**Recommendation #3: Exemption from Agreement to Submit to Mutual Jurisdiction for IGO Complainants**

1. **In relation to the UDRP**: The EPDP team recommends that an IGO Complainant (as defined under Recommendation #1, above) be exempt from the requirement to state that it will “submit, with respect to any challenges to a decision in the administrative proceeding canceling or transferring the domain name, to the jurisdiction of the courts in at least one specified Mutual Jurisdiction”.
2. **In relation to the URS:** The EPDP team recommends that an IGO Complainant (as defined under Recommendation #1, above) be exempt from the requirement to state that it will “submit, with respect to any challenges to a determination in the URS proceeding, to the jurisdiction of the courts in at least one specified Mutual Jurisdiction”.

**Suggested Amendment from BC (07 Jan 2022):**

A Respondent may challenge a decision (from the administrative proceeding canceling or transferring the domain name) in a court in at least one Mutual Jurisdiction specified by the Complainant in the Complaint, however in such a court proceeding an IGO may raise its claimed privileges and immunities. For greater clarity, nothing in this provision abrogates or diminishes an IGO’s right to claim privileges and immunities as a defense to a challenged administrative proceeding's decision, nor does the IGO’s agreement to this provision constitute a waiver of any of its claimed privileges and immunities.