

## 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 H~~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 Mechanisms<sup>1</sup> and Rights Protection Mechanisms Review.<sup>2</sup>

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 fees, ~~they~~ are lower for URS and range from USD 300 – 500. In comparison, For instance, UDRP provider WIPO charging ing from USD 1500 – 2000 for a single panelist and from USD 2000 – 4000 for three panelists.<sup>3</sup>

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]*

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

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

<sup>3</sup> <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]*