

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~~ taking down websites ~~that which~~ infringe ons intellectual property rights as well as ~~to in~~ fighting cybersquatting.

Compared to UDRP, ~~ffees, they~~ are lower for URS and range from USD 300 – 500. In comparison, For instance, UDRP provider WIPO charges ing 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]*