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

LIST OF FINAL REFINED SUNRISE CHARTER QUESTIONS	RELEVANT AG SURVEY RESULTS (if any)	RELEVANT DATA REVIEWED PREVIOUSLY (e.g. AG TMCH Report; Deloitte data; staff compilations; INTA survey; CCT-RT data)	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 Registries and Registrars?			
Q1 - 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[1], ALP[2], QLP[3] – 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 • 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			

---

[1] 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.

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

[3] 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.

registration/eligibility policies? Examples include POLICE.PARIS and POLICE.NYC for geo-TLDs, and WINDOWS.CONSTRUCTION for specialized gTLDs			