**QUESTIONS FOR ICANN COMPLIANCE, EXTERNAL LEGAL COUNSEL AND OTHER APPROPRIATE PARTIES**

Questions suggested during the WG call of 10 August:

1. Has Compliance had any situations referred to them, such as complaints about new gTLDs or registry conduct, which they feel would have been within scope of the TM-PDDRP but which they dealt with themselves or where the complainant for whatever reason didn't choose to pursue further through the TM-PDDRP?

Note previous answer from Compliance to a similar question:

*“Compliance has received a minimal number of complaints from trademark holders regarding registry operator’s practices. However, not having received them in the context of a TM-PDDRP complaint, they were not assessed for viability under the Procedure and therefore, it would be speculative to opine whether they could have been covered under the Procedure.”*

1. If Compliance becomes aware of possible problematic activity involving use of TMCH or other RPMs (e.g. by registrars or registries), or if as a result of community work or reviews any other circumstance comes to light which may justify further investigation, do they proceed to investigate in the absence of a formal complaint? If they are empowered to act, have they taken action based on the data/information they have?

Questions subsequently suggested on the mailing list:

1. What additional information can Compliance provide us regarding the details of their complaints involving New gTLDs?  We have heard from TM-PDDRP Providers that complaints that might otherwise go to them have gone to Compliance instead. We are operating with a disconnect - and we think there is more information that Compliance can provide us on these matters. What complaints have they received re: ccTLDs, and specifically, .SUCKS?