Trademark Claims Service Questions

1. Is the mandatory 90-day Trademark Claims period having its intended effect of deterring bad faith registrations?
	1. If not: what about the Trademark Claims Service should be adjusted, added or eliminated in order for it to have its intended effect?
		1. Should the Claims period be extended?
		2. Should the Claims period be shortened?
	2. Specific Questions: Does having a mandatory pre-registration Trademark Claims Notice fail in its goal of deterring bad faith registrations?
		1. If so: would lengthening the duration of the claims service have a beneficial effect on meeting its goal? Would making the claims service permanent have a beneficial effect on meeting its goal?
	3. Does the Trademark Claims Notice to users meet its intended purpose?
		1. If not: Is it intimidating, hard to understand or otherwise inadequate?
			1. If so: How can it be improved?
		2. Does it inform potential registrants of the limitations of trademark holders rights?
			1. If not: How can it be improved?
2. Is the Trademark Claims period having any unintended consequences?
	1. If so: what about the Trademark Claims Service should be adjusted, added or eliminated in order to avoid having these unintended consequences?
	2. Specific Questions: Does having a mandatory pre-registration Trademark Claims Notice create a “chilling effect” on good faith registrations?
		1. If so: would the “chilling effect” be reduced or minimized if the Claims period were of a shorter duration?
			1. If so: what would be an appropriate shorter period?
	3. Does the Trademark Claims Notice to users meet its intended purpose?
		1. If not: Is it intimidating, hard to understand or otherwise inadequate?
			1. If so: How can it be improved?
		2. Does it inform potential registrants of the limitations of trademark holders rights?
			1. If not: How can it be improved?
3. Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?