

International Centre for Dispute Resolution

New gTLD String Confusion Panel

In the Matter Between:

Re: 50 504 00270 13

Commercial Connect, LLC, OBJECTOR

and

DERForsale, LLC, APPLICANT

String: <.FORSALE >

EXPERT DETERMINATION

1. The Parties

The Objector is Commercial Connect, LLC (“Objector” or “Commercial Connect”), located at 1418 South 3rd Street, Louisville, Kentucky, United States of America.

The Applicant is DERForsale, LLC (“Applicant” or “DERForsale”), located at 150 Granby Street, Norfolk, Virginia, United States of America, and is represented by Wiley Rein LLP, United States of America.

2. The New gTLD String Objected To

The new gTLD string applied for and objected to is: <.forsale>

3. Prevailing Party

The Applicant has prevailed and the Objection is dismissed.

4. The New gTLD String Confusion Process

This Expert Determination arises from a string confusion objection to an application for a new generic top-level domain (“gTLD”) as a part of the New gTLD Program (the “Program”) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”). To put this objection in context, an understanding of the overall procedures for the Program and for resolving string confusion objections is helpful.

The ICANN gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Guidebook”) established several phases for obtaining a new gTLD. The first phase is the application submission period, which opened on

January 12, 2012 and closed on April 12, 2012, with no limit on the overall number of gTLD applications.

Second, after a gTLD application passes the Administrative Completeness Check, an Initial Evaluation of the application is conducted by independent evaluation panels in various categories, including string similarity and technical and operational capability. If the String Similarity Panel finds the applied-for gTLD string to be confusingly similar to the gTLD string in another application, the two strings will be placed in a contention set. Section 2.2.1.1.2 of the Guidebook states that, during this Initial Evaluation, “[s]tring confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another visually that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion.”

Third, even if an application is not placed in a contention set during the Initial Evaluation, a third party may object to the application on several grounds, one of which is string confusion. Module 3 of the Guidebook contains Objection Procedures and the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (the “Procedure”). Article 1(b) of the Procedure states that “[t]he new gTLD program includes a dispute resolution procedure, pursuant to which disputes between a person or entity who applies for a new gTLD and a person or entity who objects to that gTLD are resolved in accordance with this New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure.”

Article 1(c) of the Procedure states that “[d]ispute resolution proceedings shall be administered by a Dispute Resolution Service Provider (“DRSP”) in accordance with this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).” Pursuant to Article 3(a) of the Procedure, string confusion objections shall be administered by the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (“ICDR”). The ICDR has duly adopted “Supplementary Procedures for ICANN’s New gTLD Program” (“ICDR Supplementary Procedures”), which govern this proceeding pursuant to Article 4(b)(i) of the Procedure. The ruling on a string confusion objection is called an “Expert Determination,” pursuant to Articles 2(d) and 4(a) of the Procedure.

Pursuant to Section 3.2.2.1 of the Guidebook, if a gTLD applicant successfully asserts a string confusion objection against another applicant, the two applied-for strings will be considered to be in direct contention. Both applications will be placed in a contention set; the contention resolution procedure described in Module 4 of the Guidebook results in only one application from the contention set moving forward in the process. On the other hand, if a string confusion objection is rejected, both applications may move forward in the process without being considered in direct contention with one another.

5. Procedural History of this Case

The Objection was filed with the ICDR on March 13, 2013, in the form of a “Dispute Resolution Objection” (the “Objection”), and an “Online Filing Demand for Arbitration/Mediation Form” (“Online Filing Demand”). The ICDR notified the parties of its receipt of the Objection on March 18, 2013 and proceeded to conduct an administrative review of the Objection.

On April 4, 2013, ICDR notified the parties that the Objection did not comply with Articles 5-8 of the Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules. ICDR requested that the Objector, within five

days from the date of the notification, provide proof or statement that copies of the Objection had been sent to the Applicant.

On April 11, 2013, ICDR notified the parties that the deficiencies had been corrected, so the Objection now complied with Articles 5-8 of the Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, and should be registered for processing.

On April 17, 2013, ICDR notified the parties that ICANN had published its Dispute Announcement of all admissible objections filed. ICDR also informed the parties that, in accordance with Article 11 of the Procedure, the Applicant should file a Response to the Objection within 30 days.

The Applicant filed a Response with the ICDR dated May 16, 2013. On May 24, 2013, the ICDR notified the parties that the Response complied with Article 11 of the Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules.

On June 14, 2013, ICDR notified the parties that Grant L. Kim had been appointed to serve as the Expert, and requested that the parties review the Expert's resume and submit any comments or challenges regarding the appointment by no later than June 19, 2013. The parties did not submit any comments or challenges within this period.

6. Basis for Objector's Standing to Object based on String Confusion

Section 3.2.2.1 of the Guidebook states that "any gTLD applicant in this application round may file a string confusion objection to assert string confusion between an applied-for gTLD and the gTLD for which it has applied, where string confusion between the two applicants has not already been found in the Initial Evaluation."

The Objector meets these requirements. The Objector is a gTLD applicant in the current application round, having filed an application for the string ".shop". The Objector asserts string confusion between ".shop" and a string applied for by the Applicant, ".forsale". Further, no string confusion between ".shop" and ".forsale" was found in the Initial Evaluation. Accordingly, the Objector has standing to object.

7. Factual Background

The Objector Commercial Connect states that it is a company established in 2000. The Objector filed a gTLD application for the string ".shop" after the application window for the New gTLD Program opened on January 12, 2012. As a result of the Initial Evaluation, the Objector's application for ".shop" has been placed into a string contention set with eight other gTLD applications for ".shop". The Initial Evaluation determined that the Objector's application is "Eligible for Extended Evaluation" because the application did not receive a passing score in the category of Technical & Operational Capability.

The Applicant DERForsale states that it is a wholly owned subsidiary of Dominion Enterprises, a marketing services company. The Applicant filed a gTLD application for the string ".forsale" after the application window for the New gTLD Program opened on January 12, 2012. As a result of the Initial Evaluation, DERForsale's application has been placed into a string

contention set with one other application for the string “.forsale”. DERForsale’s application received a passing score for every Initial Evaluation category, so its Initial Evaluation Result is “Pass.”

8. Parties’ Contentions

8.1. Commercial Connect’s Objection

The Objector Commercial Connect LLC states that it was established in 2000 for the specific purpose of bringing the “.shop” gTLD to the Internet. The Objector alleges that, when ICANN opened an application round for new gTLDs in 2000, the Objector was the only applicant for the “.shop” gTLD that had made it completely through the approval process. The Objector further alleges that, although it did not receive delegation for the “.shop” gTLD in 2000, ICANN invited the Objector to resubmit its application and stated that ICANN would give preferential consideration to the application.

The Objector alleges that in 2004 ICANN opened another application round for new gTLDs, but made the requirement so strict by concentrating on sponsored domains that the Objector could not apply. The Objector alleges that, as a result, the Objector was instrumental in helping to establish eCWR, which was an eCommerce Trade Union that helped to open communication channels and educate potential new eCommerce merchants.

The Objector alleges that during ICANN’s development of the Guidebook in 2008, it was discussed that the Objector should receive preferential treatment as the original applicant for the “.shop” gTLD. Objector maintains that since then it has been active in obtaining supporters for its cause to provide a safe and secure eCommerce experience, and that there are over currently 15,000 supporters for the Objector’s application for the “.shop” gTLD.

The Objector proceeds in the Objection to discuss the rules in the Guidebook regarding string confusion, as well as the interpretation of these rules based on the drafting history of the Guidebook. The Objector concludes that “all similar string[s] including visually, aurally, and same meaning should be in the same contention set.”

The “Dispute Resolution Objection” submitted by the Objector does not specify “.forsale” as the string at issue or make specific arguments as to why “.forsale” is confusingly similar to “.shop.” Instead, the Objection states:

The gTLD filed by _____, so nearly resembles the .shop TLD that it is probable that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable internet user because the _____ gTLD application is similar either visually, aurally, or has a similar meaning.

The blanks in this sentence are presumably intended to refer to DERForsale and “.forsale,” but the Objector did not fill in those blanks. The only place where the Objector mentioned “.forsale” is in its Online Filing Demand, which states that “[t]he gTLD filed by DerForsale LLC, so nearly resembles the .shop TLD that it is probable that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable internet user because the .forsale gTLD application is similar either visually, aurally, or has a similar meaning.”

8.2. DERForsale's Response

The Applicant DERForsale contends that the Objection should be dismissed because it fails to provide "[a] detailed explanation of the validity of the objection and why it should be upheld," as required by Section 3.3.1 of the Guidebook.

The Applicant further contends that ".shop" and ".forsale" are not so similar that it is probable that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user. The Applicant asserts that ".forsale" is not confusingly similar to ".shop" in sight, in sound, or in meaning. The Applicant notes that "for sale" is not included in the Objector's own description of similar words in its Online Filing Demand, which states:

The following are words that have similar meanings to shop.

Agency
Boutique
Bureau
Chain
Deli
Department store
Emporium
Five-and-dime
Mall
Market
Mill
Office
Outlet
Service
Showroom
Stand
Store

The Applicant further notes asserts the co-existence of domain names that include identical terms such as www.shop.com and www.shop.co implies that "entirely dissimilar" terms such as ".forsale" and ".shop" can co-exist. The Applicant also examines other factors that contribute to the likelihood of confusion under the U.S. trademark law and argues that consumers can easily distinguish the two strings.

Lastly, the Applicant notes that the Objector failed to object to another application for ".forsale" by Sea Oaks, LLC. The Applicant argues that the Objector's failure to object to a different application for ".forsale" constitutes an admission that ".forsale" is not confusingly similar to ".shop."

9. Discussion and Findings

9.1. Jurisdiction

The Expert finds that he has been properly appointed pursuant to the Procedure and the ICDR Supplementary Procedures, and has jurisdiction to decide this dispute. The Applicant has accepted the applicability of the Procedure and the ICDR Supplementary Procedures by applying for a new gTLD pursuant to Article 1(d) of the Procedure. The Objector has likewise accepted the applicability of the Procedure and the ICDR Supplementary Procedures by filing an objection to a new gTLD pursuant to Article 1(d) of the Procedure.

9.2. Legal Standard for String Confusion

Article 2(e)(i) of the Procedure defines a string confusion objection as referring to an objection that “the string comprising the potential gTLD is confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain or another string applied for in the same round of applications.” Article 2(e) notes that the grounds for this objection are “set out in full” in Module 3 of the Guidebook.

Section 3.5.1 of the Guidebook explains the string confusion standard as follows:

A DRSP panel hearing a string confusion case objection will consider whether the applied-for gTLD string is likely to result in string confusion. String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. For a likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user. Mere association, in the sense that the string brings another string to mind, is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion.

Section 2.2.1.1.3 of Guidebook clarifies that a string confusion objection “is not limited to visual similarity”; rather, confusion “may be based on any type of similarity (including visual, aural, or similarity of meaning).”

Section 3.5 of the Guidebook states that “[t]he objector has the burden of proof.” Section 3.5 further states that the panel “will use appropriate general principles (standards) to evaluate the merits of each objection” and “may also refer to other relevant rules of international law in connection with the standards.”

The Applicant has cited numerous court cases concerning the standard for likely confusion under United States trademark law. The string confusion standard, however, is part of an international legal regime for resolving string confusion objections, which is not tied to the law of a specific country. This is clear from the reference in Section 3.5 to “appropriate general principles” and “international law.” Thus, while court decisions on trademark law might be of some limited interest (especially where they reflect an international consensus), the most important factor in determining the applicable standard is the plain language of the Procedure and the Guidebook, especially the standard in Section 3.5.1 of the Guidebook. The underlying purpose of the new gTLD program is also relevant, since the Procedure and the Guidebook should be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with that purpose.

The plain language of Section 3.5.1 makes clear that string confusion is a high standard. In addition to requiring “a likelihood of confusion,” Section 3.5.1 emphasizes that “mere association” is insufficient, and that confusion must be “probable, not merely possible.” Section 3.5.1 also refers to “so nearly resembles,” indicating that the resemblance between the two strings should be quite close.

Imposing a high standard for string confusion is consistent with the purpose of the new gTLD program. As explained the Preamble of the Guidebook, “[t]he new gTLD program will open up the top level of the Internet’s namespace to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the DNS” [Domain Name System]. While there are currently 22 gTLDs (as well as over 250 country code top-level domains), “[t]he new gTLD program will create a means for prospective registry operators to apply for new gTLDs, and create new options for consumers in the market.” Thus, when the new program is launched, “ICANN expects a diverse set of applications for new gTLDs, including IDNs, creating significant potential for new uses and benefit to Internet users across the globe.” To this end, ICANN did not limit the number of gTLDs applications in the current application round, because this would “severely limit the anticipated benefits of the Program: innovation, choice, and competition.” New gTLDs Applicant Guidebook April 2011 Discussion Draft Public Comment Summary and Analysis, page 5, <http://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/summary-analysis-agv6-30may11-en.pdf>.

9.3. Findings

9.3.1. Specificity of the Objection

The Applicant contends that the Objection should be dismissed on the ground that it fails to provide “[a] detailed explanation of the validity of the objection and why it should be upheld,” as required by Section 3.3.1 of the Guidebook. The Expert agrees that it is questionable whether the Objection complies with this requirement. Most of the Objection addresses background issues such as the Objector’s prior efforts to obtain the “.shop” gTLD and the general rules for string confusion. The last page of the Objection alleges string confusion, but does not even identify the specific gTLD and applicant at issue (leaving empty blanks instead). The Objector’s Online Filing Demand makes the conclusory assertion that “the .forsale gTLD application is similar either visually, aurally, or has a similar meaning,” but does not explain the specific basis for any such similarity. Indeed, the disjunctive “or” makes it impossible to determine the type of similarity asserted (appearance, sound, or meaning).

As discussed below, however, the Objection fails on substantive grounds. Therefore, the Expert finds that it is not necessary to rule on the Applicant’s argument that the Objection should be dismissed for failure to include the detailed explanation required by Section 3.3.1.

9.3.2. String Confusion

The Expert finds that the Objector has failed meet its burden of proving that “.forsale” so nearly resembles “.shop” as to cause probable confusion in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user. The two strings do not look similar. They begin with different letters, have different lengths, and do not share any similar sequence of letters. The two strings also do not sound similar. “Shop” has one syllable, “forsale” has two syllables, and the sounds are very different.

The only sense in which “shop” and “forsale” have some arguable similarity is that they both relate generally to the concept of buying and selling. As stated in Section 3.5.1 of the Guidebook, however, “[m]ere association, in the sense that one string brings another string to mind, is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion.”

Moreover, even the “association” between “shop” and “for sale” is weak. “Shop” typically refers to a *physical location* where *multiple, movable* products can be purchased from a *commercial retailer*. Indeed, the words that the Objector identified as having similar meanings as “shop” all involve physical locations, such as “boutique,” “deli,” “market,” and “store.” “Forsale,” in contrast, is not tied to the commercial sale of multiple products at a specific location; rather, it is typically associated with an *individual* owner putting up an *individual* item for sale, such as “house for sale.” Moreover, as illustrated by “house for sale,” this concept includes non-movable items such as real estate that would not be found in a “shop.” Thus, “for sale” and “shop” do not so closely resemble each other as to cause probable confusion in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user.

Finally, the Expert notes that if “.shop” and “.forsale” were deemed to be confusingly similar because they relate to the general concept of buying and selling, this would imply that *all* gTLDs that relate to buying and selling should be in the same contention set, out of which only one string would survive. This would severely limit competition among eCommerce registry providers and reduce the number of choices for parties seeking to register a domain name for an online business, which would be contrary to the purpose of the New gTLD Program: increasing competition and promoting consumer choice.

For the above reasons, the Expert concludes that “.forsale” and “.shop” are not confusingly similar to the average, reasonable Internet user under the standard set forth in the Procedure and the Guidebook. In view of this conclusion, the Expert finds that it is not necessary to address the Applicant’s arguments that domain names such as “www.shop.com” and “www.shop.co” can co-exist, or that the Objector has conceded that “.forsale” and “.shop” are not confusingly similar by failing to object to the application of Sea Oaks, LLC for “.forsale.”

9.3.3. Other Issues

As noted above, the Objector has alleged that ICANN agreed to give it preferential treatment as the initial applicant for the “.shop” gTLD. The Objector has not argued, however, that this alleged preference has any bearing on the merits of its Objection. In any event, the Expert finds that the Objector’s alleged discussions with ICANN are irrelevant to this case. Whether the Objection has merit depends on whether it meets the criteria set forth in the Procedure and the Guidebook. Moreover, ICANN has stated that “[t]here should be a level playing field for the introduction of new gTLDs, with no privileged treatment for potential applicants.” New gTLD Draft Applicant Guidebook Version 4 Public Comment Summary and Analysis, page 90, <http://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/summary-analysis-agv4-12nov10-en.pdf>.

10. Determination

For the following reasons, the Expert finds that the Applicant has prevailed and the Objection is dismissed.

Dated: September 4, 2013



Grant L. Kim

Sole Expert Panelist