

**Staff Proposed Introductory Text:**

Please find attached a Consolidated List of Provider Questions developed by the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) Providers Sub Team of the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPM) PDP Working Group (WG). The purpose of these questions is to help the WG gain a more thorough understanding of and insights into your practice as professional URS service providers. **You are only being asked to formulate responses insofar as you have the knowledge or ability to do so.** Some questions are addressed to specific Providers. You are welcome to reply to these questions as well, if they concern you or for any other reasons.

As the WG is planning to discuss your responses during the ICANN62 Meeting, we will be grateful to receive your responses by **Monday, 18 June 2018**. We understand that you may need more time to complete your responses to some of the questions, so please let us know a likely response time and the questions for which you believe you will need the additional time.

We have included a table of relevant responses that you have provided already, either during your presentation in ICANN61 or via follow-up emails. The table also includes the relevant Supplemental Rules and additional staff notes. While not requested by the WG, you are welcome to review and provide additional details/clarifications to the content in the table.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!

## FINAL Consolidated List of URS Provider Questions (1 May 2018)

### Communications

1. What percentage, if any, of communications to Complainants and Registrants are done in ways other than electronically/via the Internet? What alternative means are utilized?
2. Which of the two cited methods in URS Rule 2(a) do you use to deliver the Notice of Complaint, including both the hard and electronic copy? What mechanism(s) do you have in place in either method to track actual delivery to or receipt by the Respondent? Do you utilize any means to confirm receipt?
  - o *URS Rule 2(a): When forwarding a Complaint, including any annexes, electronically to the Respondent, it shall be the Provider's responsibility to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to Respondent. Achieving actual notice, or employing the following measures to do so, shall discharge this responsibility:*
    - (i) *sending the Notice of Complaint to all email, postal-mail and facsimile addresses shown in the domain name's registration data in the Whois database for the registered domain-name holder, the technical contact, and the administrative contact, as well as to any email addresses for the Respondent provided by the Complainant; and*

Commented [AL1]: Staff Question: Monday, 18 June is 45 days after Friday, 04 May, which is the last day when the finalized questions must be sent to the Providers.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Commented [AL2]: Staff Comment: This question has been amended by merging it with a previous question under "Notice of Complaint and Locking of Domain", per Justine Chew's suggestion.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

(ii) providing the Complaint, including any annexes, in electronic form, either via email to email addresses mentioned in (i) above, or via an email link to an online platform requiring users to create an account.

3. Do you conform to the communications timeline in accordance with URS Rule 2(g)?

Formatted: Not Highlight

- o URS Rule 2(g): Except as otherwise provided in these Rules, all time periods calculated under these Rules to begin when a communication is made shall begin to run on the earliest date that the communication is deemed to have been made in accordance with Rule 2(f).
- o Note also URS Rule 2(f): Except as otherwise provided in these Rules, or decided by an Examiner, all communications provided for under these Rules shall be deemed to have been made: (i) if via the Internet, on the date that the communication was transmitted, provided that the date of transmission is verifiable; or, where applicable; (ii) if delivered by telecopy or facsimile transmission, on the date shown on the confirmation of transmission; or (iii) if by postal or courier service, on the date marked on the receipt.

4. Do you receive notifications from Registry Operators via email regarding the completion of URS actions on a domain name?

Formatted: Not Highlight

5. Do you receive notification via email from Registry Operators:

- A) If a URS Locked or URS Suspended domain name has been either deleted or purged?
- B) If the registration of a URS Locked or URS Suspended domain name has expired?
- C) If a URS Suspended domain name has been renewed for an additional year?

6. Do you receive information from ICANN with regard to the point of contact of the Back End Registry Operator appointed by a Registry Operator?

7. Have you experienced difficulties in communicating with Registry Operators in respect of their role in any part of a URS proceeding? If yes, please elaborate.

Formatted: Not Highlight

## The Complaint

1. Do you accept Complaints that do not contain all the elements required in URS Rule 3(b)? Please provide your online forms for Complaint filing and identify any deviation from URS Rule 3(b).

Formatted: Not Highlight

2. Do you ask for any additional information in the Complaint beyond what is required in the URS Rules? If so, please provide the relevant provision(s) of your Supplemental Rules.

Formatted: Not Highlight

3. A) (To Forum) How does 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 URS Rule 3(b)(v)? Specifically:

Formatted: Not Highlight

Alternative (a) The RPM WG understands that the applicable categories of goods and services relating to the trademark is encoded in the SMD file. Are you able to access and read this encoded information? What part(s) of the information in the SMD file are made available to Examiners, Complainants and Respondents for the URS proceeding? OR

ALTERNATIVE (b) Can the categories of goods and services and jurisdiction of the trademark be read from the SMD file? If so, is it human or machine-readable?

Commented [MW3]: Alternative (a) was drafted by staff in light of recent emails from Justine Chew, Michael Karanicolas and Susan Payne; alternative (b) was suggested by Phil Corwin. The Sub Team is requested to indicate which alternative is preferred.

Formatted: Not Highlight

**B)** (To ADNDRC) Does ADNDRC's electronic Complaint form (Form C URS) also allow the uploading of SMD files in the same manner as MFSD?

In answering this question please note the following:

- *An SMD file is typically a file with the extension .smd and such format is not expressly provided for under Forum's Annex A. By comparison, MFSD's Supplementary Rules 3 expressly specifies the acceptance of .smd files as an annex.*
- *URS Rule 3(b)(v): Specify the trademark(s) or service mark(s) on which the complaint is based and the goods or services with which the mark is used including evidence of use – which can be a declaration and a specimen of current use in commerce - submitted directly or by including a relevant SMD (Signed Mark Data) from the Trademark Clearinghouse.*

4. What other circumstances -- not included in the non-exclusive list in the URS Procedure 1.2.6.3 -- have led your Examiners to determine that the domain name was registered and was being used in bad faith? Have there been cases where your Examiners have not expressly cited a circumstance as the basis of their finding of demonstrable bad faith registration and use? Here is the relevant provision in the [URS Procedure](#):

- *URS Procedure 1.2.6.3: that the domain was registered and is being used in bad faith. A non-exclusive list of circumstances that demonstrate bad faith registration and use by the Registrant include:*
  - Registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or*
  - Registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the trademark holder or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or*
  - Registrant registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or*
  - By using the domain name Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to Registrant's web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Registrant's web site or location or of a product or service on that web site or location.*

5. (To ADNDRC) Has any Complainant expressed any difficulty with regard to the 500-word limit set for the Complaint?

6. (To ADNDRC and Forum) Do you check to determine whether a domain that is cited in a new URS Complaint is already subject to an open and active URS or UDRP proceeding? If so, how do you find this information?

7. Do you check to determine whether a domain name subject to a URS Complaint is also involved in an active court case in the event that a Respondent does not provide a Response? If so, how do you find this information?

**Commented [AL4]: Staff Comment:** The final sub-question ((a) or (b)) that is agreed by the Sub Team will be used for both 3A and 3B.

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Commented [AL5]: Justine Chew:** Propose we retain Q4 as is. Drawing inferences is fine in terms of reviewing decisions and identifying if Examiners have cited any circumstances which do not match the list under Procedure 1.2.6.3. It is useful to have the Providers' indications as to their results and compare the same to Rebecca Tushnet's research.

**Staff suggestion in light of Justine's comment:** Our initial review of Prof. Rebecca Tushnet's research indicates that her data breaks out the various "bad faith" grounds, both those specifically listed in the URS and in an "other" category. In order to alleviate the need for the Providers to otherwise review all the Determinations, staff suggests that this data be made available to the Providers with the request that they focus on the cases in the "other" category. Leveraging Rebecca's data may be more efficient than having the Providers conduct the same data crawl and research that Rebecca has completed.

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

8. Have you accepted any Complaints that multiple related companies brought against a single domain name Registrant?

Formatted: Not Highlight

9. Have you accepted any Complaints that were filed against multiple related Registrants in the same filing?

Formatted: Not Highlight

10. How many Complaints have you accepted that listed fifteen or more disputed domain names registered by the same Registrant?

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

11. (To Forum and MFSD) How many Complaints have been dismissed as a direct result of the incorrect domain name Registrant being named in the Complaint, regardless of whether the domain name(s) registered were subject to a privacy or proxy service? Are you able to determine whether the mistake was due to Complainant error, or a WHOIS inaccuracy? If so, please share with us your analysis.

Commented [AL6]: Staff Comment: Data gathered by staff for the URS Documents Sub Team indicates that this question can already be answered. We therefore suggest **DELETING** this question. The answer is: **six (6) Complaints listed 15 or more disputed domains registered by the same Registrant**; all cases were handled by Forum.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

## Fees

1. Do you have any opinion regarding the design and feasibility of a "loser pays" model that could levy additional costs against a losing party to a URS?

Commented [AL7]: Justine Chew: Propose we retain Q2 as is. Again, it is useful to have the Providers' indications as to their results and compare the same to Rebecca Tushnet's research.

2. Among the Complaints you received that each listed fifteen or more disputed domain names registered by the same Registrant, how many Respondents filed a Response and paid the required Response Fee?

Staff Comment: Staff suggests **DELETING** this question. Based on staff's collected data and Rebecca's research, there have been no Responses filed to the 6 Complaints in question, meaning that no Response Fee for those cases was paid.

3. Have you received feedback on whether your fees structure has been a major deterrent to the filing of Complaints or Responses?

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

## Administrative Review

1. (To Forum) Has there been any issue with regard to meeting the two (2) business days requirement of conducting the Administrative Review?

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

## Notice of Complaint and Locking of Domain

1. Please provide feedback regarding your experiences in getting the disputed domain name(s) locked. In particular, have you experienced any difficulties having the URS Lock activated within 24 hours after sending the request to Registry Operators?

Commented [AL8]: Justine Chew: Propose this Q2 be **DELETED**. I suspect that the intent of this question to be already covered in Communications Q2 and hence this would be a duplicate of some kind. I am, of course, happy to be corrected if I have misunderstood the implications. Do we recall who proposed this question? ... [1]

Formatted: Strikethrough

2. Is there a way to know whether a Registrant has actually received the hard and electronic copy of the Notice of Complaint from you? Do you utilize any means to confirm receipt?

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Not Highlight

3. Have you received any notification of delayed communications to the Registrant?

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

4. (To Forum and MFSD) Have you received any notification of non-delivery of communications? If Respondents did not receive notifications on the first attempt, how could they know of the Complaint? What steps do you take if you receive notifications of non-delivery?

Commented [AL9]: Staff Comment: Staff suggests ... [2]

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

5. Do you have a view on the meaning of "a normal domain name lifecycle" (this phrase is used in Registrar Requirement 2 in the URS Technical Requirements)?

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

- 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).

Formatted: Strikethrough

## The Response

- (To Forum and MFSD) Have your Examiners received any Responses alleging an abusive Complaint? If so, how did the Examiners act in determining the validity of the allegations in those cases? What decisions were rendered on that claim? [Have your Examiners received any affirmative claims for relief from Respondents, for reasons beyond an allegation of an abusive Complaint? If so, what was the basis of the claim\(s\)?](#)

Formatted: Not Highlight

- Is this statement contained in URS Rule 5(a)(v) included in your Respondent forms?
  - URS Rule 5(v): Conclude with the following statement followed by the signature (in any electronic format) of the Respondent or its authorized representative:

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Commented [AL10]: Staff Comment: This question has been amended by merging with the related Q5 in this section, which is now proposed for DELETION (see below).

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: s

*"Respondent agrees that its claims and remedies concerning the dispute, or the dispute resolution, shall be solely against the Complainant and waives all such claims and remedies against (a) the Provider and Examiner, except in the case of deliberate wrongdoing, (b) the Registrar, (c) the Registry Operator, and (d) the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, as well as their directors, officers, employees, and agents. Respondent certifies that the information contained in this Response is, to the best of Respondent's knowledge, complete and accurate, that this Response is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, and that the assertions in this Response are warranted under these Rules and under applicable law, as it now exists or as it may be extended by a good-faith and reasonable argument."*

- Have you received any requests for an extension of time to respond?
  - If yes, how many/what percentage of the Respondents asked for an extension of time?
  - How many of these requests were received after Default (14 Calendar Days), or after Determination (no more than 30 Calendar Days)?

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

- Have you ever extended the period of time for the filing of a Response by a Respondent under exceptional cases per URS Rule 5(e)? If yes, what have you considered as "exceptional cases" in those instances?
  - URS Rules 5(e): At the request of the Respondent, the Provider may, in exceptional cases, extend the period of time for the filing of the response. The period may also be extended by written stipulation between the Parties, provided the stipulation is approved by the Provider. Requests for an extension of time shall comply with the Provider's Supplemental Rules.

Commented [AL11]: Justine Chew: I am in favour of retaining these questions as they stand.

Staff Comment: Staff suggests DELETING these questions, as our initial review of Rebecca's research data indicates that no requests for extension of time to respond have been made.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

Commented [AL12]: Staff Comment: Staff suggests DELETING this question as it has now been merged with Q1 in this same section.

- Have you received any affirmative claims for relief by the Respondent for reasons beyond an allegation of abusive Complaint? If you have, what was the basis of the claim(s)?

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

- Have you conducted a compliance check for a Respondent for factors beyond the two items stated in URS Rule 5(g)?

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

- *URS Rule 5(g): The Provider's compliance check for a Response shall at least consist of: (1) ascertaining the Response has been filed in a language acceptable under the Rules for that case; and (2) checking for payment of required fees.*
7. (To Forum and MFSD) Who determines whether a Response is non-compliant – you or the appointed Examiner?
  8. How many/what percentage of Responses were determined to be non-compliant?
  9. How many Responses were filed but were not accompanied by payment of any required fees?
  10. Can you identify any case in which the Response was determined non-compliant for reasons other than the non-payment of the fees? If any, what was the reason(s)?
  11. Do you believe the deadline for filing Responses is long enough? (Please provide your rationale and any feedback from Respondents that the time period is insufficient.) If not, what time period would you support, keeping in mind that the URS is supposed to operate with rapidity?
  12. Have you received any late Responses?
  13. (To ADNDRC and MFSD) A) Has any Respondent expressed any difficulty with regard to the 2,500-word limit set for the Response?
    - B) Do you believe that the balance of the word limits for the Complaint (500 words) and the Response (2,500 words) is reasonable? If not, what adjusted balance would you suggest?
  14. Where, to your knowledge, Responses were filed containing facts that sought to refute the claims of bad faith registration by setting out circumstances other than those in URS Procedure 5.7, were such facts persuasive? If so, should additional grounds be added to Procedure 5.7?
    - *URS Procedure 5.7: The Response can contain any facts refuting the claim of bad faith registration by setting out any of the following circumstances:*
      - 5.7.1 *Before any notice to Registrant of the dispute, Registrant's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or*
      - 5.7.2 *Registrant (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if Registrant has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or*
      - 5.7.3 *Registrant is making a legitimate or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Such claims, if found by the Examiner to be proved based on its evaluation of all evidence, shall result in a finding in favor of the Registrant.*
  15. (To FORUM) What is the purpose of FORUM Supplemental Rule 5(d)(ii)? In any cases in which this Rule has been employed:
    - A) Has any other named Respondent sought to be separated out from the case?
    - B) Have any Registrants asked to be dismissed from the case on the basis of not having registered or being in control of the domain? If so, have your Examiners granted or denied such requests?
    - *FORUM Supplemental Rules 5(d): Multiple Respondents.*
      - (ii) *If you are named in a case that contains domain names not registered or controlled by*

**Commented [AL13]: Staff Comment:** This rewording is based on the most recent Sub Team feedback.

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Deleted:** Where, t

**Deleted:**

**Deleted:** were

**Commented [AL14]: Staff Comment:** This suggested rewording was supported by Justine Chew; it replaces the first part of the original question, which was: "Have your Examiners received Responses that contain facts that sought to refute the claim of bad faith registration by setting out circumstances other than those included in URS Procedure 5.7?" The rewording was suggested based on an initial review of Rebecca's research, which shows that such responses were indeed filed.

**Deleted:** ? W

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

*you, you may request that the Examiner dismiss the case as to any domain names not owned by you. It is up to the Examiner's discretion to make a factual finding as to whether or not the evidence supports your claim.*

## Stay of the Administrative Proceeding

1. Have you received any joint requests for a Stay of the Administrative Proceeding? If yes, how many cases were reinstated or otherwise dismissed upon expiration of the Stay?
2. Have you received any requests for a Stay after the appointment of the Examiner? If so, how was this handled?

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

## Examiner

1. What factors should we consider in regard to evaluating your processes and practices pertaining to Examiners' selection and training?
2. (To ADNDRC and Forum) Why have the qualifications of some of your Examiners not been published?
3. (To MFSD) What is your conflict of interest policy for Examiners? How do you make the Examiners aware of their obligation to be impartial and independent?
4. (To MFSD) How do your Examiners confirm their impartiality and independence?
5. Can you provide a copy of any oath taken by your Examiners to affirm that they will be neutral and independent? Is the oath signed by the Examiners?
6. Do you undertake any independent inquiries to adequately satisfy yourself of your Examiners' impartiality and independence? Or do you rely solely upon the oath or declaration made by each Examiner?
7. (To Forum and MFSD) Has any of your Examiners voluntarily disclosed any conflict of interest? If not, then what action was taken upon discovery of any conflict? If a conflict was disclosed, did the Examiner do this before and/or during the case proceeding?
8. Has there been any incident in which an allegation of partiality, non-independence, or bias of an Examiner was raised by any party to 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 subsequently evaluated?
9. (To Forum and MFSD) When a conflict of interest has been confirmed, what remedial actions have been taken? Is any Examiner who failed to disclose a proven conflict permitted to preside in subsequent cases?
10. (To Forum) Why do you have a requirement that any request to challenge the selection of an Examiner must be filed within one (1) Business Day under Forum Supplemental Rule 10(d)? Has any party filed a challenge after the end of the required time period? Have Respondents alleged any difficulties in meeting this deadline for filing a challenge?

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

- o *FORUM Supplemental Rules 10(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.*

11. (To ADNDRC) Has ADNDRC experienced any instance where an Examiner refused or failed to act per your Supplemental Rules 8.4? What motivated ADNDRC to adopt Rule 8.4?

- o *ADNDRC Supplemental Rules 8.4: 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.*

12. Has any Examiner ever been removed from the pool of Examiners for any reason? If so, why? What behaviors would disqualify/bar an Examiner from future cases?

13. [Do you permit one to continue being an Examiner if one represented a Complainant in a URS or UDRP proceeding where there was finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking?](#)

14. [How large is the pool of URS Examiners? Are the Examiners randomly assigned, rotated, or assigned using some other procedure \(please specify\)?](#)

o Providers' Responses

**ADNDRC: 180 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.

**Form: 122 Examiners** -- Rotation with 4 cases assigned at a time, with exceptions made for Examiner's availability and language considerations.

**MFSD: 23 Examiners** -- 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.

15. [What steps, if any, do you take to ensure that your Examiners have a diversity of relevant experience? \(e.g., have experience representing Respondents as well as Complainants\) If so, please explain!](#)

Language

1. Do you think it would be feasible to mandate sending Registry and Registrar notices in the same language(s)?

Formatted: Not Highlight

Commented [AL15]: **Staff Comment:** Per Sub Team feedback, staff have removed the original question proposed by Kirikos, which states: "Is one permitted to continue be an Examiner if one has represented a client in a domain dispute (URS or UDRP) where there was a Determination that the Complaint was an abuse of the process?"

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

Commented [AL16]: **Justine Chew:** I actually take the view that this question has been answered in totality by Providers (see Providers' responses) and do not see why this Q14 should not be DELETED altogether.

**Staff Comment:** Staff suggests **DELETING** this question, as this question has been answered by the Providers.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Commented [AL17]: **Staff Comment:** This wording reflects the most recent Sub Team members' agreement on this question.

Formatted: Not Highlight



- *Background: 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.*

2. Are all of your Examiners fluent in English?

3. Are all of your assigned Examiners fluent in the non-English language of the Respondents?

4. Can you provide any information as to whether, and in how many instances, it has been demonstrated that a Respondent had the capability of understanding English in addition to their primary language?

**Commented [AL18]: Staff Comment:** Rebecca's research data notes specific decisions published in languages other than English, as well as cases where it was specifically noted that an Examiner was fluent in other language(s). While this may not answer the question, it may be an interesting data point for the WG to review.

Formatted: Not Highlight

## Further Statement

1. Have you acted in conformance with URS Rule 10 by not allowing an Examiner to request further statements or documents from either of the Parties?

Formatted: Not Highlight

- *URS Rules 10: In order to ensure expedience of the proceeding, the Examiner may not request further statements or documents from either of the Parties.*

Formatted: Not Highlight

## Withdrawal

1. (To FORUM) Do you have any explanation of the seeming inconsistency between the use of the phrase "without prejudice" in 12(a), versus "with or without prejudice" used in 12(b) of the FORUM Supplemental Rules?

Formatted: Not Highlight

- *FORUM Supplemental Rules 12(a): Prior to the first issued Determination, the Complainant may withdraw the Complaint without prejudice. A withdrawal request must be Submitted to the FORUM via the online portal. Upon the FORUM's receipt of the withdrawal request, the Complaint will be withdrawn without prejudice and the administrative proceeding will be terminated.*

Formatted: Not Highlight

- *FORUM Supplemental Rules 12(b): Prior to the first issued Determination, the Complaint may be withdrawn pursuant to a joint request made by both parties. A withdrawal request must be Submitted to the FORUM via the online portal, must be consented to by both parties, and may request dismissal either with or without prejudice.*

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

**Commented [AL19]: Staff/WG Comment:** Sub Team should consider **DELETING** this question, as Providers do not have the capability to prevent changing the content of a site.

**Justine Chew:** Now that we are somewhat confident that Providers have no control over content of a site, I propose to turn the question around to ask if a Registrant has exploited this 'loophole' to change site content then submitting "evidence of changed content" in its Response to defeat a Complaint. I welcome comments, edits.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Highlight

Deleted: question

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

## Default

1. With reference to URS Procedure 6.2, how do you assist in ensuring that the Registrant is actually prohibited from changing content on their site during the Default period?

**Alternative (a) proposed by Justine Chew:** With reference to URS Procedure 6.2, to your knowledge, has there been any Response filed appending evidence of site content which directly conflicts with the Complainant's claim? If yes, did such evidence point to the Registrant having changed its site content during the Default period?  
(to retain bulleted URS Procedure 6.2 as reference)

Alternative (b) proposed by staff: With reference to URS Procedure 6.2, to your knowledge, has any Registrant changed content on their sites during the Default period, possibly to support an argument that there has been a legitimate use? If so, do you know how the matter was handled?

- o URS Procedure 6.2: In either case, the Provider shall provide Notice of Default via email to the Complainant and Registrant, and via mail and fax to Registrant. During the Default period, the Registrant will be prohibited from changing content found on the site to argue that it is now a legitimate use and will also be prohibited from changing the Whois information.

2. Has any of your Examiners drawn inferences per URS Rule 12(f) when a party is not in compliance with URS Rules, Procedures, and Supplemental Rules, in the absence of exceptional circumstances? If so, what inferences were made?

- o URS Rules 12(f): If a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, these Rules, the URS Procedure or the Provider's Supplemental Rules, the Examiner shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate.

- Deleted: Reformulated question
- Deleted: do you know
- Deleted: s
- Deleted: that
- Deleted: argue for
- Formatted: Not Highlight
- Formatted: Not Highlight
- Formatted: Not Highlight
- Formatted: Not Highlight
- Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

## Examiner Determination

1. To your knowledge, has any Examiner rendered his/her Determination based upon wordmark factors beyond the three elements enumerated in URS Procedure 8.1.2?

- o URS Procedure 8.1: The standards that the qualified Examiner shall apply when rendering its Determination are whether: 8.1.2 The registered domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark: (i) for which the Complainant holds a valid national or regional registration and that is in current use; or (ii) that has been validated through court proceedings; or (iii) that is specifically protected by a statute or treaty currently in effect and that was in effect at the time the URS Complaint is filed;

Formatted: Not Highlight

2. Do you know of any situation in which the nominal registrant changed after the Complaint was filed? If so, how was it handled?

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Commented [AL20]: **Staff Comment:** This does not seem to be a question the Providers can answer without checking the full WHOIS history; however, this may still not be entirely accurate. Staff suggests DELETING this question.

3. Noting that URS Rule 13(a) provides that an Examiner may "make a Determination ... in accordance with ... any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable", are you aware of instances where an Examiner has invoked substantive criteria beyond those articulated in the URS Rules, Procedure and Supplemental Rules?

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

4. How do you compel your Examiners to comply with your templates in writing their Determinations or guidelines? Do you intervene in an administrative capacity to ensure your Examiners provide the most comprehensive written Determinations they possibly can? How do you strive to standardize the completeness or quality of your Examiners' written Determinations beyond the use of your online Determination template or form?

Commented [AL21]: **Staff Comment:** Rebecca's research includes data on the cases where Examiners invoked "other" substantive criteria beyond the URS Rules, Procedure, and Supplemental Rules. In order to alleviate the need for the Providers to check all Examinations, staff therefore suggests that Rebecca's data be made available to the Providers with the suggestion that they focus on this data subset. Leveraging Rebecca's research yields may be more efficient than having the Providers conduct the same data crawl and research that Rebecca has completed.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

5. The URS Documents Sub Team has suggested that a Guide for URS Examiners be developed, to assist them with understanding the distinction between clear-cut and more difficult cases. Do you agree? If so, who should develop this guide – ICANN, each Provider separately, or should all Providers collaborate to develop a uniform guide?

6. How do your Examiners apply the “clear and convincing evidence” standard of proof required in URS cases?
7. How do you ensure that Examiners actually provide some explanation of the facts and reasoning in support of their Determinations? If you do not do so, please explain why.
8. Among your Examiner’s Determinations, how many did not provide the reasons on which the Determination is based but simply state that the URS elements have been established?
9. How often has URS Rule 13(d) been invoked? What factors have been cited by Examiners in making that determination?
  - o *URS Rules 13(d): If after considering the submissions the Examiner finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith or was brought primarily to harass the domain name holder, the Examiner shall declare in its Determination that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the URS proceeding.*
10. (a) Do you supply the Examiners with information, analysis or research concerning a Complaint or Response that is not to be found within the Complaint or Response itself? If so, please explain.  
 (b) Do you provide drafts or exemplars to the Examiners? If so, please explain.

**Providers’ Responses:**

**ADNDRC:** ADNDRC has a template for Examiners and has all past Determinations made available online for Examiners to reference. When examiners log onto the ADNDRC case determination system, they will be directed to an Online Determination Form with basic guidelines for structuring an URS determination. However, ADNDRC does not restrain the way that the examiners would like to write their decision. 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. ADNDRC adheres with its very strict publication rules. Within 24 hours upon receipt of that Determination, ADNDRC makes the decision available online and to the Parties, the Registry, and the Registrar. 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.

**FORUM:** 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.

**MFSD:** 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. Determination shall

**Commented [AL22]: Staff Comment:** Please see our comment above for Q3; here we similarly suggest directing the Providers to focus on the data subset where “other” substantive criteria were invoked by the Examiner.

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Commented [AL23]: Justine Chew:** I am in favour of retaining this question as it stands. No changes.

**Staff Comment:** Staff’s initial review of Rebecca’s research suggests that the numerical answer to this question can be derived from the data; we suggest **DELETING** the question.

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Strikethrough

**Commented [AL24]: Staff Comment:** Staff suggest **DELETING** this question, as the Providers have stated that there has been zero (0) findings of abusive Complaints, meaning that URS Rule 13(d) has not been invoked.

**Formatted:** Strikethrough, Highlight

**Formatted:** Strikethrough, Highlight

**Formatted:** Strikethrough, Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Commented [MW25]: Phil Corwin:** I am fine with the reformulation – but do we need to ask this given the extensive responses we already have?

**Commented [AL26]: Staff Comment:** Per Sub Team’s comments, staff have incorporated Justine’s editorial comments to George Kirikos’ rewritten question, and deleted the previous alternative offered by Cyntia, which states: “Do you provide Examiners with templates, preferred language or any other standardized material to be used in the writing of decisions? If so, please provide the language, templates or materials (or links to these).”

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Formatted:** Not Highlight

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). 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. After receiving the confirmation from the Registry that the remedy is carried out, MFSD checks in the WHOIS data whether such action is reflected.

## Remedies

1. Please provide feedback regarding any difficulties encountered in the implementation of the suspension remedy.
2. Are you aware of any instances where a successful Complainant has requested the extension of the registration period of the URS Suspended domain name for one additional year? If so, do you know if any of them encountered difficulties extending the registration period of a URS Suspended domain name for the additional year? If so, do you know how the matter was handled?
3. During the one additional year of URS Suspension available to the successful Complainant, the domain name must remain registered to the original Registrant. Should the registration information be altered in such circumstances?
4. Have you received any notices or queries from any party regarding procedural and/or implementation anomalies or mistakes following the issuance of a Determination (e.g., resolution of a domain name to particular Name Servers following issuance of a Determination)? If yes, what action did you take on receiving the notice or to resolving the query?

## Determinations and Publication

1. What is your Examiners' practice with regard to the publication of an Appeal Determination?
2. Do you agree with the policy embodied in URS Rule 15(f)?
  - o URS Rule 15(f): Determinations related to the same domain names and/or parties, but not part of the same case, need not be linked in any way on the Provider's website.
3. Has any Determination that your Examiners have issued concerned the same domain name(s) at issue in a prior case? If so, have you linked the cases? Has any Final Determination been made by the same Examiner who made the initial Default Determination in the same case? If so, how many times has this occurred?
4. (To FORUM) What is the purpose of FORUM Supplemental Rule 15(b)? Has any party requested to include or exclude certain information from a publicly available Determination? If so, how did FORUM act on such request?

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: If

Deleted: are

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: when

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: ,

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: how many/what percentage of successful Complainants have requested such extension? To your knowledge, has

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: any successful Complainant

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted:

Deleted: renewing

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: one

Formatted: Highlight

Commented [AL28]: **Staff Comment:** Staff suggests **DELETING** this question on the basis that the staff data collected for the URS Documents Sub Team has the answer - There has been fourteen (14) Appeal cases, only one (1) of which saw the Examiner exercise the permitted discretion to publish only the Appeal Determination and not both the Appeal and initial Determinations (see URS Rule 15(e)).

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Not Highlight

Commented [AL29]: **Staff Comment:** Staff's initial review of Rebecca's research shows that data has been included that can answer Parts 1, 3 and 4 of this question. As such, staff proposes that the Providers be requested to focus on answering only Part 2 of the question.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: **Alternative question proposed by staff:** If there is any Determination that concerns the same domain name(s) at issue in a prior case, do you link these cases? ¶

Formatted: Not Highlight

- *FORUM Supplemental Rules 15(b): All requests pursuant regarding what information a party wants included or excluded from a publicly available Determination must be made in a timely, compliant Complaint or Response.*

## Settlement or Other Grounds for Termination

1. How many "unnecessary or impossible" incidents, per URS Rule 16(b), have been recorded by you?
  - *URS Rules 16(b): If, before the Examiner's Determination is made, it becomes unnecessary or impossible to continue the URS proceeding for any reason, the Examiner shall terminate the proceeding, unless a Party raises justifiable grounds for objection within a period of time to be determined by the Examiner.*

## Effect of Court Proceedings

1. To your knowledge, have there been instances of legal proceedings relating to URS proceedings and, if so, what effect did such instance(s) have?

Formatted: Not Highlight

Commented [AL30]: **Justine Chew: I have a feeling that the original intent of the question is now being obscured with the reworded question** -- I thought the original question sought to understand whether Providers check of legal proceedings initiated prior to or during a URS proceeding in order to exercise discretion whether to suspend or terminate the URS proceeding or proceed to a Determination. See URS Rule 17.

Deleted: How often, if ever, was a related legal proceeding initiated prior to or during a URS proceeding? What was the effect on the URS proceeding?

## Appeal

1. How do you implement URS Rule 19(b)? Do you conduct an administrative check on the data of any additional evidence sought to be introduced? How do you determine that the Appellant in seeking to introduce new evidence, is in fact, providing evidence that is material to the Determination and clearly pre-dates the filing of the Complaint?
  - *URS Rule 19(b): Appellant shall have a limited right to introduce new admissible evidence that is material to the Determination subject to payment of an additional fee, provided the evidence clearly pre-dates the filing of the Complaint.*

2. ~~(To FORUM) How often/in what percentage of Appeals was a three member Appeal Panel requested? Which party made the request?~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [AL32]: **Staff Comment:** Staff suggests **DELETING** this question. Based on staff data collected for the Documents Sub Team and Rebecca's research, **nine (9) out of fourteen (14) Appeal cases had three-member Appeal Panels.**

3. (To FORUM) In appointing Examiners to the three-member Appeal Panel, did you encounter any difficulties appointing Examiners from each party's list to the Panel?

**Justine Chew:** I am agreeable to staff suggestion to **DELETE** this question since the intent of it is covered by Documents Sub Team's analysis.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

## Exclusion of Liability

1. Have you or any of your Examiners been sued in regard to the issuance of a URS Determination?

## Others

1. Have you undertaken any internal reviews of your Supplemental Rules? If yes, how often? Have you discerned a need to tighten or provide greater clarity to your Supplemental Rules?

2. Do you have any difficulties complying with the URS technical requirements (e.g., utilizing PGP Keys, etc.)?

3. Do you maintain any regular communications with ICANN? If yes, [did ICANN request any information or data from you via such communications? What other areas of the URS do such communications touch on? Please provide details.](#)

4. (To FORUM) Did any party submit an individual file in excess 10MB? Did any party submit electronic case documents in excess of 10MB, in the aggregate, per domain name?

5. Do you think it would be feasible to add a requirement that Respondents who abuse the process should be sanctioned? What would be an indication of Respondent abuse, beyond bad faith registration and use of a domain name?

---

#### General Comments from Sub Team Members

Phil Corwin: I would not ask questions where staff believes we have already received complete answers from the Providers – but if in doubt as to completeness, include the questions. I would include questions that may be somewhat illuminated by Prof. Tushnet's research and analysis because, as stated below, that may only provide partial answers.

**Commented [AL33]: Staff Comment:** Per Sub Team feedback, staff deleted the original Q4 ("Has ICANN ever requested any information or data from you since entering into your MoU) and part of the original Q3 ("What areas of the URS do such communications touch on?").

Formatted: Highlight

**Commented [AL34]: WG Comment:** Remove this question if no suggestion for rephrasing is put forward.

**Cynthia King:** We could ask if Providers support sanctions against abusers of the process whether Complainant or Respondent.

**Justine Chew:** I agree with the WG comment to **DELETE** this question if no suggestion for rephrasing is put forward.

I have difficulties with Q5 as currently worded. In the first part of Q5, it is not clear what is meant by "abuse the process" because the 2nd part goes on to refer to "... an indication of Respondent abuse, beyond bad faith registration and use of a domain name".

There seems to be disconnect between "abuse of process" meaning abuse of the use of URS proceedings versus "... abuse, beyond bad faith registration and use of a domain name" which is the subject of URS proceedings.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

**Justine Chew:** Propose this Q2 be **DELETED**. I suspect that the intent of this question to be already covered in Communications Q2 and hence this would be a duplicate of some kind. I am, of course, happy to be corrected if I have misunderstood the implications. Do we recall who proposed this question?

**Staff Comment:** We suggest DELETING this question as it has now been merged with Communications Q2 (see page 1).

**Staff Comment:** Staff suggests **DELETING** this question, as the answer is published on icann.org as a "fact": <https://archive.icann.org/en/registrars/gtld-lifecycle.jpg>. It may also be more appropriate to ask registries and registrars for views on this question.

**Justine Chew:** I support staff's suggestion (which I believe has been reflected in WG discussions) to **DELETE** this Q5.