



Universidad  
Católica del Norte



ASSISTANCE TO DOMAIN NAME HOLDERS

# **DETAILED STUDY GUIDE: UNDERSTANDING THE UNIFORM DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY (UDRP)**

**Humberto Carrasco-Blanc**

**José Sánchez-Oyarzún**

**Kathryn A. Kleiman**

**American University**

**Margarita Valdés-Cortés**

**Javier Maestre-Rodríguez**

**Chris Reed**



## DETAILED STUDY GUIDE: UNDERSTANDING THE UNIFORM DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY (UDRP)

**Humberto Carrasco-Blanco** 

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1034-7521>

Universidad Católica del Norte - <https://ror.org/02akpm128>

**José Sánchez-Oyarzún**

Universidad Católica del Norte - <https://ror.org/02akpm128>

**Kathryn A. Kleiman** 

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8725-0064>

American University - <https://ror.org/052w4zt36>

**Margarita Valdés-Cortés**

Universidad de Chile - <https://ror.org/047gc3g35>

**Javier Maestre-Rodríguez**

Maestre Abogados

**Chris Reed** 

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9124-5489>

Queen Mary University of London - <https://ror.org/026zzn846>

Detailed study guide: Understanding the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP)

Work Coordinator: Humberto Carrasco-Blanc


<https://repositorio.ucn.cl/handle/20.500.14729/9314>

Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas



**License:** This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

You are free to copy, redistribute, and adapt the material, even for commercial purposes, provided that appropriate credit is given and any changes made are indicated. More information: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

 Universidad Católica del Norte. <https://ror.org/02akpm128>

Published in Coquimbo, Chile, 2026.

Departamento de Ciencia Abierta y Cultura Científica.

This is a derivative work of: *Domain name disputes: Understanding the problem.*  
<https://doi.org/10.22199/ADNH002>

**Associated with this work, the following materials are available (please click the links below to access them):**

- an audio recording,
- a video presentation,
- and a FAQ.

#### **Acknowledgements:**

This work was supported by the ICANN Grant Program through the project “Assistance for Domain Name Holders in ICANN’s Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy Procedures”, implemented by Universidad Católica del Norte.

## Abstract

This Open Educational Resource provides a structured and analytical guide to the global administrative mechanism designed to address abusive domain name registrations, particularly those involving trademark conflicts in the digital environment. It explains the legal and contractual foundations of the system, details the three cumulative elements required for a successful complaint, and examines evidentiary standards related to legitimate interests and bad faith. The guide outlines the procedural stages from complaint to implementation, clarifies available remedies, and critically evaluates advantages such as speed and cost-effectiveness alongside limitations including restricted remedies and non-binding precedent. It also situates this mechanism within a broader ecosystem of dispute resolution tools, comparing it with judicial litigation and rapid suspension procedures, and highlighting its role in transnational digital governance and online brand protection.

**Keywords:** cybersquatting; domain name disputes; trademark enforcement; bad faith registration; legitimate interests; online dispute resolution; digital governance; transnational regulation; brand protection; rapid suspension procedures.

## AI Use Statement

In the preparation of this work, artificial intelligence tools such as Gemini, ChatGPT, and NotebookLM were used to support tasks including the improvement of paragraph drafting, topic research, and the development of summaries, among other uses. These outputs were reviewed more than twice by human beings, who appear as the authors, and therefore all decisions regarding content, legal interpretation, argumentative structure, and conclusions rest entirely with them, who assume full responsibility for the accuracy and rigor of the work. No sensitive or confidential information was entered into the platform used, and each generated response was critically reviewed before being incorporated into the document.

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction to UDRP</b> .....	6
<b>2. Fundamental Principles and Application Criteria</b> .....	6
<b>3. The UDRP Process: From Complaint to Decision</b> .....	7
<b>4. Advantages and Limitations of UDRP</b> .....	8
<b>5. Alternatives and Complements to UDRP</b> .....	8
<b>Comprehension Quiz</b> .....	9
<b>Quiz Answer Keys</b> .....	10
<b>Essay Questions</b> .....	11
<b>Glossary of Key Terms</b> .....	11

## 1. Introduction to UDRP

- **Definition and Purpose:** What is the UDRP, and what core problem was it designed to address?
- **Legal Framework:** Which types of domain names does UDRP apply to?
- Who is contractually bound by the UDRP, and how does this consent occur?
- How does the UDRP relate to traditional judicial litigation?
- **Historical Context:** What organizations were primarily responsible for its development and adoption?
- When was it adopted?
- What specific phenomenon led to its creation?
- **Key Objectives:** What is "cybersquatting," and how does the UDRP combat it?
- What are the main benefits of the UDRP over traditional litigation in achieving these objectives?
- How does the UDRP contribute to user trust and the commercial growth of the Internet?
- Explain the "private governance" paradigm demonstrated by the UDRP.
- What are some other legitimate interests that the UDRP incorporates?

## 2. Fundamental Principles and Application Criteria

- **The Three Essential Elements for a Successful UDRP Complaint:** Understand that all three elements must be proven by the complainant.
- **Element 1: Identity or Confusing Similarity with a Trademark (Paragraph 4(a)(i))** What does this element require the complainant to demonstrate?
- Are only registered trademarks covered? Provide an example.
- What parts of a domain name are typically ignored by UDRP panels when assessing similarity?
- Provide examples of "confusing similarity."
- Is the content of the associated website usually relevant for this element? Why or why not?
- How does this element relate to consumer confusion?
- **Element 2: Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests of the Registrant (Paragraph 4(a)(ii))** What must the complainant establish initially for this element?
- What specific circumstances, if proven by the respondent, can demonstrate legitimate interests? Provide examples.
- Explain the shifting burden of proof for this element.
- List examples of evidence that panels consider when determining legitimate interests.

<https://repositorio.ucn.cl/handle/20.500.14729/9314>

- **Element 3: Registration and Use in Bad Faith (Paragraph 4(a)(iii))** What must the complainant prove regarding bad faith?
- List and explain the four common circumstances that indicate registration and use in bad faith, as per Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.
- Can passive possession of a domain name be considered bad faith?
- What is the significance of the timing of domain name registration relative to trademark rights? Provide an example.
- How does the UDRP's interpretation of "bad faith" demonstrate its adaptability? Provide examples.
- What is "Reverse Domain Name Hijacking" (RDNH), and how does the bad faith criterion safeguard against it? Illustrate with an example.

### 3. The UDRP Process: From Complaint to Decision

- **Overview of Stages:** Outline the basic, sequential stages of a UDRP procedure.
- **Detailed Stages:**
  - **Filing the Complaint:** Who initiates it? What must it include? What are the financial requirements?
  - **Filing the Response:** Who is notified? What is the timeframe? What must the response aim to do?
  - **Panel Appointment:** Who appoints the panel? What is their expertise? How are costs shared for a single vs. three-member panel?
  - **Panel Decision:** What does the panel evaluate? What is the typical format of proceedings (e.g., written submissions, hearings)? What is the timeframe for a decision?
  - **Notification and Implementation:** Who is notified? What is the registrar's role? What are the typical outcomes?
- **Possible Outcomes:** What are the two main remedies if the complainant wins? Which is more common?
- When is a complaint rejected?
- Can UDRP decisions be subsequently litigated in national courts? What is the timeframe for this?
- **Nature of the UDRP Procedure:** Why is it considered "administrative," "rapid," and "cost-effective"?
- What are the inherent limitations due to this design (e.g., remedies, precedential value)?
- **Consolidation:** Explain the concept of "consolidation" in UDRP procedures and its benefits, using the C&J Clark case as an example.

## 4. Advantages and Limitations of UDRP

- **Key Advantages:** Be able to explain each of the following:
  - Speed
  - Cost-effectiveness
  - International Scope
  - Expert Decision-Makers
  - Simplicity of Pleadings
  - Specific and Direct Remedy
- **Challenges and Criticisms (Limitations):** Be able to explain each of the following:
  - Limited Remedies (no monetary compensation)
  - Absence of Internal Appeal Mechanism
  - Non-Binding Precedent (unpredictability)
  - Potential for Abuse / Power Disparities (RDNH)
  - Concerns about Impartiality and Independence
  - Limited Scope for Complex IP Issues
  - Settlement Discussions as Evidence (discourages pre-dispute resolution)
- **Fundamental Trade-off:** Explain the core trade-off UDRP operates on (speed/cost vs. predictability/remedies).
- **De Facto "Best Practices":** How has the UDRP system, despite non-binding precedent, established best practices in trademark enforcement online?

## 5. Alternatives and Complements to UDRP

- **UDRP vs. Judicial Litigation:** Compare and contrast these two mechanisms across the following criteria:
  - Speed
  - Cost
  - Remedies (e.g., ACPA)
  - Precedent and Appeal
  - Complexity
  - Settlement Discussions as Evidence

<https://repositorio.ucn.cl/handle/20.500.14729/9314>

- **Other Administrative Procedures:Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS):**When was it introduced?  
For which gTLDs?
  - How does its speed compare to UDRP?
  - What is its evidence threshold?
  - What is its limited remedy? How does it differ from UDRP?
  - How does its cost compare?
- **ccTLD Policies:**What are ccTLDs?
  - Do they all adopt UDRP?
  - What variations can exist in ccTLD policies? Provide examples.
  - Why is it crucial to consult local ccTLD administrators?
- **Strategic Choice of Mechanism:** Explain how the choice of resolution mechanism depends on the specific objectives and circumstances of the case.
  - When is UDRP preferred?
  - When is URS useful?
  - When are judicial litigations more appropriate?
  - What about ccTLDs?
- **Ecosystem of Tools:** How do these various mechanisms form a comprehensive ecosystem for IP protection online?

## Comprehension Quiz

Answer the following questions in 2-3 sentences each.

1. What is the primary purpose of the UDRP, and which global organizations were instrumental in its development and adoption?
2. Explain how registrants of domain names implicitly consent to be bound by the UDRP.
3. Name the three essential elements a complainant must prove for a successful UDRP complaint.
4. If a respondent can demonstrate they were commonly known by a domain name, even without formal trademark rights, what UDRP element might they be refuting, and why is this significant?
5. Provide an example of "typosquatting" and explain why it typically satisfies the UDRP criterion of "identity or confusing similarity with a trademark."
6. Describe two specific circumstances that the UDRP considers as evidence of registration and use in "bad faith."

<https://repositorio.ucn.cl/handle/20.500.14729/9314>

7. What is "Reverse Domain Name Hijacking" (RDNH), and how does the UDRP's requirement for proving both registration and use in bad faith help prevent it?
8. Briefly explain the primary difference in remedies available under the UDRP compared to traditional judicial litigation, particularly concerning monetary compensation.
9. Identify two key advantages of using the UDRP for domain name disputes instead of national court litigation.
10. How does the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system differ from the UDRP in terms of its speed and the remedy it offers?

## Quiz Answer Keys

1. The primary purpose of the UDRP is to provide a standardized legal framework for the expedited resolution of disputes related to abusive domain name registrations, particularly cybersquatting. It was primarily developed by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and adopted by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).
2. Any individual or entity registering a domain name under gTLDs (and many ccTLDs) automatically consents to abide by the UDRP. This consent is generally integrated into the standard domain registration agreement with ICANN-accredited registrars, who are contractually obliged to enforce the policy.
3. The three essential elements a complainant must prove for a successful UDRP complaint are: (1) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights; (2) the registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and (3) the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.
4. If a respondent can demonstrate they were commonly known by a domain name, even without formal trademark rights, they might be refuting the second UDRP element: "Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests of the Registrant." This is significant because it provides a legitimate defense against a complainant's claim, indicating a valid reason for holding the domain name.
5. Typosquatting, like registering "googl.com" for Google, involves intentional misspelling of a trademark in a domain name. This typically satisfies the "identity or confusing similarity" criterion because the slight variation is likely to cause consumer confusion, leading users to believe the domain is associated with the legitimate brand.
6. Two specific circumstances indicating bad faith include: (1) registering a domain name primarily to sell, rent, or transfer it to the trademark owner for profit exceeding documented costs (a hallmark of cybersquatting); and (2) intentionally using the domain name to attract internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the complainant's mark regarding the source or affiliation of the website.
7. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (RDNH) occurs when a trademark owner files a UDRP complaint in bad faith, knowing they lack legitimate grounds for success. The UDRP's requirement to prove both bad faith registration *and* bad faith use acts as a safeguard against RDNH, protecting legitimate

domain name holders from unwarranted challenges by trademark owners seeking to acquire desirable domains unfairly.

8. The primary difference in remedies is that the UDRP only allows for the transfer or cancellation of the disputed domain name. Traditional judicial litigation, such as under the ACPA, can provide for monetary compensation, including actual damages and statutory damages, which is not available through the UDRP.
9. Two key advantages of using the UDRP are its speed, as resolutions can often be achieved in a matter of weeks, and its cost-effectiveness, as it is significantly cheaper than filing a lawsuit in national courts.
10. The Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system is faster than the UDRP, typically issuing decisions within 14 days, and offers a more limited remedy. Unlike the UDRP which can transfer the domain, the URS only allows for the temporary suspension of the domain name until its expiration, making it unsuitable for permanent domain recovery.

## Essay Questions

1. Analyze the UDRP's "private governance" model. Discuss how the collaboration between ICANN and WIPO, alongside contractual obligations for registrars, allows the UDRP to effectively address trans-border domain name disputes without relying on traditional intergovernmental regulation, and evaluate the implications of this model for future digital governance challenges.
2. Critically examine the balance between efficiency and justice in the UDRP framework. Discuss how its design, characterized by speed, cost-effectiveness, and limited remedies, presents both significant advantages for combatting cybersquatting and inherent limitations for more complex intellectual property disputes or when monetary compensation is sought.
3. Discuss the three essential elements required for a successful UDRP complaint in detail. Explain the evidentiary burden for each element, providing specific examples of what complainants and respondents might need to prove, and analyze how the "bad faith" criterion's dynamic interpretation contributes to the UDRP's adaptability.
4. Compare and contrast the UDRP with traditional judicial litigation and the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system as mechanisms for resolving domain name disputes. Analyze their respective strengths and weaknesses across key criteria such as speed, cost, available remedies, precedential value, and complexity, and explain when a brand owner might strategically choose one over the others.
5. Evaluate the UDRP's impact on building user trust and fostering the commercial growth of the Internet. Discuss how its role in quickly addressing abusive domain name registrations, combined with the development of "de facto best practices," contributes to a more reliable online environment, and consider any ongoing challenges to maintaining this trust.

## Glossary of Key Terms

- **Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP):** A global administrative procedure for resolving disputes between trademark owners and domain name registrants over abusive registrations.

<https://repositorio.ucn.cl/handle/20.500.14729/9314>

- **Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN):** A non-profit organization responsible for coordinating the maintenance and procedures of several databases related to the namespaces and numerical spaces of the Internet, ensuring the Internet's stable and secure operation.
- **World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO):** A specialized agency of the United Nations that provides international intellectual property services and acts as a leading dispute resolution service provider for UDRP cases.
- **Cybersquatting:** The abusive practice of registering a domain name identical or confusingly similar to a trademark with the malicious intent of profiting from it, often by selling it to the legitimate trademark owner or diverting traffic.
- **Generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD):** Domain name extensions such as .com, .net, .org, which are overseen by ICANN and are mandatorily subject to the UDRP.
- **Country Code Top-Level Domain (ccTLD):** Domain name extensions associated with specific countries or territories (e.g., .mx for Mexico, .uk for United Kingdom), which may voluntarily adopt the UDRP or implement their own dispute resolution policies.
- **Registrar:** An entity accredited by ICANN (or a ccTLD operator) to register domain names for individuals and organizations. Registrars are contractually bound to comply with the UDRP.
- **Complainant:** The party initiating a UDRP dispute, typically the trademark owner who alleges abusive registration of a domain name.
- **Respondent:** The party against whom a UDRP complaint is filed, typically the registrant of the disputed domain name.
- **Panel:** One or three independent experts in trademark law and domain name disputes appointed by a UDRP service provider (like WIPO) to adjudicate a UDRP case.
- **Bad Faith:** A crucial UDRP criterion referring to the malicious intent behind the registration and use of a domain name, often for commercial gain at the expense of a trademark owner.
- **Typosquatting:** A form of cybersquatting involving the registration of domain names that are slight misspellings or typographical errors of well-known trademarks, intended to exploit user mistakes.
- **Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (RDNH):** An abusive practice where a trademark owner files a UDRP complaint against a domain name registrant knowing that they do not have legitimate grounds to succeed, effectively attempting to "hijack" the domain.
- **Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) System:** An administrative dispute resolution procedure complementary to UDRP, introduced by ICANN for new gTLDs, designed for clearer cases of cybersquatting, offering a faster process but only allowing for temporary suspension of the domain.
- **Abusive Registration and Use:** The core conduct the UDRP aims to combat, encompassing practices like cybersquatting where a domain name infringes on trademark rights and is held without legitimate interest.

<https://repositorio.ucn.cl/handle/20.500.14729/9314>

- **Domain Registration Agreement:** The contract between a domain name registrant and a registrar, which typically includes the registrant's implicit consent to the UDRP.
- **Precedente No Vinculante:** A characteristic of UDRP decisions, meaning that while WIPO publishes panel opinions for consistency, individual panels are not formally bound by previous rulings, leading to a degree of unpredictability.
- **Monetary Compensation:** Financial damages (e.g., for lost profits) that are not available as remedies under the UDRP but can be sought through traditional judicial litigation.
- **Consolidación:** A UDRP procedural mechanism allowing a complainant to group multiple domain names in a single complaint, particularly useful for addressing widespread cybersquatting campaigns by a single entity.