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.
- **<u>Premium Pricing</u>**: Pricing of second level domain names that are determined by the registry as Premium Names.
- <u>Standard Pricing</u>: 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 | 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): Is the Sunrise Period serving its intended purpose? Is it having unintended effects? Is the TMCH Provider requiring appropriate forms of "use" (if not, how can this corrected)? Have abuses of the Sunrise Period been documented by trademark owners? Have abuses of the Sunrise Period been documented by Registrants? Have abuses of the Sunrise Period been documented by Registrars? | | | |
| Q1 | | | |

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.

| • | Should the availability of Sunrise registrations only for identical matches be reviewed? If the matching process is expanded, how can Registrant free expression and fair use rights be protected and balanced against trademark rights? | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| Q2 | | | |
| • | Threshold question: Is Registry pricing within the scope of the RPM WG or ICANN's review? Does Registry Sunrise or premium name pricing unfairly limit the ability of trademark owners to participate in Sunrise? If so, how extensive is this problem? | | |
| Q3 | | | |
| • | 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? 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? What concerns might be raised by either or both of these requirements? | | |
| Q4 | | | |
| • | Are Registry Operator Reserved Names practices unfairly limiting participation in Sunrise by trademark owners? Should Section 1.3.3 of Specification 1 of the Registry Agreement be modified to address these concerns? | | |

| 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? | | |
| 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? | | |
| 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? | | |
| • Are there any unintended results? | | |
| Does the ability of Registry Operators to | | |
| expand their Sunrise Periods create | | |
| uniformity concerns that should be | | |
| addressed by this WG? | | |
| • Are there any benefits observed when the | | |
| Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 | | |
| days? | | |
| Are there any disadvantages? | | |
| | | |
| (b) In light of evidence gathered above, should the | | |
| Sunrise Period continue to be mandatory or | | |
| become optional? | | |
| • 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? | | |
| In considering mandatory vs optional, | | |
| should Registry Operators be allowed to | | |
| choose between Sunrise and Claims (that | | |
| is, make ONE mandatory)? | | |
| Q6 | | |

| What are Sunrise Dispute Resolution | | |
|---|------|--|
| Policies (SDRPs), and are any changes | | |
| needed? Issues that the WG might evaluate | | |
| include: are SDRPs serving the purpose(s) | | |
| for which they were created? If not, should | | |
| they be better publicized, better used or | | |
| | | |
| changed? | | |
| Q7 | | |
| Can SMD files be used for Sunrise Period | | |
| registrations after they have been canceled | | |
| or revoked? How prevalent is this as a | | |
| problem? | | |
| Q8 | | |
| On LRP ² , ALP ³ , QLP ⁴ – Limited Registration Periods, | | |
| Approved Launch Programs and Qualified Launch | | |
| Programs: | | |
| Are Limited Registration Periods in need of | | |
| review vis a vis the Sunrise Period? | | |
| Approved Launch Programs? Qualified | | |
| Launch programs? | | |
| | | |
| Are the ALP and QLP periods in need of | | |
| review? | | |
| What aspects of the LRP are in need of review? | | |
| 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? | | |
| Q10 | | |
| Explore use and the types of proof required | | |
| by the TMCH when purchasing domains in | | |
| , , , , , | | |
| the sunrise period | | |
| Q11 | | |

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.

³ ALP: "Approved Launch Program" for which a registry operator has applied and been approved by ICANN to offer prior to Sunrise.

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.

| How effectively can trademark holders who use non-English scripts/languages participate in sunrise (including IDN sunrises), and should any of them be further "internationalized" (such as in terms of service providers, languages served)? | | |
|--|--|--|
| Q12 Should Sunrise Registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs? 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 | | |

Data available to date:

- Analysis Group Revised Report on the TMCH (February 2017): <u>https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Analysis%20Group%20Revised%20TMCH%20Report%20-%20March%202</u> <u>017.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1490349029000&api=v2</u>
 - Analysis Group responses to questions from the Working Group:
 - June 2017: <u>https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2017-June/002043.html</u>
 - July 2017: <u>https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2017-July/002257.html</u>
- Registry Operator responses to initial survey from TMCH Data Gathering Sub Team (December 2016): <a href="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%2 <u>OTeam%20Meeting%2010%20March%202018.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1521579214000&api=v2</u>
- Deloitte responses to initial questions from TMCH Data Gathering Sub Team (January 2017): <a href="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): <u>https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Follow%20Up%20Questions%20for%20Deloitte%20-%20updated</u> <u>%205%20March%202017.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1488753827000&api=v2</u> and

https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Deloitte%20Follow%20Up%20Questions%20Annex%20-%204%20 March%202017.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1488752114000&api=v2

- Deloitte response to follow up questions (April 2017): <u>https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Deloitte%20Follow%20Up%20Questions%20Annex%20-%204%20</u> <u>March%202017.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1488752114000&api=v2</u>
- Deloitte numbers report as discussed with the Working Group at ICANN58 (March 2017): <u>https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64066042/Deloitte%20Follow%20Up%20Questions%20Annex%20-%204%20</u> <u>March%202017.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1488752114000&api=v2</u>
- ICANN staff-compiled summary data on Sunrise registrations: <u>http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/attachments/20171010/fc173bd9/Staffcompilationreport-Sunrisedata-3Oct2017-0001.pdf</u>
- INTA cost impact survey: <u>https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/69277722/INTA%20New%20gTLD%20Cost%20Impact%20Study%20Presentation%2</u> <u>0-%2030%20Aug.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1504147055000&api=v2</u> and <u>https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-</u> <u>3A community.icann.org download attachments 61606864 INTA-2520Cost-2520Impact-2520Report-2520revised-25204-2D13-2D17-</u> <u>2520v2.1.pdf-3Fversion-3D1-26modificationDate-3D1500376749000-26api-</u> <u>3Dv2&d=DwMGaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-</u> <u>H4xR2EBk&m=MLOyWdAdSdj4cRa39aHRCVYsVa9ub30XpFPLr1fc51l&s=KXW3vtHBAKxxiT4X6sLxZQO2dlKSW8Zc-BhfZ1t7IAA&e</u>
- 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): <u>https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/sunrise-claims-periods</u>
- Analysis Group Sunrise & Trademark Claims survey results:
 - Inception Report (September 2018): <u>https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/90771305/9.6.2018%20Inception%20Report.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1536257</u> <u>221000&api=v2</u>
 - Final Report (October 2018): <u>https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/90773066/Final%20ICANN%20RPM%20Survey%20Report%202018.10.18.pdf?version=1</u> <u>&modificationDate=1540302625000&api=v2</u>
 - All data files reported: <u>https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=90771305</u>
 - Analysis Group response to follow up questions (November 2018): <a href="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: <u>https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/cct/metrics</u> (includes updated data on IDN gTLDs, Sunrise and UDRP & URS decisions)