**COMMENTS REGARDING ABANDONMENT RATE DATA FROM TRADEMARK CLAIMS SUB TEAM CALL ON 26 MAY 2017**

**Key to Abbreviated Names:**

MG – Michael Graham

KD – Kristine Dorrain

RT – Rebecca Tushnet

KK – Kathy Kleiman

AG – Analysis Group

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments made by Sub Team Members during 26 May call** | **Notes from Analysig Group (AG) & Sub Team Discussion** | **Sub Team Agreement** |
| **1. Comments pertaining to the domain name registration process and triggering of a Claims Notice** | a. MG: What is the abandonment rate of domain name registrations not triggering a Claims Notice (abandoned for reasons other than a Claims Notice)? How does this compare to the abandonment rate associated with a triggered Claims Notice? |  |  |
|  | b. MG: Anecdotal data needed on why potential registrants did not complete registrations – was abandonment the result of a Claims Notice being presented, or was it due to other reasons? |  |  |
|  | c. KD: How many potential registrants initially abandoned the domain name registration to complete the registration at a later time? Is this data available via registry operators? | AG: Could not trace potential registrants in the data (for example, they did not have ISP addresses), so they were not able to identify return applicants. |  |
|  | d. KD: Is cart abandonment taking place at the time of a Claims Notice being presented, and not at some other point in the process? |  |  |
|  | e. RT: Is the abandonment rate representing a total or sequential percentage of abandonment (abandonment on presentation of the Claims Notice, or abandonment during all stages of the registration process)? |  |  |
|  | f. RT: Pricing as a data point concerning a decision to abandon a registration might be irrelevant, as potential registrants know the price of the domain they are seeking to register well before a Claims Notice is presented - abandonment due to pricing will likely occur before a Claims Notice is presented |  |  |
|  | g. KK: The abandonment rate is very revealing, since if a potential registrant reaches the stage in the process of a registration when a Claims Notice is presented, there is nothing else deterring the registrant from completing the registration |  |  |
|  | h. KK: Anecdotal evidence is helpful in understanding why potential registrants are turning back |  |  |
|  | i. KK: Have instances of leaving potential registrations in the cart unpurchased contributed to the abandonment rate, with an intent to purchase at a later time? | AG: Could not trace potential registrants in the data (for example, they did not have ISP addresses), so they were not able to identify return applicants. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **2. Comments pertaining to the understanding/interpretation of the 93.7% Abandonment Rate in the Analysis Group Revised Report** | a. KK: Need to determine what value there is in the 93.7% abandonment rate |  |  |
|  | b. MG: More information required on “ping rates” (trademark record downloads)* + Where they were coming from
	+ Percentages
	+ Same strings triggering Claims Notices (trademark record downloads)
 | AG: If no registration was made, it is possible that multiple abandoned attempts were made to register the same domain; there was no way for AG to track duplicate “pings” or to see what domain was being applied for if the application is abandoned. |  |
|  | c. MG: How much of the abandonment rate truly represents abandoned potential domain name registrations, and not downloads of trademark records not associated with attempted registrations? Where can this data be obtained? | KK: The Analysis Group stated that they eliminated duplicative downloads of trademark Claims data |  |
|  | d. MG: Data on UDRP and URS cases and decisions involving exact and non-exact matches of trademarks, and more importantly, trademarks registered in the TMCH |  |  |
| **3. Identifying variables that may assist in improving the understanding of the Abandonment Rate** | a. MG: Data that compares a correlation between abandonment rates across different gTLDs and the prices of registering domain names under those gTLDs | AG sent data requests to a sample of registrars that offer registrations in the most popular new TLDs, asking for data on all new gTLD domain registration attempts: * the attempted domain name (e.g., Domain.newTLD)
* the date of the registration attempt
* indication for whether a Claims Service notification was sent
* indication of whether the registration was completed.

Data was received from only one registrar. |  |
|  | b. KD: General cart abandonment rates for online purchases in the same general price point as domain names ($8 - $80) - to be used as a comparative benchmark against abandonment rates of domain name registrations triggering a Claims Notice | f. RT: Comparing to other abandonment rates would be limited in value, as the WG needs to assess the Claims Notice as the particular reason why registrations are abandoned |  |
|  | c. KD: Abandonment rate for .com over some period of time | AG does not have information on registration activity for legacy TLDs, but legacy TLD registration activity may not be a good comparable for registration activity in new gTLDs, since domains in legacy TLDs may have a different value to registrants than new gTLD domains. Legacy TLDs were also available at a different time than new gTLDs, and it is possible that registrant behavior has changed over time. |  |
|  | d. KD: Abandonment rate of the same TLDs after the Claims Period experiencing high abandonment rates during the Claims Period | AG: Not able to collect this data. AG requested registration attempt and abandonment data from registrars, however, data was received only from one registrar.  |  |
|  | e. KK: Are cart abandonments a result of an improper understanding of the Claims Notice? (Needs to be addressed to answer Updated Question 3)  |  |  |