

Instructions:

This table was built to assist the Sunrise Data Review Sub Team in its analysis as to whether, and how, the previously collected Sunrise data (between December 2016 and March 2018) answer each of the final agreed Charter questions.

- In the **Sunrise Tab** of the [analysis tool](#), Staff have included excerpts, as well as the relevant page/slide reference, from the previously collected data that staff believe may assist in answering the final agreed Charter questions. Summaries of the excerpts are included in Column B.
- The excerpts cited by Staff are nonexclusive; Sub Team members are welcome to download and reference the actual documents, linked from the **Source Tab**, to cite relevant information that may help answer the final agreed Charter questions.
- When providing input, please note the source name and page/slide number of the previously collected data.

Sunrise Charter Question 5(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?

(i) Are there any unintended results?

(ii) Does the ability of Registry Operators to expand their Sunrise Periods create uniformity concerns that should be addressed by this WG?

(iii) Are there any benefits observed when the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?

(iv) Are there any disadvantages?

Sub Team Member Name	Do the previously collected data help answer this Sunrise Charter Question?	If yes, which sub question(s) do the survey results assist?	How do the data assist (e.g. "Information X in document Y demonstrate Z")?	Source Name & Page/Slide Reference
George Kirikos	No		(no for first 4 documents, will adjust this later on as we go through the other 8)	
Griffin Barnett	No			
David McAuley	No		Referring to AG Independent Review of TMCH and two followups	
Michael	Yes	Regarding the	Table 12 seems suggestive that having a longer sunrise might not result in more	Analysis Group

Sunrise Charter Question 5(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?

(i) Are there any unintended results?

(ii) Does the ability of Registry Operators to expand their Sunrise Periods create uniformity concerns that should be addressed by this WG?

(iii) Are there any benefits observed when the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?

(iv) Are there any disadvantages?

Sub Team Member Name	Do the previously collected data help answer this Sunrise Charter Question?	If yes, which sub question(s) do the survey results assist?	How do the data assist (e.g. "Information X in document Y demonstrate Z")?	Source Name & Page/Slide Reference
Karanicolas		need or benefits of extending sunrise	trademark owners registering. -- Sub Team Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michael K: Low usage of Sunrise tied to argument that a longer Sunrise period would not necessarily make a difference. 	Revised TMCH Report p. 37
David McAuley	Yes	Question and iii.	INTA Cost Impact Survey	Slide 59

Sunrise Charter Question 5(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?

(i) Are there any unintended results?

(ii) Does the ability of Registry Operators to expand their Sunrise Periods create uniformity concerns that should be addressed by this WG?

(iii) Are there any benefits observed when the Sunrise Period is extended beyond 30 days?

(iv) Are there any disadvantages?

Sub Team Member Name	Do the previously collected data help answer this Sunrise Charter Question?	If yes, which sub question(s) do the survey results assist?	How do the data assist (e.g. "Information X in document Y demonstrate Z")?	Source Name & Page/Slide Reference