

# DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENT

(Numbers refer to the paragraph numbers of the book)

## **TITRE I<sup>ER</sup>. CONSIDÉRATIONS PRÉLIMINAIRES : UN ARBRE DE RÉSOLUTION DES LITIGES A QUATRE BRANCHES**

1. Types of dispute
2. Overview of the types of objections considering the nature of the dispute
3. Standing to object
4. Dispute resolution service providers (DRSP)
5. Quick overview of the dispute resolution process
6. Conditions to be met for a string confusion objection
7. Conditions to be met for a legal rights objection
8. Conditions to be met for a limited public interest objection
9. Conditions to be met for a community objection
10. Plan

## **TITRE II. OBJECTION POUR SIMILITUDE DE CHAÎNE PROPICE À CONFUSION (STRING CONFUSION OBJECTION)**

11. Key elements of the procedure

### **CHAPITRE 1<sup>ER</sup>. LA QUALITÉ D’OBJECTEUR (STANDING TO OBJECT)**

12. Applicable rules
13. Irrelevant issues
14. Generic strings
15. Geographical strings
16. Competition risks
17. The particular situation of the “indirect” applicant
18. String contention procedures to be used for identical strings
19. A two steps procedure for similar strings

### **CHAPITRE 2. LES CONDITIONS DE FOND D’UNE OBJECTION POUR SIMILITUDE DE CHAÎNE PROPICE À CONFUSION (STRING CONFUSION OBJECTION STANDARDS)**

20. Key standard for evaluation
21. Two steps evaluation
22. Systematic comparison of the strings
23. Limits of the visual comparison of the strings
24. Assessment of the visual similarities and differences between the strings
25. Plural words (visual comparison)

## DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENT

26. One letter difference
27. Typosquatting
28. Translation of the string into another language
29. Minor differences
30. Assessment by a linguist expert (visual)
31. Pronouncing differences (oral similarity)
32. Number of syllables
33. Specific nature of words or expression which don't belong to the common language
34. Plural words (oral comparison)
35. Assessment by an expert (oral)
36. Meaning differences
37. The reference language
38. Synonyms in different languages
39. The reference of the average internet user
40. Irrelevant elements
41. Acronyms
42. Words with several meanings
43. Connected words (but not synonyms)
44. Plural words (meanings comparison)
45. The unique evaluation standard for the confusion requirement
46. The distinction between similarity and confusion
47. The meaning of the "probable" requirement
48. The likelihood of confusion standard from the trademark law
49. The average internet user reference
50. The impact of the prior "string review"
51. The planned use of the string
52. The reputation of the objector's sign
53. The ownership on sensitive terms
54. Evidence based on survey
55. The peaceful coexistence
56. Competing applications on the same string
57. Prior coexistence of similar strings in the plural-singular forms
58. Generic nature of the disputed sign
59. The use of search engines

### CHAPITRE 3. LES QUESTIONS PROCEDURALES (PROCEDURAL MATTERS)

60. The necessity to make a distinction between the different forms of objection procedures
61. The distinction between string confusion objection procedure and string similarity review procedure
62. The burden of proof
63. The evidence based on expert reports or surveys
64. Legal standards used by the panels
65. The existence of prior agreements between objector and ICANN
66. The binding character of the case law

- 67. Consolidation of objections
- 68. Lack of answer from the applicant (default)
- 69. Justification of the objection grounds
- 70. Contention sets

### **TITRE III. OBJECTION POUR VIOLATION DES DROITS D'AUTRUI (LEGAL RIGHTS OBJECTION)**

#### **CHAPITRE 1<sup>ER</sup>. LA QUALITÉ D'OBJECTEUR (STANDING TO OBJECT)**

- 71. Plan
- 72. Two types of objectors
- 73. The concept of intergovernmental organisation
- 74. The conditions to be eligible to the « .int » domain
- 75. The implementation of the eligibility requirements
- 76. The broad nature of the right owner concept
- 77. The right ownership requirement : a flexible approach
- 78. The right ownership requirement : the situation of the trademark owned by a subsidiary
- 79. The right ownership requirement : the situation of the trademark licensee
- 80. The right ownership requirement : time of the evaluation
- 81. The right ownership requirement : the generic words
- 82. Limits of the panel's verification of the owned rights

#### **CHAPITRE 2. LES CONDITIONS DE FOND D'UNE OBJECTION POUR VIOLATION DES DROITS D'AUTRUI (LEGAL RIGHTS OBJECTION STANDARDS)**

- 83. The decision process
- 84. The non-exhaustive character of the listed factors
- 85. The necessity to combine the different factors
- 86. The reference to tough criteria
- 87. The reference to the exploitation of a first-level domain
- 88. The implementation of preventive measures
- 89. The impact of the generic character of the string
- 90. The reputation of the objector's trademark
- 91. The limited scope of the objection procedure
- 92. The rules detailing the three evaluation criteria
- 93. The unfair advantage standard
- 94. The evaluation criteria
- 95. Unfair advantage regarding generic terms
- 96. Other relevant elements
- 97. Unjustifiable impairment criteria
- 98. The required connection with the generic nature of the string
- 99. The evaluation from the first-level domain perspective
- 100. The impermissible likelihood of confusion
- 101. The impact of the generic nature of the string

## DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENT

102. The evaluation from the first-level domain perspective
103. Other relevant circumstances
104. The scope of the eight evaluation factors
105. The reference to the usual similarity and identity standards
106. The required similarity level
107. The generic nature of the string
108. Irrelevant elements
109. The bona fide acquisition requirement and the rights acquired by the objector in consideration of the objection procedure
110. The required similarity
111. The generic strings
112. Irrelevant elements
113. The objector public recognition factor: the generic strings
114. The objector public recognition factor: the generic strings (the term understood pursuant its usual meaning)
115. The objector public recognition factor: the generic strings (the term understood pursuant to a secondary meaning)
116. The objector public recognition factor: the reputation gained by the objector's sign
117. The objector public recognition factor: the seniority of the use of the sign by the objector
118. The objector public recognition factor: the limits of the trademark protection
119. The objector public recognition factor: the evidence by surveys
120. The knowledge of the objector's rights: the background of the parties relationships
121. The knowledge of the objector's rights: multiple applications
122. The knowledge of the objector's rights: the use of the string pursuant to its usual meaning
123. The knowledge of the objector's rights: the prior use of the sign by both parties
124. The knowledge of the objector's rights: the rights acquired for the purpose of filing an objection
125. The knowledge of the objector's rights: the reputation of the objector's sign
126. The knowledge of the objector's rights: the preparation of the applicant to exploit the string
127. The knowledge of the objector's rights: the burden of proof
128. The bona fide use of the string: the generic nature of the string
129. The bona fide use of the string: reasonable preparation for the exploitation of the string (reject of objection)
130. The bona fide use of the string: reasonable preparation for the exploitation of the string (success of the objection)
131. The bona fide use of the string: background of the parties relationships
132. The bona fide use of the string: the burden of proof
133. The rights of the applicant on the string: the generic nature of the sign
134. The rights of the applicant on the string: the rights acquired for the purpose of being used in the framework of an objection procedure
135. The rights of the applicant on the string: background of the parties relationships
136. The rights of the applicant on the string: the nature of the claimed rights
137. The rights of the applicant on the string: the vesting terms
138. The rights of the applicant on the string: the burden of proof

- 139. The applicant public recognition: the legal context of the use of the sign
- 140. The applicant public recognition: the reputation of the applicant
- 141. The applicant public recognition: the investments made by the applicant
- 142. The burden of proof
- 143. The likelihood of confusion: the limited scope of the objector's trademark
- 144. The likelihood of confusion: the nature of the objector's trademark
- 145. The likelihood of confusion: the background of the parties relationships
- 146. The likelihood of confusion: the generic nature of the sign
- 147. The likelihood of confusion: the evidence by surveys
- 148. The evaluation factors applicable to intergovernmental organisations: an open list of factors
- 149. The evaluation factors applicable to intergovernmental organisations: identity or similarity
- 150. The evaluation factors applicable to intergovernmental organisations: the peaceful coexistence
- 151. The evaluation factors applicable to intergovernmental organisations: the use of the sign in relation with a bona fide offer of products or services
- 152. The evaluation factors applicable to intergovernmental organisations: the public recognition
- 153. The evaluation factors applicable to intergovernmental organisations: the likelihood of confusion
- 154. The evaluation factors applicable to intergovernmental organisations: the lack of case law

**CHAPITRE 3. LES QUESTIONS PROCÉDURALES (PROCEDURAL MATTERS)**

- 155. The ability to submit supplemental arguments
- 156. The consolidation of objections
- 157. The decision made by a three-members panel
- 158. The interference of judicial procedures
- 159. The limited scope of the objection procedure
- 160. The hearing of the parties
- 161. The issues which relate to the decision on the merits of the case
- 162. The lack of penalty for the abuse of the objection procedure
- 163. Dissenting opinions

**TITRE IV. OBJECTION RELEVANT DE L'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC LIMITÉ (LIMITED PUBLIC INTEREST OBJECTION)**

**CHAPITRE 1<sup>ER</sup>. LA QUALITÉ D'OBJECTEUR (STANDING TO OBJECT)**

- 164. Applicable rules
- 165. The admissibility as a rule
- 166. The lack of standing as an exception (quick look assessment)

DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENT

**CHAPITRE 2. LES CONDITIONS DE FOND D'UNE OBJECTION  
RELEVANT DE L'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC LIMITÉ (LIMITED  
PUBLIC INTEREST OBJECTION STANDARDS)**

- 167. Applicable standards and plan
- 168. The absence of case law
- 169. The connection with international law principles
- 170. The abuse of the string
- 171. An open objection criteria
- 172. The string by itself is not contrary to international law principles
- 173. The public order and morality concepts
- 174. The nature of the claimed rules
- 175. The generic terms and the competition
- 176. The sensitive character of some strings
- 177. The preventive measures proposed by the applicant

**CHAPITRE 3. LES QUESTIONS PROCÉDURALES (PROCEDURAL  
MATTERS)**

- 178. The scope of the quick look assessment procedure
- 179. The filing of multiple objections
- 180. The burden of proof
- 181. The ICANN policy impact
- 182. The possible remedies
- 183. The evidence by experts
- 184. The impartiality of the independent objector
- 185. The standing requirements applicable to the independent objector

**TITRE V. OBJECTION DE LA COMMUNAUTÉ (COMMUNITY  
OBJECTION)**

- 186. Applicable rules and plan

**CHAPITRE 1<sup>ER</sup>. LA QUALITÉ D'OBJECTEUR (STANDING TO OBJECT)**

- 187. Plan
- 188. The evaluation factors
- 189. An established institution: the average internet user as reference
- 190. The recognition by international official bodies
- 191. Professional bodies
- 192. Internal structure of the objector
- 193. Objector's profile
- 194. Objector's position within the community
- 195. The age of the institution: requirement definition
- 196. The age of the institution: the five-year requirement
- 197. Public evidence of existence: no restriction to the accepted evidence

198. Public evidence of existence: the recognition by public bodies or through public formalities
199. Public evidence of existence: the well-known representation role of the objector
200. Public evidence of existence: the organization of public events
201. Public evidence of existence: the representation in the framework of legal procedures
202. Other elements: no restriction to the admitted elements
203. Other elements: the internal rules of the objector
204. Other elements: the sectorial importance of the objector
205. Other elements: the undisputed standing of the objector
206. Other elements: specific legislations
207. Other elements: irrelevant elements
208. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the requirement
209. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the composition of the objector's decision making bodies
210. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: indirect representation of the community
211. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the situation of entities belonging to the same group of companies
212. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the objector as official regulator of the community
213. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the concertation within the community
214. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the regulation of the community
215. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the services provided by the objector to the community
216. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the organization of events for the community members
217. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the community delimitation criteria and the global scope of the community
218. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the affiliation requirement
219. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: unorganized communities
220. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the situation of entities belonging to the same group of companies
221. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the identification of the community and the connections with the applicable standards on the merits of the objection
222. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: identification of the community and role of the panel
223. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the community belonging to a larger community and the determination of the relevant community
224. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the community belonging to a larger community and the nature of the relationship between the objector and the community
225. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the community belonging to a larger community and the standing to object

## DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENT

- 226. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the non-exclusive character of the objector's connections with the community
- 227. On-going relationship with a clearly delineated community: the possible impact of the lack of community application
- 228. The standing to object requirements applicable to the independent objector
- 229. The limited scope of the independent objector's right to object
- 230. The communities which may be represented by the independent objector
- 231. The impartiality of the independent objector

## CHAPITRE 2. LES CONDITIONS DE FOND D'UNE OBJECTION DE COMMUNAUTÉ (COMMUNITY OBJECTION STANDARDS)

- 232. Applicable standards
- 233. The cumulative requirements
- 234. The eligibility of commercial entities
- 235. Community test : a mandatory requirement
- 236. Community test : a similar requirement for standing and merits
- 237. Community test : the relevant community
- 238. Community test : the evaluation factors
- 239. Plan
- 240. Community test : the ability of the public to identify the community limits
- 241. Community test : the diversity inside the community
- 242. Community test : publications made for the community
- 243. Community test : the well-known role within the community
- 244. Community test : the relationship between the community members
- 245. Community test : the delimitation factors definition
- 246. Community test : the justification of the delimitation factors
- 247. Community test : the existence of specific rules and governing bodies
- 248. Community test : delimitation criteria
- 249. Community test : the identification of a community does not mean the delimitation of said community
- 250. Community test : the independance of the relevant delimitation criteria
- 251. Community test : the age of the community as an obvious fact
- 252. Community test : the purpose of the age of the community requirement
- 253. Community test : the global validity of the delimitation criteria
- 254. Community test : the local communities
- 255. Community test : the communities organised as a network
- 256. Community test : what is a community member?
- 257. Community test : the affiliation of the main members of the community
- 258. Community test : the concept of community
- 259. Community test : the connection between applied for string and the community
- 260. Community test : the representation in legal procedures
- 261. Community test : the ICANN policy
- 262. Substantial opposition test: the relevant community
- 263. Substantial opposition test: the importance of the opposing parties within the community
- 264. Substantial opposition test: isolated oppositions



- 265. Substantial opposition test: massive oppositions
- 266. Substantial opposition test: the support of entities independent from the objector
- 267. Substantial opposition test: professional bodies
- 268. Substantial opposition test: market shares
- 269. Substantial opposition test: the relevant character of the arguments raised by the opposing parties
- 270. Substantial opposition test: the massive support within the community
- 271. Substantial opposition test: the global institutions
- 272. Substantial opposition test: the community internal rules of operation
- 273. Substantial opposition test: the association of the community with other applications on similar string
- 274. Substantial opposition test: the control of the costs of the gTLD process for the community
- 275. Substantial opposition test: the multiple objections
- 276. Substantial opposition test: connections with the delimitation requirement
- 277. Targeting test: the relevant community
- 278. Targeting test: the targeted public
- 279. Targeting test: the public represented by the objector
- 280. Targeting test: the targeted public and the open strings
- 281. Targeting test: the content of the applicant answer to the objection
- 282. Targeting test: the public feeling and generic terms
- 283. Targeting test: the public feeling supersedes the planned use of the string
- 284. Targeting test: the public to be considered as the reference
- 285. Targeting test: possible connections with other communities
- 286. Targeting test: the association with a larger community
- 287. Targeting test: possible association with the objector
- 288. Detriment test: the relevant community
- 289. Detriment test: no restriction regarding the damage to consider
- 290. Detriment test: the lack of control on the use of second-level domain names
- 291. Detriment test: prior use of the disputed sign
- 292. Detriment test: the required confidence of internet users
- 293. Detriment test: the apparently official character of the web sites registered with the string
- 294. Detriment test: the possible connections with activities which may damage the community interests
- 295. Detriment test: the anti-abuse measures to be implemented by the applicant
- 296. Detriment test: the commercial nature of the applicant's project
- 297. Detriment test: the connections between the applicant and one member of the community
- 298. Detriment test: the mock participation of the community within the string management
- 299. Detriment test: the closed exploitation of the string
- 300. Detriment test: the regulated professions
- 301. Detriment test: the necessity to be clearly identified
- 302. Detriment test: the exploitation of the string to the exclusive benefit of one of the members of the community
- 303. Detriment test: the inability of the applicant to manage the relevant applicable regulation
- 304. Detriment test: the determination of the damaged community

## DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENT

- 305. Detriment test: the control of the commercial exploitation of sporting events
- 306. Detriment test: the damage to offline activities
- 307. Detriment test: the damage to the promotional activities of the community
- 308. Detriment test: the particular importance of the DNS for the community
- 309. Detriment test: the opportunity to manage its own domain
- 310. Detriment test: the DNS importance factor alone is not sufficient
- 311. Detriment test: the planned access conditions to the new string
- 312. Detriment test: prior abuse of the community related signs
- 313. Detriment test: the clarity of the applicant's project
- 314. Detriment test: the burden of proof
- 315. Detriment test: the damage to the users

### CHAPITRE 3. LES QUESTIONS PROCÉDURALES (PROCEDURAL MATTERS)

- 316. Connections with the contention set procedures
- 317. Limited scope of the objection procedure
- 318. The amendment to the application during the objection process
- 319. Combination of objection and community application
- 320. Connections between standing requirements and objection standards
- 321. The burden of proof
- 322. The proactive role of the panel
- 323. Consolidation of objections

### TITRE VI. LA RÉOLUTION DES CONFLITS DE CHAÎNES

- 324. Contention set
- 325. The possible impact of objections on the contention set composition
- 326. Contention set dispute resolution
- 327. Community priority evaluation
- 328. Ascending-clock auction