

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vorwerk International AG v. Xu Liju
Case No. D2025-1260

1. The Parties

1.1 The Complainant is Vorwerk International AG, Switzerland, represented by Moeller IP & Co S.A., Argentina.

1.2 The Respondent is Xu Liju, China, represented by John Berryhill, Ph.d., Esq., United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

2.1 The disputed domain name <tm7.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with eNom, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 27, 2025. At that time, publicly available Whois details did not identify the underlying registrant of the Domain Name.

3.2 On March 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 28, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing underlying registrant and contact information for the Domain Name. The Center sent an email to the Complainant on March 31, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 31, 2025, that took the form of an email to the Center requesting that its previously filed Complaint be amended “including the respondent’s information”.

3.3 The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

3.4 In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

the due date for Response was April 27, 2025. The due date for the Response was extended until May 1, 2025 pursuant to the Respondent's counsel's request on April 14, 2025 for a mandatory four calendar day extension request pursuant to Rule 5(b) of the Rules. The Response was filed with the Center on May 1, 2025.

3.5 The Center appointed Matthew S. Harris, Flip Jan Claude Petillion, and Steven M. Levy as panelists in this matter on May 27, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of the Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

4.1 The Complainant is a company incorporated in Switzerland and forms part of the Vorwerk Group. The Vorwerk Group deals in household appliances, and that business has been in existence for over 140 years. In 2021, the Vorwerk Group generated a turnover of EUR 3.4 billion and has a global presence in over 60 countries, with around 578,000 independent sales partners and around 12,000 employees.

4.2 One of the Vorwerk Group's business divisions operates under the name "Thermomix". This division is engaged in the distribution and sale of multifunctional kitchen appliances. In 2021, Thermomix generated approximately EUR 1.7 billion in sales, with 59,900 self-employed sales advisors and 5,200 employees. The names of the appliances sold by this division, together with the Complainant's description of those products and the year of their introduction, are as follows:

- VKM5 (1961) – Delivered seven different functions: stirring, kneading, chopping, grating, mixing, milling and juicing.
- VM 10 (1960s) - More advanced model than the previous one.
- VM 2000/2200 (1971) – It was the first robot capable of cooking food.
- THERMOMIX 3000/3300 (1980s) – First model with temperature control.
- THERMOMIX TM21 (1996) – Introduced the stainless-steel bowl and butterfly whisk.
- THERMOMIX TM31 (2004) – Revolutionized design and features, with the first guided cooking system.
- THERMOMIX TM5 (2014) – Introduced a touchscreen and digital recipe connectivity.
- THERMOMIX TM6 (2019) – Added new functions such as slow cooking, sous vide, and high-temperature cooking.
- THERMOMIX TM7 (2025) – Latest version with a larger screen, quieter motor, and improved cooking modes.

4.3 The Complainant is the owner of an extensive portfolio of trade marks worldwide that incorporate or comprise the term "THERMOMIX". The Complainant is also the owner of various trade marks that comprise or incorporate the term "TM6", the earliest of which appears to be a Swiss trade mark registration (No. 728186) applied for on February 6, 2019, which was then used as the basis of an international trade mark registration (No. 1481594) dated March 15, 2019.

4.4 The Complainant is also the owner of International trade mark No.1833753 dated June 10, 2024, for TM7 as a word mark in classes 7, 9, 11, 16, 21, 38, 41, and 43. This mark is based upon a German trade mark registration (No. 30 2024 002 388), which was filed on February 29, 2024, with a date of entry in the register of April 17, 2024. This international trade mark registration designated around 15 jurisdictions, although it appears to date to have proceeded fully or partially to registration in only a small number of those jurisdictions. One such is the United Kingdom where the mark (No. WO1833753) has a date of protection of April 1, 2025.

4.5 The Domain Name was registered on June 24, 2001. It is currently registered in the name of an individual based in China. It has been used to redirect Internet users to a webpage the content of which

suggests the Domain Name is for sale. There is no evidence of the Domain Name having been actively used for any other purpose.

4.6 The circumstances surrounding the registration and holding of the Domain Name are dealt with in greater detail subsequently in this decision.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

5.1 The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

5.2 Notably, the Complainant contends that there is "an undeniable phonetic and graphic identity between the [Domain Name] and the Complainant's trademarks THERMOMIX and THERMOMIX TM7". Although the Complainant refers in its Complaint to its "TM6" trade mark, it does not appear to advance any claim that the Domain Name is identical or similar to that mark.

5.3 The Complainant further contends (citing *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)) that the Respondent has no relevant trade mark rights and that the website operating from the Domain Name does not disclose the nature of the relationship, or lack thereof, between itself and the Complainant and on these grounds does not involve a bona fide offering of goods and services. Instead, it contends as follows:

"... the Respondent must have chosen to use THERMOMIX and TM7 marks in the Domain Name to free ride on the Complainant's reputation and goodwill to mislead unsuspecting Internet users to its website for commercial gain, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source or affiliation of the site, which previous Panels understood as a not legitimate use."

5.4 The Complainant also contends that the Domain Name has been registered and used in bad faith. In this respect it claims that its "'THERMOMIX' trademark is highly distinctive and recognized, with numerous trademark registrations predating the registration of the [Domain Name.]".

5.5 So far as its "TM7" trade mark is concerned, it contends as follows:

"Even though the TM7 trademark is a new trademark in the market, as it represents the latest version of the Thermomix machine, it is crucial to note that the history of the complainant's brand versions demonstrates that, at the time of registration, there should have been awareness of the association between 'TM' and a number to designate Thermomix products. For instance, Thermomix TM21 dates back to 1996, having been commercialized prior to the registration of the disputed domain name."

5.6 The Complainant also alleged that the "Respondent either knew or should have known of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration" and that the "Respondent's registration was clearly motivated by an intention to free ride on the Complainant's marks".

5.7 At one point in the Complaint the Complainant also alleges that "the Respondent appears to be selling products related to the Complainant's brand".

B. Respondent

5.8 In its Response, the Respondent contends that the Complainant's collection of "THERMOMIX" marks has nothing to do with this dispute. The Respondent accepts that the Complainant has trade mark rights in the term "TM7" in the form of a German trade mark, but observes that this mark was only applied for and obtained in 2024. It also acknowledges the Complainant's international trade mark registration that is based

upon that German mark, but characterises this as being “in various stages of prosecution” in the relevant designated territories. The Respondent further accepts that the “TM7” mark satisfies the first criterion of the Policy, but claims that the Complainant did not need to use the mark in advance of obtaining that registration, had yet to sell any products that used this mark as at the date of the Complaint, and was merely “taking orders ahead of actual production”.

5.9 So far as legitimate rights and interests are concerned, the Respondent contends that rights or legitimate interests include equitable interests such as the “right of seniority” in a domain name. In this respect the Respondent relies upon a number of decisions under the Policy including *Success Bank v. ZootGraphics c/o Ira Zoot* NAF Claim Number: FA0904001259918. The Panel understands the Respondent to be contending in this respect that a respondent can hold legitimate rights in domain names that take the form of either ordinary words, or short acronyms of a few letters that might be being used by a large number of businesses, in circumstances where the domain name was registered prior to the date of the trade mark rights upon which a complainant relies and that the Respondent was therefore unaware of those rights.

5.10 In this respect, the Respondent notes and claims that (a) it is not disputed that the Respondent registered the Domain Name as long ago as 2001, (b) short domain names of a few characters are inherently attractive since they may be used as acronyms (and the Respondent cites a number of cases which are said to support that contention), (c) because domain names that take the form “TM[Number].com” are capable of many legitimate uses, all have been registered at least up to “TM10.com” and (as it is claimed would be unsurprising to anyone familiar with the market in short domain names) some of these registrations are held by domain name traders, and (d) the term “TM7” is independently used by multiple businesses in respect of multiple products and services. The Respondent provides evidence in support of a number of these contentions.

5.11 The Respondent describes itself as part of a “family enterprise relating to web development”, that has acquired various short and generic domain names as a result of its activities. A number of these domain names are identified, and some of these, like the Domain Name, take the form of three or four characters combined with a Top-Level Domain. The Respondent also claims that these sorts of short domain name were also likely to be particularly attractive to Chinese entities, since initially domain names could only take the form of Latin characters, and that domain names of this sort might be read aloud as either mimicking the sounds of Chinese words and/or as useful mnemonics of Chinese words. In the case of “TM7”, this (it is said) could be understood as mnemonic for a combination of many Chinese words and the number 7, which is said to be “sometimes considered auspicious”.

5.12 The Respondent further contends that the Domain Name was registered without any knowledge of the Complainant. In this respect, the Respondent is scathing of the Complainant’s contention that the Respondent would have known at the time the Domain Name was registered in 2001 of the Complainant’s use of the letters “TM” in combination with a number as a name for one of its products since 1996, and that the Domain Name was registered with the knowledge that the Complainant would in due course use the name “TM7”. It observes that the numbering used by its products has not been sequential, with only the term “TM21” being used prior to the date of the registration of the Domain Name, and that although the Complainant has used the sequence “TM5”, “TM6” and “TM7”, the first of these only began to be used in 2014.

5.13 So far as bad faith is concerned, the Respondent contends that there cannot be bad faith registration where the corresponding mark that it is said to take unfair advantage of did not exist at the date of registration. Further, it contends that the “Complainant presents zero evidence of any reason why the Respondent would or should have psychically predicted the Complainant’s TM7 product, when the domain name was registered in 2001”.

5.14 The Respondent also finally observes that some of the statements in the Complaint (such as claims by reference to the *Okidata* test, the THERMOMIX marks, and to “the well-established reputation of the VORWERK mark”) can only be understood if they have been cut and pasted from submissions in earlier

disputes “without really caring whether the text is relevant to the facts of this particular domain name”. In this respect it contends as follows:

“Whether bizarrely fictional allegations are inadvertently made through inept use of cypypasta or AI, UDRP complainants do not have a right to inflict this sort of time-wasting exercise of weeding out irrelevant marks and nonsense allegations, on UDRP panelists working well below their hourly rate to provide a community service.”

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

6.1 It is generally accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trade mark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

6.2 The Complainant refers in its Complaint to trade marks comprising the terms “THERMOMIX” and “TM6”. It contends that its THERMOMIX marks are confusingly similar to the Domain Name, but no attempt is made to further explain or substantiate that contention, and it is questionable whether this claim is seriously pursued. In any event, this contention is rejected by the Panel, which does not accept that THERMOMIX is recognisable in the Domain Name where the only thing that the Domain Name and that mark have in common are the letters “T” and “M”. So far as the TM6 marks are concerned, although they are identified in the Complaint, no case appears to be advanced by reference to those marks. Accordingly, this is also disregarded by the Panel.

6.3 That leaves the Complainant’s TM7 mark. The Respondent concedes that the Complainant has a relevant mark for TM7 at least in Germany, and by reason of this mark the Complainant satisfies the first element of the Policy. The Panel accepts that this is correct and that as the Domain Name comprises the letters “tm7” combined with the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), this mark is at least confusingly similar, if not identical, to the Domain Name.

6.4 The Panel addresses the Respondent’s comments in relation to the timing of the German trade mark later on in this decision in the context of the assessment of bad faith (section 1.1.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#))

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

6.5 The Respondent has advanced a positive case by reference to a number of decisions under the Policy that it has rights or a legitimate interest for the purposes of the Policy. The Panel essentially understands the argument to be that (i) it is legitimate to register and hold domain names either for future use or sale to a third party if they comprise dictionary words or simple acronyms that might be attractive for use by others in the future where there is no targeting of any particular business that is the owner of trade mark rights in or similar to that term, (ii) that the Domain Name was registered because it was such an attractive short acronym and the Respondent did not target any particular trade mark owner and certainly did not target the Complainant (of which it was unaware), and (iii) it follows in such circumstances that the Respondent has a relevant legitimate interest in the Domain Name for the purposes of the Policy.

6.6 Although the Panel does not find the language of “senior user” that the Respondent uses in its submissions particularly helpful, the Panel does accept that there are cases where panels have generally adopted and accepted the reasoning advanced by the Respondent in this case. Indeed, there was language to this effect in section 2.2 of the original WIPO Overview, where a number of early cases are cited that are said to support that view. However, the relevant text was removed from the equivalent sections of the WIPO Overview 2.0 and 3.0. The remaining text, which is at 2.10 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), appears to suggest

that there will only be a legitimate interest in the case of dictionary terms where the domain name is “genuinely used, or at least demonstrably intended for such use, in connection with the relied-upon dictionary meaning and not to trade off third-party trademark rights.” That said, the same part of the Overview seems to suggest that there can be a legitimate interest in holding a domain name comprising an acronym where there is evidence before the panel that the domain name “does not capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in the complainant’s mark”.

6.7 However, the Panel does not consider it necessary to consider the issue of rights and legitimate interests any further given its findings as to the third element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

6.8 At one point in its Complaint, the Complainant asserts that the Domain Name was registered by the Respondent to target the Complainant’s THERMOMIX marks. Given the dissimilarity between those marks and the Domain Name, that contention is rejected. Similarly, the Complainant at one point contends that the Respondent has used the Domain Name to sell “products related to the Complainant’s brand”. However, this claim is unsupported by evidence and is similarly rejected by the Panel.

6.9 Given this, at its heart the Complainant’s case essentially boils down to the contentions that the Complainant had used the term “TM21” as a designation for one version of its products prior to the registration of the Domain Name, the Respondent was aware of that use and then registered the Domain Name in the belief that the Complainant would in future use the term “TM7” as a trade mark in respect of one of its products, and that accordingly the Domain Name has been registered in bad faith.

6.10 The Panel rejects these contentions for the following reasons:

- (i) “TM21” was just one of a number of terms used in respect of the Complainant’s products prior to the registration of the Domain Name. No other “TM” designation had been used at that time.
- (ii) The Complainant has failed to advance any evidence as to the fame or other reputation of the “TM21” name in respect of its products at the time of registration.
- (iii) At the time that the Domain Name was registered, the Complainant had not used any sequence of “TM” related names for its products, and no argument or evidence is advanced by the Complainant as to why its future use of “TM7” would have been obvious to the Respondent at that time.
- (iv) The term “TM7” is a short acronym (like many other three-character acronyms) that might be legitimately used or adopted by many businesses or organisations. The Panel, therefore, accepts that the Domain Name, which is made up of this acronym and the “.com” gTLD, is likely to have been considered inherently attractive and valuable to a web developer or domain name trader quite separately from any association with the Complainant.
- (v) The Respondent has provided evidence that it is the owner of other domain names that comprise short acronyms and that is consistent with its contentions that it was because the Domain Name was inherently attractive, rather than any knowledge or targeting of the Complainant’s trade marks, that the Respondent registered the Domain Name.
- (vi) There is a 24 year gap between the date of registration of the Domain Name and the Complainant’s first use of the term “TM7”, which makes it inherently extremely unlikely that the Complainant’s potential use of the term “TM7” was being targeted or otherwise anticipated.

6.11 The Respondent claims that because the Domain Name pre-dates the Complainant’s trade mark, then the Complainant must necessarily fail. That expresses matters too highly. There can be circumstances, where a domain name that predates trade mark rights has been registered in bad faith, but that is normally an exceptional state of affairs.

6.12 These issues are more fully addressed in section 3.8.1 and 3.8.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), which states as follows:

“3.8.1 Domain names registered before a complainant accrues trademark rights

Subject to scenarios described in 3.8.2 below, where a respondent registers a domain name before the complainant’s trademark rights accrue, panels will not normally find bad faith on the part of the respondent. (This would not however impact a panel’s assessment of a complainant’s standing under the first UDRP element.)

...

3.8.2 Domain names registered in anticipation of trademark rights

In certain limited circumstances where the facts of the case establish that the respondent’s intent in registering the domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the complainant’s nascent (typically as yet unregistered) trademark rights, panels have been prepared to find that the respondent has acted in bad faith.

Such scenarios include registration of a domain name: (i) shortly before or after announcement of a corporate merger, (ii) further to the respondent’s insider knowledge (e.g., a former employee), (iii) further to significant media attention (e.g., in connection with a product launch or prominent event), or (iv) following the complainant’s filing of a trademark application.”

6.13 However, none of these sorts of limited circumstances, identified in section 3.8.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), apply in this case.

6.14 Accordingly, the Complainant has failed to show that the Domain Name was registered or has been used in bad faith and therefore failed to satisfy the third element of the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

6.15 Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (“RDNH”) or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The Respondent has not expressly sought a finding of RDNH, but as is recorded in section 4.16 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), it is not necessary for a party to make such a request in order for the Panel to reach such a finding.

6.16 Section 4.16 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) also conveniently summarises the sorts of circumstances that have led panels to conclude that there has been RDNH or an abuse of the administrative proceeding. In particular, it states as follows:

“Reasons articulated by panels for finding RDNH include: (i) facts which demonstrate that the complainant knew it could not succeed as to any of the required three elements – such as the complainant’s lack of relevant trademark rights, clear knowledge of respondent rights or legitimate interests, or clear knowledge of a lack of respondent bad faith (see generally section 3.8) such as registration of the disputed domain name well before the complainant acquired trademark rights, (ii) facts which demonstrate that the complainant clearly ought to have known it could not succeed under any fair interpretation of facts reasonably available prior to the filing of the complaint, including relevant facts on the website at the disputed domain name or readily available public sources such as the WhoIs database, (iii) unreasonably ignoring established Policy precedent notably as captured in this WIPO Overview – except in limited circumstances which prima facie justify advancing an alternative legal argument, (iv) the provision of false evidence, or otherwise attempting to mislead the panel, (v) the provision of intentionally incomplete material evidence – often clarified by the respondent, (vi) the complainant’s failure to disclose that a case is a UDRP refiling, (vii) filing the complaint

after an unsuccessful attempt to acquire the disputed domain name from the respondent without a plausible legal basis, (viii) basing a complaint on only the barest of allegations without any supporting evidence.

Given the undertakings in paragraphs 3(b)(xiii) and (xiv) of the UDRP Rules, some panels have held that a represented complainant should be held to a higher standard.”

6.17 The Complainant is not only legally represented but is represented by a firm that has acted as a legal representative in a large number of UDRP cases both for this Complainant and other entities. As such it should be very familiar with the requirements of the UDRP.

6.18 Notwithstanding this, at the very least the Complaint has not been prepared with the care that it should have been. In this respect the Panel has already mentioned (a) the Complainant’s unintelligible claims by reference to *Oki Data* test as well as to the THERMOMIX and VORWERK marks, and (b) the unsubstantiated allegation that the Domain Name has been used in respect of products that compete with the Complainant. Why this has happened is not entirely clear. The Respondent suggestion that this is a result of the “inept use” of copy and paste from submissions in earlier UDRP complaints strikes the Panel as a plausible explanation. It is also the Panel’s sad experience that complaints are too often delegated to junior lawyers whose work is inadequately supervised. But whatever the cause, the lack of care with which the Complaint has been prepared reflects poorly on the Complainant’s legal advisers.

6.19 Further, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant’s legal advisers knew or ought to have known that in circumstances where it was relying on a mark that was only registered nearly 25 years after the Domain Name was initially registered (and where it was not suggested that there was some more recent transfer of the Domain Name that might constitute a fresh registration), and where the mark had not been used to any significant degree prior to the mark’s registration, that it could not show bad faith registration. As has already been discussed earlier in this decision, the fact that a domain name was registered prior to the relevant trade mark registration, is not always fatal to a complainant. But it involves a complainant at the least showing that the domain name was registered with the knowledge of forthcoming rights and an intention to take unfair advantage of the same. The Complainant’s assertions that the Respondent had such knowledge and intention when at the time the Complainant had only used the term “TM21”, where there is no real evidence of the extent of the fame of that product, and where it would or should have been aware that many businesses might equally have used the term “TM7”, are little more than bare assertions and are inherently incredible. The Complainant, or at least the Complainant’s advisers, either knew or should have known this to be case.

6.20 Further, relatively recently in *AKAPOL S.A. v. Ehren Schaiberger*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2284](#), which was another case in which the Complainant’s legal advisers acted for the complainant and RDNH was sought, the panel commented as follows:

“The Panel does not consider the Complainant’s conduct warrants a finding of RDNH. The case the Respondent cites – *Zenni Optical, LLC. v. DNS Administrator / Cykon Technology Limited* WIPO Case No. [D2009-1594](#) is one where the complainant’s case was fatally flawed from the outset in that the domain name registration relied upon predated the complainant’s trademark rights. The Panel considers the present case to be weak but not flawed in that manner. The Complainant owns the PLASTICOLA trademark which appears to predate the date of registration of the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the PLASTICOLA trademark. The Complainant has overstated its case and failed to appreciate the Respondent would likely have a case of innocent independent derivation. However the Complainant did not know that for certain until the Response was filed. It could of course have sought to establish the facts before commencing the Complaint by communicating with the Respondent. Its failure to do so, assuming it could make contact, may be regrettable but does not in the Panel’s opinion fall within the above guidelines nor does it warrant the censure of a finding of RDNH.”

6.21 Therefore, the Complainant’s legal advisers would or at least should have been aware both from the guidance provided by the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and its involvement in the *AKAPOL S.A.* case *supra* that the Complainant’s case was also similarly “fatally flawed”.

6.22 Further, although a poorly prepared complaint is usually of itself insufficient grounds to justify a finding of RDNH, it is in this case at the very least consistent with the Complaint being prepared with little concern as to whether the Complainant had a credible claim.

6.23 Accordingly, in consideration of all of the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding.

7. Decision

7.1 For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied. Moreover, the Panel finds that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith and constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

/Matthew S. Harris/

Matthew S. Harris

Presiding Panelist

/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/

Flip Jan Claude Petillion

Panelist

/Steven M. Levy /

Steven M. Levy

Panelist

Date: June 10, 2025