**Row 4:**

ADNDRC – electronically only, fax or letter types of postal mail are not provided

FORUM – electronically, fax, postal mail, phone calls

MFSD – electronically, fax, postal mail

**Row 6:**

ADNDRC – 100% electronically

FORUM – email (vast majority), U.S. mail, fax, phone

MFSD – communications to Complaints 100% email, communications to Respondents 100% email, Notice of Complaint and Notice of Default are sent to Respondents via email, courier (except for P.O. Box addresses), registered letter with return receipt, or fax

**Row 7:**

ADNDRC – only delivers the Notice of Complaint electronically

FORUM – sends the Notice Complaint utilizing U.S. Mail, sends Complaints and annexes via email, does not confirm receipt but saves a log of rejected emails, failed faxes, and returned mail

MFSD – sends the electronic copy of the Notice of Complaint as well as a hard copy via courier (except for P.O. Box addresses), or registered letter with return receipt, or fax; provides details of the method tracking; only sends the electronic copy of the Complaint and its annexures

**Row 9:**

(Not divergent responses) ADNDRC and MFSD noted delay in receiving notification regarding the completion of URS actions; MFSD also submitted reports to ICANN after having attempted several times to receive modifications from the Registry Operator on the completion of the requested URS actions.

**Row 10:**

ANDRC – yes to all questions

FORUM – pending response prior to ICANN62

MFSD – no to all questions

**Row 11:**

ADNDRC – no

FORUM & MFSD – yes

**Row 12:**

(Not divergent responses) FORUM noted the difficulty in getting the Registry and Registrar to implement a settlement which involves a transfer at the Registrar level; MFSD noted that some RO’s email addresses are different from the contact present in ICANN’s repository; MFSD also noted the cases when they had to submit reports to ICANN for the lack of response/implementation by the Registry Operator.

**Row 14:**

ADNDRC – yes

FORUM & MFSD – no (MFSD accepts “Doe Complaint” starting from 25 May 2018)

**Row 17:**

ADNDRC – no

FORUM – pending response prior to ICANN62

MFSD – MFSD noted “other circumstances”: use of false contact details; failure to provide any evidence of bona fide registration and use; failure to submit any response; changed website content after having received the letter of Complainant’s lawyer and redirected the domain name to another website; passive holding of the domain name while having registered a vast number of domain names incorporating well-known trademarks under the same new gTLD; constructive knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark; adult content; failure to reply to cease and desist letters

**Row 18:**

ADNDRC & MFSD – no

FORUM – yes

**Row 19:**

ADNDRC – yes, conducts cross-checks

FORUM – replies heavily upon info from Complaint, but conducts searches if there is a suspicion

MFSD – yes, conducts manual online research at the URS and UDRP Providers’ websites

**Row 21:**

ADNDRC – yes (no elaboration on the number of such Complaints)

FORUM – yes

MFSD – no

**Row 22:**

ADNDRC – yes (no elaboration on the number of such Complaints)

FORUM – yes

MFSD – no

**Row 23:**

FORUM – yes

ADNDRC & MFSD – no

**Row 26:**

FORUM & MFSD – against

ADNDRC - not against

**Row 28:**

(Not divergent responses) MFSD provided thoughtful comments with regard to the difficulties of filing “Doe Complaints”, as well as other factors deterrent to filling Complaints; MFSD also offered suggestions for procedural amendments to resolve some of the issues facing the Doe Complaints.

**Row 31:**

ADNDRC – more than 2 cases

FORUM – 17 cases

MFSD – 3 cases

**Row 33:**

(Not divergent responses) FORUM emphasized their greater concerns with regard to having the lock activated within 24 hours, due to GDPR.

**Row 35:**

ADNDRC – no

FORUM – yes

MFSD – yes (no elaboration on the number of such notifications)

**Row 40:**

FORUM – yes (36 cases)

ADNDRC & MFSD – no

**Row 41:**

FORUM – yes

ADNDRC & MFSD – no

**Row 42:**

FORUM & MFSD – yes

ADNDRC – no

**Row 43:**

ADNDRC – ADNDRC only flags the “superficial formatting and non-compliance issue”, and the appointed Examiners screen the other non-compliance issues

FORUM – FORUM screens all response compliance issues

MFSD – MFSD only screens non-payment issue, and flags other non-compliance issues for the Examiner to consider

**Row 47:**

(Not divergent responses) MFSD provided additional information with regard to the possibility for Respondents to request an extension of time to respond

**Row 49:**

ADNDRC – (paid by Respondent, 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

FORUM – (paid by Respondent, non-refundable)

re-examination fee, more than 30 days late – US $200; re-examination extension fee – US $100

MFSD – (paid by Respondent, non-refundable)

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;

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

**Row 50:**

FORUM – yes (not long enough - feedback from both Respondents and Complaints; no suggestion on adjusted balance),

ADNDRC & MFSD – no

**Row 53:**

ADNDRC & MFSD – no feedback

FORUM – respondent did not know how to proceed and needed FORUM’s assistance; general complaints regarding online filing portal

**Row 55:**

FORUM – yes (58 cases)

ADNDRC & MFSD – no

**Row 56:**

FORUM – yes

ADNDRC & MFSD – no

**Row 60:**

ADNDRC – “panel selection and training processes must be flexible and not rigorous”, no elaboration on detailed factors

FORUM – dispute resolution experience, language skills, experience in IP/domain name disputes, willingness to get paid less, availability, fast turnaround, UDRP Panelists

MFSD – language skills, experience in IP/domain name disputes/ADR proceedings, UDRP Panelists/TLD Panelists, Examiners at the other two Providers, appointment, education/training opportunities

**Row 62:**

ADNDRC – qualifications will be published “subject to examiner’s consent on how much information can be made publicly available”

FORUM – “there may be very brief moments when a current Examiner’s qualifications are not available because they are being updated”

MFSD – qualifications of all Examiners are published

**Row 63:**

ADNDRC – if the Parties consent, a person may serve as an Examiner if he/she has any interest in the dispute

FORUM & MFSD – no indication of such exception

**Row 65:**

ADNDRC – email

FORUM – Neutral’s Oath

MFSD – email & confirmation on Determination form

**Row 67:**

ADNDRC – didn’t provide a direct answer

FORUM – yes, case coordinator notes the conflict of interest, case is then reassigned to the next Examiner in the rotation

MFSD – yes, before appointment, MFSD requests Examiner to disclose possible conflict of interest.

**Row 73:**

ADNDRC – 180 Examiners

FORUM – 122 Examiners

MFSD – 23 Examiners

**Row 74:**

ADNDRC – assignment depends on nature of the disputes, availability, identity of the Parties, nationality of the Parties, Examiners’ independence and impartiality, their past experience working with URS Parties, legal background

FORUM – rotation with 4 cases assigned at a time, exception made for availability and language considerations

MFSD – assignment depends on language skills, availability

**Row 75:**

(Not divergent responses) ADNDRC did not provide complete response to the third sub question

**Row 76:**

ADNDRC – will not permit such Examiner to continue presiding in a URS case

FORUM – did not provide complete response

MFSD – no monitoring of UDRP proceedings with finding of RDNH, evaluate on a case by case basis should that happen

**Row 77:**

ADNDRC – no elaboration on the specific steps

FORUM – pending response prior to ICANN62

MFSD – “open, transparent and non-discriminatory” selection process, “engage with various stakeholders of the Internet community, including domain owners' associations, and encourage professionals having language skills and thorough experience in domain name disputes to send us their CVs and requests of accreditation”

**Row 79:**

ADNDRC – only in English

FORUM & MFSD – provides translation and appoints Examiners that speak the language of the Respondent

**Row 80:**

ADNDRC – no

FORUM & MFSD – yes

**Row 81:**

(Not divergent responses) MFSD did not provide a direct answer

**Row 84:**

(Not divergent responses) ADNDRC did not elaborate on any instances, unlike MFSD. Response from FORUM is pending prior to ICANN62.

**Row 92:**

ADNDRC – no

FORUM – pending response prior to ICANN62

MFSD – yes

**Row 95:**

ADNDRC – references past UDRP/URS cases

FORUM – pending response prior to ICANN62

MFSD – no

**Row 97:**

ADNDRC – “routinely go through Examiners decisions to ensure standards of decisions, and will note down Examiners who we think have not adhered with the standards or qualities of URS awards, and will not appoint them”

FORUM – does not intervene “unless there is a Determination or series of Determinations by the same Examiner that are in some way questionable”

MFSD – “Examiners were encouraged by MFSD to refer to WIPO Overview of WIPO Panels Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0)”; “adopts the best practice of well-known international Dispute Resolution Providers (e.g. WIPO and CAC), known also as ex-post quality check”; “the only sanction applicable by MFSD…is the de-accreditation and de-listing of an Examiner”; monitors case law and education of Examiners

**Row 98:**

ADNDRC – yes, collaboration with the other providers and ICANN

FORUM & MFSD – not necessarily, but if yes, collaboration with the other providers

**Row 99:**

ADNDRC – no elaboration on how Examiners apply the “clear and convincing evidence”

FORUM – pending response prior to ICANN62

MFSD – “Section VII of our online Determination form…requires the Examiners to reassume the position and defenses of the Parties (A and B), the procedural findings (C), the findings of facts (D), the reasoning with reference to the three URS requirements (paragraph 1.2.6 of the URS Procedure), providing them with instructions and guidelines on the URS elements and defenses”

**Row 100:**

ADNDRC – provides Examiners online Guidelines which requires them to provide some explanations of facts and reasoning in support of their Determinations

FORUM – does not undertake to review each Determination for an explanation of the facts and reasoning

MFSD – “Section VII of our online Determination form…requires the Examiners to reassume the position and defenses of the Parties (A and B), the procedural findings (C), the findings of facts (D), the reasoning with reference to the three URS requirements (paragraph 1.2.6 of the URS Procedure), providing them with instructions and guidelines on the URS elements and defenses”

**Row 103:**

ADNDRC & FORUM – no to A) and B)

MFSD – A) provides information regarding the case management (procedural matters), B) Determination form is partially filled with some data (identification of Parties, domain name, Registry Operator and Registrar, procedural history and Examiner's name) captured automatically by the online dispute management system), and the Examiners is encouraged to refer to WIPO Overview of WIPO Panels Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0) and to cite URS and UDRP case law they retain significant for the decision of the dispute.

**Row 105:**

ADNDRC – no difficulties

FORUM & MFSD – delay in the activation of the URS suspension or non-implementation of URS suspension

**Row 106:**

ADNDRC – no

FORUM – yes, the roles of Registry and Registrar may not have been understood by one or the other in the process

MFSD – yes, but no further information if extension was obtained

**Row 111:**

ADNDRC & MFSD – no

FORUM – yes (1 case)

**Row 112:**

ADNDRC & MFSD – no

FORUM – yes (14 cases)

**Row 115:**

ADNDRC & MFSD – no (answers to the questions are not complete)

FORUM – Yes

**Row 122 & 123**

(Not divergent responses) FORUM is hosting the combined abusive Complaint database; abusive Complaint determination can be easily found by clicking a box on the FORUM website

**Row 128:**

ADNDRC & MFSD – 0 Appeals

FORUM – 14 Appeals covering 16 domains

**Row 129:**

(Not divergent responses) MFSD provided details of its administrative review in the event that the Appellant may introduce new admissible evidence

**Row 136:**

ADNDRC – answer is unclear

FORUM – yes, made a change regarding fees for multiple domain names

MFSD – Yes, made a change in schedule of fees

**Row 137:**

ADNDRC – yes

FORUM & MFSD – no

**Row 138:**

(Not divergent responses) ADNDRC did not provide any details with regard to the information/data in the communications with ICANN