

Comparative Study of ccTLDs and gTLDs

Table of Contents

	Summary.....	p.2
1.	Existence of Alternative Dispute Resolution Systems....	p.4
2.	Dispute Resolution Providers	p.6
3.	Number and Choice of Panellists	p.9
4.	Costs of Dispute Resolution Proceedings	p.14
5.	Number of Cases / Restrictions on Complainants.....	p.18
6.	Complainant's Rights.....	p.21
7.	Requirements for Domain Name Transfer.....	p.24
8.	Variation of UDRP 3 Part Test.....	p.28
9.	Submission of Documents Electronically.....	p.31
10.	Length of time for Domain Name Transfers.....	p.33
11.	Remedies.....	p.35
12.	Costs Against Parties.....	p.37
13.	Mediation.....	p.39
14.	Appeals.....	p.42

Summary

This document is a comparative study of the CIRA Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (CDRP) as compared to the dispute resolution policies of other country code top level domains (ccTLD) and generic top level domain (gTLD) Registries. The comparative study focuses on 14 key areas.

The information was gathered based on a survey which was sent out by CIRA to members of the Council of European National Top Level Domain Registries (CENTR). (CIRA would like to thank the Registries that responded. We apologize for any errors, which are our own, and we will promptly correct any errors that are brought to our attention). CIRA also reviewed the dispute resolution policies of Australia, the United States, and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), which is the dispute resolution policy for generic top level domain names such as .com, .org, .net, .biz, .gov, etc. The Registries which this comparative study covers include over 62 million ccTLD domain names, together with over 110 million gTLD domain names.

Based on the results of the comparative study, CIRA notes the following points:

- The use by CIRA of two private dispute resolution providers to administer the CDRP is not out of the ordinary. Certain Registries operate their dispute resolution process in-house, whereas others use one to four dispute resolution providers. The dispute resolution providers used by the Registries can be non-profit entities, private parties, or government agencies.
- CIRA is one of the few Registries (along with Denmark, Norway and Serbia) which requires the use of mandatory three member panels. The other Registries either require mandatory one member panels, or allow the complainant the choice of deciding between a one member panel, and a three member panel.
- Given the requirement for mandatory three member panels, the resulting costs for launching a CDRP for a domain name (\$4000 CDN) is relatively high as compared to the other Registries.
- CIRA, along with many of the other Registries, use a variation of the ICANN UDRP three part test to determine whether a domain name should be transferred to a complainant.
- CIRA is one of the few Registries (along with Serbia) which does not allow parties to submit their documents electronically. The rest of the Registries all allow documents to be submitted electronically.
- The 60 day period in the CDRP for a domain name to be transferred to a successful complainant is relatively long compared to the waiting period in other Registries.

- CIRA is one of the few Registries which allows panels to award costs against complainants in cases of reverse domain name hijacking. The majority of Registries do not allow panels to award costs either against the complainant or the registrant.
- Many Registries, like CIRA, do not incorporate mediation in their dispute resolution system. However, a number of notable exceptions include Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, and the United Kingdom, which do provide mediation.
- Only a small number of Registries appear to provide an appeal process within their dispute resolution system. These include Belgium, Denmark, New Zealand and the United Kingdom. Most Registries, like CIRA, do not.

1. Existence of Alternative Dispute Resolution Systems

CIRA provides an alternative dispute resolution system called the CIRA Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (CDRP) to resolve domain name disputes. The CDRP is a forum which is intended to provide quick, out-of-court arbitrations at relatively low cost for .CA domain names registered in bad faith. Following public consultations, CIRA developed the CDRP using ICANN's Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) as a model, but with certain key changes for use for .CA domain names. ICANN, the entity which coordinates the Internet's naming system, created the UDRP for use with generic top level domain names such as .COM or .ORG. Set out below is information regarding which registries in the comparative study offer an alternative dispute resolution system, their approximate number of domain names, and the type of alternative dispute resolution system that they use:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Approximate Number of Domain Names	Existence of ADR System	Type of Alternative Dispute Resolution System
.at	Austria	933,249	No	
.au	Australia	1,729,968	Yes	Modified UDRP
.be	Belgium	1,037,350	Yes	Modified UDRP
.ca	Canada	1,433,435	Yes	Modified UDRP
.cat	Catalan	39,251 *	Yes	UDRP
.ch	Switzerland	1,424,084	Yes	Modified UDRP
.cz	Czech Republic	686,098	Yes	Independently developed
.de	Germany	13,701,134	No	
.dk	Denmark	1,048,036 *	Yes	Independently developed
.es	Spain	1,207,832 *	Yes	Modified UDRP
.eu	European Union	3,226,961	Yes	Independently developed
.fr	France	1,737,325	Yes	Independently developed
.hu	Hungary	490,000 *	Yes	Independently developed
.il	Israel	167,420	Yes	Independently developed

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Approximate Number of Domain Names	Existence of ADR System	Type of Alternative Dispute Resolution System
.it	Italy	1,913,921	Yes	Modified UDRP
.jp	Japan	1,164,295	Yes	Modified UDRP
.lt	Lithuania	114,899	No	
.lu	Luxembourg	51,500	No	
.lv	Latvia	79,724 *	No	
.mx	Mexico	376,000 *	Yes	Modified UDRP
.nl	Netherlands	3,915,075	Yes	Modified UDRP
.no	Norway	477,969	Yes	Modified UDRP
.nz	New Zealand	358,559	Yes	Independently developed
.pl	Poland	1,591,951 *	Yes	Independently developed
.pt	Portugal	291,371 *	Yes	Independently developed
.rs	Serbia	53,354 *	Yes	Independently developed
.ru	Russia	2,838,741	No	
.se	Sweden	960,904	Yes	Modified UDRP
.si	Slovenia	80,000	Yes	Modified UDRP
.uk	United Kingdom	8,100,000 *	Yes	Modified UDRP
.us	United States	1,400,000	Yes	Modified UDRP
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	111,889,734	Yes	UDRP

*as of December 1, 2009

2. Dispute Resolution Providers

CIRA uses two dispute resolution providers to administer the CDRP: Resolution Canada and the British Columbia International Commercial Arbitration Centre. Their websites are located at www.resolutioncanada.ca and www.bcicac.com. Resolution Canada and BCICAC are private third parties which were selected by CIRA to administer the CDRP following a Request-for-Proposals (RFP) issued by CIRA. Set out below is information on the number of dispute resolution providers used by each of the Registries in the comparative study, and what type of organization the dispute resolution providers are:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Number of Dispute Resolution Providers	Type of organization of the Dispute Resolution Provider
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.au	Australia	Four	Non-Profit; WIPO
.be	Belgium	One	Non-profit
.ca	Canada	Two	Private third parties
.cat	Catalan	For UDRP: UDRP panels For ERDRP: one (IQUA)	Non-profit; private third parties; WIPO
.ch	Switzerland	One	WIPO
.cz	Czech Republic	One	Government
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.dk	Denmark	None	Complaints board set up by the Minister; Typosquatting cases are dealt with by the Registry
.es	Spain	Four	Non-profit; private third parties; WIPO
.eu	European Union	One (Czech Arbitration Court)	Court
.fr	France	ADR is entirely handled by AFNIC i.e. no dispute resolution provider. However, AFNIC also offers three procedures, each managed by a different body: the CMAP (Centre de Mediation and d'Arbitrage de Paris) [Paris Mediation and Arbitration Centre], WIPO and le Forum des	Non-profit; private third parties; WIPO

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Number of Dispute Resolution Providers	Type of organization of the Dispute Resolution Provider
		droits sur l'internet (FDI) [Internet Rights Forum]	
.hu	Hungary	One	Non-profit
.il	Israel	Pool of experts	Private third parties
.it	Italy	Four	Private third parties
.jp	Japan	One	Non-profit
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.mx	Mexico	One	WIPO
.nl	Netherlands	One	WIPO
.no	Norway	One	Non-profit
.nz	New Zealand	There are eight experts on the Panel.	Private third parties
.pl	Poland	Three: Arbitration Court at Polish Chamber of Commerce, Arbitration Court at Polish Chamber of Information Technology and Telecommunication, WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center.	Non-profit; WIPO
.pt	Portugal	One	Non-profit
.rs	Serbia	None	List of panellists chosen by the chair; not a separate legal entity.
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.se	Sweden	Process is provided at the Registry's offices. The Registry appoints the panellists and pays the panellists for each case that is settled.	Non-profit; Registry

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Number of Dispute Resolution Providers	Type of organization of the Dispute Resolution Provider
.si	Slovenia	One	List of panellists chosen by the Chair
.uk	United Kingdom	None	Service is run in-house
.us	United States	Two	Non-profit; private third parties
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net. org, etc.)	Four	Non-Profit; private third parties; WIPO

3. Number and Choice of Panellists

The CDRP requires the use of mandatory three person panels to hear each case. Three person panels are generally seen as more credible, because the parties are able to participate in the arbitrator selection process. There is also the view that having three members in a panel puts checks and balances in place to make incorrect decisions less likely. However, the use of mandatory three person panels comes at an increased cost, which is perhaps a reason why few Registries use this system. Based on the responses in the comparative study, only Canada, Denmark, Norway and Serbia require mandatory three person panels. Other Registries either require the use of a mandatory one member panel, or allow the complainant to choose between a one member panel and a three member panel; if the complainant chooses one panellist and the registrant elects for three panellists, the parties split the increased costs.

In the CDRP, the three panellists are chosen by a roster presented by the complainant and the registrant. Both Resolution Canada and the British Columbia International Commercial Arbitration Centre provide a list of available candidates on their websites who are able to serve as panellists ([here](#) and [here](#)). When preparing their written submissions, the complainant and the registrant both nominate up to five candidates from the list of available candidates on the dispute resolution provider's website. The dispute resolution provider then appoints the three panellists according to the following:

- (a) three panellists nominated by both parties;
- (b) if the same three panellists are not nominated by both parties or are not available, two panellists nominated by both parties and one panellist selected by the provider;
- (c) if the same two panellists are not nominated by both parties or are not available, one panellist nominated by each party and one panellist selected by the provider; or
- (d) if no panellist nominated by both parties is available, three panellists selected by the provider.

If the respondent does not file a response, the complainant may elect to convert the three member panel to a one member panel. If a single member panel is requested, the dispute resolution provider selects from its list of candidates a panellist who is not on the list of candidates nominated by the complainant.

Set out below is information on the number of panellists per case for each of the Registries in the comparative study and how the panellists are chosen:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Number of Panellists assigned to hear each case	Can parties choose number of panellists?	How are the panellists for each case chosen?
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.au	Australia	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Single Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider. Three-member panels are chosen by a roster presented by the complainant and the registrant, with the third panellist chosen by the provider.
.be	Belgium	1 panellist for first instance cases; 3 panellist team in case of appeal.	No	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider.
.ca	Canada	Mandatory 3 member panellists	No (unless no response from registrant)	Panellists are chosen by a roster presented by the complainant and the registrant. If the registrant does not provide a response, the complainant may convert the 3 member panel to a 1 member panel.
.cat	Catalan	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Panellists are chosen by a roster presented by the complainant and the registrant.
.ch	Switzerland	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider.
.cz	Czech Republic	Mandatory 1 panellist for all cases	No	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider.
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.dk	Denmark	3 panellists	No	Panellists are chosen by Minister for Science, Technology and Innovation.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Number of Panellists assigned to hear each case	Can parties choose number of panellists?	How are the panellists for each case chosen?
.es	Spain	Mandatory 1 panellist for all cases	No	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider.
.eu	European Union	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	a.) Single Panellist: If neither the Complainant nor the Respondent has elected a three-member Panel the Provider appoints a single Panellist from its list of panellists. b.) 3-member Panel: In the event that either the Complainant or the Respondent elects a three-member Panel, the Provider shall appoint one Panellist from the list of candidates submitted by the Complainant, one Panellist from the list of candidates submitted by the Respondent, and one Panellist from its list of panellists. If either Party does not duly submit its list of candidates, the Provider shall appoint any additional panellists from its list of panellists.
.fr	France	For the purpose of this ADR, the panel consists of the CEO and four senior members of AFNIC appointed by him.	No	Panel consists of the CEO and four senior members of AFNIC appointed by him.
.hu	Hungary	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider
.il	Israel	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	The registry, in its capacity as facilitator of the ADR.
.it	Italy	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Number of Panellists assigned to hear each case	Can parties choose number of panellists?	How are the panellists for each case chosen?
.jp	Japan	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider.
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.mx	Mexico	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Normally, the single panellist is chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider. But in the case of three panellists, each party may choose one, additionally.
.nl	Netherlands	Mandatory 1 panellist for all cases	No	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider.
.no	Norway	3 panellists, although leader of the ADR has the mandate to extend the panel in cases that turn out to be principle.	No	Panellists are chosen by the leader of the ADR for each case.
.nz	New Zealand	Mandatory 1 panellist for all cases	No	They are appointed "first cab off the rank". The Expert at the top of the list is asked if they have any conflicts and if they can meet the time frame required. If they aren't conflicted and can meet the time frame, they are allocated the dispute and then go to the bottom of the list.
.pl	Poland	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Panellists are chosen by a roster presented by the complainant and the registrant.
.pt	Portugal	Mandatory 1 panellist for all cases	No	Panellists are chosen by a roster presented by the complainant and the registrant.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Number of Panellists assigned to hear each case	Can parties choose number of panellists?	How are the panellists for each case chosen?
.rs	Serbia	Mandatory 3 panellists for all cases	No	Panellists are chosen by a roster presented by the complainant and the registrant.
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.se	Sweden	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider.
.si	Slovenia	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider.
.uk	United Kingdom	Mandatory 1 panellist for all cases	No	Panellists are chosen on a "cab rank" basis - each dispute is assigned to the panellist at the top of the list (unless there is a conflict of interest).
.us	United States	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider for a 1 member panel. For 3 member panels, 3 names given by each party, 1 panellist selected from each list of three names, and third name selected by provider.
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	1 or 3 panellists	Yes	For one member panel: Panellists are chosen by the Dispute Resolution Provider. For three member panel, 3 names given by each party, 1 panellist selected from each list of three names, and third name selected by provider.

4. Costs of Dispute Resolution Proceedings

The cost for launching a CDRP complaint is as follows:

Number of domain names	Single panelist	Three panelists	Total cost (including administrative fee)
1	\$1,750 plus GST	\$3,000 plus GST	\$4,000 plus GST
2 – 5	\$2,250 plus GST	\$4,500 plus GST	\$5,500 plus GST
6 – 10	\$2,500 plus GST	\$5,250 plus GST	\$6,250 plus GST

(There is no difference in cost between the two dispute resolution providers)

Accordingly, the cost for filing a CDRP complaint with a three member panel is \$4,000 plus applicable taxes, which is paid entirely by the complainant. If the respondent does not file a response, the complainant may elect to convert to a one member panel, dropping the cost to approximately \$2,500 plus applicable taxes. If the respondent files a response, the complainant must proceed with a three member panel. Set out below is information on the costs for filing a complaint per domain name for the Registries in the comparative study, and who pays the costs for the complaint:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Cost for Filing a Complaint per domain name	Who Pays for the Costs
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.au	Australia	AUD\$ 2,000 1 member AUD\$ 4,500 3 member	If the complainant chooses 1 panellist and the registrant elects for 3 panellists, the parties split the increased costs (UDRP model).
.be	Belgium	1,620 EUR/case for up to 5 domain names involved.	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.ca	Canada	Per domain name: \$4000 for 3 member panelist; \$2500 for single panellist.	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.cat	Catalan	Same fees as UDRP	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.ch	Switzerland	CHF 600 for the dispute resolution. CHF 2000 for the voluntary decision of an expert.	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Cost for Filing a Complaint per domain name	Who Pays for the Costs
.cz	Czech Republic	The costs are calculated on the basis of the value of the subject-matter (3%, minimum 7000 CZK /approx. 280 EUR/). The value of the subject-matter shall be estimated by the Complainant in its Action.	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.dk	Denmark	150 dkr. for a consumer. 500 dkr. for a commercial. Typosquatting cases are free.	The complainant pays the cost for filing, but if the complainant's claim is sustained the fee is returned.
.es	Spain	1400 EUR	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.eu	European Union	In case of 1 to 5 disputed domain names and a single panellist: 1,300 EUR. In case of 1 to 5 disputed domain names and 3 panellists: 3,100 EUR.	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.fr	France	250 EUR per domain name.	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.hu	Hungary	1 panellist-100.000.-HUF = 370 EUR 3 panellist- 150.000.-HUF= 556 EUR	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.il	Israel	1 panellist, 1-5 domains in petition = 2,400 NIS 1 panellist, 6-10 domains in petition = 3,600 NIS 3 panellists, 1-5 domains in petition = 3,600 NIS 3 panellists, 6-10 domains in petition = 7,200 NIS	If the complainant chooses 1 panellist and the registrant elects for 3 panellists, the parties split the increased costs (UDRP model).
.it	Italy	1 panellist: from 850 EUR to 1500 EUR 3 panellists: from 2000 EUR to 4000 EUR	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.jp	Japan	JPY180,000 (USD1,700) for 1 panellist panel JPY360,000 (USD3,400) for 3 panellist panel	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Cost for Filing a Complaint per domain name	Who Pays for the Costs
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.mx	Mexico	1,500 USD	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.nl	Netherlands	1,500 EUR	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.no	Norway	4 times the court fee, for the moment approx. 350 EUR.	The ADR is financed partly through a complaint fee and partly through the registration fee. There is a test arrangement now where the complainant is refunded this fee if the complaint is approved.
.nz	New Zealand	It is free to file a complaint. There is also no cost to send it to mediation (mediation only if a response is received). The cost is if the complainant wants to refer it to an Expert. That cost is \$1800 NZD plus GST. The fee paid is all passed on to the Expert.	As stated, there is no cost for filing the complaint. The complainant must pay for it to be referred to an Expert.
.pl	Poland	Approximately 720 EUR/ one panellist. Approximately 1440 EUR/ three panellists.	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.pt	Portugal	45 - 450 EUR.	The cost is split evenly between the complainant and the registrant.
.rs	Serbia	1,600 EUR.	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Cost for Filing a Complaint per domain name	Who Pays for the Costs
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.se	Sweden	About 900 EUR (10 000 SEK). If the applicant wins, he/she will get half the amount back from .SE, the actual cost will then be 450 EUR. If the applicant loses, the actual cost is 900 EUR, no money will be refunded.	Applicant pays for 1 or 3 panellists. If applicant pays for 1 panellist and the registrant choose 3 panellists, the registrant will pay the additional fee.
.si	Slovenia	677 EUR	The entire cost is paid for by the complainant.
.uk	United Kingdom	There is no fee for filing a complaint. A fee is charged in order to obtain a decision (£750 plus VAT for a full decision, £200 plus VAT for a summary decision).	There is no cost for filing the complaint. The complainant must pay for it to be referred to an Expert.
.us	United States	Per domain name: (\$USD) AAA: \$2025 for single panellist, \$4525 for 3 member panellist NAF: \$1300 for single panellist, \$2600 for 3 member panellist	If the complainant chooses 1 panellist and the registrant elects for 3 panellists, the parties split the increased costs.
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net. org, etc.)	Per domain name: (\$USD) Asian Domain Name Dispute Resolution Centre: \$1000 for 1 panellist; \$2500 for 3 panellists Arbitration Centre for Internet Disputes : 500 EUR for 1 panellist; 3100 EUR for 3 panellists NAF: \$1300 for 1 panellist; \$2600 for 3 panellists WIPO: \$1500 for 1panellist; \$4000 for 3 panellists	If the complainant chooses 1 panellist and the registrant elects for 3 panellists, the parties split the increased costs

5. Number of Cases / Restrictions on Complainants

Since the launch of the CDRP in 2002, there have been 149 decisions (as of May 1, 2010). Copies of all the CDRP decisions are available on CIRA's [website](#). The number of CDRP decisions broken out by year is as follows:

2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 (to date)
3	10	9	26	21	21	30	23	6

The CDRP contains restrictions on who can file a complainant, specifically, only people and organizations who meet CIRA's [Canadian Presence Requirements For Registrants](#) (CPR) are able to submit complaints under the CDRP. This is a logical extension given that Registrants are required to meet CIRA's CPR policy in order to hold a .CA domain name. Restricting complainants to those who meet CPR ensures that complainants bringing an action under the CDRP can have the .CA domain name transferred to them upon winning the dispute.

However, the argument against this requirement is that foreign entities which do business in Canada (but which are not incorporated in Canada) are not eligible to file a CDRP complaint. The only way for a foreign entity to be eligible to file a CDRP complaint is if they own a Canadian trademark registration for the domain name at issue (given that foreign entities may qualify under CIRA's CPR if they own a trademark registration). In CDRP proceedings, a foreign entity is able to file a CDRP complaint if the domain name at issue consists of, or includes, the exact word component of a registered trademark of which the foreign entity is the owner. If the foreign entity does not own a registered trademark, it is not able to file a CDRP complaint. Therefore, foreign entities which do business in Canada and which may have common law rights in Canada are not able to file a CDRP complaint.

The following chart sets out the approximate number of domain name dispute cases that are filed each year in each Registry in the comparative study, and whether there are any restrictions on who can file a complaint:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Approximate number of cases filed each year	Any restrictions on who can file a complaint
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.au	Australia	25	No
.be	Belgium	30	No
.ca	Canada	20	Yes

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Approximate number of cases filed each year	Any restrictions on who can file a complaint
.cat	Catalan	0 -1	No
.ch	Switzerland	25	No
.cz	Czech Republic	Less than 10	No
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.dk	Denmark	200 ordinary cases and 800 typosquatting cases	No
.es	Spain	70	No
.eu	European Union	100	No
.fr	France	Predec – 100 WIPO – 50 Others – 1 or 2	No
.hu	Hungary	50 – 60	No
.il	Israel	1 to 6	No
.it	Italy	50	Yes – challenge procedure has to be previously activated
.jp	Japan	8	No
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.mx	Mexico	10	No
.nl	Netherlands	80	No
.no	Norway	30	No
.nz	New Zealand	72	No
.pl	Poland	80	No

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Approximate number of cases filed each year	Any restrictions on who can file a complaint
.pt	Portugal	None as of yet	No
.rs	Serbia	Information not available	No
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.se	Sweden	15 – 20 (50 last three years)	No
.si	Slovenia	5 – 10	No
.uk	United Kingdom	600 – 700	No
.us	United States	28	No
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	1,875	No

6. Complainant's Rights

The first requirement that a complainant must establish in a CDRP proceeding is to show that: "the Registrant's .CA domain name is Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the complainant had rights prior to the date of registration of the domain name and continues to have such Rights".

A "Mark" is defined in the CDRP as follows:

- (a) a trade-mark, including the word elements of a design mark, or a trade name that has been used in Canada by a person, or the person's predecessor in title, for the purpose of distinguishing the wares, services or business of that person or predecessor or a licensor of that person or predecessor from the wares, services or business of another person;
- (b) a certification mark, including the word elements of a design mark, that has been used in Canada by a person or the person's predecessor in title, for the purpose of distinguishing wares or services that are of a defined standard;
- (c) a trade-mark, including the word elements of a design mark, that is registered in CIPO; or
- (d) the alphanumeric and punctuation elements of any badge, crest, emblem or mark in respect of which the Registrar of Trade-marks has given public notice of adoption and use pursuant to paragraph 9(1)(n) of the Trade-marks Act (Canada).

Accordingly, a complainant's rights must fall within the definition of "mark" in order to satisfy the first requirement of the CDRP. A complainant may be able to rely on a business name or corporate name if they can establish that they used this business name or corporate name as a trademark.

By contrast, complainants in certain of the other Registries in the comparative study are able to rely on rights which are not currently included in the CDRP. These include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Regional names / geographic indicators
- Personal names / personality rights
- Trademarks which enjoy reputation in the home country but which are not used
- Trademarks which are the subject of a pending trademark application in the home country based on proposed use and/or use and registration abroad, prior to the mark being used in the home country

Set out below is information on what type of rights a complainant is entitled to rely upon in the dispute resolution processes of each of the Registries in the comparative study:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Registered marks	Government / Official marks	Unregistered Trademarks/ Trademarks used in home country	Business names	Corporate names	Regional names / geographic indicators	Personal names / personality rights	Trademarks which enjoy reputation in home country but not used	Trademarks subject of pending trademark application
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)								
.au	Australia	x		x	x	x		x		
.be	Belgium	x	x		x	x	x	x		
.cat	Catalan	x		x	x	x		x		
.ch	Switzerland	x		x	x	x	x	x		
.ca	Canada	x	x	x	x	x				
.cz	Czech Republic	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)								
.dk	Denmark	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
.es	Spain	x	x		x		x			
.eu	European Union	x		x		x		x		
.fr	France	x					x	x		
.hu	Hungary	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
.il	Israel	x		x	x	x			x	x
.it	Italy	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
.jp	Japan	x		x	x	x		x		
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)								
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)								
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)								
.mx	Mexico	x			x	x				x
.nl	Netherlands	x			x			x		
.no	Norway	x	x	x	x	x				

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Registered marks	Government / Official marks	Unregistered Trademarks/ Trademarks used in home country	Business names	Corporate names	Regional names / geographic indicators	Personal names / personality rights	Trademarks which enjoy reputation in home country but not used	Trademarks subject of pending trademark application
.nz	New Zealand	x	x	x	x	x		x		
.pl	Poland	x			x	x		x	x	x
.pt	Portugal	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
.rs	Serbia	x								
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)								
.se	Sweden	x	x		x	x		x		
.si	Slovenia	x	x		x	x	x	x		
.uk	United Kingdom	x	x	x	x			x		
.us	United States	x		x	x	x		x		
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	x		x	x	x		x		

7. Requirements for Domain Name Transfer

The CDRP provides that in order to succeed in a Proceeding, there is a three part test where the complainant must establish the following:

- a) the Registrant's dot-ca domain name is Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant had rights prior to the date of registration of the domain name and continues to have such Rights;
- b) the Registrant has registered the domain name in bad faith as described in paragraph 3.7;
and the Complainant must provide some evidence that:
- c) the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the domain name as described in paragraph 3.6.

Even if the complainant provides (a) and (b) and some evidence of (c), the respondent will succeed in the Proceeding if they prove, on a balance of probabilities, that the respondent has a legitimate interest in the domain name.

This CDRP three part test is a variation of the test used in the ICANN UDRP.

Set out below is information on what a complainant must establish in order to have the domain name transferred over to them for each of the Registries in the comparative study:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Requirements
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.au	Australia	(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name, trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and (ii) the registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and (iii) the domain name has been registered or subsequently used in bad faith.
.be	Belgium	See three conditions UDRP Differences a) list of rights is longer c) registered OR used in bad faith.
.ca	Canada	a) the Registrant's dot-ca domain name is Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant had Rights prior to the date of registration of the domain name and continues to have such Rights; (b) the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the domain name as described in paragraph 3.6; and (c) the Registrant has registered the domain name in bad faith as described in paragraph 3.7.
.cat	Catalan	a) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; b) The registrant does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and c) The registrant registered the domain name and is using it in bad faith.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Requirements
.ch	Switzerland	1. both the existence and the infringement of the claimed Right in a distinctive sign clearly result from the wording of the law or from an acknowledged interpretation of the law and from the presented facts and are proven by the evidence submitted; and 2. the Respondent has not conclusively pleaded and proven any relevant grounds for defence; and 3. the infringement of the right justifies the transfer or deletion of the domain name, depending on the remedy requested in the request.
.cz	Czech Republic	Specific factors not specified
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.dk	Denmark	Reviewed by Complaints Board.
.es	Spain	a) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; b) The registrant does not have any rights of legitimate interests in the domain name; and c) The registrant registered the domain name OR is using it in bad faith.
.eu	European Union	The name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by national and/or Community law, such as the rights mentioned in Article10(1) of Commission Regulation 874/2004, AND (a) it has been registered by its holder without rights or legitimate interest in the name; or (b) it has been registered or is being used in bad faith.
.fr	France	The complainant must establish that: a) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; b) The registrant does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and c) The registrant registered the domain name and is using it in bad faith.
.hu	Hungary	a) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in which the complainant has rights guaranteed by domestic or European law; b) The registrant does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; or c) The registrant registered the domain name and is using it in bad faith.
.il	Israel	3.1. the Domain Name is the same or confusingly similar to a trademark, trade name, registered company name or legal entity registration ("Name") of the complainant; and 3.2. the Complainant has rights in the Name; and 3.3. the Holder has no rights in the Name; and 3.4. the application for allocation of the Domain Name was made or the Domain Name was used in bad faith.
.it	Italy	The complainant must demonstrate to have its own title on the domain name and that the registrant is using it in bad faith
.jp	Japan	(1) complainant has the right to the name and (2) registrant has bad faith in using the name
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Requirements
.mx	Mexico	Registrant's Bad Faith (registration or use)
.nl	Netherlands	2.1. Complaints may be submitted by any party which asserts and establishes that: a. a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to: I. a trademark, or trade name, protected under Dutch law in which the complainant has rights; or II. a personal name registered in the General Municipal Register ('gemeentelijke basisadministratie') of a municipality in the Netherlands, or the name of a Dutch public legal entity or the name of an association or foundation registered in the Netherlands under which the complainant undertakes public activities on a permanent basis; and b. the registrant has no rights to or legitimate interests in the domain name; and c. the domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.
.no	Norway	i. The Complainant has Rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the Domain Name; and ii. The Domain Name, in the hands of the Respondent, is an Abusive Registration. "Abusive Registration" is broadly defined, and covers either registration or use of the domain name. We do not use the definition "abusive registration", but "bad faith", but the reality is actually the same.
.nz	New Zealand	The complainant must prove that they have rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the domain name, and that the domain name in the hands of the respondent is an unfair registration. Both elements must be proven and there is a definition of an Unfair Registration and what evidence may demonstrate that.
.pl	Poland	Infringement of his interest if it is protected by Polish law.
.pt	Portugal	No cases as of yet
.rs	Serbia	1. That the .rs domain is identical or substantively similar to the trade mark, business or trade name of the prosecutor for the same or similar type of goods or services, or if the similarity can create confusion and mislead participants on the market; 2. That the registrant has no right or legitimate interest to use the disputed .rs domain; 3. That the registrant has registered and used the .rs domain in question contrary to the principles of good faith, honesty and good business practices.
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.se	Sweden	There are three conditions (absolute requirements) that must be met for the disputed domain name to be transferred to the applicant or deregistered ("a right with a legal basis in Sweden, justified interest AND bad faith").
.si	Slovenia	1. that the Domain name of the Holder is identical to or interchangeable with their trade mark valid on the territory of the Republic of Slovenia, or company name, as taken from the court register, or that it violates their copyright under the law of the Republic of Slovenia, registered geographic designation to which they are entitled under the law of the Republic of Slovenia, or encroaches on their rights to their personal name under the law of the Republic of Slovenia, or encroaches upon other rights recognised in the legal system of the Republic of Slovenia; 2. that the Domain name holder has no legally recognised interest with regard to the registered Domain name; and 3. that the Domain name was registered or is used in bad faith.
.uk	United Kingdom	i. The Complainant has Rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the Domain Name; and ii. The Domain Name, in the hands of the Respondent, is an Abusive Registration. "Abusive Registration" is broadly defined, and covers either registration or use of the domain name.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Requirements
.us	United States	1. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, 2. The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and 3. The domain name has been registered in bad faith or is being used in bad faith.
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	a) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; b) the registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and (c) the registrant's domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

8. Variation of UDRP 3 part Test

This CDRP three part test is a variation of the test used in the ICANN UDRP. The notable differences between the CDRP three part test varies and the UDRP three part test are the following:

- Under the CDRP, it is explicit that the Complainant's trade-mark rights must predate the date of registration of the domain name.
- Under the CDRP, the three bad faith factors are exhaustive, whereas under the UDRP, the four bad faith factors are non-exhaustive.
- Under the CDRP, the list of factors that may be relied upon to demonstrate a legitimate interest in a domain name are exhaustive, whereas under the UDRP, they are non-exhaustive.

CIRA looked at the following issues with respect to the Registries in the comparative study: 1) whether it is necessary for the complainant to have rights prior to the registration date of the domain name; 2) whether the list of legitimate interest factors is exhaustive or non-exhaustive; and 3) whether the list of bad faith factors is exhaustive or non-exhaustive. The findings are set out below:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Requirement for complainant to have rights prior to registration of domain name	List of Legitimate Interest Factors	List of Bad Faith Factors
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.au	Australia	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.be	Belgium	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.ca	Canada	Yes	Exhaustive	Exhaustive
.cat	Catalan	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.ch	Switzerland	Yes	Exhaustive	Does not apply
.cz	Czech Republic	Does not apply	Does not apply	Exhaustive
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Requirement for complainant to have rights prior to registration of domain name	List of Legitimate Interest Factors	List of Bad Faith Factors
.dk	Denmark	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.es	Spain	Yes	Exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.eu	European Union	No	Exhaustive	Exhaustive
.fr	France	Yes	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.hu	Hungary	Yes	Exhaustive	Does not apply
.il	Israel	Yes	Exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.it	Italy	Yes	Exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.jp	Japan	Yes	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.mx	Mexico	Yes	Exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.nl	Netherlands	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.no	Norway	Yes	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.nz	New Zealand	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.pl	Poland	No	Does not apply	Does not apply
.pt	Portugal	Yes	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.rs	Serbia	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.se	Sweden	Yes	Exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.si	Slovenia	Yes	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Requirement for complainant to have rights prior to registration of domain name	List of Legitimate Interest Factors	List of Bad Faith Factors
.uk	United Kingdom	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
.us	United States	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	No	Non-exhaustive	Non-exhaustive

9. Submission of Documents Electronically

The CDRP currently requires the parties to submit five copies of their complaint and submissions to the dispute resolution provider. It does not allow parties to send in their documents electronically. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) recently implemented an initiative that will allow for entirely electronic (e.g., paperless) submissions. The following Registries in the comparative study currently allow parties to send in their documents electronically. In this regard, CIRA appears to be one of the few Registries which does not allow parties to send in their documents electronically.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Ability to submit documents electronically
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.au	Australia	Yes
.be	Belgium	Yes
.ca	Canada	No
.cat	Catalan	Yes
.ch	Switzerland	Yes
.cz	Czech Republic	Yes
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.dk	Denmark	Yes
.es	Spain	Yes
.eu	European Union	Yes
.fr	France	Yes
.hu	Hungary	Yes
.il	Israel	Yes
.it	Italy	Yes
.jp	Japan	Yes
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Ability to submit documents electronically
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.mx	Mexico	Yes
.nl	Netherlands	Yes
.no	Norway	Yes
.nz	New Zealand	Yes
.pl	Poland	Yes
.pt	Portugal	Yes
.rs	Serbia	No
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.se	Sweden	Yes
.si	Slovenia	Yes
.uk	United Kingdom	Yes
.us	United States	Yes
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	Yes

10. Length of time for Domain Name Transfers

The CDRP provides that if a panel determines that a domain name is to be cancelled or transferred to the complainant, it will implement the decision 60 days after the date on which CIRA is notified by the provider that the complainant, the Registrant, and the Registrant's Registrar have been notified by the provider of the panel's decision. CIRA's 60 day waiting period for a domain name to be transferred to a successful complainant appears to be long compared to the waiting periods of other Registries. Certain of the other Registries such as Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the UDRP provide for shorter waiting periods, but allow the transfer to be put on hold if the Registrant provides evidence of the initiation of court proceedings challenging the panel's decision. The transfer will then not be implemented until the court proceeding is resolved.

Set out below is information regarding the length of time it takes for a domain name to be transferred to the complainant in each of the Registries in the comparative study:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Length of time for domain name transfer to complainant
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.au	Australia	10 business days
.be	Belgium	14 days
.ca	Canada	60 days
.cat	Catalan	10 business days
.ch	Switzerland	20 business days
.cz	Czech Republic	Less than 2 days
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.dk	Denmark	7 – 14 days
.es	Spain	45 days
.eu	European Union	30 calendar days
.fr	France	15 days
.hu	Hungary	30 days (unless Court proceedings are initiated)

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Length of time for domain name transfer to complainant
.il	Israel	At least 30 days
.it	Italy	15 days (unless Registrant initiates Court challenge)
.jp	Japan	10 – 15 business days
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.mx	Mexico	About a week
.nl	Netherlands	10 days (unless Registrant provides evidence of court case)
.no	Norway	7 days (unless Registrant provides evidence of court case)
.nz	New Zealand	10 days (unless Registrant launches appeal)
.pl	Poland	Arbitration court award must be accepted by the state court
.pt	Portugal	No cases as of yet
.rs	Serbia	10 days
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)
.se	Sweden	14 days (unless Registrant initiates Court challenge)
.si	Slovenia	21 days
.uk	United Kingdom	10 days
.us	United States	10 days
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	10 business days (unless Registrant initiates Court challenge)

11. Remedies

The CDRP provides that a panel may order the cancellation (deletion) of the domain name at issue, or transfer the domain name to the complainant. These remedies are consistent with the remedies of the panels in the other Registries. Set out below is information regarding the remedies that panels can order in the Registries in the comparative study:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Transfer of domain name to complainant	Deletion of domain name	Other
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.au	Australia	x	x	
.be	Belgium	x	x	
.ca	Canada	x	x	
.cat	Catalan	x		
.ch	Switzerland	x	x	
.cz	Czech Republic	x	x	
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.dk	Denmark	x	x	
.es	Spain	x		
.eu	European Union	x	x	
.fr	France	x	x	Panel applies the remedy chosen by the complainant. Panel can also order the blocking of the domain name.
.hu	Hungary	x	x	Revocation of the domain name from the registrant
.il	Israel	x	x	Panel is not limited
.it	Italy	x		
.jp	Japan	x	x	

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Transfer of domain name to complainant	Deletion of domain name	Other
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.mx	Mexico	x		
.nl	Netherlands	x		
.no	Norway	x	x	
.nz	New Zealand	x	x	
.pl	Poland			Panel only determines whether complainant's rights were infringed
.pt	Portugal	x	x	
.rs	Serbia	x		
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.se	Sweden	x	x	
.si	Slovenia	x	x	
.uk	United Kingdom	x	x	
.us	United States	x	x	
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	x	x	

12. Costs Against Parties

The CDRP also provides that in instances where a finding is made that the complaint was brought in bad faith, the panel may also make an order for the complainant to pay to the provider in trust for the respondent an amount of up to \$5,000 to offset any costs incurred in preparing for and filing material in the proceeding. This is a fairly extraordinary remedy, as there has been only one instance in the history of the CDRP where a panel has ordered costs against a complainant. Nevertheless, this “reverse hijacking clause” is fairly unique to CIRA as few of the Registries in the comparative study allow their panels to order costs against losing parties. It is also of note that although CIRA allows costs to be awarded against complainants in cases of reverse hijackings, it does not allow panels to award costs against registrants.

Set out below is information regarding which Registries in the comparative study allow their panels to award cost, and against whom:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Ability to award costs	Against whom
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.au	Australia	No	
.be	Belgium	No	
.ca	Canada	Yes	Complainant (in findings of reverse domain name hijacking)
.cat	Catalan	No	
.ch	Switzerland	No	
.cz	Czech Republic	Yes	Registrant
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.dk	Denmark	No	
.es	Spain	No	
.eu	European Union	No	
.fr	France	No	
.hu	Hungary	No	
.il	Israel	Yes	Registrant

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Ability to award costs	Against whom
.it	Italy	No	
.jp	Japan	No	
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.mx	Mexico	No	
.nl	Netherlands	No	
.no	Norway	No	
.nz	New Zealand	No	
.pl	Poland	Yes	Registrant and complainant
.pt	Portugal	No	
.rs	Serbia	No	
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)	
.se	Sweden	No	
.si	Slovenia	No	
.uk	United Kingdom	No	
.us	United States	No	
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	No	

13. Mediation

The CDRP does not contain any processes for mediation. By contrast, certain other Registries contain mediation provisions in their dispute resolution process. For example, mediation policies have been adopted in other dispute resolution systems, including those of Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, and the United Kingdom. Set out below is information on which Registries in the comparative study provide mediation in their dispute resolution process, how the mediators are chosen, and who pays for the mediation:

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Whether mediation is offered	Who provides the mediation	How mediators are chosen	Who pays for the mediation
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)			
.au	Australia	No			
.be	Belgium	No			
.ca	Canada	No			
.cat	Catalan	Yes	IQUA	By the provider of the dispute resolution process	Complainant
.ch	Switzerland	No			
.cz	Czech Republic	No			
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)			
.dk	Denmark	Yes	The Board's secretariat		The Registry
.es	Spain	No			
.eu	European Union	No			
.fr	France	No			
.hu	Hungary	No			
.il	Israel	No			
.it	Italy	Yes	Mediators are listed on the Registry website	Chosen by the Registry	The losing party.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Whether mediation is offered	Who provides the mediation	How mediators are chosen	Who pays for the mediation
.jp	Japan	No			
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)			
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)			
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)			
.mx	Mexico	No			
.nl	Netherlands	Yes	Trained Employee of the Registry	Registry appoints the mediator	The Registry
.no	Norway	Yes	The Registry	Chosen by the leader of the ADR	The mediation is part of the ADR system and is financed partly through the complaint fee and partly through the registration fee. If it fails, it goes on to complaint treatment by 3 panelists.
.nz	New Zealand	Yes	Registry has contract with 10 mediators who provide the services.	Same way as experts - "first cab off the rank" system	Domain Name Commission Ltd.
.pl	Poland	Yes	Same providers as the arbitration	Only one mediator unless parties appoint someone else.	Registrant and complainant
.pt	Portugal	Yes	The Arbitration Centre	By the Centre	The parties
.rs	Serbia	No			
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)			
.se	Sweden	No			
.si	Slovenia	No			
.uk	United Kingdom	Yes	The Registry	Complaints are assigned to the	The Registry

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Whether mediation is offered	Who provides the mediation	How mediators are chosen	Who pays for the mediation
				mediators alternately.	
.us	United States	No			
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	No			

14. Appeals

The CDRP does not contain an appeal process. Although parties may appeal a decision to a superior Court, there is no appeal process within the CDRP. No CDRP decision has ever been appealed to a superior Court. By contrast, certain other Registries have adopted appellate processes, including Belgium, Denmark, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. Set out below is information on which Registries provide appeal procedures within their dispute resolution process (outside of Court proceedings), what the appeal consists of, and who pays for the appeal.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Whether appeal procedure is offered	Who hears the appeal	Who pays for the appeal
.at	Austria	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.au	Australia	No		
.be	Belgium	Yes	Appeal must be initiated within 14 days from original decision. Case is then attributed to panel of 3 third party deciders.	Appealing party.
.ca	Canada	No		
.cat	Catalan	No		
.ch	Switzerland	No		
.cz	Czech Republic	No		
.de	Germany	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.dk	Denmark	Yes	Typosquatting decisions can be appealed to the complaint board	Complainant
.es	Spain	No		
.eu	European Union	No		
.fr	France	No		
.hu	Hungary	No		
.il	Israel	No		
.it	Italy	No		

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Whether appeal procedure is offered	Who hears the appeal	Who pays for the appeal
.jp	Japan	No		
.lt	Lithuania	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.lu	Luxembourg	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.lv	Latvia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.mx	Mexico	No		
.nl	Netherlands	No		
.no	Norway	No		
.nz	New Zealand	Yes	An appeal panel will generally consist of the Chair of Experts (unless the first-instance Expert or conflicted) and two other Experts. The Appeal Panel considers appeals on the basis of a full review of the matter and may review procedural matters.	Appealing party.
.pl	Poland	No		
.pt	Portugal	No		
.rs	Serbia	No		
.ru	Russia	Not applicable (no dispute resolution process)		
.se	Sweden	No		
.si	Slovenia	No		
.uk	United Kingdom	Yes	Once a panellist's decision has been filed, either party can appeal the decision and may file a new submission detailing where they think the original panellist has erred. They must also pay a fee (which goes directly to the appeal panel). The appeal panel consists of three experts, who re-	Appealing party.

ccTLD / gTLD	Country / Region	Whether appeal procedure is offered	Who hears the appeal	Who pays for the appeal
			examine the complaint in full.	
.us	United States	No		
gTLD	Generic (e.g. .com, .net, org, etc.)	No		