

	Original Charter Questions	Sub Team Comments/Discussion	Updated Question
1.	<p>Does a Trademark Claims<sup>1</sup> period create a potential “chilling effect” on genuine registrations, and, if so, how should this be addressed?</p> <p>What is the effect of the 90-day Trademark Claims process?</p> <p>Should the Trademark Claims period be extended beyond ninety (90) days?</p>		<p><u>1. Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect, specifically:</u></p> <p>a. <u>Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect of deterring bad-faith registrations?</u></p> <p>b. <u>Is the Trademark Claims service having any unintended consequences, such as deterring good-faith registrations?</u></p> <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> <p>a. Should the Claims period be extended - if so, how long (up to permanently)?</p> <p>b. Should the Claims period be shortened?</p> <p>c. Should the Claims period be mandatory?</p> <p>d. Should any TLDs be exempt from the Claims RPM and if so, which ones and why?</p> <p><u>3. Does the Trademark Claims Notice to users meet its intended purpose?</u></p> <p>a. <u>If not, is it intimidating, hard to understand, or</u></p>

<sup>1</sup> The Sub Team agrees that, as used in this list of Charter questions, the phrase “Trademark Claims” covers both the pre-registration Claims Notice that is sent to a prospective registrant who is attempting to register a domain name that matches a trademark label in the TMCH, and the post-registration Notice of Registered Name that is sent to the relevant rights-holder when the registrant proceeds to complete the registration.

			<p><u>otherwise inadequate?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. <u>If inadequate, how can it be improved?</u></li><li>b. <u>Does it inform potential registrants of the scope and limitations of trademark holders' rights?</u><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. <u>If not, how can it be improved?</u></li></ul></li><li>c. <u>Are translations of the Trademark Claims Notice effective in informing potential registrants of the scope and limitation of trademark holders' rights?</u></li></ul> <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"><li>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?</li><li>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 limitations of trademark holders' rights, when applications for domain names that are non-exact matches to trademark records submitted to the TMCH are attempted?</li></ul>
--	--	--	--

2.	Should the Trademark Claims period continue to apply to all new gTLDs?		5. Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?