

	Revised Charter Questions (following Sub Team call of 28 April)	Sub Team Comments/Discussion	Updated Question
1.	<p><u>General Question:</u> Is the mandatory 90-day Trademark Claims period having its intended effect? If not, or if there are unintended consequences, what should be adjusted, added or eliminated?</p> <p><u>Specific Questions:</u> 1A: Does having a mandatory pre-registration Trademark Claims Notice create a “chilling effect” on good faith registrations? 1B: If so, would the perceived “chilling effect” be reduced or minimized if the Claims period was of a shorter duration? 1C: If so, what would be the appropriate shorter period? 1D: Does having a mandatory Claims service (as structured currently) fail in its goal of deterring bad faith registrations? 1E: If so, would lengthening the duration of the claims service (or making it permanent) have beneficial effect? 1F: Is the Trademark Claims Notice to users intimidating or hard to understand? Does it meet the intended purpose of informing potential registrants of the limitations of</p>		<p><u>1. Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect of deterring bad faith registrations?</u></p> <p>a. If no, or if it could be better: what about the Trademark Claims service should be adjusted, added or eliminated in order for it to have its intended effect?</p> <p>i. Should the Claims period be extended – if so, permanently? ii. Should the Claims period be shortened? iii. Should the Claims period be mandatory? iv. Should any TLDs be exempt from the Claims RPM?</p> <p><u>2. Is the Trademark Claims service having any unintended consequences, such as a “chilling effect” on good faith</u></p>

	<p>trademark holders rights? If the notice is inadequate, how can we improve it?</p>		<p><u>registrations?</u></p> <p>a. If so: what about the Trademark Claims service should be adjusted, added or eliminated in order to avoid having these unintended consequences?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Should the Claims period be extended – if so, permanently?ii. Should the Claims period be shortened?iii. Should the Claims period be mandatory?iv. Should any TLDs be exempt from the Claims RPM? <p><u>3. Does the Trademark Claims Notice to users meet its intended purpose?</u></p> <p>a. If not: Is it intimidating, hard to understand, or otherwise inadequate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. If so: How can it be improved? <p>b. Does it inform potential registrants of the scope and</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>limitations of trademark holders' rights?</p> <p>i. If not: How can it be improved?</p>
2.	Should the Trademark Claims period be extended beyond ninety (90) days?		
3.	Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?		