**DRAFT FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS TO THE THREE TM-PDDRP PROVIDERS**

1. Do you agree that the TM-PDDRP, in its present form, does not permit the filing of a joint complaint by multiple different trademark holders even against the same registry operator for the same allegedly infringing behavior in respect of different trademarks?
2. Under your Supplemental Rules, is consolidation of several complaints by the same trademark owner against different registry operators permitted? If so, what are the limitations?
3. Under your Supplemental Rules, is consolidation of several complaints by different trademark owners (including unaffiliated entities) against the same registry operator permitted? If so, what are the limitations?
4. What is your view on the proposal to add the express possibility of a joint complaint to the TM-PDDRP and/or your Supplemental Rules, which essentially would clarify pre-filing and post-filing consolidation of complaints and minimize any administrative burdens of consolidation on your organization while also maximizing efficiency and cost-effectiveness for complainants?

**DRAFT SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR IPC/BC MEMBERS**

1. Are you aware of the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP) that was developed as a rights protection mechanism for the 2012 New gTLD Program?
2. Have you (or your clients) considered using it?
3. If you (or your clients) have considered filing a complaint but did not proceed, what were the reasons?
4. Has there been any registry conduct that you believe constitutes a “substantial pattern or practice of specific bad faith intent to profit” from the sale of domain names at the second level that you believe the TM-PDDRP should, but currently does not, address?