

NEXT STEPS

CCT-RT DISCUSSION PAPER WORKSHEET

HIGH LEVEL QUESTION: Has the expansion of gTLDs been effective at promoting non-price competition ~~among between~~ TLD operators?

OWNER: Dejan Djukic

SUB-QUESTIONS: Did URS improved rights protection of the trademark owners?
Did URS ~~managed to~~ reduce the costs of disputes resolution?
~~Comparing to UDRP-How~~ effective ~~is has~~ URS been as compared to UDRP?

FINDINGS: These findings are based on Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (CCT) Metrics Reporting, chapters related to Rights Protection Mechanisms¹ and Rights Protection Mechanisms Review.²

Generally, URS has improved right protection mechanisms, ~~it's is~~ more effective in ~~order to~~ take down websites ~~that which~~ infringe ons intellectual property rights as well as ~~to in~~ fighting cybersquatting.

Compared to UDRP, ~~fees, they~~ are lower for URS and range from USD 300 – 500. In comparison, For instance, UDRP provider WIPO charges from USD 1500 – 2000 for a single panelist and from USD 2000 – 4000 for three panelists.³

In general, URS is more effective, ~~but,~~ on the other hand, it has its limitations since its -and purpose is only to suspend domain name registrations only. ~~As a result, Main concern is related to possibility that~~ the same domain name could be registered by another potential infringer once it is released.

CAUSES:

URS was designed to combat obvious cases of trademark infringements or cybersquatting ~~through the use of, based on that it is limited to~~ suspensions, only. Some rights holders prefer having the domain names s transferred to their portfolios, which cannot be achieved by using URS. Still, it is characteristics as a fairly effective, cheap, and fast right protection mechanism despite ~~couldn't be diminished by the~~ limitations mentioned above.

PRIORITY TO ADDRESS: *[ex. Prior to Subsequent Procedures, Mid-term, Long-term This is an important area for community input]*

¹ <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/cct-metrics-rpm-2016-06-27-en>

² <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews/cct/rpm>

³ <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/fees/>

NEXT STEPS

RECOMMENDATIONS: *[recommendations to ICANN. For each, specify: 1. Target of recommendation (i.e. Staff, Board, SubProc PDP); 2. Nature of recommendation; 3. Implementation details, exceptional costs, etc.]*

REVIEW: *[how the effectiveness of these recommendations will be reviewed; e.g. data source recommended for review and recommended timeframe for review]*