

Instructions:

This table was built to assist the Trademark Claims Data Review Sub Team in its analysis as to whether, and how, the Analysis Group survey results answer each of the final agreed Charter questions. Specifically, the Analysis Group survey gathered data to help answer the question highlighted in yellow. Relevant survey data can be found in the following tabs/rows in the [survey analysis tool](#), including, but not limited to:

- “Registries & Registrars” tab, row 59-76

When providing input, please note the tab title and cell number (if applicable) as reflected in the survey analysis tool.

Claims Charter Question 5:

Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Claims Charter Question 5?	How do the survey results assist (e.g. “Registries responses in tab/cell X demonstrate Y”)?	Tab Title & Cell Number (if applicable)
George Kirikos	Yes*	<p>[asterisk with my usual disclaimer for “Yes”, given the statistical deficiencies in the survey]</p> <p>Cell F31 of Registries and Registrars tab indicates some flexibility desired to add non-trademarks in some geoTLDs.</p> <p>Cell F59 of Registries and Registrars tab shows there isn’t uniformity even at present in the period for the trademark claims (7 responded with 90 days or less, and 5 responded with 180+ days).</p> <p>Cells F60 and G65 of Registries and Registrars tab shows negative impacts of the current requirement, suggesting that if there is going to be a change in the future, those might provide justifications/basis for non-uniformity.</p> <p>Cells F61 and G63-64 of Registries and Registrars tab shows split view of the ideal length of the Claims period.</p> <p>Cells G78 and F79 of Registries and Registrars tab shows some registrars/registries would see costs/burdens decrease, which might provide a basis/justification for non-uniformity.</p> <p>Registry - Q26, Registry -Q28, Registry-Q29, and Registry -Q29a tabs provide supporting data for registries. Registrar - Q4i, Registrar - Q10 and Registrar - Q11 tabs provide supporting data for</p>	<p>Registries & Registrars tab, cells F31, F59, F60, G65, F61, G63-64, G78, F79, F81</p> <p>TM & Brand Owners tab, cell F84</p> <p>TM Owner - Q27 Tab, rows 5, 8, 9</p> <p>TM Owner - Q27a tab, column A</p>

Claims Charter Question 5:

Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Claims Charter Question 5?	How do the survey results assist (e.g. "Registries responses in tab/cell X demonstrate Y")?	Tab Title & Cell Number (if applicable)
		<p>registrars.</p> <p>Cell F81 of Registries and Registrars tab indicates current non-uniformity already exists, with regards to perpetual Claims Period. No registries voluntarily opted-in to Donuts' Claims Plus perpetual claims period, though.</p> <p>Cell F84 of the ™ & Brand Owners tab suggests there is some flexibility for dropping Claims Period requirement by brand owners (although not the first choice). Rows 5, 8, and 9 of the ™ Owner - Q27 tab provides more details on their views concerning making Claims period optional. However, column A of the TM Owner - Q27a tab seems to contradict this, as most of the free form responses seem to desire it not be eliminated.</p>	<p>Registry - Q26, Registry - Q28, Registry - Q29, Registry -Q29a tabs</p> <p>Registrar-Q4i, Registrar - Q10, Registrar - Q11 tabs</p>
Griffin Barnett	Yes	<p>Data suggests both Sunrise and Claims should remain mandatory [TM Owner F84-85].</p> <p>One survey question asked if Sunrise or Claims policies should be altered to "better accommodate" Community or Geo TLDs. 78% of respondents said Yes, but their rationale mostly related to Sunrise issues rather than Claims period issues. [Ry/Rr D-F30-31].</p> <p>Some Ry/Rr reported challenges with running Sunrise, QLP/ALP, and Claims but most appeared to figure out a launch plan that accommodated Sunrise and Claims and still accommodate QLP/ALP as well [Ry/Rr D-F54].</p> <p>About 39% of Ry respondents indicated running a Claims period of over 90 days (5 ran 180+ day periods). Ry respondents had varying opinions on ideal length of Claims period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 days (3) - 30 days (3) - 60 days (1) - 90 days (2) - 180 days (1) 	<p>[TM Owner F84-85]</p> <p>[Ry/Rr D-F30-31]</p> <p>[Ry/Rr D-F54]</p>

Claims Charter Question 5:

Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Claims Charter Question 5?	How do the survey results assist (e.g. "Registries responses in tab/cell X demonstrate Y")?	Tab Title & Cell Number (if applicable)
		<p>- Perpetual length (3) Rr respondents also had varying views: - Fewer than 90 days (7) - 90 days (5) - 91-180 days (1) - 180+ days (3) - Don't know / Not sure (1)</p> <p>The survey responses for Ry/Rr also indicated there would basically be no change in terms of impact on cybersquatting, operating cost, technical burden, or customer understanding if Claims period was shortened or lengthened. [Ry/Rr C-F59-66].</p> <p>The data also suggest that a shorter Claims period would increase cybersquatting, while a longer period would decrease it. Some Ry said eliminating Claims would have no impact on cybersquatting rates, but the rationale for this claim is not provided in the data. [Ry Q28].</p> <p>Ultimately, these data suggest that Claims period should remain uniform across gTLD types (being mandatory and the same mandatory minimum duration), and may support lengthening the period to enhance its purpose of deterring cybersquatting, given data suggesting that (a) some Ry are already extending the period, and (b) the impact on cost/technical burdens to Ry/Rr would be minimal.</p>	<p>[Ry/Rr C-F59-66].</p> <p>[Ry Q28]</p>
Maxim Alzoba		<p>Regarding ALP: this bit it might be caused by the confusion while reading RR/RY responses, the only ALP was .MADRID (as I remember), and other GEOs combined QLP, Limited Periods (Sunrise and Claims periods are obligatory, so all TLDs had to implement it (with changes only for TLD with ALP)) P.s: on RR/RY Tab ALP mentioned 4 times and there is no text saying that ALP was fine. (I am not a SubTeam member for Claims, so adding my note here)</p>	

Claims Charter Question 5:

Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Claims Charter Question 5?	How do the survey results assist (e.g. "Registries responses in tab/cell X demonstrate Y")?	Tab Title & Cell Number (if applicable)
----------------------	--	---	---

Kristine Dorrain	Yes	Generally agree with everyone above on the data. I think there is a discrepancy between Griffin's and George's characterizations of the impact of claims on RYs. I've noted on a previous worksheet that most RYs have already sunk those costs so with the exception of issues that some TLDs might face (like the GEOs), RYs are likely to be pretty neutral. Claims is a bigger issue for RRs. So I think this is one example where lumping RY and RR responses is not helpful.	See above.
Kathy	yes	Table Q29 in Registry tab (separate table) suggests that the majority of registries think that Claims period should be optional. Some think that the Sunrise period should be required and Claims optional, others think both should be option, the highest number think that one should be required and the Ry should be allowed to choose. But few thought that both should continue to be required.	Ry special table Q29

Claims Charter Question 5:

Should the Trademark Claims period continue to be uniform for all types of gTLDs in subsequent rounds?

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Claims Charter Question 5?	How do the survey results assist (e.g. "Registries responses in tab/cell X demonstrate Y")?	Tab Title & Cell Number (if applicable)
-----------------------------	---	--	--