Opinion by Masiello, Administrative Trademark Judge:

Yuzu Labs Public Benefit Corporation ("Applicant") filed an application for registration on the Principal Register of the designation SITECONNECT in standard characters as a mark for the following services:¹

Providing temporary use of a non-downloadable web-based software platform that enables users to locate and connect with clinical research sites for the purpose of participating in clinical research studies; providing

---

¹ Application Serial No. 86746143 was filed on September 2, 2015 under Trademark Act Section 1(a), 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a), on the basis of Applicant’s asserted use of the mark in commerce. In this decision, page references to the application record refer to the .pdf version of the USPTO’s Trademark Status & Document Retrieval (TSDR) system. References to the briefs refer to the Board’s TTABVUE docket system.
temporary use of a non-downloadable website featuring a software platform that enables users to locate and connect with clinical research sites for the purpose of participating in clinical research studies, in International Class 42.

The Trademark Examining Attorney refused registration on the ground that Applicant’s applied-for mark is merely descriptive of Applicant’s services, under Section 2(e)(1) of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1052(e)(1). When the refusal was made final, Applicant appealed to this Board and filed a request for reconsideration. The Examining Attorney denied the request for reconsideration and this appeal was resumed. The case is fully briefed.

1. Evidentiary objections.

Applicant attached three pages of evidence to its brief, and the Examining Attorney has objected to this evidence as untimely under 37 C.F.R. § 2.142(d). Applicant points out that the evidence attached to the brief consists of copies of evidence already made of record with Applicant’s request for reconsideration.² The evidence filed with the request for reconsideration was timely and we have considered it. It was unnecessary to refile the evidence with Applicant’s brief. The Board generally will not go through the exercise of comparing evidence attached to a brief with the prosecution record to determine whether it is properly of record.

2. Refusal under Section 2(e)(1).

A mark is merely descriptive of services within the meaning of Section 2(e)(1) if it forthwith conveys an immediate idea of an ingredient, quality, characteristic,

² Applicant’s reply brief, 10 TTABVUE.
feature, function, purpose or use of the services. In re Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., 675 F.3d 1297, 102 USPQ2d 1217, 1219 (Fed. Cir. 2012); see also, In re Gyulay, 820 F.2d 1216, 3 USPQ2d 1009 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Whether a mark is merely descriptive is determined in relation to the services for which registration is sought and the context in which the mark is used, not in the abstract or on the basis of guesswork. In re Abcor Dev. Corp., 588 F.2d 811, 200 USPQ 215, 218 (CCPA 1978); In re Remacle, 66 USPQ2d 1222, 1224 (TTAB 2002). In other words, we evaluate whether someone who knows what the services are will understand the mark to convey information about them. DuoProSS Meditech Corp. v. Inviro Med. Devices Ltd., 695 F.3d 1247, 103 USPQ2d 1753, 1757 (Fed. Cir. 2012). A mark need not immediately convey an idea of each and every specific feature of the services in order to be considered merely descriptive; it is enough if it describes one significant attribute, function or property of the services. See In re Gyulay, 3 USPQ2d at 1010; In re H.U.D.D.L.E., 216 USPQ 358 (TTAB 1982); In re MBAssociates, 180 USPQ 338 (TTAB 1973).

Applicant and the Examining Attorney have made of record the following relevant definitions:

site:

The place where a structure or group of structures was, is, or is to be located: a good site for the school;

A website.

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY, <ahdictionary.com>.³

site:

the place where something (such as a building) is, was or will be located;

a place that is used for a particular activity;

a spatial location of an actual or planned structure or set of structures (as a building, town, or monuments);

the place, scene, or point of an occurrence or event <a picnic site>;

one or more internet addresses at which an individual or organization provides information to others <an FTP site>; especially : WEB SITE.

MERRIAM-WEBSTER DICTIONARY, <merriam-webster.com>.4

site:

Site may refer to:

- Location (geography), a point or an area on the Earth’s surface or elsewhere;

  ...

- Building site, a place where construction takes place;

In information technology:

- Website, a set of related web pages containing content;

- Active Directory Site, an object that represents a geographic location that hosts networks.

  ...

WIKIPEDIA, <wikipedia.org>.5

---

4 Office Action of July 1, 2016 at 8.
*****

connect:

To join to or by means of a communications circuit: *Please connect me to the number in San Diego. Her computer is connected to the Internet;*

To become joined or united: *two streams connecting to form a river;*

To establish a rapport or relationship; relate: *The candidate failed to connect with the voters.*

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY, <ahdictionary.com>.⁶

*****

connect:

to join or fasten together usually by something intervening;

to become joined <the two rooms *connect* by a hallway> <ideas that *connect* easily to form a theory>;

to have or establish a rapport <tried to *connect* with the younger generation>;

to establish a communications connection <*connect* to the Internet>.

MERRIAM-WEBSTER DICTIONARY, <merriam-webster.com>.⁷

*****

The Examining Attorney points out that Applicant’s identification of services uses the words at issue, describing the purpose of the services as “enabl[ing] users to ... connect with clinical research sites.” The Examining Attorney contends:

---

⁵ Request for reconsideration of December 30, 2016 at 11.
⁶ Office Action of December 11, 2015 at 8.
⁷ Office Action of July 1, 2016 at 9.
Specifically, SITE refers to the clinical research sites of the users and CONNECT refers to the function of the software. ... Together, SITECONNECT immediately conveys information to the relevant consumer regarding the purpose and/or function of the applicant’s services ....

Applicant, in its brief, states that it “accepts the term ‘connect’ is descriptive of the services.” Applicant focuses primarily on the meaning of the term SITE, and argues that “the term ‘site’ has several meanings that are suggestive of Applicant’s services. The term is not immediately descriptive when it conveys several interpretations.”

Applicant elaborates:

The term “site” is defined as “a place that is used for a particular activity” .... Additionally, the term “site” refers to a “website” and an “active directory site” .... All the definitions of the term “site” suggest various features of Applicant’s services. The “site” may refer to the Applicant’s own website used to connect users and research. It may refer to the research center’s website. It may refer to the scheduling website. Or, the term site can refer to a physical building where the clinical research is conducted. The term has several connotations, and can be interpreted to suggest several different characteristics.

The definitions of record show that SITE is a word of broad applicability in various contexts. However, as we have noted above, we consider Applicant’s mark in the context of the services for which it is used. Applicant’s specimens of use and the other evidence relating to Applicant show that the purpose of Applicant’s service is to facilitate the recruitment of participants for clinical research studies. Applicant’s

---

8 Examining Attorney’s brief, 9 TTABVUE 8.
9 Applicant’s brief at 3, 7 TTABVUE 4.
10 Id.
11 Id. at 4, 7 TTABVUE 5.
substitute specimen of use, an online advertisement, refers to the “clinical research sites” mentioned in the identification of services as “sites” and “clinical sites” (“Built for any site’s workflow”; “Connecting people with clinical sites”). Applicant’s original specimen of use refers to them as “recruitment websites” (“Screening call scheduling for recruitment websites”). Other web pages of Applicant also refer to them as “sites” and “clinical sites”:

How does SiteConnect benefit sites and potential participants?

an online scheduling platform for clinical research recruitment for Sites and Sponsors. Connect more meaningfully … and boost productivity at clinical sites.

37% of the time sites spend on recruitment activities is spent playing phone tag.

Applicant’s web page provides a customer testimonial showing that the customer uses the word “site” to refer to the “clinical research sites” at issue:

The ability to easily schedule screening calls has benefits for both the site and the potential participant. It increases site productivity …

On this record it is clear that SITE has descriptive meaning in the context of Applicant’s services. Applicant’s contention, quoted above, that SITE has several different meanings that “suggest various features of Applicant’s services” (i.e.,

---

12 Specimen filed June 9, 2016.
13 Specimen filed September 2, 2015.
15 Office Action of July 1, 2016 at 6.
16 Id. at 7.
17 Id.
“Applicant’s own website,” “the research center’s website,” “the scheduling website,” and “a physical building where the clinical research is conducted”) is unavailing because, in the context of Applicant’s services, all of these meanings of SITE refer, in a descriptive way, to “features” of the services. A term that has multiple meanings, all of which are merely descriptive of the services, remains merely descriptive within the meaning of Section 2(e)(1). See In re Carlson, 91 USPQ2d 1198, 1201 (TTAB 2009). We do not agree with Applicant that these meanings of SITE are “several connotations” of the word that “suggest various features” of the services. Rather, the dictionary definitions and other evidence demonstrate that these are denotations of the word SITE which describe features of the services.

Turning to the mark as a whole, we consider whether the combination of the component words of Applicant’s mark “conveys any distinctive source-identifying impression contrary to the descriptiveness of the individual parts.” In re Oppedahl & Larson LLP, 373 F.3d 1171, 71 USPQ2d 1370, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2004). If, instead, each component retains its merely descriptive significance in relation to the goods, the combination results in a composite that is itself merely descriptive. See In re Tower Tech, Inc., 64 USPQ2d 1314, 1317-18 (TTAB 2002).

Applicant argues as follows:

The combination [of SITE and CONNECT] suggests several characteristics of Applicant’s services – Applicant’s website connects users to sponsors, research, scheduling and a variety of information; research centers are connected to patients; users and sponsors are connected to research websites; patients are scheduled (connected) for an appointment or meeting. There are multiple suggestions of who and what is connected and
the meaning of “site” changes with the various information or user connected. More information is needed to understand the nature of the services.\textsuperscript{18}

The Examining Attorney responds:

The dictionary definitions of record show SITE and CONNECT are commonly understood English words whose meanings do not change because of the order they are presented or their manner of use. ... [T]he order of the wording does not create a separate commercial impression.\textsuperscript{19}

The relevant customers would readily understand the meanings of the words SITE and CONNECT in the context of the services. In Applicant’s mark the words are not ordered in a standard grammatical structure, and we bear in mind that an unusual order of the words could change the message that is conveyed by the mark. However, in this case, we do not perceive any non-descriptive meaning arising from the order of the words SITE and CONNECT in Applicant’s mark. As we have noted above, we consider whether someone who knows what the services are will understand the mark to convey information about them. \textit{DuoProSS Meditech v. Inviro Med. Devices}, 103 USPQ\textsuperscript{2d} at 1757. In the context of Applicant’s services, customers would readily understand SITECONNECT as describing a service that provides a connecting function to “sites.” As the identification of services indicates, Applicant’s customers wish to “locate and connect with clinical research sites.” The evidence shows that such clinical research sites refer to themselves as “sites” and seek to “connect more meaningfully” with potential participants in their research

\textsuperscript{18} Applicant’s brief at 6, 7 TTABVUE 7.

\textsuperscript{19} Examining Attorney’s brief, 9 TTABVUE 8.
studies. The fact that the mark, alone, does not convey every detail of the nature of Applicant’s service does not render the mark suggestive. A mark need not immediately convey an idea of each and every specific feature of the services in order to be considered merely descriptive. In re Gyulay, 3 USPQ2d at 1010. We do not agree that “more information is needed” in order for a customer to understand that Applicant’s service provides a facility for desired communications (connecting) with clinical research sites.

We have considered Applicant’s other arguments, but find them unavailing. Applicant points out that the Examining Attorney has not shown that the single word SITECONNECT has any definition. However, it is not necessary that a term appear in a dictionary for that mark to be found merely descriptive. In re SPX Corp., 63 USPQ2d 1592, 1596 (TTAB 2002). Moreover, combining two words which are merely descriptive into a single term by the deletion of a space does not avoid a finding of mere descriptiveness for the combined term. Id.

Applicant also argues that SITECONNECT is not “used by any other business” and that it is “a unique designation that is not needed by third parties to describe their services.”20 However, there is no need to demonstrate that others have used the mark at issue or that they need to use it, although such proof might be highly relevant to an analysis under Section 2(e)(1). In re Fat Boys Water Sports LLC, 118 USPQ2d 1511, 1515 (TTAB 2016). The fact that Applicant may be the first or only user of a term does not render that term distinctive if it otherwise meets the

---

20 Applicant’s brief at 4 and 6, 7 TTABVUE 5 and 7.

Applicant also points out that the USPTO has previously registered the mark SITECONNECT for computer hardware and web-based services relating to carwashes and convenience stores. See Reg. No. 4732355.21 The details of that registration are distinguishable from the case before us and does not affect our analysis. We must decide each case on its own merits and “[e]ven if some prior registrations had some characteristics similar to [applicant’s] application, the PTO’s allowance of such prior registrations does not bind the Board.” In re Nett Designs Inc., 236 F.3d 1339, 57 USPQ2d 1564, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 2001); see also In re Cordua Rests., Inc., 823 F.3d 594, 118 USPQ2d 1632, 1635 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“The PTO is required to examine all trademark applications for compliance with each and every eligibility requirement ....”).

After careful review of all of the evidence and arguments that are properly of record, including those not specifically discussed herein, we find that the

---

designation SITECONNECT is merely descriptive of Applicant’s services within the meaning of Trademark Act Section 2(e)(1).

3. Request for amendment to Supplemental Register.

Applicant, in its brief, states:

Applicant preserved its right to amend its mark on the Supplemental Register pending a decision on the issue of descriptiveness. Should the Board maintain the Examiner’s refusal to register SITECONNECT on the Principal Register, the Applicant respectfully requests the Board amend the application or remand to the Examiner to enter the amendment.22

Applicant’s request for reconsideration clearly did not effect an amendment of the application to seek registration on the Supplemental Register. (“While the Application is suitable for amendment to the Supplemental Register, ... such an amendment is not now made.”)23

The Board’s ability to amend an application that it has reviewed on appeal is limited See 37 C.F.R. § 2.142(g) (“An application which has been considered and decided on appeal will not be reopened except for the entry of a disclaimer... or upon order of the Director....”). The Board can neither amend the application as requested nor remand the Application after decision on appeal to allow Applicant to amend the application. In re Societe D’Exploitation de la Marque Le Fouquet’s, 67 USPQ2d1784, 1789 (TTAB 2003). See TBMP § 1218.

Decision: The refusal under Section 2(e)(1) is AFFIRMED.

22 Applicant’s brief at 7, 7 TTABVUE 8.
23 Applicant’s request for reconsideration filed December 30, 2016 at 3.