August 31, 2016

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)
Attn: ICANN Board and ICANN Board Governance Committee
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA  90094-2536 USA
Phone: +1.310.301.5800
Fax: +1.310.823.8649
Email: correspondence@icann.org and reconsideration@icann.org


Dear ICANN Board members,

On 25 August 2016, the standard applicants for .HOTEL, in which ICANN cancelled their applications due to a community applicant prevailing at Community Priority Evaluation, filed Reconsideration Request 16-11¹. Within Reconsideration Request 16-11, there are numerous factual inaccuracies that Dot Registry wishes to address and correct for the record.

Inaccuracy No. 1 (Response to Question 6, page 5):

“...Dot Registry – i.e., the applicant for .inc, .llc and .llp who requested community priority – never had a chance of succeeding in a community priority evaluation (CPE). Although, like any applicant, Dot Registry is entitled to ICANN respecting its AoI and Bylaws – and it may initiate whatever procedure to that purpose - until date it has not been proven that Dot Registry has been materially harmed by ICANN’s violation of the AoI and Bylaws. A refusal of Dot Registry’s solicited community priority would be in line with the CPE criteria, as the purpose of community-based applications has never been to eliminate competition among applicants for a generic word TLD or to pick winners and losers within a diverse commercial industry, and because the CPE criteria were specifically developed to prevent “undue priority [being given] to an application that refers to a ‘community’ construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string” (Applicant Guidebook; Module 4-9).”

Applicant Guidebook, Section 4.2.3, Community Priority Evaluation Criteria, page 4-9 states, among other things, that community applications will be assessed against “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application) in a holistic approach. It should be noted that a qualified community application eliminates all directly contending standard applications, regardless of how well qualified the latter may be. Reconsideration Request 16-11 statements are therefore not consistent with what the Applicant Guidebook states.

In addition, these standard .HOTEL applicants are not in any position to determine if Dot Registry’s applications achieve Community Priority status or not, only ICANN retains such authority. Dot Registry reserves its legal rights to seek redress for any interference in the process of ICANN rendering it’s final decision in the Dot Registry, LLC v. ICANN matter.

Inaccuracy No. 2 (Response to Question 7, page 6):

“...ICANN had clear policies to deny community priority to mere industries, and to disqualify applicants who were not trustworthy...”

The word “industries” does not appear anywhere in the Applicant Guidebook nor does ICANN have a policy to exclude “industries” as communities. Consistent with Applicant Guidebook, Section 1.1.2.4, GAC Early warnings, pages 1-7 to 1-8, Dot Registry’s community applications for .corp, .inc, .llc, and .llp were all labeled by the Government Advisory Committee, and accepted by the New gTLD Program Committee, as “highly regulated sectors” vulnerable to online fraud and abuse needing additional protections, not “industries.” Furthermore, the Guidebook specifically contemplates that “a community can consist of legal entities (for example, an association of suppliers of a particular service) . . . or a logical alliance of communities.”

Inaccuracy No. 3 (Response to Question 8.I.A, page 9):

“...The close relationship between these two IRP Declarations makes them an indivisible whole, which requires the ICANN Board to consider them together to avoid the risk of irreconcilable decisions...”

ICANN should not consider the two IRP Declaration to be one in the same. The Despegar, et al. v. ICANN IRP arose from scorned standard applicants whose applications were cancelled as a result of the community applicant prevailing at Community Priority Evaluation. The Despegar Panel determined that ICANN did not violate its Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws and that ICANN prevailed in the IRP. In contract, the Dot Registry, LLC v. ICANN IRP arose out of issues relating to the fair and transparent treatment and handling of their community applications, by ICANN and the Economist Intelligence Unit, during the Community Priority Evaluation process, as required by ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, ICANN’s Bylaws, ICANN’s

---

2 Applicant Guidebook, p. 4-12.
Applicant Guidebook, and the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Community Priority Evaluation Guidelines. Unlike the .HOTEL standard applicants, Dot Registry prevailed in its IRP.

Dot Registry suggests that the Board consider the Despegar IRP Declaration only to the extent that it take heed of the Despegar IRP Panel’s view that the BGC needs to look into how the EIU applies the CPE criteria to determine whether the EIU properly applied them. As the Despegar IRP Panel rightly noted, “The BGC needs to have a reasonable degree of assurance that the EIU has correctly applied the policy.”

**Inaccuracy No. 4 (Response to Question 8.III.A, page 15):**

“...Requesters learnt from the Decision [Despegar, et al. v. ICANN IRP] that Mr. Krischenowski was not the only individual affiliated to HTLD, who violated Requestors trade secrets. Mr. Oliver Sümé and Ms. Katrin Ohlmer (identified in the Decision as Mr. Krischenowski’s associates) were also ‘responsible for numerous instances of suspected international unauthorized access to other applicants’ confidential information, which occurred from March through October 2014’ ...

As an affected party to ICANN’s Applicant Portal Data Breach, Dot Registry, LLC has not been made aware of the existence of this new information that other individuals may have also been involved in the data breach. As a matter of transparency, ICANN should immediately send formal notification to all of the affected parties.

**Inaccuracy No. 5 (Response to Question 8.III.B, page 16):**

“...The ICANN Board even agreed to refund Dot Registry’s legal costs.”

In accordance with the ICANN Board Resolution 2016.08.09.11:

*The Board accepts the findings of the Final Declaration that:*

(i) Dot Registry is the prevailing party in the Dot Registry, LLC v. ICANN IRP; and
(ii) ICANN shall pay to Dot Registry US$235,294.37 upon demonstration that these incurred costs have been paid in full.

In the *Dot Registry, LLC v. ICANN IRP*, the majority Panel declared in Section 154:

*Pursuant to the ICANN Bylaws, Art. IV, Section 3.18, the Panel declares that Dot Registry is the prevailing party. The administrative fees and expenses of the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (“ICDR”) totaling $4,600.00 and the compensation and expenses for the Panelists totaling $461,388.70 shall be borne entirely by ICANN. Therefore, ICANN shall pay to Dot Registry, LLC $235,294.37 representing*

---

said fees, expenses and compensation previously incurred by Dot Registry, LLC upon
demonstration that these incurred costs have been paid in full.

ICANN has not paid any of Dot Registry’s legal fees, only Dot Registry’s portion of the ICDR
fees related to the IRP, as required in the final Declaration.

Inaccuracy No. 6 (Response to Question 8.IV.B, page 18):

“...As already explained under section III.B above, the ICANN Board is addressing the
violations of its AoI and Bylaws in the CPE for Dot Registry, and has provided a remedy
to Dot Registry...”

ICANN has not provided a remedy or final decision related to the Dot Registry, LLC v. ICANN
IRP Declaration. Dot Registry understands that the ICANN Board will meet during its 15
September 2016 retreat to discuss next steps in the matter. The Dot Registry, LLC, v. ICANN
IRP Majority Panel determined that Dot Registry suffered harm and injury, directly and
indirectly, as a result of the Board’s actions and inactions, as well as ICANN staff and EIU
actions and inactions, and that harm and injury has yet to be addressed by the Board in good
faith. Dot Registry has written multiple times to the ICANN Board and has not received a
response to date.

As previously conveyed to the ICANN Board, Dot Registry is certainly interested in meeting
with the Board to discuss acceptable remedies in the context of their deliberations, in order to
reach a mutually acceptable resolution once and for all.

Dot Registry asks ICANN to publish this correspondence on the correspondence page and under
Reconsideration Request 16-11.

Please feel free to reach me directly at +1.816.200.7080 Central Time if you have any questions.

DOT REGISTRY, LLC
Sincerely,

Shaul Jolles
Chief Executive Officer