

	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, specifically:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect of deterring bad-faith registrations?</u> b. <u>Is the Trademark Claims service having any unintended consequences, such as deterring good-faith registrations?</u> <p>2. If the answers to 1.a. is “no” or 1.b. is “yes”, 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Should the Claims period be extended - if so, how long (up to

	<p>trademark holders rights? If the notice is inadequate, how can we improve it?</p>		<p>permanently)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Should the Claims period be shortened? c. Should the Claims period be mandatory? d. Should any TLDs be exempt from the Claims RPM and if so, which ones and why? <p><u>3. Does the Trademark Claims Notice to users meet its intended purpose?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>If not, is it intimidating, hard to understand, or otherwise inadequate?</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>If inadequate, how can it be improved?</u> b. <u>Does it inform potential registrants of the scope and limitations of trademark holders' rights?</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>If not, how can it be improved?</u> c. <u>Are translations of the Trademark Claims Notice effective in informing potential registrants of the scope</u>
--	--	--	--

			<p><u>and limitation of trademark holders' rights?</u></p> <p>4. If the Review of all RPMs in all gTLDs PDP determines that non-exact matches of trademarks should be allowed inclusion in the TMCH, should the Trademark Claims Notice reflect this to inform potential registrants during attempted registrations of domain names that are non-exact matches to trademark records submitted to the TMCH?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. If the answer is "yes", should the standard Claims Notice cover notifications regarding attempted registrations of both exact and non-exact matches to trademarks registered in the TMCH?b. If the answer to 4.a. is "no", should an alternative Claims Notice be used, which is specific to informing potential registrants of the scope and
--	--	--	--

			<p>limitations of trademark holders' rights, when applications for domain names that are non-exact matches to trademark records submitted to the TMCH are attempted?</p>
2.	Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?		5. Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?