

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

IPMO Advisory AG v. PMaspire Global, PMaspire Group and PMO
Global Tech Ltd
Case No. DIO2026-0035

1. The Parties

The Complainant is IPMO Advisory AG, Switzerland, represented by Law Office Lazarov Skopje, North Macedonia.

The Respondents are PMaspire Global, PMaspire Group, Singapore, and PMO Global Tech Ltd, United Kingdom (hereinafter referred to as “the Respondent”), represented by Motsnyi IP Group, Serbia.

2. The Domain Name(s) and Registrar(s)

The disputed domain name <aipmo.io> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 13, 2026. On July 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 14, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 16, 2026 requesting that the Complaint be read as directed against both PMO Global Tech Ltd and the Registrar-disclosed registrant, PMaspire Global / PMaspire Group.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 9, 2026. Following receipt of a request from the Respondent on August 6, 2026, the Response due date was extended to August 13, 2026, in accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(b), and the Response was filed with the Center on August 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Warwick A. Rothnie as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

On September 15, 2026, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Order No. 1 pursuant to paragraph 12 of the Rules inviting:

- (1) the Complainant to submit a supplemental filing clarifying dealings between the Complainant and a director of the Respondent; and
- (2) the Respondent to submit a response, if so desired, in reply to the Complainant's supplemental filing (if any).

In accordance with that Administrative Order, the Complainant submitted a supplemental filing on September 22, 2026, and the Respondent submitted a reply on September 29, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant operates the Association of International Project Management Officers – AIPMO for short. As the name of the association suggests, it is a professional association of those engaged in the design, establishment and management of project management offices (PMOs). The Complainant's association has been operating under the name since 2015.

Since then, the Complainant has been providing PMO frameworks, certification pathways, professional training, conferences, research, publications, assessments, consulting and software-supported PMO analysis under the association's name and its abbreviation, AIPMO. Although based in the Zurich, Switzerland area, according to the Complaint, the Complainant delivers its training services in more than 50 countries, and more than 2,000 project management professionals have earned certifications from the Complainant. The Complaint also states that the Complainant's "ecosystem" has also been used in academic and applied research contexts, including research collaboration and doctoral-level work with university partners such as Alma Mater Europaea ECM and Stellenbosch University, concerning PMO management, PMO maturity and enablement, and related project, program, and portfolio management topics.

By at least November 10, 2025, the Complainant also launched education and certification activities directed to the use of AI tools in project management. These activities included an AI-PMO Day program and an AI-PMO Enablement Book. The Complainant has also developed GPT-supported learning resources including the AI-PMO Foundations-All-Access GPT. As part of this initiative, the Complainant also offers software under the trademark PMO-MI and from the website "www.pmo-mi.com". According to the website, "PMO-MI® is the assessment, benchmarking and improvement model for PMOs. Score maturity and impact across 24 service domains — then get the roadmap to the next tier."

The Complainant operates from a website "www.aipmo.org". In addition to this website and the "www.pmo-mi.com" website, the Complainant also has a website at <ipmoadvisory.com> from which, according to the website, training in project management skills has been offered since 2002 (although presumably not by the Complainant which was incorporated only in 2015).

The Complainant's LinkedIn account at "www.linkedin.com/company/aipmo---association-of-international-project-management-officers/?originalSubdomain=ch", which is headed "AIPMO - Association of International Project Management Officers", has some 9,000 followers.

The Complaint includes evidence that the Complainant has a number of registered trademarks for AIPMO:

(1) Swiss Registered Trademark No. 693887 which was registered on October 11, 2016, in respect of a range of services in International Classes 36, 41 and 42;¹

(2) United Kingdom Registered Trademark No. UK00801337369, which was registered on September 8, 2017, in respect of the following services in International Class 41:

"Education, training; entertainment services; sporting and cultural activities; academies (education); coaching (training); correspondence courses; education; teaching; boarding school education; correspondence courses; information relating to education; tuition; organization of exhibitions for cultural or educational purposes; organization and conducting of training workshops; organization and conducting of colloquiums; organization and conducting of concerts; organization and conducting of conferences; organization and conducting of congresses; organization and conducting of non-virtual educational forums; organization and conducting of seminars; organization and conducting of symposiums; vocational guidance (education or training advice)"

Although registered on September 8, 2017, this registered trademark claims a priority date of June 28, 2016.

(3) United States of America ("United States") Registered Trademark No. 5,343,450, which was registered on November 28, 2017, in the Principal Register in respect of essentially the same services in International Class 41 as the United Kingdom Registered Trademark; and

(4) International Registration No. 1337369, which was registered on November 14, 2016, in respect of similar services to those listed in the United States registered trademark and which designated the European Union and India in addition to the United States.

According to the WhoIs Report, the disputed domain name was registered on January 15, 2024.

It resolves to a website of the Respondent.² The Respondent, PMO Global Tech Ltd, was incorporated in the United Kingdom on April 27, 2023.

The website is headed "cosmicAI" and "cosmic – world's leading next generation AI PMO." It offers project management tools using AI including in particular an AI assistant called "Tura" and for which monthly or annual subscription fees are charged. Under a tab headed "PMO Conference UK", the Respondent offers two conferences – an AI PMO Conference London 2026 which includes keynotes, panels, case studies, networking and AI PMO demonstrations. The second conference has a link headed Agile PMO Conference but, at the time this Decision is being prepared, resolves to a "Page Not Found" page.

¹ A Google translation of the class 36 services is "insurance, financial affairs, monetary affairs, real estate affairs".

² The Registrar's verification response identifies the respondent as PMaspire Global, PMaspire Group, Singapore. By its amendment, the Complainant requested that the Complaint be read as directed against both PMO Global Tech Ltd and PMaspire Global / PMaspire Group. Following notification of the Complaint to the addresses confirmed as correct by the Registrar, the Response was received from PMO Global Tech Ltd, a company incorporated in the United Kingdom. According to the Response, PMaspire Singapore Pte. Ltd. has recently been dissolved. Prior to its dissolution, it and PMO Global Tech Ltd were both part of the "PMaspire" global network and group of companies. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves appears to be operated by PMO Global Tech Ltd. In these circumstances, the Panel will treat PMO Global Tech Ltd as the Respondent.

The footer of the website's pages reads "Copyright 2025 aipmo. All Rights Reserved."

The Respondent is the owner of:

- (a) United Kingdom Registered Trademark No UK00004156115 for the device:



which was filed on February 5, 2025, and registered on May 2, 2025, in respect of computer software and business software and associated goods in International Class 9 and software design; software as a service [SaaS] featuring software for machine learning in International Class 42.

- (b) United Kingdom Registered Trademark No UK00004225223 for a figurative mark:



which was filed on June 26, 2025, and registered on October 17, 2025, in respect of business advisory and consultancy services in International Class 35 and software development services in International Class 42; and

- (c) United Kingdom Registered Trademark No UK00004381239, THE AI PMO MATURITY MODEL (AI-PMO)³, which was filed on April 30, 2026 and registered on July 31, 2026 in respect of Education and training services in the field of project management, project management offices (PMO), and artificial intelligence; providing certification programs; conducting workshops, seminars, and professional training related to AI enabled PMO maturity models and frameworks in International Class 41 and Software as a service (SaaS) featuring software for project management office (PMO) management, maturity assessment, artificial intelligence based analytics, predictive governance, and decision support; development and provision of AI driven PMO software platforms in International Class 42.

The third trademark, TM UK00004381239, was filed after the Respondent's director received a LinkedIn message on February 26, 2026, from an officer of the Complainant objecting to the use of the disputed domain name and a subsequent cease-and-desist letter from the Complainant's representatives. When the Complaint was filed on July 13, 2026, that application was still pending; it proceeded to registration on July 31, 2026.

According to the Response, the PMaspire group has been actively providing global project management solutions since 2014. The domain name <pmaspire.com> was registered on December 2, 2014. The website to which this domain name resolves offers a range of services including a project management suite, an AI based PMO software and [project management] training for training companies. In 2019, "PMaspire" launched a service called "Baseline" which was an AI based PMO Dashboard for smooth project completion. In 2021, it also published an article "Artificial Intelligence (AI) Driven Project Management Office (PMO)".

On September 29, 2025, the Respondent filed a patent application in the United Kingdom, GB2516141.5 entitled "Systems and methods for provisioning of cloud computing resources for project management office".

In the LinkedIn message on February 26, 2026, the Complainant's officer stated his opening greeting was "Hello Abdulla, Been some time. Trust all is well." The supplemental filings confirm that the Respondent's director and the Complainant's officer had previously communicated with each other between February 18, 2024, and May 2024 in connection with a possible collaboration, including a possible "Global PMO Day" project. In the first of those communications, the Complainant's officer stated "we never spoke". All of

those communications post-date the registration of the disputed domain name on January 15, 2024, as the Complainant accepts. In the event, the collaboration did not proceed. At the time, the Respondent's director was acting in his capacity as the CEO of PMO Global Institute Inc., a different company in the same corporate group as the Respondent.

It appears that the Complainant first became aware of the Respondent's offering on January 19, 2026, when it was brought to the attention of one of its officers by one of the Complainant's business partners. That business partner, according to the Respondent, was formerly an authorised business partner of PMO Global Institute Inc. but that relationship had ended on acrimonious terms.

5. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of a disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules directs the Panel to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Respondent does not dispute that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's registered trademarks. Disregarding the country-code Top-Level-Domain .io (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7³), therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the first requirement under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

It is also not in dispute between the parties that the Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to use the disputed domain name and the Respondent is not associated with the Complainant in any relevant way.

The Respondent contends, however, adoption of the disputed domain name is supported by derivation from the PMO element of its company name. Thus, invoking paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent contends further that it chose the disputed domain name because "AI PMO" directly describes the nature of its business – the provision of project management office services using artificial intelligence. It then claims that, before any notice of the dispute, it was using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services within paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. It also relies on [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.2 and 2.10. In that connection, the Respondent points out that the "PMaspire" group has been providing its Baseline service, which is an AI based PMO dashboard, since 2019. Two of the Respondent's registered trademarks include "AI PMO" and that phrase is used throughout its website.

³ In view of the close correspondence of the Policy to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), the Panel accepts it is appropriate to treat interpretation of corresponding elements in the same way. *IOTA Foundation v Privacy Service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf/Super Green*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2022-0001](#).

Further yet, the Respondent contends that it and the Complainant operate in different fields – the Complainant is engaged in providing training services while the Respondent is engaged in providing software and project management services using artificial intelligence. Any overlap is incidental and accidental. The Respondent also points out that in the Complainant's use of the acronym AIPMO "AI" stands for "Association of International" not "artificial intelligence" and the Complainant's offerings in relation to artificial intelligence post-date the PMaspire group's involvement in this field. The Respondent also relies on its three trademarks registered in the United Kingdom.

The Complainant, for its part, contends that the Respondent consistently uses the separated expression "AI PMO" and trades under the distinct "cosmic" brand, yet selected the exact unhyphenated AIPMO mark as its domain name with its concomitant risks of confusion. Further, the trademark application for THE AI PMO MATURITY MODEL (AI-PMO)³ was filed after notice of the dispute and cannot retrospectively confer rights or legitimate interests. Further still, the Complainant contends that a trademark obtained primarily to circumvent the Policy does not assist the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.12.

On the materials before the Panel, it does not appear that there is any dispute that the Respondent is operating a business providing project management office services and training involving the use of artificial intelligence (or AI).

The Panel does not consider that the disputed domain name can fairly be considered as derived from the Respondent's name for the purposes of paragraph 4(c)(ii). The Panel does not consider that this trade source use, or the registration or use of the disputed domain name, can be supported by reference to the Respondent's name. AIPMO as a discrete expression has a very different look, sound and idea to PMO alone. The addition of the component AI changes the look, sound, and idea conveyed too much.

The Panel does not place much, if any, weight on the contention that the parties are in different fields and any overlap is purely accidental or incidental. For example, the Respondent's own registered trademarks include the provision of business advisory services, training and workshops, and other educational services.

The Panel acknowledges that there are uses of "AI PMO" on the Respondent's website, and those of its corporate group, in a descriptive sense; that is, using the expression to refer to the use of artificial intelligence in project management. However, the use of the disputed domain name and some other uses on the Respondent's website are in the nature of identifying trade source; that is, as badges of origin.

The Respondent's registered trademarks for the two "logos", Registered Trademark Nos. UK00004156115 and UK00004225223, provide limited assistance to the Respondent. In the case of Registered Trademark No. UK00004225223, there is no use of AIPMO at all, but in Registered Trademark No. UK00004156115 the element "AI PMO" is included as a minor element, albeit likely to be perceived as descriptive feature.

Registered Trademark No. UK00004381239, however, is for the word mark THE AI PMO MATURITY MODEL (AI-PMO)³. It can be reasonably argued that use of the disputed domain name is supported by that registration.

The Respondent had not applied to register Registered Trademark No. UK00004381239 when it registered the disputed domain name. Indeed, it did not apply to register the trademark until after the Complainant's officer challenged the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name in February, earlier this year. Strictly speaking, therefore, the Respondent's trademark registration cannot be relied on to justify registration of the disputed domain name.

Typically, the question of rights or legitimate interests is assessed at the time the Complaint is filed. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.11. In the present case, as the Complainant emphasizes, the Respondent's trademark application was still pending. Ordinarily, the Panel considers that these matters would likely preclude a respondent from establishing that it had rights or legitimate interests in a challenged domain name. As the Complainant contends, those circumstances would often indicate the trademark application

was pretextual. That said, the Panel cannot ignore the fact that the Respondent's trademark application has now proceeded to registration. Further, it did so without the Complainant opposing registration even though it appears the Complainant was well aware that the application was pending.

Both parties appear to accept "pmo" as a commonly used acronym for "project management office", used widely in the project management sector, and "ai" is indeed a standard acronym for "artificial intelligence".

Nonetheless, the Panel does have reservations about the Respondent's adoption of the disputed domain name as a unitary expression and the usages of the expression as a trademark and not just as a descriptor.

Against that, the Respondent does have a registered trademark. The mark as registered does feature AI and PMO separated either by a space or a hyphen. At least so far as the space is concerned, it cannot be represented in a domain name so is either omitted or replaced by a hyphen in typical domain naming conventions. Further, even though the Complainant appears to have been aware of the Respondent's pending application, it did not take steps to oppose registration before grant. Ultimately, the fact of the matter is the Respondent does have the registered trademark in the United Kingdom which provides a basis for rights to use the disputed domain name, at least in the United Kingdom, for the purposes of the Policy. It is not the Panel's place to go behind the validity of that registration or its scope in proceedings of the nature of proceedings under the Policy. That is something better addressed in an appropriate court or other relevant tribunal.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has failed to establish that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Complaint must fail.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

As the Complaint must fail, no good purpose would be served by considering this requirement under the Policy.

D.Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Respondent contends that there should be a finding of reverse domain name hijacking.

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding.

The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

While the Complaint has failed, this is not an appropriate case for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. When the Complaint was filed, a critical trademark application on which the Respondent relies was still pending and the application was made only after the Complainant challenged the Respondent. Moreover, the Complainant had already been operating under an identical trademark (AIPMO) and domain name (<aipmo.org>) at the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. In those circumstances it was not prima facie unreasonable for the Complainant to have brought the Complaint.

In the circumstances, therefore, the Panel declines to make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

6. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Warwick A. Rothnie/

Warwick A. Rothnie

Sole Panelist

Date: October 6, 2026