**SUMMARY TABLE – REVIEW OF AGREED SUNRISE CHARTER QUESTIONS AND DATA COLLECTED**

*Prepared by ICANN staff for use by the proposed new Sunrise Review Sub Team*

The Sunrise Charter Questions Sub Team developed the following definitions for various specific terms used in the final list of agreed questions:

* **Reserved Names:** second level domain names that are withheld from registration per written agreement between the registry and ICANN (see Section 2.6 and Specification 5 in the base Registry Agreement).
* **Premium Names:** second level domain names offered for registration that, in the determination of the registry, are more desirable for the purchaser.
* **Premium Pricing:** Pricing of second level domain names that are determined by the registry as Premium Names.
* **Standard Pricing:** Pricing of second level domain names at the General Availability stage that is not Premium Pricing, including without limitation renewal pricing that is not Premium Pricing.

| **LIST OF FINAL AGREED SUNRISE CHARTER QUESTIONS[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **RELEVANT AG SUNRISE SURVEY RESULTS** | **RELEVANT DATA REVIEWED PREVIOUSLY** | **SUB TEAM POLICY/OPERATIONAL FIX RECOMMENDATIONS (for WG discussion)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preamble (intended as “level setting” questions by the Sunrise Charter Questions Sub Team):   1. Is the Sunrise Period serving its intended purpose? 2. Is it having unintended effects? 3. Is the TMCH Provider requiring appropriate forms of “use” (if not, how can this corrected)? 4. Have abuses of the Sunrise Period been documented by trademark owners? 5. Have abuses of the Sunrise Period been documented by Registrants? 6. Have abuses of the Sunrise Period been documented by Registries and Registrars? | **Summary**  The AG survey results assist in answering sub questions (a), (b), (c), and (d). The survey data indicate that:   1. Sunrise Period has served its intended purpose to some extent, but with significant limitations due to hurdles such as pricing, certain registry practice, and lack of transliteration support. 2. Sunrise Period has unintended effects, including negative impacts on registries and registrars, issues of operating Sunrise and Qualified Launch Programs / Approved Launch Programs. 3. While proof of use does not seem to be a major issue, some trademark and brand owner respondents did not submit proof of use due to various reasons. 4. There is abuse of the Sunrise Period by registries documented by trademark and brand owners.   The survey data do not assist in answering sub questions (e) and (f).  **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  TM & Brand Owners tab: rows 14-26, 34-43, 84, 85  Registry & Registrar - Q15 & Q4f tab: cells B10-14, B22-27, F52, rows 47-54  Registrar - Q4h tab: cells B5-7, C5-7, E8, F8  Registry & Registrar - Q16 &Q4g tab: cells D26-34  **Details**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Fw2j0gTvXi8lKlt5qELD6i1Ifg7-_9-jFSup8MEmH80/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [9 January 2019](https://community.icann.org/x/iQj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q1   1. Should the availability of Sunrise registrations only for identical matches be reviewed? 2. If the matching process is expanded, how can Registrant free expression and fair use rights be protected and balanced against trademark rights? | **Summary**  While the AG survey results do not substantially assist in answering this question, trademark and brand owners’ responses somewhat assisted answering its sub question (a), indicating the availability of Sunrise registration should not be only for identical matches due to IDN issues and other factors. Nevertheless, the survey results do not suggest an opinion as whether to expand the matching criteria or not.  The survey data do not assist in answering sub question (b).  **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  TM & Brand Owners tab: cells F9, F55, F66-68, F70-73, F80-81, G18  Registry - Q29a tab: cell A7  **Details** <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1J3URFVIhknwU53IZDyF4GMrJ-VKnEsgXk2e2Dd0Fcv8/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [16 January 2019](https://community.icann.org/x/nAj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q2  Threshold question: Is Registry pricing within the scope of the RPM WG or ICANN's review?   1. Does Registry Sunrise or premium name pricing unfairly limit the ability of trademark owners to participate in Sunrise? 2. If so, how extensive is this problem? | **Summary**  The AG survey results assist in answering this question, including both of its sub questions (a) and (b):   1. The disparate pricing between Sunrise and General Availability was a clear factor that limited the ability of the majority of trademark and brand owner survey respondents to participate during Sunrise. 2. This problem seems extensive among the trademark and brand owner survey respondents.   **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  TM & Brand Owners tab: cells F19-26, D-G19-20, D-F21-22, D-F25  Registries & Registrars tab: cells F12, F14-15  Registry - Q7 tab  TM Owner - Q27 tab: cell A41  **Details**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uwNtzemdC65DWMcVkJ2HfWFIHyCvtJzqMgaarLn2nsM/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [16 January 2019](https://community.icann.org/x/nAj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q3   1. Should Registry Operators be required to create a mechanism that allows trademark owners to challenge the determination that a second level name is a Premium Name or Reserved Name? 2. Additionally, should Registry Operators be required to create a release mechanism in the event that a Premium Name or Reserved Name is challenged successfully, so that the trademark owner can register that name during the Sunrise Period? 3. What concerns might be raised by either or both of these requirements? | **Summary**  Some Sub Team members believe the trademark and brand owners’ responses assist in answering all of its sub questions (a), (b), and (c). Trademark and brand owner respondents believe that:   1. Registry Operators should be required to create a mechanism that allows trademark owners to challenge the determination that a second level name is a Premium Name or Reserved Name. 2. Registry Operators should be required to create a release mechanism in the event that a Premium Name or Reserved Name is challenged successfully, so that the trademark owner can register that name during the Sunrise Period 3. The concerns that might be raised by these requirements include that registries might have less flexibility in terms of what names they can reserve.   **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  TM & Brand Owners tab: cells D-F 34-37  Registries & Registrars tab: cells D-F 17-19  **Details**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dxPbe4gApZO6USTfDI-xMp3lIeS7hIxozX_0ad_xfl8/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [16 January 2019](https://community.icann.org/x/nAj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q4   1. Are Registry Operator Reserved Names practices unfairly limiting participation in Sunrise by trademark owners? 2. Should Section 1.3.3 of Specification 1 of the Registry Agreement be modified to address these concerns? 3. Should Registry Operators be required to publish their Reserved Names lists -- what Registry concerns would be raised by that publication, and what problem(s) would it solve? 4. Should Registry Operators be required to provide trademark owners in the TMCH notice, and the opportunity to register, the domain name should the Registry Operator release it – what Registry concerns would be raised by this requirement? | **Summary**  The AG survey results assist in answering this question, including all of its sub questions (a), (b), (c), and (d):   1. Trademark and brand owner respondents believe that Registry Operator Reserved Names practice limited their participation in Sunrise. 2. Section 1.3.3. Of Specification 1 of the Registry Agreement may require modification if a Registry Operator is required to create a formal challenge mechanism that allows the release of the successfully challenged Premium Name or Reserved Name to eligible brand owner trademark owners. 3. Trademark and brand owner respondents overwhelming support the publication of Reserved Names lists by Registry Operators; this would reduce the limitation of trademark and brand owners participating in Sunrise. Registry Operator respondents do not support this idea. Registry Operator respondents are mainly concerned with the revelation of competitive data; other concerns, not reflected in the survey data, include potential breach of ICANN or Registry policies. Nevertheless, some Registry Operator respondents seem to provide the Reserved Names lists to Registrars. 4. Trademark and brand owner respondents overwhelming support the idea that Registry Operators be required to provide trademark owners in the TMCH notice, and the opportunity to registry the domain name should the Registry Operator release it. A majority of Registry Operator respondents do not support this idea. Registrar respondents have mixed views.   **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  TM & Brand Owners tab: cells D-F34-37, F37-43  Registries & Registrars tab: cells D-F17-19, F23-25, G20-22  Registrar - Q8 tab  **Details**  https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-rpRnMArtFoS8\_6Sx99aBY3FAJRWhfyyPY-bc6CR6DI/edit?usp=sharing  **Sub Team Discussion:** [16 January 2019](https://community.icann.org/x/nAj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q5(a)  Does the current 30-day minimum for a Sunrise Period serve its intended purpose, particularly in view of the fact that many registry operators actually ran a 60-day Sunrise Period?   1. Are there any unintended results? 2. Does the ability of Registry Operators to expand their Sunrise Periods create uniformity concerns that should be addressed by this WG? 3. Are there any benefits observed when the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days? 4. Are there any disadvantages? | **Summary**  The AG survey results assist in answering this question, including all of its sub questions (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv). The survey data indicate that:  (a): The current 30-day minimum for a Sunrise Period seems to generally serve its intended purpose;  (i): There are unintended results, including negative impacts on both Registry Operators and Registrars, issues for GEO TLDs, and confusion about the two types of Sunrise periods.  (ii): The uniformity concerns with regard to Registry Operators’ ability to expand their Sunrise Periods should be addressed to increase customer understanding and provide appropriate notice to brand owners.  (iii): When the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days, there are benefits to brand owners, and maybe some Registrars whose revenues would increase / risks would decrease.  (iv): When the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days, there are disadvantages to some Registry Operators and Registrars, including additional cost burdens or delay in revenue streams. Nevertheless, most Registry Operators have already run a 60-day end-date Sunrise, so the additional burdens may not be significant.  **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  TM & Brand Owners tab: cells F28-32, G28  Registries & Registrars tab: cells F41, G41-42, H41  Registry & Registrar - Q15 & Q4f tab: cells B10-14, B22-27  Registry Q16/Registrar Q4g tab: cells D26-34  Registrar - Q4h tab: cells B5-7, C5-7, E8, F8  **Details**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1cHtWXXy9jh5JsoieFE7VinddaWvGTlaAE58E4ujn_ao/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [19 December 2018](https://community.icann.org/x/Pgj_BQ), [2 January 2019](https://community.icann.org/x/hwj_BQ), [9 January 2019](https://community.icann.org/x/iQj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q5(b)  In light of evidence gathered above, should the Sunrise Period continue to be mandatory or become optional?   1. Should the WG consider returning to the original recommendation from the IRT and STI of Sunrise Period OR Trademark Claims in light of other concerns, including freedom of expression and fair use? 2. In considering mandatory vs optional, should Registry Operators be allowed to choose between Sunrise and Claims (that is, make ONE mandatory)? | **Summary**  The AG survey results assist in answering this question, including both of its sub questions (i), (ii):  (b): Trademark and brand owner respondents think the Sunrise Period should continue to be  mandatory.  (i): There seems to be a need for the WG to consider returning to the original recommendation from the IRT and STI, as there are concerns with the implementation of ALP and QLP, particularly as relevant for GEO TLDs (eg., issues with notice on ALP, allowed number of GEO TLD domain strings under QLP).  (ii): Registry Operator respondents prefer Sunrise and Claims to be optional, with a slight preference for Sunrise to be mandatory, and Claims to be optional.  **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  TM & Brand Owners tab: cells D-F14, D-F17, F28-32, D-F84-85, G28  Registries & Registrars tab: cells D-F30-31, D-F79-80, F41, F50-52, G41-42, H41  Registry & Registrar - Q15 & Q4f tab: cells B10-14, B22-27  Registry Q16/Registrar Q4g tab: cells D26-34  Registrar - Q4h tab: cells B5-7, C5-7, E8, F8  Registry - Q29 tab  **Details**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1t_R-Ceo_aTnb3zI6AZw4kYJVJJfCIvCkIMGBxViEo8o/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [16 January 2019](https://community.icann.org/x/iwj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q6   1. What are Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policies (SDRPs), and are any changes needed? 2. Are SDRPs serving the purpose(s) for which they were created? 3. If not, should they be better publicized, better used or changed? | **Summary**  The AG survey results do not assist in answering this question. However, survey results suggest possible recommendations to solve problems related to Sunrise registration through SDRP.  **Data**  Not Applicable  **Details (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fDahBHB3JiMg0EHPZa4h5H_SVXrADKSnsneQe1MIJOA/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [16 January 2019](https://community.icann.org/x/iwj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q7   1. Can SMD files be used for Sunrise Period registrations after they have been canceled or revoked? 2. How prevalent is this as a problem? | **Summary**  The AG survey results do not assist in answering this question. However, previously collected data from the TMCH (Deloitte) assist in answering this question.  **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  Not Applicable  **Details**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/16aDHI9a5HdStzw0t5RG3xs0kCiRXK5qVr5nHucTXNVs/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:**[23 January 2018](https://community.icann.org/x/jQj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q8  On LRP[[2]](#footnote-2), ALP[[3]](#footnote-3), QLP[[4]](#footnote-4) – Limited Registration Periods, Approved Launch Programs and Qualified Launch Programs:   1. Are Limited Registration Periods in need of review vis a vis the Sunrise Period? Approved Launch Programs? Qualified Launch programs? 2. Are the ALP and QLP periods in need of review? 3. What aspects of the LRP are in need of review? | **Summary**  The AG survey results assist in answering this question, including all of its sub questions (a), (b), and (c). Responses from Registry Operators and Registrars indicate that:   1. Due to various unanticipated issues, the Limited Registration Periods are in need of review, particularly the Approved Launch Programs. 2. It is implied that ALP and QLP periods are in need of review. 3. The aspects of the LRP that are in need of review include: lack of clarity/understanding, conflict between locally protected terms and TMCH, eligibility issues, registration of locally-targeted TLD, Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) issues, ICANN Org process, issues with GEO TLDs, overly generic strings, etc.   **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  Registries & Registrars tab: cells D51-52, F52-54  Registry - Q29a tab: cells A5, A7  **Details**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mKDObpwPUDjn2-uhKENIEL6mZIwVC_wZX2VxVuvQqag/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [23 January 2018](https://community.icann.org/x/jQj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q9  In light of the evidence gathered above, should the scope of Sunrise Registrations be limited to the categories of goods and services for which the trademark is actually registered and put in the Clearinghouse? | **Summary**  Some members believe the survey data assists in answering this question, indicating that the Sunrise Registration should be limited to the categories of goods and services for which the trademark is actually registered and put in the TMCH due to issues such as overly generic strings and gaming concerns.  **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  Registries & Registrars tab: cells F52-53, G74  TM & Brand Owners tab: cell F14, F17, F25  TM Owner - Q10 tab: cell F6  Actual & Potential Registrants tab: cell E14  **Details**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1SuRmmmORn9CKT6946wYpjpjGjJ_3F8UCIfNzU1dWh8E/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [23 January 2018](https://community.icann.org/x/jQj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q10  Explore use and the types of proof required by the TMCH when purchasing domains in the sunrise period | **Summary**  The AG survey results do not assist in answering this question. However, trademark and brand owner respondents provided information on how many TMCH records had proof of use submitted, as well as the reasons why proof of use was not submitted. In addition, the Staff Report on RPMs include examples of the use and types of proof, which may assist in answering this question.  **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  Not Applicable  **Details**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/15CeX6Ky2Y070drQ6NeHX8H-kTPopsnkH43v_OlRWVi0/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [23 January 2018](https://community.icann.org/x/jQj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q11   1. How effectively can trademark holders who use non-English scripts/languages participate in sunrise (including IDN sunrises)? 2. Should any of them be further “internationalized” (such as in terms of service providers, languages served)? | **Summary**  The AG survey results assist in answering this question, including both of its sub questions (a) and (b). Responses from Registry Operators indicate that:   1. Some trademark and brand owners cannot effectively use non-English scripts/languages to be able to participate in Sunrise (including IDN Sunrises) due to factors such as the lack of support by TMCH for transliteration of the trademark. 2. Aspects such as service providers and languages served may be further “internationalized” as there is interest/desire for IDN Sunrise registration. However, some TLDs have an IDN-only policy, hence no need to establish a separate IDN Sunrise.   **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  Registries & Registrars tab: cells F56-57  Registry - Q29a tab: cell A7  **Detail**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NwYDeR1ICnwTQbGtW0lN9DW658DrdA6TvPLtJJOlTo8/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [23 January 2018](https://community.icann.org/x/jQj_BQ) |  |  |
| Q12   1. Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs? 2. 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 | **Summary**  The AG survey results assist in answering this question, including both of its sub questions (a) and (b). Responses from Registry Operators indicate that:   1. Sunrise Registration should not have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs due to factors such as conflicts between locally protected terms and TMCH, eligibility issues, issues with GEO TLDs, registration of locally-targeted TLD, IDN issues, high cost of Sunrise for small local businesses, etc. It is also a priority to accommodate community and GEO TLDs, including those related to family names in some jurisdictions, locally or niche meaningful names, local specifications, history, culture, public services, signature locations, names important for the Capital, local administrations, etc. Registrations under some specialized gTLDs would also prevent propagation of profane language. 2. There are mixed views in terms of altering rules for some Registry Operators, such as certain types of specialized TLDs (e.g., community or GEO TLDs), based on their published registration/eligibility policies. It seems that the majority of Registry Operator respondents were able to work within the existing rules despite the hurdles.   **Data (See:** [**Survey Analysis Tool**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1aBw-dW2gBzvBfhUgl3u6ShWlPZt0yyNF-Vs1qmUuIjg/edit?usp=sharing)**)**  Registries & Registrars tab: cells D-F27-29, D-F30-31, D-F51-54  Registry - Q29a tab: cell A5, A7  **Detail**  <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Kwy-c7xAxVIrknsIOzGYmB7PIK9u0PJIFdjYu5dV7Iw/edit?usp=sharing>  **Sub Team Discussion:** [23 January 2018](https://community.icann.org/x/jQj_BQ) |  |  |

**Data available to date:**

* Analysis Group Revised Report on the TMCH (February 2017): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Analysis%20Group%20Revised%20TMCH%20Report%20-%20March%202017.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1490349029000&api=v2>
  + Analysis Group responses to questions from the Working Group:
    - June 2017: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2017-June/002043.html>
    - July 2017: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2017-July/002257.html>
* Registry Operator responses to initial survey from TMCH Data Gathering Sub Team (December 2016): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Registry%20Responses%20to%20TMCH%20Data%20Sub%20Team%20-%2013%20Dec.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1485897782000&api=v2>
  + RPM Data Sub Team meeting with Jon Nevett, Donuts (March 2018): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/79438928/Transcription%20ICANN61%20GNSO%20RPM%20Data%20Sub%20Team%20Meeting%2010%20March%202018.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1521579214000&api=v2>
* Deloitte responses to initial questions from TMCH Data Gathering Sub Team (January 2017): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Deloitte%20responses%20to%20TMCH%20Data%20Gathering%20Sub%20Team%20questions%20-%20Jan%202017.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1485897782000&api=v2>
  + Follow up questions from Working Group (March 2017): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Follow%20Up%20Questions%20for%20Deloitte%20-%20updated%205%20March%202017.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1488753827000&api=v2> and <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Deloitte%20Follow%20Up%20Questions%20Annex%20-%204%20March%202017.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1488752114000&api=v2>
  + Deloitte response to follow up questions (April 2017): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Deloitte%20Follow%20Up%20Questions%20Annex%20-%204%20March%202017.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1488752114000&api=v2>
  + Deloitte numbers report as discussed with the Working Group at ICANN58 (March 2017): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Deloitte%20Follow%20Up%20Questions%20Annex%20-%204%20March%202017.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1488752114000&api=v2>
* ICANN staff-compiled summary data on Sunrise registrations: [<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/attachments/20171010/fc173bd9/Staffcompilationreport-Sunrisedata-3Oct2017-0001.pdf>](http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/attachments/20171010/fc173bd9/Staffcompilationreport-Sunrisedata-3Oct2017-0001.pdf)
* INTA cost impact survey: <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/69277722/INTA%20New%20gTLD%20Cost%20Impact%20Study%20Presentation%20-%2030%20Aug.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1504147055000&api=v2> and <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_download_attachments_61606864_INTA-2520Cost-2520Impact-2520Report-2520revised-25204-2D13-2D17-2520v2.1.pdf-3Fversion-3D1-26modificationDate-3D1500376749000-26api-3Dv2&d=DwMGaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=MLOyWdAdSdj4cRa39aHRCVYsVa9ub30XpFPLr1fc51I&s=KXW3vtHBAKxxiT4X6sLxZQO2dlKSW8Zc-BhfZ1t7lAA&e>
* ICANN Org-maintained list of Registry Operators and relevant dates for Sunrise, Trademark Claims and other specific approved program periods (e.g. Limited Registration Periods, Qualified Launch Programs): <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/sunrise-claims-periods>
* Analysis Group Sunrise & Trademark Claims survey results:
  + Inception Report (September 2018): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/90771305/9.6.2018%20Inception%20Report.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1536257221000&api=v2>
  + Final Report (October 2018): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/90773066/Final%20ICANN%20RPM%20Survey%20Report%202018.10.18.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1540302625000&api=v2>
  + All data files reported: <https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=90771305>
  + Analysis Group response to follow up questions (November 2018): <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/99483940/Questions%20%26%20Comments%20-%20Final%20Report%20RPM%20Survey%20-%20AG%20comments.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1543271647000&api=v2>

Additional sources suggested previously:

* Articles from DNS industry and trademark-related blogs touching on Sunrise and Trademark Claims (list of suggested blogs posted at <https://community.icann.org/display/RARPMRIAGPWG/2017-08-16+Review+of+all+Rights+Protection+Mechanisms+%28RPMs%29+in+all+gTLDs+PDP+WG>)
* News articles and research on Sunrise and Trademark Claims from Lexis-Nexis (or similar) databases

Other potentially relevant sources:

* Metrics reports from ICANN Org relevant to Competition, Consumer Protection & Consumer Trust Reviews: <https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/cct/metrics> (includes updated data on IDN gTLDs, Sunrise and UDRP & URS decisions)

1. For the actual text of the proposed refined questions submitted by the Sunrise Charter Questions Sub Team to the full Working Group, please see the accompanying Status of TMCH & Related RPM Discussions summary document also circulated by ICANN staff (3 December 2018). Between the date of the Sub Team’s report and the submission of a Working Group data request to the GNSO Council in September 2017, the Working Group discussed the Sub Team’s suggestions for refining the original Charter questions as well as for data collection. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. LRP: “Limited Registration Period” between the end of Sunrise and the start of General Availability with some registration restriction that limits domain names from being generally available to all registrants that are qualified to register domain names within the TLD. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. ALP: “Approved Launch Program” for which a registry operator has applied and been approved by ICANN to offer prior to Sunrise. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. QLP: “Qualified Launch Program” under which a registry operator is able to offer up to 100 names to third parties prior to a Sunrise period, in order to promote its TLD. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)