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| **Jurisdiction Subgroup Questionnaire Response Summary and Analysis** |
| **Administrative Questions** | **Name and Affiliation of Respondent** | Luis R. Furlán (Guatemala)Karina Cortes (Puerto Rico)Rika Tsunoda - MIC JapanCarlos Vera (?)Michael Graham (USA)QUEH Ser Pheng Singapore GAC RepresentativeMzia Gogilashvili - Georgian governmentMathieu Aubert (?) |
| **Name of Reviewer, Date:** | Greg Shatan | May 28, 2017 |
| **Link to Response:****Luis R. Fuiran** | <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ccwg-acctws2.jurisdiction.questionnaire/2017-February/000006.html> |
|  | **Karina Cortes** | <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ccwg-acctws2.jurisdiction.questionnaire/2017-February/000007.html> |
|  | **Shin Takamura** | <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ccwg-acctws2.jurisdiction.questionnaire/2017-April/000008.html> |
|  | **Carlos Vera** | <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ccwg-acctws2.jurisdiction.questionnaire/2017-April/000010.html> |
|  | **Michael Graham** | <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ccwg-acctws2.jurisdiction.questionnaire/2017-April/000011.html> |
|  | **Queh Ser Pheng** | <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ccwg-acctws2.jurisdiction.questionnaire/2017-April/000017.html> |
|  | **Mzia Gogilashvili** | <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ccwg-acctws2.jurisdiction.questionnaire/2017-April/000022.html> |
|  | **Matthieu Aubert** | <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ccwg-acctws2.jurisdiction.questionnaire/2017-April/000023.html> |
|  |  | **Summary** | **Reviewer’s Discussion and Analysis of Response** |
| **Question 1** | **Summary of response to Q1** (“Has your business, your privacy or your ability to use or purchase domain name-related services been affected by ICANN's jurisdiction in any way?”) | All of the respondents essentially answered “no.” Six responded “no”; one with “Not to my knowledge”; and one with “I do not recognize such cases as those in the question.” | Overall, the respondents did not have any issues arising from ICANN’s jurisdiction. |
| **For Q1, did respondent provide any specific cases, situations or incidents in which respondent was involved?** (If yes, include the date, parties involved, a summary of the event and links to any relevant documents provided by respondent.) | No. One respondent did add “The handling of complaints like Whois inaccuracy is improving.” | This response does not appear relevant to the Subgroup’s work. |
| **Question 2** | **Summary of response to Q2** (“Has ICANN's jurisdiction\* affected any dispute resolution process or litigation related to domain names you have been involved in?”) | One responded “Yes. It has affected the litigation process positively given that Puerto Rico has political (and therefore juridical) ties with the United States.” The remainder essentially answered “no.” Six responded “no”; one with “Not to my knowledge”; and one with “I do not recognize such cases as those in the question.” | One respondent described a positive effect on the litigation process resulting from US jurisdiction.The respondents did not have any issues arising from ICANN’s jurisdiction. |
| **For Q2, did respondent provide any specific cases, situations or incidents in which respondent was involved?** (If yes, include the date, parties involved, a summary of the event and links to any relevant documents provided by respondent.) | No. |  |
| **Question 3** | **Summary of response to Q3** (“Do you have copies of and/or links to any verifiable reports of experiences of other parties that would be responsive to the questions above?”) | All eight respondents answered no. | Respondents were unaware of any third party situations relating the effect of ICANN’s jurisdiction on such party’s business, privacy or ability to use or purchase domain name-related services, or any third party litigation affected by ICANN’s jurisdiction. |
| **For Q3, did respondent provide copies or links to reports of third party experiences?** | No. | N/A |
| **Question 4** | **Summary of response to Q4a** (“Are you aware of any material, documented instance(s) where ICANN has been unable to pursue its Mission because of its jurisdiction?”) | Seven respondents answered no. One did not respond. | Respondents did not know of any instance where ICANN’s jurisdiction rendered it unable to pursue ICANN’s Mission in any way. |
| **For Q4a, did respondent provide any relevant documentation?** | No. | N/A |
| **Summary of response to Q4b** (“Are you aware of and able to document the existence of an alternative jurisdiction where ICANN would not be so prevented from pursuing its Mission?”) | All eight respondents answered no. | Since Q4a was answered in the negative, no response to Q4b was required. |
| **For Q4b, did respondent provide any relevant documentation?** | No. | N/A |
| **Relevance to Subgroup’s Work** | **Did any specific case, situation or incident mentioned by respondent raise a “Proposed Issue” that could be considered by the Subgroup?** | No. | N/A |
| **If yes, briefly restate the case, situation or incident.** | N/A | N/A |
| **Briefly state the Proposed Issue.** | N/A | N/A |
| **Did respondent provide any case or situation that could be used as a “Stress Test” by the Subgroup?** | No. | N/A |
| **If yes, briefly state the “Stress Test”.** | N/A | N/A |
| **Did respondent mention anything else relevant to the Subgroup’s work?** | No. | N/A |