

## TABLES FOR THE RPM SUNRISE & TRADEMARK CLAIMS DATA REQUESTS APPROVED BY THE GNSO COUNCIL

Prepared for RPM Data Sub Team use by ICANN staff – 18 October 2017

**TABLE 1: SURVEYS OF VARIOUS TARGET GROUPS**

Data Sources and Proposed Methodology	Purpose & Scope	Relevant Charter Question	Sub Team’s Suggested Draft Questions, Notes & Additional Guidance
1. Survey of New gTLD Registry Operators (RO)	Obtain anecdotal evidence to facilitate Working Group review of Sunrise Charter Question #2 (whether Sunrise and/or Premium Pricing affects trademark (TM) holders’ ability to participate in Sunrise)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does Registry Sunrise or Premium Name pricing practices unfairly limit the ability of trademark owners to participate during Sunrise?</li> <li>● If so, how extensive is this problem?</li> </ul>	<p>This question is a subjective one that can only be answered by trademark holders. Some information that might contribute to a greater understanding of this question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Did/do you view the sunrise period as providing a valuable service?</li> <li>● Was sunrise participation something that you encouraged?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If yes, what practices or policies did you implement to encourage sunrise registrations?</li> <li>○ If no, do you have suggestions for other policies that would have</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

			<p>better protected brand owners rights in your TLD(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● [can ask, but likely won't get answered] Did you receive any complaints from brand owners about your sunrise pricing, including premium pricing that applied during sunrise? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, can you share any steps you took to resolve the complaint?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<p>Obtain anecdotal evidence to facilitate Working Group review of Sunrise Charter Question #4 (whether registry use of Reserved Names lists affects TM holders' ability to participate in Sunrise)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are Registry Operator reserved names practices unfairly limiting participation in Sunrise by trademark holders?</li> <li>● Should Section 1.3.3 of Specification 1 of the Registry Agreement be modified to address these concerns?</li> <li>● Should Registry Operators be required to publish their reserved names lists -- what Registry concerns would be raised by that publication, and what problem(s) would it solve?</li> <li>● Should Registries be required to provide Trademark Owners in the TMCH notice, and the opportunity to register the domain name should the Registry release it – what Registry concerns would be raised by this requirement?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Did you reserve domain names that you knew were trademarks? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, were those reserved names also “dictionary” words?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Did you reserve names for political or legal reasons specific to your jurisdiction? If so, where did this list come from? Are they blocked or can the names be released to certain parties? How many names are in this category?</li> <li>● Would you support an ICANN policy (such as through a modification to Section 1.3.3 of Spec 1 of the RA) that required ROs to publish their reserved names lists? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why (for either yes or</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

			<p>no)? Specifically would such publication violate any local laws?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should domain names on the reserved list that match entries in the TMCH, be offered first to brand owners? Why or why not?</li> <li>• Alternatively, should RO's notify brand owners when a reserved name matching a TMCH entry is sold to a 3P (even if the claims period is over)? Why or why not?</li> </ul>
	<p>Obtain anecdotal evidence to facilitate Working Group review of Sunrise Charter Question #5 (whether there should be mandatory/optional Sunrise, and the efficacy of a 30-day mandatory minimum Sunrise period)</p>	<p>(a) Does the current 30-day minimum for a Sunrise Period serve its intended purpose, particularly in view of the fact that many registry operators actually ran a 60-day Sunrise Period?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any unintended results?</li> <li>• Does the ability of Registry Operators to expand their Sunrise Periods create uniformity concerns that should be addressed by this WG?</li> <li>• Are there any benefits observed when the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?</li> <li>• Are there any disadvantages?</li> </ul> <p>(b) In light of evidence gathered above, should the Sunrise Period continue to be mandatory or become optional?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the WG consider returning to the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did you run any sunrise period for longer than 30 days? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If not, why not?</li> <li>○ If so, what were the benefits (to the registry or to brand owners)?</li> <li>○ If so, what were the drawbacks? Were there any complaints or was anyone confused? (Include complaints from potential non-brand owner registrants).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Do you think the 30-day minimum sunrise period is effective in preventing cybersquatting? Why or why not?</li> <li>• What suggestions do you have</li> </ul>

		<p>original recommendations from the IRT and STI of Sunrise Period OR Trademark Claims in light of other concerns including freedom of expression and fair use?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In considering mandatory vs optional, should Registry Operators be allowed to choose between Sunrise and Claims (that is, make ONE mandatory)?</li> </ul>	<p>for improving participation or preventing cybersquatting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If sunrise was not mandatory, but the TMCH was still available, would you voluntarily offer sunrise? IF so, would you make any changes to the ICANN-mandated policy? If not, why not?</li> <li>● If you could choose between offering EITHER sunrise or TM claims, what would you choose? Why? If TM claims were perpetual, would your answer change?</li> </ul>
	<p>Obtain anecdotal evidence to facilitate Working Group review of Sunrise Charter Question #12 (whether there is a need for priority or special rules for specialized gTLDs)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs? Should there be a different rule for some registries, such as specialized gTLDs (e.g. community or geo TLDs), based on their published registration/eligibility policies? Examples include POLICE.PARIS and POLICE.NYC for geo-TLDs, and WINDOWS.CONSTRUCTION for specialized gTLDs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If any registry that you operate has registration eligibility restrictions, have you had to balance those restrictions against sunrise requirements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, what have you done to accommodate both?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● What difficulties did you encounter?</li> <li>● How could the ICANN brand protection policies like sunrise or claims be altered to better accommodate restricted TLDs (like community or GEO tlds)?</li> </ul>

	<p>If a RO ran an Approved Launch Program (ALP), Qualified Launch Program (QLP) and/or Limited Registration Period (LRP) – obtain feedback on whether, and if so what aspects of, the programs should be reviewed (Sunrise Charter Question #8)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are Limited Registration Periods in need of review vis a vis the Sunrise Period? Approved Launch Programs? Qualified Launch programs?</li> <li>● Are the ALP and QLP periods in need of review?</li> <li>● What aspects of the LRP are in need of review?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Did you offer any Approved Launch, Qualified Launch, Limited Registration, or Founder’s periods (or any similar pre-GA program that limited participants? [If no, stop here.]</li> <li>● Which did you launch? Add a new comment for each.</li> <li>● Did you encounter any unanticipated startup issues with these programs - specifically, what barriers (if any) did you encounter as you rolled out Limited Registration Periods? Approved Launch Programs and Qualified Launch Programs? How (if at all) did your LRP, QLP or ALP interact with the Sunrise Period? Please provide some examples.</li> <li>● How were you able to reconcile your plans for ALP, LRP and QLP with the ICANN requirements to offer sunrise and claims? Explain as specifically as possible.</li> <li>● What suggestions do you have for future New gTLD roll-outs? What rules, if any, would you recommend for resolving these issues that you have raised above? How could pre-General Availability periods be made</li> </ul>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			more accessible and successful?
	<p>If a RO offered an Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) gTLD – obtain feedback on the efficacy of Sunrise for IDN gTLDs (Sunrise Charter Question #11)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How effectively can trademark holders who use non-English scripts/languages able to participate in sunrise (including IDN sunrises), and should any of them be further “internationalized” (such as in terms of service providers, languages served)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you operating an IDN TLD?</li> <li>• Are you offering second level domains in any IDN script? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [If no to both, skip]</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Did you receive any sunrise registrations in any of your supported SLD IDN languages? If so, what percentage of your sunrise registrations were for IDN domains?</li> <li>• Did you receive inquiries about sunrise registrations for IDN domain names that you didn’t support?</li> <li>• Did you hear from brand owners in the areas targeted by your IDN who did not understand how to participate in sunrise or the TMCH?</li> <li>• Did you offer any special registration periods for IDN domain names apart from the TMCH/sunrise period?</li> </ul>
	<p>If a RO operates in a jurisdiction where profane or other words (strings) are prohibited – obtain feedback on its use of Reserved Names lists (Sunrise Charter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are Registry Operator reserved names practices unfairly limiting participation in Sunrise by trademark holders?</li> <li>• Should Section 1.3.3 of Specification 1 of the Registry Agreement be modified to</li> </ul>	<p>MERGED WITH THE SIMILAR QUESTION ABOVE.</p>

<p>Question #4)</p>	<p>address these concerns?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Should Registry Operators be required to publish their reserved names lists -- what Registry concerns would be raised by that publication, and what problem(s) would it solve?</li> <li>● Should Registries be required to provide Trademark Owners in the TMCH notice, and the opportunity to register the domain name should the Registry release it – what Registry concerns would be raised by this requirement?</li> </ul>	
<p>Obtain feedback from ROs who may believe that their business models (e.g. geo, community or other specialized TLDs) possess attributes that warrant a non-uniform policy in relation to Claims (Claims Charter Question #5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Did you offer an extended Claims period? If so, for how long? Why?</li> <li>● Do you believe the Claims period was effective for preventing cybersquatting? Why or why not?</li> <li>● If ICANN did not mandate a Claims period, but the TMCH still existed, would you voluntarily offer one? If so, what would you do same/different?</li> <li>● If you run a registry that has an eligibility-restricted TLD, or that offered LRP(s), a QLP, and ALP or other Founders-type program, were there any aspects of the Claims service that didn't work specifically for those</li> </ul>

			TLDs/periods? What aspects? What changes would you make to better align these periods with the Claims service?
2. Survey of Registrars	Obtain anecdotal evidence to facilitate Working Group review of Sunrise Charter Questions #4 & #5 (i.e. ROs' use of Reserved Names lists; mandatory vs. optional Sunrise; efficacy of mandatory minimum 30-day Sunrise period)	<p><b>Question 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are Registry Operator reserved names practices unfairly limiting participation in Sunrise by trademark holders?</li> <li>• Should Section 1.3.3 of Specification 1 of the Registry Agreement be modified to address these concerns?</li> <li>• Should Registry Operators be required to publish their reserved names lists -- what Registry concerns would be raised by that publication, and what problem(s) would it solve?</li> <li>• Should Registries be required to provide Trademark Owners in the TMCH notice, and the opportunity to register the domain name should the Registry release it – what Registry concerns would be raised by this requirement?</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 5:</b></p> <p>(a) Does the current 30-day minimum for a Sunrise Period serve its intended purpose, particularly in view of the fact that many registry operators actually ran a 60-day Sunrise Period?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any unintended results?</li> <li>• Does the ability of Registry Operators to</li> </ul>	<p>Q4 This question is a subjective one that can only really be answered by trademark holders. Registrars may not be the primary source of information to inform this, although they may be able to contribute to the understanding of this question if they have had feedback from their customers. So questions to registrars would seek to understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have you had feedback from your customers regarding their experiences with registry reserved names – positive or negative</li> <li>• How do you get notified of registry reserved names? What percentage of registries publish a list on their website, provide a list to their accredited registrar, confirm that a names is reserved (either unavailable, or available at a premium price) only once you try to register? other? How far in advance are reserved names notified to you, and do you have experience that this is either adequate or inadequate?</li> </ul>



		<p>expand their Sunrise Periods create uniformity concerns that should be addressed by this WG?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any benefits observed when the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?</li> <li>• Are there any disadvantages?</li> </ul> <p>(b) In light of evidence gathered above, should the Sunrise Period continue to be mandatory or become optional?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the WG consider returning to the original recommendations from the IRT and STI of Sunrise Period OR Trademark Claims in light of other concerns including freedom of expression and fair use?</li> <li>• In considering mandatory vs optional, should Registry Operators be allowed to choose between Sunrise and Claims (that is, make ONE mandatory)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you have any comments on the proposal that registries should publish their lists of reserved names?</li> <li>• When name collision names were released from reservation, trademark owners with a mark in the TMCH were given a right of first refusal. What was your experience of this, what went well? were there any technical or other issues?</li> <li>• If registry reserved names were to be offered first to trade mark owners with a mark in the TMCH, what would be the best way to do this from your perspective as a registrar? A second Sunrise? A right of first refusal? What concerns would this raise for you as a registrar?</li> </ul> <p>Q5 From your experience as a registrar: Are there any benefits or disadvantages to a Sunrise which is 30 days (start date sunrise); are there any advantages and disadvantages to a 60 day (end date) sunrise?</p> <p>Do you get adequate notice of the</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>commencement of Sunrises, If not, what would be adequate notice? Same question regarding changes/extension of the Sunrise term.</p> <p>Would there be any benefits, or disadvantages, to all registries running the same standardised-term Sunrise?</p> <p>What would be the advantages and disadvantages of making only the claims or the sunrise mandatory. If a registry could choose only one, what would be the advantages and disadvantages for you as a registrar?</p>
	<p><b>Specific survey questions for Claims Charter Question #1:</b></p> <p>1.What is the abandonment rate associated with reasons other than only a Claims notice being triggered? What is the difference between abandonment rates between those that trigger Claims Notices, and those that don't?</p>	<p>Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect? Consider the following questions specifically in the context both of a Claims Notice as well as a Notice of Registered Name:</p> <p>a) Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect of deterring bad-faith registrations and providing notice to domain name applicants?</p> <p>b) Is the Trademark Claims service having any unintended consequences, such as deterring good-faith domain name applications?</p>	<p>Q1 Do you have any records of the "abandonment rate" (ie domain name applicants who request the registration of a particular domain but do not go thorough to copmplete the payment? If so, what are the rates of abandonment for legacy TLDs and ccTLDs? What is the abandonment rate for a new gTLDs during the claims period – both for names which receive claims notices and those which do not? And after the claims period?</p>
	<p>2. Is there anecdotal data explaining why potential registrants did not complete</p>		<p>Q2 do you capture any feedback from registrants as to why they do not complete a purchase?</p>

registrations?		Do you have any views of your own as to why registrants do not complete a purchase?
3. At what point in the registration process is a trademark record downloaded? Does this happen when domain names are placed in carts, or does it happen when payment/attempted registrations are done later in the process?	<p>NOTE: “follow on” question for Claims Charter Question #1, –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If the answers to 1.a. is “no” or 1.b. is “yes”, or if it could be better: What about the Trademark Claims Notice and/or the Notice of Registered Name should be adjusted, added or eliminated in order for it to have its intended effect, under each of the following questions?</li> </ul> <p>a) Should the Claims period be extended - if so, for 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>e) Should the proof of use requirements for Sunrise be extended to include the issuance of TMCH notices?</p>	<p>Q3 At what point in the registration process is a trademark record downloaded? Does this happen when domain names are placed in carts, or does it happen when payment/attempted registrations are done later in the process?</p> <p>Do you collect any feedback from your customers regarding their understanding of the trademark claims notice. Is there any particular wording which is generally well understood, or misunderstood?</p>
4. Many registrars take orders for domain names before general availability – pre-orders do not normally result in Claims notices being presented until within 48 hours of general availability – does this contribute to the abandonment rate? If so, to what extent are pre-ordered domain name registrations abandoned?		<p>Q4 Do you/Did you offer pre-registration for new gTLD domain names before the launch of GA? If yes, when was the claims notice submitted to the customer?</p> <p>If you capture data about “abandonment rates” what is the rate for domain pre-orders compared to domains which were not pre-ordered?</p>
5. Would it be feasible for		Q5 Given the registration process that

	registrars to run surveys of domain name applicants during subsequent rounds of new gTLDs for anecdotal evidence on why registrations are being abandoned? Is this something ICANN should mandate?		you operate, would it be feasible for you to run surveys of domain name applicants who decide not to proceed with a registration during subsequent rounds of new gTLDs for anecdotal evidence on why registrations are being abandoned? Are there any technical or procedural reasons which would make this impossible or disproportionately difficult or costly?
	6. Has the TM Claims Notice been translated into the language of the registration agreement and is it being made available to registrants in that language?		Q6 what languages other than English do you use for your registration agreement with new gTLD domain name registrants? Do you translate the claims notice into all of these languages?
3. Survey of TM & Brand Owners	Obtain feedback on Sunrise Charter Questions #2, #4 & #5 (whether Premium Pricing and the use of Premium Names and Reserved Names lists affected TM owners' willingness to participate in Sunrise; whether intended purpose of mandatory 30-day Sunrise fulfilled, and whether Sunrise should be mandatory/optional)	<p><b>Question 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does Registry Sunrise or Premium Name pricing practices unfairly limit the ability of trademark owners to participate during Sunrise?</li> <li>If so, how extensive is this problem?</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are Registry Operator reserved names practices unfairly limiting participation in Sunrise by trademark holders?</li> <li>Should Section 1.3.3 of Specification 1 of the Registry Agreement be modified to address these concerns? <b>NOTE: I have not</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>This Survey is designed to obtain information from trademark and brand owners regarding the Rights Protection Mechanisms of the New gTLD program, and in particular the Trademark Clearing House ("TMCH") and the Sunrise and Trademark Claims programs that the TMCH supports. Please answer each question truthfully and completely to the best of your ability.</b></p> <p><b>Question 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you or your company own registrations for any trademarks?</li> </ul>

		<p>included this in questions to trademark owners because it would be beyond their knowledge and should be answered in response to the information we learn by asking Question 4 – not part of the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Should Registry Operators be required to publish their reserved names lists -- what Registry concerns would be raised by that publication, and what problem(s) would it solve?</li> <li>· Should Registries be required to provide Trademark Owners in the TMCH notice, and the opportunity to register the domain name should the Registry release it – what Registry concerns would be raised by this requirement?</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 5:</b></p> <p>(a) Does the current 30-day minimum for a Sunrise Period serve its intended purpose, particularly in view of the fact that many registry operators actually ran a 60-day Sunrise Period?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Are there any unintended results?</li> <li>· Does the ability of Registry Operators to expand their Sunrise Periods create uniformity concerns that should be addressed by this WG?</li> <li>· Are there any benefits observed when the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?</li> <li>· Are there any disadvantages?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, how many?</li> <li>○ If not, stop survey.</li> <li>● Have you registered any of your trademarks with the TMCH? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, how many?</li> <li>○ If not, stop survey.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Have you submitted Proof of Use for any of your trademarks with the TMCH in order to take part in Sunrise Services? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, how many?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Have you applied to register any of your trademarks in a New gTLD during a Sunrise Period? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, in what gTLDs?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● What factors have you considered in deciding whether to apply to register your trademark during any Sunrise Period?</li> <li>● Was the price of registering in a gTLD a factor in your decision whether to apply or not?</li> <li>● In what gTLDs did you decide not to seek Sunrise Period registration due to price?</li> <li>● If you remember the price, please indicate what it was.</li> <li>● Do you believe this was an unfair or premium price?</li> <li>● Was the reason for the pricing</li> </ul>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>(b) In light of evidence gathered above, should the Sunrise Period continue to be mandatory or become optional?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the WG consider returning to the original recommendations from the IRT and STI of Sunrise Period OR Trademark Claims in light of other concerns including freedom of expression and fair use?</li> </ul> <p>In considering mandatory vs optional, should Registry Operators be allowed to choose between Sunrise and Claims (that is, make ONE mandatory)?</p>	<p>explained to you?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are you aware of any other trademark registration owners who have decided not to apply to register their trademarks as domain names during Sunrise Periods due to the price of registration?</li> <li>If so, how many of these trademark owners are you aware of?</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you know if any of your trademarks have been reserved by any New gTLD Registry operators? [MAY HAVE TO EXPLAIN]</li> <li>Has your participation in Sunrise Period registration been affected by Registry Operator reservation of names?</li> <li>Do you believe Registry Operators should be required to publish their reserved names lists? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If so, what problems do you think publication of these lists would solve or address?</li> </ul> </li> <li>In the event a Registry has</li> </ul>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>placed a trademark in its reserved names list and later decides to release that name for registration, should the Registry be required to provide Trademark Owners in the TMCH notice of the release, and a priority opportunity to register the domain name upon its release?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Why do you believe this should be the case?</li><li>● Do you believe Registries will have any issue with this requirement and if so, what would those issues be?</li></ul> <p><b>Question 5:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Do you believe the 30-day minimum for a Sunrise Period serves its intended purpose? [NOTE: I think we need to identify that purpose as a preface to these questions]</li><li>● Do you believe the 60-period observed by many registry operators would be more appropriate?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ If so, why?</li></ul></li><li>● Does the fact that different</li></ul>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>Registry Operators expand their Sunrise Periods to different lengths create any concerns for you?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ If so, what are those concerns?</li><li>● What benefits have you observed when a Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?</li><li>● What disadvantages have you observed when a Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?</li><li>● Do you believe that the Sunrise Period should continue to be mandatory in New gTLDs or should it be optional?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Why?</li></ul></li><li>● Do you believe having a Sunrise Period but no Claims Service, or having a Claims Service but no Sunrise Period would be a better means for meeting the goals of the TMCH and these Rights Protection Mechanisms?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Why?</li></ul></li><li>● If you believe one of these procedures should be made optional, should Registry Operators be allowed to choose which to incorporate in their Registry operations?</li></ul>
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



	<p>Obtain feedback on number of cease-and-desist letters sent (Claims Charter Question #3 – whether Claims serves its intended purpose)</p>	<p>(a) Does the Trademark Claims Notice to domain name applicants meet its intended purpose?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. If not, is it intimidating, hard to understand, or otherwise inadequate? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If inadequate, how can it be improved?</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii. Does it inform domain name applicants of the scope and limitations of trademark holders' rights? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If not, how can it be improved?</li> </ul> </li> <li>iii. Are translations of the Trademark Claims Notice effective in informing domain name applicants of the scope and limitation of trademark holders' rights?</li> </ul> <p>(b) Should Claims Notifications only be sent to registrants who complete domain name registrations, as opposed to those who are attempting to register domain names that are matches to entries in the TMCH?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Why?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How many Claims Notices have you received for your trademarks?</li> <li>● How many of these Claims Notices did you follow with a cease and desist letter?</li> <li>● How many times did the applicant agree to abandon its application?</li> <li>● How many times did the applicant refuse to abandon its application?</li> <li>● How many URS, UDRP or other actions did you file against applicants that refused to abandon their applications based on likelihood of confusion, cybersquatting or bad faith?</li> <li>● In how many such actions did the applicant abandon its application prior to decision?</li> <li>● In how many such actions did you succeed?</li> <li>● In how many such actions did you lose?</li> <li>● Based on your experience, do you believe the Trademark Claims Notice to domain name applicants has itself met its</li> </ul>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

--	--	--

intended purpose? [AGAIN we might want to explain here what that purpose is said to be in the Applicant's Guide Book and also provide a copy for review]

- If you do not believe it has met its intended purpose, can you say why you believe this?
- Is the Claims Notice hard to understand, or otherwise inadequate?
- If you believe it is inadequate, how do you think it could be improved?
- Does the Claims Notice inform domain name applicants of the scope and limitations of trademark holders' rights?
  - If not, how can it be improved?
- Should Claims Notifications only be sent to domain name applicants who complete domain name registrations that are matches of trademarks registered in the TMCH, as opposed to those who have applied to register domain names that are matches of trademarks registered in the TMCH?

	<p>Obtain feedback on actual brand owner experiences regarding evidence of harm intended to be addressed by the Claims RPM (Claims Charter Question #4(a))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the evidence of harm under the existing [exact match] system?<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you aware of what harms were meant to be addressed by the Trademark Claims service of notification of TMCH registration to applicants, requirement of statement of non-infringement, and notification of trademark owners upon registration of TMCH registered names?</li> <li>• Do you have any evidence of the harm being addressed actually occurring prior to the Claims service? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Please describe it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Do you have any evidence that you, your company or your trademarks, or your ability to register domain names have been harmed in any way by the fact that Claims Notices are only issued to Exact Match applications?</li> <li>• How many UDRP, URS or litigation proceedings have you brought based on the registration and/or use of domain names that are exact matches of your trademarks – both those registered in the</li> </ul>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>1</sup> This Charter question had the following note: “In conducting this analysis, recall that IDNs and Latin-based words with accents and umlauts are currently not serviced or recognized by many registries.”

			<p>TMCH and others?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many UDRP, URS or litigation proceedings have you brought based on the registration and/or use of domain names that are not exact matches of your trademarks – both those registered in the TMCH and others?</li> <li>• Do you have any evidence that broadening the comparison bases to include variants of trademarks and not only exact matches would be useful and protect the rights of both trademark owners and domain name applicants?</li> </ul>
4. Survey of Domain Name Registrants	Obtain anecdotal evidence on effect of Claims Notices (Claims Charter Question #1(b))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the Trademark Claims service having any unintended consequences, such as deterring good-faith domain name applications?<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<p>This survey is about domain names and the process about registering domain names. Examples of domains are amazon.com, shoes.co.uk, petdogs.de.</p> <p>In this scheme, .com, .uk, and .de are</p>
	Obtain “more granular data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the Trademark Claims service having</li> </ul>	

<sup>2</sup> Note the “follow on” question if the answer to this sub-question is Yes: “What about the Trademark Claims Notice and/or the Notice of Registered Name should be adjusted, added or eliminated in order for it to have its intended effect, under each of the following questions?”

- Should the Claims period be extended - if so, for how long (up to permanently)?
- Should the Claims period be shortened?
- Should the Claims period be mandatory?
- Should any TLDs be exempt from the Claims RPM and if so, which ones and why?
- Should the proof of use requirements for Sunrise be extended to include the issuance of TMCH notices?

	<p>about the percentage of those who abandoned registration attempts in response to a notice based on dictionary terms versus those who abandoned attempts in response to distinctive trademarks” (quote from Sub Team report on Claims Charter Question #1(b))</p>	<p>any unintended consequences, such as deterring good-faith domain name applications?<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>called top-level domains.</p> <p>Domain names are used by individuals and organizations to put up web sites, sell merchandize, create communities, publish blogs, and establish branded email addresses.</p> <p>In the last three years over 1000 new domains have been introduced. These domains might be: city types (e.g., .london, .nyc), generic types (e.g., .club, .art, .vip, .shop, .blog, .eco).</p> <p>1) Have you ever registered a domain name?</p> <p>[if no, terminate survey]</p> <p>2) If, when registering your domain, you received a notice with the following wording, would you:</p> <p>(a) Proceed with the registration without thinking about it much  (b) Think about the notice and carefully consider whether you should continue with the registration  (c) Seek additional information  (d) Abandon the registration</p>
	<p>Obtain feedback on number of cease-and-desist letters received (Claims Charter Question #3)</p>	<p>(a) Does the Trademark Claims Notice to domain name applicants meet its intended purpose?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. If not, is it intimidating, hard to understand, or otherwise inadequate? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If inadequate, how can it be improved?</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii. Does it inform domain name applicants of the scope and limitations of trademark holders’ rights? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If not, how can it be improved?</li> </ul> </li> <li>iii. Are translations of the Trademark Claims Notice effective in informing domain name applicants of the scope and limitation of trademark holders’ rights?</li> </ul> <p>(b) Should Claims Notifications only be sent</p>	

<sup>3</sup> Note the “follow on” question, as above.

		<p>to registrants who complete domain name registrations, as opposed to those who are attempting to register domain names that are matches to entries in the TMCH?</p>	<p>3) Have you, within the last three years, registered or even initiated the registration of a domain in of the “new” types of top-level domains. These domains might be: city types (e.g., .london, .nyc), generic types (e.g., .club, .art, .vip, .shop, .blog, .eco).</p> <p>[if no, terminate survey]</p> <p>4) If yes, please type the first three letter of the top-level domain where you registered a name</p> <p>5) When you registered names in any of the new top-level domains, did you receive a notice that stated: ....</p> <p>[if no, terminate survey]</p> <p>6) How did you react to this notice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Proceeded with the registration without thinking about it much</li> <li>(b) Thought about the notice and carefully considered it, and then continued with the registration</li> <li>(c) Abandoned the registration</li> </ul> <p>7) Have you received such a notice on more than one occasion?</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>[if no, terminate survey]</p> <p>8) How did you react to the second (and other) notices?</p> <p>(a) Having seen it before, proceeded with the registration without thinking about it much</p> <p>(b) Having seen it before, still thought about the notice and carefully considered it, and then continued with the registration</p> <p>(c) Having seen it before, abandoned the registration without thinking about it much</p>
5. Survey of Potential Registrants	Obtain “more granular data about the percentage of those who abandoned registration attempts in response to a notice based on dictionary terms versus those who abandoned attempts in response to distinctive trademarks” (Claims Charter Question #1(b))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the Trademark Claims service having any unintended consequences, such as deterring good-faith domain name applications?<sup>4</sup></li> </ul>	

<sup>4</sup> Note the “follow on” question if the answer is Yes, as above.

	<p>Show copy of Claims Notice to average Internet users who are likely to register a domain - to test understanding of the notice (in multiple languages, using languages into which the TMCH has translated its website) (Claims Charter Questions #1 &amp; #3)</p>	<p><b>Question 1:</b> Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect? Consider the following questions specifically in the context both of a Claims Notice as well as a Notice of Registered Name:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect of deterring bad-faith registrations and providing notice to domain name applicants?</li> <li>b) Is the Trademark Claims service having any unintended consequences, such as deterring good-faith domain name applications?<sup>5</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>Question 3:</b> (a) Does the Trademark Claims Notice to domain name applicants meet its intended purpose?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. If not, is it intimidating, hard to understand, or otherwise inadequate? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If inadequate, how can it be improved?</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii. Does it inform domain name applicants of the scope and limitations of trademark holders’</li> </ul>	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

---

<sup>5</sup> Note the “follow on” question, as above.



		<p>rights?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If not, how can it be improved?</li> </ul> <p>iii. Are translations of the Trademark Claims Notice effective in informing domain name applicants of the scope and limitation of trademark holders' rights?</p> <p>(b) Should Claims Notifications only be sent to registrants who complete domain name registrations, as opposed to those who are attempting to register domain names that are matches to entries in the TMCH?</p>	
6. Survey of public interest groups and trade associations (to be identified by the Working Group)	Obtain feedback on Sunrise Charter Question #5 (mandatory vs. optional Sunrise and efficacy of 30-day mandatory minimum Sunrise period)	<p>(a) Does the current 30-day minimum for a Sunrise Period serve its intended purpose, particularly in view of the fact that many registry operators actually ran a 60-day Sunrise Period?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are there any unintended results?</li> <li>● Does the ability of Registry Operators to expand their Sunrise Periods create uniformity concerns that should be addressed by this WG?</li> <li>● Are there any benefits observed when the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?</li> <li>● Are there any disadvantages?</li> </ul> <p>(b) In light of evidence gathered above, should the Sunrise Period continue to be mandatory or become optional?</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Should the WG consider returning to the original recommendations from the IRT and STI of Sunrise Period OR Trademark Claims in light of other concerns including freedom of expression and fair use?</li><li>• In considering mandatory vs optional, should Registry Operators be allowed to choose between Sunrise and Claims (that is, make ONE mandatory)?</li></ul>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**TABLE 2: RESEARCH BEING CONDUCTED ICANN STAFF OR OTHER THIRD PARTIES**

TASK	SCOPE/DESCRIPTION	RELEVANT CHARTER QUESTION	STAFF UPDATE/COMMENTS
<p>7. Research (can be done by law students or graduate researchers and/or staff)</p>	<p>A two-step process to obtain specific data showing:            (1) what domains registered in new gTLDs were disputed; and            (2) whether they were registered during the applicable claims period for that gTLD (purpose is to evaluate efficacy of Claims Notice if one had been issued (Claims Charter Questions #1, #2, #3)):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Collect, compile and organize all UDRP complaints filed in gTLDs launched under the 2012 New gTLD Program (equivalent URS data is already being compiled by</li> </ul>	<p><b>Question 1:</b>            Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect? Consider the following questions specifically in the context both of a Claims Notice as well as a Notice of Registered Name:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Is the Trademark Claims service having its intended effect of deterring bad-faith registrations and providing notice to domain name applicants?</li> <li>b) Is the Trademark Claims service having any unintended consequences, such as deterring good-faith domain name applications?</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 2:</b>            If the answers to 1.a. is “no” or 1.b. is “yes”, or if it could be better: What about the Trademark Claims Notice and/or the Notice of Registered Name should be adjusted, added or eliminated in order for it to have its intended effect, under each of the following questions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Should the Claims period be extended - if so, for how long (up to permanently)?</li> <li>b) Should the Claims period be shortened?</li> <li>c) Should the Claims period be mandatory?</li> </ul>	<p><b>URS/UDRP:</b>            Staff is currently compiling the following data on the URS, to match URS cases filed to domains registered during the relevant Claims period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of URS cases filed</li> <li>● The second level domains filed against and the respective gTLDs</li> <li>● WHOIS records (at the time the URS complaint was filed) – to check if domain was registered during the applicable Claims period</li> </ul> <p>In compiling the above data, staff has reviewed and used, as much as possible, the findings from the Analysis Group.</p> <p>Staff can only compile limited UDRP data at this time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Even though some Working Group members had suggested it will be relatively simple to pull just the UDRP cases filed against domains registered in new gTLDs,</li> </ul>

	<p>ICANN staff)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Pull down WHOIS records for all domains subject to URS and UDRP complaints under the 2012 New gTLD Program – check for registration date to see if it matches with the relevant gTLD RO’s Claims Period and identify whether the URS complaint involves a trademark accepted into the TMCH in order to evaluate efficacy of Claims Notice if one had been issued</li> </ul>	<p>d) Should any TLDs be exempt from the Claims RPM and if so, which ones and why?</p> <p>e) Should the proof of use requirements for Sunrise be extended to include the issuance of TMCH notices?</p> <p><b>Question 3:</b></p> <p>(a) Does the Trademark Claims Notice to domain name applicants meet its intended purpose?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If not, is it intimidating, hard to understand, or otherwise inadequate?</li> <li>If inadequate, how can it be improved?</li> <li>Does it inform domain name applicants of the scope and limitations of trademark holders’ rights?</li> <li>If not, how can it be improved?</li> <li>Are translations of the Trademark Claims Notice effective in informing domain name applicants of the scope and limitation of trademark holders’ rights?</li> </ol> <p>(b) Should Claims Notifications only be sent to registrants who complete domain name registrations, as opposed to those who are attempting to register domain names that are matches to entries in the TMCH?</p>	<p>that is not the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Detailed UDRP data at the level needed for this exercise is not currently available in a uniform manner, and comprises well over 40,000 disputes.</li> <li>● Consequently, compiling meaningful data on UDRP cases will require very extensive manual work (even to normalize the data applicable to UDRP complaints filed against domains registered in new gTLDs).</li> </ul> <p>If the Sub Team believes that it is necessary to obtain UDRP data for complaints filed concerning domains registered in new gTLDs, staff recommends that, as part of this Sunrise and Claims data gathering exercise, the Sub Team consider a request to all UDRP providers for more specific data than is currently available publicly, in a format that can be normalized and compiled by ICANN staff.</p> <p>To the extent that specific legal review of UDRP cases is desired at this stage (rather than, e.g. Phase Two), the cost and timing of getting external researchers to do that work should be</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>factored in, and consideration be given to whether the budget for the current request can accommodate this task at this time.</p>
	<p>Find articles and other research “discussing the harm of typosquatting and other forms of non-exact-match cybersquatting, including all forms of consumer harm, not just traffic redirection” (quote from Sub Team report on</p>	<p>Is the exact match requirement for Trademark Claims serving the intended purposes of the Trademark Claims RPM? In conducting this analysis, recall that IDNs and Latin-based words with accents and umlauts are currently not serviced or recognized by many registries.</p> <p>a) What is the evidence of harm under the existing system?</p> <p>b) Should the matching criteria for Notices be</p>	<p>Staff has been asked to conduct a LexisNexis search to find such articles – as this does not appear to be an imminent need and will take up a substantial amount of staff time. We have not yet started on this task.</p> <p>NOTE: The purpose of this research is to find articles that may assist the Working</p>

	<p>Claims Charter Question #4) and “gaming” of the Sunrise Period.</p>	<p>expanded?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Should the marks in the TMCH be the basis for an expansion of matches for the purpose of providing a broader range of claims notices?</li> <li>ii. What results (including unintended consequences) might each suggested form of expansion of matching criteria have?</li> <li>iii. What balance should be adhered to in striving to deter bad-faith registrations but not good-faith domain name applications?</li> <li>iv. What is the resulting list of non-exact match criteria recommended by the WG, if any?</li> </ul> <p>c) What is the feasibility of implementation for each form of expanded matches?</p> <p>d) If an expansion of matches solution were to be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Should the existing TM Claims Notice be amended? If so, how?</li> <li>ii. Should the Claim period differ for exact matches versus non-exact matches?</li> </ul>	<p>Group with its pending review of the “Graham-Shatan-Winterfeldt” proposal for non-exact matches (consolidated proposal dated 8 June 2017 available at <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/qlDwAw">https://community.icann.org/x/qlDwAw</a>).</p>
<p>8. Contractors</p>	<p>Hire contractor to generate “semantics of programming that can be used to test the historical data to see how many Claims Notices may</p>	<p>Is the exact match requirement for Trademark Claims serving the intended purposes of the Trademark Claims RPM? In conducting this analysis, recall that IDNs and Latin-based words with accents and umlauts are currently not</p>	<p>This may require a substantial expenditure of money for a task that does not seem imminent. Staff recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Sub Team consider the relevance</li> </ul>

<p>be generated” (quote from Sub Team report on Claims Charter Question #4)</p>	<p>serviced or recognized by many registries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What is the evidence of harm under the existing system?</li> <li>b) Should the matching criteria for Notices be expanded? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Should the marks in the TMCH be the basis for an expansion of matches for the purpose of providing a broader range of claims notices?</li> <li>ii. What results (including unintended consequences) might each suggested form of expansion of matching criteria have?</li> <li>iii. What balance should be adhered to in striving to deter bad-faith registrations but not good-faith domain name applications?</li> <li>iv. What is the resulting list of non-exact match criteria recommended by the WG, if any?</li> </ul> </li> <li>c) What is the feasibility of implementation for each form of expanded matches?</li> <li>d) If an expansion of matches solution were to be implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. Should the existing TM Claims Notice be amended? If so, how?</li> <li>iv. Should the Claim period differ for exact matches versus non-exact matches?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>and priority of this task. If it is deemed necessary, the Sub Team should provide more specific guidance on scope (e.g. what keywords and variants to include).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Nevertheless, in view of the likely expense, staff recommends that this request be paused until staff has obtained and analyzed input from IBM to see if that data can assist with answering this question.</li> </ul>
<p>Following completion of above task, ICANN staff to</p>		<p>The Working Group had agreed previously that doing this now will be</p>

<p>work with contractor (can be Deloitte and/or IBM) to determine feasibility of developing a possible Claims system to handle non-exact matches (Claims Charter Question #4)</p>		<p>premature – staff therefore recommends that this task be paused until the results of analysis of IBM input (see above) are available.</p>
<p>ICANN staff to work with Deloitte and/or IBM to obtain aggregated, anonymized statistics demonstrating both percentages of disputed and undisputed domains that were accepted into the TMCH and that generated a Claims Notice</p>		<p>Staff has not yet commenced this task, although we are consulting with our Global Domains Division (GDD) colleagues who work with Deloitte and IBM as to the ability of these contractors to provide this information at no extra cost.</p>
<p>ICANN staff to work with contractor to obtain Sunrise and General Availability for a sampling of different types of domains (e.g. geo, community, open) - purpose is to determine if Sunrise and/or Premium Pricing affected ability of trademark holders to participate in Sunrise (Sunrise Charter Question</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does Registry Sunrise or Premium Name pricing practices unfairly limit the ability of trademark owners to participate during Sunrise?</li> <li>● If so, how extensive is this problem?</li> </ul>	<p>Staff has already presented our initial findings on Sunrise registration data to the Working Group, based on a breakdown of gTLDs into “generic”, “geographic” and “brands/Spec 13” categories. We can (but have not yet proceeded to) pull General Availability registration data for a sample of each type of gTLD – this can be done as part of #7 (above).</p>



	#2)		
	Hire contractor to assist Working Group in sorting and analyzing all data and feedback collected		Staff recommends that this proposal be paused as it is not clear that a third-party expert in data analytics is needed at this time.
9. List of gTLDs that had Approved Launch Programs, Qualified Launch Programs and/or Limited Registration Periods	ICANN staff to compile the list for Working Group analysis of the efficacy of these mechanisms (Sunrise Charter Question #8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are Limited Registration Periods in need of review vis a vis the Sunrise Period? Approved Launch Programs? Qualified Launch programs?</li> <li>• Are the ALP and QLP periods in need of review?</li> <li>• What aspects of the LRP are in need of review?</li> </ul>	Staff has already begun to compile this data; however, additional information may be needed from the relevant registry operators to answer the Charter questions.
10. List of IDN gTLDs that had a Sunrise Period	ICANN staff to compile the list for Working Group analysis of the efficacy of Sunrise for TMs in non-Latin scripts (Sunrise Charter Question #11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How effectively can trademark holders who use non-English scripts/languages able to participate in sunrise (including IDN sunrises), and should any of them be further “internationalized” (such as in terms of service providers, languages served)?</li> </ul>	Staff is likely to be able to provide this data based on our initial Sunrise registration findings.
11. Compilation of investigative journalists’	Staff to collect articles from Working Group-approved list of blogs, to assist with Working Group analysis of Sunrise Charter Questions	<p><b>Question 5:</b></p> <p>(a) Does the current 30-day minimum for a Sunrise Period serve its intended purpose, particularly in view of the fact that many registry operators actually ran a 60-day Sunrise Period?</p>	Staff has begun on this task, but it is an extensive task that will require a substantial amount of staff time to complete (especially in combination with the research request to search LexisNexis

<p>and other media reports as well as coverage from industry blogs and publications</p>	<p>#5 (mandatory vs. optional Sunrise and efficacy of 30-day mandatory minimum Sunrise period); and #12 (whether there is a need for priority or special rules for specialized gTLDs)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are there any unintended results?</li> <li>● Does the ability of Registry Operators to expand their Sunrise Periods create uniformity concerns that should be addressed by this WG?</li> <li>● Are there any benefits observed when the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?</li> <li>● Are there any disadvantages?</li> </ul> <p>(b) In light of evidence gathered above, should the Sunrise Period continue to be mandatory or become optional?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Should the WG consider returning to the original recommendations from the IRT and STI of Sunrise Period OR Trademark Claims in light of other concerns including freedom of expression and fair use?</li> <li>● In considering mandatory vs optional, should Registry Operators be allowed to choose between Sunrise and Claims (that is, make ONE mandatory)?</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 12:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs? Should there be a different rule for some registries, such as specialized gTLDs (e.g. community or geo TLDs), based on their published registration/eligibility policies? Examples include POLICE.PARIS and POLICE.NYC for geo-TLDs, and</li> </ul>	<p>for articles on cyber-squatting, consumer harm and “gaming”, above).</p> <p>The list of blogs that have been suggested for this task includes over 30 blogs to date:  <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/ShMhB">https://community.icann.org/x/ShMhB</a></p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		WINDOWS.CONSTRUCTION for specialized gTLDs.	
12. Compilation of all URS cases (including domains in dispute and outcomes)	Staff to compile the list, to compare against WHOIS data (to be obtained as part of the two-step research process noted in #7 above) for domains in dispute and discover which domains were registered during the relevant Claims Period for that gTLD		See staff note under Item #7, above.
13. Compilation of data and conclusions from the Analysis Group's report on the Trademark Clearinghouse	Staff to extract relevant data and conclusions as a starting point for the Working Group's analysis of the efficacy of the Sunrise and Claims RPMs, and avoid duplication of effort where the Analysis Group has already provided the data required		See staff note under Item #7, above – in our initial findings of Sunrise registration data, staff has been able to confirm the Analysis Group's data.
14. Compilation of INTA Cost Impact Study results	Staff to compile results relevant to Sunrise and Claims, to supplement anecdotal evidence obtained via the surveys proposed above, to determine if Sunrise and/or	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does Registry Sunrise or Premium Name pricing practices unfairly limit the ability of trademark owners to participate during Sunrise?</li> <li>• If so, how extensive is this problem?</li> </ul>	The Working Group has already received a presentation on the INTA survey results: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/GhghB">https://community.icann.org/x/GhghB</a> . Staff suggests revisiting this data (if necessary) following discussions with the CCT Review Team, which has also

	Premium Pricing affected ability of trademark holders to participate in Sunrise (Sunrise Charter Question #2)		reviewed the survey results.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------