that a decision has not already been published, by filing with the FORUM a written request stating the circumstances and specific reasons for the disqualification. (d) A request to challenge must be filed in writing with the FORUM within one (1) Business Day of the date of receipt of the notice of the selection.	Yes -- Upon appointment and acceptance of an Examiner, MFSD informs the parties by email, copying the Registry Operator and the Registrar, the name of the Examiner. The email contains the date, aside from exceptional circumstances, when the Examiner should render its Determination. Any party may challenge the appointment of the Examiner, provided that the Determination hasn't been rendered, by submitting a written request of challenge to MFSD, specifying the reason and within one business day from the receipt of the communication of the appointment. So far there was no such challenge of the Examiner. Supplemental Rules: 9. Examiner Any Party may challenge the appointment of the Examiner, provided that the Determination has not been already published, by Submitting a request of challenge in writing to MFSD, specifying the reasons, within 1 Business Day from the receipt of communication of appointment.	
	Has there been any incidence of allegations of partiality or non-independence or bias of an Examiner being raised by any party of an URS proceeding either during the initial determination process or as ground for a review or Appeal? If so, how was the conflict of interest discovered?				
	When a conflict of interest has been discovered, what remedial actions have been taken?	After the disclose of the conflict of interest, the case proceeding is suspended. The case intake ADNDRC office will appoint another independent/impartial Examiner within 24 hours of the written disclosure. Supplemental Rules: Article 8. Impartiality and Independence of Examiner 4. Where an Examiner has been appointed but before rendering a Determination the appointed Examiner fails to act or refuses to act, the Relevant Office of the Centre may appoint a substitute Examiner upon request by the Parties or in its discretion.	Supplemental Rules: 10. Impartiality and Independence (e) Provided a Determination has not already been published by the selected Examiner, the FORUM will promptly review the challenge and determine whether circumstances exist requiring Examiner disqualification in accord with this rule. The decision of the FORUM is not subject to Appeal.	Supplemental Rules: 9. Examiner Upon submission MFSD shall immediately review the request of challenge and, at its sole discretion, shall decide whether to substitute the Examiner. In case of substitution of the Examiner, MFSD shall immediately appoint an other Examiner to decide the dispute.	
FORUM Supplemental Rules 10(d)	Why the request to challenge the selection of an Examiner must be filed within one (1) Business Day? Has any party filed a challenge beyond the required time period? Have there been any difficulties to meet the deadline for filing a challenge?				
ADNDRC Supplemental Rules 8.4	Has ADNDRC experienced an event where an Examiner refused or failed to act per its Supplemental Rules Article 8.4? What motivated ADNDRC to include that Article 8.4?				
URS Procedure 7.3.	What procedures do the Providers have to rotate the Examiners?	Assignment of Examiners depends on the nature of the dispute, the availability of the Examiner (particularly important for URS proceedings considering its rapid nature), identity of the Parties, and nationality of the Parties (e.g. if an American trademark owner files a Complaint against a Chinese domain name holder, ADNDRC will not appoint an Examiner from either the US or China, but an Examiner with a neutral nationality). Assignment also depends on Examiners' independence and impartiality, their past experiences working with either URS Party, and the relevant legal background.	Rotation with 4 cases assigned at a time, with exceptions made for Examiner's availability and language considerations.	MFSD adopts the principle of the rotation. Assignment of Examiners is based on a case by case analysis. Examiner's language skills (in accordance with the language of the Response) are the most important factor. Another consideration is the availability of the Examiner due to the strict time frame of the proceeding.	
	Is there any possibility for Examiner-shopping?				
Language					

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
Q from Documents Sub Team	Obtain feedback from the Providers as to whether there have been any difficulties or issues with the current language requirements, and on what they are doing to implement the current requirements.	All communication with URS Parties, Registries, and Registrars are conducted in English. ADNDRC does not have a formal procedure of translating documents or communications to corresponding languages, but the case administrators are usually happy to answer questions from URS parties. At times, ADNDRC does receive inquiries, especially from the Respondent, regarding the language of the proceedings.	FORUM checks WHOIS information and information from the Registrar to obtain the physical location of the Respondent. Based on that information, FORUM researches what the dominant language is in Respondent's physical location in order to provide translations. FORUM translate all template documents. If there is a Response that comes in from a given region, FORUM appoints an Examiner that speaks the language of the Respondent. All the documents are prepared for that Examiner in the corresponding language. Many determinations on FORUM website are in the non English languages of the Respondents.	Communications to the Respondent, including the Notice of Complaint, Notice of default, and all emails, are translated to the language of the Respondent, in addition to English.	
	Is there any challenge in the URS proceedings caused by the linguistic deficiencies of the Examiners?				
URS Rules 4(b)	Are the Providers checking WHOIS info in order to determine the language to be used to transmit the Notice of Complaint?	No	Yes -- WHOIS as well as information obtained from Registrars.	Yes -- The translated language is determined by checking the predominant language of the Registrant country.	
	Do the Providers think it will be feasible to make it mandatory to send Registry and Registrar notices in the same language(s)? (the URS Documents Sub Team has noted that the current practice seems to be that Registry notices are sent in English while Registrar notices are sent in English as well as (where applicable) the language of the affected registrant)				
URS Rules 9(c)	Are all Examiners indeed fluent in English?	Not all Examiners have indicated fluency in English in their CVs/Bio on Provider's website, although all CVs/Bio are written in English.	Not all Examiners have indicated fluency in English in their CVs/Bio on Provider's website, although all CVs/Bio are written in English.	Not all Examiners have indicated fluency in English in their CVs/Bio on Provider's website, although all CVs/Bio are written in English.	https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/79436564/URS%20Rules%20Research%20-%20URS%20Rule%206%28a%29.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1522688440690&api=v2
	Are the assigned Examiners fluent in the non-English language of the Respondents?				
URS Rules 9(b)	Obtain feedback from the Providers as to whether, and in how many instances, it has been demonstrated that a Respondent had the capability of understanding English.				
Further Statements					
URS Rules 10	Has any Examiner violated this rule by requesting further statements or documents from either of the Parties?				
In-Person Hearings					
URS Rules 11	Has the lack of in-person hearings been raised as an issue?				
Withdrawal					
FORUM Supplemental Rules 12	Why the phrase "without prejudice" is used in 12(a) but "with or without prejudice" is used in 12(b)? Why the inconsistency?				
Default					
URS Rules 12 (b) URS Procedure 6.2	Does the Registry Operator, in locking a domain, also have the technical capability to prevent the Registrant from changing the content on the Registrant's site? Or does the Notice of Default sent by the Provider to the Registrant (and also to the Complainant) merely instructs that the Registrant is prohibited from doing so, hence the ability to enforce that prohibition?				After a URS Provider receives a Response for a default determination, the Provider will inform the Registry operator to "roll back" per section 6.5 of URS Procedure. The RO needs to "roll back" the redirection of the nameserver so the domain name resolves as it did prior to the dispute. The RO must maintain the URS LOCK on the domain name. The URS Provider will inform the RO of the final determination which may require the RO to (1) suspend the domain name again; or (2) perform a full rollback, allowing the registrant to regain control.

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
URS Rules 12 (d) URS Procedure 6.4	What percentage of cases that the Respondent submitted an answer within six (6) months after a Default Determination?				ACTION ITEM: Staff to check how the additional six months extension in URS Procedure 6.4 was originated, and what was changed between 2009 and 2013. (The definition of "extension" needs to be clarified – Extend what for six months? Why does a Registrant need an additional six months?)
URS Rules 12 (f)	Has any Examiner drawn inferences when a Party is not in compliance with URS Rules, Procedures, and Supplemental Rules, in the absence of exceptional circumstances?				
Examiner Determination					
URS Procedure 8.1.2	Has any Examiner mistakenly rendered his/her Determination due to factors beyond the three elements mentioned in this provision?				
URS Rules 8(d)	Do the Providers know any situation that the nominal registrant changed after the Complaint was filed? If so, how was it handled?				Registry Requirement 3: ...the Registry Operator MUST cause the Whois information to reflect that the domain name is not able to be transferred, deleted or modified for the life of the registration... Registrar Requirement 5: Registrar SHOULD NOT modify the contact data (i.e. contacts and registrant data) of a URS Locked or URS Suspended domain name.
	How many Complaints have been dismissed on the basis of the wrong Respondent being named with the domain(s) registered with a privacy/proxy service?	ADNDRC has not had any experience in dealing with privacy/proxy service used by a Registrant.			
URS Rules 13 (a)	Has any Examiner evoked rules beyond the URS Rules, Procedures, and Supplemental Rules?				
URS Rules 8 (a), 8(c), 13(b), 13(c) Q from Documents Sub Team	What guidance that Providers have formally or informally given to the Examiners? What are the "guidelines" referred in URS Rule 13(c)? Are they referring to the Provider's Supplemental Rules? If not, can the Providers provide a copy of their guidelines?	ADNDRC has a template for Examiners and has all past Determinations made available online for Examiners to reference. Within seven calendar days of receiving a Determination, any Party may send a notice to ADNDRC and any other Parties, requesting the Examiner to correct any computational, clerical, or typographical errors in the Determination. Such corrections shall be given in writing to the Parties and become part of the Determinations. ADNDRC has not dealt with such cases.	FORUM has a template for Determinations through its portal. There are text boxes that are required to be filled out for the reasoning. Determinations are issued upon completion to the Parties and are available on the website immediately. All of the decisions on the Website can be full text searched.	Determinations are filed by the Examiner through his/her account at the online dispute management platform (in case of exceptional circumstances, e. g. technical problems, by e-mail). Examiners are provided with instructions on the URS elements and defenses and how to conduct the Examination of a URS proceeding -- references to URS Procedure and Rules are contained in the online Determination form.	
	Both the Forum and MFSD provide a template or guidelines to their Examiners in writing a determination. Does ADNDRC do the same?				
	How do FORUM and MFSD compel their Examiners to comply with such template or guidelines? (Noting previous remarks that the quality of determinations vary from Examiner to Examiner)	ADNDRC adheres with its very strict publication rules. Within 24 hours upon receipt of that Determination, ADNDRC makes the decision			Determination shall meet the requirements of paragraphs 8 and 9 of URS Procedure and 13 and 15 of URS Rules and is of the length that the Examiner deems appropriate (no limit).

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
	The URS Documents Sub Team is suggesting that a Guide for URS Examiners be developed, to assist them with understanding the distinction between easy and more difficult cases. Question for Providers: Who should develop this guide – ICANN, each Provider, or all Providers to collaborate on a consolidated guide?	<p>Determination, ADNDRC makes the decision available online and to the Parties, the Registry, and the Registrar.</p> <p>After receiving Determinations from Examiners, ADNDRC determines whether the Determination complies with the URS Rules. If a particular Examiner's writing of Determination does not meet the standards, there usually will be an internal reference so that this particular Examiner would unlikely be appointed in future URS proceedings.</p> <p>Supplemental Rules: Article 9. Examiner Determination</p> <p>1. An Examiner shall make its Determination in writing and shall state the reasons upon which the Determination is based. The Determination shall be of a length that the Examiner deems appropriate and shall meet all the requirements set forth in Article 13 of the Rules.</p> <p>2. The Examiner shall communicate its Determination to the Relevant Office of the Centre within three (3) Business Days of its appointment. In exceptional circumstances, the Relevant Office of the Centre may extend the time as required for the Examiner to communicate its Determination.</p> <p>3. The Relevant Office of the Centre shall within 24 hours upon receipt of a Determination from the Examiner notify the Determination to the Parties, the Registrar, the Registry Operator, and ICANN, and publish the full Determination on the Centre's website according to Article 9 of the Procedure and Article 15 of the Rules.</p>		<p>Determination is transmitted to Registry (cc Registrar) with the specification of the remedy and the required actions to be taken by the Registry and to the Parties. After that the Determination is published on the MFSD Website.</p> <p>After receiving the confirmation from the Registry that the remedy is carried out, MFSD checks in the WHOIS data whether such action is reflected.</p> <p>Supplemental Rules: 13. Examiner Decisions</p> <p>Examiner decisions will meet the requirements set forth in Paragraphs 13 and 15 of the Rules and will be of a length that the Examiner deems appropriate.</p>	
	How do Examiners determine the standard of proof in URS cases?				
	How do the Providers ensure that Examiners actually provide the reasons of their respective Determinations?				
URS Rules 13 (b)	Among Examiner's Determinations, how many do not provide the reasons on which the Determination is based?				
URS Rules 13 (d)	How often was this rule invoked? What factors have been considered by Examiners in making that determination?				
Remedies					
Q from Documents Sub Team	Obtain feedback from the Providers regarding implementation of the suspension remedy.				
URS Procedure 10.3	How many successful Complainants have requested to extend the registration period for one additional year?				
URS Technical Requirements - Registry Requirement 10	Do the Providers know any cases that Registry Operators refused to offer the option for URS Complainant to extend a URS Suspended domain name's registration for an additional year?				
	Why during the one additional year of URS Suspension, the domain name must remain registered to the original Registrant, instead of the successful Complainant?				
	To implement this Procedure/Requirement, there seem to be eligibility restrictions for TLDs. Why the inconsistency?				
Determinations and Publication					
URS Rules 15 (a)	Have the Providers published all URS Determinations?	Yes	Yes	Yes	https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/79436564/URS%20Rules%20Research%20-%20URS%20Rule%2015%28a%29%28c%29%28d%29%28e%29.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1520360041000&api=v2
URS Rules 15 (c)	Has any Examiner decided to publish both the Default and Final Determinations, when the Final Determination changed the Default Determination outcome for the same case?	No - No case has both Default and Final Determinations listed (As of 06 March 2018)	Yes - 1 case (As of 06 March 2018)	No - No case has both Default and Final Determinations listed (As of 06 March 2018)	

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
URS Rules 15 (d)	Has any Examiner decided to publish both the Default and Final Determinations, when the Final Determination upheld the Default Determination outcome for the same case?	No - No case has both Default and Final Determinations listed (As of 06 March 2018)	Yes - 14 cases (As of 06 March 2018)	No - No case has both Default and Final Determinations listed (As of 06 March 2018)	v4
URS Rules 15 (e)	What are Examiners' practice with regard to the publication of Appeal Determination?				
URS Rules 15 (f)	In the URS Rules, what is the rationale in behind not linking the Determinations related to the same domain names and/or parties?				
	Have the Providers ever linked the Determinations related to the same domain names? If not, why not?				
	How many Final Determinations were made by the same Examiner who also made the Default Determinations for the same case?				
FORUM Supplemental Rules 15(b)	What is the purpose of this provision? Has any party requested to include or exclude certain information from a publicly available Determination? If so, how did FORUM act on such request?				
Settlement or Other Grounds for Termination					
URS Rules 16 (b)	How many such incidents have been recorded by the Provider (i.e., before the Examiner's Determination is made, it became unnecessary or impossible to continue the URS proceeding for any reason)?				
Effect of Court Proceedings					
URS Rules 17 (a)	How often was a legal proceeding initiated prior to or during a URS proceeding? Have there been any intervening lawsuit?				
Abusive Complaints					
MoU 2b(viii) URS Rules 18 (e) URS Procedure 11.6	How have the Providers complied with the obligation to establish and maintain a process to monitor URS abuse? Are the Providers coordinating abusive Complaints among themselves? How do the Providers share information about abusive Complaints?	ADNDRC reminds its Examiners of the existence of the abusive Complaints rule and asks them to provide ADNDRC their findings for any abusive Complaints. Currently ADNDRC does not have a mechanism that will automatically flag abusive Complaints, who would be barred from utilizing URS. It is a part of the Administrative Review process to flag that. Upon a Determination of abusive Complaints, any of the four ADNDRC offices responsible for publishing the decision will notify the other three ADNDRC offices of the result. Information regarding abusive Complaints, if any, will also be shared among the Forum, MFSD and ADNDRC.	If an Examiner finds a Complaint abusive, the Examiner will electronically flag it and FORUM staff will be notified immediately. Forum will review the Determination, inform the other Providers and add the decision to the abusive findings database shared by the Providers. The abusive Complaint determination will also be available on FORUM's website and easily found by clicking the box entitled: URS finding of abuse, on FORUM's decision search template: www.adrforum.com/SearchDecisions . FORUM is hosting the combined abusive Complaint database. Each Provider has login information to add any cases to the database. Only the Provider that adds information is able to edit any of that information; the other Providers cannot go in and take somebody out. The system is developed to inform all Providers the minute that a finding of abuse case is registered in the database.	Publication of the Determination containing a finding that a Complaint is abusive or contains deliberate material falsehoods among the Abusive of Proceedings: https://urs.mfspd.it/urs-disputes . Emailing the Determination and case details to the other two Providers (FORUM and ADNDRC). Submission to FORUM's Abusive Filing Database. Supplemental Rules: 10. Notice of the Determination to the Parties, the Registry Operator and Registrar, Publication of the Decision; abusive Complaints In case of abusive Complaint, within 1 Business Day, MFSD will submit information of the abuse to the abuse case database accessible to all URS Service Providers.	https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/79436564/URS%20Rule%2018.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1522699121668&api=v2
URS Rules 3 (e), 18(a) URS Procedure 11.2, 11.3	Have Examiners found any abusive Complaint?	No (As of 15 March 2018)	No (As of 15 March 2018) -- FORUM had one case in early 2016 that was checked in the database as abusive; it was an error and removed.	No (As of 15 March 2018)	
URS Rules 18 (d)	Have the Providers registered any case of abuse?	No (As of 15 March 2018)	No (As of 15 March 2018)	No (As of 15 March 2018)	
URS Procedure 11.1, 11.4, 11.5	Have the Providers set forward any penalty for abusive Complaint?	No (As of 15 March 2018)	No (As of 15 March 2018)	No (As of 15 March 2018)	

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
URS Rules 18 (f)	Do the Providers, incorporating it as a standard procedure, verify the admissibility of the Complaint against the abuse case database for every single URS case?	Providers would check it, but there is nothing to check at present.	Providers would check it, but there is nothing to check at present.	During the Administrative Review of the Complaint, the designated case manager would check whether the Complainant has exceeded its quota of abusive Complaints (i.e., Checklist #6 Has the Complainant exceeded its quota of abusive Complaints? – If YES – Dismissal). MFSD also checks the websites of the three Providers if there are any abusive cases regarding such Complainant.	
Appeal					
ICANN61 Presentation	What is the Appeal rate from each Provider? Do the Providers have any insight as to why there are few Appeals?	0 Appeals The reason could include that the parties are just very satisfied with the results of the examinations. Also they have alternative remedies that could be provided to them in court of competent jurisdiction. Among the 33 cases that ADNDRC has handled, only six parties have submitted Responses. This may be an indicator that a lot of Respondents have not given their consideration to the URS proceeding. The suspension of the domain name to them is probably not as serious as having the domain name transferred to the trademark owners.	14 Appeals covering 16 domains It comes down to a client decision -- it just may be not worth it for them to proceed any further.	0 Appeals Parties may not have any reasons to Appeal and may be satisfied with the outcome of the proceeding. Since the URS do not preclude subsequent UDRP proceeding, there is also the possibility to file a UDRP after the URS. MFSD has not been contacted by the Complainants or the Respondents regarding the Appeal proceeding.	
URS Rules 19 (b)	How do the Providers implement this rule? Do the Providers conduct administrative check on this? How do the Providers determine that the Appellant is in fact seeking to introduce new admissible evidence that is material to the Determination, clearly pre-dating the filing of the Complaint?				
URS Procedure 12	Has there been any case that the same Examiner was selected for the Appeal Panel whose Determination was Appealed?	The Appeal Panel members should be different from the Examiner who made Appealed Determination for the Complaint. Same rules as FORUM. Supplemental Rules: Article 12. Appointment of Appeal Panel 2. The Relevant Office of the Centre shall appoint suitable individuals from the list of Examiners to form the Appeal Panel having regard to the factors listed in Article 7 of the Supplemental Rules. <u>The Relevant Office of the Centre will not re-appoint the Examiner whose Determination is being Appealed.</u>	New appellate Examiners are appointed for Appeals. The only choice that the party would have would be at three-member panel in an Appeal - they each would give FORUM a list of three Examiner candidates. FORUM would do its best to impanel one of the three candidates from each Party's list and then Forum appoints a chair for the URS Appeals. Supplemental Rules: 16. URS Appeal Supplemental Rules And) Appeal Panel Appointment (i) If neither party has timely requested and paid for a three member Appeal Panel, the FORUM shall select an Examiner from its list of qualified Examiners to hear the Appeal. <u>The FORUM will not reappoint the Examiner who made the Determination being Appealed.</u> (ii) If either party has timely requested and paid for a three member Appeal Panel, each party shall select three Examiners from the FORUM's list of qualified Examiners within the time allotted for the Appeal or Reply submissions as stated in the Rules. The FORUM will make every effort to appoint one of the Examiners from each parties' list to the Panel, but if all three selections are unavailable, or there are insufficient Examiners who are fluent in the language needed, the FORUM will make an appropriate selection. The FORUM will appoint the presiding Examiner from its list of qualified Examiners. <u>None of the Examiners on the Appeal Panel may be the Examiner who made the Determination being Appealed.</u>	The Appeal Panel members should be different from the Examiner who made Appealed Determination for the Complaint. Supplemental Rules: 16. Appeal If either party has requested and paid the fees for the three-member panel, each party shall indicate three Examiners from MFSD's list of Examiners within the time period allotted respectively for the Submission of Appeal and the Response to the Appeal. MFSD will appoint one Examiner per party, one chosen from the names indicated by the appellant, the other chosen from those indicated by the appellee. The third Examiner is appointed by MFSD choosing from the names shown in the list of candidates submitted by MFSD to the parties; selection from the parties' candidates is made by MFSD trying to reconcile within reason the each party's preferences. <u>None of the Examiners of the three member panel shall be the same that issued the Appealed Determination.</u>	
FORUM Supplemental Rules 16(d)	How often was a three-member Appeal Panel requested? To appoint Examiners to the three-member Appeal Panel, did FORUM encounter any difficulties appointing Examiners from each parties' list to the Panel?				
Exclusion of Liability					

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
URS Rules 20	Was any Provider or Examiner directly sued for a URS Determination?				
Others					
Generally	Do the Providers envision any difficulty complying with the provisions related to WHOIS in the URS Rules, Procedure, Technical Requirements, and Supplemental Rules, given the uncertainty after GDPR goes into effect on 25 May 2018?				
Generally	Do the Providers undertake their own internal reviews of their Supplemental Rules? If yes, how often? Have the Providers found a need to tighten or provide greater clarity on their Rules in any way?				
URS Technical Requirements	Do the Providers have any difficulties complying with the highly technical requirements (e.g., PGP Keys, etc.)?				
MoU 2b(x)	Has ICANN ever enquired any information or data from the Providers?				
MoU 2c	Do ICANN and Providers maintain regular communications?				
Q from Documents Sub Team	Do the Providers think it would be feasible to add a requirement that Respondents who abuse the process should be sanctioned? (The definition of "Respondent abuse" needs to be clarified. How does the abuse of the URS process by a Respondent look like?)				
FORUM Supplemental Rules Appendix A	Did any Party submit an individual file in excess of 10MB? Did any Party submit electronic case documents in excess of 10MB, in the aggregate, per domain name?				
ICANN61 Presentation	If a domain is used to further a phishing attack, do their online filing systems accept evidence of email abuse, such as the email header?	Same Response as FORUM and MFSD.	Forum would consider the information/evidence that can be attached to the Complaint. Regarding the type of evidence that would be a permissible attachment as a follow up, that wouldn't be for FORUM to decide. That would be for the Examiners to decide whether it falls within the categories.	If it is attachable to the Complaint, it can be accepted as proof.	
ICANN61 Presentation	If the WG were to recommend the URS apply to legacy gTLDs (as a consensus policy), can the Providers easily scale their services accordingly or would they anticipate challenges doing so?	There is not much technical issue for ADNDRC to extend the current URS system to legacy domains. ADNDRC would welcome such extension as that would help ADNDRC to expand its services provided under the URS.	The system itself would be easily scalable. FORUM would have to certainly consider if it wants to undertake that, with the fee structure that is provided. FORUM is certainly not making any money off of the URS cases. What FORUM is trying to do is to give filers a complete package of options.	If URS becomes a consensus policy, MFSD has no technical problems to receive Complaints also for other type of domain names, different from new gTLDs.	

Origin	Proposed Questions	ADNDRC Response	FORUM Response	MFSD Response	Additional Notes
<p>ICANN61 Presentation</p>	<p>Q to FORUM: According to:</p> <p>[A] https://fedsoc.org/commentary/publications/national-arbitration-forum-settlement-with-minnesota-attorney-general "On July 20, 2009, Minnesota Attorney General Lori Swanson announced that the country's largest arbitrator of credit-card and consumer-collection disputes would no longer handle consumer arbitrations.</p> <p>The National Arbitration Forum's decision to end its consumer-arbitration business resulted from a settlement it reached with the State of Minnesota less than a week after Attorney General Swanson sued the company in Ramsey County, Minnesota, accusing the company of violating Minnesota's consumer-fraud, deceptive-trade-practices, and false-advertising statutes."</p> <p>[B] https://www.creditcards.com/credit-card-news/minnesota-attorney-general-lawsuit-national-arbitration-forum-1282.php</p> <p>"The lawsuit claims the NAF, the largest arbitration company in the United States, violates state consumer fraud and deceptive trade laws by hiding its financial ties to collection agencies and credit card companies. The lawsuit also claims the company violates false advertising laws by misrepresenting themselves as a neutral organization. "</p> <p>My questions are:</p> <p>(1) In light of [A], how do NAF's business practices in handling domain name disputes differ from those in the consumer-arbitration business which it left, and how can domain name registrants be confident that the same abuses which were alleged in consumer arbitrations are not present in its domain name dispute business?</p> <p>(2) In light of [B], who are the beneficial owners of NAF, and do they have any ties to the trademark industry, law firms, or anyone else that might affect its neutrality? In other words, what is the "Statement of Interest" (SOI) for NAF itself as an organization?</p>		<p>With respect to the topic of consumer arbitration, that is a political football in the United States certainly, and for the record, Forum voluntarily ceased doing consumer arbitrations. As far as how can domain name registrants be confident that those same abuses won't happen, alleged abuses won't happen here; that's why FORUM is here explaining our processes and how we do things. Everything is published, as far as Determinations, Examiner information, etc. so I don't know how I can prove a negative that we don't have those abuses anymore.</p> <p>As far as the SOI for NAF, I can't tell you who the owners are, I don't know that they can tell you who I am so I don't know how they would have any influence on how I essentially run the business the domain name programs. It's not like owners are in my office on a daily basis. I don't even know who they are necessarily. And if there are any further questions as for their identity, I think I would definitely have to run that through staff counsel.</p>		