

Instructions:

This table was built to assist the Sunrise 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 questions 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 47-54

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

Sunrise Charter Question 12:

(a) Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs?

(b) Should there be a different rule for some registries, such as certain types of 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

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Sunrise Charter Question 12?	If yes, which sub question(s) do the survey results assist?	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*	a,b	<p>[asterisk with my usual disclaimer for “Yes”, given the statistical deficiencies in the survey]</p> <p>Cell F52 of the Registries & Registrars tab mentions overly generic strings in the TMCH, and conflicts between locally protected terms and TMCH.</p> <p>Cell F53 of the Registries & Registrars tab had responses indicating eligibility was a problem, as was gaming. Reference to Abril Amadeu’s comments at ICANN59 transcribed at https://schr.ws/hosted_files/icann59johannesburg2017/8a/transcript%20RPM%201%20%2029%20June%202017.pdf%20session%201.pdf mentions on page 9 how TMCH registration is overkill for those looking to register in just a locally-targeted gTLD, IDN issues (page 10) including accents; pages 33-34 mentions QLP worked to general satisfaction without many problems, but ALP was “complete failure and a complete</p>	<p>Registries & Registrars tab, cells F52, F53, F54</p> <p>Registry - Q29a tab, cell A5, A7</p>

Sunrise Charter Question 12:

(a) Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs?

(b) Should there be a different rule for some registries, such as certain types of 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

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Sunrise Charter Question 12?	If yes, which sub question(s) do the survey results assist?	How do the survey results assist (e.g. "Registries responses in tab/cell X demonstrate Y")?	Tab Title & Cell Number (if applicable)
			<p>fraud" due to lack of approvals from ICANN staff beyond a test and long delays sitting down with ICANN staff, as well as assertions ICANN staff was asking for conditions beyond policy, and IPC opposition; also (page 34) concerns about geoTLDs and 4.5.2 and 4.5.3 of the TMCH requirements. Page 37 questions whether sunrise should always have absolute highest priority.</p> <p>Cell F54 of the Registries & Registrars tab mentions 1 response had the sunrise period before the QLP</p> <p>Cell A5 of the Registry - Q29a tab suggests "the registry should have a degree of freedom to assign specific domain names to specific interest groups."</p> <p>Cell A7 of the Registry - Q29a tab suggests "small local businesses are not protected well due to high cost" of TMCH registrations.</p> <p>There is also some overlap in this question with Sunrise Charter Question 9 (limitations of scope in sunrise to categories of goods/services of a mark), so see responses there:</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1SuRmmmORn9CKT6946wYpjpjGjJ_3F8UCIfNzU1dWh8E/edit</p> <p>(not repeated here)</p>	

Sunrise Charter Question 12:

(a) Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs?

(b) Should there be a different rule for some registries, such as certain types of 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

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Sunrise Charter Question 12?	If yes, which sub question(s) do the survey results assist?	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		I generally agree with George and also note my comment in the link he provided is the same as I'd provide here.	
Maxim Alzoba	Yes	a,b	I agree with George's assessment of the Survey data above.	
Kathy	Yes	A,b	<p>Reposting some of the data we have seen in response to other charter questions:</p> <p>" We reviewed internally ICANN terms of Approved Launch Program and decided that it imposes high uncertainty and financial risks of not being able to deliver services until ALP is approved under the process which lacks clarity. Experience of .CORE showed us that our estimation was correct. We had to create special limited registration periods after the Sunrise to ensure protection of the local communities: for the trademark/service mark holders, protected under the Legislation of the Russian Federation, trade name holders, registered in Moscow, right holders for the use of product origin appellation in Moscow and/or Moscow Region, Non-profit organizations established under the laws in effect in the Russian Federation and registered in Moscow, Founders of the mass media registered under the procedure specified in the laws in effect in the Russian Federation, the output of which is being intended for distribution in Moscow, State and Municipal Authorities of Moscow, State Authorities of the Russian Federation, Municipal and Federal entities. P.s: Such information it is available as Launch Program for all new gTLDs at https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/sunrise-claims-periods and for .moscow and .xn--80adxhks in particular.</p>	<p>RY/RR Tab</p> <p>D51/52 (questions)</p> <p>F51/52 answers</p>

Sunrise Charter Question 12:

(a) Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs?

(b) Should there be a different rule for some registries, such as certain types of 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

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Sunrise Charter Question 12?	If yes, which sub question(s) do the survey results assist?	How do the survey results assist (e.g. "Registries responses in tab/cell X demonstrate Y")?	Tab Title & Cell Number (if applicable)
----------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

			<p>- people don't understand "sunrise" "ga" "landrush".... so after GA, some people think the TLD is reserved to companies or local public entities or whatever, people don't understand the price...."</p>	
Kathy	Yes	a,b	<p>Q12. Should the ICANN brand protection policies like Sunrise or Claims to be altered to better accommodate Community or GEO TLDs? Q12a. Please share your thoughts on how these policies could be changed to better accommodate Community or GEO TLDs.</p> <p>Response: - Yes (7) - No (1) - Don't know / not sure (1)</p> <p>- Allow for non-trademark rights established by local law, such as family names in some jurisdictions.</p> <p>- Allow for locally or niche meaningful names that wouldn't otherwise create confusion with brands to be used.</p> <p>- No better right for TM holders since their TM can equate terms relevant to the community.</p>	<p>Ry/Rr Tab</p> <p>Questions D30/31</p> <p>Response F30/F31</p>

Sunrise Charter Question 12:

(a) Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs?

(b) Should there be a different rule for some registries, such as certain types of 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

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Sunrise Charter Question 12?	If yes, which sub question(s) do the survey results assist?	How do the survey results assist (e.g. "Registries responses in tab/cell X demonstrate Y")?	Tab Title & Cell Number (if applicable)
			<p>- local specifications, history, culture... should be a priority compared to a brand (for example: not registered in the country of the geo) For example, a brand called "sagrada familia" can not be priority over the old famous basilica in Barcelona, for geoTLDs .cat .barcelona .bcn"</p>	
Susan Payne	yes	both	<p>Limited feedback from Rys but some of the responses refer to geo specific reasons for reserving particular names: - GEO TLD has to provide services for the benefit of the local government, who represent Public Interest of the Citizens (in our case few Million), so set of names was reserved for public services, signature locations, names important for the Capital. On the other hand the another set of items was added to prevent propagation of profanity language into GEO TLD file zone. - worked with local administrations, work on history of the region, work with cultural and historical agencies</p>	Ry/Rr tab D and F27-29
Susan Payne	yes	Both	<p>Q: Q22. How were you able to reconcile your plans for Limited Registration Period, Approved Launch Program, or Qualified Launch Program with the ICANN requirements to offer Sunrise and Claims? A: - By establishing a permanent claims period</p>	Ry/Rr tab D and F 54

Sunrise Charter Question 12:

(a) Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs?

(b) Should there be a different rule for some registries, such as certain types of 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

Sub Team Member Name	Do the survey results help answer Sunrise Charter Question 12?	If yes, which sub question(s) do the survey results assist?	How do the survey results assist (e.g. "Registries responses in tab/cell X demonstrate Y")?	Tab Title & Cell Number (if applicable)
----------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

			<p>- We first did the sunrise period, then the QLP, and then the claims period when going to GA</p> <p>- ICANN had published information about running a QLP.</p> <p>- It was easy to design a launch program that was compliant with the requirements</p> <p>- very hard</p> <p>So, again a small number of responses and a mix of views, but ¾ appear to be saying they were able to work within the rules established for last round</p>	