

For Best Audio: Join via Telephone Using Dial-Out

Connecting via the audio bridge is always preferable to the AC audio connection.

Upon logging into Adobe Connect, a pop-up window will appear for the AC to call your phone. This preferred method will assure the best audio for the meeting.

Join Audio Conference

How would you like to join the meeting's audio conference?

Dial-out [Receive a call from the meeting]

+1 (USA) 310-111-11111

Dial-in to the Audio Conference via Phone

Using Microphone (Computer/Device)

Join Listen Only

After 2 background noise occurrences, staff will mute the offending line (either Telephone or Adobe Connect).

After two failed attempts to speak over the audio, participants will be invited to type their comments in the chat or take them to the mailing list.

PLEASE ALWAYS MUTE WHEN NOT SPEAKING!

***6 to mute and *6 to unmute**

For any questions, dial out requests, apologies, please email: mssi-secretariat@icann.org

CCT Safeguards & Trust Subteam Call #43

5 June 2018



CCT Safeguards & Trust Subteam Call #43

- Welcome, Roll-Call, Sol Updates
- Recommendation 40, 41, 42: *David*
- ~~Recommendation D: *David/Drew*~~
- Recommendation 19, 34, C: *Drew*
- A.O.B.
- Confirm Decisions Reached and Action Items

Rec. 40

Amended Recommendation 40: An Impact Study in order to ascertain the impact of the New gTLD Program on the cost and effort required to protect trademarks in the DNS should be repeated at regular intervals to see the evolution over time as the New gTLD Program continues to evolve and new gTLD registrations increase. We would specifically recommend that the next Impact Survey be completed within 18 months after issuance of the CCTRT final report, and that subsequent studies be repeated every 18 to 24 months. The CCTRT acknowledges the fact that this study was carried out in 2017 by Nielsen surveying INTA members and we encourage that to continue noting that the study needs to be more user friendly in order to help ensure a higher and more statistically significant response rate.

Rationale/related findings: Costs will likely vary considerably over time as new gTLDs are delegated and registration levels evolve. Repeating the Impact Study would enable a comparison over time.

Rec. 41

Amended Recommendation 41: Since our initial draft recommendation, the PDP Review of All RPMs in All gTLDs has started reviewing the URS in detail and this is currently ongoing. Given this ongoing review the CCTRT recommends that the RPM WG continues its review of the URS and also looks into the interoperability of the URS with the UDRP. Given the current timeline it would appear that the appropriate time to do so will be when the UDRP review is carried out by the PDP WG and at this time consideration be given to how it should interoperate with the UDRP.

The CCTRT has encountered a lack of available data in many respects and the PDP Review of All RPMs appears to also be encountering this issue and this may well prevent it drawing firm conclusions. If modifications are not easily identified then the CCTRT suggests continued monitoring until more data is available for a review at a later date. It is important that future review teams are able to have sufficient data and thus efforts need to be made to collect this on an ongoing basis.

Rationale/related findings: It is important for all gTLDs to have a level playing field so the applicability of the URS should be considered to all gTLDs.

Rec. 42

Amended Recommendation 42: A cost-benefit analysis and review of the TMCH and its scope should be carried out to provide quantifiable information on the costs and benefits associated with the present state of the TMCH services and thus to allow for an effective policy review. Since our initial draft recommendation, the PDP Review of All RPMs in All gTLDs has started reviewing the TMCH in detail and ICANN has appointed Analysis Group, Inc. to develop and conduct the survey(s) to assess the use and effectiveness of the Sunrise and Trademark Claims RPMs. Provided that this PDP Review of All RPMs has sufficient data from this survey or other surveys and is able to draw firm conclusions the CCTRT does not consider that an additional review is necessary. However the CCTRT does still underline its recommendation for a cost-benefit analysis to be carried out if such analysis can help obtain sufficient data for conclusions to be drawn objectively. Such cost-benefit analysis should include but not necessarily be limited to looking at cost to brand owners, cost to registries and cost to registrars of operating with the TMCH now and going forward and look at the interplay with premium pricing. This of course may be part of the Analysis Group survey and we would encourage that.

Rationale/related findings: The Independent Review of Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) Services Revised Report¹³⁸ has not been able to make definitive conclusions due to data limitations and indeed specifically noted that it was unable to perform a cost-benefit analysis of extending the Claims Service or expanding the matching criteria.

Confirm Decisions Reached and Action Items