

Attendance - 13 Members

Brian Beckham
Claudio DiGangi
David McAuley
Greg Shatan
Griffin Barnett
Jason Schaeffer
John McElwaine
Kathy Kleiman
Maxim Alzoba
Michael Karanicolas
Mitch Stoltz
Phil Corwin
Susan Payne

Apologies: none

Staff: Ariel Liang, Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong, Julie Bisland

Zoom chat:

13:00:17 From Julie Bisland : Welcome to the RPMs Sunrise Data Review Sub Team
Wednesday, 15 May 2019 at 18:00 UTC for 90 minutes

13:00:56 From Maxim Alzoba : Hello All

13:01:20 From julie.hedlund : @All: This call will start at 5 minutes past the top of the hour to allow for a transition from the previous call.

13:04:00 From David McAuley : is 0232 related to R2D2?

13:08:42 From Kathy Kleiman : Is Maxim on the call today?

13:08:51 From Kathy Kleiman : Some GDD participants are still in transit.

13:08:59 From julie.hedlund : yes he is

13:09:20 From Susan Payne : GDD finished last week. today is wednesday. I doubt GDD attendees are still in transit

13:09:25 From Maxim Alzoba : I'm here

13:09:47 From Kathy Kleiman : Great!

13:10:03 From David McAuley : Link to transcript for May 8 meeting (roughly on charter questions 8 and 9): <https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/policy/2019/transcript/transcript-rpm-sunrise-data-08may19-en.pdf>

13:10:06 From Kathy Kleiman : Question 8 was skipped as we waited for you...

13:10:11 From Philip Corwin : Ariel-Are we ahead of schedule for finishing before ICANN 65 or at the end of it. We want to finish prior if at all possible.

13:10:18 From Maxim Alzoba : people , who were participating in DNS OARC might be in transit (industry)

13:10:33 From Ariel Liang : @Phil - we are currently ahead of schedule for finishing, and hopefully before ICANN65

13:10:45 From Ariel Liang : Based on staff's tracking of the Sub Team progress so far

13:10:58 From Maxim Alzoba : by the ICANN65 .madrid might have actual info on how the only ALP worked

13:11:07 From Maxim Alzoba : (it should be finished by then)

13:11:21 From Maxim Alzoba : I had a chance to talk to Amadeu about it

13:12:49 From Maxim Alzoba : from CORE

13:14:12 From Ariel Liang : Kindly note that staff corrected the factual issues with ALP, QLP, LRP in the "Summary of Discussions/Individual Comments" section after reviewing the data noted in the table. The updated Summary Table, along with the proposed answers/preliminary recommendations, will be shared with the Sub Team at the end of the Sub Team deliberation

13:14:48 From Ariel Liang : We are referring to Sunrise Q8

13:14:49 From Kathy Kleiman : @Ariel, we made no recommendations on Q8 -- as David noted, we were waiting for the REGistries

13:15:06 From Kathy Kleiman : Q8

13:15:20 From Ariel Liang : Yes, we have not captured any preliminary recommendations or proposed answer for Q8 yet

13:15:30 From Ariel Liang : We will share the update at the end of the deliberations

13:15:35 From Kathy Kleiman : Could someone refresh our recollection on Claudio's proposal, its number and its substance?

13:16:13 From Maxim Alzoba : please note, that the answer from RySG (or geoTLDs) is not the same as info from particular Registries

13:16:20 From julie.hedlund : @All: Just to note that Question 8 is on the agenda, first under item #3.

13:16:22 From David McAuley : Claudio's was proposal #9 as I recall

13:16:34 From Maxim Alzoba : could we scroll to the text?

13:16:40 From julie.hedlund : @David: Correct and there is an open discussion thread on it.

13:16:52 From David McAuley : good point, thanks Julie

13:17:47 From Maxim Alzoba : according to the evidence provided by CORE (Amadeu), ALP is in need of review (but not at cost of stopping the next round)

13:18:42 From David McAuley : Claudio's proposal was on span-the-dot - as was Google Registry's that jeff Neuman sent over to us from the Sub Pro PDP

13:18:53 From Kathy Kleiman : @Maxim, do you have some specific recommendations?

13:18:53 From David McAuley : Jeff

13:19:10 From Ariel Liang : Please refer to discussion thread for Q1 — discussion of Proposal #9 is included in that thread

13:19:32 From David McAuley : thanks for that Ariel, good clarification

13:19:50 From Maxim Alzoba : @Kathy, ALP implementation should allow applicants to use it (no endless cycles of asking the same questions from ICANN)

13:19:51 From Ariel Liang : This is the open message:
<https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-sunrise/2019-April/000278.html>

13:19:56 From David McAuley : and Greg is making a good point about using threads

13:20:23 From julie.hedlund : On the agenda is Question 8 next.

13:21:17 From Kathy Kleiman : could someone remind us of the differences?
13:21:33 From Ariel Liang : Q8 starts on page 34
13:21:34 From Maxim Alzoba : could we return to the #9
13:22:33 From julie.hedlund : @Maxim: We are on Question 8.
13:23:15 From julie.hedlund : @Maxim: The document on the screen is on Question 8.
13:23:21 From Philip Corwin : I note that Q8 does not propose any modification of the LRP, ALP, and QLP, just asks whether they should be reviewed? Where are we going with this question in terms of possible recommendations?
13:23:44 From David McAuley : #9 does makes reference to ALP
13:23:49 From julie.hedlund : @Maxim: That is being discussed in a thread on the list and is on Question 1.
13:23:53 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : Proposal 9
13:24:24 From julie.hedlund : @Maxim: Could you contribute that comment to the thread at: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-sunrise/2019-April/000278.html>
13:24:39 From Susan Payne : Section 4.5.2 of the TMCH Requirements provides that Registry Operators may, prior to the start date of its Sunrise Period, apply to ICANN to conduct an "Approved Launch Program" not otherwise permitted by the TMCH Requirements. An Approved Launch Program may allow the Registry Operator to register certain domain names prior to the completion of the Sunrise Period for the TLD. A Registry Operator may submit an application to conduct an Approved Launch Program for its TLD (a "Launch Application") in accordance with the Approved Launch Program Application Process
13:24:44 From Maxim Alzoba : please add this to the notes of the meeting
13:25:11 From David McAuley : Thanks Maxim, noted comment that use of ALP is mistaken here
13:25:20 From Maxim Alzoba : "Approved Launch Plan for the Uniregistry" is not ALP
13:25:26 From Greg Shatan : A launch plan approved by ICANN is not the same as an Approved Launch Program, afaik
13:25:34 From Ariel Liang : Noted Maxim. Thanks for the clarification
13:26:07 From Maxim Alzoba : the only registry who had approved ALP is .madrid
13:26:16 From Maxim Alzoba : and we had report of Amadeu about it
13:26:37 From Susan Payne : @Maxim, yes, although some others did apply so they aren't the only ones who can comment
13:26:37 From David McAuley : thank you Kristine for a specific recommendation like that
13:26:44 From Kathy Kleiman : +1 Support Kristine's idea -- especially if we can give a "shot" at defining ALP, QLP, LRP. We do have a sense that a few Registry operators had a lot of problems.
13:26:59 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : Yes, only a few ROs even tried!
13:27:07 From Maxim Alzoba : and by ICANN65 .madrid is going to have some info on how it worked by then
13:27:08 From Susan Payne : we don't need to give a shot to define them. they are defined
13:27:09 From Griffin Barnett : ALP, QLP, and LRP are all defined terms
13:27:18 From Maxim Alzoba : +1 Griffin

13:27:31 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : Right, we dont' need a definition, we need, essentially, an issues report.

13:27:38 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : for this one question.

13:27:59 From Kathy Kleiman : @Griffin, I've looked up the definitions a million times (and shared them with the Subteam) and still don't understand these programs :-) and their problems...

13:28:00 From Maxim Alzoba : new hand

13:28:06 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : I want to be clear, we need more than data about the problem...we need suggested solutions.

13:28:23 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : We need to expressly ask for that. Those of us who have tried these things have concrete suggestions.

13:28:37 From Kathy Kleiman : +1 Kristine

13:28:53 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : thats loud...

13:29:11 From Greg Shatan : What was loud?

13:29:42 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : there was a phone ringing on a open line.

13:29:46 From Griffin Barnett : @Kathy, the definition of an ALP, at least, is intentionally broad to allow ROs to seek approval for different kinds of programs, but the purpose is all ultimately the same: programs for allocating domains that precede or are otherwise exempted from the Sunrise process

13:29:57 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : +1 griffin.

13:30:04 From julie.hedlund : @Kristine: Do you have some questions to suggest that the Sub Team could recommend being included for public comment?

13:30:12 From Susan Payne : QLP delivers POLICE.newyork

13:30:37 From Maxim Alzoba : if TM owners would be able to challenge reserved names - then QLP will not help

13:31:03 From Maxim Alzoba : cities do not make fast procurement procedures , it takes at least 1 year

13:31:08 From Griffin Barnett : The definition of QLP is similar, but more constrained insofar as it relates specifically to the ability to allocate up to 100 domains in a TLD to third parties prior to or during the Sunrise Period for the purposes of promoting the TLD

13:31:13 From julie.hedlund : @Kristine: Thanks :-) Didn't mean right this moment!

13:31:29 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : @Julie. great. I am not a good fast thinker....

13:32:14 From Griffin Barnett : Finally, a Limited Registration Period is a period between Sunrise and GA: Registry Operator MAY establish additional periods during which it will accept domain name registrations following the Sunrise Period but prior to General Registration (a "Limited Registration Period").

13:32:58 From Griffin Barnett : These are all pretty well defined (if broadly defined) in the Trademark Claims Requirements document: (<http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/rpm-requirements-14may14-en.pdf>), which is incorporated by reference into Spec 7 of the Registry Agreement

13:33:20 From Maxim Alzoba : QLP is not enough for cities with more than 100 monuments+streets+wholly owned subsidiaries of the cities, agencies e.t.c.

13:33:21 From Kathy Kleiman : Tx Griffin.

13:33:23 From Kathy Kleiman : +1 Susan

13:33:25 From Maxim Alzoba : without reserved lists

13:33:35 From Griffin Barnett : As Susan is saying, we still may need info from ROs as to why these programs were challenging to conduct

13:33:47 From Griffin Barnett : But it doesn't seem to me to be a problem with their definitions

13:34:07 From Griffin Barnett : Seems perhaps more of an implementation issue/question as between ROs and ICANN

13:34:18 From Maxim Alzoba : the only set of TLDs aware of the issues - GEO TLDs (getTLDs association and individual GEO registries)

13:34:27 From julie.hedlund : @All: Note also that a discussion thread was opened last week on Question 8 so if you have further comments (or questions to suggest for public comment) please feel free to provide these on the thread.

13:34:28 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : It's related to sunrise because some of these period do/should precede Sunrise.

13:34:49 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : It means that Sunrise takes SECOND place to other periods.

13:35:16 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : It's setting policy for who gets in before brand owners. I have to imagine brand owners care about this.

13:35:52 From Griffin Barnett : @Kristine - brand owners definitely care...there were many comments put in about the ALP/QLP when they were being developed, and again on individual requests for ALPs

13:35:57 From Griffin Barnett : If I recall correctly

13:36:17 From Kathy Kleiman : And Amadeu shared problems with trying to reserve city sections -- named segments - greater than 100 in number.

13:36:29 From Greg Shatan : Kristine, all good points.

13:37:01 From Griffin Barnett : Having said that, we understand there may be legitimate reasons for using these programs to reserve or pre-allocate certain names in the context of, in particular, geoTLDs to ensure their use by local authorities/for municipal reasons even where certain terms are also protected TMs

13:37:33 From Griffin Barnett : It's about achieving the proper balance and avoid possible misuse of these mechanisms

13:37:44 From Maxim Alzoba : I mean combined QLP+LRP+Reserved list worked together (as a replacement for non working ALP)

13:38:02 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : +1 Maxim.

13:38:18 From Griffin Barnett : @maxim - so do we still need the ALP, or are the existing other types of programs adequate?

13:38:32 From Griffin Barnett : To achieve the same goal?

13:38:34 From Maxim Alzoba : we need workable ALP, but not at the cost of stopping next round

13:39:00 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : +1 Maxim.

13:39:20 From Susan Payne : Yes, agreed Maxim
13:39:26 From Kathy Kleiman : @Maxim, I don't think anyone is trying to stop the next round.
13:39:43 From Kathy Kleiman : Perhaps Kristine can work with Maxim on questions?
13:40:13 From Maxim Alzoba : my conversation with Sebastien Ducos (geoTLDs) - he told me that 100 was not enough, but there is no desire to extend it to bigger number if it stops the round (if QLP, LRP and reserved lists do not change)
13:40:14 From Griffin Barnett : I'd like to see a more concrete summary of the problems with using ALP from the 2012 round
13:40:40 From Griffin Barnett : I don't know that we have great data from our data collection effort on this question; I'll need to double check the data on this question
13:40:55 From julie.hedlund : @All: Note that the structure of the Initial Report allows for specific questions to be asked for public comment. So, if you have suggestions for questions for the Sub Team to recommend, you can provide them in the discussion thread.
13:41:06 From Maxim Alzoba : idea of ALP was good, the implementation is horrible (going in circles where the same questions was asked again and again)
13:41:12 From Maxim Alzoba : was horrible
13:41:13 From Susan Payne : @Griffin, no the data is pretty minimal
13:41:24 From David McAuley : Kristine's idea is a request for more data, as Greg suggests, at least as I see it
13:41:56 From Kathy Kleiman : +100
13:42:04 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : I'm sure we can work on something together, right Maxim?
13:42:05 From julie.hedlund : @David: But via questions included in the initial report for public comment, I think.
13:42:19 From David McAuley : yes, that is what I mean, thanks
13:42:27 From Griffin Barnett : It seems like where we are heading is that ALP is in need of review (Q8(a) but perhaps not the QLP or LRPs?
13:42:31 From Maxim Alzoba : we could try , but we will need help of geoTLDs
13:42:35 From Ariel Liang : Please note the discussion thread for Q8 has been open (till 22 May): <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-sunrise/2019-May/000293.html>
13:42:40 From David McAuley : that is how I understand Kristine's suggestion
13:43:34 From Kathy Kleiman : "It is implied that the ALP and QLP periods are in need of review." ==> our summary table
13:43:59 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : I think it's worth gathering relevant information, but at this point, I agree with Maxim.
13:45:28 From Kathy Kleiman : OK, now I understand, tx!
13:46:38 From Maxim Alzoba : the request for info from geoTLDs
13:46:59 From Maxim Alzoba : should be fast (around 2 weeks)
13:47:42 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : Thanks Greg.
13:47:49 From julie.hedlund : Q8 thread: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-sunrise/2019-May/000293.html>
13:47:52 From David McAuley : agree with Greg - off to use the thread
13:48:04 From David McAuley : #10

13:48:36 From julie.hedlund : Agenda: Question 10, then 11, then 12 if time permits.

13:48:39 From David McAuley : it's an exhortation

13:48:50 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : LMAO David

13:49:07 From David McAuley : and a thread on 9

13:49:28 From Maxim Alzoba : as I remember it was about example: a person making 3d printed prototype, shipping to the neighbour, after being paid by the same person, and using it as a proof

13:50:33 From Ariel Liang : Please note Q9 thread has been open till 22 May:
<https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-sunrise/2019-May/000294.html>

13:50:33 From Maxim Alzoba : use = content of the website (for example) and content is out of scope of ICANN

13:50:55 From Ariel Liang : Please provide further comment/input via the discussion thread for Q9

13:51:38 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : All, I have to jump at the top of the hour.

13:52:18 From julie.hedlund : @Kristine: Noted and thanks for joining!

13:53:15 From David McAuley : comments. concerns

13:53:19 From Griffin Barnett : It's kind of an odd phrasing

13:53:29 From Griffin Barnett : it doesn't really ask us to do anything in particular

13:53:38 From Philip Corwin : To echo my prior remark, what potential recommendations could this question lead to?

13:53:41 From Griffin Barnett : Other than say.. OK, we know what the proof of use requirements for Sunrise are

13:55:14 From David McAuley : Kristine hand up then PHil

13:55:17 From Philip Corwin : My hand is up

13:55:23 From Susan Payne : Greg - hands from Kristine and Phil

13:55:57 From David McAuley : That's my recollection as well

13:56:28 From Griffin Barnett : Good point Kristine

13:56:30 From David McAuley : Thanks Kristine

13:57:28 From Griffin Barnett : The way I read this question, it seems to be getting at whether there were problems in purchasing domain in Sunrise because of proof of use issues; this really seems more of an issue relating to the TMCH rather than SUNrise specifically, in case there are concerns about current POU requirements

13:58:12 From Griffin Barnett : I'm not aware of problems where someone sought to register a name in Sunrise but was denied bc of a lack of POU (where they had an SMD file or otherwise shouldve been eligible through properly submitting POU to TMCH)

13:59:46 From Philip Corwin : Griffin, I agree that this seems more like a TMCH Q thana Sunrise Q

13:59:49 From Maxim Alzoba : two items: use of domain - outside of ICANN's remit (if it is not in the policies of the TLD, like of .cat - language to be used Catalan (in a year)) and another item : proof of use (to be eligible for TMCH sunrise)

13:59:53 From Griffin Barnett : Kathy - I don't think it's correct to say that bc 96% of marks in the TMCH have POU it means Deloitte is approving POU 96% of the time...

13:59:59 From Kristine Dorrain (Amazon Registry) : Parting shot before I bail... we may wish to pull the notes from the original group's discussion on this question rather than guessing.

14:00:41 From Griffin Barnett : So the purported token use issue is, as Phil suggested, a TMCH issue not a Sunrise issue per se

14:00:49 From Griffin Barnett : (even though it is obviously relevant to Sunrise)

14:01:21 From Susan Payne : What Griffing said about the 96% assumption. Re @Kathgy suggestion that then it should be 100% -= that's a question we have discussed in Claims - don't re-op[en it

14:01:21 From John McElwaine : Proof of use is required for Sunrise

14:02:07 From John McElwaine : The alleged 4% are people that decided only to take advantage of Claims Notices which did not require proof of use.

14:02:17 From Griffin Barnett : Not sure I understand Kathy's point about getting marks in the TMCH with POU to 100% ... it's a decision for the TM owner about submitting POU as to whether they want to take advantage of Sunrise, or just record in TMCH for Claims purposes

14:02:34 From John McElwaine : @Griffin +1

14:02:44 From Griffin Barnett : Plus many jurisdictions don't require POU at the time a registration is made, so again doesn't necessary address the purported gaming issue based on token use

14:03:55 From Kathy Kleiman : Based on experience shared by Greg some time ago, TMCH requires a real showing of proof of use.

14:03:56 From David McAuley : Thanks Greg -

14:04:03 From David McAuley : gravel in hand

14:04:13 From Maxim Alzoba : bye , Greg

14:05:22 From Griffin Barnett : +1 Susan

14:06:48 From Michael Karanicolas : Why is Trademark Claims the appropriate venue rather than here? Why should the folks in this group not get to address it?

14:07:52 From julie.hedlund : There were gremlins in the Zoom room!

14:10:09 From Kathy Kleiman : @Maxim, what do you recommend?

14:10:30 From Kathy Kleiman : Does Amazon have IDNs? Should we circle back when Kristine joins us again?

14:10:40 From Maxim Alzoba : new hand

14:11:02 From Griffin Barnett : @Michael, I think there was agreement to continue the discussion of Q10 on list in this sub-tea, so maybe your concern is addressed?

14:11:07 From Griffin Barnett : *sub-team

14:11:13 From Maxim Alzoba : it was additional info from CORE about European languages with letters hyphen e.t.c.

14:11:23 From Maxim Alzoba : new

14:11:26 From Kathy Kleiman : i'll wait

14:11:30 From Kathy Kleiman : for Maxim

14:12:21 From Maxim Alzoba : the same as ALP conversation

14:12:25 From Maxim Alzoba : for Amadeu

14:12:39 From Griffin Barnett : Q11 strikes me as potentially relating to matching rules for Sunrise, insofar as certain characters in non-English/Latin language/script may be faced with

trouble being accepted into the TMCH or obtaining Sunrise registrations because of the special IDN characters

14:13:12 From Michael Karanicolas : @Griffin - Yes - no need to specifically come back to this, just so long as this sub-team gets a chance to engage on this issue.

14:13:20 From Maxim Alzoba : and for transliteration - I am not sure that this goes well with the TM rights practice

14:13:48 From Susan Payne : correct Kathy, same issue

14:14:14 From Maxim Alzoba : Q12 and Q8 have common grounds

14:14:24 From Kathy Kleiman : Combine Q12 and 8?

14:14:35 From Griffin Barnett : Agree re the relationship b/w Q8 and Q12

14:15:17 From Kathy Kleiman : @Phil, same problem - 100 Reserved unlikely to be enough... Q8 discussion

14:15:26 From Griffin Barnett : I would suggest that the "different rule for some registries" is an alternative to the current system of having exceptions/opt-outs to Sunrise via ALP and QLP

14:15:45 From Griffin Barnett : In effect, this allows the ROs who want to take advantage of these exceptions to seek them out

14:15:53 From Kathy Kleiman : @David and All: Q11 ask about non-English language participation in Sunrise in Initial report?

14:15:54 From Maxim Alzoba : I am not sure that AGB had 'specialized' word at all (2 references - one to UN agencies , another is about process

14:15:59 From Griffin Barnett : (again, noting the apparent implementation struggles with these programs, which is a separate issue)

14:17:10 From Maxim Alzoba : but extension of 100 should not come at cost of stopping the next round

14:17:18 From Maxim Alzoba : for QLPs

14:17:32 From julie.hedlund : @All: There is already a thread on Q8.

14:17:58 From Maxim Alzoba : @julie, to join 12 to 8 it might need to be changed

14:18:06 From julie.hedlund : Not sure how we can join an open thread with a new thread.

14:18:42 From Maxim Alzoba : threads is a tool, if it does not serve the cause (delivery of PDP results), it might be in need of change

14:18:55 From julie.hedlund : @All: Note also that we cannot alter the agreed charter questions. We can't rewrite them.

14:18:56 From Ariel Liang : We will discuss with the Co-Chairs for the approach, as they are just email threads not as chat groups, not sure how "merge" looks like but we will discuss with ST Co-Chairs

14:19:21 From Maxim Alzoba : it is not about changing the Charter questions, it was about seen them together

14:19:36 From Kathy Kleiman : Merging discussions of overlapping questions...

14:19:48 From Michael Karanicolas : The Q's can't be changed.... But they can be discussed together, right?

14:19:53 From Maxim Alzoba : without changing the questions itself

14:19:59 From David McAuley : Agree with Maxim - maybe that was what I was getting to - need to preserve charter Q's but look for efficiencies

14:20:17 From Griffin Barnett : Q12(a) is a bit confusing to me because it seems to assume that SUNrise do not currently have priority over other registrations, which they do, absent an exception via ALP or QLP

14:20:49 From Maxim Alzoba : so we do not discuss the same thing few times in different threads

14:20:49 From Griffin Barnett : Which seems appropriate given the purpose of Sunrise

14:21:35 From Maxim Alzoba : @Griffin, a period comes first, but it does not give exclusive rights

14:22:10 From Maxim Alzoba : outside of it's timeframe

14:23:29 From Maxim Alzoba : I will try to participate in all meetings at ICANN65 if it does not overlap with Council or RySG ExCom duties

14:23:31 From Philip Corwin : Yes, Day 2 and 4 in Marrakech as of now

14:23:53 From Griffin Barnett : @Maxim - not sure I understand; if a registration is a Sunrise Registration (i.e. made during Sunrise by an eligible rights holder), then it has priority over other registrations in the TLD, by current ICANN rules, unless where the same name is reserved/previously allocated during an ALP or QLP

14:23:59 From Griffin Barnett : Is that not correct?

14:24:14 From Maxim Alzoba : only during the Sunrise period

14:24:30 From Griffin Barnett : That's what makes it a Sunrise Registration....

14:24:34 From Griffin Barnett : By definition...

14:24:38 From Maxim Alzoba : not before (QLP) or after (LRPs or GA)

14:25:29 From Maxim Alzoba : + claims for 90 days following (or if a Registry decides to extend claims)

14:26:40 From julie.hedlund : Good clarification David.

14:27:13 From Kathy Kleiman : Tx David and All!

14:27:16 From Kathy Kleiman : And Greg!

14:27:17 From Philip Corwin : Bye all. Good meeting

14:27:17 From Griffin Barnett : Thanks all

14:27:21 From David McAuley : Thanks all

14:27:22 From Maxim Alzoba : bye all

14:27:24 From julie.hedlund : Thanks everyone — bye!