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Interim Supplementary Procedures for Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Independent Review Process (IRP)\(^1\)
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These interim procedures (Interim Supplementary Procedures) supplement the International Centre for Dispute Resolution’s international arbitration rules in accordance with the independent review process set forth in Article 4, Section 4.3 of ICANN’s Bylaws. These procedures apply to all independent review process proceedings filed after 1 May 2018.

In drafting these Interim Supplementary Procedures, the IRP Implementation Oversight Team (IOT) applied the following principles: (1) remain as close as possible to the current Supplementary Procedures or the Updated Supplementary Procedures (USP) posted for public comment on 28 November 2016\(^2\); (2) to the extent public comments received in response to the USP reflected clear movement away from either the current Supplementary Procedures or the

\(^1\) CONTEXTUAL NOTE: These Interim Supplementary Procedures are intended to supplement the ICDR RULES. Therefore, when the ICDR RULES appropriately address an item, there is no need to re-state that Rule within the Supplemental Procedures. The IOT, through its work, may identify additional places where variance from the ICDR RULES is recommended, and that would result in addition or modification to the Supplemental Procedures.

USP, to reflect that movement unless doing so would require significant drafting that should be properly deferred for broader consideration; (3) take no action that would materially expand any part of the Supplementary Procedures that the IOT has not clearly agreed upon, or that represent a significant change from what was posted for comment and would therefore require further public consultation prior to changing the supplemental rules to reflect those expansions or changes.

1. Definitions

In these Interim Supplementary Procedures:

A CLAIMANT is any legal or natural person, group, or entity including, but not limited to the Empowered Community, a Supporting Organization, or an Advisory Committee, that has been materially affected by a Dispute. To be materially affected by a Dispute, the Claimant must suffer an injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the alleged violation.

COVERED ACTIONS are any actions or failures to act by or within ICANN committed by the Board, individual Directors, Officers, or Staff members that give rise to a DISPUTE.

DISPUTES are defined as:

(A) Claims that COVERED ACTIONS violated ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, including, but not limited to, any action or inaction that:

1) exceeded the scope of the Mission;

2) resulted from action taken in response to advice or input from any Advisory Committee or Supporting Organization that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;

3) resulted from decisions of process-specific expert panels that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;

4) resulted from a response to a DIDP (as defined in Section 22.7(d)) request that is claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; or

5) arose from claims involving rights of the EC as set forth in the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;
(B) Claims that ICANN, the Board, individual Directors, Officers or Staff members have not enforced ICANN’s contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract; and

(C) Claims regarding the Post-Transition IANA entity service complaints by direct customers of the IANA naming functions that are not resolved through mediation.

EMERGENCY PANELIST refers to a single member of the STANDING PANEL designated to adjudicate requests for interim relief or, if a STANDING PANEL is not in place at the time the relevant IRP is initiated, it shall refer to the panelist appointed by the ICDR pursuant to ICDR RULES relating to appointment of panelists for emergency relief (ICDR RULES Article 6).

IANA refers to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority.

ICDR refers to the International Centre for Dispute Resolution, which has been designated and approved by ICANN’s Board of Directors as the IRP Provider (IRPP) under Article 4, Section 4.3 of ICANN’s Bylaws.

ICANN refers to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.

INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS or IRP refers to the procedure that takes place upon the Claimant’s filing of a written statement of a DISPUTE with the ICDR.

IRP PANEL refers to the panel of three neutral members appointed to decide the relevant DISPUTE.

IRP PANEL DECISION refers to the final written decision of the IRP PANEL that reflects the reasoned analysis of how the DISPUTE was resolved in compliance with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws.

ICDR RULES refers to the ICDR’s International Arbitration rules in effect at the time the relevant request for independent review is submitted.

PROCEDURES OFFICER refers to a single member of the STANDING PANEL designated to adjudicate requests for consolidation, intervention, and/or participation as an amicus, or, if a STANDING PANEL is not in place at the time the relevant IRP is initiated, it shall refer to the panelist appointed by the ICDR pursuant to its International Arbitration Rules relating to appointment of panelists for consolidation (ICDR Rules Article 8).

PURPOSES OF THE IRP are to hear and resolve Disputes for the reasons specified in the ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(a).
STANDING PANEL refers to an omnibus standing panel of at least seven members from which three-member IRP PANELS are selected to hear and resolve DISPUTES consistent with the purposes of the IRP.

2. Scope

The ICDR will apply these Interim Supplementary Procedures, in addition to the ICDR RULES, in all cases submitted to the ICDR in connection with Article 4, Section 4.3 of the ICANN Bylaws after the date these Interim Supplementary Procedures go into effect. In the event there is any inconsistency between these Interim Supplementary Procedures and the ICDR RULES, these Interim Supplementary Procedures will govern. These Interim Supplementary Procedures and any amendment of them shall apply in the form in effect at the time the request for an INDEPENDENT REVIEW is commenced. IRPs commenced prior to the adoption of these Interim Supplementary Procedures shall be governed by the Supplementary Procedures in effect at the time such IRPs were commenced.

In the event that any of these Interim Supplementary Procedures are subsequently amended, the rules surrounding the application of those amendments will be defined therein.

3. Composition of Independent Review Panel

The IRP PANEL will comprise three panelists selected from the STANDING PANEL, unless a STANDING PANEL is not in place when the IRP is initiated. The CLAIMANT and ICANN shall each select one panelist from the STANDING PANEL, and the two panelists selected by the parties will select the third panelist from the STANDING PANEL. A STANDING PANEL member’s appointment will not take effect unless and until the STANDING PANEL member signs a Notice of STANDING PANEL Appointment affirming that the member is available to serve and is Independent and Impartial pursuant to the ICDR RULES. In addition to disclosing relationships with parties to the DISPUTE, IRP PANEL members must also disclose the existence of any material relationships with ICANN, and/or an ICANN Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee. In the event that a STANDING PANEL is not in place when the relevant IRP is initiated or is in place but does not have capacity due to other IRP commitments, the CLAIMANT and ICANN shall each select a qualified panelist from outside the STANDING PANEL, and the two panelists selected by the parties shall select the third panelist. In the event that the two party-selected panelists cannot agree on the third panelist, the ICDR RULES shall apply to selection of the third panelist. In the event that a panelist resigns, is incapable of performing the duties of a panelist, or is removed and the position becomes vacant, a substitute arbitrator shall be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this Section [3] of these Interim Supplementary Procedures.
4. **Time for Filing**

An INDEPENDENT REVIEW is commenced when CLAIMANT files a written statement of a DISPUTE. A CLAIMANT shall file a written statement of a DISPUTE with the ICDR no more than 120 days after a CLAIMANT becomes aware of the material effect of the action or inaction giving rise to the DISPUTE; provided, however, that a statement of a DISPUTE may not be filed more than twelve (12) months from the date of such action or inaction.

In order for an IRP to be deemed to have been timely filed, all fees must be paid to the ICDR within three business days (as measured by the ICDR) of the filing of the request with the ICDR.

5. **Conduct of the Independent Review**

It is in the best interests of ICANN and of the ICANN community for IRP matters to be resolved expeditiously and at a reasonably low cost while ensuring fundamental fairness and due process consistent with the PURPOSES OF THE IRP. The IRP PANEL shall consider accessibility, fairness, and efficiency (both as to time and cost) in its conduct of the IRP.

In the event that an EMERGENCY PANELIST has been designated to adjudicate a request for interim relief pursuant to the Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(p), the EMERGENCY PANELIST shall comply with the rules applicable to an IRP PANEL, with such modifications as appropriate.

5A. **Nature of IRP Proceedings**

The IRP PANEL should conduct its proceedings by electronic means to the extent feasible.

Hearings shall be permitted as set forth in these Interim Supplementary Procedures. Where necessary, the IRP PANEL may conduct hearings via telephone, video conference or similar technologies. The IRP PANEL should conduct its proceedings with the presumption that in-person hearings shall not be permitted. For purposes of these Interim Supplementary Procedures, an “in-person hearing” refers to any IRP proceeding held face-to-face, with participants physically present in the same location. The presumption against in-person hearings may be rebutted only under extraordinary circumstances, where, upon motion by a Party, the IRP PANEL determines that the party seeking an in-person hearing has demonstrated that: (1) an in-

---

3 The IOT recently sought additional public comment to consider the Time for Filing rule that will be recommended for inclusion in the final set of Supplementary Procedures. In the event that the final Time for Filing procedure allows additional time to file than this interim Supplementary Procedure allows, ICANN committed to the IOT that the final Supplementary Procedures will include transition language that provides potential claimants the benefit of that additional time, so as not to prejudice those potential claimants.
person hearing is necessary for a fair resolution of the claim; (2) an in-person hearing is necessary to further the PURPOSES OF THE IRP; and (3) considerations of fairness and furtherance of the PURPOSES OF THE IRP outweigh the time and financial expense of an in-person hearing. In no circumstances shall in-person hearings be permitted for the purpose of introducing new arguments or evidence that could have been previously presented, but were not previously presented, to the IRP PANEL.

All hearings shall be limited to argument only unless the IRP Panel determines that a the party seeking to present witness testimony has demonstrated that such testimony is: (1) necessary for a fair resolution of the claim; (2) necessary to further the PURPOSES OF THE IRP; and (3) considerations of fairness and furtherance of the PURPOSES OF THE IRP outweigh the time and financial expense of witness testimony and cross examination.

All evidence, including witness statements, must be submitted in writing 15 days in advance of any hearing.

With due regard to ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(s), the IRP PANEL retains responsibility for determining the timetable for the IRP proceeding. Any violation of the IRP PANEL’s timetable may result in the assessment of costs pursuant to Section 10 of these Interim Supplementary Procedures.

5B. Translation

As required by ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(l), “All IRP proceedings shall be administered in English as the primary working language, with provision of translation services for CLAIMANTS if needed.” Translation may include both translation of written documents/transcripts as well as interpretation of oral proceedings.

The IRP PANEL shall have discretion to determine (i) whether the CLAIMANT has a need for translation services, (ii) what documents and/or hearing that need relates to, and (iii) what language the document, hearing or other matter or event shall be translated into. A CLAIMANT not determined to have a need for translation services must submit all materials in English (with the exception of the request for translation services if the request includes CLAIMANT’s certification to the IRP PANEL that submitting the request in English would be unduly burdensome).

In determining whether a CLAIMANT needs translation, the IRP PANEL shall consider the CLAIMANT’s proficiency in spoken and written English and, to the extent that the CLAIMANT is represented in the proceedings by an attorney or other agent, that representative’s proficiency
in spoken and written English. The IRP PANEL shall only consider requests for translations from/to English and the other five official languages of the United Nations (i.e., Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, or Spanish).

In determining whether translation of a document, hearing or other matter or event shall be ordered, the IRP PANEL shall consider the CLAIMANT’s proficiency in English as well as in the requested other language (from among Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian or Spanish). The IRP PANEL shall confirm that all material portions of the record of the proceeding are available in English.

In considering requests for translation, the IRP PANEL shall consider the materiality of the particular document, hearing or other matter or event requested to be translated, as well as the cost and delay incurred by translation, pursuant to ICDR Article 18 on Translation, and the need to ensure fundamental fairness and due process under ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(n)(iv).

Unless otherwise ordered by the IRP PANEL, costs of need-based translation (as determined by the IRP PANEL) shall be covered by ICANN as administrative costs and shall be coordinated through ICANN’s language services providers. Even with a determination of need-based translation, if ICANN or the CLAIMANT coordinates the translation of any document through its legal representative, such translation shall be considered part of the legal costs and not an administrative cost to be born by ICANN. Additionally, in the event that either the CLAIMANT or ICANN retains a translator for the purpose of translating any document, hearing or other matter or event, and such retention is not pursuant to a determination of need-based translation by the IRP PANEL, the costs of such translation shall not be charged as administrative costs to be covered by ICANN.

6. Written Statements

A CLAIMANT’S written statement of a DISPUTE shall include all claims that give rise to a particular DISPUTE, but such claims may be asserted as independent or alternative claims.

The initial written submissions of the parties shall not exceed 25 pages each in argument, double-spaced and in 12-point font. All necessary and available evidence in support of the CLAIMANT’S claim(s) should be part of the initial written submission. Evidence will not be included when calculating the page limit. The parties may submit expert evidence in writing, and there shall be one right of reply to that expert evidence. The IRP PANEL may request additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the Board, the Supporting Organizations, or from other parties.
In addition, the IRP PANEL may grant a request for additional written submissions from any person or entity who is intervening as a CLAIMANT or who is participating as an amicus upon the showing of a compelling basis for such request. In the event the IRP PANEL grants a request for additional written submissions, any such additional written submission shall not exceed 15 pages, double-spaced and in 12-point font.

For any DISPUTE resulting from a decision of a process-specific expert panel that is claimed to be inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, as specified at Bylaw Section 4.3(b)(iii)(A)(3), any person, group or entity that was previously identified as within a contention set with the CLAIMANT regarding the issue under consideration within such expert panel proceeding shall reasonably receive notice from ICANN that the INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS has commenced. ICANN shall undertake reasonable efforts to provide notice by electronic message within two business days (calculated at ICANN’s principal place of business) of receiving notification from the ICDR that the IRP has commenced.

7. Consolidation, Intervention and Participation as an Amicus

A PROCEDURES OFFICER shall be appointed from the STANDING PANEL to consider any request for consolidation, intervention, and/or participation as an amicus. Except as otherwise expressly stated herein, requests for consolidation, intervention, and/or participation as an amicus are committed to the reasonable discretion of the PROCEDURES OFFICER. In the event that no STANDING PANEL is in place when a PROCEDURES OFFICER must be selected, a panelist may be appointed by the ICDR pursuant to its INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION RULES relating to appointment of panelists for consolidation.

In the event that requests for consolidation or intervention are granted, the restrictions on Written Statements set forth in Section 6 shall apply to all CLAIMANTS collectively (for a total of 25 pages exclusive of evidence) and not individually unless otherwise modified by the IRP PANEL in its discretion consistent with the PURPOSES OF THE IRP.

Consolidation

Consolidation of DISPUTES may be appropriate when the PROCEDURES OFFICER concludes that there is a sufficient common nucleus of operative fact among multiple IRPs such that the joint resolution of the DISPUTES would foster a more just and efficient resolution of the DISPUTES than addressing each DISPUTE individually. If DISPUTES are consolidated, each existing DISPUTE shall no longer be subject to further separate consideration. The PROCEDURES OFFICER may in its discretion order briefing to consider the propriety of consolidation of DISPUTES.
Intervention

Any person or entity qualified to be a CLAIMANT pursuant to the standing requirement set forth in the Bylaws may intervene in an IRP with the permission of the PROCEDURES OFFICER, as provided below. This applies whether or not the person, group or entity participated in an underlying proceeding (a process-specific expert panel per ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(b)(iii)(A)(3)).

Intervention is appropriate to be sought when the prospective participant does not already have a pending related DISPUTE, and the potential claims of the prospective participant stem from a common nucleus of operative facts based on such briefing as the PROCEDURES OFFICER may order in its discretion.

In addition, the Supporting Organization(s) which developed a Consensus Policy involved when a DISPUTE challenges a material provision(s) of an existing Consensus Policy in whole or in part shall have a right to intervene as a CLAIMANT to the extent of such challenge. Supporting Organization rights in this respect shall be exercisable through the chair of the Supporting Organization.

Any person, group or entity who intervenes as a CLAIMANT pursuant to this section will become a CLAIMANT in the existing INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS and have all of the rights and responsibilities of other CLAIMANTS in that matter and be bound by the outcome to the same extent as any other CLAIMANT. All motions to intervene or for consolidation shall be directed to the IRP PANEL within 15 days of the initiation of the INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS. All requests to intervene or for consolidation must contain the same information as a written statement of a DISPUTE and must be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee. The IRP PANEL may accept for review by the PROCEDURES OFFICER any motion to intervene or for consolidation after 15 days in cases where it deems that the PURPOSES OF THE IRP are furthered by accepting such a motion.

Excluding materials exempted from production under Rule 8 (Exchange of Information) below, the IRP PANEL shall direct that all materials related to the DISPUTE be made available to entities that have intervened or had their claim consolidated unless a CLAIMANT or ICANN objects that such disclosure will harm commercial confidentiality, personal data, or trade secrets; in which case the IRP PANEL shall rule on objection and provide such information as is consistent with the PURPOSES OF THE IRP and the appropriate preservation of confidentiality as recognized in Article 4 of the Bylaws.
Participation as an Amicus Curiae

Any person, group, or entity that has a material interest relevant to the DISPUTE but does not satisfy the standing requirements for a CLAIMANT set forth in the Bylaws may participate as an amicus curiae before an IRP PANEL, subject to the limitations set forth below. Without limitation to the persons, groups, or entities that may have such a material interest, the following persons, groups, or entities shall be deemed to have a material interest relevant to the DISPUTE and, upon request of person, group, or entity seeking to so participate, shall be permitted to participate as an amicus before the IRP PANEL:

i. A person, group or entity that participated in an underlying proceeding (a process-specific expert panel per ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(b)(iii)(A)(3));

ii. If the IRP relates to an application arising out of ICANN’s New gTLD Program, a person, group or entity that was part of a contention set for the string at issue in the IRP; and

iii. If the briefings before the IRP PANEL significantly refer to actions taken by a person, group or entity that is external to the DISPUTE, such external person, group or entity.

All requests to participate as an amicus must contain the same information as the Written Statement (set out at Section 6), specify the interest of the amicus curiae, and must be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee.

If the PROCEDURES OFFICER determines, in his or her discretion, subject to the conditions set forth above, that the proposed amicus curiae has a material interest relevant to the DISPUTE, he or she shall allow participation by the amicus curiae. Any person participating as an amicus curiae may submit to the IRP Panel written briefing(s) on the DISPUTE or on such discrete questions as the IRP PANEL may request briefing, in the discretion of the IRP PANEL and subject to such deadlines, page limits, and other procedural rules as the IRP PANEL may specify in its discretion.4 The IRP PANEL shall determine in its discretion what materials related to the DISPUTE to make available to a person participating as an amicus curiae.

4 During the pendency of these Interim Supplementary Rules, in exercising its discretion in allowing the participation of amicus curiae and in then considering the scope of participation from amicus curiae, the IRP PANEL shall lean in favor of allowing broad participation of an amicus curiae as needed to further the purposes of the IRP set forth at Section 4.3 of the ICANN Bylaws.
8. Exchange of Information

The IRP PANEL shall be guided by considerations of accessibility, fairness, and efficiency (both as to time and cost) in its consideration of requests for exchange of information.

On the motion of either Party and upon finding by the IRP PANEL that such exchange of information is necessary to further the PURPOSES OF THE IRP, the IRP PANEL may order a Party to produce to the other Party, and to the IRP PANEL if the moving Party requests, documents or electronically stored information in the other Party’s possession, custody, or control that the Panel determines are reasonably likely to be relevant and material to the resolution of the CLAIMS and/or defenses in the DISPUTE and are not subject to the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine or otherwise protected from disclosure by applicable law (including, without limitation, disclosures to competitors of the dislosing person, group or entity, of any competition-sensitive information of any kind). Where such method(s) for exchange of information are allowed, all Parties shall be granted the equivalent rights for exchange of information.

A motion for exchange of documents shall contain a description of the specific documents, classes of documents or other information sought that relate to the subject matter of the Dispute along with an explanation of why such documents or other information are likely to be relevant and material to resolution of the Dispute.

Depositions, interrogatories, and requests for admission will not be permitted.

In the event that a Party submits what the IRP PANEL deems to be an expert opinion, such opinion must be provided in writing and the other Party must have a right of reply to such an opinion with an expert opinion of its own.

9. Summary Dismissal

An IRP PANEL may summarily dismiss any request for INDEPENDENT REVIEW where the Claimant has not demonstrated that it has been materially affected by a DISPUTE. To be materially affected by a DISPUTE, a Claimant must suffer an injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the alleged violation.

An IRP PANEL may also summarily dismiss a request for INDEPENDENT REVIEW that lacks substance or is frivolous or vexatious.
10. Interim Measures of Protection

A Claimant may request interim relief from the IRP PANEL, or if an IRP PANEL is not yet in place, from the STANDING PANEL. Interim relief may include prospective relief, interlocutory relief, or declaratory or injunctive relief, and specifically may include a stay of the challenged ICANN action or decision in order to maintain the status quo until such time as the opinion of the IRP PANEL is considered by ICANN as described in ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(o)(iv).

An EMERGENCY PANELIST shall be selected from the STANDING PANEL to adjudicate requests for interim relief. In the event that no STANDING PANEL is in place when an EMERGENCY PANELIST must be selected, a panelist may be appointed by the ICDR pursuant to ICDR RULES relating to appointment of panelists for emergency relief. Interim relief may only be provided if the EMERGENCY PANELIST determines that the Claimant has established all of the following factors:

(i) A harm for which there will be no adequate remedy in the absence of such relief;

(ii) Either: (A) likelihood of success on the merits; or (B) sufficiently serious questions related to the merits; and

(iii) A balance of hardships tipping decidedly toward the party seeking relief.

Interim relief may be granted on an ex parte basis in circumstances that the EMERGENCY PANELIST deems exigent, but any Party whose arguments were not considered prior to the granting of such interim relief may submit any opposition to such interim relief, and the EMERGENCY PANELIST must consider such arguments, as soon as reasonably possible. The EMERGENCY PANELIST may modify or terminate the interim relief if the EMERGENCY PANELIST deems it appropriate to do so in light of such further arguments.

11. Standard of Review

Each IRP PANEL shall conduct an objective, de novo examination of the DISPUTE.

a. With respect to COVERED ACTIONS, the IRP PANEL shall make findings of fact to determine whether the COVERED ACTION constituted an action or inaction that violated ICANN’S Articles or Bylaws.
b. All DISPUTES shall be decided in compliance with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws, as understood in the context of the norms of applicable law and prior relevant IRP decisions.

c. For Claims arising out of the Board’s exercise of its fiduciary duties, the IRP PANEL shall not replace the Board’s reasonable judgment with its own so long as the Board’s action or inaction is within the realm of reasonable business judgment.

d. With respect to claims that ICANN has not enforced its contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract, the standard of review shall be whether there was a material breach of ICANN’s obligations under the IANA Naming Function Contract, where the alleged breach has resulted in material harm to the Claimant.

e. IRPs initiated through the mechanism contemplated at Article 4, Section 4.3(a)(iv) of ICANN’s Bylaws shall be subject to a separate standard of review as defined in the IANA Naming Function Contract.

12. IRP PANEL Decisions

IRP PANEL DECISIONS shall be made by a simple majority of the IRP PANEL. If any IRP PANEL member fails to sign the IRP PANEL DECISION, the IRP PANEL member shall endeavor to provide a written statement of the reason for the absence of such signature.

13. Form and Effect of an IRP PANEL DECISION

a. IRP PANEL DECISIONS shall be made in writing, promptly by the IRP PANEL, based on the documentation, supporting materials and arguments submitted by the parties. IRP PANEL DECISIONS shall be issued in English, and the English version will be authoritative over any translations.

b. The IRP PANEL DECISION shall specifically designate the prevailing party as to each Claim.

c. Subject to Article 4, Section 4.3 of ICANN’s Bylaws, all IRP PANEL DECISIONS shall be made public, and shall reflect a well-reasoned application of how the DISPUTE was resolved in compliance with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws, as understood in light of prior IRP PANEL DECISIONS decided under
the same (or an equivalent prior) version of the provision of the Articles and Bylaws at issue, and norms of applicable law.

14. Appeal of IRP PANEL Decisions

An IRP PANEL DECISION may be appealed to the full STANDING PANEL sitting en banc within 60 days of the issuance of such decision. The en banc STANDING PANEL will review such appealed IRP PANEL DECISION based on a clear error of judgment or the application of an incorrect legal standard. The en banc STANDING PANEL may also resolve any disputes between panelists on an IRP PANEL or the PROCEDURES OFFICER with respect to consolidation of CLAIMS or intervention.

15. Costs

The IRP PANEL shall fix costs in its IRP PANEL DECISION. Except as otherwise provided in Article 4, Section 4.3(e)(ii) of ICANN’s Bylaws, each party to an IRP proceeding shall bear its own legal expenses, except that ICANN shall bear all costs associated with a Community IRP, as defined in Article 4, Section 4.3(d) of ICANN’s Bylaws, including the costs of all legal counsel and technical experts.

Except with respect to a Community IRP, the IRP PANEL may shift and provide for the losing party to pay administrative costs and/or fees of the prevailing party in the event it identifies the losing party’s Claim or defense as frivolous or abusive.
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ARTICLE 1 MISSION, COMMITMENTS AND CORE VALUES

Section 1.1. MISSION

(a) The mission of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)") is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet’s unique identifier systems as described in this Section 1.1(a) (the "Mission"). Specifically, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers):

(i) Coordinates the allocation and assignment of names in the root zone of the Domain Name (Domain Name) System ("DNS (Domain Name System)") and coordinates the development and implementation of policies concerning the registration of second-level domain names in generic top-level domains ("gTLDs"). In this role, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s scope is to coordinate the development and implementation of policies:

- For which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and/or stability of the DNS (Domain Name System) including, with respect to gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registrars and registries, policies in the areas described in Annex G-1 and Annex G-2; and

- That are developed through a bottom-up consensus-based multistakeholder process and designed to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique names systems.
The issues, policies, procedures, and principles addressed in Annex G-1 and Annex G-2 with respect to gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registrars and registries shall be deemed to be within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission.

(ii) Facilitates the coordination of the operation and evolution of the DNS (Domain Name System) root name server system.

(iii) Coordinates the allocation and assignment at the top-most level of Internet Protocol (Protocol) numbers and Autonomous System numbers. In service of its Mission, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (A) provides registration services and open access for global number registries as requested by the Internet Engineering Task Force ("IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force)") and the Regional Internet Registries ("RIRs") and (B) facilitates the development of global number registry policies by the affected community and other related tasks as agreed with the RIRs.

(iv) Collaborates with other bodies as appropriate to provide registries needed for the functioning of the Internet as specified by Internet protocol standards development organizations. In service of its Mission, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s scope is to provide registration services and open access for registries in the public domain requested by Internet protocol development organizations.

(b) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not act outside its Mission.

(c) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not regulate (i.e., impose rules and restrictions on) services that use the Internet's unique identifiers or the content that such services carry or provide, outside the express scope of Section 1.1(a). For the avoidance of doubt, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not hold any governmentally authorized regulatory authority.

(d) For the avoidance of doubt and notwithstanding the foregoing:

(i) the foregoing prohibitions are not intended to limit ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s authority or ability to
(ii) Notwithstanding any provision of the Bylaws to the contrary, the terms and conditions of the documents listed in subsections (A) through (C) below, and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s performance of its obligations or duties thereunder, may not be challenged by any party in any proceeding against, or process involving, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (including a request for reconsideration or an independent review process pursuant to Article 4) on the basis that such terms and conditions conflict with, or are in violation of, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission or otherwise exceed the scope of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s authority or powers pursuant to these Bylaws ("Bylaws") or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation ("Articles of Incorporation"):

(A)

1) all registry agreements and registrar accreditation agreements between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and registry operators or registrars in force on 1 October 2016 \([1]\), including, in each case, any terms or conditions therein that are not contained in the underlying form of registry agreement and registrar accreditation agreement;

2) any registry agreement or registrar accreditation agreement not encompassed by (1) above to the extent its terms do not materially from the form of registry agreement or registrar accreditation agreement that existed on 1 October 2016;

(B) any renewals of agreements described in subsection (A) pursuant to their terms and conditions for renewal; and

(C) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Five-Year Strategic Plan and Five-Year Operating Plan (Five-Year Operating Plan) existing on 10 March 2016.
(iii) Section 1.1(d)(ii) does not limit the ability of a party to any agreement described therein to challenge any provision of such agreement on any other basis, including the other party's interpretation of the provision, in any proceeding or process involving ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(iv) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall have the ability to negotiate, enter into and enforce agreements, including public interest commitments, with any party in service of its Mission.

Section 1.2. COMMITMENTS AND CORE VALUES

In performing its Mission, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will act in a manner that complies with and reflects ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Commitments and respects ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Core Values, each as described below.

(a) COMMITMENTS

In performing its Mission, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) must operate in a manner consistent with these Bylaws for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and international conventions and applicable local law, through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets. Specifically, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) commits to do the following (each, a "Commitment," and collectively, the "Commitments"):  

(i) Preserve and enhance the administration of the DNS (Domain Name System) and the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS (Domain Name System) and the Internet;

(ii) Maintain the capacity and ability to coordinate the DNS (Domain Name System) at the overall level and work for the maintenance of a single, interoperable Internet;
(iii) Respect the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s activities to matters that are within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission and require or significantly benefit from global coordination;

(iv) Employ open, transparent and bottom up, multistakeholder policy development processes that are led by the private sector (including business stakeholders, civil society, the technical community, academia, and end users) while duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities. These processes shall (A) seek input from the public, for whose benefit ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in all events shall act, (B) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (C) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process;

(v) Make decisions by applying documented policies consistently, neutrally, objectively, and fairly, without singling out any particular party for discriminatory treatment (i.e., making an unjustified prejudicial distinction between or among different parties); and

(vi) Remain accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms defined in these Bylaws that enhance ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s effectiveness

(b) **CORE VALUES**

In performing its Mission, the following "**Core Values**" should also guide the decisions and actions of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers):

(i) To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of, other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties and the roles of bodies internal to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and relevant external expert bodies;

(ii) Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels
of policy development and decision-making to ensure that the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process is used to ascertain the global public interest and that those processes are accountable and transparent;

(iii) Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment in the DNS (Domain Name System) market;

(iv) Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial to the public interest as identified through the bottom up, multistakeholder policy development process;

(v) Operating with efficiency and excellence, in a fiscally responsible and accountable manner and, where practicable and not inconsistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s other obligations under these Bylaws, at a speed that is responsive to the needs of the global Internet community;

(vi) While remaining rooted in the private sector (including business stakeholders, civil society, the technical community, academia, and end users), recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities;

(vii) Striving to achieve a reasonable balance between the interests of different stakeholders, while also avoiding capture; and

(viii) Subject to the limitations set forth in Section 27.2, within the scope of its Mission and other Core Values, respecting internationally recognized human rights as required by applicable law. This Core Value does not create, and shall not be interpreted to create, any obligation on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) outside its Mission, or beyond obligations found in applicable law. This Core Value does not obligate ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to enforce its human rights obligations, or the human rights obligations of other parties, against other parties.

(c) The Commitments and Core Values are intended to apply in the broadest possible range of circumstances. The Commitments reflect ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s fundamental compact with the global Internet community and are intended to apply consistently and comprehensively to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s activities. The specific way in which Core Values are applied, individually and collectively, to any given situation may depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated. Situations may arise in which perfect fidelity to all Core Values simultaneously is not possible. Accordingly, in any situation where one Core Value must be balanced with another, potentially competing Core Value, the result of the balancing must serve a policy developed through the bottom up multistakeholder process or otherwise best serve ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission.

ARTICLE 2 POWERS

Section 2.1. GENERAL POWERS

Except as otherwise provided in the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, the powers of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be exercised by, and its property controlled and its business and affairs conducted by or under the direction of, the Board (as defined in Section 7.1). With respect to any matters that would fall within the provisions of Section 3.6(a)-(c), the Board may act only by a majority vote of all Directors. In all other matters, except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws or by law, the Board may act by majority vote of the Directors present at any annual, regular, or special meeting of the Board. Any references in these Bylaws to a vote of the Board shall mean the vote of only those Directors present at the meeting where a quorum is present unless otherwise specifically provided in these Bylaws by reference to "of all Directors."

Section 2.2. RESTRICTIONS

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not act as a Domain Name (Domain Name) System Registry or Registrar or Internet Protocol (Protocol) Address Registry in competition with entities affected by the policies of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). Nothing in this Section 2.2 is intended to prevent ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) from taking whatever steps are necessary to protect the operational stability of the Internet in the event of financial failure of a Registry or Registrar or other emergency.
Section 2.3. NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition.

ARTICLE 3 TRANSPARENCY

Section 3.1. OPEN AND TRANSPARENT

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and its constituent bodies shall operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness, including implementing procedures to (a) provide advance notice to facilitate stakeholder engagement in policy development decision-making and cross-community deliberations, (b) maintain responsive consultation procedures that provide detailed explanations of the basis for decisions (including how comments have influenced the development of policy considerations), and (c) encourage fact-based policy development work.

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall also implement procedures for the documentation and public disclosure of the rationale for decisions made by the Board and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s constituent bodies (including the detailed explanations discussed above).

Section 3.2. WEBSITE

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall maintain a publicly accessible Internet World Wide Web site (the "Website"), which may include, among other things, (a) a calendar of scheduled meetings of the Board, the EC (Empowered Community) (as defined in Section 6.1(a)), Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) (as defined in Section 11.1), and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) (as defined in Section 12.1); (b) a docket of all pending policy development matters, including their schedule and current status; (c) specific meeting notices and agendas as described below; (d) information on the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget (as defined in Section 22.4(a)(i)), the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget (as defined in Section 22.4(b)(i)), annual audit, financial contributors and the amount of their contributions, and related matters; (e) information about the
availability of accountability mechanisms, including reconsideration, independent review, and Ombudsman activities, as well as information about the outcome of specific requests and complaints invoking these mechanisms; (f) announcements about ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) activities of interest to significant segments of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community; (g) comments received from the community on policies being developed and other matters; (h) information about ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s physical meetings and public forums; and (i) other information of interest to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community.

Section 3.3. MANAGER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There shall be a staff position designated as Manager of Public Participation, or such other title as shall be determined by the President, that shall be responsible, under the direction of the President, for coordinating the various aspects of public participation in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), including the Website and various other means of communicating with and receiving input from the general community of Internet users.

Section 3.4. MEETING NOTICES AND AGENDAS

At least seven days in advance of each Board meeting (or if not practicable, as far in advance as is practicable), a notice of such meeting and, to the extent known, an agenda for the meeting shall be posted.

Section 3.5. MINUTES AND PRELIMINARY REPORTS

a. All minutes of meetings of the Board, the Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) and Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) (and any councils thereof) shall be approved promptly by the originating body and provided to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary "Secretary") for posting on the Website. All proceedings of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration (as defined in Section 6.3) and the EC (Empowered Community) shall be provided to the Secretary for posting on the Website.
b. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the second business day after the conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office), any resolutions passed by the Board at that meeting shall be made publicly available on the Website; provided, however, that any actions relating to personnel or employment matters, legal matters (to the extent the Board determines it is necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)), matters that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is prohibited by law or contract from disclosing publicly, and other matters that the Board determines, by a three quarters (3/4) vote of Directors present at the meeting and voting, are not appropriate for public distribution, shall not be included in the resolutions made publicly available. The Secretary shall send notice to the Board and the Chairs of the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) (as set forth in Article 9 through Article 11) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) (as set forth in Article 12) informing them that the resolutions have been posted.

c. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the seventh business days after the conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office), any actions taken by the Board shall be made publicly available in a preliminary report on the Website, subject to the limitations on disclosure set forth in Section 3.5(b) above. For any matters that the Board determines not to disclose, the Board shall describe in general terms in the relevant preliminary report the reason for such nondisclosure.

d. No later than the day after the date on which they are formally approved by the Board (or, if such day is not a business day, as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office, then the next immediately following business day), the minutes of the Board shall be made publicly available on the Website; provided, however, that any minutes of the Board relating to personnel or employment matters, legal matters (to the extent the Board determines it is necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)), matters that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is prohibited by law or
contract from disclosing publicly, and other matters that the Board determines, by a three-quarters (3/4) vote of Directors present at the meeting and voting, are not appropriate for public distribution, shall not be included in the minutes made publicly available. For any matters that the Board determines not to disclose, the Board shall describe in general terms in the relevant minutes the reason for such nondisclosure.

Section 3.6. NOTICE AND COMMENT ON POLICY ACTIONS

(a) With respect to any policies that are being considered by the Board for adoption that substantially affect the operation of the Internet or third parties, including the imposition of any fees or charges, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall:

(i) provide public notice on the Website explaining what policies are being considered for adoption and why, at least twenty-one days (and if practical, earlier) prior to any action by the Board;

(ii) provide a reasonable opportunity for parties to comment on the adoption of the proposed policies, to see the comments of others, and to reply to those comments (such comment period to be aligned with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s public comment practices), prior to any action by the Board; and

(iii) in those cases where the policy action affects public policy concerns, to request the opinion of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) ("GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)" or "Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)"") and take duly into account any advice timely presented by the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) on its own initiative or at the Board's request.

(b) Where both practically feasible and consistent with the relevant policy development process, an in-person public forum shall also be held for discussion of any proposed policies as described in Section 3.6(a)(ii), prior to any final Board action.
(c) After taking action on any policy subject to this Section 3.6, the Board shall publish in the meeting minutes the rationale for any resolution adopted by the Board (including the possible material effects, if any, of its decision on the global public interest, including a discussion of the material impacts to the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System), financial impacts or other issues that were considered by the Board in approving such resolutions), the vote of each Director voting on the resolution, and the separate statement of any Director desiring publication of such a statement.

(d) Where a Board resolution is consistent with GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice (as defined in Section 12.2(a) (x)), the Board shall make a determination whether the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice was a material factor in the Board's adoption of such resolution, in which case the Board shall so indicate in such resolution approving the decision (a "GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Board Resolution") and shall cite the applicable GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice. To the extent practical, the Board shall ensure that GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Board Resolutions only relate to the matters that were the subject of the applicable GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice and not matters unrelated to the applicable GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice. For the avoidance of doubt: (i) a GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Board Resolution shall not have the effect of making any other Board resolutions in the same set or series so designated, unless other resolutions are specifically identified as such by the Board; and (ii) a Board resolution approving an action consistent with GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice received during a standard engagement process in which input from all Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) has been requested shall not be considered a GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Board Resolution based solely on that input, unless the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice was a material factor in the Board's adoption of such resolution.

(e) GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Carve-out
(i) Where a Board resolution is consistent with GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice and the Board has determined that the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice was a material factor in the Board's adoption of such resolution as described in the relevant GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Board Resolution, the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall not participate as a decision-maker in the EC (Empowered Community)'s exercise of its right to challenge the Board's implementation of such GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice. In such cases, the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) may participate in the EC (Empowered Community) in an advisory capacity only with respect to the applicable processes described in Annex D, but its views will not count as support or an objection for purposes of the thresholds needed to convene a community forum or exercise any right of the EC (Empowered Community) ("GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Carve-out"). In the case of a Board Recall Process (as defined in Section 3.3 of Annex D), the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Carve-out shall only apply if an IRP Panel has found that, in implementing GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice, the Board acted inconsistently with the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws.

(ii) When the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Carve-out applies (A) any petition notice provided in accordance with Annex D or Approval Action Board Notice (as defined in Section 1.2 of Annex D) shall include a statement that cites the specific GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Board Resolution and the line item or provision that implements such specific GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Board Resolution ("GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Statement"), (B) the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall not be eligible to support or object to any petition pursuant to Annex D or Approval Action (as defined in Section 1.1 of Annex D), and (C) any EC (Empowered Community) Decision (as defined in Section 4.1(a) of Annex D) that requires the support of four or more Decisional Participants (as defined in Section 6.1(a)) pursuant to Annex D shall instead require the support of three or more Decisional Participants with no more than one Decisional Participant objecting.
(iii) For the avoidance of doubt, the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Carve-out shall not apply to the exercise of the EC (Empowered Community)’s rights where a material factor in the Board’s decision was advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) that was not GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice.

Section 3.7. TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS

As appropriate and to the extent provided in the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall facilitate the translation of final published documents into various appropriate languages.

ARTICLE 4 ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW

Section 4.1. PURPOSE

In carrying out its Mission, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be accountable to the community for operating in accordance with the Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws, including the Mission set forth in Article 1 of these Bylaws. This Article 4 creates reconsideration and independent review processes for certain actions as set forth in these Bylaws and procedures for periodic review of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s structure and operations, which are intended to reinforce the various accountability mechanisms otherwise set forth in these Bylaws, including the transparency provisions of Article 3 and the Board and other selection mechanisms set forth throughout these Bylaws.

Section 4.2. RECONSIDERATION

(a) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall have in place a process by which any person or entity materially affected by an action or inaction of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board or Staff may request ("Requestor") the review or reconsideration of that action or inaction by the Board. For purposes of these Bylaws, "Staff" includes employees and individual long-term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names
and Numbers) does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors directly.

(b) The EC (Empowered Community) may file a Reconsideration Request (as defined in Section 4.2(c)) if approved pursuant to Section 4.3 of Annex D ("Community Reconsideration Request") and if the matter relates to the exercise of the powers and rights of the EC (Empowered Community) of these Bylaws. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall act as the Requestor for such a Community Reconsideration Request and shall act on behalf of the EC (Empowered Community) for such Community Reconsideration Request as directed by the Decisional Participants, as further described in Section 4.3 of Annex D.

(c) A Requestor may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) action or inaction ("Reconsideration Request") to the extent that the Requestor has been adversely affected by:

(i) One or more Board or Staff actions or inactions that contradict ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission, Commitments, Core Values and/or established ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policy(ies);

(ii) One or more actions or inactions of the Board or Staff that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the Requestor could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board's or Staff's consideration at the time of action or refusal to act; or

(iii) One or more actions or inactions of the Board or Staff that are taken as a result of the Board's or staff's reliance on false or inaccurate relevant information.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section 4.2, the scope of reconsideration shall exclude the following:

(i) Disputes relating to country code top-level domain ("ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain)") delegations and re-delegations;

(ii) Disputes relating to Internet numbering resources; and
(iii) Disputes relating to protocol parameters.

(e) The Board has designated the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee to review and consider Reconsideration Requests. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall have the authority to:

(i) Evaluate Reconsideration Requests;

(ii) Summarily dismiss insufficient or frivolous Reconsideration Requests;

(iii) Evaluate Reconsideration Requests for urgent consideration;

(iv) Conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;

(v) Request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from other parties; and

(vi) Make a recommendation to the Board on the merits of the Reconsideration Request, if it has not been summarily dismissed.

(f) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall absorb the normal administrative costs of the Reconsideration Request process. Except with respect to a Community Reconsideration Request, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) reserves the right to recover from a party requesting review or reconsideration any costs that are deemed to be extraordinary in nature. When such extraordinary costs can be foreseen, that fact and the reasons why such costs are necessary and appropriate to evaluating the Reconsideration Request shall be communicated to the Requestor, who shall then have the option of withdrawing the request or agreeing to bear such costs.

(g) All Reconsideration Requests must be submitted by the Requestor to an email address designated by the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee:

(i) For Reconsideration Requests that are not Community Reconsideration Requests, such Reconsideration Requests must be submitted:
(A) for requests challenging Board actions, within 30 days after the date on which information about the challenged Board action is first published in a resolution, unless the posting of the resolution is not accompanied by a rationale. In that instance, the request must be submitted within 30 days from the initial posting of the rationale;

(B) for requests challenging Staff actions, within 30 days after the date on which the Requestor became aware of, or reasonably should have become aware of, the challenged Staff action; or

(C) for requests challenging either Board or Staff inaction, within 30 days after the date on which the Requestor reasonably concluded, or reasonably should have concluded, that action would not be taken in a timely manner.

(ii) For Community Reconsideration Requests, such Community Reconsideration Requests must be submitted in accordance with the timeframe set forth in Section 4.3 of Annex D.

(h) To properly initiate a Reconsideration Request, all Requestors must review, complete and follow the Reconsideration Request form posted on the Website at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/accountability/reconsideration-en. Requestors must also acknowledge and agree to the terms and conditions set forth in the form when filing.

(i) Requestors shall not provide more than 25 pages (double-spaced, 12-point font) of argument in support of a Reconsideration Request, not including exhibits. Requestors may submit all documentary evidence necessary to demonstrate why the action or inaction should be reconsidered, without limitation.

(j) Reconsideration Requests from different Requestors may be considered in the same proceeding so long as: (i) the requests involve the same general action or inaction; and (ii) the Requestors are similarly affected by such action or inaction. In addition, consolidated filings may be appropriate if the alleged causal connection and the resulting harm is substantially the same for all of the Requestors. Every Requestor must be able to demonstrate that it has been materially harmed and adversely impacted by the action or inaction giving rise to the request.
(k) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall review each Reconsideration Request upon its receipt to determine if it is sufficiently stated. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee may summarily dismiss a Reconsideration Request if: (i) the Requestor fails to meet the requirements for bringing a Reconsideration Request; or (ii) it is frivolous. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's summary dismissal of a Reconsideration Request shall be documented and promptly posted on the Website.

(l) For all Reconsideration Requests that are not summarily dismissed, except Reconsideration Requests described in Section 4.2(l)(iii) and Community Reconsideration Requests, the Reconsideration Request shall be sent to the Ombudsman, who shall promptly proceed to review and consider the Reconsideration Request.

(i) The Ombudsman shall be entitled to seek any outside expert assistance as the Ombudsman deems reasonably necessary to perform this task to the extent it is within the budget allocated to this task.

(ii) The Ombudsman shall submit to the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee his or her substantive evaluation of the Reconsideration Request within 15 days of the Ombudsman's receipt of the Reconsideration Request. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall thereafter promptly proceed to review and consideration.

(iii) For those Reconsideration Requests involving matters for which the Ombudsman has, in advance of the filing of the Reconsideration Request, taken a position while performing his or her role as the Ombudsman pursuant to Article 5 of these Bylaws, or involving the Ombudsman's conduct in some way, the Ombudsman shall recuse himself or herself and the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall review the Reconsideration Request without involvement by the Ombudsman.

(m) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee may ask ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Staff for its views on a Reconsideration Request, which comments shall be made publicly available on the Website.
(n) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee may request additional information or clarifications from the Requestor, and may elect to conduct a meeting with the Requestor by telephone, email or, if acceptable to the Requestor, in person. A Requestor may also ask for an opportunity to be heard. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee’s decision on any such request is final. To the extent any information gathered in such a meeting is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation.

(o) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee may also request information relevant to the Reconsideration Request from third parties. To the extent any information gathered is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation. Any information collected by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) from third parties shall be provided to the Requestor.

(p) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall act on a Reconsideration Request on the basis of the public written record, including information submitted by the Requestor, by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Staff, and by any third party.

(q) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall make a final recommendation to the Board with respect to a Reconsideration Request within 30 days following its receipt of the Ombudsman’s evaluation (or 30 days following receipt of the Reconsideration Request involving those matters for which the Ombudsman recuses himself or herself or the receipt of the Community Reconsideration Request, if applicable), unless impractical, in which case it shall report to the Board the circumstances that prevented it from making a final recommendation and its best estimate of the time required to produce such a final recommendation. In any event, the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall endeavor to produce its final recommendation to the Board within 90 days of receipt of the Reconsideration Request. The final recommendation of the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall be documented and promptly (i.e., as soon as practicable) posted on the Website and shall address each of the arguments raised in the Reconsideration Request. The Requestor may file a 10-page (double-spaced, 12-point font) document, not including exhibits, in rebuttal to the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee’s recommendation within 15 days of receipt of the recommendation, which shall also be promptly (i.e., as soon as practicable) posted to the Website and
provided to the Board for its evaluation; provided, that such rebuttal shall: (i) be limited to rebutting or contradicting the issues raised in the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's final recommendation; and (ii) not offer new evidence to support an argument made in the Requestor's original Reconsideration Request that the Requestor could have provided when the Requestor initially submitted the Reconsideration Request.

(r) The Board shall not be bound to follow the recommendations of the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee. The final decision of the Board and its rationale shall be made public as part of the preliminary report and minutes of the Board meeting at which action is taken. The Board shall issue its decision on the recommendation of the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee within 45 days of receipt of the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's recommendation or as soon thereafter as feasible. Any circumstances that delay the Board from acting within this timeframe must be identified and posted on the Website. In any event, the Board's final decision shall be made within 135 days of initial receipt of the Reconsideration Request by the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee. The Board's decision on the recommendation shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3 of these Bylaws. If the Requestor so requests, the Board shall post both a recording and a transcript of the substantive Board discussion from the meeting at which the Board considered the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's recommendation. All briefing materials supplied to the Board shall be provided to the Requestor. The Board may redact such briefing materials and the recording and transcript on the basis that such information (i) relates to confidential personnel matters, (ii) is covered by attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine or other recognized legal privilege, (iii) is subject to a legal obligation that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) maintain its confidentiality, (iv) would disclose trade secrets, or (v) would present a material risk of negative impact to the security, stability or resiliency of the Internet. In the case of any redaction, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide the Requestor a written rationale for such redaction. If a Requestor believes that a redaction was improper, the Requestor may use an appropriate accountability mechanism to challenge the scope of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s redaction.

(s) If the Requestor believes that the Board action or inaction for which a Reconsideration Request is submitted is so urgent that the timing requirements of the process set forth in this Section 4.2 are too ong, the
Requestor may apply to the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee for urgent consideration. Any request for urgent consideration must be made within two business days (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) of the posting of the resolution at issue. A request for urgent consideration must include a discussion of why the matter is urgent for reconsideration and must demonstrate a likelihood of success with the Reconsideration Request.

(t) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall respond to the request for urgent consideration within two business days after receipt of such request. If the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee agrees to consider the matter with urgency, it will cause notice to be provided to the Requestor, who will have two business days after notification to complete the Reconsideration Request. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall issue a recommendation on the urgent Reconsideration Request within seven days of the completion of the filing of the Reconsideration Request, or as soon thereafter as feasible. If the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee does not agree to consider the matter with urgency, the Requestor may still file a Reconsideration Request within the regular time frame set forth within these Bylaws.

(u) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall submit a report to the Board on an annual basis containing at least the following information for the preceding calendar year:

(i) the number and general nature of Reconsideration Requests received, including an identification if the Reconsideration Requests were acted upon, summarily dismissed, or remain pending;

(ii) for any Reconsideration Requests that remained pending at the end of the calendar year, the average length of time for which such Reconsideration Requests have been pending, and a description of the reasons for any Reconsideration Request pending for more than ninety (90) days;

(iii) an explanation of any other mechanisms available to ensure that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is accountable to persons materially affected by its decisions; and

(iv) whether or not, in the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's view, the criteria for which reconsideration may be
requested should be revised, or another process should be adopted or modified, to ensure that all persons materially affected by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) decisions have meaningful access to a review process that ensures fairness while limiting frivolous claims.

Section 4.3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS FOR COVERED ACTIONS

(a) In addition to the reconsideration process described in Section 4.2, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall have a separate process for independent third-party review of Disputes (defined in Section 4.3(b)(iii)) alleged by a Claimant (as defined in Section 4.3(b)(i)) to be within the scope of the Independent Review Process ("IRP"). The IRP is intended to hear and resolve Disputes for the following purposes ("Purposes of the IRP"):

(i) Ensure that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not exceed the scope of its Mission and otherwise complies with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

(ii) Empower the global Internet community and Claimants to enforce compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws through meaningful, affordable and accessible expert review of Covered Actions (as defined in Section 4.3(b)(i)).

(iii) Ensure that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is accountable to the global Internet community and Claimants.

(iv) Address claims that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has failed to enforce its rights under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract (as defined in Section 16.3(a)).

(v) Provide a mechanism by which direct customers of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming functions may seek resolution of PTI (as defined in Section 16.1) service complaints that are not resolved through mediation.
(vi) Reduce Disputes by creating precedent to guide and inform the Board, Officers (as defined in Section 15.1), Staff members, Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations), Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), and the global Internet community in connection with policy development and implementation.

(vii) Secure the accessible, transparent, efficient, consistent, coherent, and just resolution of Disputes.

(viii) Lead to binding, final resolutions consistent with international arbitration norms that are enforceable in any court with proper jurisdiction.

(ix) Provide a mechanism for the resolution of Disputes, as an alternative to legal action in the civil courts of the United States or other jurisdictions.

This Section 4.3 shall be construed, implemented, and administered in a manner consistent with these Purposes of the IRP.

(b) The scope of the IRP is defined with reference to the following terms:

(i) A "Claimant" is any legal or natural person, group, or entity including, but not limited to the EC (Empowered Community), a Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization), or an Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) that has been materially affected by a Dispute. To be materially affected by a Dispute, the Claimant must suffer an injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the alleged violation.

(A) The EC (Empowered Community) is deemed to be materially affected by all Covered Actions. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not assert any defenses of standing or capacity against the EC (Empowered Community) in any forum.

(B) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not object to the standing of the EC (Empowered Community), a Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization), or an Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) to participate in an IRP, to compel an
IRP, or to enforce an IRP decision on the basis that it is not a legal person with capacity to sue. No special pleading of a Claimant's capacity or of the legal existence of a person that is a Claimant shall be required in the IRP proceedings. No Claimant shall be allowed to proceed if the IRP Panel (as defined in Section 4.3(g)) concludes based on evidence submitted to it that the Claimant does not fairly or adequately represent the interests of those on whose behalf the Claimant purports to act.

(ii) "Covered Actions" are defined as any actions or failures to act by or within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) committed by the Board, individual Directors, Officers, or Staff members that give rise to a Dispute.

(iii) "Disputes" are defined as:

(A) Claims that Covered Actions constituted an action or inaction that violated the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, including but not limited to any action or inaction that:

(1) exceeded the scope of the Mission;

(2) resulted from action taken in response to advice or input from any Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) or Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;

(3) resulted from decisions of process-specific expert panels that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;

(4) resulted from a response to a DIDP (as defined in Section 22.7(d)) request that is claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; or

(5) arose from claims involving rights of the EC (Empowered Community) as set forth in the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

(B) Claims that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the Board, individual Directors, Officers or Staff members have not enforced ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s
contractual rights with respect to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, and

(C) Claims regarding PTI service complaints by direct customers of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming functions that are not resolved through mediation.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section 4.3, the IRP’s scope shall exclude all of the following:

(i) EC (Empowered Community) challenges to the result(s) of a PDP (Policy Development Process), unless the Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization)(s) that approved the PDP (Policy Development Process) supports the EC (Empowered Community) bringing such a challenge;

(ii) Claims relating to ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) delegations and re-delegations;

(iii) Claims relating to Internet numbering resources, and

(iv) Claims relating to protocol parameters.

(d) An IRP shall commence with the Claimant’s filing of a written statement of a Dispute (a "Claim") with the IRP Provider (described in Section 4.3(m) below). For the EC (Empowered Community) to commence an IRP ("Community IRP"), the EC (Empowered Community) shall first comply with the procedures set forth in Section 4.2 of Annex D.

(e) Cooperative Engagement Process

(i) Except for Claims brought by the EC (Empowered Community) in accordance with this Section 4.3 and Section 4.2 of Annex D, prior to the filing of a Claim, the parties are strongly encouraged to participate in a non-binding Cooperative Engagement Process ("CEP") for the purpose of attempting to resolve and/or narrow the Dispute. CEPs shall be conducted pursuant to the CEP Rules to be developed with community involvement, adopted by the Board, and as amended from time to time.
(ii) The CEP is voluntary. However, except for Claims brought by the EC (Empowered Community) in accordance with this Section 4.3 and Section 4.2 of Annex D, if the Claimant does not participate in good faith in the CEP and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is the prevailing party in the IRP, the IRP Panel shall award to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) all reasonable fees and costs incurred by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in the IRP, including legal fees.

(iii) Either party may terminate the CEP efforts if that party (A) concludes in good faith that further efforts are unlikely to produce agreement; or (B) requests the inclusion of an independent dispute resolution facilitator ("IRP Mediator") after at least one CEP meeting.

(iv) Unless all parties agree on the selection of a particular IRP Mediator, any IRP Mediator appointed shall be selected from the members of the Standing Panel (described in Section 4.3(j) below) by its Chair, but such IRP Mediator shall not thereafter be eligible to serve as a panelist presiding over an IRP on the matter.

(f) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) hereby waives any defenses that may be afforded under Section 5141 of the California Corporations Code ("CCC") against any Claimant, and shall not object to the standing of any such Claimant to participate in or to compel an IRP, or to enforce an IRP decision on the basis that such Claimant may not otherwise be able to assert that a Covered Action is ultra vires.

(g) Upon the filing of a Claim, an Independent Review Process Panel ("IRP Panel", described in Section 4.3(k) below) shall be selected in accordance with the Rules of Procedure (as defined in Section 4.3(n)(i)) Following the selection of an IRP Panel, that IRP Panel shall be charged with hearing and resolving the Dispute, considering the Claim and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s written response ("Response") in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in light of prior IRP Panel decisions decided under the same (or an equivalent prior) version of the provision of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws at issue, and norms of applicable law. If no Response is timely filed by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the IRP Panel may accept the Claim as unopposed and proceed to evaluate and decide the Claim pursuant to the procedures set forth in these Bylaws.
(h) After a Claim is referred to an IRP Panel, the parties are urged to participate in conciliation discussions for the purpose of attempting to narrow the issues that are to be addressed by the IRP Panel.

(i) Each IRP Panel shall conduct an objective, de novo examination of the Dispute.

(i) With respect to Covered Actions, the IRP Panel shall make findings of fact to determine whether the Covered Action constituted an action or inaction that violated the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

(ii) All Disputes shall be decided in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in the context of the norms of applicable law and prior relevant IRP decisions.

(iii) For Claims arising out of the Board's exercise of its fiduciary duties, the IRP Panel shall not replace the Board's reasonable judgment with its own so long as the Board's action or inaction is within the realm of reasonable business judgment.

(iv) With respect to claims that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has not enforced its contractual rights with respect to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, the standard of review shall be whether there was a material breach of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s obligations under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, where the alleged breach has resulted in material harm to the Claimant.

(v) For avoidance of doubt, IRPs initiated through the mechanism contemplated at Section 4 3(a)(iv) above, shall be subject to a separate standard of review as defined in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract.

(j) Standing Panel

(i) There shall be an omnibus standing panel of at least seven members (the "Standing Panel") each of whom shall possess significant relevant legal expertise in one or more of the following areas: international law, corporate governance, judicial systems,
alternative dispute resolution and/or arbitration. Each member of the Standing Panel shall also have knowledge, developed over time, regarding the DNS (Domain Name System) and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission, work, policies, practices, and procedures. Members of the Standing Panel shall receive at a minimum, training provided by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) on the workings and management of the Internet's unique identifiers and other appropriate training as recommended by the IRP Implementation Oversight Team (described in Section 4.3(n)(i))

(ii) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, in consultation with the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), initiate a four step process to establish the Standing Panel to ensure the availability of a number of IRP panelists that is sufficient to allow for the timely resolution of Disputes consistent with the Purposes of the IRP.

(A) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), in consultation with the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), shall initiate a tender process for an organization to provide administrative support for the IRP Provider (as defined in Section 4.3(m)), beginning by consulting the "IRP Implementation Oversight Team" (described in Section 4.3(n)(i)) on a draft tender document

(B) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall issue a call for expressions of interest from potential panelists, and work with the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) and the Board to identify and solicit applications from well-qualified candidates, and to conduct an initial review and vetting of applications

(C) The Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) shall nominate a slate of proposed panel members from the well-qualified candidates identified per the process set forth in Section 4.3(j)(ii)(B)

(D) Final selection shall be subject to Board confirmation, which shall not be unreasonably withheld
(iii) Appointments to the Standing Panel shall be made for a fixed term of five years with no removal except for specified cause in the nature of corruption, misuse of position, fraud or criminal activity. The recall process shall be developed by the IRP Implementation Oversight Team.

(iv) Reasonable efforts shall be taken to achieve cultural, linguistic, gender, and legal tradition diversity, and diversity by Geographic Region (as defined in Section 7.5)

(k) IRP Panel

(i) A three member IRP Panel shall be selected from the Standing Panel to hear a specific Dispute.

(ii) The Claimant and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall each select one panelist from the Standing Panel, and the two panelists selected by the parties will select the third panelist from the Standing Panel. In the event that a Standing Panel is not in place when an IRP Panel must be convened for a given proceeding or is in place but does not have capacity due to other IRP commitments or the requisite diversity of skill and experience needed for a particular IRP proceeding the Claimant and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall each select a qualified panelist from outside the Standing Panel and the two panelists selected by the parties shall select the third panelist. In the event that no Standing Panel is in place when an IRP Panel must be convened and the two party selected panelists cannot agree on the third panelist, the IRP Provider's rules shall apply to selection of the third panelist.

(iii) Assignment from the Standing Panel to IRP Panels shall take into consideration the Standing Panel members’ individual experience and expertise in issues related to highly technical, civil society, business, diplomatic, and regulatory skills as needed by each specific proceeding, and such requests from the parties for any particular expertise.

(iv) Upon request of an IRP Panel, the IRP Panel shall have access to independent skilled technical experts at the expense of ICANN.
(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), although all substantive interactions between the IRP Panel and such experts shall be conducted on the record, except when public disclosure could materially and unduly harm participants, such as by exposing trade secrets or violating rights of personal privacy.

(v) IRP Panel decisions shall be made by a simple majority of the IRP Panel.

(l) All IRP proceedings shall be administered in English as the primary working language, with provision of translation services for Claimants if needed.

(m) IRP Provider

(i) All IRP proceedings shall be administered by a well-respected international dispute resolution provider ("IRP Provider") The IRP Provider shall receive and distribute IRP Claims, Responses, and all other submissions arising from an IRP at the direction of the IRP Panel, and shall function independently from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(n) Rules of Procedure

(i) An IRP Implementation Oversight Team shall be established in consultation with the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) and comprised of members of the global Internet community. The IRP Implementation Oversight Team, and once the Standing Panel is established the IRP Implementation Oversight Team in consultation with the Standing Panel, shall develop clear published rules for the IRP ("Rules of Procedure") that conform with international arbitration norms and are streamlined, easy to understand and apply fairly to all parties. Upon request, the IRP Implementation Oversight Team shall have assistance of counsel and other appropriate experts

(ii) The Rules of Procedure shall be informed by international arbitration norms and consistent with the Purposes of the IRP Specialized Rules of Procedure may be designed for reviews of PTI service complaints that are asserted by direct customers of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming functions and are not
resolved through mediation. The Rules of Procedure shall be published and subject to a period of public comment that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), and take effect upon approval by the Board, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld.

(iii) The Standing Panel may recommend amendments to such Rules of Procedure as it deems appropriate to fulfill the Purposes of the IRP, however no such amendment shall be effective without approval by the Board after publication and a period of public comment that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(iv) The Rules of Procedure are intended to ensure fundamental fairness and due process and shall at a minimum address the following elements

(A) The time within which a Claim must be filed after a Claimant becomes aware or reasonably should have become aware of the action or inaction giving rise to the Dispute;

(B) Issues relating to joinder, intervention, and consolidation of Claims;

(C) Rules governing written submissions, including the required elements of a Claim, other requirements or limits on content, time for filing, length of statements, number of supplemental statements, if any, permitted evidentiary support (factual and expert), including its length, both in support of a Claimant's Claim and in support of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Response;

(D) Availability and limitations on discovery methods;

(E) Whether hearings shall be permitted, and if so what form and structure such hearings would take;

(F) Procedures if ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) elects not to respond to an IRP; and

(G) The standards and rules governing appeals from IRP Panel decisions, including which IRP Panel decisions may be appealed
(o) Subject to the requirements of this Section 4.3, each IRP Panel shall have the authority to

(i) Summarily dismiss Disputes that are brought without standing, lack substance, or are frivolous or vexatious;

(ii) Request additional written submissions from the Claimant or from other parties;

(iii) Declare whether a Covered Action constituted an action or inaction that violated the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, declare whether ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) failed to enforce ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s contractual rights with respect to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract or resolve PTI service complaints by direct customers of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming functions, as applicable;

(iv) Recommend that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) stay any action or decision, or take necessary interim action, until such time as the opinion of the IRP Panel is considered;

(v) Consolidate Disputes if the facts and circumstances are sufficiently similar, and take such other actions as are necessary for the efficient resolution of Disputes;

(vi) Determine the timing for each IRP proceeding; and

(vii) Determine the shifting of IRP costs and expenses consistent with Section 4.3(r)

(p) A Claimant may request interim relief. Interim relief may include prospective relief, interlocutory relief, or declaratory or injunctive relief, and specifically may include a stay of the challenged ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) action or decision until such time as the opinion of the IRP Panel is considered as described in Section 4.3(o)(iv), in order to maintain the status quo. A single member of the Standing Panel ("Emergency Panelist") shall be selected to adjudicate requests for interim relief. In the event that no Standing Panel is in place when an Emergency Panelist must be selected, the IRP Provider's rules shall apply to the
selection of the Emergency Panelist. Interim relief may only be provided if the Emergency Panelist determines that the Claimant has established all of the following factors:

(i) A harm for which there will be no adequate remedy in the absence of such relief;

(ii) Either: (A) likelihood of success on the merits; or (B) sufficiently serious questions related to the merits; and

(iii) A balance of hardships tipping decidedly toward the party seeking relief

(q) Conflicts of Interest

(i) Standing Panel members must be independent of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and its Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), and so must adhere to the following criteria:

(A) Upon consideration for the Standing Panel and on an ongoing basis, Panelists shall have an affirmative obligation to disclose any material relationship with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), a Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization), an Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee), or any other participant in an IRP proceeding.

(B) Additional independence requirements to be developed by the IRP Implementation Oversight Team, including term limits and restrictions on post term appointment to other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) positions.

(ii) The IRP Provider shall disclose any material relationship with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), a Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization), an Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee), or any other participant in an IRP proceeding

(r) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall bear all the administrative costs of maintaining the IRP mechanism, including
compensation of Standing Panel members. Except as otherwise provided in Section 43(e)(ii), each party to an IRP proceeding shall bear its own legal expenses, except that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall bear all costs associated with a Community IRP, including the costs of all legal counsel and technical experts. Nevertheless, except with respect to a Community IRP, the IRP Panel may shift and provide for the losing party to pay administrative costs and/or fees of the prevailing party in the event it identifies the losing party's Claim or defense as frivolous or abusive.

(s) An IRP Panel should complete an IRP proceeding expeditiously, issuing an early scheduling order and its written decision no later than six months after the filing of the Claim, except as otherwise permitted under the Rules of Procedure. The preceding sentence does not provide the basis for a Covered Action.

(t) Each IRP Panel shall make its decision based solely on the documentation, supporting materials, and arguments submitted by the parties, and in its decision shall specifically designate the prevailing party as to each part of a Claim.

(u) All IRP Panel proceedings shall be conducted on the record, and documents filed in connection with IRP Panel proceedings shall be posted on the Website, except for settlement negotiation or other proceedings that could materially and unduly harm participants if conducted publicly. The Rules of Procedure, and all Claims, petitions, and decisions shall promptly be posted on the Website when they become available. Each IRP Panel may, in its discretion, grant a party's request to keep certain information confidential, such as trade secrets, but only if such confidentiality does not materially interfere with the transparency of the IRP proceeding.

(v) Subject to this Section 43, all IRP decisions shall be written and made public, and shall reflect a well-reasoned application of how the Dispute was resolved in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in light of prior IRP decisions decided under the same (or an equivalent prior) version of the provision of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws at issue, and norms of applicable law.

(w) Subject to any limitations established through the Rules of Procedure, an IRP Panel decision may be appealed to the full Standing Panel sitting en banc within sixty (60) days of issuance of such decision.
(x) The IRP is intended as a final, binding arbitration process.

(i) IRP Panel decisions are binding final decisions to the extent allowed by law unless timely and properly appealed to the en banc Standing Panel. En banc Standing Panel decisions are binding final decisions to the extent allowed by law.

(ii) IRP Panel decisions and decisions of an en banc Standing Panel upon an appeal are intended to be enforceable in any court with jurisdiction over ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) without a de novo review of the decision of the IRP Panel or en banc Standing Panel, as applicable, with respect to factual findings or conclusions of law.

(iii) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) intends, agrees, and consents to be bound by all IRP Panel decisions of Disputes of Covered Actions as a final, binding arbitration.

(A) Where feasible, the Board shall consider its response to IRP Panel decisions at the Board’s next meeting, and shall affirm or reject compliance with the decision on the public record based on an expressed rationale. The decision of the IRP Panel, or en banc Standing Panel, shall be final regardless of such Board action, to the fullest extent allowed by law.

(B) If an IRP Panel decision in a Community IRP is in favor of the EC (Empowered Community), the Board shall comply within 30 days of such IRP Panel decision

(C) If the Board rejects an IRP Panel decision without undertaking an appeal to the en banc Standing Panel or rejects an en banc Standing Panel decision upon appeal, the Claimant or the EC (Empowered Community) may seek enforcement in a court of competent jurisdiction. In the case of the EC (Empowered Community), the EC (Empowered Community) Administration may convene as soon as possible following such rejection and consider whether to authorize commencement of such an action.

(iv) By submitting a Claim to the IRP Panel, a Claimant thereby agrees that the IRP decision is intended to be a final, binding arbitration decision with respect to such Claimant. Any Claimant that does not
consent to the IRP being a final, binding arbitration may initiate a non-binding IRP if ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) agrees; provided that such a non-binding IRP decision is not intended to be and shall not be enforceable.

(y) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall seek to establish means by which community, non-profit Claimants and other Claimants that would otherwise be excluded from utilizing the IRP process may meaningfully participate in and have access to the IRP process.

Section 4.4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)

STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS

(a) The Board shall cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization), each Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) Council, each Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)), and the Nominating Committee (as defined in Section 8.1) by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review. The goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization, council or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) structure, (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness and (iii) whether that organization, council or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders.

These periodic reviews shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, based on feasibility as determined by the Board. Each five-year cycle will be computed from the moment of the reception by the Board of the final report of the relevant review Working Group.

The results of such reviews shall be posted on the Website for public review and comment, and shall be considered by the Board no later than the second scheduled meeting of the Board after such results have been posted for 30 days. The consideration by the Board includes the ability to revise the structure or operation of the parts of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) being reviewed by a two-thirds vote of all
Directors, subject to any rights of the EC (Empowered Community) under the Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws

(b) The Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall provide its own review mechanisms

Section 4.5. ANNUAL REVIEW

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will produce an annual report on the state of the accountability and transparency reviews, which will discuss the status of the implementation of all review processes required by Section 4.6 and the status of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s implementation of the recommendations set forth in the final reports issued by the review teams to the Board following the conclusion of such review ("Annual Review Implementation Report"). The Annual Review Implementation Report will be posted on the Website for public review and comment. Each Annual Review Implementation Report will be considered by the Board and serve as an input to the continuing process of implementing the recommendations from the review teams set forth in the final reports of such review teams required in Section 4.6.

Section 4.6. SPECIFIC REVIEWS

(a) Review Teams and Reports

(i) Review teams will be established for each applicable review, which will include both a limited number of members and an open number of observers. The chairs of the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) participating in the applicable review shall select a group of up to 21 review team members from among the prospective members nominated by the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), balanced for diversity and skill. In addition, the Board may designate one Director or Liaison to serve as a member of the review team. Specific guidance on the selection process is provided within the operating standards developed for the conduct of reviews under this Section 4.6 (the "Operating Standards"). The Operating Standards shall be developed through community consultation, including public comment opportunities as necessary that comply with the designated practice for
public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). The Operating Standards must be aligned with the following guidelines:

(A) Each Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) and Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) participating in the applicable review may nominate up to seven prospective members for the review team;

(B) Any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) nominating at least one, two or three prospective review team members shall be entitled to have those one, two or three nominees selected as members to the review team, so long as the nominees meet any applicable criteria for service on the team; and

(C) If any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) has not nominated at least three prospective review team members, the Chairs of the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) shall be responsible for the determination of whether all 21 SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) member seats shall be filled and, if so, how the seats should be allocated from among those nominated.

(ii) Members and liaisons of review teams shall disclose to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and their applicable review team any conflicts of interest with a specific matter or issue under review in accordance with the most recent Board approved practices and Operating Standards. The applicable review team may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member deemed by the majority of review team members to have a conflict of interest. Further details on the conflict of interest practices are included in the Operating Standards.

(iii) Review team decision making practices shall be specified in the Operating Standards, with the expectation that review teams shall try to operate on a consensus basis. In the event a consensus cannot be found among the members of a review team, a majority vote of the members may be taken.
(iv) Review teams may also solicit and select independent experts to render advice as requested by the review team. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall pay the reasonable fees and expenses of such experts for each review contemplated by this Section 4.6 to the extent such fees and costs are consistent with the budget assigned for such review. Guidelines on how review teams are to work with and consider independent expert advice are specified in the Operating Standards.

(v) Each review team may recommend that the applicable type of review should no longer be conducted or should be amended.

(vi) Confidential Disclosure to Review Teams

(A) To facilitate transparency and openness regarding ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s deliberations and operations, the review teams, or a subset thereof, shall have access to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) internal information and documents pursuant to the Confidential Disclosure Framework set forth in the Operating Standards (the "Confidential Disclosure Framework"). The Confidential Disclosure Framework must be aligned with the following guidelines:

(1) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) must provide a justification for any refusal to reveal requested information. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s refusal can be appealed to the Ombudsman and/or the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board for a ruling on the disclosure request.

(2) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may designate certain documents and information as "for review team members only" or for a subset of the review team members based on conflict of interest. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s designation of documents may also be appealed to the Ombudsman and/or the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board.

(3) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may require review team members to sign a non disclosure agreement before accessing documents.
(vii) Reports

(A) Each report of the review team shall describe the degree of consensus or agreement reached by the review team on each recommendation contained in such report. Any member of a review team not in favor of a recommendation of its review team (whether as a result of voting against a matter or objecting to the consensus position) may record a minority dissent to such recommendation, which shall be included in the report of the review team. The review team shall attempt to prioritize each of its recommendations and provide a rationale for such prioritization.

(B) At least one draft report of the review team shall be posted on the Website for public review and comment. The review team must consider the public comments received in response to any posted draft report and shall amend the report as the review team deems appropriate and in the public interest before submitting its final report to the Board. The final report should include an explanation of how public comments were considered as well as a summary of changes made in response to public comments.

(C) Each final report of a review team shall be published for public comment in advance of the Board’s consideration. Within six months of receipt of a final report, the Board shall consider such final report and the public comments on the final report, and determine whether to approve the recommendations in the final report. If the Board does not approve any or all of the recommendations, the written rationale supporting the Board’s decision shall include an explanation for the decision on each recommendation that was not approved. The Board shall promptly direct implementation of the recommendations that were approved.

(b) Accountability and Transparency Review

(i) The Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s execution of its commitment to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that the outcomes of its decision making reflect the public interest and are
accountable to the Internet community ("Accountability and Transparency Review")

(ii) The issues that the review team for the Accountability and Transparency Review (the "Accountability and Transparency Review Team") may assess include, but are not limited to, the following

(A) assessing and improving Board governance which shall include an ongoing evaluation of Board performance, the Board selection process, the extent to which the Board's composition and allocation structure meets ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s present and future needs, and the appeal mechanisms for Board decisions contained in these Bylaws;

(B) assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s interaction with the Board and with the broader ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community, and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS (Domain Name System);

(C) assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) receives public input (including adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof);

(D) assessing the extent to which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community;

(E) assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations, and effective and timely policy development; and

(F) assessing and improving the Independent Review Process.

(iii) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior Accountability and Transparency
Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(iv) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team may recommend to the Board the termination or amendment of other periodic reviews required by this Section 4.6, and may recommend to the Board the creation of additional periodic reviews.

(v) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team should issue its final report within one year of convening its first meeting.

(vi) The Accountability and Transparency Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years measured from the date the previous Accountability and Transparency Review Team was convened.

(c) Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)), Stability (Security, Stability and Resilency), and Resiliency (Security Stability & Resiliency (SSR)) Review

(i) The Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s execution of its commitment to enhance the operational stability, reliability, resiliency, security, and global interoperability of the systems and processes, both internal and external, that directly affect and/or are affected by the Internet's system of unique identifiers that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) coordinates ("SSR Review").

(ii) The issues that the review team for the SSR Review ("SSR Review Team") may assess are the following:

(A) security, operational stability and resiliency matters, both physical and network, relating to the coordination of the Internet's system of unique identifiers;

(B) conformance with appropriate security contingency planning framework for the Internet's system of unique identifiers; and

(C) maintaining clear and globally interoperable security processes for those portions of the Internet's system of unique identifiers that ICANN
(iii) The SSR Review Team shall also assess the extent to which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has successfully implemented its security efforts, the effectiveness of the security efforts to deal with actual and potential challenges and threats to the security and stability of the DNS (Domain Name System), and the extent to which the security efforts are sufficiently robust to meet future challenges and threats to the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System), consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission.

(iv) The SSR Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior SSR Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(v) The SSR Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous SSR Review Team was convened.

(d) Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review

(i) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will ensure that it will adequately address issues of competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection prior to, or concurrent with, authorizing an increase in the number of new top-level domains in the root zone of the DNS (Domain Name System) pursuant to an application process initiated on or after the date of these Bylaws ("New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Round")

(ii) After a New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Round has been in operation for one year, the Board shall cause a competition, consumer trust and consumer choice review as specified in this Section 4.6(d) ("CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust) Review").

(iii) The review team for the CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust) Review ("CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice &
Consumer Trust) Review Team") will examine (A) the extent to which the expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and (B) the effectiveness of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Round's application and evaluation process and safeguards put in place to mitigate issues arising from the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Round.

(iv) For each of its recommendations, the CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust) Review Team should indicate whether the recommendation, if accepted by the Board, must be implemented before opening subsequent rounds of new generic top level domain applications periods.

(v) The CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust) Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust) Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(e) Registration Directory Service Review

(i) Subject to applicable laws, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall use commercially reasonable efforts to enforce its policies relating to registration directory services and shall work with Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) to explore structural changes to improve accuracy and access to generic top-level domain registration data, as well as consider safeguards for protecting such data.

(ii) The Board shall cause a periodic review to assess the effectiveness of the then current gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry directory service and whether its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data ("Directory Service Review").

(iii) The review team for the Directory Service Review ("Directory Service Review Team") will consider the Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development ("OECD (Organization for Economic..."
Co-operation and Development)”) Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data as defined by the OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) in 1980 and amended in 2013 and as may be amended from time to time.

(iv) The Directory Service Review Team shall assess the extent to which prior Directory Service Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(v) The Directory Service Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous Directory Service Review Team was convened, except that the first Directory Service Review to be conducted after 1 October 2016 shall be deemed to be timely if the applicable Directory Service Review Team is convened on or before 31 October 2016.

Section 4.7. COMMUNITY MEDIATION

(a) If the Board refuses or fails to comply with a duly authorized and valid EC (Empowered Community) Decision under these Bylaws, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration representative of any Decisional Participant who supported the exercise by the EC (Empowered Community) of its rights in the applicable EC (Empowered Community) Decision during the applicable decision period may request that the EC (Empowered Community) initiate a mediation process pursuant to this Section 4.7. The Board shall be deemed to have refused or failed to comply with a duly authorized and valid EC (Empowered Community) Decision if the Board has not complied with the EC (Empowered Community) Decision within 30 days of being notified of the relevant EC (Empowered Community) Decision.

(b) If a Mediation Initiation Notice (as defined in Section 4.1(a) of Annex D) is delivered to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 4.1(a) of Annex D, as soon as reasonably practicable thereafter, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall designate individuals to represent the EC (Empowered Community) in the mediation (“Mediation Administration”) and the Board shall designate representatives for the mediation (“Board Mediation Representatives”). Members of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Board can designate themselves as representatives. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned...
Names and Numbers) shall promptly post the Mediation Initiation Notice on the Website

(c) There shall be a single mediator who shall be selected by the agreement of the Mediation Administration and Board Mediation Representatives. The Mediation Administration shall propose a slate of at least five potential mediators, and the Board Mediation Representatives shall select a mediator from the slate or request a new slate until a mutually-agreed mediator is selected. The Board Mediation Representatives may recommend potential mediators for inclusion on the slates selected by the Mediation Administration. The Mediation Administration shall not unreasonably decline to include mediators recommended by the Board Mediation Representatives on proposed slates and the Board Mediation Representatives shall not unreasonably withhold consent to the selection of a mediator on slates proposed by the Mediation Administration.

(d) The mediator shall be a licensed attorney with general knowledge of contract law and general knowledge of the DNS (Domain Name System) and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). The mediator may not have any ongoing business relationship with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (or constituent thereof), any Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (or constituent thereof), the EC (Empowered Community) Administration or the EC (Empowered Community). The mediator must confirm in writing that he or she is not, directly or indirectly, and will not become during the term of the mediation, an employee, partner, executive officer, director, consultant or advisor of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (or constituent thereof), any Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (or constituent thereof), the EC (Empowered Community) Administration or the EC (Empowered Community).

(e) The mediator shall conduct the mediation in accordance with these Bylaws, the laws of California and the rules and procedures of a well-respected international dispute resolution provider, which may be the IRP Provider. The arbitration will be conducted in the English language consistent with the provisions relevant for mediation under the IRP Rules of Procedure and will occur in Los Angeles County, California, unless another location is mutually agreed between the Mediation Administration and Board Mediation Representatives.
(f) The Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives shall discuss the dispute in good faith and attempt, with the mediator's assistance, to reach an amicable resolution of the dispute.

(g) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall bear all costs of the mediator.

(h) If the Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives have engaged in good faith participation in the mediation but have not resolved the dispute for any reason, the Mediation Administration or the Board Mediation Representatives may terminate the mediation at any time by declaring an impasse.

(i) If a resolution to the dispute is reached by the Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives, the Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives shall document such resolution including recommendations ("Mediation Resolution" and the date of such resolution, the "Mediation Resolution Date"). ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post the Mediation Resolution on the Website (in no event later than 14 days after mediation efforts are completed) and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly notify the Decisional Participants of the Mediation Resolution.

(j) The EC (Empowered Community) shall be deemed to have accepted the Mediation Resolution if it has not delivered an EC (Empowered Community) Community IRP Initiation Notice (as defined in Section 4.2(e) of Annex D) pursuant to and in compliance with Section 4.2 of Annex D within eighty (80) days following the Mediation Resolution Date.

ARTICLE 5 OMBUDSMAN

Section 5.1. OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN

(a) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall maintain an Office of Ombudsman ("Office of Ombudsman"), to be managed by an ombudsman ("Ombudsman") and to include such staff support as the Board determines is appropriate and feasible. The Ombudsman shall be a full time position, with salary and benefits appropriate to the function, as determined by the Board.
(b) The Ombudsman shall be appointed by the Board for an initial term of two years, subject to renewal by the Board

(c) The Ombudsman shall be subject to dismissal by the Board only upon a three fourths (3/4) vote of the entire Board

(d) The annual budget for the Office of Ombudsman shall be established by the Board as part of the annual ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget process. The Ombudsman shall submit a proposed budget to the President, and the President shall include that budget submission in its entirety and without change in the general ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget recommended by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) President to the Board. Nothing in this Section 5.1 shall prevent the President from offering separate views on the substance, size, or other features of the Ombudsman’s proposed budget to the Board.

Section 5.2. CHARTER

The charter of the Ombudsman shall be to act as a neutral dispute resolution practitioner for those matters for which the provisions of the Independent Review Process set forth in Section 4.3 have not been invoked. The principal function of the Ombudsman shall be to provide an independent internal evaluation of complaints by members of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community who believe that the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff, Board or an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) constituent body has treated them unfairly. The Ombudsman shall serve as an objective advocate for fairness, and shall seek to evaluate and where possible resolve complaints about unfair or inappropriate treatment by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff, the Board, or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) constituent bodies, clarifying the issues and using conflict resolution tools such as negotiation, facilitation, and "shuttle diplomacy" to achieve these results. With respect to the Reconsideration Request Process set forth in Section 4.2, the Ombudsman shall serve the function expressly provided for in Section 4.2.

Section 5.3. OPERATIONS

The Office of Ombudsman shall:
(a) facilitate the fair, impartial, and timely resolution of problems and complaints that affected members of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community (excluding employees and vendors/suppliers of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) may have with specific actions or failures to act by the Board or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff which have not otherwise become the subject of either a Reconsideration Request or Independent Review Process;

(b) perform the functions set forth in Section 4.2 relating to review and consideration of Reconsideration Requests;

(c) exercise discretion to accept or decline to act on a complaint or question, including by the development of procedures to dispose of complaints that are insufficiently concrete, substantive, or related to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s interactions with the community so as to be inappropriate subject matters for the Ombudsman to act on. In addition, and without limiting the foregoing, the Ombudsman shall have no authority to act in any way with respect to internal administrative matters, personnel matters, issues relating to membership on the Board, or issues related to vendor/supplier relations;

(d) have the right to have access to (but not to publish if otherwise confidential) all necessary information and records from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and constituent bodies to enable an informed evaluation of the complaint and to assist in dispute resolution where feasible (subject only to such confidentiality obligations as are imposed by the complainant or any generally applicable confidentiality policies adopted by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers));

(e) heighten awareness of the Ombudsman program and functions through routine interaction with the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and online availability;

(f) maintain neutrality and independence, and have no bias or personal stake in an outcome; and

(g) comply with all ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) conflicts of interest and confidentiality policies
Section 5.4. INTERACTION WITH ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) AND OUTSIDE ENTITIES

(a) No ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) employee, Board member, or other participant in Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) or Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) shall prevent or impede the Ombudsman's contact with the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community (including employees of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)). ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) employees and Board members shall direct members of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community who voice problems, concerns, or complaints about ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to the Ombudsman, who shall advise complainants about the various options available for review of such problems, concerns, or complaints.

(b) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) participants shall observe and respect determinations made by the Office of Ombudsman concerning confidentiality of any complaints received by that Office.

(c) Contact with the Ombudsman shall not constitute notice to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of any particular action or cause of action.

(d) The Ombudsman shall be specifically authorized to make such reports to the Board as he or she deems appropriate with respect to any particular matter and its resolution or the inability to resolve it. Absent a determination by the Ombudsman, in his or her sole discretion, that it would be inappropriate, such reports shall be posted on the Website.

(e) The Ombudsman shall not take any actions not authorized in these Bylaws, and in particular shall not institute, join, or support in any way any legal actions challenging ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) structure, procedures, processes, or any conduct by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board, staff, or constituent bodies.
Section 5.5. ANNUAL REPORT

The Office of Ombudsman shall publish on an annual basis a consolidated analysis of the year’s complaints and resolutions, appropriately dealing with confidentiality obligations and concerns. Such annual report should include a description of any trends or common elements of complaints received during the period in question, as well as recommendations for steps that could be taken to minimize future complaints. The annual report shall be posted on the Website.

ARTICLE 6 EMPOWERED COMMUNITY

Section 6.1. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE EMPOWERED COMMUNITY

(a) The Empowered Community ("EC (Empowered Community)") shall be a nonprofit association formed under the laws of the State of California consisting of the ASO (Address Supporting Organization), the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) (as defined in Section 10.1), the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) (as defined in Section 11.1), the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) (as defined in Section 12.2(d) (j)) and the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) (each a "Decisional Participant" or "associate," and collectively, the "Decisional Participants").

(b) This Article 6 shall constitute the articles of association of the EC (Empowered Community) and shall be considered the formational "governing document" (as defined in Section 18008 of the CCC) of the EC (Empowered Community), and the terms contained herein and in these Bylaws relating to the EC (Empowered Community) shall be the EC (Empowered Community)'s "governing principles" (as defined in Section 18010 of the CCC), which may only be amended as set forth in Section 25.2. Where necessary for purposes of interpretation of these Bylaws, an "associate" shall be deemed to be a "member" of the EC (Empowered Community) as defined in Section 18015 of the CCC. Any change in the number and/or identity of Decisional Participants for any reason (including the resignation of any Decisional Participant or the addition of new Decisional Participants as a result of the creation of additional Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) or Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees)), and any corresponding changes in the voting thresholds for exercise of the EC (Empowered Community)'s rights described in Annex D of these Bylaws, will only be effective following the completion of the process for amending Fundamental Bylaws described in Section 25.2 and
Annex D. The EC (Empowered Community) may not be dissolved except upon the completion of the process for amending Fundamental Bylaws described in Section 25.2 and Annex D.

(c) The sole purpose of the EC (Empowered Community) is to exercise its rights and perform its obligations under ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws, and the EC (Empowered Community) shall have no other powers or rights except as expressly provided therein. The EC (Empowered Community) may only act as provided in these Bylaws. Any act of the EC (Empowered Community) that is not in accordance with these Bylaws shall not be effective.

(d) The EC (Empowered Community) shall not acquire, hold, manage, encumber or transfer any interest in real or personal property, nor have any directors, officers or employees. The EC (Empowered Community) shall not merge with or into another entity nor shall it dissolve, except with the approval of the Board and as part of a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment (as defined in Section 25.2(b))

(e) Decisional Participants shall not transfer their right to be an associate of the EC (Empowered Community). Any attempted transfer by any Decisional Participant of its right to be an associate of the EC (Empowered Community) shall be void ab initio.

(f) The location and street address of the EC (Empowered Community) shall be the principal office of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(g) Each Decisional Participant shall, except as otherwise provided in Annex D, adopt procedures for exercising the rights of such Decisional Participant pursuant to the procedures set forth in Annex D, including (i) who can submit a petition to such Decisional Participant, (ii) the process for an individual to submit a petition to such Decisional Participant, including whether a petition must be accompanied by a rationale, (iii) how the Decisional Participant determines whether to accept or reject a petition, (iv) how the Decisional Participant determines whether an issue subject to a petition has been resolved, (v) how the Decisional Participant determines whether to support or object to actions supported by another Decisional Participant, and (vi) the process for the Decisional Participant to notify its constituents of relevant matters.
Section 6.2. POWERS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

(a) Pursuant to and in compliance with the terms and conditions of these Bylaws, the EC (Empowered Community) shall have the powers and rights, as set forth more fully elsewhere in these Bylaws, to:

(i) Appoint and remove individual Directors (other than the President);

(ii) Recall the entire Board;

(iii) Reject ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budgets, IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budgets, Operating Plans (as defined in Section 22.5(a)(i)) and Strategic Plans (as defined in Section 22.5(b)(i));

(iv) Reject Standard Bylaw Amendments (as defined in Section 25.1(a));

(v) Approve Fundamental Bylaw Amendments, Articles Amendments (as defined in Section 25.2(b)), and Asset Sales (as defined in Article 26(a));

(vi) Reject PTI Governance Actions (as defined in Section 16.2(d));

(vii) Require the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board to re-review its rejection of FR Recommendation Decisions (as defined in Section 18.6(d)), Special IFR Recommendation Decisions (as defined in Section 18.12(e)), SCWG Creation Decisions (as defined in Section 19.1(d)) and SCWG Recommendation Decisions (as defined in Section 19.4(d));

(viii) Initiate a Community Reconsideration Request, mediation or a Community IRP; and

(ix) Take necessary and appropriate action to enforce its powers and rights, including through the community mechanism contained in Annex D or an action filed in a court of competent jurisdiction.

(b) The EC (Empowered Community) may pursue an action in any court with jurisdiction over ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to enforce the EC (Empowered Community)’s rights under these
Bylaws. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) acknowledges the EC (Empowered Community)'s legal personhood and shall not raise the EC (Empowered Community)'s legal personhood as a defense in any proceeding between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the EC (Empowered Community). ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not assert as a defense that prior filing or completion of a Reconsideration Request or an IRP Claim was a prerequisite to an action in court regarding the EC (Empowered Community)'s power to appoint or remove an individual Director or recall the Board (except to the extent an IRP Panel award is applicable pursuant to Section 3.6(e)).

(c) By nominating a Director for designation by the EC (Empowered Community) or exercising the community mechanism contained in Annex D with respect to any rights granted to the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to these Bylaws, the EC (Empowered Community) and each of its Decisional Participants agrees and consents to the terms of these Bylaws and intends to be legally bound hereby.

Section 6.3. EC (Empowered Community) ADMINISTRATION

(a) The Decisional Participants shall act through their respective chairs or such other persons as may be designated by the Decisional Participants (collectively, such persons are the "EC (Empowered Community) Administration") Each Decisional Participant shall deliver annually a written certification from its chair or co-chairs to the Secretary designating the individual who shall represent the Decisional Participant on the EC (Empowered Community) Administration.

(b) In representing a Decisional Participant on the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the representative individual shall act solely as directed by the represented Decisional Participant and in accordance with processes developed by such Decisional Participant in accordance with Section 6.1(g).

(c) In representing the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the individuals serving thereon shall act as required for the EC (Empowered Community) to follow the applicable procedures in Annex D, and to implement EC (Empowered Community) decisions made in accordance with such procedures.
(d) All communications and notices required or permitted to be given under these Bylaws by a Decisional Participant shall be provided by the Decisional Participant’s representative on the EC (Empowered Community) Administration. All communications and notices required or permitted to be given under these Bylaws by the EC (Empowered Community) shall be provided by any member of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration. Where a particular Bylaws notice provision does not require notice to the Secretary, the EC (Empowered Community) and the Decisional Participants shall provide a copy of the notice to the Secretary in accordance with Section 21.5, and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post it on the Website.

(e) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be entitled to rely on notices from a Decisional Participant’s representative or an individual serving on the EC (Empowered Community) Administration delivered in accordance with Section 21.5 as evidence that the actions set forth therein have been approved by or are the actions of the Decisional Participant, the EC (Empowered Community) or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, as applicable, pursuant to and in compliance with the requirements of these Bylaws (including Annex D).

(f) No person participating in the EC (Empowered Community), the EC (Empowered Community) Administration or a Decisional Participant shall be liable for any debt, obligation or liability of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or the EC (Empowered Community), other than in the case of a fraudulent act committed by such person.

Section 6.4. CONSENT TO BOARD-INITIATED REMOVAL OF DIRECTOR WITHOUT CAUSE

In the event the EC (Empowered Community) Administration receives from the Secretary a valid notice as described in Section 7.11(a)(i)(B), indicating that the Board has voted to remove a Director without cause pursuant to Section 7.11(a)(i)(B), the EC (Empowered Community) shall without deliberation consent to such removal, and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall provide notice to the Secretary of such consent.

ARTICLE 7 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 7.1. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD
Section 7.2. DIRECTORS AND THEIR SELECTION;
ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

(a) As of the effective date of the amendment and restatement of these
Bylaws on 1 October 2016, the EC (Empowered Community) shall be the
sole designator of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and
Numbers) and shall designate, within the meaning of Section 5220 of the
CCC, all Directors except for the President ex officio. The EC (Empowered
Community) shall notify promptly the Secretary in writing of the following
designations:

(i) Eight Directors nominated by the Nom nating Committee to be
designated as Directors by the EC (Empowered Community). These
seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws as Seats 1 through
8.

(ii) Two Directors nominated by the ASO (Address Supporting
Organization) to be designated as Directors by the EC (Empowered
Community). These seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws
as Seat 9 and Seat 10.

(iii) Two Directors nominated by the ccNSO (Country Code Names
Supporting Organization) to be designated as Directors by the EC
(Empowered Community). These seats on the Board are referred to in
these Bylaws as Seat 11 and Seat 12.

(iv) Two Directors nominated by the GNSO (Generic Names
Supporting Organization) to be designated as Directors by the EC
(Empowered Community). These seats on the Board are referred to in
these Bylaws as Seat 13 and Seat 14.

(v) One Director nominated by the At Large Community to be
designated as Directors by the EC (Empowered Community). This seat
on the Board is referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 15.
In addition to the Directors designated by the EC (Empowered Community), the President shall serve ex officio as a Director. The seat held by the President on the Board is referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 16.

(b) In carrying out its responsibilities to nominate the Directors for Seats 1 through 8 for designation by the EC (Empowered Community), the Nominating Committee shall ensure that the Board is composed of Directors who, in the aggregate, display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in Section 7.3, Section 7.4 and Section 7.5. At no time when it makes its nomination shall the Nominating Committee nominate a Director to fill any vacancy or expired term whose designation would cause the total number of Directors (not including the President) from countries in any one Geographic Region to exceed five; and the Nominating Committee shall ensure when it makes its nominations that the Board includes at least one Director who is from a country in each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Geographic Region ("Diversity Calculation"). For purposes of this Section 7.2(b), if any candidate for director maintains citizenship of more than one country, or has been domiciled for more than five years in a country of which the candidate does not maintain citizenship ("Domicile"), that candidate may be deemed to be from either country and must select in his or her Statement of Interest the country of citizenship or Domicile that he or she wants the Nominating Committee to use for Diversity Calculation purposes. For purposes of this Section 7.2(b), a person can only have one Domicile, which shall be determined by where the candidate has a permanent residence and place of habitation.

(c) In carrying out their responsibilities to nominate Directors for Seats 9 through 15 for designation by the EC (Empowered Community), the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and the At-Large Community shall seek to ensure that the Board is composed of Directors who, in the aggregate, display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in Section 7.3, Section 7.4 and Section 7.5. The Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) shall ensure that, at any given time, no two Directors nominated by a Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) are citizens from the same country or of countries located in the same Geographic Region. For purposes of this Section 7.2(c), if any candidate for Director maintains citizenship or Domicile of more than one country, that candidate may be deemed to be from either country and must select in his or
her Statement of Interest the country of citizenship or Domicile that he or she wants the Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or the At Large Community, as applicable, to use for nomination purposes. For purposes of this Section 7.2(c), a person can only have one Domicile, which shall be determined by where the candidate has a permanent residence and place of habitation.

(d) The Board shall annually elect a Chair and a Vice-Chair from among the Directors, not to include the President.

(e) The EC (Empowered Community) shall designate each person nominated as a Director by the Nominating Committee, the ASO (Address Supporting Organization), the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) and the At Large Community in accordance with this Section 7.2.

(f) As a condition to sitting on the Board, each Director other than the President ex officio shall sign a pre-service letter pursuant to which such Director

(i) acknowledges and agrees to the EC (Empowered Community)'s right to remove the Director at any time and for any reason following the processes set forth in these Bylaws;

(ii) acknowledges and agrees that serving as a Director shall not establish any employment or other relationship (whether to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the EC (Empowered Community), any body entitled to nominate a Director, or any of their agents) that provides any due process rights related to termination of service as a Director; and

(iii) conditionally and irrevocably resigns as a Director automatically effective upon communication to the Director or, in the case of Board recall, communication to the Board of a final determination of removal following the processes set forth in these Bylaws.

Section 7.3.CRITERIA FOR NOMINATION OF DIRECTORS

Directors shall be:
(a) Accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity, and intelligence, with reputations for sound judgment and open minds, and a demonstrated capacity for thoughtful group decision-making;

(b) Persons with an understanding of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Mission and the potential impact of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) decisions on the global Internet community, and committed to the success of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers);

(c) Persons who will produce the broadest cultural and geographic diversity on the Board consistent with meeting the other criteria set forth in this Section 7.3;

(d) Persons who, in the aggregate, have personal familiarity with the operation of gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registries and registrars; with ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registries; with IP (Internet Protocol or Intellectual Property) address registries; with Internet technical standards and protocols; with policy development procedures, legal traditions, and the public interest; and with the broad range of business, individual, academic, and non-commercial users of the Internet; and

(e) Persons who are able to work and communicate in written and spoken English

Section 7.4. ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

(a) Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, no official of a national government or a multinational entity established by treaty or other agreement between national governments may serve as a Director. As used herein, the term "official" means a person (i) who holds an elective governmental office or (ii) who is employed by such government or multinational entity and whose primary function with such government or entity is to develop or influence governmental or public policies.

(b) No person who serves in any capacity (including as a liaison) on any Supporting Organization Council shall simultaneously serve as a Director or Liaison to the Board. If such a person is identified by, or presents themselves to, the Supporting Organization Council or the At-Large Community for consideration for nomination to serve as a Director, the person shall not
thereafter participate in any discussion of, or vote by, the Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) Council or the committee designated by the At-Large Community relating to the nomination of Directors by the Council or At Large Community, until the Council or committee(s) specified by the At-Large Community has nominated the full complement of Directors it is responsible for nominating. In the event that a person serving in any capacity on a Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) Council is considered for nomination to serve as a Director, the constituency group or other group or entity that selected the person may select a replacement for purposes of the Council's nomination process. In the event that a person serving in any capacity on the At-Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) is identified as or accepts a nomination to be considered for nomination by the At-Large Community as a Director, the Regional At-Large Organization or other group or entity that selected the person may select a replacement for purposes of the At-Large Community's nomination process.

(c) Persons serving in any capacity on the Nominating Committee shall be ineligible for nomination or designation to positions on the Board as provided by Section 8.8.

(d) No person who serves on the EC (Empowered Community) Administration while serving in that capacity shall be considered for nomination or designated to the Board, nor serve simultaneously on the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and as a Director or Liaison to the Board.

Section 7.5. INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATION

In order to ensure broad international representation on the Board, the nomination of Directors by the Nominating Committee, each Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) and the At-Large Community shall comply with all applicable diversity provisions of these Bylaws or of any memorandum of understanding referred to in these Bylaws concerning the Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization). One intent of these diversity provisions is to ensure that at all times each Geographic Region shall have at least one Director, and at all times no Geographic Region shall have more than five Directors on the Board (not including the President). As used in these Bylaws, each of the following is considered to be a "Geographic Region": (a) Europe; (b) Asia/Australia/Pacific; (c) Latin America/Caribbean islands; (d) Africa; and (e) North America. The specific countries included in each Geographic Region shall be determined by the Board, and this Section 7.5 shall be reviewed by the Board from time to time.
(and in any event at least once every three years) to determine whether any change is appropriate, taking account of the evolution of the Internet

Section 7.6. DIRECTORS' CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Board, through the Board Governance Committee, shall require a statement from each Director not less frequently than once a year setting forth all business and other affiliations that relate in any way to the business and other affiliations of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). Each Director shall be responsible for disclosing to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) any matter that could reasonably be considered to make such Director an "interested director" within the meaning of Section 5233 of the CCC. In addition, each Director shall disclose to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) any relationship or other factor that could reasonably be considered to cause the Director to be considered to be an "interested person" within the meaning of Section 5227 of the CCC. The Board shall adopt policies specifically addressing Director, Officer, EC (Empowered Community) and Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) conflicts of interest. No Director shall vote on any matter in which he or she has a material and direct financial interest that would be affected by the outcome of the vote.

Section 7.7. DUTIES OF DIRECTORS

Directors shall serve as individuals who have the duty to act in what they reasonably believe are the best interests of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and not as representatives of the EC (Empowered Community), the Nominating Committee, Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) that nominated them, as applicable, their employers, or any other organizations or constituencies.

Section 7.8. TERMS OF DIRECTORS

(a) The regular term of office of Director Seats 1 through 15 shall begin as follows:

   (i) The regular terms of Seats 1 through 3 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and
(ii) The regular terms of Seats 4 through 6 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting every third year after 2004;

(iii) The regular terms of Seats 7 and 8 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting every third year after 2005;

(iv) The terms of Seats 9 and 12 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting every third year after 2015;

(v) The terms of Seats 10 and 13 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting every third year after 2013; and

(vi) The terms of Seats 11, 14 and 15 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting every third year after 2014

(b) Each Director holding any of Seats 1 through 15, including a Director nominated and designated to fill a vacancy, shall hold office for a term that lasts until the next term for that Seat commences and until a successor has been designated and qualified or until that Director resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws. For the avoidance of doubt, the new governance provisions effective as of the amendment and restatement of these Bylaws on 1 October 2016 shall not have the effect of shortening or terminating the terms of any Directors serving at the time of the amendment and restatement.

(c) At least two months before the commencement of each annual meeting, the Nominating Committee shall give the EC (Empowered Community) Administration (with a copy to the Decisional Participants and Secretariat) written notice of its nomination of Directors for seats with terms beginning at the conclusion of the annual meeting, and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly provide the Secretary (with a copy to the Decisional Participants) with written notice of the designation of those Directors. All such notices shall be posted promptly to the Website.
(d) At least six months before the date specified for the commencement of the term as specified in Section 7.8(a)(iv) through Section 7.8(a)(vi) above, any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or the At-Large Community entitled to nominate a Director for a Seat with a term beginning that year shall give the EC (Empowered Community) Administration (with a copy to the Secretary and the Decisional Participants) written notice of its nomination of Directors for seats with terms beginning at the conclusion of the annual meeting, and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly provide the Secretary (with a copy to the Decisional Participants) with written notice of the designation of those Directors. All such notices shall be posted promptly to the Website.

(e) No Director may serve more than three consecutive terms. For these purposes, a person designated to fill a vacancy in a term shall not be deemed to have served that term.

(f) The term as Director of the person holding the office of President shall be for as long as, and only for as long as, such person holds the office of President.

Section 7.9. NON-VOTING LIAISONS

(a) The non-voting Liaisons shall include:

(i) One appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee);

(ii) One appointed by the Root Server System Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) established by Section 12.2(c);

(iii) One appointed by the Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)) and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) established by Section 12.2(d); and

(iv) One appointed by the Internet Engineering Task Force.

(b) The Liaisons shall serve terms that begin at the conclusion of each annual meeting. At least one month before the commencement of each annual
meeting, each body entitled to appoint a Liaison shall give the Secretary written notice of its appointment.

(c) Each Liaison may be reappointed, and shall remain in that position until a successor has been appointed or until the Liaison resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

(d) The Liaisons shall be entitled to attend Board meetings, participate in Board discussions and deliberations, and have access (under conditions established by the Board) to materials provided to Directors for use in Board discussions, deliberations and meetings, but shall otherwise not have any of the rights and privileges of Directors. Liaisons shall be entitled (under conditions established by the Board) to use any materials provided to them pursuant to this Section 7.9(d) for the purpose of consulting with their respective committee or organization.

Section 7.10. RESIGNATION OF A DIRECTOR OR NON-VOTING LIAISON

Subject to Section 5226 of the CCC, any Director or Liaison may resign at any time by giving written notice thereof to the Chair of the Board, the President, the Secretary, or the Board. Such resignation shall take effect at the time specified, and, unless otherwise specified, the acceptance of such resignation shall not be necessary to make it effective.

Section 7.11. REMOVAL OF A DIRECTOR OR NON-VOTING LIAISON

(a) Directors

(i) Any Director designated by the EC (Empowered Community) may be removed without cause

(A) by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with procedures in Section 3.1 or Section 3.2 of Annex D, as applicable, or

(B) following notice to that Director, by a three fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors; provided, however, that (x) each vote to remove a Director shall be a separate vote on the sole question of the removal of
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that particular Director; and (y) such removal shall not be effective until the Secretary has provided notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of the Board's removal vote and the requirements of Section 6.4 have been met.

(ii) The Board may remove any Director who has been declared of unsound mind by a final order of court, or convicted of a felony, or been found by a final order or judgment of any court to have breached any duty under Sections 5230 through 5239 of the CCC, and in the case of such removal, the Secretary shall promptly notify the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing, with a copy to the body that nominated such Director, and shall promptly post such notification to the Website. The vacancies created by such removal shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12(a).

(iii) All Directors (other than the President) may be removed at the same time by the EC (Empowered Community) by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration delivering an EC (Empowered Community) Board Recall Notice to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 3.3 of Annex D. The vacancies created by such removal shall be filled by the EC (Empowered Community) in accordance with Section 7.12(b).

(b) With the exception of the Liaison appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee), any Liaison may be removed following notice to that Liaison and to the organization which selected that Liaison, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors if the selecting organization fails to promptly remove that Liaison following such notice. The vacancies created by such removal shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12. The Board may request the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) to consider the replacement of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) Liaison if the Board, by a three fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors, determines that such an action is appropriate.

Section 7.12. VACANCIES

(a) This Section 7.12(a) shall apply to Board vacancies other than those occurring by recall of all Directors (other than the President). A vacancy or vacancies in the Board shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any Director or Interim Director (as defined in Section 7.12(b)), or if the authorized number of Directors is increased.
Vacancies occurring in Seats 1 through 15 shall be filled by the EC (Empowered Community) after nomination as provided in Section 7.2 and Articles 8 through 12. A vacancy in Seat 16 shall be filled as provided in Article 15. A Director designated by the EC (Empowered Community) to fill a vacancy on the Board shall serve for the unexpired term of his or her predecessor in office and until a successor has been designated and qualified. No reduction of the authorized number of Directors shall have the effect of removing a Director prior to the expiration of the Director's term of office.

(b) This Section 7.12(b) shall apply to Board vacancies occurring when all Directors (other than the President) are recalled as provided by Section 7.11(a)(iii). Concurrently with delivery of any EC (Empowered Community) Board Recall Notice (as defined in Section 3.3(f) of Annex D), the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall provide written notice of the EC (Empowered Community)'s designation of individuals to fill such vacancies (each such individual, an "Interim Director") to the Decisional Participants and to the Secretary, who shall cause such notice to be promptly posted to the Website. An Interim Director must meet the criteria specified in Section 7.3, Section 7.4 and Section 7.5, as applicable. An Interim Director shall hold office until the EC (Empowered Community) designates the Interim Director's successor in accordance with Section 7.12(a), and the successor's designation shall occur within 120 days of the Interim Director's designation. For avoidance of doubt, persons designated as Interim Directors may be eligible for designation as Directors as well.

(c) The organizations selecting the Liaisons identified in Section 7.9 are responsible for determining the existence of, and filling any vacancies in those positions. Such organizations shall give the Secretary written notice of their appointments to fill any such vacancies, subject to the requirements set forth in Section 7.4, as applicable.

Section 7.13. ANNUAL MEETINGS

Annual meetings of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be held for the purpose of electing Officers and for the transaction of such other business as may come before the meeting. Each annual meeting of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be held at the principal office of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), or any other appropriate place of the Board's time and choosing, provided such annual meeting is held within 14
months of the immediately preceding annual meeting. If the Board determines that it is practical, the annual meeting should be distributed in real time and archived video and audio formats on the Internet.

Section 7.14. REGULAR MEETINGS

Regular meetings of the Board shall be held on dates to be determined by the Board. In the absence of other designation, regular meetings shall be held at the principal office of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

Section 7.15. SPECIAL MEETINGS

Special meetings of the Board may be called by or at the request of one-quarter (1/4) of the Directors, by the Chair of the Board or the President. A call for a special meeting shall be made by the Secretary. Special meetings shall be held at the principal office of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) unless otherwise specified in the notice of the meeting.

Section 7.16. NOTICE OF MEETINGS

Notice of time and place of all meetings shall be delivered personally or by telephone or by electronic mail to each Director and Liaison, or sent by first-class mail (air mail for addresses outside the United States) or facsimile, charges prepaid, addressed to each Director and Liaison at the Director’s or Liaison's address as it is shown on the records of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). In case the notice is mailed, it shall be deposited in the United States mail at least fourteen (14) days before the time of the holding of the meeting. In case the notice is delivered personally or by telephone or facsimile or electronic mail it shall be delivered personally or by telephone or facsimile or electronic mail at least forty-eight (48) hours before the time of the holding of the meeting. Notwithstanding anything in this Section 7.16 to the contrary, notice of a meeting need not be given to any Director or Liaison who signed a waiver of notice or a Director who signed a written consent to holding the meeting or an approval of the minutes thereof, whether before or after the meeting, or who attends the meeting without protesting, prior thereto or at its commencement, the lack of notice to such Director. All such waivers, consents and approvals shall be filed with the corporate records or made a part of the minutes of the meetings.
Section 7.17. QUORUM

At all annual, regular, and special meetings of the Board, a majority of the total number of Directors then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the act of a majority of the Directors present at any meeting at which there is a quorum shall be the act of the Board, unless otherwise provided herein or by law. If a quorum shall not be present at any meeting of the Board, the Directors present thereat may adjourn the meeting from time to time to another place, time or date. If the meeting is adjourned for more than twenty-four (24) hours, notice shall be given to those Directors not at the meeting at the time of the adjournment.

Section 7.18. ACTIONS BY TELEPHONE MEETING OR BY OTHER COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

Directors and Liaisons may participate in a meeting of the Board or Board Committee (as defined in Section 14.1) through use of (a) conference telephone or similar communications equipment, provided that all Directors participating in such a meeting can speak to and hear one another or (b) electronic video screen communication or other communication equipment; provided that (i) all Directors participating in such a meeting can speak to and hear one another, (ii) all Directors are provided the means of fully participating in all matters before the Board or Board Committee, and (iii) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) adopts and implements means of verifying that (A) a person participating in such a meeting is a Director or other person entitled to participate in the meeting and (B) all actions of, or votes by, the Board or Board Committee are taken or cast only by Directors and not persons who are not Directors. Participation in a meeting pursuant to this Section 7.18 constitutes presence in person at such meeting. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall make available at the place of any meeting of the Board the telecommunications equipment necessary to permit Directors and Liaisons to participate by telephone.

Section 7.19. ACTION WITHOUT MEETING

Any action required or permitted to be taken by the Board or a Committee of the Board may be taken without a meeting if all of the Directors entitled to vote thereat shall individually or collectively consent in writing to such action. Such written consent shall have the same force and effect as the unanimous
vote of such Directors. Such written consent or consents shall be filed with the minutes of the proceedings of the Board

Section 7.20. ELECTRONIC MAIL

If permitted by applicable law, communication by electronic mail shall be considered equivalent to any communication otherwise required to be in writing. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall take such steps as it deems appropriate under the circumstances to assure itself that communications by electronic mail are authentic.

Section 7.21. BOARD RIGHTS OF INSPECTION

(a) Every Director shall have the right at any reasonable time to inspect and copy all books, records and documents of every kind, and to inspect the physical properties of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(b) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall establish reasonable procedures to protect against the inappropriate disclosure of confidential information.

Section 7.22. COMPENSATION

(a) Except for the President of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), who serves ex officio as a Director, each of the Directors shall be entitled to receive compensation for his or her services as a Director. The President shall receive only his or her compensation for service as President and shall not receive additional compensation for service as a Director.

(b) If the Board determines to offer a compensation arrangement to one or more Directors (other than the President) for services to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as Directors, the Board shall follow the process that is calculated to pay an amount for service as a Director that is not an excess benefit under the standards set forth in Section 4958 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code").

(c) As part of the process, the Board shall retain an Independent Valuation Expert (as defined in Section 7.22(g)(i)) to consult with and to advise the Board regarding Director compensation arrangements and to issue to the
Board a Reasoned Written Opinion (as defined in Section 7.22(g)(ii)) from such expert regarding the ranges of Reasonable Compensation (as defined in Section 7.22(g)(iii)) for any such services by a Director. The expert's opinion shall address all relevant factors affecting the level of compensation to be paid a Director, including offices held on the Board, attendance at Board and Board Committee meetings, the nature of service on the Board and on Board Committees, and appropriate data as to comparability regarding director compensation arrangements for U S based, nonprofit, tax exempt organizations possessing a global employee base.

(d) After having reviewed the Independent Valuation Expert's Reasoned Written Opinion, the Board shall meet with the expert to discuss the expert's opinion and to ask questions of the expert regarding the expert's opinion, the comparability data obtained and relied upon, and the conclusions reached by the expert.

(e) The Board shall adequately document the basis for any determination the Board makes regarding a Director compensation arrangement concurrently with making that determination.

(f) In addition to authorizing payment of compensation for services as Directors as set forth in this Section 7.22, the Board may also authorize the reimbursement of actual and necessary reasonable expenses incurred by any Director and by Liaisons performing their duties as Directors or Liaisons.

(g) As used in this Section 7.22, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(i) An "Independent Valuation Expert" means a person retained by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to value compensation arrangements that: (A) holds itself out to the public as a compensation consultant; (B) performs valuations regarding compensation arrangements on a regular basis, with a majority of its compensation consulting services performed for persons other than ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers); (C) is qualified to make valuations of the type of services involved in any engagement by and for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers); (D) issues to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) a Reasoned Written Opinion regarding a particular compensation arrangement; and (E) includes in its
Reasoned Written Opinion a certification that it meets the requirements set forth in (A) through (D) of this definition

(ii) A "Reasoned Written Opinion" means a written opinion of a valuation expert who meets the requirements of Section 7.22(g)(i)(A) through (D). To be reasoned, the opinion must be based upon a full disclosure by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to the valuation expert of the factual situation regarding the compensation arrangement that is the subject of the opinion, the opinion must articulate the applicable valuation standards relevant in valuing such compensation arrangement, the opinion must apply those standards to such compensation arrangement, and the opinion must arrive at a conclusion regarding whether the compensation arrangement is within the range of Reasonable Compensation for the services covered by the arrangement. A written opinion is reasoned even though it reaches a conclusion that is subsequently determined to be incorrect so long as the opinion addresses itself to the facts and the applicable standards. However, a written opinion is not reasoned if it does nothing more than recite the facts and express a conclusion.

(iii) "Reasonable Compensation" shall have the meaning set forth in §53 4958 4(b)(1)(ii) of the Regulations issued under §4958 of the Code.

(h) Each of the Liaisons, with the exception of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) Liaison, shall be entitled to receive compensation for his or her services as a Liaison. If the Board determines to offer a compensation arrangement to one or more Liaisons, the Board shall approve that arrangement by a required three-fourths (3/4) vote.

Section 7.23. PRESUMPTION OF ASSENT

A Director present at a Board meeting at which action on any corporate matter is taken shall be presumed to have assented to the action taken unless his or her dissent or abstention is entered in the minutes of the meeting, or unless such Director files a written dissent or abstention to such action with the person acting as the secretary of the meeting before the adjournment thereof, or forwards such dissent or abstention by registered mail to the Secretary immediately after the adjournment of the meeting. Such right to dissent or abstain shall not apply to a Director who voted in favor of such action.
Section 7.24 INTERIM BOARD

Except in circumstances in which urgent decisions are needed to protect the security, stability or resilience of the DNS (Domain Name System) or to the extent necessary to comply with its fiduciary obligations under applicable law, a Board that consists of a majority or more of Interim Directors (an "Interim Board") shall (a) consult with the chairs of the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) before making major decisions and (b) consult through a community forum (in a manner consistent with the process for a Rejection Action Community Forum pursuant to Section 2.3 of Annex D) prior to taking any action that would, if implemented, materially change ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s strategy, policies or management, including replacement of the then-serving President. Interim Directors shall be entitled to compensation as provided in this Article 7.

Section 7.25 COMMUNICATION OF DESIGNATION

Upon its receipt of nominations as provided in Articles 7 through 12, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, on behalf of the EC (Empowered Community), shall promptly notify the Secretary of the EC (Empowered Community)'s designation of individuals to fill seats on the Board. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post all such designations promptly to the Website.

ARTICLE 8 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Section 8.1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a Nominating Committee of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) ("Nominating Committee"), responsible for nominating all Directors except the President and those Directors nominated by Decisional Participants; for nominating two directors of PTI (in accordance with the articles of incorporation and bylaws of PTI); and for such other selections as are set forth in these Bylaws. Notification of the Nominating Committee's Director nominations shall be given by the Nominating Committee Chair in writing to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC (Empowered Community) shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25. Notification of the Nominating Committee's PTI director nomination shall be given to the Secretary.
Section 8.2. COMPOSITION

The Nominating Committee shall be composed of the following persons:

(a) A non-voting Chair, appointed by the Board;

(b) A non-voting Chair-Elect, appointed by the Board as a non-voting advisor;

(c) A non-voting liaison appointed by the Root Server System Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) established by Section 12.2(c);

(d) A non-voting liaison appointed by the Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)) and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) established by Section 12.2(b);

(e) A non-voting liaison appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee);

(f) Five voting delegates selected by the At-Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) established by Section 12.2(d);

(g) Voting delegates to the Nominating Committee shall be selected from the Generic Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) established by Article 11, as follows:

(i) One delegate from the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(ii) One delegate from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(iii) Two delegates from the Business Constituency, one representing small business users and one representing large business users;

(iv) One delegate from the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency (as defined in Section 11.5(a)(iii));

(v) One delegate from the Intellectual Property Constituency; and

(vi) One delegate from consumer and civil society groups, selected by the Non-Commercial Users Constituency.
(h) One voting delegate each selected by the following entities:

(i) The Council of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) established by Section 10.3;

(ii) The Council of the Address Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) established by Section 9.2; and

(iii) The Internet Engineering Task Force.

(i) A non-voting Associate Chair, who may be appointed by the Chair, at his or her sole discretion, to serve during all or part of the term of the Chair. The Associate Chair may not be a person who is otherwise a member of the same Nominating Committee. The Associate Chair shall assist the Chair in carrying out the duties of the Chair, but shall not serve, temporarily or otherwise, in the place of the Chair.

Section 8.3. TERMS

(a) Each voting delegate shall serve a one-year term. A delegate may serve at most two successive one-year terms, after which at least two years must elapse before the individual is eligible to serve another term.

(b) The regular term of each voting delegate shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the immediately following ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting.

(c) Non-voting liaisons shall serve during the term designated by the entity that appoints them. The Chair, the Chair-Elect, and any Associate Chair shall serve as such until the conclusion of the next ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting.

(d) It is anticipated that upon the conclusion of the term of the Chair-Elect, the Chair-Elect will be appointed by the Board to the position of Chair. However, the Board retains the discretion to appoint any other person to the position of Chair. At the time of appointing a Chair-Elect, if the Board determines that the person identified to serve as Chair shall be appointed as Chair for a successive term, the Chair-Elect position shall remain vacant for the term designated by the Board.
(e) Vacancies in the positions of delegate, non-voting liaison, Chair or Chair-Elect shall be filled by the entity entitled to select the delegate, non-voting liaison, Chair or Chair-Elect involved. For any term that the Chair-Elect position is vacant pursuant to Section 8.3(d), or until any other vacancy in the position of Chair-Elect can be filled, a non-voting advisor to the Chair may be appointed by the Board from among persons with prior service on the Board or a Nominating Committee, including the immediately previous Chair of the Nominating Committee. A vacancy in the position of Associate Chair may be filled by the Chair in accordance with the criteria established by Section 8.2(i).

(f) The existence of any vacancies shall not affect the obligation of the Nominating Committee to carry out the responsibilities assigned to it in these Bylaws.

Section 8.4. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE DELEGATES

Delegates to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Nominating Committee shall be:

(a) Accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity, and intelligence, with reputations for sound judgment and open minds, and with experience and competence with collegial large group decision making;

(b) Persons with wide contacts, broad experience in the Internet community, and a commitment to the success of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers);

(c) Persons whom the selecting body is confident will consult widely and accept input in carrying out their responsibilities;

(d) Persons who are neutral and objective, without any fixed personal commitments to particular individuals, organizations, or commercial objectives in carrying out their Nominating Committee responsibilities;

(e) Persons with an understanding of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s mission and the potential impact of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s activities on the broader Internet community who are willing to serve as volunteers without compensation other than the reimbursement of certain expenses; and
(f) Persons who are able to work and communicate in written and spoken English

Section 8.5. DIVERSITY
In carrying out its responsibilities to nominate Directors to fill Seats 1 through 8 (and selections to any other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) bodies as the Nominating Committee is responsible for under these Bylaws), the Nominating Committee shall take into account the continuing membership of the Board (and such other bodies), and seek to ensure that the persons it nominates to serve as Director and selects shall, to the extent feasible and consistent with the other criteria required to be applied by Section 8.4, be guided by Section 1.2(b)(ii).

Section 8.6. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the Nominating Committee to carry out its responsibilities.

Section 8.7. PROCEDURES
The Nominating Committee shall adopt such operating procedures as it deems necessary, which shall be published on the Website.

Section 8.8. INELIGIBILITY FOR SELECTION BY NOMINATING COMMITTEE
No person who serves on the Nominating Committee in any capacity shall be eligible for nomination by any means to any position on the Board or any other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) body having one or more membership positions that the Nominating Committee is responsible for filling, until the conclusion of an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting that coincides with, or is after, the conclusion of that person's service on the Nominating Committee.

Section 8.9. INELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICE ON NOMINATING COMMITTEE
No person who is an employee of or paid consultant to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (including the Ombudsman) shall simultaneously serve in any of the Nominating Committee positions described in Section 8.2

ARTICLE 9 ADDRESS SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 9.1. DESCRIPTION

(a) The Address Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) ("Address Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization)" or "ASO (Address Supporting Organization)") shall advise the Board with respect to policy issues relating to the operation, assignment, and management of Internet addresses

(b) The ASO (Address Supporting Organization) shall be the entity established by the Memorandum of Understanding entered on 21 October 2004 between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the Number Resource Organization ("NRO (Number Resource Organization)"), an organization of the existing RIRs.

Section 9.2. ADDRESS COUNCIL

(a) The ASO (Address Supporting Organization) shall have an Address Council, consisting of the members of the NRO (Number Resource Organization) Number Council.

(b) The Address Council shall nominate individuals to fill Seats 9 and 10 on the Board. Notification of the Address Council's nominations shall be given by the Address Council in writing to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC (Empowered Community) shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

ARTICLE 10 COUNTRY CODE NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 10.1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a policy development body known as the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) ("ccNSO
(Country Code Names Supporting Organization), which shall be responsible for

(a) developing and recommending to the Board global policies relating to country code top level domains;

(b) Nurturing consensus across the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)'s community, including the name related activities of ccTLDs;

(c) Coordinating with other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations), committees, and constituencies under ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers);

(d) Nominating individuals to fill Seats 11 and 12 on the Board; and

(e) Other responsibilities of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) as set forth in these Bylaws.

Policies that apply to ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members by virtue of their membership are only those policies developed according to Section 10.4(j) and Section 10.4(k). However, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) may also engage in other activities authorized by its members. Adherence to the results of these activities will be voluntary and such activities may include: seeking to develop voluntary best practices for ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers, assisting in skills building within the global community of ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers, and enhancing operational and technical cooperation among ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers.

Section 10.2. ORGANIZATION

The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) shall consist of (a) ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers that have agreed in writing to be members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) (see Section 10.4(b)) and (b) a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council responsible for managing the policy-development process of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization).
Section 10.3. ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) COUNCIL

(a) The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall consist of three ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members selected by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members within each of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Geographic Regions in the manner described in Section 10.4(g) through Section 10.4(i); (ii) three ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members selected by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Nominating Committee; (iii) liaisons as described in Section 10.3(b); and (iv) observers as described in Section 10.3(c).

(b) There shall also be one liaison to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council from each of the following organizations, to the extent they choose to appoint such a liaison (i) the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee); (ii) the At-Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee); and (iii) each of the Regional Organizations described in Section 10.5. These liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council. Appointments of liaisons shall be made by providing written notice to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair, and shall be for the term designated by the appointing organization as stated in the written notice. The appointing organization may recall from office or replace its liaison at any time by providing written notice of the recall or replacement to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair.

(c) The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council may agree with the Council of any other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) to exchange observers. Such observers shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council. The
appointing Council may designate its observer (or revoke or change the designation of its observer) on the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council at any time by providing written notice to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair.

(d) (i) the regular term of each ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council member shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the third ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting thereafter; (ii) the regular terms of the three ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members selected by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members within each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Geographic Region shall be staggered so that one member's term begins in a year divisible by three, a second member's term begins in the first year following a year divisible by three, and the third member's term begins in the second year following a year divisible by three; and (iii) the regular terms of the three ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members selected by the Nominating Committee shall be staggered in the same manner. Each ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council member shall hold office during his or her regular term and until a successor has been selected and qualified or until that member resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

(e) A ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council member may resign at any time by giving written notice to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair.

(f) ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members may be removed for not attending three consecutive meetings of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council without sufficient cause or for grossly inappropriate behavior, both as determined by at least a 66% vote of all of the members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council.
(g) A vacancy on the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council member. Vacancies in the positions of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall be filled for the unexpired term involved by the Nominating Committee giving the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary written notice of its selection, with a notification copy to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair. Vacancies in the positions of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members selected by ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members shall be filled for the unexpired term by the procedure described in Section 10.4(g) through (i).

(h) The role of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council is to administer and coordinate the affairs of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) (including coordinating meetings, including an annual meeting, of ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members as described in Section 10.4(f)) and to manage the development of policy recommendations in accordance with Section 10.6(a). The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall also undertake such other roles as the members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) shall decide from time to time.

(i) The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall nominate individuals to fill Seats 11 and 12 on the Board by written ballot or by action at a meeting; any such nomination must have affirmative votes of a majority of all the members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council then in office. Notification of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council’s nominations shall be given by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair in writing to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC (Empowered Community) shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

(j) The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall select from among its members the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair and such Vice Chair(s) as it deems appropriate. Selections of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair and Vice Chair(s) shall be by written ballot or by action at a meeting; any such selection must have affirmative votes of a majority of all
the members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council then in office. The term of office of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair and any Vice Chair(s) shall be as specified by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council at or before the time the selection is made. The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair or any Vice Chair(s) may be recalled from office by the same procedure as used for selection.

(k) The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, subject to direction by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members, shall adopt such rules and procedures for the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) as it deems necessary, provided they are consistent with these Bylaws. Rules for ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) membership and operating procedures adopted by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall be published on the Website.

(l) Except as provided by Section 10.3(i) and Section 10.3(j), the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall act at meetings. The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall meet regularly on a schedule it determines, but not fewer than four times each calendar year. At the discretion of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, meetings may be held in person or by other means, provided that all ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members are permitted to participate by at least one means described in Section 10.3(n). Except where determined by a majority vote of the members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council present that a closed session is appropriate, physical meetings shall be open to attendance by all interested persons. To the extent practicable, ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council meetings should be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, or of one or more of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s other Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations).

(m) Notice of time and place (and information about means of participation other than personal attendance) of all meetings of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall be provided to each ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council member, liaison, and observer by e-mail, telephone, facsimile, or a paper notice delivered personally or by postal mail. In case the notice is sent by postal mail, it shall be sent at least 21 days before the day of the meeting. In case the notice is
delivered personally or by telephone, facsimile, or e-mail it shall be provided at least seven days before the day of the meeting. At least seven days in advance of each ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council meeting (or if not practicable, as far in advance as is practicable), a notice of such meeting and, to the extent known, an agenda for the meeting shall be posted.

(n) Members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council may participate in a meeting of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council through personal attendance or use of electronic communication (such as telephone or video conference), provided that (i) all ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members participating in the meeting can speak to and hear one another, (ii) all ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members participating in the meeting are provided the means of fully participating in all matters before the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, and (iii) there is a reasonable means of verifying the identity of ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members participating in the meeting and their votes. A majority of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members (i.e. those entitled to vote) then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and actions by a majority vote of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members present at any meeting at which there is a quorum shall be actions of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws. The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following the meeting, and no later than 21 days following the meeting.

Section 10.4. MEMBERSHIP

(a) The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) shall have a membership consisting of ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers. Any ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager that meets the membership qualifications stated in Section 10.4.b) shall be entitled to be members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization). For purposes of this Article 10, a ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO (International Organization for Standardization) 3166 country-code.
top-level domain, or under any later variant, for that country-code top-level domain

(b) Any ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager may become a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) member by submitting an application to a person designated by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council to receive applications. The application shall be in writing in a form designated by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council. The application shall include the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager's recognition of the role of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) within the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) structure as well as the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager's agreement, for the duration of its membership in the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), (i) to adhere to rules of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), including membership rules, (ii) to abide by policies developed and recommended by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and adopted by the Board in the manner described by Section 10.4(j) and Section 10.4(k), and (ii) to pay ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) membership fees established by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council under Section 10.7(c). A ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) member may resign from membership at any time by giving written notice to a person designated by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council to receive notices of resignation. Upon resignation the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager ceases to agree to (A) adhere to rules of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), including membership rules, (B) to abide by policies developed and recommended by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and adopted by the Board in the manner described by Section 10.4(j) and Section 10.4(k), and (C) to pay ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) membership fees established by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council under Section 10.7(c). In the absence of designation by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council of a person to receive applications and notices of resignation, they shall be sent to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary, who shall notify the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council of receipt of any such applications and notices.
(c) Neither membership in the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) nor membership in any Regional Organization described in Section 10.5 shall be a condition for access to or registration in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) database. Any individual relationship a ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager has with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager's receipt of IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) services is not in any way contingent upon membership in the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization).

(d) The Geographic Regions of ccTLDs shall be as described in Section 7.5. For purposes of this Article 10, managers of ccTLDs within a Geographic Region that are members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) are referred to as ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members "within" the Geographic Region, regardless of the physical location of the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager. In cases where the Geographic Region of a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) member is unclear, the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) member should self select according to procedures adopted by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council.

(e) Each ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager may designate in writing a person, organization, or entity to represent the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager. In the absence of such a designation, the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager shall be represented by the person, organization, or entity listed as the administrative contact in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) database.

(f) There shall be an annual meeting of ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members, which shall be coordinated by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council. Annual meetings should be open for all to attend, and a reasonable opportunity shall be provided for ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers that are not members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) as well as other non members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) to address the meeting. To the extent practicable, annual meetings of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members shall be held in person and should be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, or of one or more of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s other Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations).
(g) The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members selected by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members from each Geographic Region (see Section 10.3(a)(i)) shall be selected through nomination, and if necessary election, by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members within that Geographic Region. At least 90 days before the end of the regular term of any ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)-member-selected member of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, or upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the seat of such a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council member, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall establish a nomination and election schedule, which shall be sent to all ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members within the Geographic Region and posted on the Website.

(h) Any ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) member may nominate an individual to serve as a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council member representing the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) member's Geographic Region. Nominations must be seconded by another ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) member from the same Geographic Region. By accepting their nomination, individuals nominated to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council agree to support the policies committed to by ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members.

(i) If at the close of nominations there are no more candidates nominated (with seconds and acceptances) in a particular Geographic Region than there are seats on the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council available for that Geographic Region, then the nominated candidates shall be selected to serve on the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council. Otherwise, an election by written ballot (which may be by e-mail) shall be held to select the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members from among those nominated (with seconds and acceptances), with ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members from the Geographic Region being entitled to vote in the election through their designated representatives. In such an election, a majority of all ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members in the Geographic Region entitled to vote shall constitute a quorum, and the selected candidate must receive the votes of a majority of those cast by ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members.
Organization) members within the Geographic Region. The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council Chair shall provide the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary prompt written notice of the selection of ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council members under this paragraph.

(j) Subject to Section 10.4(k), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policies shall apply to ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members by virtue of their membership to the extent, and only to the extent, that the policies (i) only address issues that are within scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) according to Section 10.6(a) and Annex C; (ii) have been developed through the ccPDP as described in Section 10.6, and (iii) have been recommended as such by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) to the Board, and (iv) are adopted by the Board as policies, provided that such policies do not conflict with the law applicable to the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager which shall, at all times, remain paramount. In addition, such policies shall apply to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in its activities concerning ccTLDs.

(k) A ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) member shall not be bound if it provides a declaration to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council stating that (i) implementation of the policy would require the member to breach custom, religion, or public policy (not embodied in the applicable law described in Section 10.4(j)), and (ii) failure to implement the policy would not impair DNS (Domain Name System) operations or interoperability, giving detailed reasons supporting its statements. After investigation, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council will provide a response to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) member’s declaration. If there is a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council consensus disagreeing with the declaration, which may be demonstrated by a vote of 14 or more members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, the response shall state the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council’s disagreement with the declaration and the reasons for disagreement. Otherwise, the response shall state the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council’s agreement with the declaration. If the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council disagrees, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall review the situation after a six month period. At the end of that period, the ccNSO (Country Code Names
Supporting Organization) Council shall make findings as to (A) whether the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members’ implementation of the policy would require the member to breach custom, religion, or public policy (not embodied in the applicable law described in Section 10.4(j)) and (B) whether failure to implement the policy would impair DNS (Domain Name System) operations or interoperability. In making any findings disagreeing with the declaration, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall proceed by consensus, which may be demonstrated by a vote of 14 or more members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council.

Section 10.5. REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council may designate a Regional Organization for each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Geographic Region, provided that the Regional Organization is open to full membership by all ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members within the Geographic Region. Decisions to designate or de-designate a Regional Organization shall require a 66% vote of all of the members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council and shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the Board.

Section 10.6. ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) POLICY-DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND SCOPE

(a) The scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)’s policy-development role shall be as stated in Annex C to these Bylaws; any modifications to the scope shall be recommended to the Board by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) by use of the procedures of the ccPDP, and shall be subject to approval by the Board.

(b) In developing global policies within the scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and recommending them to the Board, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) shall follow the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Policy-Development Process ("ccPDP") The ccPDP shall be as stated in Annex B to these Bylaws; modifications shall be recommended to the Board by the
Section 10.7. STAFF SUPPORT AND FUNDING

(a) Upon request of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, a member of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff may be assigned to support the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and shall be designated as the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Staff Manager. Alternatively, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council may designate, at ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) expense, another person to serve as ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Staff Manager. The work of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Staff Manager on substantive matters shall be assigned by the Chair of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, and may include the duties of ccPDP Issue Manager.

(b) Upon request of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) to carry out its responsibilities. Such support shall not include an obligation for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to fund travel expenses incurred by ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) participants for travel to any meeting of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) or for any other purpose. The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council may make provision, at ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) expense, for administrative and operational support in addition or as an alternative to support provided by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(c) The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall establish fees to be paid by ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members to defray ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) expenses as described in Section 10.7(a) and Section 10.7(b), as approved by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members.
(d) Written notices given to the Secretary under this Article 10 shall be permanently retained, and shall be made available for review by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council on request. The Secretary shall also maintain the roll of members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), which shall include the name of each ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) manager’s designated representative, and which shall be posted on the Website.

ARTICLE 11 GENERIC NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 11.1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (the "Generic Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization)" or "GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)"), and collectively with the ASO (Address Supporting Organization) and ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), the "Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations)"), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains and other responsibilities of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) as set forth in these Bylaws.

Section 11.2. ORGANIZATION

The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) shall consist of

(a) A number of Constituencies, where applicable, organized within the Stakeholder Groups as described in Section 11.5;

(b) Four Stakeholder Groups organized within Houses as described in Section 11.5;

(c) Two Houses within the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council as described in Section 11.3(h);

(d) A GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), as described in Section 11.3; and
(e) Except as otherwise defined in these Bylaws, the four Stakeholder Groups and the Constituencies will be responsible for defining their own charters with the approval of their members and of the Board.

Section 11.3. GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) COUNCIL

(a) Subject to Section 11.5, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council shall consist of

(i) three representatives selected from the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(ii) three representatives selected from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(iii) six representatives selected from the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(iv) six representatives selected from the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group; and

(v) three representatives selected by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Nominating Committee, one of which shall be non voting, but otherwise entitled to participate on equal footing with other members of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council including, e.g., the making and seconding of motions and of serving as Chair if elected. One Nominating Committee appointee voting representative shall be assigned to each House (as described in Section 11.3(h)) by the Nominating Committee.

No individual representative may hold more than one seat on the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council at the same time.

Stakeholder Groups should, in their charters, ensure their representation on the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council is as diverse as possible and practicable, including considerations of geography, GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Constituency, sector, ability and gender.
There may also be liaisons to the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council from other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and/or Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), from time to time. The appointing organization shall designate, revoke, or change its liaison on the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council by providing written notice to the Chair of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council and to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Secretary. Liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote, to make or second motions, or to serve as an officer on the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, but otherwise liaisons shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council.

(b) The regular term of each GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council member shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the second ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting thereafter. The regular term of two representatives selected from Stakeholder Groups with three Council seats shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other representative selected from that Stakeholder Group shall begin in odd-numbered years. The regular term of three representatives selected from Stakeholder Groups with six Council seats shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other three representatives selected from that Stakeholder Group shall begin in odd-numbered years. The regular term of one of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other two of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin in odd-numbered years. Each GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council member shall hold office during his or her regular term and until a successor has been selected and qualified or until that member resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

Except in a "special circumstance," such as, but not limited to, meeting geographic or other diversity requirements defined in the Stakeholder Group charters, where no alternative representative is available to serve, no Council member may be selected to serve more than two consecutive terms, in such a special circumstance a Council member may serve one additional term. For these purposes, a person selected to fill a vacancy in a term shall not be deemed to have served that term. A former Council member who has served
two consecutive terms must remain out of office for one full term prior to
serving any subsequent term as Council member. A "special circumstance" is
defined in the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Operating
Procedures.

(c) A vacancy on the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)
Council shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or
removal of any member. Vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired term by
the appropriate Nominating Committee or Stakeholder Group that selected
the member holding the position before the vacancy occurred by giving the
GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Secretariat written notice of
its selection. Procedures for handling Stakeholder Group-appointed GNSO
(Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council member vacancies,
resignations, and removals are prescribed in the applicable Stakeholder
Group Charter.

A GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council member selected
by the Nominating Committee may be removed for cause (i) stated by a
three-fourths (3/4) vote of all members of the applicable House to which the
Nominating Committee appointee is assigned; or (ii) stated by a three fourths
(3/4) vote of all members of each House in the case of the non-voting
Nominating Committee appointee (see Section 11.3(h)). Such removal shall
be subject to reversal by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned
Names and Numbers) Board on appeal by the affected GNSO (Generic
Names Supporting Organization) Council member.

(d) The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council is
responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO
(Generic Names Supporting Organization). It shall adopt such procedures
(the "GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Operating
Procedures") as it sees fit to carry out that responsibility, provided that such
procedures are approved by a majority vote of each House. The GNSO
(Generic Names Supporting Organization) Operating Procedures shall be
effective upon the expiration of a twenty-one (21) day public comment period,
and shall be subject to Board oversight and review. Until any modifications
are recommended by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)
Council, the applicable procedures shall be as set forth in Section 11.6.

(e) No more than one officer, director or employee of any particular
corporation or other organization (including its subsidiaries and affiliates) shall
serve on the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council at any given time.

(f) The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) shall nominate by written ballot or by action at a meeting individuals to fill Seats 13 and 14 on the Board. Each of the two voting Houses of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), as described in Section 11.3(h), shall make a nomination to fill one of two Board seats, as outlined below; any such nomination must have affirmative votes compromising sixty percent (60%) of all the respective voting House members:

   (i) the Contracted Parties House (as described in Section 11.3(h)(i)) shall select a representative to fill Seat 13; and

   (ii) the Non-Contracted Parties House (as described in Section 11.3(h)(ii)) shall select a representative to fill Seat 14.

Election procedures are defined in the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Operating Procedures.

Notification of the Board seat nominations shall be given by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Chair in writing to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC (Empowered Community) shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

(g) The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council shall select the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Chair for a term the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council specifies, but not longer than one year. Each House (as described in Section 11.3(h)) shall select a Vice-Chair, who will be a Vice-Chair of the whole of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, for a term the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council specifies, but not longer than one year. The procedures for selecting the Chair and any other officers are contained in the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Operating Procedures. In the event that the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council has not elected a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Chair by the end of the previous Chair’s term, the Vice-Chairs will serve as interim GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Co-Chairs until a successful election can be held.
(h) Except as otherwise required in these Bylaws, for voting purposes, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council (see Section 11.3(a)) shall be organized into a bicameral House structure as described below:

(i) the Contracted Parties House includes the Registries Stakeholder Group (three members), the Registrars Stakeholder Group (three members), and one voting member appointed by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Nominating Committee for a total of seven voting members; and

(ii) the Non Contracted Parties House includes the Commercial Stakeholder Group (six members), the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (six members), and one voting member appointed by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Nominating Committee to that House for a total of thirteen voting members.

Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, each member of a voting House is entitled to cast one vote in each separate matter before the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council.

(i) Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, Annex A, Annex A 1 or Annex A-2 hereto, or the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Operating Procedures, the default threshold to pass a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council motion or other voting action requires a simple majority vote of each House. The voting thresholds described below shall apply to the following GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) actions:

(i) Create an Issues Report requires an affirmative vote of more than one-fourth (1/4) vote of each House or majority of one House.

(ii) Initiate a Policy Development Process ("PDP (Policy Development Process)"") Within Scope (as described in Annex A): requires an affirmative vote of more than one third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

(iii) Initiate a PDP (Policy Development Process) Not Within Scope requires an affirmative vote of GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority (as defined in Section 11.3(i)(xix))
(iv) Approve a PDP (Policy Development Process) Team Charter for a PDP (Policy Development Process) Within Scope requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two thirds (2/3) of one House.

(v) Approve a PDP (Policy Development Process) Team Charter for a PDP (Policy Development Process) Not Within Scope requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority.

(vi) Changes to an Approved PDP (Policy Development Process) Team Charter For any PDP (Policy Development Process) Team Charter approved under (iv) or (v) above, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council may approve an amendment to the Charter through a simple majority vote of each House.

(vii) Terminate a PDP (Policy Development Process) Once initiated, and prior to the publication of a Final Report, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council may terminate a PDP (Policy Development Process) only for significant cause, upon a motion that passes with a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote in favor of termination.

(viii) Approve a PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendation Without a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority requires an affirmative vote of a majority of each House and further requires that one GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council member representative of at least 3 of the 4 Stakeholder Groups supports the Recommendation.

(ix) Approve a PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendation With a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority.

(x) Approve a PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO (Generic
Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded

(xi) Modification of Approved PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendation Prior to Final Approval by the Board, an Approved PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendation may be modified or amended by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council with a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority vote.

(xii) Initiation of an Expedited Policy Development Process (“EPDP”): requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority.

(xiii) Approve an EPDP Team Charter requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority.

(xiv) Approval of EPDP Recommendations requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority.

(xv) Approve an EPDP Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded.

(xvi) Initiation of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance Process (“GGP”): requires an affirmative vote of more than one third (1/3) of each House or more than two thirds (2/3) of one House.

(xvii) Rejection of Initiation of a GGP Requested by the Board requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority

(xviii) Approval of GGP Recommendations: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority

(xix) A "GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority" shall mean (A) two thirds (2/3) of the Council
members of each House, or (B) three-fourths \((3/4)\) of the Council members of one House and a majority of the Council members of the other House.

(j) The voting thresholds described below shall apply to the following GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) actions as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community. For any action not listed, the default threshold for the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) to act as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered community requires a simple majority vote of each House:

(i) Amendment of PTI Articles of Incorporation as contemplated in Section 16.2: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority

(ii) GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council Inspection Request as contemplated in Section 22.7 requires an affirmative vote of more than one-fourth \((1/4)\) vote of each House or majority of one House

(iii) GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council Inspection Remedy, as contemplated in Section 22.7, and Stakeholder Group / Constituency Inspection Remedy, as contemplated in Section 22.7 e(ii) and e(iii), for an inspection requested by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community requires an affirmative vote of more than one-fourth \((1/4)\) vote of each House or majority of one House

(iv) Amendments to Fundamental Bylaws and Article Amendments as contemplated by Section 25.2 of the Bylaws, Asset Sales, as contemplated by Article 26 of the Bylaws, amendments to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Articles of Incorporation: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority

(v) Approval of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3 1(b) and support for a petition submitted by a Petitioning Decisional Participant as
contemplated in Section 3.2(d): requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority

(vi) Approval of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.1(f) requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority

(vii) Approval of a petition to remove a director holding seat 13 or 14 as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.2(a) requires an affirmative vote of at least three-fourths (3/4) of the House that appointed that Director

(viii) Approval of a petition notice to remove a director holding seat 13 or 14 as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.2(f) requires an affirmative vote of at least three-fourths (3/4) of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council and at least three fourths (3/4) of the House that appointed that Director.

(ix) Approval of a Board Recall Petition as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.3(b) and support for another Petitioning Decisional Participant requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority.

(x) Approval of a Board Recall Supported Petition as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.3(c) requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority.

Section 11.4. STAFF SUPPORT AND FUNDING

(a) A member of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff shall be assigned to support the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), whose work on substantive matters shall be assigned by the Chair of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, and shall be designated as the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Staff Manager ("Staff Manager").

(b) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) to carry out its responsibilities. Such support shall not include an obligation for ICANN (Internet Corporation...
for Assigned Names and Numbers) to fund travel expenses incurred by GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) participants for travel to any meeting of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) or for any other purpose ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may, at its discretion, fund travel expenses for GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) participants under any travel support procedures or guidelines that it may adopt from time to time.

Section 11.5. STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

(a) The following "Stakeholder Groups" are hereby recognized as representative of a specific group of one or more "Constituencies" or interest groups:

(i) Registries Stakeholder Group representing all gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registries under contract to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers);

(ii) Registrars Stakeholder Group representing all registrars accredited by and under contract to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers);

(iii) Commercial Stakeholder Group representing the full range of large and small commercial entities of the Internet ("Commercial Stakeholder Group"), which includes the Business Constituency ("Business Constituency"), Intellectual Property Constituency ("Intellectual Property Constituency") and the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency ("Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency"); and

(iv) Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group representing the full range of non-commercial entities of the Internet.

(b) Each Stakeholder Group is assigned a specific number of GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council seats in accordance with Section 11.3(a).

(c) Each Stakeholder Group identified in Section 11.3(a) and each of its associated Constituencies, where applicable, shall maintain recognition with the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board.
Recognition is granted by the Board based upon the extent to which, in fact, the entity represents the global interests of the stakeholder communities it purports to represent and operates to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness. Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters may be reviewed periodically as prescribed by the Board.

(d) Any group of individuals or entities may petition the Board for recognition as a new or separate Constituency in the Non Contracted Parties House. Any such petition shall contain:

(i) A detailed explanation of why the addition of such a Constituency will improve the ability of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) to carry out its policy-development responsibilities;

(ii) A detailed explanation of why the proposed new Constituency adequately represents, on a global basis, the stakeholders it seeks to represent;

(iii) A recommendation for organizational placement within a particular Stakeholder Group; and

(iv) A proposed charter that adheres to the principles and procedures contained in these Bylaws.

Any petition for the recognition of a new Constituency and the associated charter shall be posted for public comment.

(e) The Board may create new Constituencies as described in Sect on 11 5(c) in response to such a petition, or on its own motion, if the Board determines that such action would serve the purposes of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). In the event the Board is considering acting on its own motion it shall post a detailed explanation of why such action is necessary or desirable, set a reasonable time for public comment, and not make a final decision on whether to create such new Constituency until after reviewing all comments received. Whenever the Board posts a petition or recommendation for a new Constituency for public comment, the Board shall notify the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council and the appropriate Stakeholder Group affected and shall consider any response to that notification prior to taking action.
Section 11.6. POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The policy-development procedures to be followed by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) shall be as stated in Annex A to these Bylaws. These procedures may be supplemented or revised in the manner stated in Section 11.3(d).

ARTICLE 12 ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Section 12.1. GENERAL

The Board may create one or more "Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees)" in addition to those set forth in this Article 12. Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) membership may consist of Directors only, Directors and non-directors, or non-directors only, and may also include non-voting or alternate members. Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) shall have no legal authority to act for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), but shall report their findings and recommendations to the Board.

Section 12.2. SPECIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEES

There shall be at least the following Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees)

(a) Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)

(i) The Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) should consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as they relate to concerns of governments, particularly matters where there may be an interaction between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s policies and various laws and international agreements or where they may affect public policy issues.

(ii) Membership in the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall be open to all national governments. Membership shall also be open to Distinct Economies as recognized in international fora, and multinational governmental organizations and treaty
organizations, on the invitation of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) through its Chair

(iii) The Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) may adopt its own charter and internal operating principles or procedures to guide its operations, to be published on the Website.

(iv) The chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall be elected by the members of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) pursuant to procedures adopted by such members.

(v) Each member of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall appoint one accredited representative to the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee). The accredited representative of a member must hold a formal official position with the member's public administration. The term "official" includes a holder of an elected governmental office, or a person who is employed by such government, public authority, or multinational governmental or treaty organization and whose primary function with such government, public authority, or organization is to develop or influence governmental or public policies.

(vi) The Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall annually appoint one Liaison to the Board, without limitation on reappointment, and shall annually appoint one non voting liaison to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Nominating Committee.

(vii) The Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) may designate a non voting liaison to each of the Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) Councils and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), to the extent the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) deems it appropriate and useful to do so.

(viii) The Board shall notify the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) in a timely manner of any proposal raising public policy issues on which it or any of the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) or Advisory Committees.
(Advisory Committees) seeks public comment, and shall take duly into account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.

(ix) The Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) may put issues to the Board directly, either by way of comment or prior advice, or by way of specifically recommending action or new policy development or revision to existing policies.

(x) The advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies. In the event that the Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) advice, it shall so inform the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. Any Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) advice approved by a full Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) consensus, understood to mean the practice of adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of any formal objection ("GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice"), may only be rejected by a vote of no less than 60% of the Board, and the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) and the Board will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution. The Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) will state whether any advice it gives to the Board is GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice.

(xi) If GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice is rejected by the Board pursuant to Section 12.2(a)(x) and if no such mutually acceptable solution can be found, the Board will state in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) advice was not followed, and such statement will be without prejudice to the rights or obligations of Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) members with regard to public policy issues falling within their responsibilities.

(b) Security (Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)) and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)
(i) The role of the Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)) and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) ("Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)) and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)" or "SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee)") is to advise the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. It shall have the following responsibilities:

(A) To communicate on security matters with the Internet technical community and the operators and managers of critical DNS (Domain Name System) infrastructure services, to include the root name server operator community, the top-level domain registries and registrars, the operators of the reverse delegation trees such as in-addr.arpa and ip6.arpa, and others as events and developments dictate. The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) shall gather and articulate requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revision of the protocols related to DNS (Domain Name System) and address allocation and those engaged in operations planning.

(B) To engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Internet naming and address allocation services to assess where the principal threats to stability and security lie, and to advise the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community accordingly. The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) shall recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of DNS (Domain Name System) and address allocation security in relation to identified risks and threats.

(C) To communicate with those who have direct responsibility for Internet naming and address allocation security matters (IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force), RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) (as defined in Section 12.2(c)(i)), RIRs, name registries, etc.), to ensure that its advice on security risks, issues, and priorities is properly synchronized with existing standardization, deployment, operational, and coordination activities. The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) shall monitor these activities and inform the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and Board on their progress, as appropriate.
(D) To report periodically to the Board on its activities.

(E) To make policy recommendations to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and Board.

(ii) The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee)’s chair and members shall be appointed by the Board. SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) membership appointment shall be for a three-year term, commencing on 1 January and ending the second year thereafter on 31 December. The chair and members may be re-appointed, and there are no limits to the number of terms the chair or members may serve. The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) chair may provide recommendations to the Board regarding appointments to the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee). The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) chair shall stagger appointment recommendations so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the membership of the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) is considered for appointment or re-appointment each year. The Board shall also have the power to remove SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) appointees as recommended by or in consultation with the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee).

(iii) The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) shall annually appoint a Liaison to the Board according to Section 7.9.

(c) Root Server System Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)

(i) The role of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (“Root Server System Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)” or “RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee)”) is to advise the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. It shall have the following responsibilities:

(A) Communicate on matters relating to the operation of the Root Servers (Root Servers) and their multiple instances with the Internet technical community and the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned
Names and Numbers) community. The RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) shall gather and articulate requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revision of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation of DNS (Domain Name System) servers.

(B) Communicate on matters relating to the administration of the Root Zone (Root Zone) with those who have direct responsibility for that administration. These matters include the processes and procedures for the production of the Root Zone (Root Zone) File.

(C) Engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Root Server System and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and the root zone.

(D) Respond to requests for information or opinions from the Board.

(E) Report periodically to the Board on its activities.

(F) Make policy recommendations to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and Board.

(ii) The RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) shall be led by two co-chairs. The RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee)’s chairs and members shall be appointed by the Board.

(A) RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) membership appointment shall be for a three-year term, commencing on 1 January and ending the second year thereafter on 31 December. Members may be re-appointed, and there are no limits to the number of terms the members may serve. The RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) chairs shall provide recommendations to the Board regarding appointments to the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee). If the Board declines to appoint a person nominated by the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee), then it will provide the rationale for its decision. The RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) chairs shall stagger appointment recommendations so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the membership of the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) is considered for appointment or re-appointment each year. The Board shall also have the power to remove RSSAC (Root Server System...
Advisory Committee) appointees as recommended by or in consultation with the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee).

(B) The RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) shall recommend the appointment of the chairs to the Board following a nomination process that it devises and documents

(iii) The RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) shall annually appoint a Liaison to the Board according to Section 7.9

(d) At Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)

(i) The At Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) ("At Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee)" or "ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee)") is the primary organizational home within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) for individual Internet users. The role of the ALAC (At Large Advisory Committee) shall be to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), insofar as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users. This includes policies created through ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations), as well as the many other issues for which community input and advice is appropriate. The ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee), which plays an important role in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s accountability mechanisms, also coordinates some of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s outreach to individual Internet users.

(ii) The ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) shall consist of (A) two members selected by each of the Regional At Large Organizations ("RALOs") established according to Section 12.2(d)(vii), and (B) five members selected by the Nominating Committee. The five members selected by the Nominating Committee shall include one citizen of a country within each of the five Geographic Regions established according to Section 7.5.
(iii) The regular terms of members of the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) shall be as follows

(A) The term of one member selected by each RALO shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting in an even-numbered year.

(B) The term of the other member selected by each RALO shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting in an odd numbered year.

(C) The terms of three of the members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin at the conclusion of an annual meeting in an odd-numbered year and the terms of the other two members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin at the conclusion of an annual meeting in an even-numbered year.

(D) The regular term of each member shall end at the conclusion of the second ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) annual meeting after the term began.

(iv) The Chair of the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) shall be elected by the members of the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) pursuant to procedures adopted by the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee).

(v) The ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) shall, after consultation with each RALO, annually appoint five voting delegates (no two of whom shall be citizens of countries in the same Geographic Region) to the Nominating Committee.

(vi) The At-Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) may designate non-voting liaisons to each of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council and the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council.

(vii) There shall be one RALO for each Geographic Region established according to Section 7.5. Each RALO shall serve as the main forum and coordination point for public input to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in its Geographic Region and shall be a non-profit organization certified by ICANN (Internet Corporation...
for Assigned Names and Numbers) according to criteria and standards established by the Board based on recommendations of the At Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee). An organization shall become the recognized RA O for its Geographic Region upon entering a Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) addressing the respective roles and responsibilities of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the RALO regarding the process for selecting ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) members and requirements of openness, participatory opportunities, transparency, accountability, and diversity in the RALO's structure and procedures, as well as criteria and standards for the RALO's constituent At large Structures ("At Large Structures").

(viii) Each RALO shall be comprised of self supporting At Large Structures within its Geographic Region that have been certified to meet the requirements of the RALO's Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) according to Section 12 2(d)(ix) If so provided by its Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), a RALO may also include individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the RALO's Geographic Region

(ix) Membership in the At-Large Community

(A) The criteria and standards for the certification of At Large Structures within each Geographic Region shall be established by the Board based on recommendations from the ALAC (At Large Advisory Committee) and shall be stated in the Memorandum of Understanding between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the RALO for each Geographic Region.

(B) The criteria and standards for the certification of At Large Structures shall be established in such a way that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the Geographic Region of the RALO will predominate in the operation of each At Large Structure within the RALO, while not necessarily excluding additional participation, compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region, by others
(C) Each RALO's Memorandum of Understanding shall also include provisions designed to allow, to the greatest extent possible, every individual Internet user who is a citizen of a country within the RALO's Geographic Region to participate in at least one of the RALO's At Large Structures.

(D) To the extent compatible with these objectives, the criteria and standards should also afford to each RALO the type of structure that best fits the customs and character of its Geographic Region.

(E) Once the criteria and standards have been established as provided in this Section 12.2(d)(ix), the ALAC (At Large Advisory Committee), with the advice and participation of the RALO where the applicant is based, shall be responsible for certifying organizations as meeting the criteria and standards for At-Large Structure accreditation.

(F) Decisions to certify or decertify an At Large Structure shall be made as decided by the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) in its rules of procedure, save always that any changes made to the rules of procedure in respect of an At-Large Structure applications shall be subject to review by the RALOs and by the Board.

(G) Decisions as to whether to accredit, not to accredit, or disaccredit an At Large Structure shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the Board.

(H) On an ongoing basis, the ALAC (At Large Advisory Committee) may also give advice as to whether a prospective At-Large Structure meets the applicable criteria and standards.

(x) The ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) is also responsible, working in conjunction with the RALOs, for coordinating the following activities:

(A) Nominating individuals to fill Seat 5 on the Board: Notification of the At-Large Community's nomination shall be given by the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) Chair in writing to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC (Empowered Community) shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.
(B) Keeping the community of individual Internet users informed about the significant news from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers);

(C) Distributing (through posting or otherwise) an updated agenda, news about ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), and information about items in the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policy-development process;

(D) Promoting outreach activities in the community of individual Internet users;

(E) Developing and maintaining on-going information and education programs, regarding ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and its work;

(F) Establishing an outreach strategy about ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) issues in each RALO's Geographic Region;

(G) Participating in the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policy development processes and providing input and advice that accurately reflects the views of individual Internet users;

(H) Making public, and analyzing, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s proposed policies and its decisions and their (potential) regional impact and (potential) effect on individuals in the region;

(I) Offering Internet-based mechanisms that enable discussions among members of At Large Structures; and

(x) Establishing mechanisms and processes that enable two-way communication between members of At Large Structures and those involved in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) decision making, so interested individuals can share their views on pending ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) issues.
Section 12.3. PROCEDURES
Each Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall determine its own rules of procedure and quorum requirements; provided that each Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall ensure that the advice provided to the Board by such Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) is communicated in a clear and unambiguous written statement, including the rationale for such advice. The Board will respond in a timely manner to formal advice from all Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) explaining what action it took and the rationale for doing so.

Section 12.4. TERM OF OFFICE
The chair and each member of an Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall serve until his or her successor is appointed, or until such Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) is sooner terminated, or until he or she is removed, resigns, or otherwise ceases to qualify as a member of the Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee).

Section 12.5. VACANCIES
Vacancies on any Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall be filled in the same manner as provided in the case of original appointments.

Section 12.6. COMPENSATION
Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) members shall receive no compensation for their services as a member of such Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee). The Board may, however, authorize the reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred by Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) members, including Directors, performing their duties as Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) members.

ARTICLE 13 OTHER ADVISORY MECHANISMS

Section 13.1. EXTERNAL EXPERT ADVICE
(a) Purpose. The purpose of seeking external expert advice is to allow the policy development process within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to take advantage of existing expertise that resides in the public or private sector but outside of ICANN (Internet Corporation for
Assigned Names and Numbers). In those cases where there are relevant public bodies with expertise, or where access to private expertise could be helpful, the Board and constituent bodies should be encouraged to seek advice from such expert bodies or individuals.

(b) Types of Expert Advisory Panels

(i) On its own initiative or at the suggestion of any ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) body, the Board may appoint, or authorize the President to appoint, Expert Advisory Panels consisting of public or private sector individuals or entities. If the advice sought from such Panels concerns issues of public policy, the provisions of Section 13.1(c) shall apply.

(ii) In addition, in accordance with Section 13.1(c), the Board may refer issues of public policy pertinent to matters within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Mission to a multinational governmental or treaty organization.

(c) Process for Seeking Advice - Public Policy Matters

(i) The Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) may at any time recommend that the Board seek advice concerning one or more issues of public policy from an external source, as set out above.

(ii) In the event that the Board determines, upon such a recommendation or otherwise, that external advice should be sought concerning one or more issues of public policy, the Board shall, as appropriate, consult with the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) regarding the appropriate source from which to seek the advice and the arrangements, including definition of scope and process, for requesting and obtaining that advice.

(iii) The Board shall, as appropriate, transmit any request for advice from a multinational governmental or treaty organization, including specific terms of reference, to the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee), with the suggestion that the request be transmitted by the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) to the multinational governmental or treaty organization.
(d) Process for Seeking and Advice: Other Matters. Any reference of issues not concerning public policy to an Expert Advisory Panel by the Board or President in accordance with Section 13.1(b)(i) shall be made pursuant to terms of reference describing the issues on which input and advice is sought and the procedures and schedule to be followed.

(e) Receipt of Expert Advice and its Effect. External advice pursuant to this Section 13.1 shall be provided in written form. Such advice is advisory and not binding, and is intended to augment the information available to the Board or other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) body in carrying out its responsibilities.

(f) Opportunity to Comment. The Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee), in addition to the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and other Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), shall have an opportunity to comment upon any external advice received prior to any decision by the Board.

Section 13.2. TECHNICAL LIAISON GROUP

(a) Purpose. The quality of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s work depends on access to complete and authoritative information concerning the technical standards that underlie ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s activities. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s relationship to the organizations that produce these standards is therefore particularly important. The Technical Liaison Group ("TLG") shall connect the Board with appropriate sources of technical advice on specific matters pertinent to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s activities.

(b) TLG Organizations. The TLG shall consist of four organizations: the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI (European Telecommunications Standards Institute)), the International Telecommunications Union's Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU (International Telecommunication Union)-T), the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C (World Wide Web Consortium)), and the Internet Architecture Board ("IAB (Internet Architecture Board)").

(c) Role. The role of the TLG organizations shall be to channel technical information and guidance to the Board and to other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) entities. This role has both a
responsive component and an active "watchdog" component, which involve the following responsibilities

(i) In response to a request for information, to connect the Board or other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) body with appropriate sources of technical expertise. This component of the TLG role covers circumstances in which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) seeks an authoritative answer to a specific technical question. Where information is requested regarding a particular technical standard for which a TLG organization is responsible, that request shall be directed to that TLG organization.

(ii) As an ongoing "watchdog" activity, to advise the Board of the relevance and progress of technical developments in the areas covered by each organization's scope that could affect Board decisions or other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) actions, and to draw attention to global technical standards issues that affect policy development within the scope of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission. This component of the TLG role covers circumstances in which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is unaware of a new development, and would therefore otherwise not realize that a question should be asked.

(d) TLG Procedures The TLG shall not have officers or hold meetings, nor shall it provide policy advice to the Board as a committee (although TLG organizations may individually be asked by the Board to do so as the need arises in areas relevant to their individual charters). Neither shall the TLG debate or otherwise coordinate technical issues across the TLG organizations; establish or attempt to establish unified positions; or create or attempt to create additional layers or structures within the TLG for the development of technical standards or for any other purpose.

(e) Technical Work with the IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force) The TLG shall have no involvement with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s work for the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force)), Internet Research Task Force, or the Internet Architecture Board (IAB (Internet Architecture Board)), as described in the IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force)-ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Memorandum of Understanding Concerning
the Technical Work of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority ratified by the Board on 10 March 2000 and any supplemental agreements thereto

(f) Individual Technical Experts. Each TLG organization shall designate two individual technical experts who are familiar with the technical standards issues that are relevant to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s activities. These 8 experts shall be available as necessary to determine, through an exchange of e-mail messages, where to direct a technical question from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) when ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not ask a specific TLG organization directly.

ARTICLE 14 BOARD AND TEMPORARY COMMITTEES

Section 14.1. BOARD COMMITTEES

The Board may establish one or more committees of the Board (each, a "Board Committee"), which shall continue to exist until otherwise determined by the Board. Only Directors may be appointed to a Committee of the Board; provided, that a Liaison may be appointed as a liaison to a Committee of the Board consistent with their non-voting capacity. If a person appointed to a Committee of the Board ceases to be a Director, such person shall also cease to be a member of any Committee of the Board. Each Committee of the Board shall consist of two or more Directors. The Board may designate one or more Directors as alternate members of any such committee, who may replace any absent member at any meeting of the committee. Committee members may be removed from a committee at any time by a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of all Directors; provided, however, that in no event shall a Director be removed from a committee unless such removal is approved by not less than a majority of all Directors.

Section 14.2. POWERS OF BOARD COMMITTEES

(a) The Board may delegate to Committees of the Board all legal authority of the Board except with respect to:

(i) The filling of vacancies on the Board or on any committee;

(ii) The amendment or repeal of Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation or the adoption of new Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation;
(iii) The amendment or repeal of any resolution of the Board which by its express terms is not so amendable or repealable;

(iv) The appointment of committees of the Board or the members thereof;

(v) The approval of any self-dealing transaction, as such transactions are defined in Section 5233(a) of the CCC;

(vi) The approval of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget or IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget required by Section 22.4 or the Operating Plan or Strategic Plan required by Section 22.5; or

(vii) The compensation of any Officer described in Article 15.

(b) The Board shall have the power to prescribe the manner in which proceedings of any Committee of the Board shall be conducted. In the absence of any such prescription, such committee shall have the power to prescribe the manner in which its proceedings shall be conducted. Unless these Bylaws, the Board or such committee shall otherwise provide, the regular and special meetings of committees shall be governed by the provisions of Article 7 applicable to meetings and actions of the Board. Each committee shall keep regular minutes of its proceedings and shall report the same to the Board from time to time, as the Board may require.

Section 14.3. TEMPORARY COMMITTEES
The Board may establish such temporary committees as it sees fit, with membership, duties, and responsibilities as set forth in the resolutions or charters adopted by the Board in establishing such committees.

ARTICLE 15 OFFICERS

Section 15.1. OFFICERS
The officers of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (each, an "Officer") shall be a President (who shall serve as Chief Executive Officer), a Secretary, and a Chief Financial Officer. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may also have, at the discretion of the Board, any additional officers that it deems appropriate. Any
person, other than the President, may hold more than one office, except that no member of the Board (other than the President) shall simultaneously serve as an officer of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

Section 15.2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The officers of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be elected annually by the Board, pursuant to the recommendation of the President or, in the case of the President, of the Chair of the Board. Each such officer shall hold his or her office until he or she resigns, is removed, is otherwise disqualified to serve, or his or her successor is elected.

Section 15.3. REMOVAL OF OFFICERS

Any Officer may be removed, either with or without cause, by a two thirds (2/3) majority vote of all Directors. Should any vacancy occur in any office as a result of death, resignation, removal, disqualification, or any other cause, the Board may delegate the powers and duties of such office to any Officer or to any Director until such time as a successor for the office has been elected.

Section 15.4. PRESIDENT

The President shall be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in charge of all of its activities and business. All other officers and staff shall report to the President or his or her delegate, unless stated otherwise in these Bylaws. The President shall serve as an ex officio Director, and shall have all the same rights and privileges of any Director. The President shall be empowered to call special meetings of the Board as set forth herein, and shall discharge all other duties as may be required by these Bylaws and from time to time may be assigned by the Board.

Section 15.5. SECRETARY

The Secretary shall keep or cause to be kept the minutes of the Board in one or more books provided for that purpose, shall see that all notices are duly given in accordance with the provisions of these Bylaws or as required by law, and in general shall perform all duties as from time to time may be prescribed by the President or the Board.
Section 15.6. CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

The Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") shall be the chief financial officer of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). If required by the Board, the CFO shall give a bond for the faithful discharge of his or her duties in such form and with such surety or sureties as the Board shall determine. The CFO shall have charge and custody of all the funds of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and shall keep or cause to be kept, in books belonging to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), full and accurate amounts of all receipts and disbursements, and shall deposit all money and other valuable effects in the name of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in such depositories as may be designated for that purpose by the Board. The CFO shall disburse the funds of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as may be ordered by the Board or the President and, whenever requested by them, shall deliver to the Board and the President an account of all his or her transactions as CFO and of the financial condition of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). The CFO shall be responsible for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s financial planning and forecasting and shall assist the President in the preparation of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget, the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget and Operating Plan. The CFO shall coordinate and oversee ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s funding, including any audits or other reviews of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or its Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations). The CFO shall be responsible for all other matters relating to the financial operation of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

Section 15.7. ADDITIONAL OFFICERS

In addition to the officers described above, any additional or assistant officers who are elected or appointed by the Board shall perform such duties as may be assigned to them by the President or the Board.

Section 15.8. COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES

The compensation of any Officer of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be approved by the Board. Expenses incurred in connection with performance of their officer duties may be reimbursed to
Officers upon approval of the President (in the case of Officers other than the President), by another Officer designated by the Board (in the case of the President), or the Board.

Section 15.9. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Board, through the Board Governance Committee, shall establish a policy requiring a statement from each Officer not less frequently than once a year setting forth all business and other affiliations that relate in any way to the business and other affiliations of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

ARTICLE 16 POST-TRANSITION IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) ENTITY

Section 16.1. DESCRIPTION

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall maintain as a separate legal entity a California nonprofit public benefit corporation ("PTI") for the purpose of providing IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) services, including providing IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function services pursuant to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, as well as other services as determined by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in coordination with the direct and indirect customers of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall at all times be the sole member of PTI as that term is defined in Section 5056 of the CCC ("Member") For the purposes of these Bylaws, the "IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function" does not include the Internet Protocol (Protocol) numbers and Autonomous System numbers services (as contemplated by Section 1.1(a)(iii)), the protocol ports and parameters services and the root zone maintainer function.

Section 16.2. PTI Governance

(a) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), in its capacity as the sole Member of PTI, shall elect the directors of PTI in accordance with the articles of incorporation and bylaws of PTI and have all other powers of a sole Member under the CCC except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws.
(b) No amendment or modification of the articles of incorporation of PTI shall be effective unless approved by the EC (Empowered Community) (pursuant to the procedures applicable to Articles Amendments described in Section 25.2, as if such Article Amendment referenced therein refers to an amendment of PTI's articles of incorporation).

(c) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not amend or modify the bylaws of PTI in a manner that would effect any of the matters set forth in clauses (i) through (xiv) below (a "PTI Bylaw Amendment") if such PTI Bylaw Amendment has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the procedures described in Section 16.2(e):

(i) any change to the corporate form of PTI to an entity that is not a California nonprofit public benefit corporation organized under the CCC or any successor statute;

(ii) any change in the corporate mission of PTI that is materially inconsistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission as set forth in these Bylaws;

(iii) any change to the status of PTI as a corporation with members;

(iv) any change in the rights of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as the sole Member of PTI, including voting, classes of membership, rights, privileges, preferences, restrictions and conditions;

(v) any change that would grant rights to any person or entity (other than ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) with respect to PTI as designators or otherwise to (A) elect or designate directors of PTI; or (B) approve any amendments to the articles of incorporation or bylaws of PTI;

(vi) any change in the number of directors of the board of directors of PTI (the "PTI Board");

(vii) any changes in the allocation of directors on the PTI Board between independent directors and employees of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or employees of PTI or
to the definition of "independent" (as used in PTI's bylaws) for purposes of determining whether a director of PTI is independent;

(viii) the creation of any committee of the PTI Board with the power to exercise the authority of the PTI Board;

(ix) any change in the procedures for nominating independent PTI directors;

(x) the creation of classes of PTI directors or PTI directors with different terms or voting rights;

(xi) any change in PTI Board quorum requirements or voting requirements;

(xii) any change to the powers and responsibilities of the PTI Board or the PTI officers;

(xiii) any change to the rights to exculpation and indemnification that is adverse to the exculpated or indemnified party, including with respect to advancement of expenses and insurance, provided to directors, officers, employees or other agents of PTI; or

(xiv) any change to the requirements to amend the articles of incorporation or bylaws of PTI

(d) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not take any of the following actions (together with the PTI Bylaw Amendments, "PTI Governance Actions") if such PTI Governance Action has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the procedures described in Section 16.2(e)

(i) Any resignation by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as sole Member of PTI or any transfer, disposition, cession, expulsion, suspension or termination by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of its membership in PTI or any transfer, disposition, cession, expulsion, suspension or termination by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of any right arising from its membership in PTI
(ii) Any sale, transfer or other disposition of PTI's assets, other than (A) in the ordinary course of PTI's business, (B) in connection with an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Separation Process (as defined in Section 19.1(a)) that has been approved in accordance with Article 19 or (C) the disposition of obsolete, damaged, redundant or unused assets.

(iii) Any merger, consolidation, sale or reorganization of PTI.

(iv) Any dissolution, liquidation or winding up of the business and affairs of PTI or the commencement of any other voluntary bankruptcy proceeding of PTI.

(e) Promptly after the Board approves a PTI Governance Action (a PTI Governance Action Approval”), the Secretary shall provide a notice of the Board’s decision to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants ("Board Notice"), which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) A PTI Governance Action shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice (as defined in Section 2.2(c)(i) of Annex D) is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (as defined in Section 2.2(c)(i) of Annex D) to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice (as defined in Section 2.2(c)(ii) of Annex D) is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration
of the Rejection Action Petition Period (as defined in Section 2.2(b) of Annex D) relating to such PTI Governance Action Approval and the effectiveness of such PTI Governance Action shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition (as defined in Section 2.2(d)(i) of Annex D) is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period (as defined in Section 2.2(d)(i) of Annex D) relating to such PTI Governance Action Approval and the effectiveness of such PTI Governance Action shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice (as defined in Section 2.4(b) of Annex D) is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period (as defined in Section 2.4(a) of Annex D) relating to such PTI Governance Action Approval and the effectiveness of such PTI Governance Action shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D

(ii) A PTI Governance Action that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2
of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(iii) Following receipt of an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice relating to a PTI Governance Action, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to reject the PTI Governance Action in determining whether or not to develop a new PTI Governance Action and the substance of such new PTI Governance Action, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 16.2

Section 16.3. IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) NAMING FUNCTION CONTRACT

(a) On or prior to 1 October 2016, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall enter into a contract with PTI for the performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function (as it may be amended or modified, the "IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract") and a related statement of work (the "IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW"). Except as to implement any modification, waiver or amendment to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract or IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW related to an IFR Recommendation or Special IFR Recommendation approved pursuant to Section 18.6 or an SCWG Recommendation approved pursuant to Section 19.4 (which, for the avoidance of doubt, shall not be subject to this Section 16.3(a)), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not agree to modify, amend or waive any Material Terms (as defined below) of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract or the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW if a majority of each of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Councils reject the proposed modification, amendment or waiver. The following are the "Material Terms" of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW:

(i) The parties to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW
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Authority) Naming Function SOW;

(ii) The initial term and renewal provisions of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW;

(iii) The manner in which the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract or IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW may be terminated;

(iv) The mechanisms that are available to enforce the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract or IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW;

(v) The role and responsibilities of the CSC (as defined in Section 17.1), escalation mechanisms and/or the IFR (as defined in Section 18.1);

(vi) The IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract’s provisions requiring that fees charged by PTI be based on direct costs and resources incurred by PTI;

(vii) The IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract’s prohibition against subcontracting;

(viii) The availability of the IRP as a point of escalation for claims of PTI’s failure to meet defined service level expectations;

(ix) The IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract’s audit requirements; and

(x) The requirements related to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) funding of PTI

(b) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall enforce its rights under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW.

ARTICLE 17 CUSTOMER STANDING COMMITTEE
Section 17.1. DESCRIPTION

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall establish a Customer Standing Committee ("CSC") to monitor PTI’s performance under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW.

The mission of the CSC is to ensure continued satisfactory performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function for the direct customers of the naming services. The direct customers of the naming services are top-level domain registry operators as well as root server operators and other non-root zone functions.

The CSC will achieve this mission through regular monitoring of the performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function against the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW and through mechanisms to engage with PTI to remedy identified areas of concern.

The CSC is not authorized to initiate a change in PTI through a Special IFR (as defined in Section 18.1), but may escalate a failure to correct an identified deficiency to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), which might then decide to take further action using consultation and escalation processes, which may include a Special IFR. The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) may address matters escalated by the CSC, pursuant to their operating rules and procedures.

Section 17.2. COMPOSITION, APPOINTMENT, TERM AND REMOVAL

(a) The CSC shall consist of:

(i) Two individuals representing gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry operators appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(ii) Two individuals representing ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registry operators appointed by the ccNSO (Country Code
Names Supporting Organization) and

(iii) One individual liaison appointed by PTI,

each appointed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization; provided that such individuals should have direct experience and knowledge of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function

(b) If so determined by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), the CSC may, but is not required to, include one additional member an individual representing top-level domain registry operators that are not considered a ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) or gTLD (generic Top Level Domain), who shall be appointed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization). Such representative shall be required to submit a letter of support from the registry operator it represents.

(c) Each of the following organizations may also appoint one liaison to the CSC in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization: (i) GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) (from the Registrars Stakeholder Group or the Non Contracted Parties House), (ii) ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee), (iii) either the NRO (Number Resource Organization) or ASO (Address Supporting Organization) (as determined by the ASO (Address Supporting Organization)), (iv) GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee), (v) RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee), (vi) SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) and (vii) any other Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) established under these Bylaws.

(d) The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) and ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) shall approve the initial proposed members and liaisons of the CSC, and thereafter, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) shall approve each annual slate of members and liaisons being recommended for a new term.

(e) The CSC members and liaisons shall select from among the CSC members who will serve as the CSC’s liaison to the IFRT (as defined in...
Section 18.1) and any Separation Cross-Community Working Group ("SCWG")

(f) Any CSC member or liaison may be removed and replaced at any time and for any reason or no reason by the organization that appointed such member or liaison.

(g) In addition, the Chair of the CSC may recommend that a CSC member or liaison be removed by the organization that appointed such member or liaison, upon any of the following: (i) (A) for not attending without sufficient cause a minimum of nine CSC meetings in a one-year period (or at least 75% of all CSC meetings in a one-year period if less than nine meetings were held in such one-year period) or (B) if such member or liaison has been absent for more than two consecutive meetings without sufficient cause; or (ii) for grossly inappropriate behavior.

(h) A vacancy on the CSC shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation or removal of any CSC member or liaison. Vacancies shall be filled by the organization(s) that appointed such CSC member or liaison. The appointing organization(s) shall provide written notice to the Secretary of its appointment to fill a vacancy, with a notification copy to the Chair of the CSC. The organization(s) responsible for filling such vacancy shall use its reasonable efforts to fill such vacancy within one month after the occurrence of such vacancy.

Section 17.3. CSC CHARTER; PERIODIC REVIEW

(a) The CSC shall act in accordance with its charter (the "CSC Charter").

(b) The effectiveness of the CSC shall be reviewed two years after the first meeting of the CSC; and then every three years thereafter. The method of review will be determined by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) and the findings of the review will be published on the Website.

(c) The CSC Charter shall be reviewed by a committee of representatives from the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and the Registries Stakeholder Group selected by such organizations. This review shall commence one year after the first meeting of the CSC. Thereafter, the CSC Charter shall be reviewed by such committee of representatives from the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and the
Registries Stakeholder Group selected by such organizations at the request of the CSC, ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), the Board and/or the PTI Board and/or by an IFRT in connection with an IFR

(d) Amendments to the CSC Charter shall not be effective unless ratified by the vote of a simple majority of each of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Councils pursuant to each such organizations' procedures. Prior to any action by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), any recommended changes to the CSC Charter shall be subject to a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). Notwithstanding the foregoing, to the extent any provision of an amendment to the CSC Charter conflicts with the terms of the Bylaws, the terms of the Bylaws shall control.

Section 17.4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the CSC to carry out its responsibilities, including providing and facilitating remote participation in all meetings of the CSC.

ARTICLE 18 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) NAMING FUNCTION REVIEWS

Section 18.1. IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) NAMING FUNCTION REVIEW

The Board, or an appropriate committee thereof, shall cause periodic and/or special reviews (each such review, an "IFR") of PTI's performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function against the contractual requirements set forth in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW to be carried out by an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Function Review Team ("IFRT") established in accordance with Article 18, as follows:
(a) Regularly scheduled periodic IFRs, to be conducted pursuant to Section 18.2 below ("Periodic IFRs"); and

(b) IFRs that are not Periodic IFRs, to be conducted pursuant to Section 18.12 below ("Special IFRs")

Section 18.2. FREQUENCY OF PERIODIC IFRS

(a) The first Periodic IFR shall be convened no later than [1 October 2018].

(b) Periodic IFRs after the first Periodic IFR shall be convened no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous IFRT for a Periodic IFR was convened.

(c) In the event a Special IFR is ongoing at the time a Periodic IFR is required to be convened under this Section 18.2, the Board shall cause the convening of the Periodic IFR to be delayed if such delay is approved by the vote of (i) a supermajority of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council (pursuant to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)’s procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council’s members) and (ii) a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority. Any decision by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) to delay a Periodic IFR must identify the period of delay, which should generally not exceed 12 months after the completion of the Special IFR.

Section 18.3. IFR RESPONSIBILITIES

For each Periodic IFR, the IFRT shall:

(a) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract in relation to the needs of its direct customers and the expectations of the broader ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community, and determine whether to make any recommendations with respect to PTI’s performance;

(b) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function
Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW;

(c) Review the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW and determine whether to recommend any amendments to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW to account for the needs of the direct customers of the naming services and/or the community at large;

(d) Review and evaluate the openness and transparency procedures of PTI and any oversight structures for PTI’s performance, including reporting requirements and budget transparency;

(e) Review and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the EC (Empowered Community) with respect to actions taken by the EC (Empowered Community), if any, pursuant to Section 16.2, Section 18.6, Section 18.12, Section 19, Section 19.4, Section 22.4(b), and Annex D;

(f) Review and evaluate the performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function according to established service level expectations during the IFR period being reviewed and compared to the immediately preceding Periodic IFR period;

(g) Review and evaluate whether there are any systemic issues that are impacting PTI’s performance under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW;

(h) Initiate public comment periods and other processes for community input on PTI’s performance under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW (such public comment periods shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers));

(i) Consider input from the CSC and the community on PTI’s performance under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW;
(j) Identify process or other areas for improvement in the performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW and the performance of the CSC and the EC (Empowered Community) as it relates to oversight of PTI; and

(k) Consider and assess any changes implemented since the immediately preceding IFR and their implications for the performance of PTI under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW

Section 18.4. IFR REQUIRED INPUTS

In conducting an IFR, the IFRT shall review and analyze the following information:

(a) Reports provided by PTI pursuant to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and/or IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW during the IFR period being reviewed, any portion of which may be redacted pursuant to the Confidential Disclosure Framework set forth in the Operating Standards in accordance with Section 4.6(a)(vi);

(b) Reports provided by the CSC in accordance with the CSC Charter during the IFR period being reviewed;

(c) Community inputs through public consultation procedures as reasonably determined by the IFRT, including, among other things, public comment periods, input provided at in-person sessions during ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) meetings, responses to public surveys related to PTI's performance under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW, and public inputs during meetings of the IFRT;

(d) Recommendations for technical, process and/or other improvements relating to the mandate of the IFR provided by the CSC or the community; and
(e) Results of any site visit conducted by the IFRT, which shall be conducted in consultation with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (i) upon reasonable notice, (ii) in a manner so as to not affect PTI's performance under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract or the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW and (iii) pursuant to procedures and requirements reasonably developed by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and reasonably acceptable to the IFRT. Any such site visit shall be limited to matters reasonably related to the IFRT's responsibilities pursuant to Section 18.3.

Section 18.5. IFR RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) The results of the IFR are not limited and could include a variety of recommendations or no recommendation; provided, however, that any recommendations must directly relate to the matters discussed in Section 18.3 and comply with this Section 18.5.

(b) Any IFRT recommendations should identify improvements that are supported by data and associated analysis about existing deficiencies and how they could be addressed. Each recommendation of the IFRT shall include proposed remedial procedures and describe how those procedures are expected to address such issues. The IFRT's report shall also propose timelines for implementing the IFRT's recommendations. The IFRT shall attempt to prioritize each of its recommendations and provide a rationale for such prioritization.

(c) In any case where a recommendation of an IFRT focuses on a service specific to gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry operators, no such recommendation shall be made by the IFRT in any report to the community (including any report to the Board) if opposition to such recommendation is expressed by any IFRT member appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group. In any case where a recommendation of an IFRT focuses on a service specific to ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registry operators, no such recommendation shall be made by the IFRT in any report to the community (including any report to the Board) if opposition to such recommendation is expressed by any IFRT member appointed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization).

(d) Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the IFRT shall not have the authority to review or make recommendations relating to policy or
contracting issues that are not included in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract or the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW, including, without limitation, policy development, adoption processes or contract enforcement measures between contracted registries and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

Section 18.6. Recommendations to Amend the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function contract, iana naming function SOW or CSC charter

(a) The IFRT may recommend, among other things to the extent reasonably related to the IFR responsibilities set forth in Section 18.3, amendments to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW and/or the CSC Charter. The IFRT shall, at a minimum, take the following steps before an amendment to either the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW or CSC Charter is proposed:

(i) Consult with the Board (such consultation to be conducted in parallel with other processes set forth in this Section 18.6(a)) and PTI;

(ii) Consult with the CSC;

(iii) Conduct a public input session for ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) and gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry operators; and

(iv) Seek public comment on the amendments that are under consideration by the IFRT through a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(b) A recommendation of an IFRT for a Periodic IFR that would amend the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract or IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW shall only become effective if, with respect to each such recommendation (each, an "IFR Recommendation"), each of the following occurs
(i) The IFR Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council (pursuant to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)'s procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council's members) and (B) a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority;

(ii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the Board has approved the IFR Recommendation; and

(iii) The EC (Empowered Community) has not rejected the Board’s approval of the IFR Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 18.6(d).

(c) If the Board (x) rejects an IFR Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council pursuant to Section 18.6(b)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject an IFR Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 18.6(b)(i) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 18.6(b)(ii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable IFR Recommendation. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum (as defined in Section 2.3(a) of Annex D), which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the
Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants (as defined in Section 2.2(d)(i) of Annex D) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the IFR Recommendation or approve the IFR Recommendation (either, a "Post Forum IFR Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the IFR Recommendation, such IFR Recommendation will be subject to Section 18.6(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the IFR Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum

(C) The Board's Post-Forum IFR Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.

(d) Promptly after the Board approves an IFR Recommendation (an IFR Recommendation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the IFR Recommendation that is the subject of the IFR Recommendation Decision. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.
(i) An IFR Recommendation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such IFR Recommendation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such IFR Recommendation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such IFR Recommendation Decision.

(ii) An IFR Recommendation Decision that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(e) For the avoidance of doubt, Section 18.6(d) shall not apply when the Board acts in a manner that is consistent with an IFR Recommendation unless such IFR Recommendation relates to an IANA (Internet Assigned
Numbers Authority) Naming Function Separation Process as described in Article 19

(f) Timelines for implementing any amendments to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract or IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW shall be reasonably agreed between the IFRT, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and PTI.

(g) A recommendation of an IFRT that would amend the CSC Charter shall only become effective if approved pursuant to Section 17.3(d).

Section 18.7. COMPOSITION OF IFR TEAMS

Each IFRT shall consist of the following members and liaisons to be appointed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization:

(a) Two representatives appointed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) from its ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registry operator representatives;

(b) One non-ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) representative who is associated with a ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registry operator that is not a representative of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), appointed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization); it is strongly recommended that the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) consult with the regional ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) organizations (i.e., AfTLD, APTLD (Council of the Asia Pacific country code Top Level Domains), LACTLD (Latin American and Caribbean ccTLDs), and CENTR (Council of European National Top level domain Registries)) in making its appointment;

(c) Two representatives appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(d) One representative appointed by the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(e) One representative appointed by the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(f) One representative appointed by the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group;
(g) One representative appointed by the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee);

(h) One representative appointed by the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee);

(i) One representative appointed by the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee);

(j) One representative appointed by the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee);

(k) One liaison appointed by the CSC;

(l) One liaison who may be appointed by the ASO (Address Supporting Organization); and

(m) One liaison who may be appointed by the IAB (Internet Architecture Board).

(n) The IFRT shall also include an unlimited number of non member, non liaison participants.

(o) The IFRT shall not be a standing body A new IFRT shall be constituted for each IFR and the IFRT shall automatically dissolve following the end of the process for approving such IFRT's IFR Recommendations pursuant to Section 18.6.

Section 18.8. MEMBERSHIP; ELECTION OF CO-CHAIRS, AND LIAISONS

(a) All candidates for appointment to the IFRT as a member or liaison shall submit an expression of interest to the organization that would appoint such candidate as a member or liaison to the IFRT, which shall state: (i) why the candidate is interested in becoming involved in the FRT, (ii) what particular skills the candidate would bring to the IFRT, (iii) the candidate's knowledge of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, (iv) the candidate's understanding of the purpose of the IFRT, and (v) that the candidate understands the time necessary to participate in the IFR process and can commit to the role.
(b) Members, liaisons and participants of the IFRT shall disclose to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the IFRT any conflicts of interest with a specific complaint or issue under review. The FRT may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member deemed by the majority of IFRT members to have a conflict of interest. The co chairs of the IFRT shall record any such conflict of interest in the minutes of the IFRT.

(c) To the extent reasonably possible, the appointing organizations for the IFRT members and liaisons shall work together to achieve an IFRT that is balanced for diversity (including functional, geographic and cultural) and skill, and should seek to broaden the number of individuals participating across the various reviews; provided, that the IFRT should include members from each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Geographic Region, and the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and Registries Stakeholder Group shall not appoint multiple members who are citizens of countries from the same ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Geographic Region.

(d) The IFRT shall be led by two co chairs one appointed by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (c) (f) of Section 18.7 and one appointed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (a) (b) of Section 18.7

(e) The PTI Board shall select a PTI staff member to serve as a point of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the IFRT and PTI. The Board shall select an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff member to serve as a point of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the IFRT and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(f) Liaisons to the IFRT are not members of or entitled to vote on any matters before the IFRT, but otherwise are entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the IFRT.

(g) Other participants are entitled to participate in the IFRT, but are not entitled to vote.

(h) Removal and Replacement of IFRT Members and Liaisons
(i) The IFRT members and liaisons may be removed from the IFRT by their respective appointing organization at any time upon such organization providing written notice to the Secretary and the co-chairs of the IFRT.

(ii) A vacancy on the IFRT shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation or removal of any IFRT member or liaison. Vacancies shall be filled by the organization that appointed such IFRT member or liaison. The appointing organization shall provide written notice to the Secretary of its appointment to fill a vacancy, with a notification copy to the IFRT co-chairs. The organization responsible for filling such vacancy shall use its reasonable efforts to fill such vacancy within one month after the occurrence of such vacancy.

Section 18.9. MEETINGS

(a) All actions of the IFRT shall be taken by consensus of the IFRT, which is where a small minority may disagree, but most agree. If consensus cannot be reached with respect to a particular issue, actions by the majority of all of the members of the IFRT shall be the action of the IFRT.

(b) Any members of the IFRT not in favor of an action (whether as a result of voting against a matter or objecting to the consensus position) may record a minority dissent to such action, which shall be included in the IFRT minutes and/or report, as applicable.

(c) IFRT meetings, deliberations and other working procedures shall be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest extent possible.

(d) The IFRT shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following each IFRT meeting. Recordings and transcripts of meetings, as well as mailing lists, shall also be posted to the Website.

Section 18.10. COMMUNITY REVIEWS AND REPORTS

(a) The IFRT shall seek community input as to the issues relevant to the IFR through one or more public comment periods that shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and through discussions.
during ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public meetings in developing and finalizing its recommendations and any report.

(b) The IFRT shall provide a draft report of its findings and recommendations to the community for public comment. The public comment period is required to comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(c) After completion of the IFR, the IFRT shall submit its final report containing its findings and recommendations to the Board. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall thereafter promptly post the IFRT's final report on the Website.

Section 18.11. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for each IFRT to carry out its responsibilities, including providing and facilitating remote participation in all meetings of the IFRT

Section 18.12. SPECIAL IFRS

(a) A Special IFR may be initiated outside of the cycle for the Periodic IFRs to address any deficiency, problem or other issue that has adversely affected PTI's performance under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract and IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function SOW (a "PTI Performance Issue"), following the satisfaction of each of the following conditions:

(i) The Remedial Action Procedures of the CSC set forth in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract shall have been followed and failed to correct the PTI Performance Issue and the outcome of such procedures shall have been reviewed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) according to each organization's respective operating procedures;

(ii) The IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Problem Resolution Process set forth in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority)
Authority) Naming Function Contract shall have been followed and failed to correct the PTI Performance Issue and the outcome of such process shall have been reviewed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) according to each organization's respective operating procedures;

(iii) The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) shall have considered the outcomes of the processes set forth in the preceding clauses (i) and (ii) and shall have conducted meaningful consultation with the other Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) with respect to the PTI Performance Issue and whether or not to initiate a Special IFR; and

(iv) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), if a public comment period is requested by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), a Special IFR shall have been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council (pursuant to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)'s procedures or if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two thirds (2/3) of the Council members) and (B) a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority.

(b) Each Special IFR shall be conducted by an IFRT and shall follow the same procedures and requirements applicable to Periodic IFRs as set forth in this Section 18, except that:

(i) The scope of the Special IFR and the related inputs that are required to be reviewed by the IFRT shall be focused primarily on the PTI Performance Issue, its implications for overall IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function performance by PTI and how to resolve the PTI Performance Issue;

(ii) The IFRT shall review and analyze the information that is relevant to the scope of the Special IFR and
(iii) Each recommendation of the IFRT relating to the Special IFR, including but not limited to any recommendation to initiate an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Separation Process, must be related to remediating the PTI Performance Issue or other issue with PTI's performance that is related to the IFRT responsibilities set forth in Section 18.3, shall include proposed remedial procedures and describe how those procedures are expected to address the PTI Performance Issue or other relevant issue with PTI's performance.

(c) A recommendation of an IFRT for a Special IFR shall only become effective if, with respect to each such recommendation (each, a "Special IFR Recommendation"), each of the following occurs:

(i) The Special IFR Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council (pursuant to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)'s procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council's members) and (B) a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority;

(ii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the Board has approved the Special IFR Recommendation; and

(iii) The EC (Empowered Community) has not rejected the Board's approval of the Special IFR Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 18.12(e).

(d) If the Board (x) rejects a Special IFR Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council pursuant to Section 18.12(c)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject a Special IFR Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 18.12(c)(i) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 18.12(c)(ii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the
applicable Special IFR Recommendation. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum, which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the Special IFR Recommendation or approve the Special IFR Recommendation (either, a "Post-Forum Special IFR Recommendation Decision")

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the Special IFR Recommendation, such Special IFR Recommendation will be subject to Section 18.6(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the Special IFR Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board’s Post Forum Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board’s posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.
(e) Promptly after the Board approves a Special IFR Recommendation (a "Special IFR Recommendation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the Special IFR Recommendation that is the subject of the Special IFR Recommendation Decision. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) A Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such Special IFR Recommendation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Special IFR Recommendation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D.
or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Special IFR Recommendation Decision.

(ii) A Special IFR Recommendation Decision that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(f) For the avoidance of doubt, Section 18 12(e) shall not apply when the Board acts in a manner that is consistent with a Special IFR Recommendation unless such Special IFR Recommendation relates to an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Separation Process as described in Article 19.

Section 18.13. PROPOSED SEPARATION PROCESS

The IFRT conducting either a Special IFR or Periodic IFR may, upon conclusion of a Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, determine that an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Separation Process is necessary and, if so, it shall recommend the creation of an SCWG pursuant to Article 19.

ARTICLE 19 IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) NAMING FUNCTION SEPARATION PROCESS

Section 19.1. ESTABLISHING AN SCWG

(a) An "IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Separation Process" is the process initiated in accordance with this Article 19 pursuant to which PTI may cease to perform the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function including, without limitation, the initiation of a request for proposal to select an operator to perform the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function instead of PTI ("IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function RFP"), the selection of an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function operator other than PTI, termination or non renewal of the IANA (Internet
Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Contract, and/or divestiture, or other reorganization of PTI by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(b) The Board shall establish an SCWG if each of the following occurs:

(i) The IFR conducts either a Special IFR or Periodic IFR, upon conclusion of a Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, has recommended that an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Separation Process is necessary and has recommended the creation of an SCWG (an "SCWG Creation Recommendation");

(ii) The SCWG Creation Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council (pursuant to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)'s procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council's members) and (B) a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority;

(iii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the Board has approved the SCWG Creation Recommendation. A determination by the Board to not approve an SCWG Creation Recommendation, where such creation has been approved by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Councils pursuant to Section 19.1(b)(ii), shall require a vote of at least two thirds (2/3) of the Board and the Board shall follow the same consultation procedures set forth in Section 9 of Annex A of these Bylaws that relate to Board rejection of a PDP (Policy Development Process) recommendation that is supported by a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority; and

(iv) The EC (Empowered Community) has not rejected the Board's approval of the SCWG Creation Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 19.1(d).
(c) If the Board (x) rejects an SCWG Creation Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council pursuant to Section 19.1(b)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject an SCWG Creation Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 19.1(b)(ii) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 19.1(b)(iii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable SCWG Creation Recommendation. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum, which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the SCWG Creation Recommendation or approve the SCWG Creation Recommendation (either, a "Post Forum SCWG Creation Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the SCWG Creation Recommendation, such SCWG Creation Recommendation will be subject to Section 19.1(d)
(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the SCWG Creation Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board's Post Forum SCWG Creation Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.

(d) Promptly after the Board approves an SCWG Creation Recommendation (an "SCWG Creation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the SCWG Creation Decision. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) An SCWG Creation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A) (1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Creation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such SCWG Creation Decision;

(B) (1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the
SCWG Creation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such SCWG Creation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Creation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such SCWG Creation Decision.

(ii) An SCWG Creation Decision that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

Section 19.2. SCWG RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities of the SCWG shall be as follows:

(a) The SCWG shall determine how to resolve the PTI Performance Issue(s) which the IFRT that conducted the Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, identified as triggering formation of this SCWG.

(b) If the SCWG recommends the issuance of an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function RFP, the SCWG shall:

(i) Develop IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function RFP guidelines and requirements for the performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function, in a manner consistent with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s publicly available procurement guidelines (as in effect immediately prior to the formation of the SCWG); and

(ii) Solicit input from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as well as the global Internet community (through community consultation, including public comment opportunities as necessary that comply with the designated practice for public comment.

https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article4
periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) on requirements to plan and participate in the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function RFP process.

(c) If an SCWG Recommendation (as defined in Section 19.4(b)) to issue the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function RFP is approved pursuant to Section 19.4(b) and the EC (Empowered Community) does not reject the relevant SCWG Recommendation Decision pursuant to Section 19.4(d), the SCWG, in consultation with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), shall

(i) Issue the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function RFP;

(ii) Review responses from interested candidates to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function RFP, which may be received from PTI and/or any other entity or person; and

(iii) Recommend the entity that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) should contract with to perform the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function.

(d) If the SCWG recommends an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Separation Process other than the issuance of an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function RFP, the SCWG shall develop recommendations to be followed with respect to that process and its implementation consistent with the terms of this Article 19. The SCWG shall monitor and manage the implementation of such IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function Separation Process.

Section 19.3. COMMUNITY REVIEWS AND REPORTS

(a) The SCWG shall seek community input through one or more public comment periods (such public comment period shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) and may recommend discussions during ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public meetings in developing and finalizing its recommendations and any report.
(b) The SCWG shall provide a draft report of its findings and recommendations to the community after convening of the SCWG, which such draft report will be posted for public comment on the Website. The SCWG may post additional drafts of its report for public comment until it has reached its final report.

(c) After completion of its review, the SCWG shall submit its final report containing its findings and recommendations to the Board. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post the SCWG’s final report on the Website.

Section 19.4. SCWG RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) The recommendations of the SCWG are not limited and could include a variety of recommendations or a recommendation that no action is required; provided, however, that any recommendations must directly relate to the matters discussed in Section 19.2 and comply with this Section 19.4.

(b) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not implement an SCWG recommendation (including an SCWG recommendation to issue an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Naming Function RFP) unless, with respect to each such recommendation (each, an "SCWG Recommendation"), each of the following occurs:

(i) The SCWG Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council (pursuant to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)’s procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council’s members) and (B) a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority;

(ii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the Board has approved the SCWG Recommendation. A determination by the Board to not approve an SCWG Recommendation, where such SCWG Recommendation has been approved by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Councils pursuant to Section 19.4(b)(i), shall require a vote of at least two-thirds (2/3) of the Board and the Board shall follow the same
consultation procedures set forth in Section 9 of Annex A of these Bylaws that relate to Board rejection of a PDP (Policy Development Process) recommendation that is supported by a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority; and

(iii) The EC (Empowered Community) has not rejected the Board’s approval of the SCWG Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 19.4(d).

(c) If the Board (x) rejects an SCWG Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council pursuant to Section 19.4(b)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject an SCWG Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 19.4(b)(i) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 19.4(b)(ii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable SCWG Recommendation ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum, which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants.
(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the SCWG Recommendation or approve the SCWG Recommendation (either, a "Post Forum SCWG Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the SCWG Recommendation, such SCWG Recommendation will be subject to Section 19.4(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the SCWG Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board's Post Forum SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.

(d) Promptly after the Board approves an SCWG Recommendation (an "SCWG Recommendation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the SCWG Recommendation that is the subject of the SCWG Recommendation Decision. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) An SCWG Recommendation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the
SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such SCWG Recommendation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such SCWG Recommendation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such SCWG Recommendation Decision.

(ii) An SCWG Recommendation Decision that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(e) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall absorb the costs relating to recommendations made by the SCWG, including, without limitation, costs related to the process of selecting or potentially selecting a new operator for the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function and the operating costs of the successor operator that are necessary for the successor operator's performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function as ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s independent contractor. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not be authorized to raise fees from any TLD (Top Level Domain) registry operators to cover the costs associated with implementation of any
SCWG Recommendations that specifically relate to the transition to a successor operator. For avoidance of doubt, this restriction shall not apply to collecting appropriate fees necessary to maintain the ongoing performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function, including those relating to the operating costs of the successor operator.

(f) In the event that (i) an SCWG Recommendation that selects an entity (other than PTI) as a new operator of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function is approved pursuant to Section 19.4(b) and (ii) the EC (Empowered Community) does not reject the relevant SCWG Recommendation Decision pursuant to Section 19.4(d), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall enter into a contract with the new operator on substantially the same terms recommended by the SCWG and approved as part of such SCWG Recommendation.

(g) As promptly as practical following an SCWG Recommendation Decision becoming final in accordance with this Section 19.4, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall take all steps reasonably necessary to effect such SCWG Recommendation Decision as soon as practicable.

Section 19.5. SCWG COMPOSITION

(a) Each SCWG shall consist of the following members and liaisons to be appointed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization:

(i) Two representatives appointed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) from its ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registry operator representatives;

(ii) One non-ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) representative who is associated with a ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registry operator that is not a representative of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) appointed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization); it is strongly recommended that the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)
consult with the regional ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) organizations (i.e., AfTLD, APTLD (Council of the Asia Pacific country code Top Level Domains), LACTLD (Latin American and Caribbean ccTLDs) and CENTR (Council of European National Top level domain Registries)) in making its appointment;

(iii) Three representatives appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(iv) One representative appointed by the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(v) One representative appointed by the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(vi) One representative appointed by the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(vii) One representative appointed by the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee);

(viii) One representative appointed by the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee);

(ix) One representative appointed by the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee);

(x) One representative appointed by the ALAC (At Large Advisory Committee);

(xi) One liaison appointed by the CSC;

(xii) One liaison appointed by the IFRT that conducted the Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, that recommended the creation of the SCWG, who shall be named in the IFRT's recommendation to convene the Special IFR;

(xiii) One liaison who may be appointed by the ASO (Address Supporting Organization);

(xiv) One liaison who may be appointed by the IAB (Internet Architecture Board); and
(xv) One liaison who may be appointed by the Board.

(xvi) The SCWG may also include an unlimited number of non-member, non-liaison participants.

(b) All candidates for appointment to the SCWG as a member or liaison shall submit an expression of interest to the organization that would appoint such candidate as a member or liaison, which shall state (i) why the candidate is interested in becoming involved in the SCWG, (ii) what particular skills the candidate would bring to the SCWG, (iii) the candidate’s knowledge of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) naming function, (iv) the candidate’s understanding of the purpose of the SCWG, and (v) that the candidate understands the time necessary to participate in the SCWG process and can commit to the role.

(c) Members and liaisons of the SCWG shall disclose to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the SCWG any conflicts of interest with a specific complaint or issue under review. The SCWG may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member, liaison or participant deemed by the majority of SCWG members to have a conflict of interest. The co-chairs of the SCWG shall record any such conflict of interest in the minutes of the SCWG.

(d) To the extent reasonably possible, the appointing organizations for SCWG members and liaisons shall work together to

(i) achieve an SCWG that is balanced for diversity (including functional, geographic and cultural) and skill, and should seek to broaden the number of individuals participating across the various reviews; provided, that the SCWG should include members from each ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Geographic Region, and the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and Registries Stakeholder Group shall not appoint multiple members who are citizens of countries from the same ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Geographic Region;

(ii) ensure that the SCWG is comprised of individuals who are different from those individuals who comprised the IFRT that conducted the Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, that recommended the
creation of the SCWG, other than the liaison to the IFRT appointed by the CSC; and

(iii) seek to appoint as representatives of the SCWG as many individuals as practicable with experience managing or participating in RFP processes.

(e) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall select an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff member and a PTI staff member to serve as points of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the SCWG and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the SCWG and PT. Communications between the SCWG and the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and PTI points of contact shall be communicated by the SCWG co-chairs

(f) The SCWG shall not be a standing body. Each SCWG shall be constituted when and as required under these Bylaws and shall dissolve following the end of the process for approving such SCWG’s SCWG Recommendations pursuant to Section 19.4(d)

Section 19.6. ELECTION OF CO-CHAIRS AND LIAISONS

(a) The SCWG shall be led by two co-chairs: one appointed by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (iii)-(vi) of Section 19.5(a) and one appointed by the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (i)-(ii) of Section 19.5(a).

(b) Liaisons to the SCWG shall not be members of or entitled to vote on any matters before the SCWG, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with SCWG members.

(c) Removal and Replacement of SCWG Members and Liaisons

(i) The SCWG members and liaisons may be removed from the SCWG by their respective appointing organization at any time upon such organization providing written notice to the Secretary and the co-chairs of the SCWG.
(ii) A vacancy on the SCWG shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation or removal of any SCWG member or liaison. Vacancies shall be filled by the organization that appointed such SCWG member or liaison. The appointing organization shall provide written notice to the Secretary of its appointment to fill a vacancy, with a notification copy to the SCWG co-chairs. The organization responsible for filling such vacancy shall use its reasonable efforts to fill such vacancy within one month after the occurrence of such vacancy.

Section 19.7. MEETINGS

(a) The SCWG shall act by consensus, which is where a small minority may disagree, but most agree.

(b) Any members of the SCWG not in favor of an action may record a minority dissent to such action, which shall be included in the SCWG minutes and/or report, as applicable.

(c) SCWG meetings and other working procedures shall be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest extent possible.

(d) The SCWG shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following each SCWG meeting, and no later than five business days following the meeting.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws, the SCWG shall follow the guidelines and procedures applicable to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Cross Community Working Groups that will be publicly available and may be amended from time to time.

Section 19.8. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the SCWG to carry out its responsibilities, including providing and facilitating remote participation in all meetings of the SCWG.

Section 19.9. CONFLICTING PROVISIONS
In the event any SCWG Recommendation that is approved in accordance with this Article 19 requires ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to take any action that is inconsistent with a provision of the Bylaws (including any action taken in implementing such SCWG Recommendation), the requirements of such provision of these Bylaws shall not apply to the extent of that inconsistency.

ARTICLE 20 INDEMNIFICATION OF DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, AND OTHER AGENTS

Section 20.1. INDEMNIFICATION GENERALLY

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, to the maximum extent permitted by the CCC, indemnify each of its agents against expenses, judgments, fines, settlements, and other amounts actually and reasonably incurred in connection with any proceeding arising by reason of the fact that any such person is or was an agent of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), provided that the indemnified person's acts were done in good faith and in a manner that the indemnified person reasonably believed to be in ICANN's (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) best interests and not criminal. For purposes of this Article 20, an "agent" of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) includes any person who is or was a Director, Officer, employee, or any other agent of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (including a member of the EC (Empowered Community), the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization), any Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee), the Nominating Committee, any other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) committee, or the Technical Liaison Group) acting within the scope of his or her responsibility; or is or was serving at the request of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as a Director, Officer, employee, or agent of another corporation, partnership, joint venture, trust, or other enterprise. The Board may adopt a resolution authorizing the purchase and maintenance of insurance on behalf of any agent of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) against any liability asserted against or incurred by the agent in such capacity or arising out of the agent's status as such, whether or not ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) would have the power to indemnify the agent against that liability under the provisions of this Article 20.
Section 20.2. INDEMNIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO DIRECTOR REMOVAL

If a Director initiates any proceeding in connection with his or her removal or recall pursuant to the Bylaws, to which a person who is a member of the leadership council (or equivalent body) of a Decisional Participant or representative of a Decisional Participant in the EC (Empowered Community) Administration is a party or is threatened to be made a party (as a party or witness) (a "Director Removal Proceeding"), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, to the maximum extent permitted by the CCC, indemnify any such person, against expenses, judgments, fines, settlements, and other amounts actually and reasonably incurred by such person in connection with such Director Removal Proceeding, for actions taken by such person in his or her representative capacity within his or her Decisional Participant pursuant to the processes and procedures set forth in these Bylaws, provided that all such actions were taken by such person in good faith and in a manner that such person reasonably believed to be in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s best interests and not criminal. The actual and reasonable legal fees of a single firm of counsel and other expenses actually and reasonably incurred by such person in defending against a Director Removal Proceeding shall be paid by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in advance of the final disposition of such Director Removal Proceeding, provided, however, that such expenses shall be advanced only upon delivery to the Secretary of an undertaking (which shall be in writing and in a form provided by the Secretary) by such person to repay the amount of such expenses if it shall ultimately be determined that such person is not entitled to be indemnified by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not be obligated to indemnify such person against any settlement of a Director Removal Proceeding, unless such settlement is approved in advance by the Board in its reasonable discretion. Notwithstanding Section 20.1, the indemnification provided in this Section 20.2 shall be ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s sole indemnification obligation with respect to the subject matter set forth in this Section 20.2.

ARTICLE 21 GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 21.1. CONTRACTS
The Board may authorize any Officer or Officers, agent or agents, to enter into any contract or execute or deliver any instrument in the name of and on behalf of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), and such authority may be general or confined to specific instances. In the absence of a contrary Board authorization, contracts and instruments may only be executed by the following Officers: President, any Vice President, or the CFO. Unless authorized or ratified by the Board, no other Officer, agent, or employee shall have any power or authority to bind ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or to render it liable for any debts or obligations.

Section 21.2. DEPOSITS
All funds of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) not otherwise employed shall be deposited from time to time to the credit of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in such banks, trust companies, or other depositories as the Board, or the President under its delegation, may select.

Section 21.3. CHECKS
All checks, drafts, or other orders for the payment of money, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued in the name of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be signed by such Officer or Officers, agent or agents, of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and in such a manner as shall from time to time be determined by resolution of the Board.

Section 21.4. LOANS
No loans shall be made by or to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and no evidences of indebtedness shall be issued in its name unless authorized by a resolution of the Board. Such authority may be general or confined to specific instances; provided, however, that no loans shall be made by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to its Directors or Officers.

Section 21.5. NOTICES
All notices to be given to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the Decisional Participants, or the Secretary pursuant to any provision of these
Bylaws shall be given either (a) in writing at the address of the appropriate party as set forth below or (b) via electronic mail as provided below, unless that party has given a notice of change of postal or email address, as provided in this Section 21.5. Any change in the contact information for notice below will be given by the party within 30 days of such change. Any notice required by these Bylaws will be deemed to have been properly given (i) if in paper form, when delivered in person or via courier service with confirmation of receipt or (ii) if via electronic mail, upon confirmation of receipt by the recipient’s email server, provided that such notice via electronic mail shall be followed by a copy sent by regular postal mail service within three days. In the event other means of notice become practically achievable, such as notice via a secure website, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the Decisional Participants, and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will work together to implement such notice means.

If to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), addressed to

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300

Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536

USA

Email: [___]

Attention Secretary

If to a Decisional Participant or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, addressed to the contact information available at [insert Website reference].

ARTICLE 22 FISCAL AND STRATEGIC MATTERS, INSPECTION AND INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

Section 22.1. ACCOUNTING

The fiscal year end of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be determined by the Board.
Section 22.2. AUDIT

At the end of the fiscal year, the books of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be closed and audited by certified public accountants. The appointment of the fiscal auditors shall be the responsibility of the Board.

Section 22.3. ANNUAL REPORT AND ANNUAL STATEMENT

The Board shall publish, at least annually, a report describing its activities, including an audited financial statement, a description of any payments made by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to Directors (including reimbursements of expenses) and a description of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s progress towards the obligations imposed under the Bylaws as revised on 1 October 2016 and the Operating Plan and Strategic Plan. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall cause the annual report and the annual statement of certain transactions as required by the CCC to be prepared and sent to each member of the Board and to such other persons as the Board may designate, no later than one hundred twenty (120) days after the close of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s fiscal year.

Section 22.4. BUDGETS

(a) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget

   (i) In furtherance of its Commitment to transparent and accountable budgeting processes, at least forty five (45) days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed annual operating plan and budget of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) for the next fiscal year (the "ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget"), which shall be posted on the Website. The ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget shall identify anticipated revenue sources and levels and shall, to the extent practical, identify anticipated material expense items by line item.
(ii) Prior to approval of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget by the Board, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) during the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.4(a).

(iii) Prior to approval of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget by the Board, a draft of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to post a revised draft of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget and may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget (an "ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget that is the subject of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Approval. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.
(vi) An ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget that is the subject of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date (as defined in Section 2.2(a) of Annex D) relating to such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget that is the subject of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and
(C)(1) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget that is the subject of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) An ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice relating to an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to reject the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget in determining the substance of such new ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.4(a).

(ix) If an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget has not come into full force and effect pursuant to this Section 22.4(a) on or prior to the first date of any fiscal year of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the Board shall adopt a temporary budget in accordance with Annex E hereto ("Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget"), which Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget shall be...
effective until such time as an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget has been effectively approved by the Board and not rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to this Section 22.4(a).

(b) IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget

(i) At least 45 days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed annual operating plan and budget of PTI and the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) department, which budget shall include itemization of the direct costs for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) department, all costs for PTI, direct costs for shared resources between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and PTI and support functions provided by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to PTI and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) department for the next fiscal year (the "IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget"), which shall be posted on the Website. Separately and in addition to the general ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) planning process, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall require PTI to prepare and submit to the PTI Board a proposed annual operating plan and budget for PTI's performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions for the next fiscal year ("PTI Budget"). ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall require PTI to consult with the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), as well as the Registries Stakeholder Group, the IAB (Internet Architecture Board) and RIRs, during the PTI Budget development process, and shall seek public comment on the draft PTI Budget prior to approval of the PTI Budget by PTI. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall require PTI to submit the PTI Budget to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as an input prior to and for the purpose of being included in the proposed Operating Plan (as defined in Section 22.5(a)) and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget.
(ii) Prior to approval of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget by the Board, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), as well as the Registries Stakeholder Group, IAB (Internet Architecture Board) and RRs during the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.4(b)

(iii) Prior to approval of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget by the Board, a draft of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to post a revised draft of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget and may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s public comment processes

(v) Promptly after the Board approves an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget (an "IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget that is the subject of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Approval. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) An IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:
(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget that is the subject of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification on Date relating to such IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget that is the subject of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget that is the subject of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the
expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) An IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice relating to an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to reject the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget in determining the substance of such new IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.4(b).

(ix) If an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget has not come into full force and effect pursuant to this Section 22.4(b) on or prior to the first date of any fiscal year of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the Board shall adopt a temporary budget in accordance with Annex F hereto ("Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget"), which Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget shall be effective until such time as an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget has been effectively approved by the Board and not rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to this Section 22.4(b).

(c) If an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget does not receive an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice but an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget receives an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice, any subsequent revised ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget shall not alter the expenditures allocated for the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget.
(d) If an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget does not receive an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice but an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget receives an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice, any subsequent revised IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget shall, once approved, be deemed to automatically modify the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget in a manner determined by the Board without any further right of the EC (Empowered Community) to reject the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget.

(e) Under all circumstances, the Board will have the ability to make out of budget funding decisions for unforeseen expenses necessary to maintaining ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Mission or to fulfilling ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s pre-existing legal obligations and protecting ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) from harm or waste.

(f) To maintain ongoing operational excellence and financial stability of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions (so long as they are performed by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or pursuant to contract with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) and PTI, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be required to plan for and allocate funds to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions and to PTI, as applicable, that are sufficient to cover future expenses and contingencies to ensure that the performance of those IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions and PTI in the future are not interrupted due to lack of funding.

(g) The ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget and the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget shall be published on the Website

Section 22.5. PLANS

(a) Operating Plan

(i) At least 45 days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed operating plan of
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) for the next five fiscal years (the "Operating Plan"), which shall be posted on the Website.

(ii) Prior to approval of the Operating Plan by the Board, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) during the Operating Plan development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.5(a).

(iii) Prior to approval of the Operating Plan by the Board, a draft of the Operating Plan shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to post a revised draft of the Operating Plan and may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves an Operating Plan (an "Operating Plan Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) An Operating Plan shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:
(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such Operating Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Operating Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Operating Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Operating Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Operating Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Operating Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.
(vii) An Operating Plan that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice relating to an Operating Plan, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to reject the Operating Plan in determining the substance of such new Operating Plan, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.5(a).

(b) Strategic Plan

(i) At least 45 days prior to the commencement of each five fiscal year period, with the first such period covering fiscal years 2021 through 2025, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed strategic plan of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) for the next five fiscal years (the "Strategic Plan"), which shall be posted on the Website.

(ii) Prior to approval of the Strategic Plan by the Board, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) during the Strategic Plan development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.5(b).

(iii) Prior to approval of the Strategic Plan by the Board, a draft of the Strategic Plan shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to submit a revised draft of the Strategic Plan and may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN
(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s public comment processes

(v) Promptly after the Board approves a Strategic Plan (a "Strategic Plan Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) A Strategic Plan shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(g) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such Strategic Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Strategic Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval shall be
in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Strategic Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Strategic Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Strategic Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Strategic Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) A Strategic Plan that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio

(viii) Following receipt of an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice relating to a Strategic Plan, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to reject the Strategic Plan in determining the substance of such new Strategic Plan, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.5(b)

Section 22.6. FEES AND CHARGES

The Board may set fees and charges for the services and benefits provided by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), with the goal of fully recovering the reasonable costs of the operation of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and establishing reasonable reserves for future expenses and contingencies reasonably
related to the legitimate activities of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). Such fees and charges shall be fair and equitable, shall be published for public comment prior to adoption, and once adopted shall be published on the Website in a sufficiently detailed manner so as to be readily accessible.

Section 22.7. INSPECTION

(a) A Decisional Participant (the "Inspecting Decisional Participant") may request to inspect the accounting books and records of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), as interpreted pursuant to the provisions of Section 6333 of the CCC, and the minutes of the Board or any Board Committee for a purpose reasonably related to such Inspecting Decisional Participant's interest as a Decisional Participant in the EC (Empowered Community). The Inspecting Decisional Participant shall make such a request by providing written notice from the chair of the Inspecting Decisional Participant to the Secretary stating the nature of the documents the Inspecting Decisional Participant seeks to inspect ("Inspection Request"). Any Inspection Request must be limited to the accounting books and records of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) relevant to the operation of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) as a whole, and shall not extend to the underlying sources of such accounting books or records or to documents only relevant to a small or isolated aspect of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s operations or that relate to the minutiae of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s financial records or details of its management and administration (the "Permitted Scope"). Unless ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) declines such request (as provided below), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall make the records requested under an Inspection Request available for inspection by such Inspecting Decisional Participant within 30 days of the date the Inspection Request is received by the Secretary or as soon as reasonably practicable thereafter. All materials and information made available by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) for inspection pursuant to an Inspection Request may only be used by the Inspecting Decisional Participant for purposes reasonably related to such Inspecting Decisional Participant's interest as a Decisional Participant in the EC (Empowered Community). ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post all Inspection Requests to the Website.
(b) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may decline an Inspection Request on the basis that such Inspection Request (i) is motivated by a Decisional Participant's financial, commercial or political interests, or those of one or more of its constituents, (ii) relates to documents that are not reasonably related to the purpose specified in the Inspection Request or the Inspecting Decisional Participant's interest as a Decisional Participant in the EC (Empowered Community), (iii) requests identical records provided in a prior request of such Decisional Participant, (iv) is not within the Permitted Scope, (v) relates to personnel records, (vi) relates to documents or communications covered by attorney client privilege, work product doctrine or other legal privilege or (vii) relates to documents or communications that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may not make available under applicable law because such documents or communications contain confidential information that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is required to protect. If an Inspection Request is overly broad, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may request a revised Inspection Request from the Inspecting Decisional Participant.

(c) Any such inspections shall be conducted at the times and locations reasonably determined by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and shall not be conducted in a manner that unreasonably interferes with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s operations. All such inspections shall be subject to reasonable procedures established by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), including, without limitation, the number of individuals authorized to conduct any such inspection on behalf of the Inspecting Decisional Participant. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may require the inspectors to sign a non-disclosure agreement. The Inspecting Decisional Participant may, at its own cost, copy or otherwise reproduce or make a record of materials inspected. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may redact or determine not to provide requested materials on the same basis that such information is of a category or type described in Section 22.7(b), in which case ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide the Inspecting Decisional Participant a written rationale for such redactions or determination.

(d) The inspection rights provided to the Decisional Participants pursuant to this Section 22.7 are granted to the Decisional Participants and are not granted or available to any other person or entity. Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing in this Section 22.7 shall be construed as limiting the
accessibility of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s document information disclosure policy ("DIDP")

(e) If the Inspecting Decisional Participant believes that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has violated the provisions of this Section 22.7, the Inspecting Decisional Participant may seek one or more of the following remedies: (i) appeal such matter to the Ombudsman and/or the Board for a ruling on the matter, (ii) initiate the Reconsideration Request process in accordance with Section 4.2, (iii) initiate the Independent Review Process in accordance with Section 4.3, or (iv) petition the EC (Empowered Community) to initiate (A) a Community IRP pursuant to Section 4.2 of Annex D or (B) a Board Recall Process pursuant to Section 3.3 of Annex D. Any determination by the Ombudsman is not binding on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff, but may be submitted by the Inspecting Decisional Participant when appealing to the Board for a determination, if necessary.

Section 22.8. INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

If three or more Decisional Participants deliver to the Secretary a joint written certification from the respective chairs of each such Decisional Participant that the constituents of such Decisional Participants have, pursuant to the internal procedures of such Decisional Participants, determined that there is a credible allegation that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has committed fraud or that there has been a gross mismanagement of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)\’s resources, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall retain a third-party, independent firm to investigate such alleged fraudulent activity or gross mismanagement. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post all such certifications to the Website. The independent firm shall issue a report to the Board. The Board shall consider the recommendations and findings set forth in such report. Such report shall be posted on the Website, which may be in a redacted form as determined by the Board, in order to preserve attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine or other legal privilege or where such information is confidential, in which case ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide the Decisional Participants that submitted the certification a written rationale for such redactions.

ARTICLE 23 MEMBERS

https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article4
ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not have members, as contemplated by Section 5310 of the CCC, notwithstanding the use of the term "member" in these Bylaws, in any ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) document, or in any action of the Board or staff. For the avoidance of doubt, the EC (Empowered Community) is not a member of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

ARTICLE 24 OFFICES AND SEAL

Section 24.1. OFFICES

The principal office for the transaction of the business of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall be in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, United States of America. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may also have an additional office or offices within or outside the United States of America as it may from time to time establish.

Section 24.2. SEAL

The Board may adopt a corporate seal and use the same by causing it or a facsimile thereof to be impressed or affixed or reproduced or otherwise.

ARTICLE 25 AMENDMENTS

Section 25.1. AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDARD BYLAWS

(a) Except as otherwise provided in the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, these Bylaws may be altered, amended, or repealed and new Bylaws adopted only upon approval by a two-thirds vote of all Directors and in compliance with the terms of this Section 25 1 (a "Standard Bylaw Amendment").

(b) Prior to approval of a Standard Bylaw Amendment by the Board, a draft of the Standard Bylaw Amendment shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment in accordance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public comment processes.
(c) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to post a revised draft of the Standard Bylaw Amendment and may conduct one or more additional public comment periods in accordance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public comment processes.

(d) Within seven days after the Board’s approval of a Standard Bylaw Amendment ("Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval"), the Secretary shall (i) provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall contain the form of the approved amendment and the Board's rationale for adopting such amendment, and (ii) post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website. The steps contemplated in Article 2 of Annex D shall then be followed.

(e) A Standard Bylaw Amendment shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(i) (A) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (B) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Standard Bylaw Amendment that is the subject of the Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 30th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval and the effectiveness of such Standard Bylaw Amendment shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)'s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(ii) (A) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (B) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Standard Bylaw Amendment that is the subject of the Standard Bylaw
Amendment Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Standard Bylaw Amendment and the effectiveness of such Standard Bylaw Amendment shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; or

(iii) (A) An EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (B) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Standard Bylaw Amendment that is the subject of the Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Standard Bylaw Amendment and the effectiveness of such Standard Bylaw Amendment shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the EC (Empowered Community)’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(f) If an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice is timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D, the Standard Bylaw Amendment contained in the Board Notice shall be deemed to have been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community). A Standard Bylaw Amendment that has been rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) shall be null and void and shall not become part of these Bylaws, notwithstanding its approval by the Board.

(g) The Secretary shall promptly inform the Board of the receipt and substance of any Rejection Action Petition, Rejection Act on Supported Petition or EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, as applicable, to the Secretary hereunder.

(h) Following receipt of an EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice pertaining to a Standard Bylaw Amendment, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and the Board shall consider the
explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to reject the Standard Bylaw Amendment in determining whether or not to develop a new Standard Bylaw Amendment and the substance of such new Standard Bylaw Amendment, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 25.1.

Section 25.2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FUNDAMENTAL BYLAWS AND ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

(a) Article 1; Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.7; Article 6; Sections 7.1 through 7.5, inclusive, and Sections 7.8, 7.11, 7.12, 7.17, 7.24 and 7.25; those portions of Sections 8.1, 9.2(b), 10.3(i), 11.3(f) and 12.2(d)(x)(A) relating to the provision to the EC (Empowered Community) of nominations of Directors by the nominating body, Articles 16, 17, 18 and 19, Sections 22.4, 22.5, 22.7 and 22.8, Article 26, Section 27.1; Annexes D, E and F; and this Article 25 are each a "Fundamental Bylaw" and, collectively, are the "Fundamental Bylaws".

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of these Bylaws, a Fundamental Bylaw or the Articles of Incorporation may be altered, amended, or repealed (a "Fundamental Bylaw Amendment" or an "Articles Amendment"), only upon approval by a three fourths vote of all Directors and the approval of the EC (Empowered Community) as set forth in this Section 25.2.

(c) Prior to approval of a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment, or an Articles Amendment by the Board, a draft of the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment in accordance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public comment processes.

(d) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to submit a revised draft of the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, and may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods in accordance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public comment processes.

(e) Within seven days after the Board's approval of a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, the Secretary shall (i)
provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall contain the form of the approved amendment and (ii) post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website. The steps contemplated in Article 1 of Annex D shall then be followed.

(f) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration timely delivers an EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice (as defined in Section 1 4(b) of Annex D), the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed approved by the EC (Empowered Community), and, as applicable, (i) such Fundamental Bylaw Amendment shall be in full force and effect as part of these Bylaws as of the date immediately following the Secretary's receipt of the EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice; or (ii) the Secretary shall cause such Articles Amendment promptly to be certified by the appropriate officers of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and filed with the California Secretary of State. In the event of such approval, neither the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment nor the Articles Amendment shall be subject to any further review or approval of the EC (Empowered Community). The Secretary shall promptly inform the Board of the receipt of an EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice.

(g) If an EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary, the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed not approved by the EC (Empowered Community), shall be null and void, and, notwithstanding its approval by the Board, the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment shall not be part of these Bylaws and the Articles Amendment shall not be filed with the Secretary of State.

(h) If a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, is not approved by the EC (Empowered Community), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and the Board shall consider the concerns raised by the EC (Empowered Community) in determining whether or not to develop a new Fundamental Bylaws Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, and the substance thereof, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 25 2.
Section 25.3. AMENDMENTS RESULTING FROM A POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The Board shall not combine an amendment of these Bylaws that was the result of a policy development process of a Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (a "PDP (Policy Development Process) Amendment") with any other amendment. The Board shall indicate in the applicable Board Notice whether such amendment is a PDP (Policy Development Process) Amendment.

Section 25.4. OTHER AMENDMENTS

For the avoidance of doubt, these Bylaws can only be amended as set forth in this Article 25. Neither the EC (Empowered Community), the Decisional Participants, the Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations), the Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) nor any other entity or person shall have the power to directly propose amendments to these Bylaws.

ARTICLE 26 SALE OR OTHER DISPOSITION OF ALL OR SUBSTANTIALLY ALL OF ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'S ASSETS

(a) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) may consummate a transaction or series of transactions that would result in the sale or disposition of all or substantially all of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s assets (an "Asset Sale") only upon approval by a three-fourths vote of all Directors and the approval of the EC (Empowered Community) as set forth in this Article 26.

(b) Prior to approval of an Asset Sale by the Board, a draft of the definitive Asset Sale agreement (an "Asset Sale Agreement"), shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment in accordance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public comment processes.

(c) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to submit a revised draft of the Asset Sale Agreement, as applicable, and may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to conduct one or more additional public...
comment periods in accordance with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s public comment processes.

(d) Within seven days after the Board's approval of an Asset Sale the Secretary shall (i) provide a Board Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall contain the form of the Asset Sale Agreement and (ii) post the Board Notice on the Website. The steps contemplated in Article 1 of Annex D shall then be followed.

(e) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration timely delivers an EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice for the Asset Sale pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of Section 1.4(b) of Annex D, the Asset Sale set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed approved by the EC (Empowered Community), and the Asset Sale may be consummated by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), but only under the terms set forth in the Asset Sale Agreement. In the event of such approval, the Asset Sale shall not be subject to any further review or approval of the EC (Empowered Community). The Secretary shall promptly inform the Board of the receipt of an EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice.

(f) If an EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice is not timely delivered by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration to the Secretary, the Asset Sale set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed not approved by the EC (Empowered Community), shall be null and void, and, notwithstanding its approval by the Board, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall not consummate the Asset Sale.

(g) If an Asset Sale is not approved by the EC (Empowered Community), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and the Board shall consider the concerns raised by the EC (Empowered Community) in determining whether or not to consider a new Asset Sale, and the substance thereof, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Article 26.

ARTICLE 27 TRANSITION ARTICLE

Section 27.1. WORK STREAM 2

(a) The Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Accountability ("CCWG-
Accountability") was established pursuant to a charter dated 3 November 2014 ("CCWG-Accountability Charter"). The CCWG-Accountability Charter was subsequently adopted by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee), ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee), ASO (Address Supporting Organization) and SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) ("CCWG Charting Organizations"). The CCWG-Accountability Charter as in effect on 3 November 2014 shall remain in effect throughout Work Stream 2 (as defined therein).

(b) The CCWG-Accountability recommended in its Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations to the Board, dated 23 February 2016 ("CCWG-Accountability Final Report") that the below matters be reviewed and developed following the adoption date of these Bylaws ("Work Stream 2 Matters"), in each case, to the extent set forth in the CCWG-Accountability Final Report:

(i) Improvements to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s standards for diversity at all levels;

(ii) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff accountability;

(iii) Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) and Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) accountability, including but not limited to improved processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture;

(iv) Improvements to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s transparency, focusing on enhancements to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s existing DIDP, transparency of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s interactions with governments, improvements to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s whistleblower policy and transparency of Board deliberations;

(v) Developing and clarifying the FOI-HR (as defined in Section 27.2);

(vi) Addressing jurisdiction-related questions, including how choice of jurisdiction and applicable laws for dispute settlement impact ICANN
(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s accountability;

(vii) Considering enhancements to the Ombudsman's role and function;

(viii) Guidelines for standards of conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising removal of individual Directors; and

(ix) Reviewing the CEP (as set forth in Section 4.3).

(c) As provided in the CCWG-Accountability Charter and the Board's 2014.10.16.16 resolution, the Board shall consider consensus-based recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability on Work Stream 2 Matters ("Work Stream 2 Recommendations") with the same process and criteria it committed to using to consider the CCWG-Accountability recommendations in the CCWG-Accountability Final Report ("Work Stream 1 Recommendations"). For the avoidance of doubt, that process and criteria includes:

(i) All Work Stream 2 Recommendations must further the following principles:

(A) Support and enhance the multistakeholder model;

(B) Maintain the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System);

(C) Meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) services;

(D) Maintain the openness of the Internet; and

(E) Not result in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) becoming a government-led or an inter-governmental organization.

(ii) If the Board determines, by a vote of a two-thirds majority of the Board, that it is not in the global public interest to implement a Work Stream 2 Recommendation, it must initiate a dialogue with the CCWG-Accountability.
(iii) The Board shall provide detailed rationale to accompany the initiation of dialogue. The Board and the CCWG-Accountability shall mutually agree upon the method (e.g., by teleconference, email or otherwise) by which the dialogue will occur. Discussions shall be held in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner in an effort to find a mutually acceptable solution.

(iv) The CCWG-Accountability shall have an opportunity to address the Board's concerns and report back to the Board on further deliberations regarding the Board's concerns. The CCWG-Accountability shall discuss the Board's concerns within 30 days of the Board's initiation of the dialogue.

If a Work Stream 2 Recommendation is modified by the CCWG-Accountability, the CCWG-Accountability shall submit the modified Work Stream 2 Recommendation to the Board for further consideration along with detailed rationale on how the modification addresses the concerns raised by the Board.

(v) If, after the CCWG-Accountability modifies a Work Stream 2 Recommendation, the Board still believes it is not in the global public interest to implement the Work Stream 2 Recommendation, the Board may, by a vote of a two-thirds majority of the Board, send the matter back to the CCWG-Accountability for further consideration. The Board shall provide detailed rationale to accompany its action. If the Board determines not to accept a modified version of a Work Stream 2 Recommendation, unless required by its fiduciary obligations, the Board shall not establish an alternative solution on the issue addressed by the Work Stream 2 Recommendation until such time as the CCWG-Accountability and the Board reach agreement.

(d) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall provide adequate support for work on Work Stream 2 Matters, within budgeting processes and limitations reasonably acceptable to the CCWG-Accountability.

(e) The Work Stream 2 Matters specifically referenced in Section 27.1(b) shall be the only matters subject to this Section 27.1 and any other accountability enhancements should be developed through ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s other procedures.
(f) The outcomes of each Work Stream 2 Matter are not limited and could include a variety of recommendations or no recommendation; provided, however, that any resulting recommendations must directly relate to the matters discussed in Section 27.1(b).

Section 27.2. HUMAN RIGHTS

(a) The Core Value set forth in Section 1.2(b)(viii) shall have no force or effect unless and until a framework of interpretation for human rights ("FOI-HR") is:
(i) approved for submission to the Board by the CCWG-Accountability as a consensus recommendation in Work Stream 2, with the CCWG Chartering Organizations having the role described in the CCWG-Accountability Charter, and
(ii) approved by the Board, in each case, using the same process and criteria as for Work Stream 1 Recommendations.

(b) No person or entity shall be entitled to invoke the reconsideration process provided in Section 4.2, or the independent review process provided in Section 4.3, based solely on the inclusion of the Core Value set forth in Section 1.2(b)(viii) (i) until after the FOI-HR contemplated by Section 27.2(a) is in place or (ii) for actions of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or the Board that occurred prior to the effectiveness of the FOI-HR.

Section 27.3. EXISTING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES

Notwithstanding the adoption or effectiveness of these Bylaws, task forces and other groups in existence prior to the date of these Bylaws shall continue unchanged in membership, scope, and operation unless and until changes are made by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) in compliance with the Bylaws.

Section 27.4. CONTRACTS WITH ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)

Notwithstanding the adoption or effectiveness of these Bylaws, all agreements, including employment and consulting agreements, entered into by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall continue in effect according to their terms.
Annex A: GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Policy Development Process

The following process shall govern the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy development process ("PDP (Policy Development Process)") until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the Board. The role of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) is outlined in Article 11 of these Bylaws. If the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) is conducting activities that are not intended to result in a Consensus (Consensus) Policy, the Council may act through other processes.

Section 1. Required Elements of a Policy Development Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to form Consensus (Consensus) Policies as defined within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) contracts, and any other policies for which the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council requests application of this Annex A:

a. Final Issue Report requested by the Board, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council ("Council") or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee), which should include at a minimum a) the proposed issue raised for consideration, b) the identity of the party submitting the issue, and c) how that party is affected by the issue;

b. Formal initiation of the Policy Development Process by the Council;

c. Formation of a Working Group or other designated work method;

d. Initial Report produced by a Working Group or other designated work method;

e. Final Report produced by a Working Group, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;

f. Council approval of PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendations contained in the Final Report, by the required thresholds;

g. PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendations and Final Report shall be forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations
Report approved by the Council; and

h. Board approval of PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendations.

Section 2. **Policy Development Process Manual**

The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) shall maintain a Policy Development Process Manual ("PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual") within the operating procedures of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) maintained by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council. The PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of a PDP (Policy Development Process), including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Section 11.3(d).

Section 3. **Requesting an Issue Report**

**Board Request.** The Board may request an Issue Report by instructing the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council ("Council") to begin the process outlined the PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual. In the event the Board makes a request for an Issue Report, the Board should provide a mechanism by which the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council can consult with the Board to provide information on the scope, timing, and priority of the request for an Issue Report.

**Council Request.** The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council may request an Issue Report by a vote of at least one-fourth (1/4) of the members of the Council of each House or a majority of one House.

**Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) Request.** An Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) may raise an issue for policy development by action of such committee to request an Issue Report, and transmission of that request to the Staff Manager and GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council.

Section 4. **Creation of an Issue Report**
Within forty-five (45) calendar days after receipt of either (i) an instruction from the Board; (ii) a properly supported motion from the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council; or (iii) a properly supported motion from an Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee), the Staff Manager will create a report (a *Preliminary Issue Report*). In the event the Staff Manager determines that more time is necessary to create the Preliminary Issue Report, the Staff Manager may request an extension of time for completion of the Preliminary Issue Report.

The following elements should be considered in the Issue Report:

a. The proposed issue raised for consideration;

b. The identity of the party submitting the request for the Issue Report;

c. How that party is affected by the issue, if known;

d. Support for the issue to initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process), if known;

e. The opinion of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) General Counsel regarding whether the issue proposed for consideration within the Policy Development Process is properly within the scope of the Mission, policy process and more specifically the role of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) as set forth in the Bylaws.

f. The opinion of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Staff as to whether the Council should initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process) on the issue.

Upon completion of the Preliminary Issue Report, the Preliminary Issue Report shall be posted on the Website for a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

The Staff Manager is responsible for drafting a summary and analysis of the public comments received on the Preliminary Issue Report and producing a Final Issue Report based upon the comments received. The Staff Manager should forward the Final Issue Report, along with any summary and analysis of the public comments received, to the Chair of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council for consideration for initiation of a PDP (Policy Development Process).
Section 5. **Initiation of the PDP (Policy Development Process)**

The Council may initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process) as follows:

**Board Request:** If the Board requested an Issue Report, the Council, within the timeframe set forth in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual, shall initiate a PDP (Policy Development Process). No vote is required for such action.

**GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) Requests:** The Council may only initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process) by a vote of the Council. Initiation of a PDP (Policy Development Process) requires a vote as set forth in Section 11.3(i)(ii) and Section 11.3(i)(iii) in favor of initiating the PDP (Policy Development Process).

Section 6. **Reports**

An Initial Report should be delivered to the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council and posted for a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), which time may be extended in accordance with the PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual. Following the review of the comments received and, if required, additional deliberations, a Final Report shall be produced for transmission to the Council.

Section 7. **Council Deliberation**

Upon receipt of a Final Report, whether as the result of a working group or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual.

The Council approval process is set forth in Section 11.3(i)(iv) through Section 11.3(vii), as supplemented by the PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual.

Section 8. **Preparation of the Board Report**

If the PDP (Policy Development Process) recommendations contained in the Final Report are approved by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting
Organization) Council, a Recommendations Report shall be approved by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council for delivery to the Board.

Section 9. Board Approval Processes

The Board will meet to discuss the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council recommendation as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Board Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any PDP (Policy Development Process) Recommendations approved by a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). If the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council recommendation was approved by less than a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to determine that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the policy recommended by a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote or less than a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority vote is not in the best interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by
teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

d. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such policy is not in the interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). For any Supplemental Recommendation approved by less than a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board shall be sufficient to determine that the policy in the Supplemental Recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

Section 10. Implementation of Approved Policies

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the policy, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to work with the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council to create an implementation plan based upon the implementation recommendations identified in the Final Report, and to implement the policy. The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council may, but is not required to, direct the creation of an implementation review team to assist in implementation of the policy.

Section 11. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the PDP (Policy Development Process), from policy suggestion to a final decision by the Board, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each PDP (Policy Development Process) issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the PDP.
(Policy Development Process) process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, WG (Working Group) Discussions, etc.).

Section 12. Additional Definitions

"Comment Site", "Comment Forum", "Comments For a" and "Website" refer to one or more websites designated by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) on which notifications and comments regarding the PDP (Policy Development Process) will be posted.

"Supermajority Vote" means a vote of more than sixty-six (66) percent of the members present at a meeting of the applicable body, with the exception of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council.

"Staff Manager" means an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff person(s) who manages the PDP (Policy Development Process).

"GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote" shall have the meaning set forth in the Bylaws.

Section 13. Applicability

The procedures of this Annex A shall be applicable to all requests for Issue Reports and PDPs initiated after 8 December 2011. For all ongoing PDPs initiated prior to 8 December 2011, the Council shall determine the feasibility of transitioning to the procedures set forth in this Annex A for all remaining steps within the PDP (Policy Development Process). If the Council determines that any ongoing PDP (Policy Development Process) cannot be feasibly transitioned to these updated procedures, the PDP (Policy Development Process) shall be concluded according to the procedures set forth in Annex A in force on 7 December 2011.

Annex A-1: GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Expedited Policy Development Process

The following process shall govern the specific instances where the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council invokes the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Expedited Policy Development Process ("EPDP"). The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)
Council may invoke the EPDP in the following limited circumstances: (1) to address a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy recommendation by the Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation; or (2) to create new or additional recommendations for a specific policy issue that had been substantially scoped previously such that extensive, pertinent background information already exists, e.g. (a) in an Issue Report for a possible PDP (Policy Development Process) that was not initiated; (b) as part of a previous PDP (Policy Development Process) that was not completed; or (c) through other projects such as a GGP. The following process shall be in place until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the Board. Where a conflict arises in relation to an EPDP between the PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual (see Annex 2 of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Operating Procedures) and the procedures described in this Annex A-1, the provisions of this Annex A-1 shall prevail.

The role of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) is outlined in Article 11 of these Bylaws. Provided the Council believes and documents via Council vote that the above-listed criteria are met, an EPDP may be initiated to recommend an amendment to an existing Consensus (Consensus) Policy; however, in all cases where the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) is conducting policy-making activities that do not meet the above criteria as documented in a Council vote, the Council should act through a Policy Development Process (see Annex A).

Section 1. Required Elements of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Expedited Policy Development Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to develop expedited GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy recommendations, including recommendations that could result in amendments to an existing Consensus (Consensus) Policy, as part of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Expedited Policy Development Process:

a. Formal initiation of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Expedited Policy Development Process by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, including an EPDP scoping document;

b. Formation of an EPDP Team or other designated work method;
c. Initial Report produced by an EPDP Team or other designated work method;

d. Final EPDP Policy Recommendation(s) Report produced by an EPDP Team, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;

e. GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council approval of EPDP Policy Recommendations contained in the Final EPDP Policy Recommendation(s) Report, by the required thresholds;

f. EPDP Recommendations and Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and

g. Board approval of EPDP Recommendation(s).

Section 2. **Expedited Policy Development Process Manual**

The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) shall include a specific section(s) on the EPDP process as part of its maintenance of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Policy Development Process Manual (PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual), described in Annex 5 of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Operating Procedures. The EPDP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of an EPDP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The E PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Section 11.3(d).

Section 3. **Initiation of the EPDP**

The Council may initiate an EPDP as follows:

The Council may only initiate the EPDP by a vote of the Council. Initiation of an EPDP requires an affirmative Supermajority vote of the Council (as defined in Section 11.3(i)(xii) of these Bylaws) in favor of initiating the EPDP.

The request to initiate an EPDP must be accompanied by an EPDP scoping document, which is expected to include at a minimum the following information:
1. Name of Council Member / SG (Stakeholder Group) / C;

2. Origin of issue (e.g. previously completed PDP (Policy Development Process));

3. Scope of the effort (detailed description of the issue or question that the EPDP is expected to address);

4. Description of how this issue meets the criteria for an EPDP, i.e. how the EPDP will address either: (1) a narrowly defined policy issue that as identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy recommendation by the Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation, or (2) new or additional policy recommendations on a specific GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) policy issue that had been scoped previously as part of a PDP (Policy Development Process) that as not completed or other similar effort, including relevant supporting information in either case;

5. If not provided as part of item 4, the opinion of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) General Counsel as to whether the issue proposed for consideration is properly within the scope of the Mission, policy process and more specifically the role of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization);

6. Proposed EPDP mechanism (e.g. WG (Working Group), DT (Drafting Team), individual volunteers);

7. Method of operation, if different from GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Working Group Guidelines;

8. Decision-making methodology for EPDP mechanism, if different from GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Working Group Guidelines;

9. Target completion date.

Section 4. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of an EPDP Final Recommendation(s) Report, whether as the result of an EPDP Team or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report to all Council members; and (ii) call

Approval of EPDP Recommendation(s) requires an affirmative vote of the Council meeting the thresholds set forth in Section 11.3(i)(xiv) and (xv), as supplemented by the PDP (Policy Development Process) Manual.

Section 5. Preparation of the Board Report

If the EPDP Recommendation(s) contained in the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report are approved by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, a Recommendation(s) Report shall be approved by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council for delivery to the Board.

Section 6. Board Approval Processes

The Board will meet to discuss the EPDP recommendation(s) as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Recommendations Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the EPDP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any EPDP Recommendations approved by a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). If the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council recommendation was approved by less than a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to determine that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the proposed EPDP Recommendations are not in the best interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (the Corporation), the Board shall (i)
articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such guidance is not in the interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers). For any Supplemental Recommendation approved by less than a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board shall be sufficient to determine that the guidance in the Supplemental Recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

Section 7. Implementation of Approved Policies

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the EPDP recommendations, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to implement the EPDP Recommendations. If deemed necessary, the Board shall direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to work with the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council to create a guidance implementation plan, based upon the guidance recommendations identified in the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report.

Section 8. Maintenance of Records
Throughout the EPDP, from initiation to a final decision by the Board, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each EPDP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the EPDP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, EPDP Discussions, etc.).

Section 9. Applicability

The procedures of this Annex A-1 shall be applicable from 28 September 2015 onwards.

Annex A-2: GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance Process

The following process shall govern the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) guidance process ("GGP") until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the Board. The role of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) is outlined in Article 11 of these Bylaws. If the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) is conducting activities that are intended to result in a Consensus (Consensus) Policy, the Council should act through a Policy Development Process (see Annex A).

Section 1. Required Elements of a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to develop GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) guidance:

1. Formal initiation of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance Process by the Council, including a GGP scoping document;

2. Identification of the types of expertise needed on the GGP Team;

3. Recruiting and formation of a GGP Team or other designated work method;

4. Proposed GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance Recommendation(s) Report produced by a GGP Team or other designated work method;
5. Final GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance Recommendation(s) Report produced by a GGP Team, or other
designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for
deliberation;

6. Council approval of GGP Recommendations contained in the Final Recommendation(s) Report, by the required thresholds;

7. GGP Recommendations and Final Recommendation(s) Report shall be forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report
approved by the Council; and

8. Board approval of GGP Recommendation(s).

Section 2. **GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance Process Manual**

The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) shall maintain a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance Process (GGP Manual) within the operating procedures of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) maintained by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council. The GGP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of a GGP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The GGP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Section 11.3(d).

Section 3. **Initiation of the GGP**

The Council may initiate a GGP as follows:

The Council may only initiate the GGP by a vote of the Council or at the formal request of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board. Initiation of a GGP requires a vote as set forth in Section 11.3(i)(xvi) in favor of initiating the GGP. In the case of a GGP requested by the Board, a GGP will automatically be initiated unless the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council votes against the initiation of a GGP as set forth in Section 11.3(i)(xvii).

The request to initiate a GGP must be accompanied by a GGP scoping document, which is expected to include at a minimum the following
information:

1. Name of Council Member / SG (Stakeholder Group) / C

2. Origin of issue (e.g., board request)

3. Scope of the effort (detailed description of the issue or question that the GGP is expected to address)

4. Proposed GGP mechanism (e.g., WG (Working Group), DT (Drafting Team), individual volunteers)

5. Method of operation, if different from GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Working Group Guidelines

6. Decision-making methodology for GGP mechanism, if different from GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Working Group Guidelines

7. Desired completion date and rationale

In the event the Board makes a request for a GGP, the Board should provide a mechanism by which the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council can consult with the Board to provide information on the scope, timing, and priority of the request for a GGP.

Section 4. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of a Final Recommendation(s) Report, whether as the result of a GGP Team or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final Recommendation(s) Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the GGP Manual.

The Council approval process is set forth in Section 11.3(xviii) as supplemented by the GGP Manual.

Section 5. Preparation of the Board Report

If the GGP recommendations contained in the Final Recommendation(s) Report are approved by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, a Recommendations Report shall be approved by the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council for delivery to the Board.
Section 6. Board Approval Processes

The Board will meet to discuss the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance recommendation(s) as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Board Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the GGP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any GGP Recommendations approved by a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such guidance is not in the best interests of the CANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the proposed GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance recommendation(s) adopted by a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote is not in the best interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

d. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such guidance is not in the interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).
ames and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

Section 7. Implementation of Approved GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the guidance, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to implement the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Guidance. If deemed necessary, the Board may direct ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Staff to work with the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council to create a guidance implementation plan, if deemed necessary, based upon the guidance recommendations identified in the Final Recommendation(s) Report.

Section 8. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the GGP, from initiation to a final decision by the Board, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each GGP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the GGP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, GGP Discussions, etc.).

Section 9. Additional Definitions

"Comment Site", "Comment Forum", "Comments Fora" and "Website" refer to one or more websites designated by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) on which notifications and comments regarding the GGP will be posted.

"GGP Staff Manager" means an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff person(s) who manages the GGP.


The following process shall govern the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) policy-development process ("PDP (Policy Development Process)").
1. Request for an Issue Report

An Issue Report may be requested by any of the following:

a. **Council.** The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council (in this Annex B, the "Council") may call for the creation of an issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least seven of the members of the Council present at any meeting or voting by e-mail.

b. **Board.** The Board may call for the creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

c. **Regional Organization.** One or more of the Regional Organizations representing ccTLDs in the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) recognized Regions may call for creation of an issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

d. **ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee).** An ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) may call for creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

e. **Members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization).** The members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least ten members of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) present at any meeting or voting by e-mail.

Any request for an Issue Report must be in writing and must set out the issue upon which an Issue Report is requested in sufficient detail to enable the Issue Report to be prepared. It shall be open to the Council to request further information or undertake further research or investigation for the purpose of determining whether or not the requested Issue Report should be created.

2. Creation of the Issue Report and Initiation Threshold
Within seven days after an affirmative vote as outlined in Item 1(a) above or
the receipt of a request as outlined in Items 1 (b), (c), or (d) above the Council
shall appoint an Issue Manager. The Issue Manager may be a staff member
of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (in which
case the costs of the Issue Manager shall be borne by ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)) or such other person or
persons selected by the Council (in which case the ccNSO (Country Code
Names Supporting Organization) shall be responsible for the costs of the
Issue Manager).

Within fifteen (15) calendar days after appointment (or such other time as the
Council shall, in consultation with the Issue Manager, deem to be
appropriate), the Issue Manager shall create an Issue Report. Each Issue
Report shall contain at least the following:

a. The proposed issue raised for consideration;

b. The identity of the party submitting the issue;

c. How that party is affected by the issue;

d. Support for the issue to initiate the PDP (Policy Development
   Process);

e. A recommendation from the Issue Manager as to whether the Council
   should move to initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process) for this
   issue (the "Manager Recommendation"). Each Manager
   Recommendation shall include, and be supported by, an opinion of the
   ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
   General Counsel regarding whether the issue is properly within the
   scope of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and
   Numbers) policy process and within the scope of the ccNSO (Country
   Code Names Supporting Organization). In coming to his or her
   opinion, the General Counsel shall examine whether:

   1) The issue is within the scope of the Mission;

   2) Analysis of the relevant factors according to Section 10.6(b) and
      Annex C affirmatively demonstrates that the issue is within the scope
      of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization);

   In the event that the General Counsel reaches an opinion in the
   affirmative with respect to points 1 and 2 above then the General
Counsel shall also consider whether the issue:

3) Implicates or affects an existing ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) policy;

4) Is likely to have lasting value or applicability, albeit with the need for occasional updates, and to establish a guide or framework for future decision-making.

In all events, consideration of revisions to the ccPDP (this Annex B) or to the scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) (Annex C) shall be within the scope of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization).

In the event that General Counsel is of the opinion the issue is not properly within the scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Scope, the Issue Manager shall inform the Council of this opinion. If after an analysis of the relevant factors according to Section 10.6 and Annex C a majority of 10 or more Council members is of the opinion the issue is within scope the Chair of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) shall inform the Issue Manager accordingly. General Counsel and the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council shall engage in a dialogue according to agreed rules and procedures to resolve the matter. In the event no agreement is reached between General Counsel and the Council as to whether the issue is within or outside Scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) then by a vote of 15 or more members the Council may decide the issue is within scope. The Chair of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) shall inform General Counsel and the Issue Manager accordingly. The Issue Manager shall then proceed with a recommendation whether or not the Council should move to initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process) including both the opinion and analysis of General Counsel and Council in the Issues Report.

In the event that the Manager Recommendation is in favor of initiating the PDP (Policy Development Process), a proposed time line for conducting each of the stages of PDP (Policy Development Process) outlined herein ("PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line").
g. If possible, the issue report shall indicate whether the resulting output is likely to result in a policy to be approved by the Board. In some circumstances, it will not be possible to do this until substantive discussions on the issue have taken place. In these cases, the issue report should indicate this uncertainty. Upon completion of the Issue Report, the Issue Manager shall distribute it to the full Council for a vote on whether to initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process).

3. Initiation of PDP (Policy Development Process)

The Council shall decide whether to initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process) as follows:

a. Within 21 days after receipt of an Issue Report from the Issue Manager, the Council shall vote on whether to initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process). Such vote should be taken at a meeting held in any manner deemed appropriate by the Council, including in person or by conference call, but if a meeting is not feasible the vote may occur by e-mail.

b. A vote of ten or more Council members in favor of initiating the PDP (Policy Development Process) shall be required to initiate the PDP (Policy Development Process) provided that the Issue Report states that the issue is properly within the scope of the Mission and the ccSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Scope.

4. Decision Whether to Appoint Task Force; Establishment of Time Line

At the meeting of the Council where the PDP (Policy Development Process) has been initiated (or, where the Council employs a vote by e-mail, in that vote) pursuant to Item 3 above, the Council shall decide, by a majority vote of members present at the meeting (or voting by e-mail), whether or not to appoint a task force to address the issue. If the Council votes:

a. In favor of convening a task force, it shall do so in accordance with Item 7 below.

b. Against convening a task force, then it shall collect information on the policy issue in accordance with Item 8 below.

The Council shall also, by a majority vote of members present at the meeting or voting by e-mail, approve or amend and approve the PDP (Policy Development Process).

5. Composition and Selection of Task Forces

a. Upon voting to appoint a task force, the Council shall invite each of the Regional Organizations (see Section 10.5) to appoint two individuals to participate in the task force (the "Representatives"). Additionally, the Council may appoint up to three advisors (the "Advisors") from outside the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) and, following formal request for GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) participation in the Task Force, accept up to two Representatives from the Governmental Advisory Committee to sit on the task force. The Council may increase the number of Representatives that may sit on a task force in its discretion in circumstances that it deems necessary or appropriate.

b. Any Regional Organization wishing to appoint Representatives to the task force must provide the names of the Representatives to the Issue Manager within ten (10) calendar days after such request so that they are included on the task force. Such Representatives need not be members of the Council, but each must be an individual who has an interest, and ideally knowledge and expertise, in the subject matter, coupled with the ability to devote a substantial amount of time to the task force’s activities.

c. The Council may also pursue other actions that it deems appropriate to assist in the PDP (Policy Development Process), including appointing a particular individual or organization to gather information on the issue or scheduling meetings for deliberation or briefing. All such information shall be submitted to the Issue Manager in accordance with the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line.

6. Public Notification of Initiation of the PDP (Policy Development Process) and Comment Period

After initiation of the PDP (Policy Development Process), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post a notification of such action to the Website and to the other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees). A comment period (in accordance with the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line, and ordinarily at least 21 days long) shall be commenced for the issue.
Comments shall be accepted from ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers, other Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations), Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), and from the public. The Issue Manager, or some other designated Council representative shall review the comments and incorporate them into a report (the "Comment Report") to be included in either the Preliminary Task Force Report or the Initial Report, as applicable.

7. Task Forces

a. Role of Task Force. If a task force is created, its role shall be responsible for (i) gathering information documenting the positions of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members within the Geographic Regions and other parties and groups; and (ii) otherwise obtaining relevant information that shall enable the Task Force Report to be as complete and informative as possible to facilitate the Council's meaningful and informed deliberation.

The task force shall not have any formal decision-making authority. Rather, the role of the task force shall be to gather information that shall document the positions of various parties or groups as specifically and comprehensively as possible, thereby enabling the Council to have a meaningful and informed deliberation on the issue.

b. Task Force Charter or Terms of Reference. The Council, with the assistance of the Issue Manager, shall develop a charter or terms of reference for the task force (the "Charter") within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line. Such Charter shall include:

1. The issue to be addressed by the task force, as such issue was articulated for the vote before the Council that initiated the PDP (Policy Development Process);

2. The specific time line that the task force must adhere to, as set forth below, unless the Council determines that there is a compelling reason to extend the timeline; and

3. Any specific instructions from the Council for the task force, including whether or not the task force should solicit the advice of outside advisors on the issue.
The task force shall prepare its report and otherwise conduct its activities in accordance with the Charter. Any request to deviate from the Charter must be formally presented to the Council and may only be undertaken by the task force upon a vote of a majority of the Council members present at a meeting or voting by e-mail. The quorum requirements of Section 10.3(n) shall apply to Council actions under this Item 7(b).

c. Appointment of Task Force Chair. The Issue Manager shall convene the first meeting of the task force within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line. At the initial meeting, the task force members shall, among other things, vote to appoint a task force chair. The chair shall be responsible for organizing the activities of the task force, including compiling the Task Force Report. The chair of a task force need not be a member of the Council.

d. Collection of Information.

1. Regional Organization Statements. The Representatives shall each be responsible for soliciting the position of the Regional Organization for their Geographic Region, at a minimum, and may solicit other comments, as each Representative deems appropriate, including the comments of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members in that region that are not members of the Regional Organization, regarding the issue under consideration. The position of the Regional Organization and any other comments gathered by the Representatives should be submitted in a formal statement to the task force chair (each, a "Regional Statement") within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line. Every Regional Statement shall include at least the following:

(i) If a Supermajority Vote (as defined by the Regional Organization) was reached, a clear statement of the Regional Organization's position on the issue;

(ii) If a Supermajority Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions espoused by the members of the Regional Organization;

(iii) A clear statement of how the Regional Organization arrived at its position(s). Specifically, the statement should detail specific meetings, teleconferences, or other means of deliberating an issue, and a list of all members who participated or otherwise submitted their views;
(iv) A statement of the position on the issue of any ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members that are not members of the Regional Organization;

(v) An analysis of how the issue would affect the Region, including any financial impact on the Region; and

(vi) An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy.

2. Outside Advisors. The task force may, in its discretion, solicit the opinions of outside advisors, experts, or other members of the public. Such opinions should be set forth in a report prepared by such outside advisors, and (i) clearly labeled as coming from outside advisors; (ii) accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisors' (a) qualifications and relevant experience and (b) potential conflicts of interest. These reports should be submitted in a formal statement to the task force chair within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line.

e. Task Force Report. The chair of the task force, working with the Issue Manager, shall compile the Regional Statements, the Comment Report, and other information or reports, as applicable, into a single document ("Preliminary Task Force Report") and distribute the Preliminary Task Force Report to the full task force within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line. The task force shall have a final task force meeting to consider the issues and try and reach a Supermajority Vote. After the final task force meeting, the chair of the task force and the Issue Manager shall create the final task force report (the "Task Force Report") and post it on the Website and to the other ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees). Each Task Force Report must include:

1. A clear statement of any Supermajority Vote (being 66% of the task force) position of the task force on the issue;

2. If a Supermajority Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions espoused by task force members submitted within the time line for submission of constituency reports. Each statement should clearly indicate (i) the reasons underlying the position and (ii) the Regional Organizations that held the position;
3. An analysis of how the issue would affect each Region, including any financial impact on the Region;

4. An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy; and

5. The advice of any outside advisors appointed to the task force by the Council, accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisors’ (i) qualifications and relevant experience and (ii) potential conflicts of interest.

8. Procedure if No Task Force is Formed

a. If the Council decides not to convene a task force, each Regional Organization shall, within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line, appoint a representative to solicit the Region’s views on the issue. Each such representative shall be asked to submit a Regional Statement to the Issue Manager within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line.

b. The Council may, in its discretion, take other steps to assist in the PDP (Policy Development Process), including, for example, appointing a particular individual or organization, to gather information on the issue or scheduling meetings for deliberation or briefing. All such information shall be submitted to the Issue Manager within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line.

c. The Council shall formally request the Chair of the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) to offer opinion or advice.

d. The Issue Manager shall take all Regional Statements, the Comment Report, and other information and compile (and post on the Website) an Initial Report within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line. Thereafter, the Issue Manager shall, in accordance with Item 9 below, create a Final Report.

9. Comments to the Task Force Report or Initial Report

a. A comment period (in accordance with the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line, and ordinarily at least 21 days long) shall be opened for comments on the Task Force Report or Initial Report. Comments shall be accepted from ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers, other Supporting Organizations (Supporting
Organizations), Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees), and from the public. All comments shall include the author's name, relevant experience, and interest in the issue.

b. At the end of the comment period, the Issue Manager shall review the comments received and may, in the Issue Manager's reasonable discretion, add appropriate comments to the Task Force Report or initial Report, to prepare the "Final Report". The Issue Manager shall not be obligated to include all comments made during the comment period, nor shall the Issue Manager be obligated to include all comments submitted by any one individual or organization.

c. The Issue Manager shall prepare the Final Report and submit it to the Council chair within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line.

10. Council Deliberation

a. Upon receipt of a Final Report, whether as the result of a task force or otherwise, the Council chair shall (i) distribute the Final Report to all Council members; (ii) call for a Council meeting within the time designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line wherein the Council shall work towards achieving a recommendation to present to the Board; and (iii) formally send to the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Chair an invitation to the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) to offer opinion or advice. Such meeting may be held in any manner deemed appropriate by the Council, including in person or by conference call. The Issue Manager shall be present at the meeting.

b. The Council may commence its deliberation on the issue prior to the formal meeting, including via in-person meetings, conference calls, e-mail discussions, or any other means the Council may choose.

c. The Council may, if it so chooses, solicit the opinions of outside advisors at its final meeting. The opinions of these advisors, if relied upon by the Council, shall be (i) embodied in the Council's report to the Board, (ii) specifically identified as coming from an outside advisor; and (iii) accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisor's (a) qualifications and relevant experience and (b) potential conflicts of interest.
11. Recommendation of the Council

In considering whether to make a recommendation on the issue (a "Council Recommendation"), the Council shall seek to act by consensus. If a minority opposes a consensus position, that minority shall prepare and circulate to the Council a statement explaining its reasons for opposition. If the Council's discussion of the statement does not result in consensus, then a recommendation supported by 14 or more of the Council members shall be deemed to reflect the view of the Council, and shall be conveyed to the Members as the Council's Recommendation. Notwithstanding the foregoing as outlined below, all viewpoints expressed by Council members during the PDP (Policy Development Process) must be included in the Members Report.

12. Council Report to the Members

In the event that a Council Recommendation is adopted pursuant to Item 11 then the Issue Manager shall, within seven days after the Council meeting, incorporate the Council's Recommendation together with any other viewpoints of the Council members into a Members Report to be approved by the Council and then to be submitted to the Members (the "Members Report"). The Members Report must contain at least the following:

a. A clear statement of the Council's recommendation;

b. The Final Report submitted to the Council; and

c. A copy of the minutes of the Council's deliberation on the policy issue (see Item 10), including all the opinions expressed during such deliberation, accompanied by a description of who expressed such opinions.

13. Members Vote

Following the submission of the Members Report and within the time designated by the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line, the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Council Recommendation. The vote of members shall be electronic and members' votes shall be lodged over such a period of time as designated in the PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line (at least 21 days long).
In the event that at least 50% of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members lodge votes within the voting period, the resulting vote will be employed without further process. In the event that fewer than 50% of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members lodge votes in the first round of voting, the first round will not be employed and the results of a final, second round of voting, conducted after at least thirty days notice to the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members, will be employed if at least 50% of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) members lodge votes. In the event that more than 66% of the votes received at the end of the voting period shall be in favor of the Council Recommendation, then the recommendation shall be conveyed to the Board in accordance with Item 14 below as the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Recommendation.

14. Board Report

The Issue Manager shall within seven days after a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Recommendation being made in accordance with Item 13 incorporate the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Recommendation into a report to be approved by the Council and then to be submitted to the Board (the "Board Report"). The Board Report must contain at least the following:

a. A clear statement of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) recommendation;

b. The Final Report submitted to the Council; and

c. the Members’ Report.

15. Board Vote

a. The Board shall meet to discuss the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Recommendation as soon as feasible after receipt of the Board Report from the Issue Manager, taking into account procedures for Board consideration.

b. The Board shall adopt the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66% the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interest of the ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

1. In the event that the Board determines not to act in accordance with the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Recommendation, the Board shall (i) state its reasons for its determination not to act in accordance with the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Recommendation in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

2. The Council shall discuss the Board Statement with the Board within thirty days after the Board Statement is submitted to the Council. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board shall discuss the Board Statement. The discussions shall be held in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution.

3. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its Council Recommendation. A recommendation supported by 14 or more of the Council members shall be deemed to reflect the view of the Council (the Council's Supplemental Recommendation). That Supplemental Recommendation shall be conveyed to the Members in a Supplemental Members Report, including an explanation for the Supplemental Recommendation. Members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Supplemental Recommendation under the same conditions outlined in Item 13. In the event that more than 66% of the votes cast by ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Members during the voting period are in favor of the Supplemental Recommendation then that recommendation shall be conveyed to Board as the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Supplemental Recommendation and the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66% of the Board determines that acceptance of such policy would constitute a breach of the fiduciary duties of the Board to the Company.

4. In the event that the Board does not accept the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Supplemental Recommendation, it shall state its reasons for doing so in its final decision ("Supplemental Board Statement").
5. In the event the Board determines not to accept a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Supplemental Recommendation, then the Board shall not be entitled to set policy on the issue addressed by the recommendation and the status quo shall be preserved until such time as the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) shall, under the ccPDP, make a recommendation on the issue that is deemed acceptable by the Board.

16. Implementation of the Policy

Upon adoption by the Board of a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Recommendation or ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall, as appropriate, direct or authorize ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff to implement the policy.

17. Maintenance of Records

With respect to each ccPDP for which an Issue Report is requested (see Item 1), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall maintain on the Website a status web page detailing the progress of each ccPDP, which shall provide a list of relevant dates for the ccPDP and shall also link to the following documents, to the extent they have been prepared pursuant to the ccPDP:

a. Issue Report;

b. PDP (Policy Development Process) Time Line;

c. Comment Report;

d. Regional Statement(s);

e. Preliminary Task Force Report;

f. Task Force Report;

g. Initial Report;

h. Final Report;

. Members’ Report;
. Board Report;

k. Board Statement;

. Supplemental Members' Report; and

m. Supplemental Board Statement.

In addition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall post on the Website comments received in electronic written form specifically suggesting that a ccPDP be initiated.

Annex C: The Scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)

This annex describes the scope and the principles and method of analysis to be used in any further development of the scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)'s policy-development role. As provided in Section 10.6(b) of the Bylaws, that scope shall be defined according to the procedures of the ccPDP.

The scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)'s authority and responsibilities must recognize the complex relation between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers/registries with regard to policy issues. This annex shall assist the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Council, and the Board and staff in delineating relevant global policy issues.

Policy areas

The ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)'s policy role should be based on an analysis of the following functional model of the DNS (Domain Name System):

1. Data is registered/maintained to generate a zone file,

2. A zone file is in turn used in TLD (Top Level Domain) name servers.

Within a TLD (Top Level Domain) two functions have to be performed (these are addressed in greater detail below):
1. Entering data into a database ("Data Entry Function") and

2. Maintaining and ensuring upkeep of name-servers for the TLD (Top Level Domain) ("Name Server Function").

These two core functions must be performed at the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registry level as well as at a higher level (IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) function and root servers) and at lower levels of the DNS (Domain Name System) hierarchy. This mechanism, as RFC (Request for Comments) 1591 points out, is recursive:

There are no requirements on sub domains of top-level domains beyond the requirements on higher-level domains themselves. That is, the requirements in this memo are applied recursively. In particular, all sub domains shall be allowed to operate their own domain name servers, providing in them whatever information the sub domain manager sees fit (as long as it is true and correct).

The Core Functions

1. Data Entry Function (DEF):

Looking at a more detailed level, the first function (entering and maintaining data in a database) should be fully defined by a naming policy. This naming policy must specify the rules and conditions:

   a. under which data will be collected and entered into a database or data changed (at the TLD (Top Level Domain) level among others, data to reflect a transfer from registrant to registrant or changing registrar) in the database.

   b. for making certain data generally and publicly available (be it, for example, through Whois or nameservers).

2. The Name-Server Function (NSF (National Science Foundation (USA)))

The name-server function involves essential interoperability and stability issues at the heart of the domain name system. The importance of this function extends to nameservers at the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) level, but also to the root servers (and root-server system) and nameservers at lower levels.
On its own merit and because of interoperability and stability considerations, properly functioning nameservers are of utmost importance to the individual, as well as to the local and the global Internet communities.

With regard to the nameserver function, therefore, policies need to be defined and established. Most parties involved, including the majority of ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registries, have accepted the need for common policies in this area by adhering to the relevant RFCs, among others RFC (Request for Comments) 1591.

*Respective Roles with Regard to Policy, Responsibilities, and Accountabilities*

It is in the interest of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) managers to ensure the stable and proper functioning of the domain name system. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registries each have a distinctive role to play in this regard that can be defined by the relevant policies. The scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) cannot be established without reaching a common understanding of the allocation of authority between ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) registries.

Three roles can be distinguished as to which responsibility must be assigned on any given issue:

- Policy role: i.e. the ability and power to define a policy;
- Executive role: i.e. the ability and power to act upon and implement the policy; and
- Accountability role: i.e. the ability and power to hold the responsible entity accountable for exercising its power.

Firstly, responsibility presupposes a policy and this delineates the policy role. Depending on the issue that needs to be addressed those who are involved in defining and setting the policy need to be determined and defined. Secondly, this presupposes an executive role defining the power to implement and act within the boundaries of a policy. Finally, as a counter-balance to the executive role, the accountability role needs to defined and determined.
The information below offers an aid to:

1. delineate and identify specific policy areas;
2. define and determine roles with regard to these specific policy areas.

This annex defines the scope of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) with regard to developing policies. The scope is limited to the policy role of the ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) policy-development process for functions and levels explicitly stated below. It is anticipated that the accuracy of the assignments of policy, executive, and accountability roles shown below will be considered during a scope-definition ccPDP process.

Name Server Function (as to ccTLDs)

Level 1: Root Name Servers
Policy role: IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force), RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) (ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers))
Executive role: Root Server System Operators
Accountability role: RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) (ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers))

Level 2: ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) Registry Name Servers in respect to interoperability
Policy role: ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Policy Development Process (ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)), for best practices a ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) process can be organized
Executive role: ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) Manager
Accountability role: part ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority)), part Local Internet Community, including local government

Level 3: User's Name Servers
Policy role: ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) Manager, IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force) (RFC (Request for Comments))
Executive role: Registrant (Registrant)
Accountability role: ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) Manager

Data Entry Function (as to ccTLDs)
Level 1: Root Level Registry
Policy role: ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization) Policy Development Process (ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers))
Executive role: ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority))
Accountability role: ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community, ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) Managers, (national authorities in some cases)

Level 2: ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) Registry
Policy role: Local Internet Community, including local government, and/or ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) Manager according to local structure
Executive role: ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) Manager
Accountability role: Local Internet Community, including national authorities in some cases

Level 3: Second and Lower Levels
Policy role: Registrant (Registrant)
Executive role: Registrant (Registrant)
Accountability role: Registrant (Registrant), users of lower-level domain names

ANNEX D: EC (Empowered Community) MECHANISM

ARTICLE 1 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC (Empowered Community)'S RIGHTS TO APPROVE APPROVAL ACTIONS

Section 1.1. APPROVAL ACTIONS

The processes set forth in this Article 1 shall govern the escalation procedures for the EC (Empowered Community)'s exercise of its right to approve the following (each, an "Approval Action") under the Bylaws:

a. Fundamental Bylaw Amendments, as contemplated by Section 25.2 of the Bylaws;

b. Articles Amendments, as contemplated by Section 25.2 of the Bylaws; and
c. Asset Sales, as contemplated by Article 26 of the Bylaws.

Section 1.2. APPROVAL PROCESS

Following the delivery of a Board Notice for an Approval Action ("Approval Action Board Notice") by the Secretary to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Approval Action Board Notification Date"), the Decisional Participants shall thereafter promptly inform their constituents of the delivery of the Approval Action Board Notice. Any Approval Action Board Notice relating to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment shall include a statement, if applicable, that the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, is based solely on the outcome of a PDP (Policy Development Process), citing the specific PDP (Policy Development Process) and the provision in the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment subject to the Approval Action Board Notice that implements such PDP (Policy Development Process) (as applicable, a "PDP (Policy Development Process) Fundamental Bylaw Statement" or "PDP (Policy Development Process) Articles Statement") and the name of the Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) that is a Decisional Participant that undertook the PDP (Policy Development Process) relating to the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable (as applicable, the "Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant" or "Articles Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant"). The process set forth in this Section 1.2 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Approval Action is referred to herein as the "Approval Process."

Section 1.3. APPROVAL ACTION COMMUNITY FORUM

a. CANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Approval Action (an "Approval Action Community Forum").

b. If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration requests a publicly-available conference call by providing a notice to the Secretary, CANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration,
schedule such call prior to any Approval Action Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

c. The Approval Action Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the Approval Action Board Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s principal office) on the 30th day after the Approval Action Board Notification Date ("Approval Action Community Forum Period"). If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration requests that the Approval Action Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, the Approval Action Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), taking into account any date and/or time requested by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration. If the Approval Action Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting and that public meeting is held after 1:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s principal office) on the 30th day after the Approval Action Board Notification Date, the Approval Action Community Forum Period for the Approval Action shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.

d. The Approval Action Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC (Empowered Community) Administration selects, and/or, only if the Approval Action Community Forum is held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Approval Action Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
umbers) public meeting, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly inform ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of the date, time and participation methods of such Approval Action Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

e. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall manage and moderate the Approval Action Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

f. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing its views and questions on the Approval Action prior to the convening of and during the Approval Action Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

g. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Approval Action Community Forum in order to address any questions or concerns regarding the Approval Action.

h. For the avoidance of doubt, the Approval Action Community Forum is not a decisional body.

. During the Approval Action Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Community Forums may be held at the discretion of the Board or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration. If the Board decides to hold an additional one or two Approval Action Community Forums, it shall provide a rationale for such decision, which rationale ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide support services for the Approval Action Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Approval Action Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN.
Section 1.4. DECISION WHETHER TO APPROVE AN APPROVAL ACTION

(a) Following the expiration of the Approval Action Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Approval Action Community Forum Period (such period, the "Approval Action Decision Period"), with respect to each Approval Action, each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Approval Action, (ii) objects to such Approval Action or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to such Approval Action), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period).

(b) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period, deliver a written notice ("EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Article 1 of this Annex D, the EC (Empowered Community) has approved the Approval Action if:

(i) The Approval Action does not relate to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment and is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(ii) The Approval Action relates to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment and is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development
Process) Decisional Participant if the Board Notice included a PDP (Policy Development Process) Fundamental Bylaw Statement) and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant; or

(iii) The Approval Action relates to an Articles Amendment and is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Articles Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant if the Board Notice included a PDP (Policy Development Process) Articles Statement) and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(c) If the Approval Action does not obtain the support required by Section 1.4(b)(i), (ii) or (iii) of this Annex D, as applicable, the Approval Process will automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Approval Process has been terminated with respect to the Approval Action ("Approval Process Termination Notice").

(d) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Approval Action Board Notice, (ii) EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice, (iii) Approval Process Termination Notice, (iv) written explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration related to any of the foregoing, and (v) other notices the Secretary receives under this Article 1.

ARTICLE 2 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC (Empowered Community)'S RIGHTS TO REJECT SPECIFIED ACTIONS

Section 2.1. Rejection Actions

The processes set forth in this Article 2 shall govern the escalation procedures for the EC (Empowered Community)'s exercise of its right to reject the following (each, a "Rejection Action") under the Bylaws:

a. PTI Governance Actions, as contemplated by Section 16.2(d) of the Bylaws;

b. FR Recommendation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 18.6(d) of the Bylaws;
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c. Special IFR Recommendation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 8.12(e) of the Bylaws;

d. SCWG Creation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 19.1(d) of the Bylaws;

e. SCWG Recommendation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 9.4(d) of the Bylaws;

f. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budgets, as contemplated by Section 22.4(a)(v) of the Bylaws;

g. ANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budgets, as contemplated by Section 22.4(b)(v) of the Bylaws;

h. Operating Plans, as contemplated by Section 22.5(a)(v) of the Bylaws;

. Strategic Plans, as contemplated by Section 22.5(b)(v) of the Bylaws; and

. Standard Bylaw Amendments, as contemplated by Section 25.1(e) of the Bylaws.

Section 2.2. PETITION PROCESS FOR SPECIFIED ACTIONS

(a) Following the delivery of a Board Notice for a Rejection Action ("Rejection Action Board Notice") by the Secretary to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and Decisional Participants (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Rejection Action Board Notification Date"), the Decisional Participants shall thereafter promptly inform their constituents of the delivery of the Rejection Action Board Notice. The process set forth in this Section 2.2 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Rejection Action is referred to herein as the "Rejection Process."

(b) During the period beginning on the Rejection Action Board Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the Rejection Action Board Notification Date (as it relates to a particular Rejection Action, the Rejection Action Petition Period"), subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to a Decisional Participant, seeking to reject the Rejection Action and initiate the Rejection Process (a "Rejection Action Petition").
(c) A Decisional Participant that has received a Rejection Action Petition shall either accept or reject such Rejection Action Petition; provided that a Decisional Participant may only accept such Rejection Action Petition if it was received by such Decisional Participant during the Rejection Action Petition Period.

(i) If, in accordance with the requirements of Section 2.2(c) of this Annex D, a Decisional Participant accepts a Rejection Action Petition during the Rejection Action Petition Period, the Decisional Participant shall promptly provide to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary written notice ("Rejection Action Petition Notice") of such acceptance (such Decisional Participant, the "Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant"), and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post such Rejection Action Petition Notice on the Website. The Rejection Action Petition Notice shall also include:

(A) the rationale upon which rejection of the Rejection Action is sought. Where the Rejection Action Petition Notice relates to an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget, an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget, an Operating Plan or a Strategic Plan, the Rejection Action Petition Notice shall not be valid and shall not be accepted by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration unless the rationale set forth in the Rejection Action Petition Notice is based on one or more significant issues that were specifically raised in the applicable public comment period(s) relating to perceived inconsistencies with the Mission, purpose and role set forth in ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, the global public interest, the needs of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s stakeholders, financial stability, or other matter of concern to the community; and

(B) where the Rejection Action Petition Notice relates to a Standard Bylaw Amendment, a statement, if applicable, that the Standard Bylaw Amendment is based solely on the outcome of a PDP (Policy Development Process), citing the specific PDP (Policy Development Process) and the provision in the Standard Bylaw Amendment subject to the Board Notice that implements such PDP (Policy Development Process)
Process) ("PDP (Policy Development Process) Standard Bylaw Statement") and the name of the Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) that is a Decisional Participant that undertook the PDP (Policy Development Process) relating to the Standard Bylaw Amendment ("Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant").

The Rejection Process shall thereafter continue pursuant to Section 2.2(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration has not received a Rejection Action Petition Notice pursuant to Section 2.2(c)(i) of this Annex D during the Rejection Action Petition Period, the Rejection Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Rejection Process has been terminated with respect to the Rejection Action contained in the Approval Notice ("Rejection Process Termination Notice"). ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post such Rejection Process Termination Notice on the Website.

(d) Following the delivery of a Rejection Action Petition Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration pursuant to Section 2.2(c)(i) of this Annex D, the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Rejection Action Petition. The Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 7th day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period (the "Rejection Action Petition Support
Period*), the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Rejection Action Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant, and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post such Rejection Action Supported Petition on the Website. Each Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Rejection Action Petition, and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post each such notice on the Website. Such Rejection Action Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Rejection Action Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Rejection Action Community Forum (as defined in Section 2.3 of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Rejection Action Supported Petition;

(D) a statement as to whether the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Rejection Action Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, taking into account the limitation on holding such a Rejection Action Community Forum when the Rejection Action Supported Petition relates to an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget or IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget as described in Section 2.3(c) of this Annex D; and
(E) a PDP (Policy Development Process) Standard Bylaw Statement, if applicable.

The Rejection Process shall thereafter continue for such Rejection Action Supported Petition pursuant to Section 2.3 of this Annex D. The foregoing process may result in more than one Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to the same Rejection Action.

(ii) The Rejection Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a Rejection Process Termination Notice, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website, if:

(A) no Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant is able to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Rejection Action Petition during the Rejection Action Petition Support Period; or

(B) where the Rejection Action Supported Petition includes a PDP (Policy Development Process) Standard Bylaw Statement, the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant is not (x) the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants.

Section 2.3. REJECTION ACTION COMMUNITY FORUM

a. If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration receives a Rejection Action Supported Petition under Section 2.2(d) of this Annex D during the Rejection Action Petition Support Period, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Rejection Action Supported Petition ("Rejection Action Community Forum"). If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration receives more than one Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to the same Rejection Action, all such Rejection Action Supported Petitions shall be discussed at the same Rejection Action Community Forum.
b. If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Rejection Action Supported Petition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC Empowered Community Administration, schedule such call prior to any Rejection Action Community Forum relating to that Rejection Action Supported Petition, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website. If a conference call has been requested in relation to more than one Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to the same Rejection Action, all such Rejection Action Supported Petitions shall be discussed during the same conference call.

c. The Rejection Action Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period "Rejection Action Community Forum Period") unless all Rejection Action Supported Petitions relating to the same Rejection Action requested that the Rejection Action Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, in which case the Rejection Action Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting (except as otherwise provided below with respect to a Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget or IANA Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget) on the date and at the time determined by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant(s) and the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant(s). If the Rejection Action Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period, the
Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting. Notwithstanding the foregoing and notwithstanding any statement in the Rejection Action Supported Petition, a Rejection Action Community Forum to discuss a Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget or IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget may only be held at a scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting if such Rejection Action Community Forum occurs during the Rejection Action Community Forum Period, without any extension of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period.

d. The Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC (Empowered Community) Administration selects, and/or, only if the Rejection Action Community Forum is held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Rejection Action Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly inform ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of the date, time and participation methods of such Rejection Action Community Forum, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

e. The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall manage and moderate the Rejection Action Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

f. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing its views and questions on the Rejection Action Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Rejection Action Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall also be delivered to the
Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

g. ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff including the CFO when the Rejection Action Supported Petition relates to an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget, IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget or Operating Plan) and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Rejection Action Community Forum in order to address the concerns raised in the Rejection Action Supported Petition.

h. If the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants for an applicable Rejection Action Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Rejection Action Community Forum that the issue raised in such Rejection Action Supported Petition has been resolved, such Rejection Action Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Rejection Process with respect to such Rejection Action Supported Petition will be terminated. If all Rejection Action Supported Petitions relating to a Rejection Action are withdrawn, the Rejection Process will automatically be terminated. If a Rejection Process is terminated, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Rejection Action Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Rejection Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Rejection Action Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

During the Rejection Action Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Rejection Action Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration.

CANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide support services for the Rejection Action Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Rejection Action Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN.
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) related to the Rejection Action Community Forum.

Section 2.4. DECISION WHETHER TO REJECT A REJECTION ACTION

(a) Following the expiration of the Rejection Action Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Community Forum Period (such period, the "Rejection Action Decision Period"), with respect to each Rejection Action Supported Petition, each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Rejection Action Supported Petition and has determined to reject the Rejection Action, (ii) objects to such Rejection Action Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to such Rejection Action Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of any of the foregoing prior to expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period).

(b) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period, shall promptly deliver a written notice ("EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Article 2 of Annex D, the EC (Empowered Community) has resolved to reject the Rejection Action if (after accounting for any adjustments to the below as required by the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Carve-out pursuant to Section 3.6(e) of the Bylaws if the Rejection Action Supported Petition included a GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Statement):
(i) A Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to a Rejection Action other than a Standard Bylaw Amendment is (A) supported by four or more Decisional Participants and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant; or

(ii) A Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to a Standard Bylaw Amendment that is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant if the Rejection Action Supported Petition included a PDP (Policy Development Process) Standard Bylaw Statement) and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(c) If no Rejection Action Supported Petition obtains the support required by Section 2.4(b)(i) or (ii) of this Annex D, as applicable, the Rejection Process will automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Rejection Process Termination Notice.

(d) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Rejection Action Board Notice, (ii) Rejection Action Petition, (iii) Rejection Action Petition Notice, (iv) Rejection Action Supported Petition, (v) EC (Empowered Community) Rejection Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to reject the Rejection Action, (vi) Rejection Process Termination Notice, and (vii) other notices the Secretary receives under this Article 2.

ARTICLE 3 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC (Empowered Community)’S RIGHTS TO REMOVE DIRECTORS AND RECALL THE BOARD

Section 3.1. NOMINATING COMMITTEE DIRECTOR REMOVAL PROCESS

(a) Subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to a Decisional Participant seeking to remove a Director holding Seats 1 through 8 and initiate the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition"). Each Nominating Committee
Director Removal Petition shall set forth the rationale upon which such individual seeks to remove such Director. The process set forth in this Section 3.1 of Annex D is referred to herein as the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Process."

(b) During the period beginning on the date that the Decisional Participant received the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition (such date of receipt, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Date") and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Date (as it relates to a particular Director, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period"), the Decisional Participant that has received a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant") shall either accept or reject such Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition; provided that a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant shall not accept a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition if, during the same term, the Director who is the subject of such Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition had previously been subject to a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition that led to a Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum (as discussed in Section 3.1(e) of this Annex D).

(c) During the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant shall invite the Director subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) to a dialogue with the individual(s) bringing the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant's representative on the EC (Empowered Community) Administration. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition may not be accepted unless this invitation has been extended upon reasonable notice and accommodation to the affected Director's availability. If the invitation is accepted by either the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition or the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director), the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant shall not accept the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition until the
dialogue has occurred or there have been reasonable efforts to have the dialogue.

(i) If, in accordance with Section 3.1(b) of this Annex D, a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant accepts a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period (such Decisional Participant, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant"), the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of its acceptance of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition, provide written notice ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice") of such acceptance to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice shall include the rationale upon which removal of the affected Director is sought. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall thereafter continue pursuant to Section 3.1(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration has not received a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice pursuant to Section 3.1(c)(i) of this Annex D during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall automatically be terminated with respect to the applicable Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process has been terminated with respect to the applicable Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice").

(d) Following the delivery of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration by a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 3.1(c)(i) of this Annex D, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the other Decisional
Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 7th day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period (the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period"), the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant. Each Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition. Such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
Names and Numbers) organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.1(e) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.

The Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall thereafter continue for such Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition pursuant to Section 3.1(e) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice if the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant is unable to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period.

(e) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration receives a Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition under Section 3.1(d) of this Annex D during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the
direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, schedule such call prior to any Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website. The date and time of any such conference call shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition regarding his or her availability.

(ii) The Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period") unless the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition requested that the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, in which case the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant(s); provided, that, the date and time of any Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition regarding his or her availability. If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period, the Nominating
Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.

(iii) The Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC (Empowered Community) Administration selects, and/or, only if the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum is held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly inform ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of the date, time and participation methods of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall manage and moderate the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner; provided that no individual from the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant or the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant, nor the individual who initiated the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition, shall be permitted to participate in the management or moderation of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum.

(v) The Director subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing its views and questions on the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC
(Empowered Community) Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(vi) The Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) are expected to attend the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum in order to address the issues raised in the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participants for an applicable Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum that the issue raised in such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition has been resolved, such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process with respect to such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process is terminated, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

(viii) During the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Nominating Committee Director Removal
Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration.

(ix) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide support services for the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum as well as all written submissions of the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) related to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum.

(f) Following the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period (such period, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period).

(g) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal
Decision Period, deliver a written notice ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of Section 3.1 of this Annex D, the EC (Empowered Community) has approved of the removal of the Director who is subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process if the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition is (i) supported by three or more Decisional Participants and (ii) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(h) Upon the Secretary's receipt of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice, the Director subject to such Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice shall be effectively removed from office and shall no longer be a Director and such Director's vacancy shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12 of the Bylaws.

(i) If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 3.1(g) of this Annex D, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process will automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice. The Director who was subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and not be subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director's current term.

(j) If neither a Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice nor a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice are received by the Secretary prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall automatically terminate and the Director who was subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and shall not be subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director's current term.

(k) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 3.1 to the contrary, if, for any reason, including due to resignation, death or disability, a Director who is the subject of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process ceases to be a
Director, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process for such Director shall automatically terminate without any further action of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration.

(I) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition, (ii) Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice, (iii) Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, (iv) Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to remove the relevant Director, (v) Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 3.1.

Section 3.2. SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) DIRECTOR REMOVAL PROCESS

(a) Subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to the ASO (Address Supporting Organization), ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization), GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) or At-Large Community (as applicable, the "Applicable Decisional Participant") seeking to remove a Director who was nominated by that Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or the At-Large Community in accordance with Section 7.2(a) of the Bylaws, and initiate the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process ("SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition"). The process set forth in this Section 3.2 of this Annex D is referred to herein as the "SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process."

(b) During the period beginning on the date that the Applicable Decisional Participant received the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition (such date of receipt, the "SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a
domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Date") and ending at
declared by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet
Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s principal office) on the date
that is the 21st day after the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory
Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director
Removal Petition Date (as it relates to a particular Director, the "SO
(Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative
Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Period")
the Applicable Decisional Participant shall either accept or reject such SO
(Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact
(of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition pursuant to the internal
procedures of the Applicable Decisional Participant for the SO (Supporting
Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a
domain registration)) Director Removal Petition; provided that the Applicable
Decisional Participant shall not accept an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC
(Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration))
Director Removal Petition if, during the same term, the Director who is the
subject of such SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or
Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition
had previously been subject to an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC
(Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration))
Director Removal Petition that led to an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC
(Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration))
Director Removal Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.2(d) of this
Annex D).

(c) During the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or
Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition
Period, the Applicable Decisional Participant shall invite the Director subject
to the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or
Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition
and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the
affected Director) to a dialogue with the individual(s) bringing the SO
(Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact
(of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition and the Applicable
Decisional Participant’s representative on the EC (Empowered Community)
Administration. The SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee;
or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal
Petition may not be accepted unless this invitation has been extended upon
reasonable notice and accommodation to the affected Director's availability. If
the invitation is accepted by either the Director who is the subject of the SO
(Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition or the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director), the Applicable Decisional Participant shall not accept the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition until the dialogue has occurred or there have been reasonable efforts to have the dialogue.

(i) If, in accordance with Section 3.2(b) the Applicable Decisional Participant accepts an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition during the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Period, the Applicable Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the Applicable Decisional Participant's acceptance of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition, provide written notice ("SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice") of such acceptance to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary. Such SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Applicable Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Applicable Decisional Participant requests that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.2(d) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory...
Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Applicable Decisional Participant has determined to hold the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.

The SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process shall thereafter continue for such SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition pursuant to Section 3.2(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration has not received an SO (Supporting Organization) AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice pursuant to Section 3.2(c)(i) during the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Period, the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process shall automatically be terminated with respect to the applicable SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process has been terminated with respect to the applicable SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition ("SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process Termination Notice").
(d) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration receives an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice under Section 3.2(c) of this Annex D during the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Period, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice ("SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, schedule such call prior to any SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website. The date and time of any such conference call shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice regarding his or her availability.

(ii) The SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the SO (Supporting
Director Removal Community Forum Period unless the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice requested that the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, in which case the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Applicable Decisional Participant; provided, that the date and time of any SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice regarding his or her availability. If the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Period, the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.
(iii) The SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC (Empowered Community) Administration selects, and/or, only if the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum is held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly inform ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of the date, time and participation methods of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall manage and moderate the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner; provided that no individual from the Applicable Decisional Participant, nor the individual who initiated the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition, shall be permitted to participate in the management or moderation of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum.

(v) The Director subject to the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration writing its views and questions on the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum.
Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration))
Director Removal Petition Notice prior to the convening of and during
the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or
Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal
Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC
(Empowered Community) Administration shall also be delivered to the
Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed
appropriate by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and
Numbers).

(vi) The Director who is the subject of the SO (Supporting
Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a
domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice and the Chair of
the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected
Director) are expected to attend the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC
(Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain
registration)) Director Removal Community Forum in order to address
the issues raised in the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory
Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration))
Director Removal Petition Notice.

(vii) If the Applicable Decisional Participant agrees before, during or
after the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or
Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal
Community Forum that the issue raised in such SO (Supporting
Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a
domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice has been
resolved, such SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee;
or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal
Petition Notice shall be deemed withdrawn and the SO (Supporting
Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a
domain registration)) Director Removal Process with respect to such
SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a
domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice will be terminated. If an SO (Supporting
Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a
domain registration)) Director Removal Process is terminated, the EC
(Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24)
hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the SO (Supporting
Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a
domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice, deliver to the
Secretary an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum is not a decisional bod and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Applicable Decisional Participant.

(viii) During the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum Period, an additional one or two SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forums may be held at the discretion of the Applicable Decisional Participant or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration.

(ix) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide support services for the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum as well as all written submissions of the Director who is the subject of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) related to the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum.

(e) Following the expiration of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Community Forum Period, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the request of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, issue a request for comments and
recommendations from the community, which shall be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website along with a means for comments and recommendations to be submitted to ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) on behalf of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration. This comment period shall remain open until 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 7th day after the request for comments and recommendations was posted on the Website (the "SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Comment Period"). ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website all comments and recommendations received by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) during the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Comment Period.

(f) Following the expiration of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Comment Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Comment Period (such period, the "SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Decision Period"), the Applicable Decisional Participant shall inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing as to whether the Applicable Decisional Participant has support for the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice within the Applicable Decisional Participant of a three-quarters majority as determined pursuant to the internal procedures of the Applicable Decisional Participant ("SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Notice"). The Applicable Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of obtaining such support, deliver the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and Secretary, and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the
Applicable Decisional Participant, concurrently post on the Website an explanation provided by the Applicable Decisional Participant as to why the Applicable Decisional Participant has chosen to remove the affected Director. Upon the Secretary’s receipt of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Notice from the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the Director subject to such SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Notice shall be effectively removed from office and shall no longer be a Director and such Director’s vacancy shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12 of the Bylaws.

(g) If the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice does not obtain the support required by Section 3.2(f) of this Annex D, the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process will automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the failure to obtain such support, deliver to the Secretary an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process Termination Notice. The Director who was subject to the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and shall not be subject to the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director’s current term.

(h) If neither an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Notice nor an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process Termination Notice are received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Decision Period, the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process shall automatically terminate and the Director who was subject to the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board.
and shall not be subject to the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director's current term.

(i) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 3.2 to the contrary, if, for any reason, including due to resignation, death or disability, a Director who is the subject of an SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process ceases to be a Director, the SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process for such Director shall automatically terminate without any further action of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration.

(j) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post to the Website any (i) SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition, (ii) SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Petition Notice, (iii) SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to remove the relevant Director, (iv) SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Process Termination Notice, and (v) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 3.2.

Section 3.3. BOARD RECALL PROCESS

(a) Subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to a Decisional Participant seeking to remove all Directors (other than the President) at the same time and initiate the Board Recall Process ("Board Recall Petition"), provided that a Board Recall Petition cannot be submitted solely on the basis of a matter decided by a Community IRP if (i) such Community IRP was initiated in connection with the Board's implementation of GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice and (ii) the EC (Empowered Community) did not prevail in such Community IRP. Each Board Recall Petition shall include a rationale setting forth the reasons why such individual seeks to recall the Board. The process set forth in this
Section 3.3 of this Annex D is referred to herein as the "Board Recall Process."

(b) A Decisional Participant that has received a Board Recall Petition shall either accept or reject such Board Recall Petition during the period beginning on the date the Decisional Participant received the Board Recall Petition ("Board Recall Petition Date") and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the Board Recall Petition Date (the "Board Recall Petition Period").

(i) If, in accordance with Section 3.3(b) of this Annex D, a Decisional Participant accepts a Board Recall Petition during the Board Recall Petition Period (such Decisional Participant, the "Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant"), the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of its acceptance of the Board Recall Petition, provide written notice ("Board Recall Petition Notice") of such acceptance to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary. The Board Recall Petition Notice shall include the rationale upon which removal of the Board is sought. The Board Recall Process shall thereafter continue pursuant to Section 3.3(c) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration has not received a Board Recall Petition Notice pursuant to Section 3.3(b)(i) of this Annex D during the Board Recall Petition Period, the Board Recall Process shall automatically be terminated with respect to the Board Recall Petition and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Board Recall Process has been terminated with respect to the Board Recall Petition ("Board Recall Process Termination Notice").

(c) Following the delivery of a Board Recall Petition Notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration by a Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 3.3(b)(i) of this Annex D, the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Board Recall Petition.
The Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least two other Decisional Participants (each, a "Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 7th day after the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Period (the "Board Recall Petition Support Period"), the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Board Recall Supported Petition") within twenty-four hours of receiving the support of at least two Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants. Each Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Board Recall Petition. Such Board Recall Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Board Recall Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants requests that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Board Recall Community Forum as defined in Section 3.3(d) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Board Recall Supported Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants have determined to hold the Board Recall Community Forum during
the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.

The Board Recall Process shall thereafter continue for such Board Recall Supported Petition pursuant to Section 3.3(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Board Recall Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a Board Recall Process Termination Notice if the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant is unable to obtain the support of at least two other Decisional Participants for its Board Recall Petition during the Board Recall Petition Support Period.

(d) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration receives a Board Recall Supported Petition under Section 3.3(c) of this Annex D during the Board Recall Petition Support Period, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Board Recall Supported Petition ("Board Recall Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Board Recall Supported Petition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, schedule such call prior to any Board Recall Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website. The date and time of any such conference call shall be determined after consultation with the Board regarding the availability of the Directors.

(ii) The Board Recall Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period ("Board Recall Community Forum Period") unless the Board Recall
Supported Petition requested that the Board Recall Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, in which case the Board Recall Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants; provided, that, the date and time of any Board Recall Community Forum shall be determined after consultation with the Board regarding the availability of the Directors. If the Board Recall Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period, the Board Recall Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.

(iii) The Board Recall Community Forum shall have at least one face-to-face meeting and may also be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC (Empowered Community) Administration selects. If the Board Recall Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly inform ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of the date, time and participation methods of the Board Recall Community Forum, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall manage and moderate the Board Recall Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner; provided that no individual from the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant or a Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participant, nor the individual who initiated the Board Recall Petition,
shall be permitted to participate in the management or moderation of
the Board Recall Community Forum.

(v) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or
Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional
Participants) may deliver to the EC (Empowered Community)
Administration in writing its views and questions on the Board Recall
Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Board
Recall Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC
(Empowered Community) Administration shall also be delivered to the
Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed
appropriate by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and
Numbers).

(vi) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)
staff and the full Board are expected to attend the Board Recall
Community Forum in order to address the issues raised in the Board
Recall Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of
the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants for the Board
Recall Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Board
Recall Community Forum that the issue raised in such Board Recall
Supported Petition has been resolved, such Board Recall Supported
Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Board Recall Process with
respect to such Board Recall Supported Petition will be terminated. If a
Board Recall Process is terminated, the EC (Empowered Community)
Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of
the issue raised in the Board Recall Supported Petition, deliver to the
Secretary a Board Recall Process Termination Notice. For the
avoidance of doubt, the Board Recall Community Forum is not a
decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled
pursuant to the internal procedures of the Board Recall Petitioning
Decisional Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional
Participants.

(viii) During the Board Recall Community Forum Period, an additional
one or two Board Recall Community Forums may be held at the
discretion of the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and the
Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants, or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration.

(ix) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide support services for the Board Recall Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Board Recall Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) related to the Board Recall Community Forum.

(e) Following the expiration of the Board Recall Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Board Recall Community Forum Period (such period, the "Board Recall Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Board Recall Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Board Recall Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to such Board Recall Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of any of the foregoing prior to expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period).

(f) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, deliver a written notice ("EC (Empowered Community) Board Recall Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Section 3.3 of this Annex D, the EC (Empowered Community) has resolved to remove all Directors (other than the President) if (after accounting for any adjustments to the below as required by the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Carve-out pursuant to Section 3.6(e) of
the Bylaws if an IRP Panel found that, in implementing GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Consensus (Consensus) Advice, the Board acted inconsistently with the Articles or Bylaws a Board Recall Supported Petition (i) is supported by four or more Decisional Participants, and (ii) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(g) Upon the Secretary's receipt of an EC (Empowered Community) Board Recall Notice, all Directors (other than the President) shall be effectively removed from office and shall no longer be Directors and such vacancies shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12 of the Bylaws.

(h) If the Board Recall Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 3.3(f) of this Annex D, the Board Recall Process will automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Board Recall Process Termination Notice. All Directors shall remain on the Board.

(i) If neither an EC (Empowered Community) Board Recall Notice nor a Board Recall Process Termination Notice are received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, the Board Recall Process shall automatically terminate and all Directors shall remain on the Board.

(j) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Board Recall Petition, (ii) Board Recall Petition Notice, (iii) Board Recall Supported Petition, (iv) EC (Empowered Community) Board Recall Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration as to why the EC (Empowered Community) has chosen to recall the Board, (v) Board Recall Process Termination Notice, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 3.3.

Article 4 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC (Empowered Community)'S RIGHTS TO INITIATE MEDIATION, A COMMUNITY IRP OR RECONSIDERATION REQUEST

Section 4.1. MEDIATION INITIATION

(a) If the Board refuses or fails to comply with a decision by the EC (Empowered Community) delivered to the Secretary pursuant to an EC (Empowered Community) Approval Notice, EC (Empowered Community)
Rejection Notice, Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice, SO (Supporting Organization)/AC (Advisory Committee; or Administrative Contact (of a domain registration)) Director Removal Notice or EC (Empowered Community) Board Recall Notice pursuant to and in compliance with Article 1, Article 2 or Article 3 of this Annex D, or rejects or otherwise does not take action that is consistent with a final IFR Recommendation, Special IFR Recommendation, SCWG Creation Recommendation or SCWG Recommendation, as applicable (each, an "EC (Empowered Community) Decision"), the EC (Empowered Community) Administration representative of any Decisional Participant who supported the exercise by the EC (Empowered Community) of its rights in the applicable EC (Empowered Community) Decision during the applicable decision period may request that the EC (Empowered Community) initiate mediation with the Board in relation to that EC (Empowered Community) Decision as contemplated by Section 4.7 of the Bylaws, by delivering a notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the Decisional Participants and the Secretary requesting the initiation of a mediation ("Mediation Initiation Notice"). ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post to the Website any Mediation Initiation Notice.

(b) As soon as practicable after receiving a Mediation Initiation Notice, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Secretary shall initiate mediation, which shall proceed in accordance with Section 4.7 of the Bylaws.

Section 4.2. COMMUNITY IRP

(a) After completion of a mediation under Section 4.7 of the Bylaws, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration representative of any Decisional Participant who supported the exercise by the EC (Empowered Community) of its rights in the applicable EC (Empowered Community) Decision during the applicable decision period may request that the EC (Empowered Community) initiate a Community IRP (a "Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant"), as contemplated by Section 4.3 of the Bylaws, by delivering a notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the Decisional Participants requesting the initiation of a Community IRP ("Community IRP Petition"). The Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website. The process set forth in this Section 4.2 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Community IRP Petition is referred to herein as the "Community IRP Initiation Process."
(b) Following the delivery of a Community IRP Petition to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration by a Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 4.2(a) of this Annex D (which de ivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Community IRP Notification Date"), the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Community IRP Petition. The Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning on the Community IRP Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21\textsuperscript{st} day after the Community IRP Notification Date (the "Community IRP Petition Support Period"), the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Community IRP Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant. Each Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Community IRP Petition. Such Community IRP Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Community IRP Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN (Internet Corporation for
Assigned Names and Numbers) organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Community IRP Community Forum (as defined in Section 4.2(c) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Community IRP Supported Petition;

(D) a statement as to whether the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Community IRP Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting;

(E) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment, a PDP (Policy Development Process) Fundamental Bylaw Statement if applicable and, if so, the name of the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant;

(F) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to an Articles Amendment, a PDP (Policy Development Process) Articles Statement if applicable and, if so, the name of the Articles Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant;

(G) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to a Standard Bylaw Amendment, a PDP (Policy Development Process) Standard Bylaw Statement if applicable and, if so, the name of the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant; and

(H) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to a policy recommendation of a cross community working group chartered by more than one Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) ("CCWG Policy Recommendation"), a statement citing the specific CCWG Policy Recommendation and related provision in the Community IRP Supported Petition ("CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement"), and, if so, the name of any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) that is a Decisional Participant that approved the CCWG Policy Recommendation ("CCWG Policy Recommendation Decisional Participant").

The Community IRP Initiation Process shall thereafter continue for such Community IRP Supported Petition pursuant to Section 4.2(c) of
this Annex D.

(ii) The Community IRP Initiation Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Community IRP Initiation Process has been terminated with respect to the Community IRP included in the Community IRP Petition ("Community IRP Termination Notice") if:

(A) no Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant is able to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Community IRP Petition during the Community IRP Petition Support Period;

(B) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a PDP (Policy Development Process) Fundamental Bylaw Statement, the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants;

(C) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a PDP (Policy Development Process) Articles Statement, the Articles Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants;

(D) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a PDP (Policy Development Process) Standard Bylaw Statement, the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants; or

(E) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement, the CCWG Policy Recommendation Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants.
(c) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration receives a Community IRP Supported Petition under Section 4.2(b) of this Annex D during the Community IRP Petition Support Period, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested third parties may discuss the Community IRP Supported Petition ("Community IRP Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Community IRP Supported Petition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, schedule such call prior to any Community IRP Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

(ii) The Community IRP Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning on the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period ("Community IRP Community Forum Period") unless the Community IRP Supported Petition requested that the Community IRP Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, in which case the Community IRP Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant(s). If the Community IRP Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period, the Community IRP...
Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.

(iii) The Community IRP Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC (Empowered Community) Administration selects and/or, only if the Community IRP Community Forum is held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Community IRP Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly inform ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of the date, time and participation methods of such Community IRP Community Forum, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall manage and moderate the Community IRP Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

(v) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing its views and questions on the Community IRP Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Community IRP Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

(vi) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Community IRP Community Forum in order to discuss the Community IRP Supported Petition.
(vii) If the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants for the Community IRP Supported Petition agree before, during or after a Community IRP Community Forum that the issue raised in such Community IRP Supported Petition has been resolved, such Community IRP Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Community IRP Initiation Process with respect to such Community IRP Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Community IRP Initiation Process is terminated, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Community IRP Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Community IRP Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Community IRP Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

(viii) During the Community IRP Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Community IRP Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration.

(ix) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide support services for the Community IRP Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Community IRP Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) related to the Community IRP Community Forum.

(d) Following the expiration of the Community IRP Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Community IRP Community Forum Period (such period, the "Community IRP Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Community IRP Supported Petition, (ii) objects to
such Community IRP Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to the Community IRP Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period).

(e) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period, shall promptly deliver a written notice ("EC (Empowered Community) Community IRP Initiation Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Section 4.2 of this Annex D, the EC (Empowered Community) has resolved to accept the Community IRP Supported Petition if:

(i) A Community IRP Supported Petition that does not include a PDP (Policy Development Process) Fundamental Bylaw Statement, a PDP (Policy Development Process) Articles Statement, a PDP (Policy Development Process) Standard Bylaw Statement or a CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement (A) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants, and (B) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(ii) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a PDP (Policy Development Process) Fundamental Bylaw Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(iii) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a PDP (Policy Development Process) Articles Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Articles Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;
(iv) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a PDP (Policy Development Process) Standard Bylaw Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP (Policy Development Process) Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant; or

(v) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the CCWG Policy Recommendation Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(f) If the Community IRP Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 4.2(e) of this Annex D, the Community IRP Initiation Process will automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Community IRP Termination Notice.

(g) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Community IRP Petition, (ii) Community IRP Supported Petition, (iii) EC (Empowered Community) Community IRP Initiation Notice, (iv) Community IRP Termination Notice, (v) written explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration related to any of the foregoing, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 4.2.

Section 4.3. COMMUNITY RECONSIDERATION REQUEST

(a) Any Decisional Participant may request that the EC (Empowered Community) initiate a Reconsideration Request (a "Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant"), as contemplated by Section 4.2(b) of the Bylaws, by delivering a notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the other Decisional Participants, with a copy to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website, requesting the review or reconsideration of an action or inaction of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board or staff ("Community Reconsideration Petition"). A Community Reconsideration Petition must be delivered within 30 days after the occurrence of any of the conditions set forth
in Section 4.2(g)(i)(A), (B) or (C) of the Bylaws. In that instance, the Community Reconsideration Petition must be delivered within 30 days from the initial posting of the rationale. The process set forth in this Section 4.3 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Community Reconsideration Petition is referred to herein as the "Community Reconsideration Initiation Process."

(b) Following the delivery of a Community Reconsideration Petition to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration by a Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 4.3(a) of this Annex D (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Community Reconsideration Notification Date"), the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC (Empowered Community) Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Community Reconsideration Petition. The Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning on the Community Reconsideration Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the Community Reconsideration Notification Date (the "Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period"), the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Community Reconsideration Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant. Each Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Community Reconsideration Petition. Such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition shall include:
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(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Community Reconsideration Community Forum (as defined in Section 4.3(c) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Community Reconsideration Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.

The Community Reconsideration Initiation Process shall thereafter continue for such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition pursuant to Section 4.3(c) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Community Reconsideration Initiation Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Community Reconsideration Initiation Process has been terminated with respect to the Reconsideration Request included in the Community Reconsideration Petition ("Community Reconsideration Termination Notice") if the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant is unable to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Community Reconsideration Petition during the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period.
(c) If the EC (Empowered Community) Administration receives a Community Reconsideration Supported Petition under Section 4.3(b) of this Annex D during the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested third parties may discuss the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition "Community Reconsideration Community Forum".

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall, at the direction of the EC (Empowered Community) Administration, schedule such call prior to any Community Reconsideration Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

(ii) The Community Reconsideration Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning on the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period ("Community Reconsideration Forum Period") unless the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition requested that the Community Reconsideration Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, in which case the Community Reconsideration Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant(s). If the Community Reconsideration Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time...
at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period, the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting.

(iii) The Community Reconsideration Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC (Empowered Community) Administration selects and/or, only if the Community Reconsideration Community Forum is held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Community Reconsideration Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) public meeting, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall promptly inform ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) of the date, time and participation methods of such Community Reconsideration Community Forum which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall manage and moderate the Community Reconsideration Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

(v) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing its views and questions on the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Community Reconsideration Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).
(vi) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Community Reconsideration Community Forum in order to discuss the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participants for a Community Reconsideration Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Community Reconsideration Community Forum that the issue raised in such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition has been resolved, such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Community Reconsideration Initiation Process with respect to such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Community Reconsideration Initiation Process is terminated, the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Community Reconsideration Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Community Reconsideration Community Forum is not a decisional bod and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

(viii) During the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Community Reconsideration Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC (Empowered Community) Administration.

(ix) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will provide support services for the Community Reconsideration Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Community Reconsideration Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and any Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (including Decisional Participants) related to the Community Reconsideration Community Forum.
(d) Following the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period (such period, the "Community Reconsideration Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC (Empowered Community) Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period).

(e) If (i) three or more Decisional Participants support the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition and (ii) no more than one Decisional Participant objects to the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, then the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period, deliver a notice to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Section 4.3 of this Annex D, the EC (Empowered Community) has resolved to accept the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition ("EC (Empowered Community) Reconsideration Initiation Notice"). The Reconsideration Request shall then proceed in accordance with Section 4.2 of the Bylaws.

(f) If the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 4.3(e) of this Annex D, the Community Reconsideration Initiation Process will automatically be terminated and the EC (Empowered Community) Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Community Reconsideration Termination Notice.
(g) ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Community Reconsideration Petition, (ii) Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, (iii) EC (Empowered Community) Reconsideration Initiation Notice, (iv) Community Reconsideration Termination Notice, (v) written explanation provided by the EC (Empowered Community) Administration related to any of the foregoing, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 4.3.

Annex E: Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Principles

1. Principles

The caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) budget (the "Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget") is defined as an annual operating plan and budget that is established by the CFO in accordance with the following principles (the "Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Principles"):

a. It is based on then-current ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) operations;

b. It allows ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to "take good care" and not expose itself to additional enterprise risk(s) as a result of the rejection of an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the Bylaws;

c. It allows ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to react to emergency situations in a fashion that preserves the continuation of its operations;

d. It allows ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to abide by its existing obligations (including Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and contracts, as well as those imposed under law);

e. It enables ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to avoid waste of its resources during the rejection period (i.e., the period between when an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget is rejected
by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the Bylaws and when an ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget becomes effective in accordance with the Bylaws or immediately thereafter, by being able to continue activities during the rejection period that would otherwise need to be restarted at a materially incremental cost; and

f. Notwithstanding any other principle listed above, it prevents ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) from initiating activities that remains subject to community consideration (or for which that community consideration has not concluded) with respect to the applicable ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget, including without limitation, preventing implementation of any expenditure or undertaking any action that was the subject of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget that was rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) that triggered the need for the Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget.

1. Examples

Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget would logically include:

i. the functioning of the EC (Empowered Community), the Decisional Participants, and any Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) or Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) that are not Decisional Participants;

ii. the functioning of all redress mechanisms, including without imitation the office of the Ombudsman, the IRP, and mediation;

iii. employment of staff (i.e. employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN (Internet Corporation forAssigned Names and Numbers) does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) across all locations, including all related compensation, benefits, social security, pension, and other employment costs;
iv. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) in the normal course of business;

v. necessary or time-sensitive travel costs for staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

vi. operating all existing ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) offices, and continuing to assume obligations relative to rent, utilities, maintenance, and similar matters;

vii. contracting with vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

viii. conducting ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) meetings and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) intercessional meetings previously contemplated and

ix. participating in engagement activities in furtherance of the approved Strategic Plan.

b. Below is a non-limitative list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget would logically exclude:

i. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or entering into new agreements in relation to activities that are the subject of the rejection of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the Bylaws, unless excluding these actions would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Principles;
ii. in the normal course of business, travel not deemed indispensable during the rejection period, unless the lack of travel would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Principles;

iii. entering into new agreements in relation to opening or operating new ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) locations/offices, unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Principles;

iv. entering into new agreements with governments (or their affiliates), unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget Principles; and

v. the proposed expenditure that was the basis for the rejection by the EC (Empowered Community) that triggered the need for the Caretaker ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Budget.

Annex F: Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Principles

1. Principles

The caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget (the "Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget") is defined as an annual operating plan and budget that is established by the CFO in accordance with the following principles (the "Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Principles"):  

a. It is based on then-current operations of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions;

b. It allows ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, to "take good care" and not expose itself to additional enterprise risk(s) as a result of the rejection of an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the Bylaws;
c. It allows ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, to react to emergency situations in a fashion that preserves the continuation of its operations;

d. It allows ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, to abide by its existing obligations (including Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and contracts, as well as those imposed under law);

e. It allows ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, to avoid waste of its resources during the rejection period (i.e., the period between when an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget is rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the Bylaws and when an IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget becomes effective in accordance with the Bylaws) or immediately thereafter, by being able to continue activities during the rejection period that would have otherwise need to be restarted at an incremental cost; and

f. Notwithstanding any other principle listed above, it prevents ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, from initiating activities that remain subject to community consideration (or for which that community consultation has not concluded) with respect to the applicable IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget, including without limitation, preventing implementation of any expenditure or undertaking any action that was the subject of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget that was rejected by the EC (Empowered Community) that triggered the need for the Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget.

1. Examples

a. Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget.
Authority) Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget would logically include:

i. employment of staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) across all locations, including all related compensation, benefits, social security, pension, and other employment costs;

ii. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) in the normal course of business;

iii. necessary or time-sensitive travel costs for staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

iv. operating all existing offices used in the performance of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions, and continuing to assume obligations relative to rent, utilities, maintenance, and similar matters;

v. contracting with vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

vi. participating in meetings and conferences previously contemplated;

vii. participating in engagement activities with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)’s Customer Standing Committee or the customers of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions;

viii. fulfilling obligations (including financial obligations under agreements and memoranda of understanding to which ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) or its affiliates is a party that relate to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions; and

ix. participating in engagement activities in furtherance of the approved Strategic Plan.
b. Below is a non-limitative list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget would logically exclude:

i. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or entering into new agreements in relation to activities that are the subject of the rejection of the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget by the EC (Empowered Community) pursuant to the Bylaws, unless excluding these actions would violate any of the Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Principles;

ii. in the normal course of business, travel not deemed indispensable during the rejection period, unless the lack of travel would violate any of the Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Principles;

iii. entering into new agreements in relation to opening or operating new locations/offices where the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) functions shall be performed, unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Principles;

iv. entering into new agreements with governments (or their affiliates), unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget Principles; and

v. the proposed expenditure that was the basis for the rejection by the EC (Empowered Community) that triggered the need for the Caretaker IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Budget.

ANNEX G-1

The topics, issues, policies, procedures and principles referenced in Section 1.1(a)(i) with respect to gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registrars are:

- issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet, registrar services, registry services, or the DNS (Domain Name System);
• functional and performance specifications for the provision of registrar services;

• registrar policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus (Consensus) Policies relating to a gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registry;

• resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names, but including where such policies take into account use of the domain names); or

• restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registrar and registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or reseller are affiliated.

Examples of the above include, without limitation:

• principles for allocation of registered names in a TLD (Top Level Domain) (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);

• prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;

• reservation of registered names in a TLD (Top Level Domain) that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS (Domain Name System) or the Internet (e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration);

• maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning registered names and name servers;

• procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility among continuing registrars of the registered names sponsored in a TLD (Top Level Domain) by a registrar losing accreditation; and

• the transfer of registration data upon a change in registrar sponsoring one or more registered names.
ANNEX G-2

The topics, issues, policies, procedures and principles referenced in Section 1.1(a)(i) with respect to gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) registries are:

- issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or DNS (Domain Name System);

- functional and performance specifications for the provision of registry services;

- security and stability of the registry database for a TLD (Top Level Domain);

- registry policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus (Consensus) Policies relating to registry operations or registrars;

- resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names); or

- restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or registrar resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or registrar reseller are affiliated.

Examples of the above include, without limitation:

- principles for allocation of registered names in a TLD (Top Level Domain) (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);

- prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;

- reservation of registered names in the TLD (Top Level Domain) that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS (Domain Name System) or the Internet (e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration);
• maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning domain name registrations; and

• procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility for serving registered domain names in a TLD (Top Level Domain) affected by such a suspension or termination.

[1] When "1 October 2016" is used, that signals that the date that will be used is the effective date of the Bylaws.
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ABOUT THE PROGRAM

Overview

The New gTLD Program is an initiative coordinated by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), that is enabling the large expansion of the domain name system via the introduction of new top level domain (TLD), the program aims to enhance innovation, competition and consumer choice. Many new safeguards to help support a secure, stable and resilient Internet are also being introduced as a result of the program.

TLD are the letters found at the end of an Internet address, such as com, net, or org. Any TLD that does not represent a country or a territory is known as a generic TLD, or gTLD. The New gTLD Program has enabled hundreds of new top-level domains in ASCII characters and in different scripts (Internationalized Domain Name (IDN)) to enter into the Internet’s root zone since the first delegation occurred in October 2013.

The application window for the first application round closed in April 2012. Comprehensive reviews of the program are currently underway to assess performance in meeting intended objectives. The review will inform ongoing discussion with the ICANN community to determine when a second round will take place.

Resources

- Fast Facts (/en/announcements-and-media/infographics)
- Statistics (/en/program-status/statistics)
- Current Application Status (https://gtdresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus)
- Program Reviews (/en/reviews)

Program History

In 2005, ICANN’s Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) began a policy development process to consider the introduction of new gTLD based on the results of trial rounds conducted in 2000 and 2003. The GNSO is the main policy-making body for gTLD and encourages global participation in the technical management of the Internet.

The two-year policy development process included detailed and lengthy consultations with the many constituencies of ICANN’s global Internet community, including government, civil society, business, and intellectual property takaholder, and technology.

In 2008, the ICANN Board adopted 19 specific GNSO policy recommendation for implementing new gTLD, with certain allocation criteria and contractual conditions. One such recommendation provided that ICANN should introduce New gTLDs in rounds until the scale of demand is clear. After approval of the policy, ICANN undertook an open, inclusive, and transparent implementation process to address stakeholder concerns, such as the protection of intellectual property and community interests, consumer protection, and DNS stability. This work included public consultation, review, and input to multiple draft versions of the Applicant Guidebook.

In June 2011, ICANN’s Board of Directors approved the Applicant Guidebook (/en/applicant/agb) and authorized the launch of the New

A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:

We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. Learn more. OK

https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/program
A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:

We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. Learn more.
Program Statistics

On 13 June 2012, ICANN published all applied-for strings. View high-level program statistics as applications move through the evaluation process.

PROGRAM STATISTICS

Current Statistics (Updated monthly)

Application Statistics: Overview (as of 30 November 2018)

| Total Applications Submitted (https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus) | 1930 |
| Completed New gTLD Program (/en/program-status/delegated-triang) (gTLD Delegated** - introduced into Internet) | 1232 |
| Application Withdrawn | 620 |
| Application that Will Not Proceed/Not Approved | 46 |
| Currently Proceeding through New gTLD Program* | 32 |

Contention Resolution

| Total Contention Sets (https://gtldresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus) | 234 |
| Resolved Contention Sets | 227 |
| Contention Set Reolved via ICANN Auction (https://gtldresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/auctionresults) | 16 |
| Unresolved Contention Sets | 7 |

A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:

We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. Learn more.
| Registry Agreements with Specification 13 | 491 |
| Registry Agreements with Code of Conduct Exemption | 79 |
| In Contracting | 6 |
| Pre-Delegation Testing (PDT) | |
| Passed PDT | 1244 |

**Breakdown: Delegation Statistics**

| Delegated gTLDs (/en(program-status/delegated-strings) | 1232 |
| (Introduced into Internet) | |

Select Subcategories of Delegated gTLDs

(NOTE: gTLDs may fall into more than one subcategory)

| Community | 52 |
| Geographic | 53 |
| Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) | 95 |

**gTLD Startup Statistics (as of 30 November 2018)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunrise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: Registry Agreement and Delegated gTLD totals are not adjusted for TLDs that subsequently terminated their Registry Agreements and/or were removed from the root zone. In addition, Specification 13 and Code of Conduct Exemption totals are not adjusted if subsequently removed.

---

**A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:**

We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. [Learn more](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/statistics).
Application Breakdown by Region
Statistics as of 13 June 2012

1930 total number of applications received

911 North America
675 Europe
24 South America
17 Africa
303 Asia Pacific

A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:
We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. Learn more.
Application Breakdown by String Similarity
Statistics as of 26 February 2013

Approximate Number of Unique Applied-for Strings: 1,400

- Contention Sets
  - Exact Match: 230
    (two or more applications for a string with same characters)
  - Confusingly Similar: 2
    - hotels & .hoteis
    - unicorn & .unicom
- Applications in a Contention Set: 751

A note about our privacy policies and terms of service:
We have updated our privacy policies and certain website terms of service to provide greater transparency, promote simplification, and align with recent changes in privacy laws applicable to us. Learn more. [OK]
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New gTLDs have been in the forefront of ICANN’s agenda since its creation. The new gTLD program will open up the top level of the Internet’s namespace to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the DNS.

Currently the namespace consists of 22 gTLDs and over 250 ccTLDs operating on various models. Each of the gTLDs has a designated “registry operator” and, in most cases, a Registry Agreement between the operator (or sponsor) and ICANN. The registry operator is responsible for the technical operation of the TLD, including all of the names registered in that TLD. The gTLDs are served by over 900 registrars, who interact with registrants to perform domain name registration and other related services. The new gTLD program will create a means for prospective registry operators to apply for new gTLDs, and create new options for consumers in the market. When the program launches its first application round, ICANN expects a diverse set of applications for new gTLDs, including IDNs, creating significant potential for new uses and benefit to Internet users across the globe.

The program has its origins in carefully deliberated policy development work by the ICANN community. In October 2007, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)—one of the groups that coordinate global Internet policy at ICANN—formally completed its policy development work on new gTLDs and approved a set of 19 policy recommendations. Representatives from a wide variety of stakeholder groups—governments, individuals, civil society, business and intellectual property constituencies, and the technology community—were engaged in discussions for more than 18 months on such questions as the demand, benefits and risks of new gTLDs, the selection criteria that should be applied, how gTLDs should be allocated, and the contractual conditions that should be required for new gTLD registries going forward. The culmination of this policy development process was a decision by the ICANN Board of Directors to adopt the community-developed policy in June 2008. A thorough brief to the policy process and outcomes can be found at http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds.

ICANN’s work next focused on implementation: creating an application and evaluation process for new gTLDs that is aligned with the policy recommendations and provides a clear roadmap for applicants to reach delegation, including Board approval. This implementation work is reflected in the drafts of the applicant guidebook that were released for public comment, and in the explanatory papers giving insight into rationale behind some of the conclusions reached on specific topics. Meaningful community input has led to revisions of the draft applicant guidebook. In parallel, ICANN has established the resources needed to successfully launch and operate the program. This process concluded with the decision by the ICANN Board of Directors in June 2011 to launch the New gTLD Program.

For current information, timelines and activities related to the New gTLD Program, please go to http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtld-program.htm.
Module 1
Introduction to the gTLD Application Process

This module gives applicants an overview of the process for applying for a new generic top-level domain, and includes instructions on how to complete and submit an application, the supporting documentation an applicant must submit with an application, the fees required, and when and how to submit them.

This module also describes the conditions associated with particular types of applications, and the stages of the application life cycle.

Prospective applicants are encouraged to read and become familiar with the contents of this entire module, as well as the others, before starting the application process to make sure they understand what is required of them and what they can expect at each stage of the application evaluation process.

For the complete set of the supporting documentation and more about the origins, history and details of the policy development background to the New gTLD Program, please see http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/.

This Applicant Guidebook is the implementation of Board-approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs, and has been revised extensively via public comment and consultation over a two-year period.

1.1 Application Life Cycle and Timelines

This section provides a description of the stages that an application passes through once it is submitted. Some stages will occur for all applications submitted; others will only occur in specific circumstances. Applicants should be aware of the stages and steps involved in processing applications received.

1.1.1 Application Submission Dates

The user registration and application submission periods open at 00:01 UTC 12 January 2012.

The user registration period closes at 23:59 UTC 29 March 2012. New users to TAS will not be accepted beyond this
time. Users already registered will be able to complete the application submission process.

Applicants should be aware that, due to required processing steps (i.e., online user registration, application submission, fee submission, and fee reconciliation) and security measures built into the online application system, it might take substantial time to perform all of the necessary steps to submit a complete application. Accordingly, applicants are encouraged to submit their completed applications and fees as soon as practicable after the Application Submission Period opens. Waiting until the end of this period to begin the process may not provide sufficient time to submit a complete application before the period closes. Accordingly, new user registrations will not be accepted after the date indicated above.

The application submission period closes at 23:59 UTC 12 April 2012.

To receive consideration, all applications must be submitted electronically through the online application system by the close of the application submission period.

An application will not be considered, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, if:

- It is received after the close of the application submission period.
- The application form is incomplete (either the questions have not been fully answered or required supporting documents are missing). Applicants will not ordinarily be permitted to supplement their applications after submission.
- The evaluation fee has not been paid by the deadline. Refer to Section 1.5 for fee information.

ICANN has gone to significant lengths to ensure that the online application system will be available for the duration of the application submission period. In the event that the system is not available, ICANN will provide alternative instructions for submitting applications on its website.

1.1.2 Application Processing Stages

This subsection provides an overview of the stages involved in processing an application submitted to ICANN. Figure 1-1 provides a simplified depiction of the process. The shortest and most straightforward path is marked with bold lines, while certain stages that may or may not be
applicable in any given case are also shown. A brief description of each stage follows.

![Diagram of the gTLD Application Process]

Figure 1-1 – Once submitted to ICANN, applications will pass through multiple stages of processing.

### 1.1.2.1 Application Submission Period

At the time the application submission period opens, those wishing to submit new gTLD applications can become registered users of the TLD Application System (TAS).

After completing the user registration, applicants will supply a deposit for each requested application slot (see section 1.4), after which they will receive access to the full application form. To complete the application, users will answer a series of questions to provide general information, demonstrate financial capability, and demonstrate technical and operational capability. The supporting documents listed in subsection 1.2.2 of this module must also be submitted through the online application system as instructed in the relevant questions.

Applicants must also submit their evaluation fees during this period. Refer to Section 1.5 of this module for additional information about fees and payments.

Each application slot is for one gTLD. An applicant may submit as many applications as desired; however, there is no means to apply for more than one gTLD in a single application.
Following the close of the application submission period, ICANN will provide applicants with periodic status updates on the progress of their applications.

1.1.2.2 Administrative Completeness Check

Immediately following the close of the application submission period, ICANN will begin checking all applications for completeness. This check ensures that:

- All mandatory questions are answered;
- Required supporting documents are provided in the proper format(s); and
- The evaluation fees have been received.

ICANN will post the public portions of all applications considered complete and ready for evaluation within two weeks of the close of the application submission period. Certain questions relate to internal processes or information: applicant responses to these questions will not be posted. Each question is labeled in the application form as to whether the information will be posted. See posting designations for the full set of questions in the attachment to Module 2.

The administrative completeness check is expected to be completed for all applications in a period of approximately 8 weeks, subject to extension depending on volume. In the event that all applications cannot be processed within this period, ICANN will post updated process information and an estimated timeline.

1.1.2.3 Comment Period

Public comment mechanisms are part of ICANN’s policy development, implementation, and operational processes. As a private-public partnership, ICANN is dedicated to: preserving the operational security and stability of the Internet, promoting competition, achieving broad representation of global Internet communities, and developing policy appropriate to its mission through bottom-up, consensus-based processes. This necessarily involves the participation of many stakeholder groups in a public discussion.

ICANN will open a comment period (the Application Comment period) at the time applications are publicly posted on ICANN’s website (refer to subsection 1.1.2.2). This period will allow time for the community to review and submit comments on posted application materials.
Module 1
Introduction to the gTLD Application Process

(referred to as “application comments.”) The comment forum will require commenters to associate comments with specific applications and the relevant panel. Application comments received within a 60-day period from the posting of the application materials will be available to the evaluation panels performing the Initial Evaluation reviews. This period is subject to extension, should the volume of applications or other circumstances require. To be considered by evaluators, comments must be received in the designated comment forum within the stated comment period.

Evaluators will perform due diligence on the application comments (i.e., determine their relevance to the evaluation, verify the accuracy of claims, analyze meaningfulness of references cited) and take the information provided in these comments into consideration. In cases where consideration of the comments has impacted the scoring of the application, the evaluators will seek clarification from the applicant. Statements concerning consideration of application comments that have impacted the evaluation decision will be reflected in the evaluators’ summary reports, which will be published at the end of Extended Evaluation.

Comments received after the 60-day period will be stored and available (along with comments received during the comment period) for other considerations, such as the dispute resolution process, as described below.

In the new gTLD application process, all applicants should be aware that comment fora are a mechanism for the public to bring relevant information and issues to the attention of those charged with handling new gTLD applications. Anyone may submit a comment in a public comment forum.

Comments and the Formal Objection Process: A distinction should be made between application comments, which may be relevant to ICANN’s task of determining whether applications meet the established criteria, and formal objections that concern matters outside those evaluation criteria. The formal objection process was created to allow a full and fair consideration of objections based on certain limited grounds outside ICANN’s evaluation of applications on their merits (see subsection 3.2).

Public comments will not be considered as formal objections. Comments on matters associated with formal objections will not be considered by panels during Initial Evaluation. These comments will be available to and may
be subsequently considered by an expert panel during a 
dispute resolution proceeding (see subsection 1.1.2.9). 
However, in general, application comments have a very 
limited role in the dispute resolution process.

**String Contention:** Comments designated for the 
Community Priority Panel, as relevant to the criteria in 
Module 4, may be taken into account during a Community 
Priority Evaluation.

**Government Notifications:** Governments may provide a 
notification using the application comment forum to 
communicate concerns relating to national laws. However, 
a government’s notification of concern will not in itself be 
deemed to be a formal objection. A notification by a 
government does not constitute grounds for rejection of a 
gTLD application. A government may elect to use this 
comment mechanism to provide such a notification, in 
addition to or as an alternative to the GAC Early Warning 
procedure described in subsection 1.1.2.4 below.

Governments may also communicate directly to 
applicants using the contact information posted in the 
application, e.g., to send a notification that an applied-for 
gTLD string might be contrary to a national law, and to try 
to address any concerns with the applicant.

**General Comments:** A general public comment forum will 
remain open through all stages of the evaluation process, 
to provide a means for the public to bring forward any 
other relevant information or issues.

### 1.1.2.4 GAC Early Warning

Concurrent with the 60-day comment period, ICANN’s 
Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) may issue a 
GAC Early Warning notice concerning an application. This 
provides the applicant with an indication that the 
application is seen as potentially sensitive or problematic 
by one or more governments.

The GAC Early Warning is a notice only. It is not a formal 
objection, nor does it directly lead to a process that can 
result in rejection of the application. However, a GAC Early 
Warning should be taken seriously as it raises the likelihood 
that the application could be the subject of GAC Advice 
on New gTLDs (see subsection 1.1.2.7) or of a formal 
objection (see subsection 1.1.2.6) at a later stage in the 
process.
A GAC Early Warning typically results from a notice to the GAC by one or more governments that an application might be problematic, e.g., potentially violate national law or raise sensitivities. A GAC Early Warning may be issued for any reason. The GAC may then send that notice to the Board – constituting the GAC Early Warning. ICANN will notify applicants of GAC Early Warnings as soon as practicable after receipt from the GAC. The GAC Early Warning notice may include a nominated point of contact for further information.

GAC consensus is not required for a GAC Early Warning to be issued. Minimally, the GAC Early Warning must be provided in writing to the ICANN Board, and be clearly labeled as a GAC Early Warning. This may take the form of an email from the GAC Chair to the ICANN Board. For GAC Early Warnings to be most effective, they should include the reason for the warning and identify the objecting countries.

Upon receipt of a GAC Early Warning, the applicant may elect to withdraw the application for a partial refund (see subsection 1.5.1), or may elect to continue with the application (this may include meeting with representatives from the relevant government(s) to try to address the concern). To qualify for the refund described in subsection 1.5.1, the applicant must provide notification to ICANN of its election to withdraw the application within 21 calendar days of the date of GAC Early Warning delivery to the applicant.

To reduce the possibility of a GAC Early Warning, all applicants are encouraged to identify potential sensitivities in advance of application submission, and to work with the relevant parties (including governments) beforehand to mitigate concerns related to the application.

1.1.2.5 Initial Evaluation

Initial Evaluation will begin immediately after the administrative completeness check concludes. All complete applications will be reviewed during Initial Evaluation. At the beginning of this period, background screening on the applying entity and the individuals named in the application will be conducted. Applications

---

1. While definitive guidance has not been issued, the GAC has indicated that strings that could raise sensitivities include those that "purport to represent or that embody a particular group of people or interests based on historical, cultural, or social components of identity, such as nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, belief, culture or particular social origin or group, political opinion, membership of a national minority, disability, age, and/or a language or linguistic group (non-exhaustive)" and "those strings that refer to particular sectors, such as those subject to national regulation (such as .bank, .pharmacy) or those that describe or are targeted to a population or industry that is vulnerable to online fraud or abuse."
must pass this step in conjunction with the Initial Evaluation reviews.

There are two main elements of the Initial Evaluation:

1. **String reviews** (concerning the applied-for gTLD string). String reviews include a determination that the applied-for gTLD string is not likely to cause security or stability problems in the DNS, including problems caused by similarity to existing TLDs or reserved names.

2. **Applicant reviews** (concerning the entity applying for the gTLD and its proposed registry services). Applicant reviews include a determination of whether the applicant has the requisite technical, operational, and financial capabilities to operate a registry.

By the conclusion of the Initial Evaluation period, ICANN will post notice of all Initial Evaluation results. Depending on the volume of applications received, such notices may be posted in batches over the course of the Initial Evaluation period.

The Initial Evaluation is expected to be completed for all applications in a period of approximately 5 months. If the volume of applications received significantly exceeds 500, applications will be processed in batches and the 5-month timeline will not be met. The first batch will be limited to 500 applications and subsequent batches will be limited to 400 to account for capacity limitations due to managing extended evaluation, string contention, and other processes associated with each previous batch.

If batching is required, a secondary time-stamp process will be employed to establish the batches. (Batching priority will not be given to an application based on the time at which the application was submitted to ICANN, nor will batching priority be established based on a random selection method.)

The secondary time-stamp process will require applicants to obtain a time-stamp through a designated process which will occur after the close of the application submission period. The secondary time stamp process will occur, if required, according to the details to be published on ICANN’s website. (Upon the Board’s approval of a final designation of the operational details of the “secondary timestamp” batching process, the final plan will be added as a process within the Applicant Guidebook.)
If batching is required, the String Similarity review will be completed on all applications prior to the establishment of evaluation priority batches. For applications identified as part of a contention set, the entire contention set will be kept together in the same batch.

If batches are established, ICANN will post updated process information and an estimated timeline.

Note that the processing constraints will limit delegation rates to a steady state even in the event of an extremely high volume of applications. The annual delegation rate will not exceed 1,000 per year in any case, no matter how many applications are received.2

1.1.2.6 Objection Filing

Formal objections to applications can be filed on any of four enumerated grounds, by parties with standing to object. The objection filing period will open after ICANN posts the list of complete applications as described in subsection 1.1.2.2, and will last for approximately 7 months.

Objectors must file such formal objections directly with dispute resolution service providers (DRSPs), not with ICANN. The objection filing period will close following the end of the Initial Evaluation period (refer to subsection 1.1.2.5), with a two-week window of time between the posting of the Initial Evaluation results and the close of the objection filing period. Objections that have been filed during the objection filing period will be addressed in the dispute resolution stage, which is outlined in subsection 1.1.2.9 and discussed in detail in Module 3.

All applicants should be aware that third parties have the opportunity to file objections to any application during the objection filing period. Applicants whose applications are the subject of a formal objection will have an opportunity to file a response according to the dispute resolution service provider’s rules and procedures. An applicant wishing to file a formal objection to another application that has been submitted would do so within the objection filing period, following the objection filing procedures in Module 3.

Applicants are encouraged to identify possible regional, cultural, property interests, or other sensitivities regarding TLD strings and their uses before applying and, where

---

possible, consult with interested parties to mitigate any concerns in advance.

1.1.2.7 Receipt of GAC Advice on New gTLDs

The GAC may provide public policy advice directly to the ICANN Board on any application. The procedure for GAC Advice on New gTLDs described in Module 3 indicates that, to be considered by the Board during the evaluation process, the GAC Advice on New gTLDs must be submitted by the close of the objection filing period. A GAC Early Warning is not a prerequisite to use of the GAC Advice process.

If the Board receives GAC Advice on New gTLDs stating that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed, this will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved. If the Board does not act in accordance with this type of advice, it must provide rationale for doing so.

See Module 3 for additional detail on the procedures concerning GAC Advice on New gTLDs.

1.1.2.8 Extended Evaluation

Extended Evaluation is available only to certain applicants that do not pass Initial Evaluation.

Applicants failing certain elements of the Initial Evaluation can request an Extended Evaluation. If the applicant does not pass Initial Evaluation and does not expressly request an Extended Evaluation, the application will proceed no further. The Extended Evaluation period allows for an additional exchange of information between the applicant and evaluators to clarify information contained in the application. The reviews performed in Extended Evaluation do not introduce additional evaluation criteria.

An application may be required to enter an Extended Evaluation if one or more proposed registry services raise technical issues that might adversely affect the security or stability of the DNS. The Extended Evaluation period provides a time frame for these issues to be investigated. Applicants will be informed if such a review is required by the end of the Initial Evaluation period.

Evaluators and any applicable experts consulted will communicate the conclusions resulting from the additional review by the end of the Extended Evaluation period.
At the conclusion of the Extended Evaluation period, ICANN will post summary reports, by panel, from the Initial and Extended Evaluation periods.

If an application passes the Extended Evaluation, it can then proceed to the next relevant stage. If the application does not pass the Extended Evaluation, it will proceed no further.

The Extended Evaluation is expected to be completed for all applications in a period of approximately 5 months, though this timeframe could be increased based on volume. In this event, ICANN will post updated process information and an estimated timeline.

1.1.2.9 Dispute Resolution

Dispute resolution applies only to applicants whose applications are the subject of a formal objection.

Where formal objections are filed and filing fees paid during the objection filing period, independent dispute resolution service providers (DRSPs) will initiate and conclude proceedings based on the objections received. The formal objection procedure exists to provide a path for those who wish to object to an application that has been submitted to ICANN. Dispute resolution service providers serve as the fora to adjudicate the proceedings based on the subject matter and the needed expertise. Consolidation of objections filed will occur where appropriate, at the discretion of the DRSP.

As a result of a dispute resolution proceeding, either the applicant will prevail (in which case the application can proceed to the next relevant stage), or the objector will prevail (in which case either the application will proceed no further or the application will be bound to a contention resolution procedure). In the event of multiple objections, an applicant must prevail in all dispute resolution proceedings concerning the application to proceed to the next relevant stage. Applicants will be notified by the DRSP(s) of the results of dispute resolution proceedings.

Dispute resolution proceedings, where applicable, are expected to be completed for all applications within approximately a 5-month time frame. In the event that volume is such that this timeframe cannot be accommodated, ICANN will work with the dispute resolution service providers to create processing procedures and post updated timeline information.
1.1.2.10 String Contention

String contention applies only when there is more than one qualified application for the same or similar gTLD strings.

String contention refers to the scenario in which there is more than one qualified application for the identical gTLD string or for similar gTLD strings. In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.

Applicants are encouraged to resolve string contention cases among themselves prior to the string contention resolution stage. In the absence of resolution by the contending applicants, string contention cases are resolved either through a community priority evaluation (if a community-based applicant elects it) or through an auction.

In the event of contention between applied-for gTLD strings that represent geographic names, the parties may be required to follow a different process to resolve the contention. See subsection 2.2.1.4 of Module 2 for more information.

Groups of applied-for strings that are either identical or similar are called contention sets. All applicants should be aware that if an application is identified as being part of a contention set, string contention resolution procedures will not begin until all applications in the contention set have completed all aspects of evaluation, including dispute resolution, if applicable.

To illustrate, as shown in Figure 1-2, Applicants A, B, and C all apply for .EXAMPLE and are identified as a contention set. Applicants A and C pass Initial Evaluation, but Applicant B does not. Applicant B requests Extended Evaluation. A third party files an objection to Applicant C’s application, and Applicant C enters the dispute resolution process. Applicant A must wait to see whether Applicants B and C successfully complete the Extended Evaluation and dispute resolution phases, respectively, before it can proceed to the string contention resolution stage. In this example, Applicant B passes the Extended Evaluation, but Applicant C does not prevail in the dispute resolution proceeding. String contention resolution then proceeds between Applicants A and B.
Applicants prevailing in a string contention resolution procedure will proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLDs.

String contention resolution for a contention set is estimated to take from 2.5 to 6 months to complete. The time required will vary per case because some contention cases may be resolved in either a community priority evaluation or an auction, while others may require both processes.

1.1.2.11 Transition to Delegation

Applicants successfully completing all the relevant stages outlined in this subsection 1.1.2 are required to carry out a series of concluding steps before delegation of the applied-for gTLD into the root zone. These steps include execution of a registry agreement with ICANN and completion of a pre-delegation technical test to validate information provided in the application.

Following execution of a registry agreement, the prospective registry operator must complete technical set-up and show satisfactory performance on a set of technical tests before delegation of the gTLD into the root zone may be initiated. If the pre-delegation testing requirements are not satisfied so that the gTLD can be delegated into the root zone within the time frame specified in the registry agreement, ICANN may in its sole and absolute discretion elect to terminate the registry agreement.
Once all of these steps have been successfully completed, the applicant is eligible for delegation of its applied-for gTLD into the DNS root zone.

It is expected that the transition to delegation steps can be completed in approximately 2 months, though this could take more time depending on the applicant's level of preparedness for the pre-delegation testing and the volume of applications undergoing these steps concurrently.

1.1.3 Lifecycle Timelines

Based on the estimates for each stage described in this section, the lifecycle for a straightforward application could be approximately 9 months, as follows:

- **2 Months**
  - Administrative Check
- **5 Months**
  - Initial Evaluation
- **2 Months**
  - Transition to Delegation

Figure 1-3 – A straightforward application could have an approximate 9-month lifecycle.

The lifecycle for a highly complex application could be much longer, such as 20 months in the example below:
### Figure 1-4 – A complex application could have an approximate 20-month lifecycle.

#### 1.1.4 Posting Periods

The results of application reviews will be made available to the public at various stages in the process, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Posting Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Administrative Completeness Check</td>
<td>Public portions of all applications (posted within 2 weeks of the start of the Administrative Completeness Check).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Administrative Completeness Check</td>
<td>Results of Administrative Completeness Check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Early Warning Period</td>
<td>GAC Early Warnings received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Initial Evaluation</td>
<td>Status updates for applications withdrawn or ineligible for further review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contention sets resulting from String Similarity review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.1.5 Sample Application Scenarios

The following scenarios briefly show a variety of ways in which an application may proceed through the evaluation process. The table that follows exemplifies various processes and outcomes. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of possibilities. There are other possible combinations of paths an application could follow.

Estimated time frames for each scenario are also included, based on current knowledge. Actual time frames may vary depending on several factors, including the total number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Posting Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of Initial Evaluation</td>
<td>Application status updates with all Initial Evaluation results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Advice on New gTLDs</td>
<td>GAC Advice received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Extended Evaluation</td>
<td>Application status updates with all Extended Evaluation results. Evaluation summary reports from the Initial and Extended Evaluation periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Objection Filing/Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Information on filed objections and status updates available via Dispute Resolution Service Provider websites. Notice of all objections posted by ICANN after close of objection filing period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Contention Resolution (Community Priority Evaluation)</td>
<td>Results of each Community Priority Evaluation posted as completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Contention Resolution (Auction)</td>
<td>Results from each auction posted as completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to Delegation</td>
<td>Registry Agreements posted when executed. Pre-delegation testing status updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of applications received by ICANN during the application submission period. It should be emphasized that most applications are expected to pass through the process in the shortest period of time, i.e., they will not go through extended evaluation, dispute resolution, or string contention resolution processes. Although most of the scenarios below are for processes extending beyond nine months, it is expected that most applications will complete the process within the nine-month timeframe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Number</th>
<th>Initial Evaluation</th>
<th>Extended Evaluation</th>
<th>Objection(s) Filed</th>
<th>String Contention</th>
<th>Approved for Delegation Steps</th>
<th>Estimated Elapsed Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.5 – 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Applicant prevails</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Objector prevails</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Quit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Applicant prevails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.5 – 20 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Applicant prevails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.5 – 18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 1 - Pass Initial Evaluation, No Objection, No Contention** - In the most straightforward case, the application passes Initial Evaluation and there is no need for an Extended Evaluation. No objections are filed during the objection period, so there is no dispute to resolve. As there is no contention for the applied-for gTLD string, the applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD. Most applications are expected to complete the process within this timeframe.

**Scenario 2 - Extended Evaluation, No Objection, No Contention** - In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant is eligible for and requests an Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. Here, the application passes the Extended Evaluation. As with Scenario 1, no objections are filed.
during the objection period, so there is no dispute to resolve. As there is no contention for the gTLD string, the applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

Scenario 3 – Pass Initial Evaluation, No Objection, No Contention - In this case, the application passes the Initial Evaluation so there is no need for Extended Evaluation. No objections are filed during the objection period, so there is no dispute to resolve. However, there are other applications for the same or a similar gTLD string, so there is contention. In this case, the application prevails in the contention resolution, so the applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

Scenario 4 – Pass Initial Evaluation, Win Objection, No Contention - In this case, the application passes the Initial Evaluation so there is no need for Extended Evaluation. During the objection filing period, an objection is filed on one of the four enumerated grounds by an objector with standing (refer to Module 3, Objection Procedures). The objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider panel that finds in favor of the applicant. The applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

Scenario 5 – Pass Initial Evaluation, Lose Objection - In this case, the application passes the Initial Evaluation so there is no need for Extended Evaluation. During the objection period, multiple objections are filed by one or more objectors with standing for one or more of the four enumerated objection grounds. Each objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider panel. In this case, the panels find in favor of the applicant for most of the objections, but one finds in favor of the objector. As one of the objections has been upheld, the application does not proceed.

Scenario 6 – Fail Initial Evaluation, Applicant Withdraws - In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant decides to withdraw the application rather than continuing with Extended Evaluation. The application does not proceed.

Scenario 7 – Fail Initial Evaluation, Fail Extended Evaluation -- In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant requests Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. However, the
application fails Extended Evaluation also. The application does not proceed.

**Scenario 8 - Extended Evaluation, Win Objection, Pass Contention** – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant is eligible for and requests an Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. Here, the application passes the Extended Evaluation. During the objection filing period, an objection is filed on one of the four enumerated grounds by an objector with standing. The objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider panel that finds in favor of the applicant. However, there are other applications for the same or a similar gTLD string, so there is contention. In this case, the applicant prevails over other applications in the contention resolution procedure, the applicant can enter into a registry agreement, and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

**Scenario 9 - Extended Evaluation, Objection, Fail Contention** – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant is eligible for and requests an Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. Here, the application passes the Extended Evaluation. During the objection filing period, an objection is filed on one of the four enumerated grounds by an objector with standing. The objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider that finds in favor of the applicant. However, there are other applications for the same or a similar gTLD string, so there is contention. In this case, another applicant prevails in the contention resolution procedure, and the application does not proceed.

**Transition to Delegation** – After an application has successfully completed Initial Evaluation, and other stages as applicable, the applicant is required to complete a set of steps leading to delegation of the gTLD, including execution of a registry agreement with ICANN, and completion of pre-delegation testing. Refer to Module 5 for a description of the steps required in this stage.

**1.1.6 Subsequent Application Rounds**

ICANN’s goal is to launch subsequent gTLD application rounds as quickly as possible. The exact timing will be based on experiences gained and changes required after this round is completed. The goal is for the next application round to begin within one year of the close of the application submission period for the initial round.
ICANN has committed to reviewing the effects of the New gTLD Program on the operations of the root zone system after the first application round, and will defer the delegations in a second application round until it is determined that the delegations resulting from the first round did not jeopardize root zone system security or stability.

It is the policy of ICANN that there be subsequent application rounds, and that a systemized manner of applying for gTLDs be developed in the long term.

1.2 Information for All Applicants

1.2.1 Eligibility

Established corporations, organizations, or institutions in good standing may apply for a new gTLD. Applications from individuals or sole proprietorships will not be considered. Applications from or on behalf of yet-to-be-formed legal entities, or applications presupposing the future formation of a legal entity (for example, a pending Joint Venture) will not be considered.

ICANN has designed the New gTLD Program with multiple stakeholder protection mechanisms. Background screening, features of the gTLD Registry Agreement, data and financial escrow mechanisms are all intended to provide registrant and user protections.

The application form requires applicants to provide information on the legal establishment of the applying entity, as well as the identification of directors, officers, partners, and major shareholders of that entity. The names and positions of individuals included in the application will be published as part of the application; other information collected about the individuals will not be published.

Background screening at both the entity level and the individual level will be conducted for all applications to confirm eligibility. This inquiry is conducted on the basis of the information provided in questions 1-11 of the application form. ICANN may take into account information received from any source if it is relevant to the criteria in this section. If requested by ICANN, all applicants will be required to obtain and deliver to ICANN and ICANN's background screening vendor any consents or agreements of the entities and/or individuals named in questions 1-11 of the application form necessary to conduct background screening activities.
ICANN will perform background screening in only two areas: (1) General business diligence and criminal history; and (2) History of cybersquatting behavior. The criteria used for criminal history are aligned with the "crimes of trust" standard sometimes used in the banking and finance industry.

In the absence of exceptional circumstances, applications from any entity with or including any individual with convictions or decisions of the types listed in (a) - (m) below will be automatically disqualified from the program.

a. within the past ten years, has been convicted of any crime related to financial or corporate governance activities, or has been judged by a court to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or has been the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN deems as the substantive equivalent of any of these;

b. within the past ten years, has been disciplined by any government or industry regulatory body for conduct involving dishonesty or misuse of the funds of others;

c. within the past ten years has been convicted of any willful tax-related fraud or willful evasion of tax liabilities;

d. within the past ten years has been convicted of perjury, forswearing, failing to cooperate with a law enforcement investigation, or making false statements to a law enforcement agency or representative;

e. has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of computers, telephony systems, telecommunications or the Internet to facilitate the commission of crimes;

f. has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of a weapon, force, or the threat of force;

g. has ever been convicted of any violent or sexual offense victimizing children, the
elderly, or individuals with disabilities;

h. has ever been convicted of the illegal sale, manufacture, or distribution of pharmaceutical drugs, or been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in Article 3 of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988;

i. has ever been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (all Protocols);

j. has been convicted, within the respective timeframes, of aiding, abetting, facilitating, enabling, conspiring to commit, or failing to report any of the listed crimes above (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (a) - (d) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (e) – (i) above);

k. has entered a guilty plea as part of a plea agreement or has a court case in any jurisdiction with a disposition of Adjudicated Guilty or Adjudication Withheld (or regional equivalents), within the respective timeframes listed above for any of the listed crimes (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (a) - (d) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (e) - (i) above);

l. is the subject of a disqualification imposed by ICANN and in effect at the time the application is considered;

m. has been involved in a pattern of adverse, final decisions indicating that the applicant

---


5 It is recognized that not all countries have signed on to the UN conventions referenced above. These conventions are being used solely for identification of a list of crimes for which background screening will be performed. It is not necessarily required that an applicant would have been convicted pursuant to the UN convention but merely convicted of a crime listed under these conventions, to trigger these criteria.
or individual named in the application was engaged in cybersquatting as defined in the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA), or other equivalent legislation, or was engaged in reverse domain name hijacking under the UDRP or bad faith or reckless disregard under the ACPA or other equivalent legislation. Three or more such decisions with one occurring in the last four years will generally be considered to constitute a pattern.

n. fails to provide ICANN with the identifying information necessary to confirm identity at the time of application or to resolve questions of identity during the background screening process;

o. fails to provide a good faith effort to disclose all relevant information relating to items (a) - (m).

Background screening is in place to protect the public interest in the allocation of critical Internet resources, and ICANN reserves the right to deny an otherwise qualified application based on any information identified during the background screening process. For example, a final and legally binding decision obtained by a national law enforcement or consumer protection authority finding that the applicant was engaged in fraudulent and deceptive commercial practices as defined in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Protecting Consumers from Fraudulent and Deceptive Commercial Practices Across Borders\(^6\) may cause an application to be rejected. ICANN may also contact the applicant with additional questions based on information obtained in the background screening process.

All applicants are required to provide complete and detailed explanations regarding any of the above events as part of the application. Background screening information will not be made publicly available by ICANN.

**Registrar Cross-Ownership** -- ICANN-accredited registrars are eligible to apply for a gTLD. However, all gTLD registries

\(^6\) [http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,3746,en_2649_34267_2515000_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,3746,en_2649_34267_2515000_1_1_1_1,00.html)
are required to abide by a Code of Conduct addressing, inter alia, non-discriminatory access for all authorized registrars. ICANN reserves the right to refer any application to the appropriate competition authority relative to any cross-ownership issues.

**Legal Compliance** -- ICANN must comply with all U.S. laws, rules, and regulations. One such set of regulations is the economic and trade sanctions program administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) of the U.S. Department of the Treasury. These sanctions have been imposed on certain countries, as well as individuals and entities that appear on OFAC's List of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (the SDN List). ICANN is prohibited from providing most goods or services to residents of sanctioned countries or their governmental entities or to SDNs without an applicable U.S. government authorization or exemption. ICANN generally will not seek a license to provide goods or services to an individual or entity on the SDN List. In the past, when ICANN has been requested to provide services to individuals or entities that are not SDNs, but are residents of sanctioned countries, ICANN has sought and been granted licenses as required. In any given case, however, OFAC could decide not to issue a requested license.

### 1.2.2 Required Documents

All applicants should be prepared to submit the following documents, which are required to accompany each application:

1. **Proof of legal establishment** - Documentation of the applicant’s establishment as a specific type of entity in accordance with the applicable laws of its jurisdiction.

2. **Financial statements** - Applicants must provide audited or independently certified financial statements for the most recently completed fiscal year for the applicant. In some cases, unaudited financial statements may be provided.

As indicated in the relevant questions, supporting documentation should be submitted in the original language. English translations are not required.

All documents must be valid at the time of submission. Refer to the Evaluation Criteria, attached to Module 2, for additional details on the requirements for these documents.
Some types of supporting documentation are required only in certain cases:

1. **Community endorsement** - If an applicant has designated its application as community-based (see section 1.2.3), it will be asked to submit a written endorsement of its application by one or more established institutions representing the community it has named. An applicant may submit written endorsements from multiple institutions. If applicable, this will be submitted in the section of the application concerning the community-based designation.

   At least one such endorsement is required for a complete application. The form and content of the endorsement are at the discretion of the party providing the endorsement; however, the letter must identify the applied-for gTLD string and the applying entity, include an express statement of support for the application, and supply the contact information of the entity providing the endorsement.

   Written endorsements from individuals need not be submitted with the application, but may be submitted in the application comment forum.

2. **Government support or non-objection** - If an applicant has applied for a gTLD string that is a geographic name (as defined in this Guidebook), the applicant is required to submit documentation of support for or non-objection to its application from the relevant governments or public authorities. Refer to subsection 2.2.1.4 for more information on the requirements for geographic names. If applicable, this will be submitted in the geographic names section of the application.

3. **Documentation of third-party funding commitments** - If an applicant lists funding from third parties in its application, it must provide evidence of commitment by the party committing the funds. If applicable, this will be submitted in the financial section of the application.

### 1.2.3 Community-Based Designation

All applicants are required to designate whether their application is **community-based**.

#### 1.2.3.1 Definitions

For purposes of this Applicant Guidebook, a **community-based gTLD** is a gTLD that is operated for the benefit of a clearly delineated community. Designation or non-
designation of an application as community-based is entirely at the discretion of the applicant. Any applicant may designate its application as community-based; however, each applicant making this designation is asked to substantiate its status as representative of the community it names in the application by submission of written endorsements in support of the application. Additional information may be requested in the event of a community priority evaluation (refer to section 4.2 of Module 4). An applicant for a community-based gTLD is expected to:

1. Demonstrate an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community.
2. Have applied for a gTLD string strongly and specifically related to the community named in the application.
3. Have proposed dedicated registration and use policies for registrants in its proposed gTLD, including appropriate security verification procedures, commensurate with the community-based purpose it has named.
4. Have its application endorsed in writing by one or more established institutions representing the community it has named.

For purposes of differentiation, an application that has not been designated as community-based will be referred to hereinafter in this document as a **standard application**. A standard gTLD can be used for any purpose consistent with the requirements of the application and evaluation criteria, and with the registry agreement. A standard applicant may or may not have a formal relationship with an exclusive registrant or user population. It may or may not employ eligibility or use restrictions. Standard simply means here that the applicant has not designated the application as community-based.

### 1.2.3.2 Implications of Application Designation

Applicants should understand how their designation as community-based or standard will affect application processing at particular stages, and, if the application is successful, execution of the registry agreement and subsequent obligations as a gTLD registry operator, as described in the following paragraphs.

**Objection / Dispute Resolution** – All applicants should understand that a formal objection may be filed against any application on community grounds, even if the applicant has not designated itself as community-based or
declared the gTLD to be aimed at a particular community. Refer to Module 3, Objection Procedures.

**String Contention** – Resolution of string contention may include one or more components, depending on the composition of the contention set and the elections made by community-based applicants.

- A **settlement between the parties** can occur at any time after contention is identified. The parties will be encouraged to meet with an objective to settle the contention. Applicants in contention always have the opportunity to resolve the contention voluntarily, resulting in the withdrawal of one or more applications, before reaching the contention resolution stage.

- A **community priority evaluation** will take place only if a community-based applicant in a contention set elects this option. All community-based applicants in a contention set will be offered this option in the event that there is contention remaining after the applications have successfully completed all previous evaluation stages.

- An **auction** will result for cases of contention not resolved by community priority evaluation or agreement between the parties. Auction occurs as a contention resolution means of last resort. If a community priority evaluation occurs but does not produce a clear winner, an auction will take place to resolve the contention.

Refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures, for detailed discussions of contention resolution procedures.

**Contract Execution and Post-Delegation** – A community-based applicant will be subject to certain post-delegation contractual obligations to operate the gTLD in a manner consistent with the restrictions associated with its community-based designation. Material changes to the contract, including changes to the community-based nature of the gTLD and any associated provisions, may only be made with ICANN’s approval. The determination of whether to approve changes requested by the applicant will be at ICANN’s discretion. Proposed criteria for approving such changes are the subject of policy discussions.

Community-based applications are intended to be a narrow category, for applications where there are
unambiguous associations among the applicant, the community served, and the applied-for gTLD string. Evaluation of an applicant's designation as community-based will occur only in the event of a contention situation that results in a community priority evaluation. However, any applicant designating its application as community-based will, if the application is approved, be bound by the registry agreement to implement the community-based restrictions it has specified in the application. This is true even if there are no contending applicants.

1.2.3.3 Changes to Application Designation
An applicant may not change its designation as standard or community-based once it has submitted a gTLD application for processing.

1.2.4 Notice concerning Technical Acceptance Issues with New gTLDs
All applicants should be aware that approval of an application and entry into a registry agreement with ICANN do not guarantee that a new gTLD will immediately function throughout the Internet. Past experience indicates that network operators may not immediately fully support new top-level domains, even when these domains have been delegated in the DNS root zone, since third-party software modification may be required and may not happen immediately.

Similarly, software applications sometimes attempt to validate domain names and may not recognize new or unknown top-level domains. ICANN has no authority or ability to require that software accept new top-level domains, although it does prominently publicize which top-level domains are valid and has developed a basic tool to assist application providers in the use of current root-zone data.

ICANN encourages applicants to familiarize themselves with these issues and account for them in their startup and launch plans. Successful applicants may find themselves expending considerable efforts working with providers to achieve acceptance of their new top-level domains.

Applicants should review http://www.icann.org/en/topics/TLD-acceptance/ for background. IDN applicants should also review the material concerning experiences with IDN test strings in the root zone (see http://idn.icann.org/).
1.2.5 Notice concerning TLD Delegations

ICANN is only able to create TLDs as delegations in the DNS root zone, expressed using NS records with any corresponding DS records and glue records. There is no policy enabling ICANN to place TLDs as other DNS record types (such as A, MX, or DNAME records) in the root zone.

1.2.6 Terms and Conditions

All applicants must agree to a standard set of Terms and Conditions for the application process. The Terms and Conditions are available in Module 6 of this guidebook.

1.2.7 Notice of Changes to Information

If at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate, the applicant must promptly notify ICANN via submission of the appropriate forms. This includes applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant.

ICANN reserves the right to require a re-evaluation of the application in the event of a material change. This could involve additional fees or evaluation in a subsequent application round.

Failure to notify ICANN of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading may result in denial of the application.

1.2.8 Voluntary Designation for High Security Zones


The Final Report may be used to inform further work. ICANN will support independent efforts toward developing voluntary high-security TLD designations, which may be available to gTLD applicants wishing to pursue such designations.

1.2.9 Security and Stability

Root Zone Stability: There has been significant study, analysis, and consultation in preparation for launch of the
New gTLD Program, indicating that the addition of gTLDs to the root zone will not negatively impact the security or stability of the DNS.

It is estimated that 200-300 TLDs will be delegated annually, and determined that in no case will more than 1000 new gTLDs be added to the root zone in a year. The delegation rate analysis, consultations with the technical community, and anticipated normal operational upgrade cycles all lead to the conclusion that the new gTLD delegations will have no significant impact on the stability of the root system. Modeling and reporting will continue during, and after, the first application round so that root-scaling discussions can continue and the delegation rates can be managed as the program goes forward.

All applicants should be aware that delegation of any new gTLDs is conditional on the continued absence of significant negative impact on the security or stability of the DNS and the root zone system (including the process for delegating TLDs in the root zone). In the event that there is a reported impact in this regard and processing of applications is delayed, the applicants will be notified in an orderly and timely manner.

1.2.10 Resources for Applicant Assistance

A variety of support resources are available to gTLD applicants. Financial assistance will be available to a limited number of eligible applicants. To request financial assistance, applicants must submit a separate financial assistance application in addition to the gTLD application form.

To be eligible for consideration, all financial assistance applications must be received by 23:59 UTC 12 April 2012. Financial assistance applications will be evaluated and scored against pre-established criteria.

In addition, ICANN maintains a webpage as an informational resource for applicants seeking assistance, and organizations offering support.

See http://newgtlds.icann.org/applicants/candidate-support for details on these resources.

1.2.11 Updates to the Applicant Guidebook

As approved by the ICANN Board of Directors, this Guidebook forms the basis of the New gTLD Program. ICANN reserves the right to make reasonable updates and
changes to the Applicant Guidebook at any time, including as the possible result of new technical standards, reference documents, or policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process. Any such updates or revisions will be posted on ICANN’s website.

1.3 Information for Internationalized Domain Name Applicants

Some applied-for gTLD strings are expected to be Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs). IDNs are domain names including characters used in the local representation of languages not written with the basic Latin alphabet (a - z), European-Arabic digits (0 - 9), and the hyphen (-). As described below, IDNs require the insertion of A-labels into the DNS root zone.

1.3.1 IDN-Specific Requirements

An applicant for an IDN string must provide information indicating compliance with the IDNA protocol and other technical requirements. The IDNA protocol and its documentation can be found at http://icann.org/en/topics/idn/rfcs.htm.

Applicants must provide applied-for gTLD strings in the form of both a U-label (the IDN TLD in local characters) and an A-label.

An A-label is the ASCII form of an IDN label. Every IDN A-label begins with the IDNA ACE prefix, “xn--”, followed by a string that is a valid output of the Punycode algorithm, making a maximum of 63 total ASCII characters in length. The prefix and string together must conform to all requirements for a label that can be stored in the DNS including conformance to the LDH (host name) rule described in RFC 1034, RFC 1123, and elsewhere.

A U-label is the Unicode form of an IDN label, which a user expects to see displayed in applications.

For example, using the current IDN test string in Cyrillic script, the U-label is <испытание> and the A-label is <xn--80akhbyknj4f>.

An A-label must be capable of being produced by conversion from a U-label and a U-label must be capable of being produced by conversion from an A-label.

Applicants for IDN gTLDs will also be required to provide the following at the time of the application:
1. Meaning or restatement of string in English. The applicant will provide a short description of what the string would mean or represent in English.

2. Language of label (ISO 639-1). The applicant will specify the language of the applied-for gTLD string, both according to the ISO codes for the representation of names of languages, and in English.

3. Script of label (ISO 15924). The applicant will specify the script of the applied-for gTLD string, both according to the ISO codes for the representation of names of scripts, and in English.

4. Unicode code points. The applicant will list all the code points contained in the U-label according to its Unicode form.

5. Applicants must further demonstrate that they have made reasonable efforts to ensure that the encoded IDN string does not cause any rendering or operational problems. For example, problems have been identified in strings with characters of mixed right-to-left and left-to-right directionality when numerals are adjacent to the path separator (i.e., the dot). If an applicant is applying for a string with known issues, it should document steps that will be taken to mitigate these issues in applications. While it is not possible to ensure that all rendering problems are avoided, it is important that as many as possible are identified early and that the potential registry operator is aware of these issues. Applicants can become familiar with these issues by understanding the IDNA protocol (see http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/rfcs.htm), and by active participation in the IDN wiki (see http://idn.icann.org/) where some rendering problems are demonstrated.

6. [Optional] - Representation of label in phonetic alphabet. The applicant may choose to provide its applied-for gTLD string notated according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/ipa/). Note that this information will not be evaluated or scored. The information, if provided, will be used as a guide to ICANN in responding to inquiries or speaking of the application in public presentations.

---

7 See examples at http://stupid.domain.name/node/683
1.3.2 IDN Tables

An IDN table provides the list of characters eligible for registration in domain names according to the registry’s policy. It identifies any multiple characters that are considered equivalent for domain name registration purposes (“variant characters”). Variant characters occur where two or more characters can be used interchangeably.

Examples of IDN tables can be found in the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) IDN Repository at http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html.

In the case of an application for an IDN gTLD, IDN tables must be submitted for the language or script for the applied-for gTLD string (the “top level tables”). IDN tables must also be submitted for each language or script in which the applicant intends to offer IDN registrations at the second or lower levels.

Each applicant is responsible for developing its IDN Tables, including specification of any variant characters. Tables must comply with ICANN’s IDN Guidelines and any updates thereto, including:

- Complying with IDN technical standards.
- Employing an inclusion-based approach (i.e., code points not explicitly permitted by the registry are prohibited).
- Defining variant characters.
- Excluding code points not permissible under the guidelines, e.g., line-drawing symbols, pictographic dingbats, structural punctuation marks.
- Developing tables and registration policies in collaboration with relevant stakeholders to address common issues.
- Depositing IDN tables with the IANA Repository for IDN Practices (once the TLD is delegated).

An applicant’s IDN tables should help guard against user confusion in the deployment of IDN gTLDs. Applicants are strongly urged to consider specific linguistic and writing system issues that may cause problems when characters are used in domain names, as part of their work of defining variant characters.

---

8 See http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm
To avoid user confusion due to differing practices across TLD registries, it is recommended that applicants cooperate with TLD operators that offer domain name registration with the same or visually similar characters.

As an example, languages or scripts are often shared across geographic boundaries. In some cases, this can cause confusion among the users of the corresponding language or script communities. Visual confusion can also exist in some instances between different scripts (for example, Greek, Cyrillic and Latin).

Applicants will be asked to describe the process used in developing the IDN tables submitted. ICANN may compare an applicant’s IDN table with IDN tables for the same languages or scripts that already exist in the IANA repository or have been otherwise submitted to ICANN. If there are inconsistencies that have not been explained in the application, ICANN may ask the applicant to detail the rationale for differences. For applicants that wish to conduct and review such comparisons prior to submitting a table to ICANN, a table comparison tool will be available.

ICANN will accept the applicant’s IDN tables based on the factors above.

Once the applied-for string has been delegated as a TLD in the root zone, the applicant is required to submit IDN tables for lodging in the IANA Repository of IDN Practices. For additional information, see existing tables at http://iana.org/domains/idn-tables/ and submission guidelines at http://iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html.

1.3.3 IDN Variant TLDs

A variant TLD string results from the substitution of one or more characters in the applied-for gTLD string with variant characters based on the applicant’s top level tables.

Each application contains one applied-for gTLD string. The applicant may also declare any variant strings for the TLD in its application. However, no variant gTLD strings will be delegated through the New gTLD Program until variant management solutions are developed and implemented.9 Declaring variant strings is informative only and will not imply any right or claim to the declared variant strings.

---

When a variant delegation process is established, applicants may be required to submit additional information such as implementation details for the variant TLD management mechanism, and may need to participate in a subsequent evaluation process, which could contain additional fees and review steps.

The following scenarios are possible during the gTLD evaluation process:

a. Applicant declares variant strings to the applied-for gTLD string in its application. If the application is successful, the applied-for gTLD string will be delegated to the applicant. The declared variant strings are noted for future reference. These declared variant strings will not be delegated to the applicant along with the applied-for gTLD string, nor will the applicant have any right or claim to the declared variant strings.

Variant strings listed in successful gTLD applications will be tagged to the specific application and added to a “Declared Variants List” that will be available on ICANN’s website. A list of pending (i.e., declared) variant strings from the IDN ccTLD Fast Track is available at http://icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/string-evaluation-completion-en.htm.

ICANN may perform independent analysis on the declared variant strings, and will not necessarily include all strings listed by the applicant on the Declared Variants List.

b. Multiple applicants apply for strings that are identified by ICANN as variants of one another. These applications will be placed in a contention set and will follow the contention resolution procedures in Module 4.

c. Applicant submits an application for a gTLD string and does not indicate variants to the applied-for gTLD string. ICANN will not identify variant strings unless scenario (b) above occurs.

Each variant string declared in the application must also conform to the string requirements in section 2.2.1.3.2.

Variant strings declared in the application will be reviewed for consistency with the top-level tables submitted in the application. Should any declared variant strings not be
based on use of variant characters according to the submitted top-level tables, the applicant will be notified and the declared string will no longer be considered part of the application.

Declaration of variant strings in an application does not provide the applicant any right or reservation to a particular string. Variant strings on the Declared Variants List may be subject to subsequent additional review per a process and criteria to be defined.

It should be noted that while variants for second and lower-level registrations are defined freely by the local communities without any ICANN validation, there may be specific rules and validation criteria specified for variant strings to be allowed at the top level. It is expected that the variant information provided by applicants in the first application round will contribute to a better understanding of the issues and assist in determining appropriate review steps and fee levels going forward.

1.4 Submitting an Application

Applicants may complete the application form and submit supporting documents using ICANN’s TLD Application System (TAS). To access the system, each applicant must first register as a TAS user.

As TAS users, applicants will be able to provide responses in open text boxes and submit required supporting documents as attachments. Restrictions on the size of attachments as well as the file formats are included in the instructions on the TAS site.

Except where expressly provided within the question, all application materials must be submitted in English.

ICANN will not accept application forms or supporting materials submitted through other means than TAS (that is, hard copy, fax, email), unless such submission is in accordance with specific instructions from ICANN to applicants.

1.4.1 Accessing the TLD Application System

The TAS site will be accessible from the New gTLD webpage (http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtld-program.htm), and will be highlighted in communications regarding the opening of the application submission period. Users of TAS will be expected to agree to a standard set of terms of use.
including user rights, obligations, and restrictions in relation to the use of the system.

1.4.1.1 User Registration

TAS user registration (creating a TAS user profile) requires submission of preliminary information, which will be used to validate the identity of the parties involved in the application. An overview of the information collected in the user registration process is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Full legal name of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal business address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phone number of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fax number of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Website or URL, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Primary Contact: Name, Title, Address, Phone, Fax, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Secondary Contact: Name, Title, Address, Phone, Fax, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proof of legal establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Trading, subsidiary, or joint venture information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business ID, Tax ID, VAT registration number, or equivalent of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Applicant background: previous convictions, cybersquatting activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Deposit payment confirmation and payer information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A subset of identifying information will be collected from the entity performing the user registration, in addition to the applicant information listed above. The registered user could be, for example, an agent, representative, or
employee who would be completing the application on behalf of the applicant.

The registration process will require the user to request the desired number of application slots. For example, a user intending to submit five gTLD applications would complete five application slot requests, and the system would assign the user a unique ID number for each of the five applications.

Users will also be required to submit a deposit of USD 5,000 per application slot. This deposit amount will be credited against the evaluation fee for each application. The deposit requirement is in place to help reduce the risk of frivolous access to the online application system.

After completing the registration, TAS users will receive access enabling them to enter the rest of the application information into the system. Application slots will be populated with the registration information provided by the applicant, which may not ordinarily be changed once slots have been assigned.

No new user registrations will be accepted after 23:59 UTC 29 March 2012.

ICANN will take commercially reasonable steps to protect all applicant data submitted from unauthorized access, but cannot warrant against the malicious acts of third parties who may, through system corruption or other means, gain unauthorized access to such data.

1.4.1.2 Application Form

Having obtained the requested application slots, the applicant will complete the remaining application questions. An overview of the areas and questions contained in the form is shown here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Application and String Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Payment confirmation for remaining evaluation fee amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Applied-for gTLD string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IDN string information, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>IDN tables, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mitigation of IDN operational or rendering problems, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Representation of string in International Phonetic Alphabet (Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mission/purpose of the TLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Is the application for a community-based TLD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>If community based, describe elements of community and proposed policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Is the application for a geographic name? If geographic, documents of support required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Measures for protection of geographic names at second level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Registry Services: name and full description of all registry services to be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical and Operational Questions (External)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shared registration system (SRS) performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>EPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Registration life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Abuse prevention &amp; mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rights protection mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30(a)</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical and Operational Questions (Internal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30(b)</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Technical overview of proposed registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.2 Customer Service during the Application Process

Assistance will be available to applicants throughout the application process via the Applicant Service Center (ASC). The ASC will be staffed with customer service agents.
to answer questions relating to the New gTLD Program, the application process, and TAS.

1.4.3 Backup Application Process

If the online application system is not available, ICANN will provide alternative instructions for submitting applications.

1.5 Fees and Payments

This section describes the fees to be paid by the applicant. Payment instructions are also included here.

1.5.1 gTLD Evaluation Fee

The gTLD evaluation fee is required from all applicants. This fee is in the amount of USD 185,000. The evaluation fee is payable in the form of a 5,000 deposit submitted at the time the user requests an application slot within TAS, and a payment of the remaining 180,000 submitted with the full application. ICANN will not begin its evaluation of an application unless it has received the full gTLD evaluation fee by 23:59 UTC 12 April 2012.

The gTLD evaluation fee is set to recover costs associated with the new gTLD program. The fee is set to ensure that the program is fully funded and revenue neutral and is not subsidized by existing contributions from ICANN funding sources, including generic TLD registries and registrars, ccTLD contributions and RIR contributions.

The gTLD evaluation fee covers all required reviews in Initial Evaluation and, in most cases, any required reviews in Extended Evaluation. If an extended Registry Services review takes place, an additional fee will be incurred for this review (see section 1.5.2). There is no additional fee to the applicant for Extended Evaluation for geographic names, technical and operational, or financial reviews.

Refunds -- In certain cases, refunds of a portion of the evaluation fee may be available for applications that are withdrawn before the evaluation process is complete. An applicant may request a refund at any time until it has executed a registry agreement with ICANN. The amount of the refund will depend on the point in the process at which the withdrawal is requested, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refund Available to Applicant</th>
<th>Percentage of Evaluation Fee</th>
<th>Amount of Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 21 calendar days of a GAC Early</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>USD 148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refund Available to Applicant</td>
<td>Percentage of Evaluation Fee</td>
<td>Amount of Refund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After posting of applications until posting of Initial Evaluation results</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>USD 130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After posting Initial Evaluation results</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>USD 65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the applicant has completed Dispute Resolution, Extended Evaluation, or String Contention Resolution(s)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>USD 37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the applicant has entered into a registry agreement with ICANN</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, any applicant that has not been successful is eligible for at least a 20% refund of the evaluation fee if it withdraws its application.

An applicant that wishes to withdraw an application must initiate the process through TAS. Withdrawal of an application is final and irrevocable. Refunds will only be issued to the organization that submitted the original payment. All refunds are paid by wire transfer. Any bank transfer or transaction fees incurred by ICANN, or any unpaid evaluation fees, will be deducted from the amount paid. Any refund paid will be in full satisfaction of ICANN’s obligations to the applicant. The applicant will have no entitlement to any additional amounts, including for interest or currency exchange rate changes.

Note on 2000 proof-of-concept round applicants --
Participants in ICANN’s proof-of-concept application process in 2000 may be eligible for a credit toward the evaluation fee. The credit is in the amount of USD 86,000 and is subject to:
• submission of documentary proof by the applicant that it is the same entity, a successor in interest to the same entity, or an affiliate of the same entity that applied previously;

• a confirmation that the applicant was not awarded any TLD string pursuant to the 2000 proof-of-concept application round and that the applicant has no legal claims arising from the 2000 proof-of-concept process; and

• submission of an application, which may be modified from the application originally submitted in 2000, for the same TLD string that such entity applied for in the 2000 proof-of-concept application round.

Each participant in the 2000 proof-of-concept application process is eligible for at most one credit. A maximum of one credit may be claimed for any new gTLD application submitted according to the process in this guidebook. Eligibility for this credit is determined by ICANN.

1.5.2 Fees Required in Some Cases

Applicants may be required to pay additional fees in certain cases where specialized process steps are applicable. Those possible additional fees include:

• Registry Services Review Fee - If applicable, this fee is payable for additional costs incurred in referring an application to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP) for an extended review. Applicants will be notified if such a fee is due. The fee for a three-member RSTEP review team is anticipated to be USD 50,000. In some cases, five-member panels might be required, or there might be increased scrutiny at a greater cost. The amount of the fee will cover the cost of the RSTEP review. In the event that reviews of proposed registry services can be consolidated across multiple applications or applicants, ICANN will apportion the fees in an equitable manner. In every case, the applicant will be advised of the cost before initiation of the review. Refer to subsection 2.2.3 of Module 2 on Registry Services review.

1 The estimated fee amounts provided in this section 1.5.2 will be updated upon engagement of panel service providers and establishment of fees.
• **Dispute Resolution Filing Fee** - This amount must accompany any filing of a formal objection and any response that an applicant files to an objection. This fee is payable directly to the applicable dispute resolution service provider in accordance with the provider’s payment instructions. ICANN estimates that filing fees could range from approximately USD 1,000 to USD 5,000 (or more) per party per proceeding. Refer to the appropriate provider for the relevant amount. Refer to Module 3 for dispute resolution procedures.

• **Advance Payment of Costs** - In the event of a formal objection, this amount is payable directly to the applicable dispute resolution service provider in accordance with that provider’s procedures and schedule of costs. Ordinarily, both parties in the dispute resolution proceeding will be required to submit an advance payment of costs in an estimated amount to cover the entire cost of the proceeding. This may be either an hourly fee based on the estimated number of hours the panelists will spend on the case (including review of submissions, facilitation of a hearing, if allowed, and preparation of a decision), or a fixed amount. In cases where disputes are consolidated and there are more than two parties involved, the advance payment will occur according to the dispute resolution service provider’s rules.

The prevailing party in a dispute resolution proceeding will have its advance payment refunded, while the non-prevailing party will not receive a refund and thus will bear the cost of the proceeding. In cases where disputes are consolidated and there are more than two parties involved, the refund of fees will occur according to the dispute resolution service provider’s rules.

ICANN estimates that adjudication fees for a proceeding involving a fixed amount could range from USD 2,000 to USD 8,000 (or more) per proceeding. ICANN further estimates that an hourly rate based proceeding with a one-member panel could range from USD 32,000 to USD 56,000 (or more) and with a three-member panel it could range from USD 70,000 to USD 122,000 (or more). These estimates may be lower if the panel does not call for written submissions beyond the objection and response, and does not allow a hearing. Please
refer to the appropriate provider for the relevant amounts or fee structures.

- **Community Priority Evaluation Fee** – In the event that the applicant participates in a community priority evaluation, this fee is payable as a deposit in an amount to cover the cost of the panel’s review of that application (currently estimated at USD 10,000). The deposit is payable to the provider appointed to handle community priority evaluations. Applicants will be notified if such a fee is due. Refer to Section 4.2 of Module 4 for circumstances in which a community priority evaluation may take place. An applicant who scores at or above the threshold for the community priority evaluation will have its deposit refunded.

ICANN will notify the applicants of due dates for payment in respect of additional fees (if applicable). This list does not include fees (annual registry fees) that will be payable to ICANN following execution of a registry agreement.

### 1.5.3 Payment Methods

Payments to ICANN should be submitted by **wire transfer**. Instructions for making a payment by wire transfer will be available in TAS.11

Payments to Dispute Resolution Service Providers should be submitted in accordance with the provider’s instructions.

### 1.5.4 Requesting a Remittance Form

The TAS interface allows applicants to request issuance of a remittance form for any of the fees payable to ICANN. This service is for the convenience of applicants that require an invoice to process payments.

### 1.6 Questions about this Applicant Guidebook

For assistance and questions an applicant may have in the process of completing the application form, applicants should use the customer support resources available via the ASC. Applicants who are unsure of the information being sought in a question or the parameters for acceptable documentation are encouraged to communicate these questions through the appropriate

---

11 Wire transfer is the preferred method of payment as it offers a globally accessible and dependable means for international transfer of funds. This enables ICANN to receive the fee and begin processing applications as quickly as possible.
support channels before the application is submitted. This helps avoid the need for exchanges with evaluators to clarify information, which extends the timeframe associated with processing the application.

Currently, questions may be submitted via <newgtld@icann.org>. To provide all applicants equitable access to information, ICANN will make all questions and answers publicly available.

All requests to ICANN for information about the process or issues surrounding preparation of an application must be submitted to the ASC. ICANN will not grant requests from applicants for personal or telephone consultations regarding the preparation of an application. Applicants that contact ICANN for clarification about aspects of the application will be referred to the ASC.

Answers to inquiries will only provide clarification about the application forms and procedures. ICANN will not provide consulting, financial, or legal advice.
Module 2
Evaluation Procedures

This module describes the evaluation procedures and criteria used to determine whether applied-for gTLDs are approved for delegation. All applicants will undergo an Initial Evaluation and those that do not pass all elements may request Extended Evaluation.

The first, required evaluation is the Initial Evaluation, during which ICANN assesses an applied-for gTLD string, an applicant’s qualifications, and its proposed registry services.

The following assessments are performed in the Initial Evaluation:

- String Reviews
  - String similarity
  - Reserved names
  - DNS stability
  - Geographic names
- Applicant Reviews
  - Demonstration of technical and operational capability
  - Demonstration of financial capability
  - Registry services reviews for DNS stability issues

An application must pass all these reviews to pass the Initial Evaluation. Failure to pass any one of these reviews will result in a failure to pass the Initial Evaluation.

Extended Evaluation may be applicable in cases in which an applicant does not pass the Initial Evaluation. See Section 2.3 below.

2.1 Background Screening

Background screening will be conducted in two areas:

(a) General business diligence and criminal history; and
(b) History of cybersquatting behavior.
The application must pass both background screening areas to be eligible to proceed. Background screening results are evaluated according to the criteria described in section 1.2.1. Due to the potential sensitive nature of the material, applicant background screening reports will not be published.

The following sections describe the process ICANN will use to perform background screening.

2.1.1 General business diligence and criminal history

Applying entities that are publicly traded corporations listed and in good standing on any of the world’s largest 25 stock exchanges (as listed by the World Federation of Exchanges) will be deemed to have passed the general business diligence and criminal history screening. The largest 25 will be based on the domestic market capitalization reported at the end of the most recent calendar year prior to launching each round.¹

Before an entity is listed on an exchange, it must undergo significant due diligence including an investigation by the exchange, regulators, and investment banks. As a publicly listed corporation, an entity is subject to ongoing scrutiny from shareholders, analysts, regulators, and exchanges. All exchanges require monitoring and disclosure of material information about directors, officers, and other key personnel, including criminal behavior. In totality, these requirements meet or exceed the screening ICANN will perform.

For applicants not listed on one of these exchanges, ICANN will submit identifying information for the entity, officers, directors, and major shareholders to an international background screening service. The service provider(s) will use the criteria listed in section 1.2.1 and return results that match these criteria. Only publicly available information will be used in this inquiry.

ICANN is in discussions with INTERPOL to identify ways in which both organizations can collaborate in background screenings of individuals, entities and their identity documents consistent with both organizations’ rules and regulations. Note that the applicant is expected to disclose potential problems in meeting the criteria in the application, and provide any clarification or explanation at the time of application submission. Results returned from

the background screening process will be matched with the disclosures provided by the applicant and those cases will be followed up to resolve issues of discrepancies or potential false positives.

If no hits are returned, the application will generally pass this portion of the background screening.

### 2.1.2 History of cybersquatting

ICANN will screen applicants against UDRP cases and legal databases as financially feasible for data that may indicate a pattern of cybersquatting behavior pursuant to the criteria listed in section 1.2.1.

The applicant is required to make specific declarations regarding these activities in the application. Results returned during the screening process will be matched with the disclosures provided by the applicant and those instances will be followed up to resolve issues of discrepancies or potential false positives.

If no hits are returned, the application will generally pass this portion of the background screening.

### 2.2 Initial Evaluation

The Initial Evaluation consists of two types of review. Each type is composed of several elements.

**String review:** The first review focuses on the applied-for gTLD string to test:

- Whether the applied-for gTLD string is so similar to other strings that it would create a probability of user confusion;
- Whether the applied-for gTLD string might adversely affect DNS security or stability; and
- Whether evidence of requisite government approval is provided in the case of certain geographic names.

**Applicant review:** The second review focuses on the applicant to test:

- Whether the applicant has the requisite technical, operational, and financial capability to operate a registry; and
- Whether the registry services offered by the applicant might adversely affect DNS security or stability.
2.2.1 String Reviews

In the Initial Evaluation, ICANN reviews every applied-for gTLD string. Those reviews are described in greater detail in the following subsections.

2.2.1.1 String Similarity Review

This review involves a preliminary comparison of each applied-for gTLD string against existing TLDs, Reserved Names (see subsection 2.2.1.2), and other applied-for strings. The objective of this review is to prevent user confusion and loss of confidence in the DNS resulting from delegation of many similar strings.

Note: In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.

The visual similarity check that occurs during Initial Evaluation is intended to augment the objection and dispute resolution process (see Module 3, Dispute Resolution Procedures) that addresses all types of similarity.

This similarity review will be conducted by an independent String Similarity Panel.

2.2.1.1.1 Reviews Performed

The String Similarity Panel’s task is to identify visual string similarities that would create a probability of user confusion.

The panel performs this task of assessing similarities that would lead to user confusion in four sets of circumstances, when comparing:

- Applied-for gTLD strings against existing TLDs and reserved names;
- Applied-for gTLD strings against other applied-for gTLD strings;
- Applied-for gTLD strings against strings requested as IDN ccTLDs; and
- Applied-for 2-character IDN gTLD strings against:
  - Every other single character.
  - Any other 2-character ASCII string (to protect possible future ccTLD delegations).
Similarity to Existing TLDs or Reserved Names - This review involves cross-checking between each applied-for string and the lists of existing TLD strings and Reserved Names to determine whether two strings are so similar to one another that they create a probability of user confusion.

In the simple case in which an applied-for gTLD string is identical to an existing TLD or reserved name, the online application system will not allow the application to be submitted.

Testing for identical strings also takes into consideration the code point variants listed in any relevant IDN table. For example, protocols treat equivalent labels as alternative forms of the same label, just as “foo” and “Foo” are treated as alternative forms of the same label (RFC 3490).

All TLDs currently in the root zone can be found at http://iana.org/domains/root/db/.

IDN tables that have been submitted to ICANN are available at http://www.iana.org/domains/idn-tables/.

Similarity to Other Applied-for gTLD Strings (String Contention Sets) - All applied-for gTLD strings will be reviewed against one another to identify any similar strings. In performing this review, the String Similarity Panel will create contention sets that may be used in later stages of evaluation.

A contention set contains at least two applied-for strings identical or similar to one another. Refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures, for more information on contention sets and contention resolution.

ICANN will notify applicants who are part of a contention set as soon as the String Similarity review is completed. (This provides a longer period for contending applicants to reach their own resolution before reaching the contention resolution stage.) These contention sets will also be published on ICANN’s website.

Similarity to TLD strings requested as IDN ccTLDs -- Applied-for gTLD strings will also be reviewed for similarity to TLD strings requested in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process (see http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/). Should a conflict with a prospective fast-track IDN ccTLD be identified, ICANN will take the following approach to resolving the conflict.
If one of the applications has completed its respective process before the other is lodged, that TLD will be delegated. A gTLD application that has successfully completed all relevant evaluation stages, including dispute resolution and string contention, if applicable, and is eligible for entry into a registry agreement will be considered complete, and therefore would not be disqualified by a newly-filed IDN ccTLD request. Similarly, an IDN ccTLD request that has completed evaluation (i.e., is validated) will be considered complete and therefore would not be disqualified by a newly-filed gTLD application.

In the case where neither application has completed its respective process, where the gTLD application does not have the required approval from the relevant government or public authority, a validated request for an IDN ccTLD will prevail and the gTLD application will not be approved. The term “validated” is defined in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process Implementation, which can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn.

In the case where a gTLD applicant has obtained the support or non-objection of the relevant government or public authority, but is eliminated due to contention with a string requested in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process, a full refund of the evaluation fee is available to the applicant if the gTLD application was submitted prior to the publication of the ccTLD request.

Review of 2-character IDN strings — In addition to the above reviews, an applied-for gTLD string that is a 2-character IDN string is reviewed by the String Similarity Panel for visual similarity to:

a) Any one-character label (in any script), and
b) Any possible two-character ASCII combination.

An applied-for gTLD string that is found to be too similar to a) or b) above will not pass this review.

2.2.1.2 Review Methodology

The String Similarity Panel is informed in part by an algorithmic score for the visual similarity between each applied-for string and each of other existing and applied-for TLDs and reserved names. The score will provide one objective measure for consideration by the panel, as part of the process of identifying strings likely to result in user confusion. In general, applicants should expect that a higher visual similarity score suggests a higher probability...
that the application will not pass the String Similarity review. However, it should be noted that the score is only indicative and that the final determination of similarity is entirely up to the Panel’s judgment.

The algorithm, user guidelines, and additional background information are available to applicants for testing and informational purposes. Applicants will have the ability to test their strings and obtain algorithmic results through the application system prior to submission of an application.

The algorithm supports the common characters in Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, Devanagari, Greek, Japanese, Korean, and Latin scripts. It can also compare strings in different scripts to each other.

The panel will also take into account variant characters, as defined in any relevant language table, in its determinations. For example, strings that are not visually similar but are determined to be variant TLD strings based on an IDN table would be placed in a contention set. Variant TLD strings that are listed as part of the application will also be subject to the string similarity analysis.

The panel will examine all the algorithm data and perform its own review of similarities between strings and whether they rise to the level of string confusion. In cases of strings in scripts not yet supported by the algorithm, the panel’s assessment process is entirely manual.

The panel will use a common standard to test for whether string confusion exists, as follows:

**Standard for String Confusion** - String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another visually that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. For the likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user. Mere association, in the sense that the string brings another string to mind, is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion.

### 2.2.1.1.3 Outcomes of the String Similarity Review

An application that fails the String Similarity review due to similarity to an existing TLD will not pass the Initial Evaluation,
and no further reviews will be available. Where an application does not pass the String Similarity review, the applicant will be notified as soon as the review is completed.

An application for a string that is found too similar to another applied-for gTLD string will be placed in a contention set.

An application that passes the String Similarity review is still subject to objection by an existing TLD operator or by another gTLD applicant in the current application round. That process requires that a string confusion objection be filed by an objector having the standing to make such an objection. Such category of objection is not limited to visual similarity. Rather, confusion based on any type of similarity (including visual, aural, or similarity of meaning) may be claimed by an objector. Refer to Module 3, Dispute Resolution Procedures, for more information about the objection process.

An applicant may file a formal objection against another gTLD application on string confusion grounds. Such an objection may, if successful, change the configuration of the preliminary contention sets in that the two applied-for gTLD strings will be considered in direct contention with one another (see Module 4, String Contention Procedures). The objection process will not result in removal of an application from a contention set.

### 2.2.1.2 Reserved Names and Other Unavailable Strings

Certain names are not available as gTLD strings, as detailed in this section.

#### 2.2.1.2.1 Reserved Names

All applied-for gTLD strings are compared with the list of top-level Reserved Names to ensure that the applied-for gTLD string does not appear on that list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top-Level Reserved Names List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRINIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APNIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If an applicant enters a Reserved Name as its applied-for gTLD string, the application system will recognize the Reserved Name and will not allow the application to be submitted.

In addition, applied-for gTLD strings are reviewed during the String Similarity review to determine whether they are similar to a Reserved Name. An application for a gTLD string that is identified as too similar to a Reserved Name will not pass this review.

2.2.1.2.2 Declared Variants

Names appearing on the Declared Variants List (see section 1.3.3) will be posted on ICANN’s website and will be treated essentially the same as Reserved Names, until such time as variant management solutions are developed and variant TLDs are delegated. That is, an application for a gTLD string that is identical or similar to a string on the Declared Variants List will not pass this review.

2.2.1.2.3 Strings Ineligible for Delegation

The following names are prohibited from delegation as gTLDs in the initial application round. Future application rounds may differ according to consideration of further policy advice.

These names are not being placed on the Top-Level Reserved Names List, and thus are not part of the string similarity review conducted for names on that list. Refer to subsection 2.2.1.1: where applied-for gTLD strings are reviewed for similarity to existing TLDs and reserved names, the strings listed in this section are not reserved names and accordingly are not incorporated into this review.

Applications for names appearing on the list included in this section will not be approved.
2.2.1.3 DNS Stability Review

This review determines whether an applied-for gTLD string might cause instability to the DNS. In all cases, this will involve a review for conformance with technical and other requirements for gTLD strings (labels). In some exceptional cases, an extended review may be necessary to investigate possible technical stability problems with the applied-for gTLD string.
Note: All applicants should recognize issues surrounding invalid TLD queries at the root level of the DNS.

Any new TLD registry operator may experience unanticipated queries, and some TLDs may experience a non-trivial load of unanticipated queries. For more information, see the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)'s report on this topic at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac045.pdf. Some publicly available statistics are also available at http://stats.i.root-servers.org/.

ICANN will take steps to alert applicants of the issues raised in SAC045, and encourage the applicant to prepare to minimize the possibility of operational difficulties that would pose a stability or availability problem for its registrants and users. However, this notice is merely an advisory to applicants and is not part of the evaluation, unless the string raises significant security or stability issues as described in the following section.

### 2.2.1.3.1 DNS Stability: String Review Procedure

New gTLD labels must not adversely affect the security or stability of the DNS. During the Initial Evaluation period, ICANN will conduct a preliminary review on the set of applied-for gTLD strings to:

- ensure that applied-for gTLD strings comply with the requirements provided in section 2.2.1.3.2, and
- determine whether any strings raise significant security or stability issues that may require further review.

There is a very low probability that extended analysis will be necessary for a string that fully complies with the string requirements in subsection 2.2.1.3.2 of this module. However, the string review process provides an additional safeguard if unanticipated security or stability issues arise concerning an applied-for gTLD string.

In such a case, the DNS Stability Panel will perform an extended review of the applied-for gTLD string during the Initial Evaluation period. The panel will determine whether the string fails to comply with relevant standards or creates a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency, or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems, and will report on its findings.

If the panel determines that the string complies with relevant standards and does not create the conditions
described above, the application will pass the DNS Stability review.

If the panel determines that the string does not comply with relevant technical standards, or that it creates a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency, or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems, the application will not pass the Initial Evaluation, and no further reviews are available. In the case where a string is determined likely to cause security or stability problems in the DNS, the applicant will be notified as soon as the DNS Stability review is completed.

2.2.1.3.2 String Requirements

ICANN will review each applied-for gTLD string to ensure that it complies with the requirements outlined in the following paragraphs.

If an applied-for gTLD string is found to violate any of these rules, the application will not pass the DNS Stability review. No further reviews are available.

Part I -- Technical Requirements for all Labels (Strings) – The technical requirements for top-level domain labels follow.

1.1 The ASCII label (i.e., the label as transmitted on the wire) must be valid as specified in technical standards Domain Names: Implementation and Specification (RFC 1035), and Clarifications to the DNS Specification (RFC 2181) and any updates thereto. This includes the following:

1.1.1 The label must have no more than 63 characters.

1.1.2 Upper and lower case characters are treated as identical.

1.2 The ASCII label must be a valid host name, as specified in the technical standards DOD Internet Host Table Specification (RFC 952), Requirements for Internet Hosts – Application and Support (RFC 1123), and Application Techniques for Checking and Transformation of Names (RFC 3696), Internationalized Domain Names in Applications (IDNA)(RFCs 5890-5894), and any updates thereto. This includes the following:

1.2.1 The ASCII label must consist entirely of letters (alphabetic characters a-z), or
1.2.2 The label must be a valid IDNA A-label (further restricted as described in Part II below).

Part II -- Requirements for Internationalized Domain Names

- These requirements apply only to prospective top-level domains that contain non-ASCII characters. Applicants for these internationalized top-level domain labels are expected to be familiar with the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) IDNA standards, Unicode standards, and the terminology associated with Internationalized Domain Names.

2.1 The label must be an A-label as defined in IDNA, converted from (and convertible to) a U-label that is consistent with the definition in IDNA, and further restricted by the following, non-exhaustive, list of limitations:

2.1.1 Must be a valid A-label according to IDNA.

2.1.2 The derived property value of all codepoints used in the U-label, as defined by IDNA, must be PVALID or CONTEXT (accompanied by unambiguous contextual rules).\(^4\)

2.1.3 The general category of all codepoints, as defined by IDNA, must be one of (Ll, Lo, Lm, Mn, Mc).

2.1.4 The U-label must be fully compliant with Normalization Form C, as described in Unicode Standard Annex #15: Unicode Normalization Forms. See also examples in \[http://unicode.org/faq/normalization.html\].

2.1.5 The U-label must consist entirely of characters with the same directional property, or fulfill the requirements of the Bidi rule per RFC 5893.

2.2 The label must meet the relevant criteria of the ICANN Guidelines for the Implementation of Internationalised Domain Names. See \[http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation\].

\(^4\) It is expected that conversion tools for IDNA will be available before the Application Submission period begins, and that labels will be checked for validity under IDNA. In this case, labels valid under the previous version of the protocol (IDNA2003) but not under IDNA will not meet this element of the requirements. Labels valid under IDNA but not under IDNA2003 may meet the requirements; however, applicants are strongly advised to note that the duration of the transition period between the two protocols cannot presently be estimated nor guaranteed in any specific timeframe. The development of support for IDNA in the broader software applications environment will occur gradually. During that time, TLD labels that are valid under IDNA, but not under IDNA2003, will have limited functionality.
n-guidelines.htm. This includes the following, non-exhaustive, list of limitations:

2.2.1 All code points in a single label must be taken from the same script as determined by the Unicode Standard Annex #24: Unicode Script Property (See http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr24/).

2.2.2 Exceptions to 2.2.1 are permissible for languages with established orthographies and conventions that require the commingled use of multiple scripts. However, even with this exception, visually confusable characters from different scripts will not be allowed to co-exist in a single set of permissible code points unless a corresponding policy and character table are clearly defined.

Part III - Policy Requirements for Generic Top-Level Domains – These requirements apply to all prospective top-level domain strings applied for as gTLDs.

3.1 Applied-for gTLD strings in ASCII must be composed of three or more visually distinct characters. Two-character ASCII strings are not permitted, to avoid conflicting with current and future country codes based on the ISO 3166-1 standard.

3.2 Applied-for gTLD strings in IDN scripts must be composed of two or more visually distinct characters in the script, as appropriate. Note, however, that a two-character IDN string will not be approved if:

3.2.1 It is visually similar to any one-character label (in any script); or

3.2.2 It is visually similar to any possible two-character ASCII combination.

See the String Similarity review in subsection 2.2.1.1 for additional information on this requirement.

Note that the Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Working Group (JIG) has made recommendations that this section be revised to allow for single-character IDN gTLD labels. See the JIG Final Report at http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/jig-final-report-30mar11-en.pdf. Implementation models for these recommendations are being developed for community discussion.
2.2.1.4 Geographic Names Review

Applications for gTLD strings must ensure that appropriate consideration is given to the interests of governments or public authorities in geographic names. The requirements and procedure ICANN will follow in the evaluation process are described in the following paragraphs. Applicants should review these requirements even if they do not believe their intended gTLD string is a geographic name. All applied-for gTLD strings will be reviewed according to the requirements in this section, regardless of whether the application indicates it is for a geographic name.

2.2.1.4.1 Treatment of Country or Territory Names

Applications for strings that are country or territory names will not be approved, as they are not available under the New gTLD Program in this application round. A string shall be considered to be a country or territory name if:

i. it is an alpha-3 code listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.

ii. it is a long-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, or a translation of the long-form name in any language.

iii. it is a short-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, or a translation of the short-form name in any language.

iv. it is the short- or long-form name association with a code that has been designated as “exceptionally reserved” by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency.

v. it is a separable component of a country name designated on the “Separable Country Names List,” or is a translation of a name appearing on the list, in any language. See the Annex at the end of this module.

vi. it is a permutation or transposition of any of the names included in items (i) through (v). Permutations include removal of spaces, insertion of punctuation, and addition or

---

6 Country and territory names are excluded from the process based on advice from the Governmental Advisory Committee in recent communiqués providing interpretation of Principle 2.2 of the GAC Principles regarding New gTLDs to indicate that strings which are a meaningful representation or abbreviation of a country or territory name should be handled through the forthcoming ccPDP, and other geographic strings could be allowed in the gTLD space if in agreement with the relevant government or public authority.
removal of grammatical articles like “the.” A transposition is considered a change in the sequence of the long or short-form name, for example, “Republic Czech” or “Islands Cayman.”

vii. it is a name by which a country is commonly known, as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental or treaty organization.

2.2.1.4.2 Geographic Names Requiring Government Support

The following types of applied-for strings are considered geographic names and must be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities:

1. An application for any string that is a representation, in any language, of the capital city name of any country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.

2. An application for a city name, where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name.

City names present challenges because city names may also be generic terms or brand names, and in many cases city names are not unique. Unlike other types of geographic names, there are no established lists that can be used as objective references in the evaluation process. Thus, city names are not universally protected. However, the process does provide a means for cities and applicants to work together where desired.

An application for a city name will be subject to the geographic names requirements (i.e., will require documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities) if:

(a) It is clear from applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name; and
(b) The applied-for string is a city name as listed on official city documents.7

3. An application for any string that is an exact match of a sub-national place name, such as a county, province, or state, listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard.

4. An application for a string listed as a UNESCO region8 or appearing on the “Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings” list.9

In the case of an application for a string appearing on either of the lists above, documentation of support will be required from at least 60% of the respective national governments in the region, and there may be no more than one written statement of objection to the application from relevant governments in the region and/or public authorities associated with the continent or the region.

Where the 60% rule is applied, and there are common regions on both lists, the regional composition contained in the “Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings” takes precedence.

An applied-for gTLD string that falls into any of 1 through 4 listed above is considered to represent a geographic name. In the event of any doubt, it is in the applicant’s interest to consult with relevant governments and public authorities and enlist their support or non-objection prior to submission of the application, in order to preclude possible objections and pre-address any ambiguities concerning the string and applicable requirements.

Strings that include but do not match a geographic name (as defined in this section) will not be considered geographic names as defined by section 2.2.1.4.2, and therefore will not require documentation of government support in the evaluation process.

7 City governments with concerns about strings that are duplicates, nicknames or close renderings of a city name should not rely on the evaluation process as the primary means of protecting their interests in a string. Rather, a government may elect to file a formal objection to an application that is opposed by the relevant community, or may submit its own application for the string.


For each application, the Geographic Names Panel will determine which governments are relevant based on the inputs of the applicant, governments, and its own research and analysis. In the event that there is more than one relevant government or public authority for the applied-for gTLD string, the applicant must provide documentation of support or non-objection from all the relevant governments or public authorities. It is anticipated that this may apply to the case of a sub-national place name.

It is the applicant’s responsibility to:

- identify whether its applied-for gTLD string falls into any of the above categories; and
- identify and consult with the relevant governments or public authorities; and
- identify which level of government support is required.

Note: the level of government and which administrative agency is responsible for the filing of letters of support or non-objection is a matter for each national administration to determine. Applicants should consult within the relevant jurisdiction to determine the appropriate level of support.

The requirement to include documentation of support for certain applications does not preclude or exempt applications from being the subject of objections on community grounds (refer to subsection 3.1.1 of Module 3), under which applications may be rejected based on objections showing substantial opposition from the targeted community.

2.2.1.4.3 Documentation Requirements

The documentation of support or non-objection should include a signed letter from the relevant government or public authority. Understanding that this will differ across the respective jurisdictions, the letter could be signed by the minister with the portfolio responsible for domain name administration, ICT, foreign affairs, or the Office of the Prime Minister or President of the relevant jurisdiction; or a senior representative of the agency or department responsible for domain name administration, ICT, foreign affairs, or the Office of the Prime Minister. To assist the applicant in determining who the relevant government or public authority may be for a potential geographic name, the applicant may wish to consult with the relevant
Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) representative.  

The letter must clearly express the government’s or public authority’s support for or non-objection to the applicant’s application and demonstrate the government’s or public authority’s understanding of the string being requested and its intended use.

The letter should also demonstrate the government’s or public authority’s understanding that the string is being sought through the gTLD application process and that the applicant is willing to accept the conditions under which the string will be available, i.e., entry into a registry agreement with ICANN requiring compliance with consensus policies and payment of fees. (See Module 5 for a discussion of the obligations of a gTLD registry operator.)

A sample letter of support is available as an attachment to this module.

Applicants and governments may conduct discussions concerning government support for an application at any time. Applicants are encouraged to begin such discussions at the earliest possible stage, and enable governments to follow the processes that may be necessary to consider, approve, and generate a letter of support or non-objection.

It is important to note that a government or public authority is under no obligation to provide documentation of support or non-objection in response to a request by an applicant.

It is also possible that a government may withdraw its support for an application at a later time, including after the new gTLD has been delegated, if the registry operator has deviated from the conditions of original support or non-objection. Applicants should be aware that ICANN has committed to governments that, in the event of a dispute between a government (or public authority) and a registry operator that submitted documentation of support from that government or public authority, ICANN will comply with a legally binding order from a court in the jurisdiction of the government or public authority that has given support to an application.

2.2.1.4.4 Review Procedure for Geographic Names

A Geographic Names Panel (GNP) will determine whether each applied-for gTLD string represents a geographic

---

10 See https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Members
name, and verify the relevance and authenticity of the supporting documentation where necessary.

The GNP will review all applications received, not only those where the applicant has noted its applied-for gTLD string as a geographic name. For any application where the GNP determines that the applied-for gTLD string is a country or territory name (as defined in this module), the application will not pass the Geographic Names review and will be denied. No additional reviews will be available.

For any application where the GNP determines that the applied-for gTLD string is not a geographic name requiring government support (as described in this module), the application will pass the Geographic Names review with no additional steps required.

For any application where the GNP determines that the applied-for gTLD string is a geographic name requiring government support, the GNP will confirm that the applicant has provided the required documentation from the relevant governments or public authorities, and that the communication from the government or public authority is legitimate and contains the required content. ICANN may confirm the authenticity of the communication by consulting with the relevant diplomatic authorities or members of ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee for the government or public authority concerned on the competent authority and appropriate point of contact within their administration for communications.

The GNP may communicate with the signing entity of the letter to confirm their intent and their understanding of the terms on which the support for an application is given.

In cases where an applicant has not provided the required documentation, the applicant will be contacted and notified of the requirement, and given a limited time frame to provide the documentation. If the applicant is able to provide the documentation before the close of the Initial Evaluation period, and the documentation is found to meet the requirements, the applicant will pass the Geographic Names review. If not, the applicant will have additional time to obtain the required documentation; however, if the applicant has not produced the required documentation by the required date (at least 90 calendar days from the date of notice), the application will be considered incomplete and will be ineligible for further review. The applicant may reapply in subsequent application rounds, if desired, subject to the fees and requirements of the specific application rounds.
If there is more than one application for a string representing a certain geographic name as described in this section, and the applications have requisite government approvals, the applications will be suspended pending resolution by the applicants. If the applicants have not reached a resolution by either the date of the end of the application round (as announced by ICANN), or the date on which ICANN opens a subsequent application round, whichever comes first, the applications will be rejected and applicable refunds will be available to applicants according to the conditions described in section 1.5.

However, in the event that a contention set is composed of multiple applications with documentation of support from the same government or public authority, the applications will proceed through the contention resolution procedures described in Module 4 when requested by the government or public authority providing the documentation.

If an application for a string representing a geographic name is in a contention set with applications for similar strings that have not been identified as geographical names, the string contention will be resolved using the string contention procedures described in Module 4.

### 2.2.2 Applicant Reviews

Concurrent with the applied-for gTLD string reviews described in subsection 2.2.1, ICANN will review the applicant’s technical and operational capability, its financial capability, and its proposed registry services. Those reviews are described in greater detail in the following subsections.

#### 2.2.2.1 Technical/Operational Review

In its application, the applicant will respond to a set of questions (see questions 24 – 44 in the Application Form) intended to gather information about the applicant’s technical capabilities and its plans for operation of the proposed gTLD.

Applicants are not required to have deployed an actual gTLD registry to pass the Technical/Operational review. It will be necessary, however, for an applicant to demonstrate a clear understanding and accomplishment of some groundwork toward the key technical and operational aspects of a gTLD registry operation. Subsequently, each applicant that passes the technical evaluation and all other steps will be required to complete
a pre-delegation technical test prior to delegation of the new gTLD. Refer to Module 5, Transition to Delegation, for additional information.

2.2.2.2 Financial Review

In its application, the applicant will respond to a set of questions (see questions 45-50 in the Application Form) intended to gather information about the applicant’s financial capabilities for operation of a gTLD registry and its financial planning in preparation for long-term stability of the new gTLD.

Because different registry types and purposes may justify different responses to individual questions, evaluators will pay particular attention to the consistency of an application across all criteria. For example, an applicant’s scaling plans identifying system hardware to ensure its capacity to operate at a particular volume level should be consistent with its financial plans to secure the necessary equipment. That is, the evaluation criteria scale with the applicant plans to provide flexibility.

2.2.2.3 Evaluation Methodology

Dedicated technical and financial evaluation panels will conduct the technical/operational and financial reviews, according to the established criteria and scoring mechanism included as an attachment to this module. These reviews are conducted on the basis of the information each applicant makes available to ICANN in its response to the questions in the Application Form.

The evaluators may request clarification or additional information during the Initial Evaluation period. For each application, clarifying questions will be consolidated and sent to the applicant from each of the panels. The applicant will thus have an opportunity to clarify or supplement the application in those areas where a request is made by the evaluators. These communications will occur via TAS. Unless otherwise noted, such communications will include a 2-week deadline for the applicant to respond. Any supplemental information provided by the applicant will become part of the application.

It is the applicant’s responsibility to ensure that the questions have been fully answered and the required documentation is attached. Evaluators are entitled, but not obliged, to request further information or evidence from an applicant, and are not obliged to take into account any information or evidence that is not made
available in the application and submitted by the due date, unless explicitly requested by the evaluators.

2.2.3 Registry Services Review

Concurrent with the other reviews that occur during the Initial Evaluation period, ICANN will review the applicant’s proposed registry services for any possible adverse impact on security or stability. The applicant will be required to provide a list of proposed registry services in its application.

2.2.3.1 Definitions

Registry services are defined as:

1. operations of the registry critical to the following tasks: the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; dissemination of TLD zone files; operation of the registry zone servers; and dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by the registry agreement;

2. other products or services that the registry operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a consensus policy; and

3. any other products or services that only a registry operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the registry operator.

Proposed registry services will be examined to determine if they might raise significant stability or security issues. Examples of services proposed by existing registries can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/. In most cases, these proposed services successfully pass this inquiry.

Registry services currently provided by gTLD registries can be found in registry agreement appendices. See http://www.icann.org/en/registries/agreements.htm.

A full definition of registry services can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html.

For purposes of this review, security and stability are defined as follows:

Security – an effect on security by the proposed registry service means (1) the unauthorized disclosure, alteration, insertion or destruction of registry data, or (2) the unauthorized access to or disclosure of information or
resources on the Internet by systems operating in accordance with all applicable standards.

**Stability** - an effect on stability means that the proposed registry service (1) does not comply with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized, and authoritative standards body, such as relevant standards-track or best current practice RFCs sponsored by the IETF, or (2) creates a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency, or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems, operating in accordance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized and authoritative standards body, such as relevant standards-track or best current practice RFCs and relying on registry operator’s delegation information or provisioning services.

### 2.2.3.2 Customary Services

The following registry services are customary services offered by a registry operator:

- Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration of domain names and name servers
- Dissemination of TLD zone files
- Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain name registrations (e.g., port-43 WHOIS, Web-based Whois, RESTful Whois)
- DNS Security Extensions

The applicant must describe whether any of these registry services are intended to be offered in a manner unique to the TLD.

Any additional registry services that are unique to the proposed gTLD registry should be described in detail. Directions for describing the registry services are provided at [http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rs_sample.html](http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rs_sample.html).

### 2.2.3.3 TLD Zone Contents

ICANN receives a number of inquiries about use of various record types in a registry zone, as entities contemplate different business and technical models. Permissible zone contents for a TLD zone are:

- Apex SOA record.
- Apex NS records and in-bailiwick glue for the TLD’s DNS servers.
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- NS records and in-bailiwick glue for DNS servers of registered names in the TLD.
- DS records for registered names in the TLD.
- Records associated with signing the TLD zone (i.e., RRSIG, DNSKEY, NSEC, and NSEC3).

An applicant wishing to place any other record types into its TLD zone should describe in detail its proposal in the registry services section of the application. This will be evaluated and could result in an extended evaluation to determine whether the service would create a risk of a meaningful adverse impact on security or stability of the DNS. Applicants should be aware that a service based on use of less-common DNS resource records in the TLD zone, even if approved in the registry services review, might not work as intended for all users due to lack of application support.

2.2.3.4 Methodology

Review of the applicant’s proposed registry services will include a preliminary determination of whether any of the proposed registry services could raise significant security or stability issues and require additional consideration.

If the preliminary determination reveals that there may be significant security or stability issues (as defined in subsection 2.2.3.1) surrounding a proposed service, the application will be flagged for an extended review by the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP), see http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rstep.html). This review, if applicable, will occur during the Extended Evaluation period (refer to Section 2.3).

In the event that an application is flagged for extended review of one or more registry services, an additional fee to cover the cost of the extended review will be due from the applicant. Applicants will be advised of any additional fees due, which must be received before the additional review begins.

2.2.4 Applicant’s Withdrawal of an Application

An applicant who does not pass the Initial Evaluation may withdraw its application at this stage and request a partial refund (refer to subsection 1.5 of Module 1).
2.3 Extended Evaluation

An applicant may request an Extended Evaluation if the application has failed to pass the Initial Evaluation elements concerning:

- Geographic names (refer to subsection 2.2.1.4). There is no additional fee for an extended evaluation in this instance.
- Demonstration of technical and operational capability (refer to subsection 2.2.2.1). There is no additional fee for an extended evaluation in this instance.
- Demonstration of financial capability (refer to subsection 2.2.2.2). There is no additional fee for an extended evaluation in this instance.
- Registry services (refer to subsection 2.2.3). Note that this investigation incurs an additional fee (the Registry Services Review Fee) if the applicant wishes to proceed. See Section 1.5 of Module 1 for fee and payment information.

An Extended Evaluation does not imply any change of the evaluation criteria. The same criteria used in the Initial Evaluation will be used to review the application in light of clarifications provided by the applicant.

From the time an applicant receives notice of failure to pass the Initial Evaluation, eligible applicants will have 15 calendar days to submit to ICANN the Notice of Request for Extended Evaluation. If the applicant does not explicitly request the Extended Evaluation (and pay an additional fee in the case of a Registry Services inquiry) the application will not proceed.

2.3.1 Geographic Names Extended Evaluation

In the case of an application that has been identified as a geographic name requiring government support, but where the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence of support or non-objection from all relevant governments or public authorities by the end of the Initial Evaluation period, the applicant has additional time in the Extended Evaluation period to obtain and submit this documentation.

If the applicant submits the documentation to the Geographic Names Panel by the required date, the GNP will perform its review of the documentation as detailed in
section 2.2.1.4. If the applicant has not provided the documentation by the required date (at least 90 calendar days from the date of the notice), the application will not pass the Extended Evaluation, and no further reviews are available.

### 2.3.2 Technical/Operational or Financial Extended Evaluation

The following applies to an Extended Evaluation of an applicant’s technical and operational capability or financial capability, as described in subsection 2.2.2.

An applicant who has requested Extended Evaluation will again access the online application system (TAS) and clarify its answers to those questions or sections on which it received a non-passing score (or, in the case of an application where individual questions were passed but the total score was insufficient to pass Initial Evaluation, those questions or sections on which additional points are possible). The answers should be responsive to the evaluator report that indicates the reasons for failure, or provide any amplification that is not a material change to the application. Applicants may not use the Extended Evaluation period to substitute portions of new information for the information submitted in their original applications, i.e., to materially change the application.

An applicant participating in an Extended Evaluation on the Technical / Operational or Financial reviews will have the option to have its application reviewed by the same evaluation panelists who performed the review during the Initial Evaluation period, or to have a different set of panelists perform the review during Extended Evaluation.

The Extended Evaluation allows an additional exchange of information between the evaluators and the applicant to further clarify information contained in the application. This supplemental information will become part of the application record. Such communications will include a deadline for the applicant to respond.

ICANN will notify applicants at the end of the Extended Evaluation period as to whether they have passed. If an application passes Extended Evaluation, it continues to the next stage in the process. If an application does not pass Extended Evaluation, it will proceed no further. No further reviews are available.
2.3.3 Registry Services Extended Evaluation

This section applies to Extended Evaluation of registry services, as described in subsection 2.2.3.

If a proposed registry service has been referred to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP) for an extended review, the RSTEP will form a review team of members with the appropriate qualifications.

The review team will generally consist of three members, depending on the complexity of the registry service proposed. In a 3-member panel, the review could be conducted within 30 to 45 calendar days. In cases where a 5-member panel is needed, this will be identified before the extended evaluation starts. In a 5-member panel, the review could be conducted in 45 calendar days or fewer.

The cost of an RSTEP review will be covered by the applicant through payment of the Registry Services Review Fee. Refer to payment procedures in section 1.5 of Module 1. The RSTEP review will not commence until payment has been received.

If the RSTEP finds that one or more of the applicant's proposed registry services may be introduced without risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security or stability, these services will be included in the applicant’s registry agreement with ICANN. If the RSTEP finds that the proposed service would create a risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security or stability, the applicant may elect to proceed with its application without the proposed service, or withdraw its application for the gTLD. In this instance, an applicant has 15 calendar days to notify ICANN of its intent to proceed with the application. If an applicant does not explicitly provide such notice within this timeframe, the application will proceed no further.

2.4 Parties Involved in Evaluation

A number of independent experts and groups play a part in performing the various reviews in the evaluation process. A brief description of the various panels, their evaluation roles, and the circumstances under which they work is included in this section.
2.4.1 Panels and Roles

The **String Similarity Panel** will assess whether a proposed gTLD string creates a probability of user confusion due to similarity with any reserved name, any existing TLD, any requested IDN ccTLD, or any new gTLD string applied for in the current application round. This occurs during the String Similarity review in Initial Evaluation. The panel may also review IDN tables submitted by applicants as part of its work.

The **DNS Stability Panel** will determine whether a proposed string might adversely affect the security or stability of the DNS. This occurs during the DNS Stability String review in Initial Evaluation.

The **Geographic Names Panel** will review each application to determine whether the applied-for gTLD represents a geographic name, as defined in this guidebook. In the event that the string is a geographic name requiring government support, the panel will ensure that the required documentation is provided with the application and verify that the documentation is from the relevant governments or public authorities and is authentic.

The **Technical Evaluation Panel** will review the technical components of each application against the criteria in the Applicant Guidebook, along with proposed registry operations, in order to determine whether the applicant is technically and operationally capable of operating a gTLD registry as proposed in the application. This occurs during the Technical/Operational reviews in Initial Evaluation, and may also occur in Extended Evaluation if elected by the applicant.

The **Financial Evaluation Panel** will review each application against the relevant business, financial and organizational criteria contained in the Applicant Guidebook, to determine whether the applicant is financially capable of maintaining a gTLD registry as proposed in the application. This occurs during the Financial review in Initial Evaluation, and may also occur in Extended Evaluation if elected by the applicant.

The **Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP)** will review proposed registry services in the application to determine if they pose a risk of a meaningful adverse impact on security or stability. This occurs, if applicable, during the Extended Evaluation period.
Members of all panels are required to abide by the established Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest guidelines included in this module.

### 2.4.2 Panel Selection Process

ICANN has selected qualified third-party providers to perform the various reviews, based on an extensive selection process. In addition to the specific subject matter expertise required for each panel, specified qualifications are required, including:

- The provider must be able to convene - or have the capacity to convene - globally diverse panels and be able to evaluate applications from all regions of the world, including applications for IDN gTLDs.
- The provider should be familiar with the IETF IDNA standards, Unicode standards, relevant RFCs and the terminology associated with IDNs.
- The provider must be able to scale quickly to meet the demands of the evaluation of an unknown number of applications. At present it is not known how many applications will be received, how complex they will be, and whether they will be predominantly for ASCII or non-ASCII gTLDs.
- The provider must be able to evaluate the applications within the required timeframes of Initial and Extended Evaluation.

### 2.4.3 Code of Conduct Guidelines for Panelists

The purpose of the New gTLD Program (“Program”) Code of Conduct (“Code”) is to prevent real and apparent conflicts of interest and unethical behavior by any Evaluation Panelist (“Panelist”).

Panelists shall conduct themselves as thoughtful, competent, well prepared, and impartial professionals throughout the application process. Panelists are expected to comply with equity and high ethical standards while assuring the Internet community, its constituents, and the public of objectivity, integrity, confidentiality, and credibility. Unethical actions, or even the appearance of compromise, are not acceptable. Panelists are expected

---

11 [http://newgtlds.icann.org/about/evaluation-panels-selection-process](http://newgtlds.icann.org/about/evaluation-panels-selection-process)
to be guided by the following principles in carrying out their respective responsibilities. This Code is intended to summarize the principles and nothing in this Code should be considered as limiting duties, obligations or legal requirements with which Panelists must comply.

Bias -- Panelists shall:

- not advance personal agendas or non-ICANN approved agendas in the evaluation of applications;

- examine facts as they exist and not be influenced by past reputation, media accounts, or unverified statements about the applications being evaluated;

- exclude themselves from participating in the evaluation of an application if, to their knowledge, there is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to such evaluation; and

- exclude themselves from evaluation activities if they are philosophically opposed to or are on record as having made generic criticism about a specific type of applicant or application.

Compensation/Gifts -- Panelists shall not request or accept any compensation whatsoever or any gifts of substance from the Applicant being reviewed or anyone affiliated with the Applicant. (Gifts of substance would include any gift greater than USD 25 in value).

If the giving of small tokens is important to the Applicant’s culture, Panelists may accept these tokens; however, the total of such tokens must not exceed USD 25 in value. If in doubt, the Panelist should err on the side of caution by declining gifts of any kind.

Conflicts of Interest -- Panelists shall act in accordance with the “New gTLD Program Conflicts of Interest Guidelines” (see subsection 2.4.3.1).

Confidentiality -- Confidentiality is an integral part of the evaluation process. Panelists must have access to sensitive information in order to conduct evaluations. Panelists must maintain confidentiality of information entrusted to them by ICANN and the Applicant and any other confidential information provided to them from whatever source,
except when disclosure is legally mandated or has been
authorized by ICANN. “Confidential information” includes
all elements of the Program and information gathered as
part of the process – which includes but is not limited to:
documents, interviews, discussions, interpretations, and
analyses – related to the review of any new gTLD
application.

Affirmation -- All Panelists shall read this Code prior to
commencing evaluation services and shall certify in writing
that they have done so and understand the Code.

2.4.3.1 Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Panelists

It is recognized that third-party providers may have a large
number of employees in several countries serving
numerous clients. In fact, it is possible that a number of
Panelists may be very well known within the registry /
registrar community and have provided professional
services to a number of potential applicants.

To safeguard against the potential for inappropriate
influence and ensure applications are evaluated in an
objective and independent manner, ICANN has
established detailed Conflict of Interest guidelines and
procedures that will be followed by the Evaluation
Panelists. To help ensure that the guidelines are
appropriately followed ICANN will:

• Require each Evaluation Panelist (provider
and individual) to acknowledge and
document understanding of the Conflict of
Interest guidelines.

• Require each Evaluation Panelist to disclose
all business relationships engaged in at any
time during the past six months.

• Where possible, identify and secure primary
and backup providers for evaluation panels.

• In conjunction with the Evaluation Panelists,
develop and implement a process to
identify conflicts and re-assign applications
as appropriate to secondary or contingent
third party providers to perform the reviews.

Compliance Period -- All Evaluation Panelists must comply
with the Conflict of Interest guidelines beginning with the
opening date of the Application Submission period and
ending with the public announcement by ICANN of the
final outcomes of all the applications from the Applicant in question.

**Guidelines** -- The following guidelines are the minimum standards with which all Evaluation Panelists must comply. It is recognized that it is impossible to foresee and cover all circumstances in which a potential conflict of interest might arise. In these cases the Evaluation Panelist should evaluate whether the existing facts and circumstances would lead a reasonable person to conclude that there is an actual conflict of interest.

**Evaluation Panelists and Immediate Family Members:**

- Must not be under contract, have or be included in a current proposal to provide Professional Services for or on behalf of the Applicant during the Compliance Period.
- Must not currently hold or be committed to acquire any interest in a privately-held Applicant.
- Must not currently hold or be committed to acquire more than 1% of any publicly listed Applicant's outstanding equity securities or other ownership interests.
- Must not be involved or have an interest in a joint venture, partnership or other business arrangement with the Applicant.
- Must not have been named in a lawsuit with or against the Applicant.
- Must not be a:
  - Director, officer, or employee, or in any capacity equivalent to that of a member of management of the Applicant;
  - Promoter, underwriter, or voting trustee of the Applicant; or
  - Trustee for any pension or profit-sharing trust of the Applicant.

**Definitions** --

**Evaluation Panelist:** An Evaluation Panelist is any individual associated with the review of an application. This includes
any primary, secondary, and contingent third party Panelists engaged by ICANN to review new gTLD applications.

Immediate Family Member: Immediate Family Member is a spouse, spousal equivalent, or dependent (whether or not related) of an Evaluation Panelist.

Professional Services: include, but are not limited to legal services, financial audit, financial planning / investment, outsourced services, consulting services such as business / management / internal audit, tax, information technology, registry / registrar services.

2.4.3.2 Code of Conduct Violations

Evaluation panelist breaches of the Code of Conduct, whether intentional or not, shall be reviewed by ICANN, which may make recommendations for corrective action, if deemed necessary. Serious breaches of the Code may be cause for dismissal of the person, persons or provider committing the infraction.

In a case where ICANN determines that a Panelist has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct, the results of that Panelist’s review for all assigned applications will be discarded and the affected applications will undergo a review by new panelists.

Complaints about violations of the Code of Conduct by a Panelist may be brought to the attention of ICANN via the public comment and applicant support mechanisms, throughout the evaluation period. Concerns of applicants regarding panels should be communicated via the defined support channels (see subsection 1.4.2). Concerns of the general public (i.e., non-applicants) can be raised via the public comment forum, as described in Module 1.

2.4.4 Communication Channels

Defined channels for technical support or exchanges of information with ICANN and with evaluation panels are available to applicants during the Initial Evaluation and Extended Evaluation periods. Contacting individual ICANN staff members, Board members, or individuals engaged by ICANN to perform an evaluation role in order to lobby for a particular outcome or to obtain confidential information about applications under review is not appropriate. In the interests of fairness and equivalent treatment for all applicants, any such individual contacts will be referred to the appropriate communication channels.
Annex: Separable Country Names List

gTLD application restrictions on country or territory names are tied to listing in property fields of the ISO 3166-1 standard. Notionally, the ISO 3166-1 standard has an “English short name” field which is the common name for a country and can be used for such protections; however, in some cases this does not represent the common name. This registry seeks to add additional protected elements which are derived from definitions in the ISO 3166-1 standard. An explanation of the various classes is included below.

Separable Country Names List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>English Short Name</th>
<th>Cl.</th>
<th>Separable Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ax</td>
<td>Åland Islands</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Åland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tutiila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swain’s Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ao</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cabinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Antigua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redonda Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lord Howe Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashmore Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carter Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coral Sea Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo</td>
<td>Bolivia, Plurinational State of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sint Eustatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Fernando de Noronha Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martim Vaz Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trinidad Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>io</td>
<td>British Indian Ocean Territory</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Chagos Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diego Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bn</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negara Brunei Darussalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>São Tiago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>São Vicente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ky</td>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Grand Cayman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Easter Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Fernández Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sala y Gómez Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Ambrosio Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Félix Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc</td>
<td>Cocos (Keeling) Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cocos Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keeling Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Malpelo Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Andrés Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providencia Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Anjouan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grande Comore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohéli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ck</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rarotonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Coco Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ec</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Galápagos Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gq</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Annobón Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bioko Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rio Muni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fk</td>
<td>Falkland Islands (Malvinas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Falkland Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Malvinas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fo</td>
<td>Faroe Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Faroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fj</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Viti Levu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rotuma Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf</td>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Austral Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Gambier Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Marquesas Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Society Archipelago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tahiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tuamotu Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Clipperton Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tf</td>
<td>French Southern Territories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Amsterdam Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Crozet Archipelago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kerguelen Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Saint Paul Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mount Athos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gd</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Southern Grenadine Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Carriacou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gp</td>
<td>Guadeloupe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>la Désirade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Marie-Galante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>les Saintes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hm</td>
<td>Heard Island and McDonald Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Heard Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>McDonald Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va</td>
<td>Holy See (Vatican City State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Holy See</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Vatican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hn</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Swan Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Amindivi Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Andaman Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Laccadive Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Minicoy Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Nicobar Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ir</td>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Gilbert Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tarawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Banaba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Line Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kirimati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Phoenix Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Abaniringa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Enderbury Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kp</td>
<td>Korea, Democratic People's Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kr</td>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mk</td>
<td>Macedonia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sabah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sarawak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mh</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jaluit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kwajalein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Majuro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Agalega Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cargados Carajos Shoals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rodrigues Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fm</td>
<td>Micronesia, Federated States of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Alternate Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Caroline Islands (see also pw)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Chuuk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kosrae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pohnpei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md</td>
<td>Moldova, Republic of</td>
<td>B1 Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Moldava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nc</td>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>C Loyalty Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp</td>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
<td>C Mariana Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Saipan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>C Musandam Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pw</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>C Caroline Islands (see also fm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Babelthuap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps</td>
<td>Palestinian Territory, Occupied</td>
<td>B1 Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>C Bismarck Archipelago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Northern Solomon Islands</td>
<td>B Bougainville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pn</td>
<td>Pitcairn</td>
<td>C Ducie Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Henderson Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Oeno Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re</td>
<td>Réunion</td>
<td>C Bassas da India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Europa Island</td>
<td>C Glorioso Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Juan de Nova Island</td>
<td>C Tromelin Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>B1 Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kaliningrad Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>Saint Helena, Ascension, and Tristan de Cunha</td>
<td>A Saint Helena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>A Tristan de Cunha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tristan de Cunha</td>
<td>C Gough Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tristan de Cunha Archipelago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kn</td>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>A Saint Kitts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nevis</td>
<td>A Nevis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pm</td>
<td>Saint Pierre and Miquelon</td>
<td>A Saint Pierre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Miquelon</td>
<td>A Miquelon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vc</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>A Saint Vincent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Grenadines</td>
<td>A The Grenadines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Northern Grenadine Islands</td>
<td>C Bequia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Saint Vincent Island</td>
<td>C Saint Vincent Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ws</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>C Savai’i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Upolu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>A Sao Tome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Principe</td>
<td>A Principe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>C Mahé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Aldabra Islands</td>
<td>C Amirante Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cosmoledo Islands</td>
<td>C Farquhar Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sb</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>C Santa Cruz Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Southern Solomon Islands</td>
<td>C Guadalcanal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>C Marion Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>C Prince Edward Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs</td>
<td>South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands</td>
<td>A South Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>South Sandwich Islands</td>
<td>A South Sandwich Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sj</td>
<td>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Svalbard</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Mayen</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sy</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tw</td>
<td>Taiwan, Province of China</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penghu Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tz</td>
<td>Tanzania, United Republic of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tl</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oecussi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tongatapu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tt</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tobago</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turks Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caicos Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tv</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fanafuti</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ae</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emirates</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>America</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>um</td>
<td>United States Minor Outlying Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baker Island</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howland Island</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jarvis Island</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnston Atoll</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingman Reef</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midway Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmyra Atoll</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wake Island</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navassa Island</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vu</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efate</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ve</td>
<td>Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bird Island</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vg</td>
<td>Virgin Islands, British</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anegada</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jost Van Dyke</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tortola</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virgin Gorda</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Virgin Islands, US</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Croix</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Thomas</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wf</td>
<td>Wallis and Futuna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wallis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Futuna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoorn Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wallis Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uvea</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ye</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socotra Island</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maintenance**

A Separable Country Names Registry will be maintained and published by ICANN Staff.
Each time the ISO 3166-1 standard is updated with a new entry, this registry will be reappraised to identify if the changes to the standard warrant changes to the entries in this registry. Appraisal will be based on the criteria listing in the “Eligibility” section of this document.

Codes reserved by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency do not have any implication on this registry, only entries derived from normally assigned codes appearing in ISO 3166-1 are eligible.

If an ISO code is struck off the ISO 3166-1 standard, any entries in this registry deriving from that code must be struck.

Eligibility

Each record in this registry is derived from the following possible properties:

Class A: The ISO 3166-1 English Short Name is comprised of multiple, separable parts whereby the country is comprised of distinct sub-entities. Each of these separable parts is eligible in its own right for consideration as a country name. For example, “Antigua and Barbuda” is comprised of “Antigua” and “Barbuda.”

Class B: The ISO 3166-1 English Short Name (1) or the ISO 3166-1 English Full Name (2) contains additional language as to the type of country the entity is, which is often not used in common usage when referencing the country. For example, one such short name is “The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela” for a country in common usage referred to as “Venezuela.”

** Macedonia is a separable name in the context of this list; however, due to the ongoing dispute listed in UN documents between the Hellenic Republic (Greece) and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia over the name, no country will be afforded attribution or rights to the name “Macedonia” until the dispute over the name has been resolved. See [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/240/37/IMG/N9324037.pdf](http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/240/37/IMG/N9324037.pdf).

Class C: The ISO 3166-1 Remarks column containing synonyms of the country name, or sub-national entities, as denoted by “often referred to as,” “includes”, “comprises”, “variant” or “principal islands”.

In the first two cases, the registry listing must be directly derivable from the English Short Name by excising words and articles. These registry listings do not include vernacular or other non-official terms used to denote the country.

Eligibility is calculated in class order. For example, if a term can be derived both from Class A and Class C, it is only listed as Class A.
Sample Letter of Government Support

[This letter should be provided on official letterhead]

ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for [TLD requested]

This letter is to confirm that [government entity] fully supports the application for [TLD] submitted to ICANN by [applicant] in the New gTLD Program. As the [Minister/Secretary/position] I confirm that I have the authority of the [government/public authority] to be writing to you on this matter. [Explanation of government entity, relevant department, division, office, or agency, and what its functions and responsibilities are]

The gTLD will be used to [explain your understanding of how the name will be used by the applicant. This could include policies developed regarding who can register a name, pricing regime and management structures.] [Government/public authority/department] has worked closely with the applicant in the development of this proposal.

The [government/public authority] supports this application, and in doing so, understands that in the event that the application is successful, [applicant] will be required to enter into a Registry Agreement with ICANN. In doing so, they will be required to pay fees to ICANN and comply with consensus policies developed through the ICANN multi-stakeholder policy processes.

[Government/public authority] further understands that, in the event of a dispute between [government/public authority] and the applicant, ICANN will comply with a legally binding order from a court in the jurisdiction of [government/public authority].

[Optional] This application is being submitted as a community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the application. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.

[Optional] I can advise that in the event that this application is successful [government/public authority] will enter into a separate agreement with the applicant. This agreement will outline the conditions under which we support them in the operation of the TLD, and circumstances under which we would withdraw that support. ICANN will not be a party to this agreement, and enforcement of this agreement lies fully with [government/public authority].
[Government / public authority] understands that the Geographic Names Panel engaged by ICANN will, among other things, conduct due diligence on the authenticity of this documentation. I would request that if additional information is required during this process, that [name and contact details] be contacted in the first instance.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Signature from relevant government/public authority
Since ICANN was founded in 1998 as a not-for-profit, multi-stakeholder organization, one of its key mandates has been to promote competition in the domain name market. ICANN’s mission specifically calls for the corporation to maintain and build on processes that will ensure competition and consumer interests - without compromising Internet security and stability. This includes the consideration and implementation of new gTLDs. It is ICANN’s goal to make the criteria and evaluation as objective as possible.

While new gTLDs are viewed by ICANN as important to fostering choice, innovation and competition in domain registration services, the decision to launch these coming new gTLD application rounds followed a detailed and lengthy consultation process with all constituencies of the global Internet community.

Any public or private sector organization can apply to create and operate a new gTLD. However, the process is not like simply registering or buying a second-level domain name. Instead, the application process is to evaluate and select candidates capable of running a registry, a business that manages top level domains such as, for example, .COM or .INFO. Any successful applicant will need to meet published operational and technical criteria in order to preserve Internet stability and interoperability.

I. Principles of the Technical and Financial New gTLD Evaluation Criteria

• Principles of conservatism. This is the first round of what is to be an ongoing process for the introduction of new TLDs, including Internationalized Domain Names. Therefore, the criteria in this round require applicants to provide a thorough and thoughtful analysis of the technical requirements to operate a registry and the proposed business model.

• The criteria and evaluation should be as objective as possible.

  • With that goal in mind, an important objective of the new TLD process is to diversify the namespace, with different registry business models and target audiences. In some cases, criteria that are objective, but that ignore the differences in business models and target audiences of new registries, will tend to make the process exclusionary. For example, the business model for a registry targeted to a small community need not possess the same robustness in funding and technical infrastructure as a registry intending to compete with large gTLDs. Therefore purely objective criteria such as a requirement for a certain amount of cash on hand will not provide for the flexibility to consider different business models. The process must provide for an objective evaluation framework, but allow for adaptation according to the differing models applicants will present. Within that framework, applicant responses will be evaluated against the criteria in light of the proposed model.

  • Therefore the criteria should be flexible: able to scale with the overall business approach, providing that the planned approach is consistent and coherent, and can withstand highs and lows.
• Criteria can be objective in areas of registrant protection, for example:
  – Providing for funds to continue operations in the event of a registry failure.
  – Adherence to data escrow, registry failover, and continuity planning requirements.

• The evaluation must strike the correct balance between establishing the business and technical competence of the applicant to operate a registry (to serve the interests of registrants), while not asking for the detailed sort of information or making the judgment that a venture capitalist would. ICANN is not seeking to certify business success but instead seeks to encourage innovation while providing certain safeguards for registrants.

• New registries must be added in a way that maintains DNS stability and security. Therefore, ICANN asks several questions so that the applicant can demonstrate an understanding of the technical requirements to operate a registry. ICANN will ask the applicant to demonstrate actual operational technical compliance prior to delegation. This is in line with current prerequisites for the delegation of a TLD.

• Registrant protection is emphasized in both the criteria and the scoring. Examples of this include asking the applicant to:
  – Plan for the occurrence of contingencies and registry failure by putting in place financial resources to fund the ongoing resolution of names while a replacement operator is found or extended notice can be given to registrants,
  – Demonstrate a capability to understand and plan for business contingencies to afford some protections through the marketplace,
  – Adhere to DNS stability and security requirements as described in the technical section, and
  – Provide access to the widest variety of services.

II. Aspects of the Questions Asked in the Application and Evaluation Criteria

The technical and financial questions are intended to inform and guide the applicant in aspects of registry start-up and operation. The established registry operator should find the questions straightforward while inexperienced applicants should find them a natural part of planning.

Evaluation and scoring (detailed below) will emphasize:

• How thorough are the answers? Are they well thought through and do they provide a sufficient basis for evaluation?

• Demonstration of the ability to operate and fund the registry on an ongoing basis
  – Funding sources to support technical operations in a manner that ensures stability and security and supports planned expenses,
  – Resilience and sustainability in the face of ups and downs, anticipation of contingencies,
  – Funding to carry on operations in the event of failure.
• Demonstration that the technical plan will likely deliver on best practices for a registry and identification of aspects that might raise DNS stability and security issues.

• Ensures plan integration, consistency and compatibility (responses to questions are not evaluated individually but in comparison to others):
  ▪ Funding adequately covers technical requirements,
  ▪ Funding covers costs,
  ▪ Risks are identified and addressed, in comparison to other aspects of the plan.

III. Scoring

Evaluation

• The questions, criteria, scoring and evaluation methodology are to be conducted in accordance with the principles described earlier in section I. With that in mind, globally diverse evaluation panelists will staff evaluation panels. The diversity of evaluators and access to experts in all regions of the world will ensure application evaluations take into account cultural, technical and business norms in the regions from which applications originate.

• Evaluation teams will consist of two independent panels. One will evaluate the applications against the financial criteria. The other will evaluate the applications against the technical & operational criteria. Given the requirement that technical and financial planning be well integrated, the panels will work together and coordinate information transfer where necessary. Other relevant experts (e.g., technical, audit, legal, insurance, finance) in pertinent regions will provide advice as required.

• Precautions will be taken to ensure that no member of the Evaluation Teams will have any interest or association that may be viewed as a real or potential conflict of interest with an applicant or application. All members must adhere to the Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest guidelines that are found in Module 2.

• Communications between the evaluation teams and the applicants will be through an online interface. During the evaluation, evaluators may pose a set of clarifying questions to an applicant, to which the applicant may respond through the interface.

Confidentiality: ICANN will post applications after the close of the application submission period. The application form notes which parts of the application will be posted.

Scoring

• Responses will be evaluated against each criterion. A score will be assigned according to the scoring schedule linked to each question or set of questions. In several questions, 1 point is the maximum score that may be awarded. In several other questions, 2 points are awarded for a response that exceeds requirements, 1 point is awarded for a response that meets requirements and 0 points are awarded for a response that fails to meet requirements. Each question must receive at least a score of “1,” making each a “pass/fail” question.

• In the Continuity question in the financial section (see Question #50), up to 3 points are awarded if an applicant provides, at the application stage, a financial instrument that will guarantee ongoing registry operations in the event of a business failure. This extra
point can serve to guarantee passing the financial criteria for applicants who score the minimum passing score for each of the individual criteria. The purpose of this weighting is to reward applicants who make early arrangements for the protection of registrants and to accept relatively riskier business plans where registrants are protected.

- There are 21 Technical & Operational questions. Each question has a criterion and scoring associated with it. The scoring for each is 0, 1, or 2 points as described above. One of the questions (IDN implementation) is optional. Other than the optional questions, all Technical & Operational criteria must be scored a 1 or more or the application will fail the evaluation.

- The total technical score must be equal to or greater than 22 for the application to pass. That means the applicant can pass by:
  - Receiving a 1 on all questions, including the optional question, and a 2 on at least one mandatory question; or
  - Receiving a 1 on all questions, excluding the optional question and a 2 on at least two mandatory questions.

  This scoring methodology requires a minimum passing score for each question and a slightly higher average score than the per question minimum to pass.

- There are six Financial questions and six sets of criteria that are scored by rating the answers to one or more of the questions. For example, the question concerning registry operation costs requires consistency between the technical plans (described in the answers to the Technical & Operational questions) and the costs (described in the answers to the costs question).

- The scoring for each of the Financial criteria is 0, 1 or 2 points as described above with the exception of the Continuity question, for which up to 3 points are possible. All questions must receive at least a 1 or the application will fail the evaluation.

- The total financial score on the six criteria must be 8 or greater for the application to pass. That means the applicant can pass by:
  - Scoring a 3 on the continuity criteria, or
  - Scoring a 2 on any two financial criteria.

- Applications that do not pass Initial Evaluation can enter into an extended evaluation process as described in Module 2. The scoring is the same.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Full legal name of the Applicant (the established entity that would enter into a Registry Agreement with ICANN)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Responses to Questions 1 - 12 are required for a complete application. Responses are not scored.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Address of the principal place of business of the Applicant. This address will be used for contractual purposes. No Post Office boxes are allowed.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phone number for the Applicant's principal place of business.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fax number for the Applicant's principal place of business.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Website or URL, if applicable.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Contact for this Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The primary contact is the individual designated with the primary responsibility for management of the application, including responding to tasks in the TLD Application System (TAS) during the various application phases. Both contacts listed should also be prepared to receive inquiries from the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax number</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Contact for this Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The secondary contact is listed in the event the primary contact is unavailable to continue with the application process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax number</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(a) Legal form of the Applicant. (e.g., partnership, corporation, non-profit institution).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In the event of questions regarding proof of establishment, the applicant may be asked for additional details, such as the specific national or other law applying to this type of entity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Attach evidence of the applicant’s establishment as the type of entity identified in Question 8(a) above, in accordance with the applicable laws identified in Question 8(b).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Applications without valid proof of legal establishment will not be evaluated further. Supporting documentation for proof of legal establishment should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(a) If the applying entity is publicly traded, provide the exchange and symbol.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) If the applying entity is a joint venture, list all joint venture partners.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business ID, Tax ID, VAT registration number, or equivalent of the Applicant.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(a) Enter the full name, date and country of birth, contact information (permanent residence), and position of all directors (i.e., members of the applicant’s Board of Directors, if applicable).</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Applicants should be aware that the names and positions of the individuals listed in response to this question will be published as part of the application. The contact information listed for individuals is for identification purposes only and will not be published as part of the application. Background checks may be conducted on individuals named in the applicant’s response to question 11. Any material misstatement or misrepresentation (or omission of material information) may cause the application to be rejected. The applicant certifies that it has obtained permission for the posting of the names and positions of individuals included in this application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Enter the full name, date and country of birth, contact information (permanent residence), and position of all officers and partners. Officers are high-level management officials of a corporation or business, for example, a CEO, vice president, secretary, chief financial officer. Partners would be listed in the context of a partnership or other such form of legal entity.</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Enter the full name and contact information of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares, and percentage held by each. For a shareholder entity, enter the principal place of business. For a shareholder individual, enter the date and country of birth and contact information (permanent residence).</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) For an applying entity that does not have directors, officers, partners, or shareholders, enter the full name, date and country of birth, contact information (permanent residence), and position of all individuals having overall legal or executive responsibility for the applying entity.</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Indicate whether the applicant or any of the individuals named above:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ICANN may deny an otherwise qualified application based on the background screening process. See section 1.2.1 of the guidebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of computers, telephony systems, telecommunications or the Internet to facilitate the commission of crimes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of a weapon, force, or the threat of force;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of any violent or sexual offense victimizing children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of the illegal sale, manufacture, or distribution of pharmaceutical drugs, or been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in Article 3 of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (all Protocols);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>has been convicted, within the respective timeframes, of aiding, abetting, facilitating, enabling, conspiring to commit, or failing to report any of the listed crimes (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (i) - (iv) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (v) – (ix) above);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>has entered a guilty plea as part of a plea agreement or has a court case in any jurisdiction with a disposition of Adjudicated Guilty or Adjudication Withheld (or regional equivalents) within the respective timeframes listed above for any of the listed crimes (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (i) – (iv) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (v) – (ix) above);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>is the subject of a disqualification imposed by ICANN and in effect at the time of this application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If any of the above events have occurred, please provide details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Indicate whether the applicant or any of the individuals named above have been involved in any decisions indicating that the applicant or individual named in the application was engaged in cybersquatting, as defined in the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), Anti-cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA), or other equivalent legislation, or was engaged in reverse domain name hijacking under the UDRP or bad faith or reckless disregard under the ACPA or equivalent legislation.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ICANN may deny an otherwise qualified application based on the background screening process. See section 1.2.1 of the guidebook for details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g) Disclose whether the applicant or any of the individuals named above has been involved in any administrative or other legal proceeding in which allegations of intellectual property infringement relating to registration or use of a domain name have been made. Provide an explanation related to each such instance.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ICANN may deny an otherwise qualified application based on the background screening process. See section 1.2.1 of the guidebook for details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h) Provide an explanation for any additional background information that may be found concerning the applicant or any individual named in the application, which may affect eligibility, including any criminal convictions not identified above.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(a) Enter the confirmation information for payment of the evaluation fee (e.g., wire transfer confirmation number).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The evaluation fee is paid in the form of a deposit at the time of user registration, and submission of the remaining amount at the time the full application is submitted. The information in question 12 is required for each payment. The full amount in USD must be received by ICANN. Applicant is responsible for all transaction fees and exchange rate fluctuation. Fedwire is the preferred wire mechanism; SWIFT is also acceptable. ACH is not recommended as these funds will take longer to clear and could affect timing of the application processing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Payer name</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Payer address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Wiring bank</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Bank address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Wire date</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied-for gTLD string</td>
<td>13  Provide the applied-for gTLD string. If applying for an IDN, provide the U-label.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Responses to Questions 13-17 are not scored, but are used for database and validation purposes. The U-label is an IDNA-valid string of Unicode characters, including at least one non-ASCII character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(a) If applying for an IDN, provide the A-label (beginning with &quot;xn--&quot;).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) If an IDN, provide the meaning, or restatement of the string in English; that is, a description of the literal meaning of the string in the opinion of the applicant.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) If an IDN, provide the language of the label (both in English and as referenced by ISO-8859-1).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) If an IDN, provide the script of the label (both in English and as referenced by ISO 15924).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) If an IDN, list all code points contained in the U-label according to Unicode form.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>For example, the string “HELLO” would be listed as: U+0046 U+0065 U+006C U+006F U+0066F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(a) If an IDN, upload IDN tables for the proposed registry. An IDN table must include: 1. the applied-for gTLD string relevant to the tables, 2. the script or language designator (as defined in BCP 47), 3. table version number, 4. effective date (DD Month YYYY), and 5. contact name, email address, and phone number. Submission of IDN tables in a standards-based format is encouraged.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In the case of an application for an IDN gTLD, IDN tables must be submitted for the language or script for the applied-for gTLD string. IDN tables must also be submitted for each language or script in which the applicant intends to offer IDN registrations at the second level (see question 44). IDN tables should be submitted in a machine-readable format. The model format described in Section 5 of RFC 4290 would be ideal. The format used by RFC 3743 is an acceptable alternative. Variant generation algorithms that are more complex (such as those with contextual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Describe the applicant’s efforts to ensure that there are no known</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>rules) and cannot be expressed using these table formats should be specified in a manner that could be re-implemented programmatically by ICANN. Ideally, for any complex table formats, a reference code implementation should be provided in conjunction with a description of the generation rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operational or rendering problems concerning the applied-for gTLD string.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variant TLD strings will not be delegated as a result of this application. Variant strings will be checked for consistency and, if the application is approved, will be entered on a Declared IDN Variants List to allow for future allocation once a variant management mechanism is established for the top-level. Inclusion of variant TLD strings in this application is for information only and confers no right or claim to these strings upon the applicant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>OPTIONAL Provide a representation of the label according to the</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>If provided, this information will be used as a guide to ICANN in communications regarding the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Phonetic Alphabet (<a href="http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/_ipa">http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/_ipa</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(a) Describe the mission/purpose of your proposed gTLD.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The information gathered in response to Question 18 is intended to inform the post-launch review of the New gTLD Program, from the perspective of assessing the relative costs and benefits achieved in the expanded gTLD space. For the application to be considered complete, answers to this section must be fulsome and sufficiently quantitative and detailed to inform future study on plans vs. results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The New gTLD Program will be reviewed, as specified in section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments. This will include consideration of the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, as well as effectiveness of (a) the application and evaluation process, and (b) safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion.

The information gathered in this section will be one source of input to help inform this review. This information is not used as part of the evaluation or scoring of the application, except to the extent that the information may overlap with questions or evaluation areas that are scored.

An applicant wishing to designate this application as community-based should ensure that these responses are consistent with its responses for question 20 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) How do you expect that your proposed gTLD will benefit registrants, Internet users, and others?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answers should address the following points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. What is the goal of your proposed gTLD in terms of areas of specialty, service levels, or reputation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. What do you anticipate your proposed gTLD will add to the current space, in terms of competition, differentiation, or innovation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. What goals does your proposed gTLD have in terms of user experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Provide a complete description of the applicant’s intended registration policies in support of the goals listed above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Will your proposed gTLD impose any measures for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>protected the privacy or confidential information of registrants or users? If so, please describe any such measures.</strong> Describe whether and in what ways outreach and communications will help to achieve your projected benefits.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answers should address the following points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. How will multiple applications for a particular domain name be resolved, for example, by auction or on a first-come/first-serve basis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Explain any cost benefits for registrants you intend to implement (e.g., advantageous pricing, introductory discounts, bulk registration discounts).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Note that the Registry Agreement requires that registrars be offered the option to obtain initial domain name registrations for periods of one to ten years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten years. Additionally, the Registry Agreement requires advance written notice of price increases. Do you intend to make contractual commitments to registrants regarding the magnitude of price escalation? If so, please describe your plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) What operating rules will you adopt to eliminate or minimize social costs (e.g., time or financial resource costs, as well as various types of consumer vulnerabilities)? What other steps will you take to minimize negative consequences/costs imposed upon consumers?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answers should address the following points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. How will multiple applications for a particular domain name be resolved, for example, by auction or on a first-come/first-serve basis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Explain any cost benefits for registrants you intend to implement (e.g., advantageous pricing, introductory discounts, bulk registration discounts).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Note that the Registry Agreement requires that registrars be offered the option to obtain initial domain name registrations for periods of one to ten years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten years. Additionally, the Registry Agreement requires advance written notice of price increases. Do you intend to make contractual commitments to registrants regarding the magnitude of price escalation? If so, please describe your plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Is the application for a community-based TLD?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>There is a presumption that the application is a standard application (as defined in the Applicant Guidebook) if this question is left unanswered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(a) Provide the name and full description of the community that the applicant is committing to serve. In the event that this application is included in a community priority evaluation, it will be scored based on the community identified in response to this question. The name of the community does not have to be formally adopted for the application to be designated as community-based.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions should include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    | • How the community is delineated from Internet users generally. Such descriptions may include, but are not limited to, the following:  
|    | • membership, registration, or licensing processes, operation in a particular industry, use of a language.  
|    | • How the community is structured and organized. For a community consisting of an alliance of groups, details about the constituent parts are required.  
|    | • When the community was established, including the date(s) of formal organization, if any, as well as a description of community activities to date.  
|    | • The current estimated size of the community, both as to membership and geographic extent. |                            |       | Responses to Question 20 will be regarded as firm commitments to the specified community and reflected in the Registry Agreement, provided the application is successful.  
|    | Responses are not scored in the Initial Evaluation.  
|    | Responses may be scored in a community priority evaluation, if applicable.  
|    | Criteria and scoring methodology for the community priority evaluation are described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook. |                            |       |         |         |
|    | (b) Explain the applicant’s relationship to the community identified in 20(a). | Y                           |       |               |          |         |
|    | Explanations should clearly state:                                       |                            |       |               |          |         |
|    | • Relations to any community organizations.                              |                            |       |               |          |         |
|    | • Relations to the community and its constituent parts/groups.           |                            |       |               |          |         |
|    | • Accountability mechanisms of the applicant to the community.            |                            |       |               |          |         |
|    | (c) Provide a description of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. | Y                           |       |               |          |         |
|    | Descriptions should include:                                            |                            |       |               |          |         |
|    | • Intended registrants in the TLD.                                      |                            |       |               |          |         |
|    | • Intended end-users of the TLD.                                        |                            |       |               |          |         |
|    | • Related activities the applicant has carried out or intends to carry out in service of this purpose.  
<p>|    | • Explanation of how the purpose is of a lasting nature.                |                            |       |               |          |         |
|    | (d) Explain the relationship between the applied-for gTLD string and the community identified in 20(a). | Y                           |       |               |          |         |
|    | Explanations should clearly state:                                       |                            |       |               |          |         |
|    | • relationship to the established name, if any, of the community.        |                            |       |               |          |         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  | (e) Provide a complete description of the applicant's intended registration policies in support of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. Policies and enforcement mechanisms are expected to constitute a coherent set. | Y | - relationship to the identification of community members.  
- any connotations the string may have beyond the community.  
Descriptions should include proposed policies, if any, on the following:  
- Eligibility: who is eligible to register a second-level name in the gTLD, and how will eligibility be determined.  
- Name selection: what types of second-level names may be registered in the gTLD.  
- Content/Use: what restrictions, if any, the registry operator will impose on how a registrant may use its registered name.  
- Enforcement: what investigation practices and mechanisms exist to enforce the policies above, what resources are allocated for enforcement, and what appeal mechanisms are available to registrants. | | | |
|  | (f) Attach any written endorsements for the application from established institutions representative of the community identified in 20(a). An applicant may submit written endorsements by multiple institutions, if relevant to the community. | Y | At least one such endorsement is required for a complete application. The form and content of the endorsement are at the discretion of the party providing the endorsement; however, the letter must identify the applied-for gTLD string and the applying entity, include an express statement support for the application, and the supply the contact information of the entity providing the endorsement.  
Endorsements from institutions not mentioned in the response to 20(b) should be accompanied by a clear description of each such institution's relationship to the community.  
Endorsements presented as supporting documentation for this question should be submitted in the original language. | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(a) Is the application for a geographic name?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>An applied-for gTLD string is considered a geographic name requiring government support if it is: (a) the capital city name of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard; (b) a city name, where it is clear from statements in the application that the applicant intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name; (c) a sub-national place name listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard; or (d) a name listed as a UNESCO region or appearing on the &quot;Composition of macro geographic (continental) or regions, geographic sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings&quot; list. See Module 2 for complete definitions and criteria. An application for a country or territory name, as defined in the Applicant Guidebook, will not be approved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) If a geographic name, attach documentation of support or non-objection from all relevant governments or public authorities.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>See the documentation requirements in Module 2 of the Applicant Guidebook. Documentation presented in response to this question should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Protection of Geographic Names: Describe proposed measures for protection of geographic names at the second and other levels in the applied-for gTLD. This should include any applicable rules and procedures for reservation and/or release of such names.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Applicants should consider and describe how they will incorporate Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) advice in their management of second-level domain name registrations. See &quot;Principles regarding New gTLDs&quot; at <a href="https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/NewgTLDs">https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/NewgTLDs</a>. For reference, applicants may draw on existing methodology developed for the reservation and release of country names in the .INFO top-level domain. See the Dot INFO Circular at <a href="https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/NewgTLDs">https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/NewgTLDs</a>. Proposed measures will be posted for public comment as part of the application. However, note that procedures for release of geographic names at the second level are not considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Registry Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Provide name and full description of all the Registry Services to be provided. Descriptions should include both technical and business components of each proposed service, and address any potential security or stability concerns. The following registry services are customary services offered by a registry operator:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Registry Services are defined as the following: (1) operations of the Registry critical to the following tasks: (i) the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; (ii) provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; (iii) dissemination of TLD zone files; (iv) operation of the Registry zone servers; and (v) dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by the Registry Agreement; and (2) other products or services that the Registry Operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a Consensus Policy; (3) any other products or services that only a Registry Operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the Registry Operator. A full definition of Registry Services can be found at <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html">http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html</a>.</td>
<td>Responses are not scored. A preliminary assessment will be made to determine if there are potential security or stability issues with any of the applicant's proposed Registry Services. If any such issues are identified, the application will be referred for an extended review. See the description of the Registry Services review process in Module 2 of the Applicant Guidebook. Any information contained in the application may be considered as part of the Registry Services review. If its application is approved, applicant may engage in only those registry services defined in the application, unless a new request is submitted to ICANN in accordance with the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration of domain names and name servers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Dissemination of TLD zone files.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain name registrations (e.g., port-43 WHOIS, Web-based WhoIs, RESTful WhoIs service).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Internationalized Domain Names, where offered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. DNS Security Extensions (DNSSEC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of Technical &amp; Operational Capability (External)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shared Registration System (SRS) Performance: describe the plan for operation of a robust and reliable SRS. SRS is a critical registry function for enabling multiple registrars to provide domain name registration services in the TLD. SRS must include the EPP interface to the registry, as well as any other interfaces intended to be provided, if they are critical to the functioning of the registry. Please refer to the requirements in Specification 6 (section 1.2) and Specification 10 (SLA Matrix) attached to the Registry Agreement; and resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer should include, but is not limited to:</td>
<td>• A high-level SRS system description; • Representative network diagram(s); • Number of servers; • Description of interconnectivity with other registry systems; • Frequency of synchronization between servers; and • Synchronization scheme (e.g., hot standby, cold standby).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The questions in this section (24-44) are intended to give applicants an opportunity to demonstrate their technical and operational capabilities to run a registry. In the event that an applicant chooses to outsource one or more parts of its registry operations, the applicant should still provide the full details of the technical arrangements. Note that the resource plans provided in this section assist in validating the technical and operational plans as well as informing the cost estimates in the Financial section below. Questions 24-30(a) are designed to provide a description of the applicant's intended technical and operational approach for those registry functions that are outward-facing, i.e., interactions with registrars, registrants, and various DNS users. Responses to these questions will be published to allow review by affected parties.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP); provide a detailed description of the interface with registrars, including how the applicant will comply with EPP in RFCs 3735 (if applicable), and 5730-5734. If intending to provide proprietary EPP extensions, provide documentation consistent with RFC 3735, including the EPP templates and schemas that will be used. Describe resourcing plans (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages. If there are proprietary EPP extensions, a complete answer is also expected to be no more than 5 pages per EPP extension.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements; (2) a technical plan scope/size consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; (4) ability to comply with relevant RFCs; (5) if applicable, a well-documented implementation of any proprietary EPP extensions; and (6) if applicable, how proprietary EPP extensions are consistent with the registration lifecycle as described in Question 27.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) Adequate description of EPP that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Sufficient evidence that any proprietary EPP extensions are compliant with RFCs and provide all necessary functionalities for the provision of registry services; (3) EPP interface is consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates that technical resources are already on hand, or committed or readily available. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whois: describe how the applicant will comply with Whois specifications for data objects, bulk access, and lookup as defined in Specifications 4 and 10 to the Registry Agreement; how the Applicant's Whois service will comply with RFC 3912; and resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer should include, but is not limited to:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements, (one of the five critical registry functions); (2) a technical plan scope/size consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the 2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all the attributes for a score of 1 and includes: (1) A Searchable Whois service: Whois service includes web-based search capabilities by domain name, registrant name, postal address, contact names, registrar IDs, and Internet Protocol addresses without arbitrary limit. Boolean search capabilities may be offered. The service shall include appropriate precautions to avoid abuse of this feature (e.g., limiting access to legitimate authorized users), and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A high-level Whois system description;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) complete knowledge and understanding of registration lifecycles and states; (2) consistency with any specific commitments made to registrants as adapted to the overall business approach for the proposed gTLD; and (3) the ability to comply with relevant RFCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relevant network diagram(s);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Evidence that Whois services are compliant with RFCs, Specifications 4 and 10 to the Registry Agreement, and any other contractual requirements including all necessary functionalities for user interface; and (5) demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are already on hand or readily available to carry out this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT and infrastructure resources (e.g., servers, switches, routers and other components);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) If applicable, a well-documented implementation of Searchable Whois.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Description of interconnectivity with other registry systems; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Provision for Searchable Whois capabilities; and (2) A description of potential forms of abuse of this feature, how these risks will be mitigated, and the basis for these descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Frequency of synchronization between servers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Registration Life Cycle: provide a detailed description of the proposed registration lifecycle for domain names in the proposed gTLD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Adequate description of Searchable Whois service that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capability and knowledge required to meet this element; and (4) demonstratess an adequate level of resources that are already on hand or readily available to carry out this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 28 | Abuse Prevention and Mitigation: Applicants should describe the proposed policies and procedures to minimize abusive registrations and other activities that have a negative impact on Internet users. A complete answer should include, but is not limited to:  
   - An implementation plan to establish and publish on its website a single abuse point of contact responsible for addressing matters requiring expedited attention and providing a timely response to abuse complaints concerning all names registered in the TLD through all registrars of record, including those involving a reseller;  
   - Policies for handling complaints regarding abuse;  
   - Proposed measures for removal of orphan glue records for names removed from the zone when provided with evidence in written form that the glue is present in connection with malicious conduct (see Specification 6); and  
   - Resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).  
   To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must include measures to promote Whois accuracy as well as measures from one other area as resources that are already on hand or committed or readily available to carry out this function.  
   0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1. | Y                          | Note that, while orphan glue often supports correct and ordinary operation of the DNS, registry operators will be required to take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sa0440.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct. | 0-2 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
   (1) Comprehensive abuse policies, which include clear definitions of what constitutes abuse in the TLD, and procedures that will effectively minimize potential for abuse in the TLD;  
   (2) Plans are adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section;  
   (3) Policies and procedures identify and address the abusive use of registered names at startup and on an ongoing basis; and  
   (4) When executed in accordance with the Registry Agreement, plans will result in compliance with contractual requirements. | 2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all the attributes for a score of 1 and includes:  
   (1) Details of measures to promote Whois accuracy, using measures specified here or other measures commensurate in their effectiveness; and  
   (2) Measures from at least one additional area to be eligible for 2 points as described in the question.  
1 - meets requirements Response includes:  
   (1) An adequate description of abuse prevention and mitigation policies and procedures that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element;  
   (2) Details of well-developed abuse policies and procedures;  
   (3) Plans are sufficient to result in compliance with contractual requirements;  
   (4) Plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application, and any commitments made to registries; and  
   (5) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed, or readily available to
* Measures to promote Whois accuracy (can be undertaken by the registry directly or by registrars via requirements in the Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA)) may include, but are not limited to:
  - Authentication of registrant information as complete and accurate at time of registration. Measures to accomplish this could include performing background checks, verifying all contact information of principals mentioned in registration data, reviewing proof of establishment documentation, and other means.
  - Regular monitoring of registration data for accuracy and completeness, employing authentication methods, and establishing policies and procedures to address domain names with inaccurate or incomplete Whois data; and
  - If relying on registrars to enforce measures, establishing policies and procedures to ensure compliance, which may include audits, financial incentives, penalties, or other means. Note that the requirements of the RAA will continue to apply to all ICANN-accredited registrars.

* A description of policies and procedures that define malicious or abusive behavior, capture metrics, and establish Service Level Requirements for resolution, including service levels for responding to law enforcement requests. This may include rapid takedown or suspension systems and sharing information regarding malicious or abusive behavior with industry partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>described below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Measures to promote Whois accuracy (can be undertaken by the registry directly or by registrars via requirements in the Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA)) may include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Authentication of registrant information as complete and accurate at time of registration. Measures to accomplish this could include performing background checks, verifying all contact information of principals mentioned in registration data, reviewing proof of establishment documentation, and other means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regular monitoring of registration data for accuracy and completeness, employing authentication methods, and establishing policies and procedures to address domain names with inaccurate or incomplete Whois data; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If relying on registrars to enforce measures, establishing policies and procedures to ensure compliance, which may include audits, financial incentives, penalties, or other means. Note that the requirements of the RAA will continue to apply to all ICANN-accredited registrars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A description of policies and procedures that define malicious or abusive behavior, capture metrics, and establish Service Level Requirements for resolution, including service levels for responding to law enforcement requests. This may include rapid takedown or suspension systems and sharing information regarding malicious or abusive behavior with industry partners;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adequate controls to ensure proper access to domain functions (can be undertaken by the registry directly or by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 – meets requirements
0 – fails requirements

Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>registrars via requirements in the Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Requiring multi-factor authentication (i.e., strong passwords, tokens, one-time passwords) from registrants to process update, transfers, and deletion requests;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Requiring multiple, unique points of contact to request and/or approve update, transfer, and deletion requests; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Requiring the notification of multiple, unique points of contact when a domain has been updated, transferred, or deleted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 20 pages.

29 Rights Protection Mechanisms: Applicants must describe how their registry will comply with policies and practices that minimize abusive registrations and other activities that affect the legal rights of others, such as the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system, and Trademark Claims and Sunrise services at startup.

A complete answer should include:

- A description of how the registry operator will implement safeguards against allowing unqualified registrations (e.g., registrations made in violation of the registry’s eligibility restrictions or policies), and reduce opportunities for behaviors such as phishing or pharming. At a minimum, the registry operator must offer a Sunrise period and a Trademark Claims service during the required time periods, and implement decisions rendered under the URS on an ongoing basis; and
- A description of resourcing plans for the

- Complete answer describes mechanisms designed to:
  (1) prevent abusive registrations, and
  (2) identify and address the abusive use of registered names on an ongoing basis.

2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes:
(1) Identification of rights protection as a core objective, supported by a well-developed plan for rights protection; and
(2) Mechanisms for providing effective protections that exceed minimum requirements (e.g., RPMs in addition to those required in the registry agreement).

1 - meets requirements: Response includes
(1) An adequate description of RPMs that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element;
(2) A commitment from the applicant to implement of rights protection mechanisms sufficient to comply with minimum requirements in Specification 7;
(3) Plans that are sufficient to result in compliance with contractual requirements;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 | Security Policy: provide a summary of the security policy for the proposed registry, including but not limited to:  
  - indication of any independent assessment reports demonstrating security capabilities, and provisions for periodic independent assessment reports to test security capabilities;  
  - description of any augmented security levels or capabilities commensurate with the nature of the applied for gTLD string, including the identification of any existing international or industry relevant security standards the applicant commits to following (reference site must be provided);  
  - list of commitments made to registrants concerning security levels.  
  To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include:  
  - Evidence of an independent assessment report demonstrating effective security controls (e.g., ISO 27001).  
  A summary of the above should be no more than 20 pages. Note that the complete security policy for the registry is required to be submitted in accordance with 30(b). | Y | Criterion 5 calls for security levels to be appropriate for the use and level of trust associated with the TLD string, such as, for example, financial services oriented TLDs. “Financial services” are activities performed by financial institutions, including:  
1) the acceptance of deposits and other repayable funds;  
2) lending;  
3) payment and remittance services;  
4) insurance or reinsurance services;  
5) brokerage services;  
6) investment services and activities;  
7) financial leasing;  
8) issuance of guarantees and commitments;  
9) provision of financial advice;  
10) portfolio management and advice;  
or 11) acting as a financial clearinghouse. Financial services is used as an example only; other strings with exceptional potential to cause harm to consumers would also be expected to deploy appropriate levels of security. | 0-2 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
1) detailed description of processes and solutions deployed to manage logical security across infrastructure and systems, monitoring and detecting threats and security vulnerabilities and taking appropriate steps to resolve them;  
2) security capabilities are consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry;  
3) a technical plan adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section;  
4) security measures are consistent with any commitments made to registrants regarding security levels; and  
5) security measures are appropriate for the applied-for gTLD string (For example, applications for strings with unique trust implications, such as financial services-oriented strings, would be expected to provide a commensurate level of security). | 2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes:  
1) Evidence of highly developed and detailed security capabilities, with various baseline security levels, independent benchmarking of security metrics, robust periodic security monitoring, and continuous enforcement; and  
2) an independent assessment report is provided demonstrating effective security controls are either in place or have been designed, and are commensurate with the applied-for gTLD string. (This could be ISO 27001 certification or other well-established and recognized industry certifications for the registry operation. If new independent standards for demonstration of effective security controls are established, such as the High Security Top Level Domain (HSTLD) designation, this could also be included. An illustrative example of an independent standard is the proposed set of requirements described in http://www.icann.org/en/letters/spons/encroahla-btc-to-backstrom- crocker-20dec11-en.pdf ). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 | (b) Security Policy: provide the complete security policy and procedures for the proposed registry, including but not limited to:  
• system (data, server, application / services) and network access control, ensuring systems are maintained in a secure fashion, including details of how they are monitored, logged and backed up;  
• resources to secure integrity of updates between registry systems and nameservers, and between nameservers, if any;  
• independent assessment reports demonstrating security capabilities (submitted as attachments), if any;  
• provisioning and other measures that mitigate risks posed by denial of service attacks;  
• computer and network incident response | N | | | | | 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Technical Overview of Proposed Registry: provide a technical overview of the proposed registry.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>To the extent this answer is affected by the applicant's intent to outsource various registry operations, the applicant should describe these plans (e.g., taking advantage of economies of scale or existing facilities). However, the response must include specifying the technical plans, estimated scale, and geographic dispersion as required by the question.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The technical plan must be adequately resourced, with appropriate expertise and allocation of costs. The applicant will provide financial descriptions of resources in the next section and those resources must be reasonably related to these technical requirements. The overview should include information on the estimated scale of the registry's technical operation, for example, estimates for the number of registration transactions and DNS queries per month should be provided for the first two years of operation. In addition, the overview should account for geographic dispersion of incoming network traffic such as DNS, Whois, and registrar transactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**31 - Technical Overview of Proposed Registry:**

- Provide a detailed overview of the proposed registry.
- The technical plan must be adequately resourced, with the right expertise and allocation of costs. Applicant must provide financial descriptions of resources in the next section and those resources must be reasonably related to the technical requirements.
- The overview should include information on the estimated scale of the registry's technical operations, for example, estimates for the number of registration transactions and DNS queries per month should be provided for the first two years of operation.
- The overview should account for geographic dispersion of incoming network traffic such as DNS, Whois, and registrar transactions.

---

**Scoring: 0-1**

**Complete answer demonstrates:**

1. Complete knowledge and understanding of technical aspects of registry requirements.
2. Consistency with planned or currently deployed technical/operational solutions.
3. Consistency with overall business approach and planned size of the registry.
4. Adequate resourcing for technical plan in the

---

**1 - meets requirements:**

- A description that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element.
- Technical plans consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application.
- Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed, or readily available to carry out this function.

---

**0 - fails requirements:**

- Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>If the registry serves a highly localized registrant base, then traffic might be expected to come mainly from one area. This high-level summary should not repeat answers to questions below. Answers should include a visual diagram(s) to highlight dataflows, to provide context for the overall technical infrastructure. Detailed diagrams for subsequent questions should be able to map back to this high-level diagram(s). The visual diagram(s) can be supplemented with documentation, or a narrative, to explain how all of the Technical &amp; Operational components conform. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) detailed and coherent network architecture; (2) architecture providing resiliency for registry systems; (3) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and (4) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2 - exceeds requirements: | Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes (1) Evidence of highly developed and detailed network architecture that is able to scale well above stated projections for high registration volumes, thereby significantly reducing the risk from unexpected volume surges and demonstrates an ability to adapt quickly to support new technologies and services that are not necessarily envisaged for initial registry startup; and (2) Evidence of a highly available, robust, and secure infrastructure. |

<p>| 1 - meets requirements: | Response includes (1) An adequate description of the architecture that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Plans for network architecture describe all necessary elements; (3) Descriptions demonstrate adequate network architecture providing robustness and security of the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 33 | Database Capabilities: provide details of database capabilities including but not limited to:  
- database software;  
- storage capacity (both in raw terms [e.g., MB, GB] and in number of registrations / registration transactions);  
- maximum transaction throughput (in total and by type of transaction);  
- scalability;  
- procedures for object creation, editing, and deletion, and user and credential management;  
- high availability;  
- change management procedures;  
- reporting capabilities; and  
- resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).  
A registry database data model can be included to provide additional clarity to this response.  
Note: Database capabilities described should be in reference to registry services and not necessarily related support functions such as Personnel or Accounting, unless such services are inherently intertwined with the delivery of registry services.  
To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include evidence of a network architecture design that greatly reduces the risk profile of the proposed registry by providing a level of scalability and adaptability (e.g., protection against DDoS attacks) that far exceeds the minimum configuration necessary for the expected volume.  
A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages. | N | 0-2 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
(1) complete knowledge and understanding of database capabilities to meet the registry technical requirements;  
(2) database capabilities consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and  
(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section. | 2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes  
(1) Highly developed and detailed description of database capabilities that are able to scale well above stated projections for high registration volumes, thereby significantly reducing the risk from unexpected volume surges and demonstrates an ability to adapt quickly to support new technologies and services that are not necessarily envisaged for registry startup; and  
(2) Evidence of comprehensive database capabilities, including high scalability and redundant database infrastructure, regularly reviewed operational and reporting procedures following leading practices.  
1 - meets requirements: Response includes  
(1) An adequate description of database capabilities that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element; and  
(2) Plans for database capabilities |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Geographic Diversity: provide a description of plans for geographic diversity of:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. name servers, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) geographic diversity of nameservers and operations centers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. operations centers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) proposed geo-diversity measures are consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answers should include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the intended physical locations of systems, primary and back-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• any registry plans to use Anycast or other topological and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>geographical diversity measures, in which case, the configuration of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the relevant service must be included;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of personnel roles allocated to this area).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include evidence of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a geographic diversity plan that greatly reduces the risk profile of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the proposed registry by ensuring the continuance of all vital business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>functions (as identified in the applicant’s continuity plan in Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39) in the event of a natural or other disaster at the principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>place of business or point of presence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.

2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes
(1) Evidence of highly developed measures for geo-diversity of operations, with locations and functions to continue all vital business functions in the event of a natural or other disaster at the principal place of business or point of presence; and
(2) A high level of availability, security, and bandwidth.

1 - meets requirements: Response includes
(1) An adequate description of Geographic Diversity that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element;
(2) Plans provide adequate geo-diversity of name servers and operations to continue critical registry functions in the event of a temporary outage at the principal place of business or point of presence;
(3) Geo-diversity plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and
(4) Database capabilities are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and
(5) Demonstrates that an adequate level of resources that are on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function.
A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.

35 DNS Service: describe the configuration and operation of nameservers, including how the applicant will comply with relevant RFCs.

All name servers used for the new gTLD must be operated in compliance with the DNS protocol specifications defined in the relevant RFCs, including but not limited to: 1034, 1035, 1982, 2181, 2182, 2671, 3226, 3596, 3597, 3901, 4343, and 4472.

- Provide details of the intended DNS Service including, but not limited to: A description of the DNS services to be provided, such as query rates to be supported at initial operation, and reserve capacity of the system. Describe how your nameserver update methods will change at various scales. Describe how DNS performance will change at various scales.
- RFCs that will be followed – describe how services are compliant with RFCs and if these are dedicated or shared with any other functions (capacity/performance) or DNS zones.
- The resources used to implement the services - describe complete server hardware and software, including network bandwidth and addressing plans for servers. Also include resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).
- Demonstrate how the system will

Note that the use of DNS wildcard resource records as described in RFC 4592 or any other method or technology for synthesizing DNS resource records or using redirection within the DNS by the registry is prohibited in the Registry Agreement.

Also note that name servers for the new gTLD must comply with IANA Technical requirements for authoritative name servers: http://www.iana.org/procedures/nameserver-requirements.html.

Complete answer demonstrates:
1. adequate description of configurations of nameservers and compliance with respective DNS protocol-related RFCs;
2. a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry;
3. a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section;
4. evidence of compliance with Specification 6 to the Registry Agreement; and
5. evidence of complete knowledge and understanding of requirements for DNS service, one of the five critical registry functions.

1 - meets requirements: Response includes:
1. Adequate description of DNS service that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capability and knowledge required to meet this element;
2. Plans are sufficient to result in compliance with DNS protocols (Specification 6, section 1.1) and required performance specifications Specification 10, Service Level Matrix;
3. Plans are consistent with technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and
4. Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function.

0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 36 | IPv6 Reachability: provide a description of plans for providing IPv6 transport including, but not limited to:  
• How the registry will support IPv6 access to Whois, Web-based Whois and any other Registration Data Publication Service as described in Specification 6 (section 1.5) to the Registry Agreement.  
• How the registry will comply with the requirement in Specification 6 for having at least two nameservers reachable over IPv6.  
• List all services that will be provided over IPv6, and describe the IPv6 connectivity and provider diversity that will be used.  
• Resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages. | N | IANA nameserver requirements are available at [http://www.iana.org/procedures/nameserver-requirements.html](http://www.iana.org/procedures/nameserver-requirements.html) | 0-1 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
(1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements;  
(2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry;  
(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and  
(4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6 to the Registry Agreement. | 1 - meets requirements: Response includes  
(1) Adequate description of IPv6 reachability that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capability and knowledge required to meet this element;  
(2) A description of an adequate implementation plan addressing requirements for IPv6 reachability, indicating IPv6 reachability allowing IPv6 transport in the network over two independent IPv6 capable networks in compliance to IPv4 IANA specifications, and Specification 10;  
(3) IPv6 plans consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and  
(4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed or readily available to carry out this function.  
0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Data Backup Policies &amp; Procedures: provide • details of frequency and procedures for backup of data, • hardware, and systems used for backup, • data format, • data backup features, • backup testing procedures, • procedures for retrieval of data/rebuild of database, • storage controls and procedures, and • resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) detailed backup and retrieval processes deployed; (2) backup and retrieval process and frequency are consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td>1 – meets requirements: Response includes: (1) Adequate description of backup policies and procedures that substantially demonstrate the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) A description of leading practices being or to be followed; (3) Backup procedures consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function. 0 – fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Data Escrow: describe • how the applicant will comply with the data escrow requirements documented in the Registry Data Escrow Specification (Specification 2 of the Registry Agreement); and • resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of data escrow, one of the five critical registry functions; (2) compliance with Specification 2 of the Registry Agreement; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) the escrow arrangement is consistent with the overall business approach and size/scope of the registry.</td>
<td>1 – meets requirements: Response includes: (1) Adequate description of a Data Escrow process that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Data escrow plans are sufficient to result in compliance with the Data Escrow Specification (Specification 2 to the Registry Agreement); (3) Escrow capabilities are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed, or readily available to carry out this function. 0 – fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Registry Continuity: describe how the applicant will comply with registry continuity obligations as described in Specification 6 (section 3) to the registry agreement. This includes conducting registry operations using diverse, redundant servers to ensure continued operation of critical functions in the case of technical failure. Describe resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). The response should include, but is not limited to, the following elements of the business continuity plan: Identification of risks and threats to compliance with registry continuity obligations; Identification and definitions of vital business functions (which may include registry services beyond the five critical registry functions) versus other registry functions and supporting operations and technology; Definitions of Recovery Point Objectives and Recovery Time Objective; and Descriptions of testing plans to promote compliance with relevant obligations. To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include: A highly detailed plan that provides for leading practice levels of availability; and Evidence of concrete steps such as a contract with a backup service provider (in addition to any currently designated service operator) or a maintained hot site. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 15 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>For reference, applicants should review the ICANN gTLD Registry Continuity Plan at <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/registries/continuity/">http://www.icann.org/en/registries/continuity/</a> gtds-registry-continuity-plan-25apr09-en.pdf. A Recovery Point Objective (RPO) refers to the point in time to which data should be recovered following a business disruption or disaster. The RPO allows an organization to define a window of time before a disruption or disaster during which data may be lost and is independent of the time it takes to get a system back on-line. If the RPO of a company is two hours, then when a system is brought back on-line after a disruption/disaster, all data must be restored to a point within two hours before the disaster. A Recovery Time Objective (RTO) is the duration of time within which a process must be restored after a business disruption or disaster to avoid what the entity may deem as unacceptable consequences. For example, pursuant to the draft Registry Agreement DNS service must not be down for longer than 4 hours. At 4 hours ICANN may invoke the use of an Emergency Back End Registry Operator to take over this function. The entity may deem this to be an unacceptable consequence therefore they may set their RTO to be something less than 4 hours and would build continuity plans accordingly. Vital business functions are functions that are critical to the success of the operation. For example, if a registry operator provides an additional service beyond the five critical registry functions, that it deems as central to its TLD, or supports an operation that is central to the TLD, this might be identified as a vital business function.</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) detailed description showing plans for compliance with registry continuity obligations; (2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6 to the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes: (1) Highly developed and detailed processes for maintaining registry continuity; and (2) Evidence of concrete steps, such as a contract with a backup service provider or a maintained hot site. 1 - meets requirements: Response includes: (1) Adequate description of a Registry Continuity plan that substantially demonstrates capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Continuity plans are sufficient to result in compliance with requirements (Specification 6); (3) Continuity plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed readily available to carry out this function. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Registry Transition: provide a Service Migration plan (as described in the Registry Transition Processes) that could be followed in the event of a Registry Transition (as described in the Registry Transition Processes) that could be followed in the event of a</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) Adequate description of a registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | that it becomes necessary to permanently transition the proposed gTLD to a new operator. The plan must take into account, and be consistent with the vital business functions identified in the previous question. Elements of the plan may include, but are not limited to:  
• Preparatory steps needed for the transition of critical registry functions;  
• Monitoring during registry transition and efforts to minimize any interruption to critical registry functions during this time; and  
• Contingency plans in the event that any part of the registry transition is unable to move forward according to the plan.  
A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages. | N | 0-1 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
(1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements;  
(2) a technical plan scope/scale consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and  
(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section. | 1 - meets requirements: Response includes  
(1) An adequate description of a failover testing plan that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element;  
(2) A description of an adequate registry transition plan with an appropriate level of review and analysis of failover testing results;  
(3) Failover testing plan is consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and  
(4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed or readily available to carry out this function. | 0 – fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1. |
| 41 | Failover Testing: provide a description of the failover testing plan, including mandatory annual testing of the plan. Examples may include a description of plans to test failover of data centers or operations to alternate sites, from a hot to a cold facility, registry data escrow testing, or other mechanisms. The plan must take into account and be consistent with the vital business functions identified in Question 39; and resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).  
The failover testing plan should include, but is not limited to, the following elements:  
• Types of testing (e.g., walkthroughs, take-down of sites) and the frequency of testing;  
• How results are captured, what is done | N | | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Monitoring and Fault Escalation Processes: provide</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements; (2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) consistency with the commitments made to registrants and registrars regarding system maintenance.</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes (1) Evidence showing highly developed and detailed fault tolerance/monitoring and redundant systems deployed with real-time monitoring tools / dashboard (metrics) deployed and reviewed regularly; (2) A high level of availability that allows for the ability to respond to faults through a 24x7 response team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include:

- Meeting the fault tolerance / monitoring guidelines described
- Evidence of commitment to provide a 24x7 fault response team.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.

To be eligible for a score of 1, answers must also include:

- Adequate description of monitoring and fault escalation processes that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element;
- Evidence showing adequate fault tolerance/monitoring systems planned with an appropriate level of monitoring and limited periodic review being performed;
- Plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application; and
- Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>DNSSEC: Provide</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td><strong>Complete answer demonstrates:</strong> (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements, one of the five critical registry functions; (2) a technical plan scope and scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) an ability to comply with relevant RFCs.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) An adequate description of DNSSEC that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Evidence that TLD zone files will be signed at time of launch, in compliance with required RFCs, and registry offers provisioning capabilities to accept public key material from registrants through the SRS; (3) An adequate description of key management procedures in the proposed TLD, including providing secure encryption key management (generation, exchange, and storage); (4) Technical plan is consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (5) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are already on hand, committed or readily available to carry out this function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demonstration of Financial Capability

**#** 45  
**Question** Financial Statements: provide  
- audited or independently certified financial statements for the most recently completed fiscal year for the applicant, and  
- audited or unaudited financial statements for the most recently ended interim financial period for the applicant for which this information may be released.  
For newly-formed applicants, or where financial statements are not audited, provide:  
- the latest available unaudited financial statements; and  
- an explanation as to why audited or independently certified financial statements are not available.  
At a minimum, the financial statements should be provided for the legal entity listed as the applicant.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 45 | Optional. IDNs:  
- State whether the proposed registry will support the registration of IDN labels in the TLD, and if so, how. For example, explain which characters will be supported, and provide the associated IDN Tables with variant characters identified, along with a corresponding registration policy. This includes public interfaces to the databases such as Whois and EPP.  
- Describe how the IDN implementation will comply with RFCs 5809-5893 as well as the ICANN IDN Guidelines at [http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm](http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm).  
- Describe resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages plus attachments. | N | IDNs are an optional service at time of launch. Absence of IDN implementation or plans will not detract from an applicant's score. Applicants who respond to this question with plans for implementation of IDNs at time of launch will be scored according to the criteria indicated here. IDN tables should be submitted in a machine-readable format. The model format described in Section 5 of RFC 4290 would be ideal. The format used by RFC 3743 is an acceptable alternative. Variant generation algorithms that are more complex (such as those with contextual rules) and cannot be expressed using these table formats should be specified in a manner that could be re-implemented programmatically by ICANN. Ideally, for any complex table formats, a reference code implementation should be provided in conjunction with a description of the generation rules. | 0-1 | IDNs are an optional service. Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements; (2) a technical plan that is adequately resource and the planned costs detailed in the financial section; (3) consistency with the commitments made to registrants and the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application; (4) issues regarding use of scripts are settled and IDN tables are complete and publicly available; and (5) ability to comply with relevant RFCs. | 1 - meets requirements for this optional element: Response includes  
(1) Adequate description of IDN implementation that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capability and knowledge required to meet this element;  
(2) An adequate description of the IDN procedures, including complete IDN tables, compliance with IDNA/IDN guidelines and RFCs, and periodic monitoring of IDN operations;  
(3) Evidence of ability to resolve rendering and known IDN issues or spoofing attacks;  
(4) IDN plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and  
(5) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed readily available to carry out this function.  
0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial statements are used in the analysis of projections and costs. A complete answer should include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(less than one year), the applicant must submit, at a minimum, pro forma financial statements including all components listed in the question. Where audited or independently certified financial statements are not available, applicant has provided an adequate explanation as to the accounting practices in its jurisdiction and has provided, at a minimum, unaudited financial statements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Projections Template: provide financial projections for costs and funding using Template 1, Most Likely Scenario (attached). Note, if certain services are outsourced, reflect this in the relevant cost section of the template. The template is intended to provide commonality among TLD applications and thereby facilitate the evaluation process. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages in addition to the template.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Applicant has provided a thorough model that demonstrates a sustainable business (even if break-even is not achieved through the first three years of operation). Applicant's description of projections development is sufficient to show due diligence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Costs and capital expenditures: in conjunction with the financial projections template, describe and explain: the expected operating costs and capital expenditures of setting up and operating the proposed registry; any functions to be outsourced, as indicated in the cost section of the template, and the reasons for outsourcing; any significant variances between years in any category of expected costs; and a description of the basis / key assumptions including rationale for the costs provided in the projections template. This may include an</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>This question is based on the template submitted in question 46.</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Costs identified are consistent with the proposed registry services, adequately fund technical requirements, and are consistent with proposed mission/purpose of the registry. Costs projected are reasonable for a registry of size and scope described in the application. Costs identified include the funding costs (interest expenses and fees) related to the continued operations instrument described in Question 50 below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - meets requirements: (1) Financial projections adequately describe the cost, funding and risks for the application (2) Demonstrates resources and plan for sustainable operations; and (3) Financial assumptions about the registry operations, funding and market are identified, explained, and supported. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all of the requirements to score a 1.

2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all of the attributes for a score of 1 and: (1) Estimated costs and assumptions are conservative and consistent with an operation of the registry volume/scope/size as described by the applicant; (2) Estimates are derived from actual examples of previous or existing registry operations or equivalent; and (3) Conservative estimates are based on those experiences and describe a range of anticipated costs and use the high end of those estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>(a) Funding and Revenue: Funding can be derived from several sources (e.g., existing capital or proceeds/revenue from operation of the proposed registry). Describe: i) How existing funds will provide resources for both: a) start-up of operations, and b) ongoing operations; ii) the revenue model including projections for transaction volumes and price (if the applicant does not intend to rely on registration revenue in order to cover the costs of the registry's</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Supporting documentation for this question should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Funding resources are clearly identified and adequately provide for registry cost projections. Sources of capital funding are clearly identified, held apart from other potential uses of those funds and available. The plan for transition of funding sources from available capital to revenue from operations (if applicable) is described.</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all the attributes for a score of 1 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Existing funds (specifically all funds required for start-up) are quantified, on hand, segregated in an account available only to the applicant for purposes of the application only;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) If on-going operations are to be at least partially resourced from existing funds (rather than revenue from on-going operations) that funding is segregated and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>funding, then the plan for transition of funding sources from available capital to revenue from operations is clearly described.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Projections are reasonably aligned with the historical financial statements provided in Question 45.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.

As described in the Applicant Guidebook, the information provided will be considered in light of the entire application and the evaluation criteria. Therefore, this answer should agree with the information provided in Template 1 to: 1) maintain registry operations, 2) provide registry services described above, and 3) satisfy the technical requirements described in the Demonstration of Technical & Operational Capability section. Costs should include both fixed and variable costs.

To be eligible for a score of two points, answers must demonstrate a conservative estimate of costs based on actual examples of previous or existing registry operations with similar approach and projections for growth and costs or equivalent. Attach reference material for such examples.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operation, it must clarify how the funding for the operation will be developed and maintained in a stable and sustainable manner; iii) outside sources of funding (the applicant must, where applicable, provide evidence of the commitment by the party committing the funds). Secured vs unsecured funding should be clearly identified, including associated sources of funding (i.e., different types of funding, level and type of security/collateral, and key items) for each type of funding; iv) Any significant variances between years in any category of funding and revenue; and vi) A description of the basis/key assumptions including rationale for the funding and revenue provided in the projections template. This may include an executive summary or summary outcome of studies, reference data, or other steps taken to develop the responses and validate any assumptions made; and vii) Assurances that funding and revenue projections cited in this application are consistent with other public and private claims made to promote the business and generate support. To be eligible for a score of 2 points, answers must demonstrate: i) A conservative estimate of funding and revenue; and ii) Ongoing operations that are not dependent on projected revenue. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td>A-40</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside sources of funding are documented and verified. Examples of evidence for funding sources include, but are not limited to: • Executed funding agreements; • A letter of credit; • A commitment letter; or • A bank statement. Funding commitments may be conditional on the approval of the application. Sources of capital funding required to sustain registry operations on an on-going basis are identified. The projected revenues are consistent with the size and projected penetration of the target markets. Key assumptions and their rationale are clearly described and address, at a minimum: • Key components of the funding plan and their key terms; and • Price and number of registrations.</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) Assurances provided that materials provided to investors and/or lenders are consistent with the projections and assumptions included in the projections templates;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>(a) Contingency Planning: describe your contingency planning:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify any projected barriers/risks to implementation of the business approach described in the application and how they affect cost, funding, revenue, or timeline in your planning;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify the impact of any particular regulation, law or policy that might impact the Registry Services offering; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe the measures to mitigate the key risks as described in this question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer should include, for each contingency, a clear description of the impact to projected revenue, funding, and costs for the 3-year period presented in Template 1 (Most Likely Scenario).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be eligible for a score of 2 points, answers must demonstrate that action plans and operations are adequately resourced in the existing funding and revenue even if contingencies occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Describe your contingency planning where funding sources are so significantly reduced that material deviations from the implementation model are required. In particular, describe:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• how on-going technical requirements will be met; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• what alternative funding can be reasonably raised at a later time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide an explanation if you do not believe there is any chance of reduced funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score Criteria:***

- **0 - fails requirements:** Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.
- **1 - meets requirements:** (1) Model adequately identifies the key risks (including operational, business, legal, jurisdictional, financial, and other relevant risks); (2) Response gives consideration to probability and resource impact of contingencies identified; and (3) If resources are not available to fund contingencies in the existing plan, funding sources and a plan for obtaining them are identified.
- **2 - exceeds requirements:** Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and:
  (1) Action plans and operations are adequately resourced in the existing funding and revenue plan even if contingencies occur.
  (2) Contingencies and risks are identified, quantified, and included in the cost, revenue, and funding analyses. Action plans are identified in the event contingencies occur. The model is resilient in the event those contingencies occur. Responses address the probability and resource impact of the contingencies identified.

**Scoring Range:**

- **0-2**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete a financial projections template (Template 2, Worst Case Scenario)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages, in addition to the template.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Describe your contingency planning where activity volumes so significantly exceed the high projections that material deviation from the implementation model are required. In particular, how will on-going technical requirements be met?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>(a) Provide a cost estimate for funding critical registry functions on an annual basis, and a rationale for these cost estimates commensurate with the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The critical functions of a registry which must be supported even if an applicant's business and/or funding fails are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) DNS resolution for registered domain names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily DNS queries (e.g., 0-100M, 100M-1B, 1B+), the incremental costs associated with increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Operation of the Shared Registration System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily EPP transactions (e.g., 0-200K, 200K-2M, 2M+), the incremental costs associated with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registrant protection is critical and thus new gTLD applicants are requested to provide evidence indicating that the critical functions will continue to be performed even if the registry fails. Registrant needs are best protected by a clear demonstration that the basic registry functions are sustained for an extended period even in the face of registry failure. Therefore, this section is weighted heavily as a clear, objective measure to protect and serve registrants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The applicant has two tasks associated with adequately making this demonstration of continuity for critical registry functions. First, costs for maintaining critical registrant protection functions are to be estimated (Part a). In evaluating the application, the evaluators will adjudge whether the estimate is reasonable given the systems architecture and overall business approach described elsewhere in the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Continuing Operations Instrument (COI) is invoked by ICANN if necessary to pay for an Emergency Back End Registry Operator (EBERO) to maintain the five critical registry functions for a period of three to five years. Thus, the cost estimates are tied to the cost for a third party to provide the functions, not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents provided are based on an accurate estimate of costs. Documented evidence or detailed plan for ability to fund on-going critical registry functions for registrants for a period of three years in the event of registry failure, default or until a successor operator can be designated. Evidence of financial wherewithal to fund this requirement prior to delegation. This requirement must be met prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figures provided are based on an accurate estimate of costs. Documented evidence or detailed plan for ability to fund on-going critical registry functions for registrants for a period of three years in the event of registry failure, default or until a successor operator can be designated. Evidence of financial wherewithal to fund this requirement prior to delegation. This requirement must be met prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all the attributes for a score of 1 and:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Financial instrument is secured and in place to provide for on-going operations for at least three years in the event of failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: (1) Costs are commensurate with technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (2) Funding is identified and instrument is described to provide for on-going operations of at least three years in the event of failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics.</td>
<td></td>
<td>to the applicant’s actual in-house or subcontracting costs for provision of these functions. Refer to guidelines at <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-23dec11-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-23dec11-en.htm</a> regarding estimation of costs. However, the applicant must provide its own estimates and explanation in response to this question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provision of Whois service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily Whois queries (e.g., 0-100K, 100K-1M, 1M+), the incremental costs associated with increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics for both web-based and port-43 services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Registry data escrow deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider administration, retention, and transfer fees as well as daily deposit (e.g., full or incremental) handling. Costs may vary depending on the size of the files in escrow (i.e., the size of the registry database).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maintenance of a properly signed zone in accordance with DNSSEC requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily DNS queries (e.g., 0-100M, 100M-1B, 1B+); the incremental costs associated with increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics. List the estimated annual cost for each of these functions (specify currency used). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Applicants must provide evidence as to how the funds required for performing these critical registry functions will be available and guaranteed to fund registry operations (for the protection of registrants in the new gTLD) for the</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Second (Part b), methods of securing the funds required to perform these functions for at least three years are to be described by the applicant in accordance with the criteria below. Two types of instruments will fulfill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
minimum of three years following the termination of the Registry Agreement. ICANN has identified two methods to fulfill this requirement:

(i) Irrevocable standby letter of credit (LOC) issued by a reputable financial institution.

- The amount of the LOC must be equal to or greater than the amount required to fund the registry operations specified above for at least three years. In the event of a draw upon the letter of credit, the actual payout would be tied to the cost of running those functions.
- The LOC must name ICANN or its designee as the beneficiary. Any funds paid out would be provided to the designee who is operating the required registry functions.
- The LOC must have a term of at least five years from the delegation of the TLD. The LOC may be structured with an annual expiration date if it contains an evergreen provision providing for annual extensions, without amendment, for an indefinite number of periods until the issuing bank informs the beneficiary of its final expiration or until the beneficiary releases the LOC as evidenced in writing. If the expiration date occurs prior to the fifth anniversary of the delegation of the TLD, applicant will be required to obtain a replacement instrument.
- The LOC must be issued by a reputable financial institution insured at the highest level in its jurisdiction. Documentation should indicate by whom the issuing institution is insured (i.e., as opposed to by whom the institution is rated).
- The LOC will provide that ICANN or its designee shall be unconditionally entitled to a release of funds (full or partial) thereunder upon delivery of written notice by ICANN or its designee.
- Applicant should attach an original copy of the executed letter of credit or a draft of the letter of credit containing the full terms and conditions. If not yet executed, the Applicant will be required to provide ICANN with an original copy of the executed LOC prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement.
- The LOC must contain at least the following required elements:
  - Issuing bank and date of issue.
  - Beneficiary: ICANN / 4676 Admiralty

(ii) One of the other methods to fulfill this requirement. The applicant must identify which of the two methods is being described. The instrument is required to be in place at the time of the execution of the Registry Agreement.

Financial Institution Ratings: The instrument must be issued or held by a financial institution with a rating beginning with “A” (or the equivalent) by any of the following rating agencies: A.M. Best, Dominion Bond Rating Service, Egan-Jones, Fitch Ratings, Kroll Bond Rating Agency, Moody’s, Morningstar, Standard & Poor’s, and Japan Credit Rating Agency.

If an applicant cannot access a financial institution with a rating beginning with “A,” but a branch or subsidiary of such an institution exists in the jurisdiction of the applying entity, then the instrument may be issued by the branch or subsidiary or by a local financial institution with an equivalent or higher rating to the branch or subsidiary.

If an applicant cannot access any such financial institutions, the instrument may be issued by the highest-rated financial institution in the national jurisdiction of the applying entity, if accepted by ICANN.

Execution by ICANN: For any financial instruments that contemplate ICANN being a party, upon the written request of the applicant, ICANN may (but is not obligated to) execute such agreement prior to submission of the applicant's application if the agreement is on terms acceptable to ICANN. ICANN encourages applicants to deliver a written copy of any such agreement (only if it requires ICANN's signature) to ICANN as soon as possible to facilitate ICANN's review. If the financial instrument requires ICANN's signature, then the applicant will receive 3 points for question 50 (for the instrument being "secured and in place") only if ICANN executes the agreement prior to submission of the application. ICANN will determine, in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Way, Suite 330 / Marina del Rey, CA 90292 / US, or its designee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Applicant’s complete name and address.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o LOC identifying number.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Exact amount in USD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Expiry date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Address, procedure, and required forms whereby presentation for payment is to be made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Conditions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partial drawings from the letter of credit may be made provided that such payment shall reduce the amount under the standby letter of credit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All payments must be marked with the issuing bank name and the bank’s standby letter of credit number.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LOC may not be modified, amended, or amplified by reference to any other document, agreement, or instrument.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The LOC is subject to the International Standby Practices (ISP 98) International Chamber of Commerce (Publication No. 590), or to an alternative standard that has been demonstrated to be reasonably equivalent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) A deposit into an irrevocable cash escrow account held by a reputable financial institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The amount of the deposit must be equal to or greater than the amount required to fund registry operations for at least three years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cash is to be held by a third party financial institution which will not allow the funds to be commingled with the Applicant’s operating funds or other funds and may only be accessed by ICANN or its designee if certain conditions are met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The account must be held by a reputable financial institution insured at the highest level in its jurisdiction. Documentation should indicate by whom the issuing institution is insured (i.e., as opposed to by whom the institution is rated).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The escrow agreement relating to the escrow account will provide that ICANN or its designee shall be unconditionally entitled to a release of funds (full or partial) thereunder upon delivery of written notice by ICANN or its designee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The escrow agreement must have a term of its sole discretion, whether to execute and become a party to a financial instrument.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The financial instrument should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of five years from the delegation of the TLD.
- The funds in the deposit escrow account are not considered to be an asset of ICANN.
- Any interest earnings less bank fees are to accrue to the deposit, and will be paid back to the applicant upon liquidation of the account to the extent not used to pay the costs and expenses of maintaining the escrow.
- The deposit plus accrued interest, less any bank fees in respect of the escrow, is to be returned to the applicant if the funds are not used to fund registry functions due to a triggering event or after five years, whichever is greater.
- The Applicant will be required to provide ICANN an explanation as to the amount of the deposit, the institution that will hold the deposit, and the escrow agreement for the account at the time of submitting an application.
- Applicant should attach evidence of deposited funds in the escrow account, or evidence of provisional arrangement for deposit of funds. Evidence of deposited funds and terms of escrow agreement must be provided to ICANN prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement.
Instructions: TLD Applicant – Financial Projections

The application process requires the applicant to submit two cash basis Financial Projections.

The first projection (Template 1) should show the Financial Projections associated with the Most Likely scenario expected. This projection should include the forecasted registration volume, registration fee, and all costs and capital expenditures expected during the start-up period and during the first three years of operations. Template 1 relates to Question 46 (Projections Template) in the application.

We also ask that applicants show as a separate projection (Template 2) the Financial Projections associated with a realistic Worst Case scenario. Template 2 relates to Question 49 (Contingency Planning) in the application.

For each Projection prepared, please include Comments and Notes on the bottom of the projection (in the area provided) to provide those reviewing these projections with information regarding:

1. Assumptions used, significant variances in Operating Cash Flows and Capital Expenditures from year-to-year;
2. How you plan to fund operations;
3. Contingency planning

As you complete Template 1 and Template 2, please reference data points and/or formulas used in your calculations (where appropriate).

Section I – Projected Cash inflows and outflows

Projected Cash Inflows

Lines A and B. Provide the number of forecasted registrations and the registration fee for years 1, 2, and 3. Leave the Start-up column blank. The start-up period is for cash costs and capital expenditures only; there should be no cash projections input to this column.

Line C. Multiply lines A and B to arrive at the Registration Cash Inflow for line C.

Line D. Provide projected cash inflows from any other revenue source for years 1, 2, and 3. For any figures provided on line D, please disclose the source in the Comments/Notes box of Section I. Note, do not include funding in Line D as that is covered in Section VI.

Line E. Add lines C and D to arrive at the total cash inflow.

Projected Operating Cash Outflows

Start up costs - For all line items (F thru L) Please describe the total period of time this start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.
**Line F.** Provide the projected labor costs for marketing, customer support, and technical support for start-up, year 1, year 2, and year 3. Note, other labor costs should be put in line L (Other Costs) and specify the type of labor and associated projected costs in the Comments/Notes box of this section.

**Line G.** Marketing Costs represent the amount spent on advertising, promotions, and other marketing activities. This amount should not include labor costs included in Marketing Labor (line F).

**Lines H through K.** Provide projected costs for facilities, G&A, interests and taxes, and Outsourcing for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Be sure to list the type of activities that are being outsourced. You may combine certain activities from the same provider as long as an appropriate description of the services being combined is listed in the Comments/Notes box.

**Line L.** Provide any other projected operating costs for start-up, year 1, year 2, year 3. Be sure to specify the type of cost in the Comments/Notes box.

**Line M.** Add lines F through L to arrive at the total costs for line M.

**Line N.** Subtract line E from line M to arrive at the projected net operation number for line N.

**Section IIa – Breakout of Fixed and Variable Operating Cash Outflows**

**Line A.** Provide the projected variable operating cash outflows including labor and other costs that are not fixed in nature. Variable operating cash outflows are expenditures that fluctuate in relationship with increases or decreases in production or level of operations.

**Line B.** Provide the projected fixed operating cash outflows. Fixed operating cash outflows are expenditures that do not generally fluctuate in relationship with increases or decreases in production or level of operations. Such costs are generally necessary to be incurred in order to operate the base line operations of the organization or are expected to be incurred based on contractual commitments.

**Line C** – Add lines A and B to arrive at total Fixed and Variable Operating Cash Outflows for line C. This must equal Total Operating Cash Outflows from Section I, Line M.

**Section IIb – Breakout of Critical Registry Function Operating Cash Outflows**

**Lines A – E.** Provide the projected cash outflows for the five critical registry functions. If these functions are outsourced, the component of the outsourcing fee representing these functions must be separately identified and provided. These costs are based on the applicant’s cost to manage these functions and should be calculated separately from the Continued Operations Instrument (COI) for Question 50.

**Line F.** If there are other critical registry functions based on the applicant’s registry business model then the projected cash outflow for this function must be provided with a description added to the Comments/Notes box. This projected cash outflow may also be included in the 3-year reserve.

**Line G.** Add lines A through F to arrive at the Total Critical Registry Function Cash Outflows.
Section III – Projected Capital Expenditures

**Lines A through C.** Provide projected hardware, software, and furniture & equipment capital expenditures for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the *Comments/Notes* box.

**Line D.** Provide any projected capital expenditures as a result of outsourcing. This should be included for start-up and years 1, 2, and 3. Specify the type of expenditure and describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the *Comments/Notes* box of Section III.

**Line E –** Please describe “other” capital expenditures in the *Comments/Notes* box.

**Line F.** Add lines A through E to arrive at the Total Capital Expenditures.

Section IV – Projected Assets & Liabilities

**Lines A through C.** Provide projected cash, account receivables, and other current assets for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. For *Other Current Assets*, specify the type of asset and describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the *Comments/Notes* box.

**Line D.** Add lines A, B, C to arrive at the Total Current Assets.

**Lines E through G.** Provide projected accounts payable, short-term debt, and other current liabilities for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. For *Other Current Liabilities*, specify the type of liability and describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the *Comments/Notes* box.

**Line H.** Add lines E through G to arrive at the total current liabilities.

**Lines I through K.** Provide the projected fixed assets (PP&E), the 3-year reserve, and long-term assets for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the *Comments/Notes* box.

**Line L.** Add lines I through K to arrive at the total long-term assets.

**Line M.** Provide the projected long-term debt for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the *Comments/Notes* box.

Section V – Projected Cash Flow

Cash flow is driven by *Projected Net Operations* (Section I), *Projected Capital Expenditures* (Section III), and *Projected Assets & Liabilities* (Section IV).

**Line A.** Provide the projected net operating cash flows for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the *Comments/Notes* box.
Line B. Provide the projected capital expenditures for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box of Section V.

Lines C through F. Provide the projected change in non-cash current assets, total current liabilities, debt adjustments, and other adjustments for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

Line G. Add lines A through F to arrive at the projected net cash flow for line H.

Section VI – Sources of Funds

Lines A & B. Provide projected funds from debt and equity at start-up. Describe the sources of debt and equity funding as well as the total period of time the start-up is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box. Please also provide evidence the funding (e.g., letter of commitment).

Line C. Add lines A and B to arrive at the total sources of funds for line C.

General Comments – Regarding Assumptions Used, Significant Variances Between Years, etc.

Provide explanations for any significant variances between years (or expected in years beyond the timeframe of the template) in any category of costing or funding.

General Comments – Regarding how the Applicant Plans to Fund Operations

Provide general comments explaining how you will fund operations. Funding should be explained in detail in response to question 48.

General Comments – Regarding Contingencies

Provide general comments to describe your contingency planning. Contingency planning should be explained in detail in response to question 49.
### In local currency (unless noted otherwise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net operating cash flows</strong>&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>405 000</td>
<td>405 000</td>
<td>405 000</td>
<td>405 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term debt</strong>&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-term debt</strong>&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounts payable</strong>&lt;sup&gt;D&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong>&lt;sup&gt;E&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current liabilities</strong>&lt;sup&gt;F&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong>&lt;sup&gt;G&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total equity</strong>&lt;sup&gt;H&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total long-term assets</strong>&lt;sup&gt;I&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong>&lt;sup&gt;J&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Fixed Costs: equals Total Costs less Variable Costs.
- Check that II) C equals I) N.
- Total Critical Function Cash Outflows:
  - Furniture & other equipment have a useful life of 5 years.
  - Furnishings & other equipment have a useful life of 5 years.

**Total Cash Inflows:**

- **Net operating cash inflows**<sup>A</sup> | 405 000 | 405 000 | 405 000 | 405 000 |
- **Change in Non-Cash Current Assets**<sup>B</sup> | 54 000 | 46 000 | 205 079 | 0 |
- **Total Cash Inflows**<sup>C</sup> | 459 000 | 451 000 | 610 079 | 405 000 |

**Total Cash Outflows:**

- **Cost of Goods Sold**<sup>D</sup> | 186 000 | 186 000 | 186 000 | 186 000 |
- **Total Operating Cash Outflows**<sup>E</sup> | 199 700 | 437 000 | 450 800 | 493 260 |
- **Total Critical Function Cash Outflows**<sup>F</sup> | 173 000 | 61 000 | 54 000 | 85 000 |
- **Total Long-term Cash Outflows**<sup>G</sup> | 1 000 000 | 1 000 000 | 1 000 000 | 1 000 000 |

**Total Cash Flow:**

- **Net cash flow for the reporting period**<sup>H</sup> | 20 300 | 20 300 | 20 300 | 20 300 |
- **Change in cash and cash equivalents**<sup>I</sup> | 20 300 | 20 300 | 20 300 | 20 300 |
- **Cash and cash equivalents**<sup>J</sup> | 20 300 | 20 300 | 20 300 | 20 300 |

**Total**

- **Net cash flows for the preceding period**<sup>K</sup> | 20 300 | 20 300 | 20 300 | 20 300 |
- **Total cash flows**<sup>L</sup> | 40 600 | 40 600 | 40 600 | 40 600 |

**Notes:**

- **Projected changes in cash flows are based on expected domains under registration.**
- **The $41k in Start Up Costs represents an offset of the $50k startup costs associated with the survey.**
- **Continued Operations Instrument (COI) for Question 50.**
- **Costs for these functions and should be calculated separately from the Total Critical Function Cash Outflows.**

---

**General Comments (Notes Regarding Assumptions Used, Significant Variances Between Years, etc.):**

- The $41k in Start Up Costs represents an offset of the $50k startup costs associated with the survey.
- Costs for these functions and should be calculated separately from the Total Critical Function Cash Outflows.
- **Check that II) C equals I) N.**
- Fixed Costs: equals Total Costs less Variable Costs.
- **Total Critical Function Cash Outflows:**
  - Furniture & other equipment have a useful life of 5 years.
  - Furnishings & other equipment have a useful life of 5 years.
## Template 1 - Financial Projections: Most Likely

### In local currency (unless noted otherwise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Reference / formula</th>
<th>Start-up Costs</th>
<th>Year-1</th>
<th>Year-2</th>
<th>Year-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Projected Cash inflows and outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Projected registration volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Registrations fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Registrations cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D) Other cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E) Total cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F) Projected operating cash outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G) Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H) Marketing labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I) Customer Support labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J) Technical labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K) Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L) Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M) General &amp; Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O) Intangible and Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P) Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Break out of Fixed and Variable Operating Cash outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Total fixed operating costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Total fixed operating costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Total operating cash outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D) Projected capital expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E) Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F) Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G) Furniture &amp; Other Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H) Total outsourcing capital expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I) Outsourcing capital expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J) Other capital expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K) Total capital expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Projected Assets &amp; Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Accounts receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Other current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D) Total current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E) Accounts payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F) Short-term debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G) Other current liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H) Total current liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I) Fixed Property, Plant &amp; Equipment (PP&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J) 3-year Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K) Other long-term assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L) Total long-term assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Total long-term debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Projected Cash Flow (excl. 3-year Reserve)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Net operating cash flows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Capital expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Change in Non Cash Current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D) Change in Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E) Debt Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F) Other Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G) Projected net cash flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Sources of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Total sources of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Comments (Notes Regarding Assumptions Used, Significant Variance Between Years, etc.)

Comments regarding how the Applicant plans to fund operations:

General Comments regarding contingencies:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Reference / Formula</th>
<th>Startup Costs</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I)</td>
<td>Projected Cash inflows and outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Forecasted registration volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Registration fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Registration cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D) Other cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E) Total Cash Inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F) Projected Operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G) Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H) Marketing Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I) Customer Support Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J) Technical Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K) General &amp; Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L) Interest and Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M) Projected Net Operating Cash Flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N) Break out of Fixed and Variable Operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O) Total Fixed Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P) Total Operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q) Total Operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R) 3-year Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S) Projected Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T) Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U) Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V) Furniture &amp; Other Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W) Outourcing Capital Expenditures, if any (list the type of activities being outsourced)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X) Other Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y) Total Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z) Projected Assets &amp; Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Accounts receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Other current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D) Total Current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E) Accounts payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F) Short-term Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G) Other Current Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H) Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I) Total Property, Plant &amp; Equipment (PP&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J) 3-year Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K) Other Long-term Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L) Total Long-term Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M) Total Long-term Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V)</td>
<td>Projected Cash Flow (excl. 3-year Reserve)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Net operating cash flows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Capital expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Change in Non-Cash Current Assets</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D) Change in Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E) Total Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F) Other Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G) Projected Net Cash Flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI)</td>
<td>Sources of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Total Sources of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Objection Procedures

This module describes two types of mechanisms that may affect an application:

I. The procedure by which ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee may provide GAC Advice on New gTLDs to the ICANN Board of Directors concerning a specific application. This module describes the purpose of this procedure, and how GAC Advice on New gTLDs is considered by the ICANN Board once received.

II. The dispute resolution procedure triggered by a formal objection to an application by a third party. This module describes the purpose of the objection and dispute resolution mechanisms, the grounds for lodging a formal objection to a gTLD application, the general procedures for filing or responding to an objection, and the manner in which dispute resolution proceedings are conducted.

This module also discusses the guiding principles, or standards, that each dispute resolution panel will apply in reaching its expert determination.

All applicants should be aware of the possibility that a formal objection may be filed against any application, and of the procedures and options available in the event of such an objection.

3.1 GAC Advice on New gTLDs

ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee was formed to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN as they relate to concerns of governments, particularly matters where there may be an interaction between ICANN’s policies and various laws and international agreements or where they may affect public policy issues.

The process for GAC Advice on New gTLDs is intended to address applications that are identified by governments to be problematic, e.g., that potentially violate national law or raise sensitivities.

GAC members can raise concerns about any application to the GAC. The GAC as a whole will consider concerns
raised by GAC members, and agree on GAC advice to forward to the ICANN Board of Directors.

The GAC can provide advice on any application. For the Board to be able to consider the GAC advice during the evaluation process, the GAC advice would have to be submitted by the close of the Objection Filing Period (see Module 1).

GAC Advice may take one of the following forms:

I. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

II. The GAC advises ICANN that there are concerns about a particular application “dot-example.” The ICANN Board is expected to enter into dialogue with the GAC to understand the scope of concerns. The ICANN Board is also expected to provide a rationale for its decision.

III. The GAC advises ICANN that an application should not proceed unless remediated. This will raise a strong presumption for the Board that the application should not proceed unless there is a remediation method available in the Guidebook (such as securing the approval of one or more governments), that is implemented by the applicant.

Where GAC Advice on New gTLDs is received by the Board concerning an application, ICANN will publish the Advice and endeavor to notify the relevant applicant(s) promptly. The applicant will have a period of 21 calendar days from the publication date in which to submit a response to the ICANN Board.

ICANN will consider the GAC Advice on New gTLDs as soon as practicable. The Board may consult with independent experts, such as those designated to hear objections in the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure, in cases where the issues raised in the GAC advice are pertinent to one of the subject matter areas of the objection procedures. The receipt of GAC advice will not toll the processing of any application (i.e., an application will not be suspended but will continue through the stages of the application process).
3.2 Public Objection and Dispute Resolution Process

The independent dispute resolution process is designed to protect certain interests and rights. The process provides a path for formal objections during evaluation of the applications. It allows a party with standing to have its objection considered before a panel of qualified experts.

A formal objection can be filed only on four enumerated grounds, as described in this module. A formal objection initiates a dispute resolution proceeding. In filing an application for a gTLD, the applicant agrees to accept the applicability of this gTLD dispute resolution process. Similarly, an objector accepts the applicability of this gTLD dispute resolution process by filing its objection.

As described in section 3.1 above, ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee has a designated process for providing advice to the ICANN Board of Directors on matters affecting public policy issues, and these objection procedures would not be applicable in such a case. The GAC may provide advice on any topic and is not limited to the grounds for objection enumerated in the public objection and dispute resolution process.

3.2.1 Grounds for Objection

A formal objection may be filed on any one of the following four grounds:

**String Confusion Objection** – The applied-for gTLD string is confusingly similar to an existing TLD or to another applied-for gTLD string in the same round of applications.

**Legal Rights Objection** – The applied-for gTLD string infringes the existing legal rights of the objector.

**Limited Public Interest Objection** – The applied-for gTLD string is contrary to generally accepted legal norms of morality and public order that are recognized under principles of international law.

**Community Objection** – There is substantial opposition to the gTLD application from a significant portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.

The rationales for these objection grounds are discussed in the final report of the ICANN policy development process for new gTLDs. For more information on this process, see
3.2.2 Standing to Object

Objectors must satisfy standing requirements to have their objections considered. As part of the dispute proceedings, all objections will be reviewed by a panel of experts designated by the applicable Dispute Resolution Service Provider (DRSP) to determine whether the objector has standing to object. Standing requirements for the four objection grounds are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection ground</th>
<th>Who may object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>String confusion</td>
<td>Existing TLD operator or gTLD applicant in current round. In the case where an IDN ccTLD Fast Track request has been submitted before the public posting of gTLD applications received, and the Fast Track requestor wishes to file a string confusion objection to a gTLD application, the Fast Track requestor will be granted standing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal rights</td>
<td>Rightsholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited public interest</td>
<td>No limitations on who may file – however, subject to a “quick look” designed for early conclusion of frivolous and/or abusive objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Established institution associated with a clearly delineated community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2.1 String Confusion Objection

Two types of entities have standing to object:

- An existing TLD operator may file a string confusion objection to assert string confusion between an applied-for gTLD and the TLD that it currently operates.

- Any gTLD applicant in this application round may file a string confusion objection to assert string confusion between an applied-for gTLD and the gTLD for which it has applied, where string confusion between the two applicants has not already been found in the Initial Evaluation. That is, an applicant does not have standing to object to another application with which it is already in a contention set as a result of the Initial Evaluation.

In the case where an existing TLD operator successfully asserts string confusion with an applicant, the application will be rejected.

In the case where a gTLD applicant successfully asserts string confusion with another applicant, the only possible
outcome is for both applicants to be placed in a contention set and to be referred to a contention resolution procedure (refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures). If an objection by one gTLD applicant to another gTLD application is unsuccessful, the applicants may both move forward in the process without being considered in direct contention with one another.

3.2.2.2 Legal Rights Objection

A rightsholder has standing to file a legal rights objection. The source and documentation of the existing legal rights the objector is claiming (which may include either registered or unregistered trademarks) are infringed by the applied-for gTLD must be included in the filing.

An intergovernmental organization (IGO) is eligible to file a legal rights objection if it meets the criteria for registration of a .INT domain name:

a) An international treaty between or among national governments must have established the organization; and

b) The organization that is established must be widely considered to have independent international legal personality and must be the subject of and governed by international law.

The specialized agencies of the UN and the organizations having observer status at the UN General Assembly are also recognized as meeting the criteria.

3.2.2.3 Limited Public Interest Objection

Anyone may file a Limited Public Interest Objection. Due to the inclusive standing base, however, objectors are subject to a “quick look” procedure designed to identify and eliminate frivolous and/or abusive objections. An objection found to be manifestly unfounded and/or an abuse of the right to object may be dismissed at any time.

A Limited Public Interest objection would be manifestly unfounded if it did not fall within one of the categories that have been defined as the grounds for such an objection (see subsection 3.5.3).

A Limited Public Interest objection that is manifestly unfounded may also be an abuse of the right to object. An objection may be framed to fall within one of the categories and be deemed manifestly unfounded if it

---

1 See also http://www.iana.org/domains/int/policy/.
accepted categories for Limited Public Interest objections, but other facts may clearly show that the objection is abusive. For example, multiple objections filed by the same or related parties against a single applicant may constitute harassment of the applicant, rather than a legitimate defense of legal norms that are recognized under general principles of international law. An objection that attacks the applicant, rather than the applied-for string, could be an abuse of the right to object.  

The quick look is the Panel’s first task, after its appointment by the DRSP and is a review on the merits of the objection. The dismissal of an objection that is manifestly unfounded and/or an abuse of the right to object would be an Expert Determination, rendered in accordance with Article 21 of the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure.

In the case where the quick look review does lead to the dismissal of the objection, the proceedings that normally follow the initial submissions (including payment of the full advance on costs) will not take place, and it is currently contemplated that the filing fee paid by the applicant would be refunded, pursuant to Procedure Article 14(e).

3.2.2.4 Community Objection

Established institutions associated with clearly delineated communities are eligible to file a community objection. The community named by the objector must be a community strongly associated with the applied-for gTLD string in the application that is the subject of the objection. To qualify for standing for a community objection, the objector must prove both of the following:

---

2 The jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights offers specific examples of how the term “manifestly ill-founded” has been interpreted in disputes relating to human rights. Article 35(3) of the European Convention on Human Rights provides: “The Court shall declare inadmissible any individual application submitted under Article 34 which it considers incompatible with the provisions of the Convention or the protocols thereto, manifestly ill-founded, or an abuse of the right of application.” The ECHR renders reasoned decisions on admissibility, pursuant to Article 35 of the Convention. (Its decisions are published on the Court’s website http://www.echr.coe.int.) In some cases, the Court briefly states the facts and the law and then announces its decision, without discussion or analysis. E.g., Decision as to the Admissibility of Application No. 34328/96 by Egbert Peree against the Netherlands (1998). In other cases, the Court reviews the facts and the relevant legal rules in detail, providing an analysis to support its conclusion on the admissibility of an application. Examples of such decisions regarding applications alleging violations of Article 10 of the Convention (freedom of expression) include: Décision sur la recevabilité de la requête no 65831/01 présentée par Roger Garaudy contre la France (2003); Décision sur la recevabilité de la requête no 65297/01 présentée par Eduardo Fernando Alves Costa contre le Portugal (2004).

The jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights also provides examples of the abuse of the right of application being sanctioned, in accordance with ECHR Article 35(3). See, for example, Décision partielle sur la recevabilité de la requête no 61164/00 présentée par Gérard Duringer et autres contre la France et de la requête no 18589/02 contre la France (2003).
It is an established institution - Factors that may be considered in making this determination include, but are not limited to:

- Level of global recognition of the institution;
- Length of time the institution has been in existence; and
- Public historical evidence of its existence, such as the presence of a formal charter or national or international registration, or validation by a government, inter-governmental organization, or treaty. The institution must not have been established solely in conjunction with the gTLD application process.

It has an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community - Factors that may be considered in making this determination include, but are not limited to:

- The presence of mechanisms for participation in activities, membership, and leadership;
- Institutional purpose related to the benefit of the associated community;
- Performance of regular activities that benefit the associated community; and
- The level of formal boundaries around the community.

The panel will perform a balancing of the factors listed above, as well as other relevant information, in making its determination. It is not expected that an objector must demonstrate satisfaction of each and every factor considered in order to satisfy the standing requirements.

3.2.3 Dispute Resolution Service Providers

To trigger a dispute resolution proceeding, an objection must be filed by the posted deadline date, directly with the appropriate DRSP for each objection ground.

- The International Centre for Dispute Resolution has agreed to administer disputes brought pursuant to string confusion objections.
- The Arbitration and Mediation Center of the World Intellectual Property Organization has agreed to administer disputes brought pursuant to legal rights objections.
The International Center of Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce has agreed to administer disputes brought pursuant to Limited Public Interest and Community Objections.

ICANN selected DRSPs on the basis of their relevant experience and expertise, as well as their willingness and ability to administer dispute proceedings in the new gTLD Program. The selection process began with a public call for expressions of interest followed by dialogue with those candidates who responded. The call for expressions of interest specified several criteria for providers, including established services, subject matter expertise, global capacity, and operational capabilities. An important aspect of the selection process was the ability to recruit panelists who will engender the respect of the parties to the dispute.

3.2.4 Options in the Event of Objection

Applicants whose applications are the subject of an objection have the following options:

The applicant can work to reach a settlement with the objector, resulting in withdrawal of the objection or the application;

The applicant can file a response to the objection and enter the dispute resolution process (refer to Section 3.2); or

The applicant can withdraw, in which case the objector will prevail by default and the application will not proceed further.

If for any reason the applicant does not file a response to an objection, the objector will prevail by default.

3.2.5 Independent Objector

A formal objection to a gTLD application may also be filed by the Independent Objector (IO). The IO does not act on behalf of any particular persons or entities, but acts solely in the best interests of the public who use the global Internet.

In light of this public interest goal, the Independent Objector is limited to filing objections on the grounds of Limited Public Interest and Community.

---

Neither ICANN staff nor the ICANN Board of Directors has authority to direct or require the IO to file or not file any particular objection. If the IO determines that an objection should be filed, he or she will initiate and prosecute the objection in the public interest.

**Mandate and Scope** - The IO may file objections against “highly objectionable” gTLD applications to which no objection has been filed. The IO is limited to filing two types of objections: (1) Limited Public Interest objections and (2) Community objections. The IO is granted standing to file objections on these enumerated grounds, notwithstanding the regular standing requirements for such objections (see subsection 3.1.2).

The IO may file a Limited Public Interest objection against an application even if a Community objection has been filed, and vice versa.

The IO may file an objection against an application, notwithstanding the fact that a String Confusion objection or a Legal Rights objection was filed.

Absent extraordinary circumstances, the IO is not permitted to file an objection to an application where an objection has already been filed on the same ground.

The IO may consider public comment when making an independent assessment whether an objection is warranted. The IO will have access to application comments received during the comment period.

In light of the public interest goal noted above, the IO shall not object to an application unless at least one comment in opposition to the application is made in the public sphere.

**Selection** - The IO will be selected by ICANN, through an open and transparent process, and retained as an independent consultant. The Independent Objector will be an individual with considerable experience and respect in the Internet community, unaffiliated with any gTLD applicant.

Although recommendations for IO candidates from the community are welcomed, the IO must be and remain independent and unaffiliated with any of the gTLD applicants. The various rules of ethics for judges and international arbitrators provide models for the IO to declare and maintain his/her independence.
The IO’s (renewable) tenure is limited to the time necessary to carry out his/her duties in connection with a single round of gTLD applications.

**Budget and Funding** - The IO’s budget would comprise two principal elements: (a) salaries and operating expenses, and (b) dispute resolution procedure costs – both of which should be funded from the proceeds of new gTLD applications.

As an objector in dispute resolution proceedings, the IO is required to pay filing and administrative fees, as well as advance payment of costs, just as all other objectors are required to do. Those payments will be refunded by the DRSP in cases where the IO is the prevailing party.

In addition, the IO will incur various expenses in presenting objections before DRSP panels that will not be refunded, regardless of the outcome. These expenses include the fees and expenses of outside counsel (if retained) and the costs of legal research or factual investigations.

### 3.3 Filing Procedures

The information included in this section provides a summary of procedures for filing:

- Objections; and
- Responses to objections.

For a comprehensive statement of filing requirements applicable generally, refer to the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (“Procedure”) included as an attachment to this module. In the event of any discrepancy between the information presented in this module and the Procedure, the Procedure shall prevail.

Note that the rules and procedures of each DRSP specific to each objection ground must also be followed. See [http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/objection-dispute-resolution](http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/objection-dispute-resolution).

#### 3.3.1 Objection Filing Procedures

The procedures outlined in this subsection must be followed by any party wishing to file a formal objection to an application that has been posted by ICANN. Should an applicant wish to file a formal objection to another gTLD application, it would follow these same procedures.

- All objections must be filed electronically with the appropriate DRSP by the posted deadline date.
Objections will not be accepted by the DRSPs after this date.

- All objections must be filed in English.
- Each objection must be filed separately. An objector wishing to object to several applications must file a separate objection and pay the accompanying filing fees for each application that is the subject of an objection. If an objector wishes to object to an application on more than one ground, the objector must file separate objections and pay the accompanying filing fees for each objection ground.

Each objection filed by an objector must include:

- The name and contact information of the objector.
- A statement of the objector’s basis for standing; that is, why the objector believes it meets the standing requirements to object.
- A description of the basis for the objection, including:
  - A statement giving the specific ground upon which the objection is being filed.
  - A detailed explanation of the validity of the objection and why it should be upheld.
- Copies of any documents that the objector considers to be a basis for the objection.

Objections are limited to 5000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments.

An objector must provide copies of all submissions to the DRSP associated with the objection proceedings to the applicant.

The DRSP will publish, and regularly update a list on its website identifying all objections as they are filed. ICANN will post on its website a notice of all objections filed once the objection filing period has closed.

3.3.2 Objection Filing Fees

At the time an objection is filed, the objector is required to pay a filing fee in the amount set and published by the relevant DRSP. If the filing fee is not paid, the DRSP will
dismiss the objection without prejudice. See Section 1.5 of Module 1 regarding fees.

Funding from ICANN for objection filing fees, as well as for advance payment of costs (see subsection 3.4.7 below) is available to the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC). Funding for ALAC objection filing and dispute resolution fees is contingent on publication by ALAC of its approved process for considering and making objections. At a minimum, the process for objecting to a gTLD application will require: bottom-up development of potential objections, discussion and approval of objections at the Regional At-Large Organization (RALO) level, and a process for consideration and approval of the objection by the At-Large Advisory Committee.

Funding from ICANN for objection filing fees, as well as for advance payment of costs, is available to individual national governments in the amount of USD 50,000 with the guarantee that a minimum of one objection per government will be fully funded by ICANN where requested. ICANN will develop a procedure for application and disbursement of funds.

Funding available from ICANN is to cover costs payable to the dispute resolution service provider and made directly to the dispute resolution service provider; it does not cover other costs such as fees for legal advice.

### 3.3.3 Response Filing Procedures

Upon notification that ICANN has published the list of all objections filed (refer to subsection 3.3.1), the DRSPs will notify the parties that responses must be filed within 30 calendar days of receipt of that notice. DRSPs will not accept late responses. Any applicant that fails to respond to an objection within the 30-day response period will be in default, which will result in the objector prevailing.

- All responses must be filed in English.
- Each response must be filed separately. That is, an applicant responding to several objections must file a separate response and pay the accompanying filing fee to respond to each objection.
- Responses must be filed electronically.

Each response filed by an applicant must include:

- The name and contact information of the applicant.
• A point-by-point response to the claims made by the objector.

• Any copies of documents that it considers to be a basis for the response.

Responses are limited to 5000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments.

Each applicant must provide copies of all submissions to the DRSP associated with the objection proceedings to the objector.

3.3.4 Response Filing Fees

At the time an applicant files its response, it is required to pay a filing fee in the amount set and published by the relevant DRSP, which will be the same as the filing fee paid by the objector. If the filing fee is not paid, the response will be disregarded, which will result in the objector prevailing.

3.4 Objection Processing Overview

The information below provides an overview of the process by which DRSPs administer dispute proceedings that have been initiated. For comprehensive information, please refer to the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (included as an attachment to this module).

3.4.1 Administrative Review

Each DRSP will conduct an administrative review of each objection for compliance with all procedural rules within 14 calendar days of receiving the objection. Depending on the number of objections received, the DRSP may ask ICANN for a short extension of this deadline.

If the DRSP finds that the objection complies with procedural rules, the objection will be deemed filed, and the proceedings will continue. If the DRSP finds that the objection does not comply with procedural rules, the DRSP will dismiss the objection and close the proceedings without prejudice to the objector’s right to submit a new objection that complies with procedural rules. The DRSP’s review or rejection of the objection will not interrupt the time limit for filing an objection.

3.4.2 Consolidation of Objections

Once the DRSP receives and processes all objections, at its discretion the DRSP may elect to consolidate certain objections. The DRSP shall endeavor to decide upon
consolidation prior to issuing its notice to applicants that the response should be filed and, where appropriate, shall inform the parties of the consolidation in that notice.

An example of a circumstance in which consolidation might occur is multiple objections to the same application based on the same ground.

In assessing whether to consolidate objections, the DRSP will weigh the efficiencies in time, money, effort, and consistency that may be gained by consolidation against the prejudice or inconvenience consolidation may cause. The DRSPs will endeavor to have all objections resolved on a similar timeline. It is intended that no sequencing of objections will be established.

New gTLD applicants and objectors also will be permitted to propose consolidation of objections, but it will be at the DRSP’s discretion whether to agree to the proposal.

ICANN continues to strongly encourage all of the DRSPs to consolidate matters whenever practicable.

3.4.3 Mediation

The parties to a dispute resolution proceeding are encouraged—but not required—to participate in mediation aimed at settling the dispute. Each DRSP has experts who can be retained as mediators to facilitate this process, should the parties elect to do so, and the DRSPs will communicate with the parties concerning this option and any associated fees.

If a mediator is appointed, that person may not serve on the panel constituted to issue an expert determination in the related dispute.

There are no automatic extensions of time associated with the conduct of negotiations or mediation. The parties may submit joint requests for extensions of time to the DRSP according to its procedures, and the DRSP or the panel, if appointed, will decide whether to grant the requests, although extensions will be discouraged. Absent exceptional circumstances, the parties must limit their requests for extension to 30 calendar days.

The parties are free to negotiate without mediation at any time, or to engage a mutually acceptable mediator of their own accord.
3.4.4 Selection of Expert Panels

A panel will consist of appropriately qualified experts appointed to each proceeding by the designated DRSP. Experts must be independent of the parties to a dispute resolution proceeding. Each DRSP will follow its adopted procedures for requiring such independence, including procedures for challenging and replacing an expert for lack of independence.

There will be one expert in proceedings involving a string confusion objection.

There will be one expert, or, if all parties agree, three experts with relevant experience in intellectual property rights disputes in proceedings involving an existing legal rights objection.

There will be three experts recognized as eminent jurists of international reputation, with expertise in relevant fields as appropriate, in proceedings involving a Limited Public Interest objection.

There will be one expert in proceedings involving a community objection.

Neither the experts, the DRSP, ICANN, nor their respective employees, directors, or consultants will be liable to any party in any action for damages or injunctive relief for any act or omission in connection with any proceeding under the dispute resolution procedures.

3.4.5 Adjudication

The panel may decide whether the parties shall submit any written statements in addition to the filed objection and response, and may specify time limits for such submissions.

In order to achieve the goal of resolving disputes rapidly and at reasonable cost, procedures for the production of documents shall be limited. In exceptional cases, the panel may require a party to produce additional evidence.

Disputes will usually be resolved without an in-person hearing. The panel may decide to hold such a hearing only in extraordinary circumstances.

3.4.6 Expert Determination

The DRSPs’ final expert determinations will be in writing and will include:

- A summary of the dispute and findings;
• An identification of the prevailing party; and
• The reasoning upon which the expert determination is based.

Unless the panel decides otherwise, each DRSP will publish all decisions rendered by its panels in full on its website.

The findings of the panel will be considered an expert determination and advice that ICANN will accept within the dispute resolution process.

3.4.7 Dispute Resolution Costs

Before acceptance of objections, each DRSP will publish a schedule of costs or statement of how costs will be calculated for the proceedings that it administers under this procedure. These costs cover the fees and expenses of the members of the panel and the DRSP's administrative costs.

ICANN expects that string confusion and legal rights objection proceedings will involve a fixed amount charged by the panelists while Limited Public Interest and community objection proceedings will involve hourly rates charged by the panelists.

Within ten (10) calendar days of constituting the panel, the DRSP will estimate the total costs and request advance payment in full of its costs from both the objector and the applicant. Each party must make its advance payment within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the DRSP’s request for payment and submit to the DRSP evidence of such payment. The respective filing fees paid by the parties will be credited against the amounts due for this advance payment of costs.

The DRSP may revise its estimate of the total costs and request additional advance payments from the parties during the resolution proceedings.

Additional fees may be required in specific circumstances; for example, if the DRSP receives supplemental submissions or elects to hold a hearing.

If an objector fails to pay these costs in advance, the DRSP will dismiss its objection and no fees paid by the objector will be refunded.

If an applicant fails to pay these costs in advance, the DRSP will sustain the objection and no fees paid by the applicant will be refunded.
After the hearing has taken place and the panel renders its expert determination, the DRSP will refund the advance payment of costs to the prevailing party.

3.5 **Dispute Resolution Principles (Standards)**

Each panel will use appropriate general principles (standards) to evaluate the merits of each objection. The principles for adjudication on each type of objection are specified in the paragraphs that follow. The panel may also refer to other relevant rules of international law in connection with the standards.

The objector bears the burden of proof in each case.

The principles outlined below are subject to evolution based on ongoing consultation with DRSPs, legal experts, and the public.

3.5.1 **String Confusion Objection**

A DRSP panel hearing a string confusion objection will consider whether the applied-for gTLD string is likely to result in string confusion. String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. For a likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user. Mere association, in the sense that the string brings another string to mind, is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion.

3.5.2 **Legal Rights Objection**

In interpreting and giving meaning to GNSO Recommendation 3 (“Strings must not infringe the existing legal rights of others that are recognized or enforceable under generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law”), a DRSP panel of experts presiding over a legal rights objection will determine whether the potential use of the applied-for gTLD by the applicant takes unfair advantage of the distinctive character or the reputation of the objector’s registered or unregistered trademark or service mark (“mark”) or IGO name or acronym (as identified in the treaty establishing the organization), or unjustifiably impairs the distinctive character or the reputation of the objector’s mark or IGO name or acronym, or otherwise creates an impermissible likelihood of confusion between the applied-for gTLD and the objector’s mark or IGO name or acronym.
In the case where the objection is based on trademark rights, the panel will consider the following non-exclusive factors:

1. Whether the applied-for gTLD is identical or similar, including in appearance, phonetic sound, or meaning, to the objector’s existing mark.

2. Whether the objector’s acquisition and use of rights in the mark has been bona fide.

3. Whether and to what extent there is recognition in the relevant sector of the public of the sign corresponding to the gTLD, as the mark of the objector, of the applicant or of a third party.

4. Applicant’s intent in applying for the gTLD, including whether the applicant, at the time of application for the gTLD, had knowledge of the objector’s mark, or could not have reasonably been unaware of that mark, and including whether the applicant has engaged in a pattern of conduct whereby it applied for or operates TLDs or registrations in TLDs which are identical or confusingly similar to the marks of others.

5. Whether and to what extent the applicant has used, or has made demonstrable preparations to use, the sign corresponding to the gTLD in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a bona fide provision of information in a way that does not interfere with the legitimate exercise by the objector of its mark rights.

6. Whether the applicant has marks or other intellectual property rights in the sign corresponding to the gTLD, and, if so, whether any acquisition of such a right in the sign, and use of the sign, has been bona fide, and whether the purported or likely use of the gTLD by the applicant is consistent with such acquisition or use.

7. Whether and to what extent the applicant has been commonly known by the sign corresponding to the gTLD, and if so, whether any purported or likely use of the gTLD by the applicant is consistent therewith and bona fide.

8. Whether the applicant’s intended use of the gTLD would create a likelihood of confusion with the objector’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the gTLD.
In the case where a legal rights objection has been filed by an IGO, the panel will consider the following non-exclusive factors:

1. Whether the applied-for gTLD is identical or similar, including in appearance, phonetic sound or meaning, to the name or acronym of the objecting IGO;

2. Historical coexistence of the IGO and the applicant’s use of a similar name or acronym. Factors considered may include:
   a. Level of global recognition of both entities;
   b. Length of time the entities have been in existence;
   c. Public historical evidence of their existence, which may include whether the objecting IGO has communicated its name or abbreviation under Article 6ter of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.

3. Whether and to what extent the applicant has used, or has made demonstrable preparations to use, the sign corresponding to the TLD in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a bona fide provision of information in a way that does not interfere with the legitimate exercise of the objecting IGO’s name or acronym;

4. Whether and to what extent the applicant has been commonly known by the sign corresponding to the applied-for gTLD, and if so, whether any purported or likely use of the gTLD by the applicant is consistent therewith and bona fide; and

5. Whether the applicant’s intended use of the applied-for gTLD would create a likelihood of confusion with the objecting IGO’s name or acronym as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the TLD.

3.5.3 Limited Public Interest Objection

An expert panel hearing a Limited Public Interest objection will consider whether the applied-for gTLD string is contrary to general principles of international law for morality and public order.

Examples of instruments containing such general principles include:

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)
• The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
• The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)
• The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
• Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women
• The International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights
• The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
• The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families
• Slavery Convention
• Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide
• Convention on the Rights of the Child

Note that these are included to serve as examples, rather than an exhaustive list. It should be noted that these instruments vary in their ratification status. Additionally, states may limit the scope of certain provisions through reservations and declarations indicating how they will interpret and apply certain provisions. National laws not based on principles of international law are not a valid ground for a Limited Public Interest objection.

Under these principles, everyone has the right to freedom of expression, but the exercise of this right carries with it special duties and responsibilities. Accordingly, certain limited restrictions may apply.

The grounds upon which an applied-for gTLD string may be considered contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order that are recognized under principles of international law are:

• Incitement to or promotion of violent lawless action;
• Incitement to or promotion of discrimination based upon race, color, gender, ethnicity, religion or national origin, or other similar types of
discrimination that violate generally accepted legal norms recognized under principles of international law;

- Incitement to or promotion of child pornography or other sexual abuse of children; or

- A determination that an applied-for gTLD string would be contrary to specific principles of international law as reflected in relevant international instruments of law.

The panel will conduct its analysis on the basis of the applied-for gTLD string itself. The panel may, if needed, use as additional context the intended purpose of the TLD as stated in the application.

3.5.4 Community Objection

The four tests described here will enable a DRSP panel to determine whether there is substantial opposition from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be targeted. For an objection to be successful, the objector must prove that:

- The community invoked by the objector is a clearly delineated community; and

- Community opposition to the application is substantial; and

- There is a strong association between the community invoked and the applied-for gTLD string; and

- The application creates a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. Each of these tests is described in further detail below.

Community – The objector must prove that the community expressing opposition can be regarded as a clearly delineated community. A panel could balance a number of factors to determine this, including but not limited to:

- The level of public recognition of the group as a community at a local and/or global level;

- The level of formal boundaries around the community and what persons or entities are considered to form the community;
• The length of time the community has been in existence;
• The global distribution of the community (this may not apply if the community is territorial); and
• The number of people or entities that make up the community.

If opposition by a number of people/entities is found, but the group represented by the objector is not determined to be a clearly delineated community, the objection will fail.

**Substantial Opposition** - The objector must prove substantial opposition within the community it has identified itself as representing. A panel could balance a number of factors to determine whether there is substantial opposition, including but not limited to:

• Number of expressions of opposition relative to the composition of the community;
• The representative nature of entities expressing opposition;
• Level of recognized stature or weight among sources of opposition;
• Distribution or diversity among sources of expressions of opposition, including:
  • Regional
  • Subsectors of community
  • Leadership of community
  • Membership of community
• Historical defense of the community in other contexts; and
• Costs incurred by objector in expressing opposition, including other channels the objector may have used to convey opposition.

If some opposition within the community is determined, but it does not meet the standard of substantial opposition, the objection will fail.

**Targeting** - The objector must prove a strong association between the applied-for gTLD string and the community represented by the objector. Factors that could be
balanced by a panel to determine this include but are not limited to:

- Statements contained in application;
- Other public statements by the applicant;
- Associations by the public.

If opposition by a community is determined, but there is no strong association between the community and the applied-for gTLD string, the objection will fail.

**Detriment** - The objector must prove that the application creates a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. An allegation of detriment that consists only of the applicant being delegated the string instead of the objector will not be sufficient for a finding of material detriment.

Factors that could be used by a panel in making this determination include but are not limited to:

- Nature and extent of damage to the reputation of the community represented by the objector that would result from the applicant's operation of the applied-for gTLD string;
- Evidence that the applicant is not acting or does not intend to act in accordance with the interests of the community or of users more widely, including evidence that the applicant has not proposed or does not intend to institute effective security protection for user interests;
- Interference with the core activities of the community that would result from the applicant's operation of the applied-for gTLD string;
- Dependence of the community represented by the objector on the DNS for its core activities;
- Nature and extent of concrete or economic damage to the community represented by the objector that would result from the applicant's operation of the applied-for gTLD string; and
- Level of certainty that alleged detrimental outcomes would occur.
If opposition by a community is determined, but there is no likelihood of material detriment to the targeted community resulting from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD, the objection will fail.

The objector must meet all four tests in the standard for the objection to prevail.
These Procedures were designed with an eye toward timely and efficient dispute resolution. As part of the New gTLD Program, these Procedures apply to all proceedings administered by each of the dispute resolution service providers (DRSP). Each of the DRSPs has a specific set of rules that will also apply to such proceedings.
NEW gTLD DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

Article 1. ICANN’s New gTLD Program

(a) The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") has implemented a program for the introduction of new generic Top-Level Domain Names ("gTLDs") in the internet. There will be a succession of rounds, during which applicants may apply for new gTLDs, in accordance with terms and conditions set by ICANN.

(b) The new gTLD program includes a dispute resolution procedure, pursuant to which disputes between a person or entity who applies for a new gTLD and a person or entity who objects to that gTLD are resolved in accordance with this New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (the “Procedure”).

(c) Dispute resolution proceedings shall be administered by a Dispute Resolution Service Provider (“DRSP”) in accordance with this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).

(d) By applying for a new gTLD, an applicant accepts the applicability of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP’s Rules that are identified in Article 4(b); by filing an objection to a new gTLD, an objector accepts the applicability of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP’s Rules that are identified in Article 4(b). The parties cannot derogate from this Procedure without the express approval of ICANN and from the applicable DRSP Rules without the express approval of the relevant DRSP.

Article 2. Definitions

(a) The “Applicant” or “Respondent” is an entity that has applied to ICANN for a new gTLD and that will be the party responding to the Objection.

(b) The “Objector” is one or more persons or entities who have filed an objection against a new gTLD for which an application has been submitted.

(c) The “Panel” is the panel of Experts, comprising one or three “Experts,” that has been constituted by a DRSP in accordance with this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).

(d) The “Expert Determination” is the decision upon the merits of the Objection that is rendered by a Panel in a proceeding conducted under this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).

(e) The grounds upon which an objection to a new gTLD may be filed are set out in full in Module 3 of the Applicant Guidebook. Such grounds are identified in this Procedure, and are based upon the Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains, dated 7 August 2007, issued by the ICANN Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), as follows:

(i) “String Confusion Objection” refers to the objection that the string comprising the potential gTLD is confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain or another string applied for in the same round of applications.

(ii) “Existing Legal Rights Objection” refers to the objection that the string comprising the potential new gTLD infringes the existing legal rights of others.
that are recognized or enforceable under generally accepted and
internationally recognized principles of law.

(iii) “Limited Public Interest Objection” refers to the objection that the string
comprising the potential new gTLD is contrary to generally accepted legal
norms relating to morality and public order that are recognized under
principles of international law.

(iv) “Community Objection” refers to the objection that there is substantial
opposition to the application from a significant portion of the community to
which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.

(f) “DRSP Rules” are the rules of procedure of a particular DRSP that have been identified
as being applicable to objection proceedings under this Procedure.

Article 3. Dispute Resolution Service Providers

The various categories of disputes shall be administered by the following DRSPs:

(a) String Confusion Objections shall be administered by the International Centre for
Dispute Resolution.

(b) Existing Legal Rights Objections shall be administered by the Arbitration and Mediation
Center of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

(c) Limited Public Interest Objections shall be administered by the International Centre for
Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.

(d) Community Objections shall be administered by the International Centre for Expertise
of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Article 4. Applicable Rules

(a) All proceedings before the Panel shall be governed by this Procedure and by the DRSP
Rules that apply to a particular category of objection. The outcome of the
proceedings shall be deemed an Expert Determination, and the members of the
Panel shall act as experts.

(b) The applicable DRSP Rules are the following:

(i) For a String Confusion Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the ICDR
Supplementary Procedures for ICANN’s New gTLD Program.

(ii) For an Existing Legal Rights Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the WIPO
Rules for New gTLD Dispute Resolution.

(iii) For a Limited Public Interest Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the Rules
for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), as
supplemented by the ICC as needed.

(iv) For a Community Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the Rules for
Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), as supplemented
by the ICC as needed.

(c) In the event of any discrepancy between this Procedure and the applicable DRSP
Rules, this Procedure shall prevail.
(d) The place of the proceedings, if relevant, shall be the location of the DRSP that is administering the proceedings.

(e) In all cases, the Panel shall ensure that the parties are treated with equality, and that each party is given a reasonable opportunity to present its position.

Article 5. Language

(a) The language of all submissions and proceedings under this Procedure shall be English.

(b) Parties may submit supporting evidence in its original language, provided and subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, that such evidence is accompanied by a certified or otherwise official English translation of all relevant text.

Article 6. Communications and Time Limits

(a) All communications by the Parties with the DRSPs and Panels must be submitted electronically. A Party that wishes to make a submission that is not available in electronic form (e.g., evidentiary models) shall request leave from the Panel to do so, and the Panel, in its sole discretion, shall determine whether to accept the non-electronic submission.

(b) The DRSP, Panel, Applicant, and Objector shall provide copies to one another of all correspondence (apart from confidential correspondence between the Panel and the DRSP and among the Panel) regarding the proceedings.

(c) For the purpose of determining the date of commencement of a time limit, a notice or other communication shall be deemed to have been received on the day that it is transmitted in accordance with paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article.

(d) For the purpose of determining compliance with a time limit, a notice or other communication shall be deemed to have been sent, made or transmitted if it is dispatched in accordance with paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article prior to or on the day of the expiration of the time limit.

(e) For the purpose of calculating a period of time under this Procedure, such period shall begin to run on the day following the day when a notice or other communication is received.

(f) Unless otherwise stated, all time periods provided in the Procedure are calculated on the basis of calendar days.

Article 7. Filing of the Objection

(a) A person wishing to object to a new gTLD for which an application has been submitted may file an objection (“Objection”). Any Objection to a proposed new gTLD must be filed before the published closing date for the Objection Filing period.

(b) The Objection must be filed with the appropriate DRSP, using a model form made available by that DRSP, with copies to ICANN and the Applicant.

(c) The electronic addresses for filing Objections (the specific addresses shall be made available once they are created by providers):

(i) A String Confusion Objection must be filed at: [●].
(ii) An Existing Legal Rights Objection must be filed at: [●].

(iii) A Limited Public Interest Objection must be filed at: [●].

(iv) A Community Objection must be filed at: [●].

(d) All Objections must be filed separately:

(i) An Objector who wishes to object to an application on more than one ground must file separate objections with the appropriate DRSP(s).

(ii) An Objector who wishes to object to more than one gTLD must file separate objections to each gTLD with the appropriate DRSP(s).

(e) If an Objection is filed with the wrong DRSP, that DRSP shall promptly notify the Objector of the error and that DRSP shall not process the incorrectly filed Objection. The Objector may then cure the error by filing its Objection with the correct DRSP within seven (7) days of receipt of the error notice, failing which the Objection shall be disregarded. If the Objection is filed with the correct DRSP within seven (7) days of receipt of the error notice but after the lapse of the time for submitting an Objection stipulation by Article 7(a) of this Procedure, it shall be deemed to be within this time limit.

Article 8. Content of the Objection

(a) The Objection shall contain, inter alia, the following information:

(i) The names and contact information (address, telephone number, email address, etc.) of the Objector;

(ii) A statement of the Objector's basis for standing; and

(iii) A description of the basis for the Objection, including:

(aa) A statement of the ground upon which the Objection is being filed, as stated in Article 2(e) of this Procedure;

(bb) An explanation of the validity of the Objection and why the objection should be upheld.

(b) The substantive portion of the Objection shall be limited to 5,000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments. The Objector shall also describe and provide copies of any supporting or official documents upon which the Objection is based.

(c) At the same time as the Objection is filed, the Objector shall pay a filing fee in the amount set in accordance with the applicable DRSP Rules and include evidence of such payment in the Objection. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within ten (10) days of the receipt of the Objection by the DRSP, the Objection shall be dismissed without prejudice.

Article 9. Administrative Review of the Objection

(a) The DRSP shall conduct an administrative review of the Objection for the purpose of verifying compliance with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, and inform the Objector, the Applicant and ICANN of the result of its review within
fourteen (14) days of its receipt of the Objection. The DRSP may extend this time limit for reasons explained in the notification of such extension.

(b) If the DRSP finds that the Objection complies with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, the DRSP shall confirm that the Objection shall be registered for processing.

(c) If the DRSP finds that the Objection does not comply with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, the DRSP shall have the discretion to request that any administrative deficiencies in the Objection be corrected within five (5) days. If the deficiencies in the Objection are cured within the specified period but after the lapse of the time limit for submitting an Objection stipulated by Article 7(a) of this Procedure, the Objection shall be deemed to be within this time limit.

(d) If the DRSP finds that the Objection does not comply with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, and the deficiencies in the Objection are not corrected within the period specified in Article 9(c), the DRSP shall dismiss the Objection and close the proceedings, without prejudice to the Objector's submission of a new Objection that complies with this Procedure, provided that the Objection is filed within the deadline for filing such Objections. The DRSP’s review of the Objection shall not interrupt the running of the time limit for submitting an Objection stipulated by Article 7(a) of this Procedure.

(e) Immediately upon registering an Objection for processing, pursuant to Article 9(b), the DRSP shall post the following information about the Objection on its website: (i) the proposed string to which the Objection is directed; (ii) the names of the Objector and the Applicant; (ii) the grounds for the Objection; and (iv) the dates of the DRSP’s receipt of the Objection.

Article 10. ICANN’s Dispute Announcement

(a) Within thirty (30) days of the deadline for filing Objections in relation to gTLD applications in a given round, ICANN shall publish a document on its website identifying all of the admissible Objections that have been filed (the “Dispute Announcement”). ICANN shall also directly inform each DRSP of the posting of the Dispute Announcement.

(b) ICANN shall monitor the progress of all proceedings under this Procedure and shall take steps, where appropriate, to coordinate with any DRSP in relation to individual applications for which objections are pending before more than one DRSP.

Article 11. Response to the Objection

(a) Upon receipt of the Dispute Announcement, each DRSP shall promptly send a notice to: (i) each Applicant for a new gTLD to which one or more admissible Objections have been filed with that DRSP; and (ii) the respective Objector(s).

(b) The Applicant shall file a response to each Objection (the “Response”). The Response shall be filed within thirty (30) days of the transmission of the notice by the DRSP pursuant to Article 11(a).

(c) The Response must be filed with the appropriate DRSP, using a model form made available by that DRSP, with copies to ICANN and the Objector.
(d) The Response shall contain, inter alia, the following information:

(i) The names and contact information (address, telephone number, email address, etc.) of the Applicant; and

(ii) A point-by-point response to the statements made in the Objection.

(e) The substantive portion of the Response shall be limited to 5,000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments. The Applicant shall also describe and provide copies of any supporting or official documents upon which the Response is based.

(f) At the same time as the Response is filed, the Applicant shall pay a filing fee in the amount set and published by the relevant DRSP (which shall be the same as the filing fee paid by the Objector) and include evidence of such payment in the Response. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within ten (10) days of the receipt of the Response by the DRSP, the Applicant shall be deemed to be in default, any Response disregarded and the Objection shall be deemed successful.

(g) If the DRSP finds that the Response does not comply with Articles 11(c) and (d)(1) of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, the DRSP shall have the discretion to request that any administrative deficiencies in the Response be corrected within five (5) days. If the administrative deficiencies in the Response are cured within the specified period but after the lapse of the time limit for submitting a Response pursuant to this Procedure, the Response shall be deemed to be within this time limit.

Article 12. Consolidation of Objections

(a) The DRSP is encouraged, whenever possible and practicable, and as may be further stipulated in the applicable DRSP Rules, to consolidate Objections, for example, when more than one Objector has filed an Objection to the same gTLD on the same grounds. The DRSP shall endeavor to decide upon consolidation prior to issuing its notice pursuant to Article 11(a) and, where appropriate, shall inform the parties of the consolidation in that notice.

(b) If the DRSP itself has not decided to consolidate two or more Objections, any Applicant or Objector may propose the consolidation of Objections within seven (7) days of the notice given by the DRSP pursuant to Article 11(a). If, following such a proposal, the DRSP decides to consolidate certain Objections, which decision must be made within 14 days of the notice given by the DRSP pursuant to Article 11(a), the deadline for the Applicant’s Response in the consolidated proceeding shall be thirty (30) days from the Applicant’s receipt of the DRSP’s notice of consolidation.

(c) In deciding whether to consolidate Objections, the DRSP shall weigh the benefits (in terms of time, cost, consistency of decisions, etc.) that may result from the consolidation against the possible prejudice or inconvenience that the consolidation may cause. The DRSP’s determination on consolidation shall be final and not subject to appeal.

(d) Objections based upon different grounds, as summarized in Article 2(e), shall not be consolidated.
Article 13. The Panel

(a) The DRSP shall select and appoint the Panel of Expert(s) within thirty (30) days after receiving the Response.

(b) Number and specific qualifications of Expert(s):

(i) There shall be one Expert in proceedings involving a String Confusion Objection.

(ii) There shall be one Expert or, if all of the Parties so agree, three Experts with relevant experience in intellectual property rights disputes in proceedings involving an Existing Legal Rights Objection.

(iii) There shall be three Experts recognized as eminent jurists of international reputation, one of whom shall be designated as the Chair. The Chair shall be of a nationality different from the nationalities of the Applicant and of the Objector, in proceedings involving a Limited Public Interest Objection.

(iv) There shall be one Expert in proceedings involving a Community Objection.

(c) All Experts acting under this Procedure shall be impartial and independent of the parties. The applicable DRSP Rules stipulate the manner by which each Expert shall confirm and maintain their impartiality and independence.

(d) The applicable DRSP Rules stipulate the procedures for challenging an Expert and replacing an Expert.

(e) Unless required by a court of law or authorized in writing by the parties, an Expert shall not act in any capacity whatsoever, in any pending or future proceedings, whether judicial, arbitral or otherwise, relating to the matter referred to expert determination under this Procedure.

Article 14. Costs

(a) Each DRSP shall determine the costs for the proceedings that it administers under this Procedure in accordance with the applicable DRSP Rules. Such costs shall cover the fees and expenses of the members of the Panel, as well as the administrative fees of the DRSP (the “Costs”).

(b) Within ten (10) days of constituting the Panel, the DRSP shall estimate the total Costs and request the Objector and the Applicant/Respondent each to pay in advance the full amount of the Costs to the DRSP. Each party shall make its advance payment of Costs within ten (10) days of receiving the DRSP’s request for payment and submit to the DRSP evidence of such payment. The respective filing fees paid by the Parties shall be credited against the amounts due for this advance payment of Costs.

(c) The DRSP may revise its estimate of the total Costs and request additional advance payments from the parties during the proceedings.

(d) Failure to make an advance payment of Costs:

(i) If the Objector fails to make the advance payment of Costs, its Objection shall be dismissed and no fees that it has paid shall be refunded.
(ii) If the Applicant fails to make the advance payment of Costs, the Objection will be deemed to have been sustained and no fees that the Applicant has paid shall be refunded.

(e) Upon the termination of the proceedings, after the Panel has rendered its Expert Determination, the DRSP shall refund to the prevailing party, as determined by the Panel, its advance payment(s) of Costs.

Article 15. Representation and Assistance

(a) The parties may be represented or assisted by persons of their choice.

(b) Each party or party representative shall communicate the name, contact information and function of such persons to the DRSP and the other party (or parties in case of consolidation).

Article 16. Negotiation and Mediation

(a) The parties are encouraged, but not required, to participate in negotiations and/or mediation at any time throughout the dispute resolution process aimed at settling their dispute amicably.

(b) Each DRSP shall be able to propose, if requested by the parties, a person who could assist the parties as mediator.

(c) A person who acts as mediator for the parties shall not serve as an Expert in a dispute between the parties under this Procedure or any other proceeding under this Procedure involving the same gTLD.

(d) The conduct of negotiations or mediation shall not, ipso facto, be the basis for a suspension of the dispute resolution proceedings or the extension of any deadline under this Procedure. Upon the joint request of the parties, the DRSP or (after it has been constituted) the Panel may grant the extension of a deadline or the suspension of the proceedings. Absent exceptional circumstances, such extension or suspension shall not exceed thirty (30) days and shall not delay the administration of any other Objection.

(e) If, during negotiations and/or mediation, the parties agree on a settlement of the matter referred to the DRSP under this Procedure, the parties shall inform the DRSP, which shall terminate the proceedings, subject to the parties' payment obligation under this Procedure having been satisfied, and inform ICANN and the parties accordingly.

Article 17. Additional Written Submissions

(a) The Panel may decide whether the parties shall submit any written statements in addition to the Objection and the Response, and it shall fix time limits for such submissions.

(b) The time limits fixed by the Panel for additional written submissions shall not exceed thirty (30) days, unless the Panel, having consulted the DRSP, determines that exceptional circumstances justify a longer time limit.
Article 18. Evidence

In order to achieve the goal of resolving disputes over new gTLDs rapidly and at reasonable cost, procedures for the production of documents shall be limited. In exceptional cases, the Panel may require a party to provide additional evidence.

Article 19. Hearings

(a) Disputes under this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules will usually be resolved without a hearing.

(b) The Panel may decide, on its own initiative or at the request of a party, to hold a hearing only in extraordinary circumstances.

(c) In the event that the Panel decides to hold a hearing:

(i) The Panel shall decide how and where the hearing shall be conducted.

(ii) In order to expedite the proceedings and minimize costs, the hearing shall be conducted by videoconference if possible.

(iii) The hearing shall be limited to one day, unless the Panel decides, in exceptional circumstances, that more than one day is required for the hearing.

(iv) The Panel shall decide whether the hearing will be open to the public or conducted in private.

Article 20. Standards

(a) For each category of Objection identified in Article 2(e), the Panel shall apply the standards that have been defined by ICANN.

(b) In addition, the Panel may refer to and base its findings upon the statements and documents submitted and any rules or principles that it determines to be applicable.

(c) The Objector bears the burden of proving that its Objection should be sustained in accordance with the applicable standards.

Article 21. The Expert Determination

(a) The DRSP and the Panel shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the Expert Determination is rendered within forty-five (45) days of the constitution of the Panel. In specific circumstances such as consolidated cases and in consultation with the DRSP, if significant additional documentation is requested by the Panel, a brief extension may be allowed.

(b) The Panel shall submit its Expert Determination in draft form to the DRSP’s scrutiny as to form before it is signed, unless such scrutiny is specifically excluded by the applicable DRSP Rules. The modifications proposed by the DRSP to the Panel, if any, shall address only the form of the Expert Determination. The signed Expert Determination shall be communicated to the DRSP, which in turn will communicate that Expert Determination to the Parties and ICANN.

(c) When the Panel comprises three Experts, the Expert Determination shall be made by a majority of the Experts.
(d) The Expert Determination shall be in writing, shall identify the prevailing party and shall state the reasons upon which it is based. The remedies available to an Applicant or an Objector pursuant to any proceeding before a Panel shall be limited to the success or dismissal of an Objection and to the refund by the DRSP to the prevailing party, as determined by the Panel in its Expert Determination, of its advance payment(s) of Costs pursuant to Article 14(e) of this Procedure and any relevant provisions of the applicable DRSP Rules.

(e) The Expert Determination shall state the date when it is made, and it shall be signed by the Expert(s). If any Expert fails to sign the Expert Determination, it shall be accompanied by a statement of the reason for the absence of such signature.

(f) In addition to providing electronic copies of its Expert Determination, the Panel shall provide a signed hard copy of the Expert Determination to the DRSP, unless the DRSP Rules provide for otherwise.

(g) Unless the Panel decides otherwise, the Expert Determination shall be published in full on the DRSP’s website.

Article 22. Exclusion of Liability

In addition to any exclusion of liability stipulated by the applicable DRSP Rules, neither the Expert(s), nor the DRSP and its employees, nor ICANN and its Board members, employees and consultants shall be liable to any person for any act or omission in connection with any proceeding conducted under this Procedure.

Article 23. Modification of the Procedure

(a) ICANN may from time to time, in accordance with its Bylaws, modify this Procedure.

(b) The version of this Procedure that is applicable to a dispute resolution proceeding is the version that was in effect on the day when the relevant application for a new gTLD is submitted.
This module describes situations in which contention over applied-for gTLD strings occurs, and the methods available to applicants for resolving such contention cases.

4.1 String Contention

String contention occurs when either:

1. Two or more applicants for an identical gTLD string successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes; or

2. Two or more applicants for similar gTLD strings successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes, and the similarity of the strings is identified as creating a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated.

ICANN will not approve applications for proposed gTLD strings that are identical or that would result in user confusion, called contending strings. If either situation above occurs, such applications will proceed to contention resolution through either community priority evaluation, in certain cases, or through an auction. Both processes are described in this module. A group of applications for contending strings is referred to as a contention set.

(In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.)

4.1.1 Identification of Contention Sets

Contention sets are groups of applications containing identical or similar applied-for gTLD strings. Contention sets are identified during Initial Evaluation, following review of all applied-for gTLD strings. ICANN will publish preliminary contention sets once the String Similarity review is completed, and will update the contention sets as necessary during the evaluation and dispute resolution stages.
Applications for identical gTLD strings will be automatically assigned to a contention set. For example, if Applicant A and Applicant B both apply for .TLDSTRING, they will be identified as being in a contention set. Such testing for identical strings also takes into consideration the code point variants listed in any relevant IDN table. That is, two or more applicants whose applied-for strings or designated variants are variant strings according to an IDN table submitted to ICANN would be considered in direct contention with one another. For example, if one applicant applies for string A and another applies for string B, and strings A and B are variant TLD strings as defined in Module 1, then the two applications are in direct contention.

The String Similarity Panel will also review the entire pool of applied-for strings to determine whether the strings proposed in any two or more applications are so similar that they would create a probability of user confusion if allowed to coexist in the DNS. The panel will make such a determination for each pair of applied-for gTLD strings. The outcome of the String Similarity review described in Module 2 is the identification of contention sets among applications that have direct or indirect contention relationships with one another.

Two strings are in **direct contention** if they are identical or similar to one another. More than two applicants might be represented in a direct contention situation: if four different applicants applied for the same gTLD string, they would all be in direct contention with one another.

Two strings are in **indirect contention** if they are both in direct contention with a third string, but not with one another. The example that follows explains direct and indirect contention in greater detail.

In Figure 4-1, Strings A and B are an example of direct contention. Strings C and G are an example of indirect contention. C and G both contend with B, but not with one another. The figure as a whole is one contention set. A contention set consists of all applications that are linked by string contention to one another, directly or indirectly.
Figure 4-1 – This diagram represents one contention set, featuring both directly and indirectly contending strings.

While preliminary contention sets are determined during Initial Evaluation, the final configuration of the contention sets can only be established once the evaluation and dispute resolution process stages have concluded. This is because any application excluded through those processes might modify a contention set identified earlier.

A contention set may be augmented, split into two sets, or eliminated altogether as a result of an Extended Evaluation or dispute resolution proceeding. The composition of a contention set may also be modified as some applications may be voluntarily withdrawn throughout the process.

Refer to Figure 4-2: In contention set 1, applications D and G are eliminated. Application A is the only remaining application, so there is no contention left to resolve.

In contention set 2, all applications successfully complete Extended Evaluation and Dispute Resolution, so the original contention set remains to be resolved.

In contention set 3, application F is eliminated. Since application F was in direct contention with E and J, but E and J are not in contention with one other, the original contention set splits into two sets: one containing E and K in direct contention, and one containing I and J.
Figure 4-2 – Resolution of string contention cannot begin until all applicants within a contention set have completed all applicable previous stages.

The remaining contention cases must then be resolved through community priority evaluation or by other means, depending on the circumstances. In the string contention resolution stage, ICANN addresses each contention set to achieve an unambiguous resolution.

As described elsewhere in this guidebook, cases of contention might be resolved by community priority evaluation or an agreement among the parties. Absent that, the last-resort contention resolution mechanism will be an auction.

4.1.2 Impact of String Confusion Dispute Resolution Proceedings on Contention Sets

If an applicant files a string confusion objection against another application (refer to Module 3), and the panel finds that user confusion is probable (that is, finds in favor of the objector), the two applications will be placed in direct contention with each other. Thus, the outcome of a dispute resolution proceeding based on a string confusion objection would be a new contention set structure for the relevant applications, augmenting the original contention set.

If an applicant files a string confusion objection against another application, and the panel finds that string
confusion does not exist (that is, finds in favor of the responding applicant), the two applications will not be considered in direct contention with one another.

A dispute resolution outcome in the case of a string confusion objection filed by another applicant will not result in removal of an application from a previously established contention set.

4.1.3 Self-Resolution of String Contention

Applicants that are identified as being in contention are encouraged to reach a settlement or agreement among themselves that resolves the contention. This may occur at any stage of the process, once ICANN publicly posts the applications received and the preliminary contention sets on its website.

Applicants may resolve string contention in a manner whereby one or more applicants withdraw their applications. An applicant may not resolve string contention by selecting a new string or by replacing itself with a joint venture. It is understood that applicants may seek to establish joint ventures in their efforts to resolve string contention. However, material changes in applications (for example, combinations of applicants to resolve contention) will require re-evaluation. This might require additional fees or evaluation in a subsequent application round. Applicants are encouraged to resolve contention by combining in a way that does not materially affect the remaining application. Accordingly, new joint ventures must take place in a manner that does not materially change the application, to avoid being subject to re-evaluation.

4.1.4 Possible Contention Resolution Outcomes

An application that has successfully completed all previous stages and is no longer part of a contention set due to changes in the composition of the contention set (as described in subsection 4.1.1) or self-resolution by applicants in the contention set (as described in subsection 4.1.3) may proceed to the next stage.

An application that prevails in a contention resolution procedure, either community priority evaluation or auction, may proceed to the next stage.
In some cases, an applicant who is not the outright winner of a string contention resolution process can still proceed. This situation is explained in the following paragraphs.

If the strings within a given contention set are all identical, the applications are in direct contention with each other and there can only be one winner that proceeds to the next step.

However, where there are both direct and indirect contention situations within a set, more than one string may survive the resolution.

For example, consider a case where string A is in contention with B, and B is in contention with C, but C is not in contention with A. If A wins the contention resolution procedure, B is eliminated but C can proceed since C is not in direct contention with the winner and both strings can coexist in the DNS without risk for confusion.

4.2 Community Priority Evaluation

Community priority evaluation will only occur if a community-based applicant selects this option. Community priority evaluation can begin once all applications in the contention set have completed all previous stages of the process.

The community priority evaluation is an independent analysis. Scores received in the applicant reviews are not carried forward to the community priority evaluation. Each application participating in the community priority evaluation begins with a score of zero.

4.2.1 Eligibility for Community Priority Evaluation

As described in subsection 1.2.3 of Module 1, all applicants are required to identify whether their application type is:

- Community-based; or
- Standard.

Applicants designating their applications as community-based are also asked to respond to a set of questions in the application form to provide relevant information if a community priority evaluation occurs.

Only community-based applicants are eligible to participate in a community priority evaluation.
At the start of the contention resolution stage, all community-based applicants within remaining contention sets will be notified of the opportunity to opt for a community priority evaluation via submission of a deposit by a specified date. Only those applications for which a deposit has been received by the deadline will be scored in the community priority evaluation. Following the evaluation, the deposit will be refunded to applicants that score 14 or higher.

Before the community priority evaluation begins, the applicants who have elected to participate may be asked to provide additional information relevant to the community priority evaluation.

### 4.2.2 Community Priority Evaluation Procedure

Community priority evaluations for each eligible contention set will be performed by a community priority panel appointed by ICANN to review these applications. The panel’s role is to determine whether any of the community-based applications fulfills the community priority criteria. Standard applicants within the contention set, if any, will not participate in the community priority evaluation.

If a single community-based application is found to meet the community priority criteria (see subsection 4.2.3 below), that applicant will be declared to prevail in the community priority evaluation and may proceed. If more than one community-based application is found to meet the criteria, the remaining contention between them will be resolved as follows:

- In the case where the applications are in indirect contention with one another (see subsection 4.1.1), they will both be allowed to proceed to the next stage. In this case, applications that are in direct contention with any of these community-based applications will be eliminated.

- In the case where the applications are in direct contention with one another, these applicants will proceed to an auction. If all parties agree and present a joint request, ICANN may postpone the auction for a three-month period while the parties attempt to reach a settlement before proceeding to auction. This is a one-time option; ICANN will grant no more than one such request for each set of contending applications.
If none of the community-based applications are found to meet the criteria, then all of the parties in the contention set (both standard and community-based applicants) will proceed to an auction.

Results of each community priority evaluation will be posted when completed.

Applicants who are eliminated as a result of a community priority evaluation are eligible for a partial refund of the gTLD evaluation fee (see Module 1).

### 4.2.3 Community Priority Evaluation Criteria

The Community Priority Panel will review and score the one or more community-based applications having elected the community priority evaluation against four criteria as listed below.

The scoring process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). This calls for a holistic approach, taking multiple criteria into account, as reflected in the process. The scoring will be performed by a panel and be based on information provided in the application plus other relevant information available (such as public information regarding the community represented). The panel may also perform independent research, if deemed necessary to reach informed scoring decisions.

It should be noted that a qualified community application eliminates all directly contending standard applications, regardless of how well qualified the latter may be. This is a fundamental reason for very stringent requirements for qualification of a community-based application, as embodied in the criteria below. Accordingly, a finding by the panel that an application does not meet the scoring threshold to prevail in a community priority evaluation is not necessarily an indication the community itself is in some way inadequate or invalid.

The sequence of the criteria reflects the order in which they will be assessed by the panel. The utmost care has been taken to avoid any “double-counting” - any negative aspect found in assessing an application for one criterion
should only be counted there and should not affect the assessment for other criteria.

An application must score at least 14 points to prevail in a community priority evaluation. The outcome will be determined according to the procedure described in subsection 4.2.2.

**Criterion #1: Community Establishment (0-4 points)**

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Community Establishment criterion:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As measured by:

A. **Delineation (2)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly delineated, organized, and pre-existing community.</td>
<td>Clearly delineated and pre-existing community, but not fulfilling the requirements for a score of 2.</td>
<td>Insufficient delineation and pre-existence for a score of 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **Extension (2)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of considerable size and longevity.</td>
<td>Community of either considerable size or longevity, but not fulfilling the requirements for a score of 2.</td>
<td>Community of neither considerable size nor longevity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section relates to the community as explicitly identified and defined according to statements in the application. (The implicit reach of the applied-for string is not
considered here, but taken into account when scoring Criterion #2, “Nexus between Proposed String and Community.”

**Criterion 1 Definitions**

- **“Community”** - Usage of the expression “community” has evolved considerably from its Latin origin – “communitas” meaning “fellowship” – while still implying more of cohesion than a mere commonality of interest. Notably, as “community” is used throughout the application, there should be: (a) an awareness and recognition of a community among its members; (b) some understanding of the community’s existence prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed); and (c) extended tenure or longevity—non-transience—into the future.

- **“Delineation”** relates to the membership of a community, where a clear and straightforward membership definition scores high, while an unclear, dispersed or unbound definition scores low.

- **“Pre-existing”** means that a community has been active as such since before the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed in September 2007.

- **“Organized”** implies that there is at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community, with documented evidence of community activities.

- **“Extension”** relates to the dimensions of the community, regarding its number of members, geographical reach, and foreseeable activity lifetime, as further explained in the following.

- **“Size”** relates both to the number of members and the geographical reach of the community, and will be scored depending on the context rather than on absolute numbers - a geographic location community may count millions of members in a limited location, a language community may have a million members with some spread over the globe, a community of service providers may have “only” some hundred members although well spread over the globe, just to mention some examples - all these can be regarded as of “considerable size.”
"Longevity" means that the pursuits of a community are of a lasting, non-transient nature.

**Criterion 1 Guidelines**

With respect to "Delineation" and "Extension," it should be noted that a community can consist of legal entities (for example, an association of suppliers of a particular service), of individuals (for example, a language community) or of a logical alliance of communities (for example, an international federation of national communities of a similar nature). All are viable as such, provided the requisite awareness and recognition of the community is at hand among the members. Otherwise the application would be seen as not relating to a real community and score 0 on both "Delineation" and "Extension."

With respect to "Delineation," if an application satisfactorily demonstrates all three relevant parameters (delineation, pre-existing and organized), then it scores a 2.

With respect to "Extension," if an application satisfactorily demonstrates both community size and longevity, it scores a 2.

**Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community (0-4 points)**

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Nexus criterion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nexus between String &amp; Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High←→Low

As measured by:

**A. Nexus (3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The string matches the name of the community or is a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community</td>
<td>String identifies the community, but does not qualify for a score of 3.</td>
<td>String nexus does not fulfill the requirements for a score of 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. **Uniqueness (1)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

String has no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application.

String does not fulfill the requirement for a score of 1.

This section evaluates the relevance of the string to the specific community that it claims to represent.

**Criterion 2 Definitions**

- "Name" of the community means the established name by which the community is commonly known by others. It may be, but does not need to be, the name of an organization dedicated to the community.

- "Identify" means that the applied-for string closely describes the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

**Criterion 2 Guidelines**

With respect to “Nexus,” for a score of 3, the essential aspect is that the applied-for string is commonly known by others as the identification / name of the community.

With respect to “Nexus,” for a score of 2, the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community. As an example, a string could qualify for a score of 2 if it is a noun that the typical community member would naturally be called in the context. If the string appears excessively broad (such as, for example, a globally well-known but local tennis club applying for “.TENNIS”) then it would not qualify for a 2.
With respect to "Uniqueness," "significant meaning" relates to the public in general, with consideration of the community language context added.

"Uniqueness" will be scored both with regard to the community context and from a general point of view. For example, a string for a particular geographic location community may seem unique from a general perspective, but would not score a 1 for uniqueness if it carries another significant meaning in the common language used in the relevant community location. The phrasing "...beyond identifying the community" in the score of 1 for "uniqueness" implies a requirement that the string does identify the community, i.e. scores 2 or 3 for "Nexus," in order to be eligible for a score of 1 for "Uniqueness."

It should be noted that "Uniqueness" is only about the meaning of the string - since the evaluation takes place to resolve contention there will obviously be other applications, community-based and/or standard, with identical or confusingly similar strings in the contention set to resolve, so the string will clearly not be "unique" in the sense of "alone."

**Criterion #3: Registration Policies (0-4 points)**

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Registration Policies criterion:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

As measured by:

A. **Eligibility (1)**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility restricted to community members.</td>
<td>Largely unrestricted approach to eligibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
This section evaluates the applicant’s registration policies as indicated in the application. Registration policies are the conditions that the future registry will set for prospective registrants, i.e. those desiring to register second-level domain names under the registry.
Criterion 3 Definitions

- “Eligibility” means the qualifications that entities or individuals must have in order to be allowed as registrants by the registry.

- “Name selection” means the conditions that must be fulfilled for any second-level domain name to be deemed acceptable by the registry.

- “Content and use” means the restrictions stipulated by the registry as to the content provided in and the use of any second-level domain name in the registry.

- “Enforcement” means the tools and provisions set out by the registry to prevent and remedy any breaches of the conditions by registrants.

Criterion 3 Guidelines

With respect to “Eligibility,” the limitation to community “members” can invoke a formal membership but can also be satisfied in other ways, depending on the structure and orientation of the community at hand. For example, for a geographic location community TLD, a limitation to members of the community can be achieved by requiring that the registrant’s physical address is within the boundaries of the location.

With respect to “Name selection,” “Content and use,” and “Enforcement,” scoring of applications against these sub-criteria will be done from a holistic perspective, with due regard for the particularities of the community explicitly addressed. For example, an application proposing a TLD for a language community may feature strict rules imposing this language for name selection as well as for content and use, scoring 1 on both B and C above. It could nevertheless include forbearance in the enforcement measures for tutorial sites assisting those wishing to learn the language and still score 1 on D. More restrictions do not automatically result in a higher score. The restrictions and corresponding enforcement mechanisms proposed by the applicant should show an alignment with the community-based purpose of the TLD and demonstrate continuing accountability to the community named in the application.
Criterion #4: Community Endorsement (0-4 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Endorsement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High     Low

As measured by:

A. Support (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s) or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented support from at least one group with relevance, but insufficient support for a score of 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient proof of support for a score of 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Opposition (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opposition of relevance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant opposition from two or more groups of non-negligible size.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section evaluates community support and/or opposition to the application. Support and opposition will be scored in relation to the communities explicitly addressed as stated in the application, with due regard for the communities implicitly addressed by the string.

Criterion 4 Definitions

- “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by
the community members as representative of the community.

- "Relevance" and "relevant" refer to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed. This means that opposition from communities not identified in the application but with an association to the applied-for string would be considered relevant.

Criterion 4 Guidelines

With respect to "Support," it follows that documented support from, for example, the only national association relevant to a particular community on a national level would score a 2 if the string is clearly oriented to that national level, but only a 1 if the string implicitly addresses similar communities in other nations.

Also with respect to "Support," the plurals in brackets for a score of 2, relate to cases of multiple institutions/organizations. In such cases there must be documented support from institutions/organizations representing a majority of the overall community addressed in order to score 2.

The applicant will score a 1 for "Support" if it does not have support from the majority of the recognized community institutions/member organizations, or does not provide full documentation that it has authority to represent the community with its application. A 0 will be scored on "Support" if the applicant fails to provide documentation showing support from recognized community institutions/community member organizations, or does not provide documentation showing that it has the authority to represent the community. It should be noted, however, that documented support from groups or communities that may be seen as implicitly addressed but have completely different orientations compared to the applicant community will not be required for a score of 2 regarding support.

To be taken into account as relevant support, such documentation must contain a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support. Considering of support is not based merely on the number of comments or expressions of support received.

When scoring "Opposition," previous objections to the application as well as public comments during the same application round will be taken into account and assessed.
in this context. There will be no presumption that such objections or comments would prevent a score of 2 or lead to any particular score for “Opposition.” To be taken into account as relevant opposition, such objections or comments must be of a reasoned nature. Sources of opposition that are clearly spurious, unsubstantiated, made for a purpose incompatible with competition objectives, or filed for the purpose of obstruction will not be considered relevant.

4.3 **Auction: Mechanism of Last Resort**

It is expected that most cases of contention will be resolved by the community priority evaluation, or through voluntary agreement among the involved applicants. Auction is a tie-breaker method for resolving string contention among the applications within a contention set, if the contention has not been resolved by other means.

An auction will not take place to resolve contention in the case where the contending applications are for geographic names (as defined in Module 2). In this case, the applications will be suspended pending resolution by the applicants.

An auction will take place, where contention has not already been resolved, in the case where an application for a geographic name is in a contention set with applications for similar strings that have not been identified as geographic names.

In practice, ICANN expects that most contention cases will be resolved through other means before reaching the auction stage. However, there is a possibility that significant funding will accrue to ICANN as a result of one or more auctions.¹

¹ The purpose of an auction is to resolve contention in a clear, objective manner. It is planned that costs of the new gTLD program will offset by fees, so any funds coming from a last resort contention resolution mechanism such as auctions would result (after paying for the auction process) in additional funding. Any proceeds from auctions will be reserved and earmarked until the uses of funds are determined. Funds must be used in a manner that supports directly ICANN’s Mission and Core Values and also allows ICANN to maintain its not for profit status.

Possible uses of auction funds include formation of a foundation with a clear mission and a transparent way to allocate funds to projects that are of interest to the greater Internet community, such as grants to support new gTLD applications or registry operators from communities in subsequent gTLD rounds, the creation of an ICANN-administered/community-based fund for specific projects for the benefit of the Internet community, the creation of a registry continuity fund for the protection of registrants (ensuring that funds would be in place to support the operation of a gTLD registry until a successor could be found), or establishment of a security fund to expand use of secure protocols, conduct research, and support standards development organizations in accordance with ICANN’s security and stability mission.
4.3.1 Auction Procedures

An auction of two or more applications within a contention set is conducted as follows. The auctioneer successively increases the prices associated with applications within the contention set, and the respective applicants indicate their willingness to pay these prices. As the prices rise, applicants will successively choose to exit from the auction. When a sufficient number of applications have been eliminated so that no direct contentions remain (i.e., the remaining applications are no longer in contention with one another and all the relevant strings can be delegated as TLDs), the auction will be deemed to conclude. At the auction’s conclusion, the applicants with remaining applications will pay the resulting prices and proceed toward delegation. This procedure is referred to as an “ascending-clock auction.”

This section provides applicants an informal introduction to the practicalities of participation in an ascending-clock auction. It is intended only as a general introduction and is only preliminary. The detailed set of Auction Rules will be available prior to the commencement of any auction proceedings. If any conflict arises between this module and the auction rules, the auction rules will prevail.

For simplicity, this section will describe the situation where a contention set consists of two or more applications for identical strings.

All auctions will be conducted over the Internet, with participants placing their bids remotely using a web-based software system designed especially for auction. The auction software system will be compatible with current versions of most prevalent browsers, and will not require the local installation of any additional software.

Auction participants (“bidders”) will receive instructions for access to the online auction site. Access to the site will be password-protected and bids will be encrypted through SSL. If a bidder temporarily loses connection to the Internet, that bidder may be permitted to submit its bids in a given auction round by fax, according to procedures described.

The amount of funding resulting from auctions, if any, will not be known until all relevant applications have completed this step. Thus, a detailed mechanism for allocation of these funds is not being created at present. However, a process can be pre-established to enable community consultation in the event that such funds are collected. This process will include, at a minimum, publication of data on any funds collected, and public comment on any proposed models.
in the auction rules. The auctions will generally be conducted to conclude quickly, ideally in a single day.

The auction will be carried out in a series of auction rounds, as illustrated in Figure 4-3. The sequence of events is as follows:

1. For each auction round, the auctioneer will announce in advance: (1) the start-of-round price, (2) the end-of-round price, and (3) the starting and ending times of the auction round. In the first auction round, the start-of-round price for all bidders in the auction will be USD 0. In later auction rounds, the start-of-round price will be its end-of-round price from the previous auction round.

2. During each auction round, bidders will be required to submit a bid or bids representing their willingness to pay within the range of intermediate prices between the start-of-round and end-of-round prices. In this way a bidder indicates its willingness to stay in the auction at all prices through and including the end-of-auction round price, or its wish to exit the auction at a price less than the end-of-auction round price, called the exit bid.

3. Exit is irrevocable. If a bidder exited the auction in a previous auction round, the bidder is not permitted to re-enter in the current auction round.
4. Bidders may submit their bid or bids at any time during the auction round.

5. Only bids that comply with all aspects of the auction rules will be considered valid. If more than one valid bid is submitted by a given bidder within the time limit of the auction round, the auctioneer will treat the last valid submitted bid as the actual bid.

6. At the end of each auction round, bids become the bidders’ legally-binding offers to secure the relevant gTLD strings at prices up to the respective bid amounts, subject to closure of the auction in accordance with the auction rules. In later auction rounds, bids may be used to exit from the auction at subsequent higher prices.

7. After each auction round, the auctioneer will disclose the aggregate number of bidders remaining in the auction at the end-of-round prices for the auction round, and will announce the prices and times for the next auction round.

- Each bid should consist of a single price associated with the application, and such price must be greater than or equal to the start-of-round price.

- If the bid amount is strictly less than the end-of-round price, then the bid is treated as an exit bid at the specified amount, and it signifies the bidder’s binding commitment to pay up to the bid amount if its application is approved.

- If the bid amount is greater than or equal to the end-of-round price, then the bid signifies that the bidder wishes to remain in the auction at all prices in the current auction round, and it signifies the bidder’s binding commitment to pay up to the end-of-round price if its application is approved. Following such bid, the application cannot be eliminated within the current auction round.

- To the extent that the bid amount exceeds the end-of-round price, then the bid is also treated as a proxy bid to be carried forward to the next auction round. The bidder will be permitted to change the proxy bid amount in the next auction round, and the amount of the proxy bid will not constrain the bidder’s ability to submit any valid bid amount in the next auction round.
• No bidder is permitted to submit a bid for any application for which an exit bid was received in a prior auction round. That is, once an application has exited the auction, it may not return.

• If no valid bid is submitted within a given auction round for an application that remains in the auction, then the bid amount is taken to be the amount of the proxy bid, if any, carried forward from the previous auction round or, if none, the bid is taken to be an exit bid at the start-of-round price for the current auction round.

8. This process continues, with the auctioneer increasing the price range for each given TLD string in each auction round, until there is one remaining bidder at the end-of-round price. After an auction round in which this condition is satisfied, the auction concludes and the auctioneer determines the clearing price. The last remaining application is deemed the successful application, and the associated bidder is obligated to pay the clearing price.

Figure 4-4 illustrates how an auction for five contending applications might progress.

Figure 4-4 – Example of an auction for five mutually-contending applications.
• Before the first auction round, the auctioneer announces the end-of-round price $P_1$.

• During Auction round 1, a bid is submitted for each application. In Figure 4-4, all five bidders submit bids of at least $P_1$. Since the aggregate demand exceeds one, the auction proceeds to Auction round 2. The auctioneer discloses that five contending applications remained at $P_1$ and announces the end-of-round price $P_2$.

• During Auction round 2, a bid is submitted for each application. In Figure 4-4, all five bidders submit bids of at least $P_2$. The auctioneer discloses that five contending applications remained at $P_2$ and announces the end-of-round price $P_3$.

• During Auction round 3, one of the bidders submits an exit bid at slightly below $P_3$, while the other four bidders submit bids of at least $P_3$. The auctioneer discloses that four contending applications remained at $P_3$ and announces the end-of-round price $P_4$.

• During Auction round 4, one of the bidders submits an exit bid midway between $P_3$ and $P_4$, while the other three remaining bidders submit bids of at least $P_4$. The auctioneer discloses that three contending applications remained at $P_4$ and announces the end-of-auction round price $P_5$.

• During Auction round 5, one of the bidders submits an exit bid at slightly above $P_5$, and one of the bidders submits an exit bid at $P_c$ midway between $P_4$ and $P_5$. The final bidder submits a bid greater than $P_c$. Since the aggregate demand at $P_5$ does not exceed one, the auction concludes in Auction round 5. The application associated with the highest bid in Auction round 5 is deemed the successful application. The clearing price is $P_c$, as this is the lowest price at which aggregate demand can be met.

To the extent possible, auctions to resolve multiple string contention situations will be conducted simultaneously.

4.3.1.1 Currency

For bids to be comparable, all bids in the auction will be submitted in any integer (whole) number of US dollars.
4.3.1.2 Fees

A bidding deposit will be required of applicants participating in the auction, in an amount to be determined. The bidding deposit must be transmitted by wire transfer to a specified bank account specified by ICANN or its auction provider at a major international bank, to be received in advance of the auction date. The amount of the deposit will determine a bidding limit for each bidder: the bidding deposit will equal 10% of the bidding limit; and the bidder will not be permitted to submit any bid in excess of its bidding limit.

In order to avoid the need for bidders to pre-commit to a particular bidding limit, bidders may be given the option of making a specified deposit that will provide them with unlimited bidding authority for a given application. The amount of the deposit required for unlimited bidding authority will depend on the particular contention set and will be based on an assessment of the possible final prices within the auction.

All deposits from non-defaulting losing bidders will be returned following the close of the auction.

4.3.2 Winning Bid Payments

Any applicant that participates in an auction will be required to sign a bidder agreement that acknowledges its rights and responsibilities in the auction, including that its bids are legally binding commitments to pay the amount bid if it wins (i.e., if its application is approved), and to enter into the prescribed registry agreement with ICANN— together with a specified penalty for defaulting on payment of its winning bid or failing to enter into the required registry agreement.

The winning bidder in any auction will be required to pay the full amount of the final price within 20 business days of the end of the auction. Payment is to be made by wire transfer to the same international bank account as the bidding deposit, and the applicant’s bidding deposit will be credited toward the final price.

In the event that a bidder anticipates that it would require a longer payment period than 20 business days due to verifiable government-imposed currency restrictions, the bidder may advise ICANN well in advance of the auction and ICANN will consider applying a longer payment period to all bidders within the same contention set.
Any winning bidder for whom the full amount of the final price is not received within 20 business days of the end of an auction is subject to being declared in default. At their sole discretion, ICANN and its auction provider may delay the declaration of default for a brief period, but only if they are convinced that receipt of full payment is imminent.

Any winning bidder for whom the full amount of the final price is received within 20 business days of the end of an auction retains the obligation to execute the required registry agreement within 90 days of the end of auction. Such winning bidder who does not execute the agreement within 90 days of the end of the auction is subject to being declared in default. At their sole discretion, ICANN and its auction provider may delay the declaration of default for a brief period, but only if they are convinced that execution of the registry agreement is imminent.

### 4.3.3 Post-Default Procedures

Once declared in default, any winning bidder is subject to immediate forfeiture of its position in the auction and assessment of default penalties. After a winning bidder is declared in default, the remaining bidders will receive an offer to have their applications accepted, one at a time, in descending order of their exit bids. In this way, the next bidder would be declared the winner subject to payment of its last bid price. The same default procedures and penalties are in place for any runner-up bidder receiving such an offer.

Each bidder that is offered the relevant gTLD will be given a specified period—typically, four business days—to respond as to whether it wants the gTLD. A bidder who responds in the affirmative will have 20 business days to submit its full payment. A bidder who declines such an offer cannot revert on that statement, has no further obligations in this context and will not be considered in default.

The penalty for defaulting on a winning bid will equal 10% of the defaulting bid. Default penalties will be charged against any defaulting applicant’s bidding deposit before the associated bidding deposit is returned.

---

2 If bidders were given the option of making a specified deposit that provided them with unlimited bidding authority for a given application and if the winning bidder utilized this option, then the penalty for defaulting on a winning bid will be the lesser of the following: (1) 10% of the defaulting bid, or (2) the specified deposit amount that provided the bidder with unlimited bidding authority.
4.4 Contention Resolution and Contract Execution

An applicant that has been declared the winner of a contention resolution process will proceed by entering into the contract execution step. (Refer to section 5.1 of Module 5.)

If a winner of the contention resolution procedure has not executed a contract within 90 calendar days of the decision, ICANN has the right to deny that application and extend an offer to the runner-up applicant, if any, to proceed with its application. For example, in an auction, another applicant who would be considered the runner-up applicant might proceed toward delegation. This offer is at ICANN’s option only. The runner-up applicant in a contention resolution process has no automatic right to an applied-for gTLD string if the first place winner does not execute a contract within a specified time. If the winning applicant can demonstrate that it is working diligently and in good faith toward successful completion of the steps necessary for entry into the registry agreement, ICANN may extend the 90-day period at its discretion. Runner-up applicants have no claim of priority over the winning application, even after what might be an extended period of negotiation.
DRAFT - New gTLD Program - String Contention

### Application/Admin Check
- Applicant begins application process
- Applicant elects whether to designate application as community-based.
- Applicant submits application in TLD Application System (TAS).
- ICANN publishes list of all complete applications.

### Initial Evaluation (IE) String Review
- ICANN runs algorithm for all applied-for gTLDs against all other applied-for gTLDs.
- String Similarity Panel performs analysis, using algorithm results, to group similar and identical strings into contention sets.
- ICANN communicates the results of the String Similarity review, including contention sets.

### IE + EE + Dispute Res
- IE, Extended Evaluation (EE), and Dispute Resolution continue. Some applications may not pass certain elements of the review process; which may alter the contention sets.

### String Contention

#### Is the applied-for gTLD in a contention set?
- **Yes**
  - Have one or more community-based applicant(s) elected community priority?
    - **Yes**
      - Community priority evaluation
    - **No**
      - Applicants with contending strings participate in auction. One or more parties proceed to subsequent stage
  - **No**
    - Applicants are encouraged to self-resolve string contention anytime prior to the contention resolution process.

#### Does one clear winner emerge?
- **Yes**
- **No**
  - Applicant enters Transition to Delegation phase
Module 5
Transition to Delegation

This module describes the final steps required of an applicant for completion of the process, including execution of a registry agreement with ICANN and preparing for delegation of the new gTLD into the root zone.

5.1 Registry Agreement

All applicants that have successfully completed the evaluation process—including, if necessary, the dispute resolution and string contention processes—are required to enter into a registry agreement with ICANN before proceeding to delegation.

After the close of each stage in the process, ICANN will send a notification to those successful applicants that are eligible for execution of a registry agreement at that time.

To proceed, applicants will be asked to provide specified information for purposes of executing the registry agreement:

1. Documentation of the applicant’s continued operations instrument (see Specification 8 to the agreement).

2. Confirmation of contact information and signatory to the agreement.

3. Notice of any material changes requested to the terms of the agreement.

4. The applicant must report: (i) any ownership interest it holds in any registrar or reseller of registered names, (ii) if known, any ownership interest that a registrar or reseller of registered names holds in the applicant, and (iii) if the applicant controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with any registrar or reseller of registered names. ICANN retains the right to refer an application to a competition authority prior to entry into the registry agreement if it is determined that the registry-registrar cross-ownership...
arrangements might raise competition issues. For this purpose “control” (including the terms “controlled by” and “under common control with”) means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of a person or entity, whether through the ownership of securities, as trustee or executor, by serving as a member of a board of directors or equivalent governing body, by contract, by credit arrangement or otherwise.

To ensure that an applicant continues to be a going concern in good legal standing, ICANN reserves the right to ask the applicant to submit additional updated documentation and information before entering into the registry agreement.

ICANN will begin processing registry agreements one month after the date of the notification to successful applicants. Requests will be handled in the order the complete information is received.

Generally, the process will include formal approval of the agreement without requiring additional Board review, so long as: the application passed all evaluation criteria; there are no material changes in circumstances; and there are no material changes to the base agreement. There may be other cases where the Board requests review of an application.

Eligible applicants are expected to have executed the registry agreement within nine (9) months of the notification date. Failure to do so may result in loss of eligibility, at ICANN's discretion. An applicant may request an extension of this time period for up to an additional nine (9) months if it can demonstrate, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, that it is working diligently and in good faith toward successfully completing the steps necessary for entry into the registry agreement.

The registry agreement can be reviewed in the attachment to this module. Certain provisions in the agreement are labeled as applicable to governmental and intergovernmental entities only. Private entities, even if supported by a government or IGO, would not ordinarily be eligible for these special provisions.

All successful applicants are expected to enter into the agreement substantially as written. Applicants may request and negotiate terms by exception; however, this extends
the time involved in executing the agreement. In the event that material changes to the agreement are requested, these must first be approved by the ICANN Board of Directors before execution of the agreement.

ICANN’s Board of Directors has ultimate responsibility for the New gTLD Program. The Board reserves the right to individually consider an application for a new gTLD to determine whether approval would be in the best interest of the Internet community. Under exceptional circumstances, the Board may individually consider a gTLD application. For example, the Board might individually consider an application as a result of GAC Advice on New gTLDs or of the use of an ICANN accountability mechanism.

5.2 Pre-Delegation Testing

Each applicant will be required to complete pre-delegation technical testing as a prerequisite to delegation into the root zone. This pre-delegation test must be completed within the time period specified in the registry agreement.

The purpose of the pre-delegation technical test is to verify that the applicant has met its commitment to establish registry operations in accordance with the technical and operational criteria described in Module 2.

The test is also intended to indicate that the applicant can operate the gTLD in a stable and secure manner. All applicants will be tested on a pass/fail basis according to the requirements that follow.

The test elements cover both the DNS server operational infrastructure and registry system operations. In many cases the applicant will perform the test elements as instructed and provide documentation of the results to ICANN to demonstrate satisfactory performance. At ICANN’s discretion, aspects of the applicant’s self-certification documentation can be audited either on-site at the services delivery point of the registry or elsewhere as determined by ICANN.

5.2.1 Testing Procedures

The applicant may initiate the pre-delegation test by submitting to ICANN the Pre-Delegation form and accompanying documents containing all of the following information:
• All name server names and IPv4/IPv6 addresses to be used in serving the new TLD data;

• If using anycast, the list of names and IPv4/IPv6 unicast addresses allowing the identification of each individual server in the anycast sets;

• If IDN is supported, the complete IDN tables used in the registry system;

• A test zone for the new TLD must be signed at test time and the valid key-set to be used at the time of testing must be provided to ICANN in the documentation, as well as the TLD DNSSEC Policy Statement (DPS);

• The executed agreement between the selected escrow agent and the applicant; and

• Self-certification documentation as described below for each test item.

ICANN will review the material submitted and in some cases perform tests in addition to those conducted by the applicant. After testing, ICANN will assemble a report with the outcome of the tests and provide that report to the applicant.

Any clarification request, additional information request, or other request generated in the process will be highlighted and listed in the report sent to the applicant.

ICANN may request the applicant to complete load tests considering an aggregated load where a single entity is performing registry services for multiple TLDs.

Once an applicant has met all of the pre-delegation testing requirements, it is eligible to request delegation of its applied-for gTLD.

If an applicant does not complete the pre-delegation steps within the time period specified in the registry agreement, ICANN reserves the right to terminate the registry agreement.
5.2.2 Test Elements: DNS Infrastructure

The first set of test elements concerns the DNS infrastructure of the new gTLD. In all tests of the DNS infrastructure, all requirements are independent of whether IPv4 or IPv6 is used. All tests shall be done both over IPv4 and IPv6, with reports providing results according to both protocols.

**UDP Support** -- The DNS infrastructure to which these tests apply comprises the complete set of servers and network infrastructure to be used by the chosen providers to deliver DNS service for the new gTLD to the Internet. The documentation provided by the applicant must include the results from a system performance test indicating available network and server capacity and an estimate of expected capacity during normal operation to ensure stable service as well as to adequately address Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attacks.

Self-certification documentation shall include data on load capacity, latency and network reachability.

Load capacity shall be reported using a table, and a corresponding graph, showing percentage of queries responded against an increasing number of queries per second generated from local (to the servers) traffic generators. The table shall include at least 20 data points and loads of UDP-based queries that will cause up to 10% query loss against a randomly selected subset of servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure. Responses must either contain zone data or be NXDOMAIN or NODATA responses to be considered valid.

Query latency shall be reported in milliseconds as measured by DNS probes located just outside the border routers of the physical network hosting the name servers, from a network topology point of view.

Reachability will be documented by providing information on the transit and peering arrangements for the DNS server locations, listing the AS numbers of the transit providers or peers at each point of presence and available bandwidth at those points of presence.

**TCP support** -- TCP transport service for DNS queries and responses must be enabled and provisioned for expected load. ICANN will review the capacity self-certification documentation provided by the applicant and will perform TCP reachability and transaction capability tests across a
randomly selected subset of the name servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure. In case of use of anycast, each individual server in each anycast set will be tested.

Self-certification documentation shall include data on load capacity, latency and external network reachability.

Load capacity shall be reported using a table, and a corresponding graph, showing percentage of queries that generated a valid (zone data, NO DATA, or NXDOMAIN) response against an increasing number of queries per second generated from local (to the name servers) traffic generators. The table shall include at least 20 data points and loads that will cause up to 10% query loss (either due to connection timeout or connection reset) against a randomly selected subset of servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure.

Query latency will be reported in milliseconds as measured by DNS probes located just outside the border routers of the physical network hosting the name servers, from a network topology point of view.

Reachability will be documented by providing records of TCP-based DNS queries from nodes external to the network hosting the servers. These locations may be the same as those used for measuring latency above.

**DNSSEC support** -- Applicant must demonstrate support for EDNS(0) in its server infrastructure, the ability to return correct DNSSEC-related resource records such as DNSKEY, RRSIG, and NSEC/NSEC3 for the signed zone, and the ability to accept and publish DS resource records from second-level domain administrators. In particular, the applicant must demonstrate its ability to support the full life cycle of KSK and ZSK keys. ICANN will review the self-certification materials as well as test the reachability, response sizes, and DNS transaction capacity for DNS queries using the EDNS(0) protocol extension with the “DNSSEC OK” bit set for a randomly selected subset of all name servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure. In case of use of anycast, each individual server in each anycast set will be tested.

Load capacity, query latency, and reachability shall be documented as for UDP and TCP above.
5.2.3 Test Elements: Registry Systems

As documented in the registry agreement, registries must provide support for EPP within their Shared Registration System, and provide Whois service both via port 43 and a web interface, in addition to support for the DNS. This section details the requirements for testing these registry systems.

System performance -- The registry system must scale to meet the performance requirements described in Specification 10 of the registry agreement and ICANN will require self-certification of compliance. ICANN will review the self-certification documentation provided by the applicant to verify adherence to these minimum requirements.

Whois support -- Applicant must provision Whois services for the anticipated load. ICANN will verify that Whois data is accessible over IPv4 and IPv6 via both TCP port 43 and via a web interface and review self-certification documentation regarding Whois transaction capacity. Response format according to Specification 4 of the registry agreement and access to Whois (both port 43 and via web) will be tested by ICANN remotely from various points on the Internet over both IPv4 and IPv6.

Self-certification documents shall describe the maximum number of queries per second successfully handled by both the port 43 servers as well as the web interface, together with an applicant-provided load expectation.

Additionally, a description of deployed control functions to detect and mitigate data mining of the Whois database shall be documented.

EPP Support -- As part of a shared registration service, applicant must provision EPP services for the anticipated load. ICANN will verify conformance to appropriate RFCs (including EPP extensions for DNSSEC). ICANN will also review self-certification documentation regarding EPP transaction capacity.

Documentation shall provide a maximum Transaction per Second rate for the EPP interface with 10 data points corresponding to registry database sizes from 0 (empty) to the expected size after one year of operation, as determined by applicant.
Documentation shall also describe measures taken to handle load during initial registry operations, such as a land-rush period.

**IPv6 support** -- The ability of the registry to support registrars adding, changing, and removing IPv6 DNS records supplied by registrants will be tested by ICANN. If the registry supports EPP access via IPv6, this will be tested by ICANN remotely from various points on the Internet.

**DNSSEC support** -- ICANN will review the ability of the registry to support registrars adding, changing, and removing DNSSEC-related resource records as well as the registry’s overall key management procedures. In particular, the applicant must demonstrate its ability to support the full life cycle of key changes for child domains. Inter-operation of the applicant’s secure communication channels with the IANA for trust anchor material exchange will be verified.

The practice and policy document (also known as the DNSSEC Policy Statement or DPS), describing key material storage, access and usage for its own keys is also reviewed as part of this step.

**IDN support** -- ICANN will verify the complete IDN table(s) used in the registry system. The table(s) must comply with the guidelines in [http://iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html](http://iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html).

Requirements related to IDN for Whois are being developed. After these requirements are developed, prospective registries will be expected to comply with published IDN-related Whois requirements as part of pre-delegation testing.

**Escrow deposit** -- The applicant-provided samples of data deposit that include both a full and an incremental deposit showing correct type and formatting of content will be reviewed. Special attention will be given to the agreement with the escrow provider to ensure that escrowed data can be released within 24 hours should it be necessary. ICANN may, at its option, ask an independent third party to demonstrate the reconstitutability of the registry from escrowed data. ICANN may elect to test the data release process with the escrow agent.
5.3 **Delegation Process**

Upon notice of successful completion of the ICANN pre-delegation testing, applicants may initiate the process for delegation of the new gTLD into the root zone database. This will include provision of additional information and completion of additional technical steps required for delegation. Information about the delegation process is available at [http://iana.org/domains/root/](http://iana.org/domains/root/).

5.4 **Ongoing Operations**

An applicant that is successfully delegated a gTLD will become a “Registry Operator.” In being delegated the role of operating part of the Internet’s domain name system, the applicant will be assuming a number of significant responsibilities. ICANN will hold all new gTLD operators accountable for the performance of their obligations under the registry agreement, and it is important that all applicants understand these responsibilities.

5.4.1 **What is Expected of a Registry Operator**

The registry agreement defines the obligations of gTLD registry operators. A breach of the registry operator’s obligations may result in ICANN compliance actions up to and including termination of the registry agreement. Prospective applicants are encouraged to review the following brief description of some of these responsibilities.

Note that this is a non-exhaustive list provided to potential applicants as an introduction to the responsibilities of a registry operator. For the complete and authoritative text, please refer to the registry agreement.

A registry operator is obligated to:

**Operate the TLD in a stable and secure manner.** The registry operator is responsible for the entire technical operation of the TLD. As noted in RFC 1591¹:

“The designated manager must do a satisfactory job of operating the DNS service for the domain. That is, the actual management of the assigning of domain names, delegating subdomains and operating nameservers must be done with technical competence. This includes keeping...

the central IR\(^2\) (in the case of top-level domains) or other higher-level domain manager advised of the status of the domain, responding to requests in a timely manner, and operating the database with accuracy, robustness, and resilience."

The registry operator is required to comply with relevant technical standards in the form of RFCs and other guidelines. Additionally, the registry operator must meet performance specifications in areas such as system downtime and system response times (see Specifications 6 and 10 of the registry agreement).

**Comply with consensus policies and temporary policies.**

gTLD registry operators are required to comply with consensus policies. Consensus policies may relate to a range of topics such as issues affecting interoperability of the DNS, registry functional and performance specifications, database security and stability, or resolution of disputes over registration of domain names.

To be adopted as a consensus policy, a policy must be developed by the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)\(^3\) following the process in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws.\(^4\) The policy development process involves deliberation and collaboration by the various stakeholder groups participating in the process, with multiple opportunities for input and comment by the public, and can take significant time.

Examples of existing consensus policies are the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (governing transfers of domain names between registrars), and the Registry Services Evaluation Policy (establishing a review of proposed new registry services for security and stability or competition concerns), although there are several more, as found at [http://www.icann.org/en/general/consensus-policies.htm](http://www.icann.org/en/general/consensus-policies.htm).

gTLD registry operators are obligated to comply with both existing consensus policies and those that are developed in the future. Once a consensus policy has been formally adopted, ICANN will provide gTLD registry operators with notice of the requirement to implement the new policy and the effective date.

---

2 IR is a historical reference to “Internet Registry,” a function now performed by ICANN.

3 [http://gnso.icann.org](http://gnso.icann.org)

In addition, the ICANN Board may, when required by circumstances, establish a temporary policy necessary to maintain the stability or security of registry services or the DNS. In such a case, all gTLD registry operators will be required to comply with the temporary policy for the designated period of time.

For more information, see Specification 1 of the registry agreement.

**Implement start-up rights protection measures.** The registry operator must implement, at a minimum, a Sunrise period and a Trademark Claims service during the start-up phases for registration in the TLD, as provided in the registry agreement. These mechanisms will be supported by the established Trademark Clearinghouse as indicated by ICANN.

The Sunrise period allows eligible rightsholders an early opportunity to register names in the TLD.

The Trademark Claims service provides notice to potential registrants of existing trademark rights, as well as notice to rightsholders of relevant names registered. Registry operators may continue offering the Trademark Claims service after the relevant start-up phases have concluded.

For more information, see Specification 7 of the registry agreement and the Trademark Clearinghouse model accompanying this module.

**Implement post-launch rights protection measures.** The registry operator is required to implement decisions made under the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) procedure, including suspension of specific domain names within the registry. The registry operator is also required to comply with and implement decisions made according to the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Policy (PDDRP).

The required measures are described fully in the URS and PDDRP procedures accompanying this module. Registry operators may introduce additional rights protection measures relevant to the particular gTLD.

**Implement measures for protection of country and territory names in the new gTLD.** All new gTLD registry operators are required to provide certain minimum protections for country and territory names, including an initial reservation requirement and establishment of applicable rules and
procedures for release of these names. The rules for release can be developed or agreed to by governments, the GAC, and/or approved by ICANN after a community discussion. Registry operators are encouraged to implement measures for protection of geographical names in addition to those required by the agreement, according to the needs and interests of each gTLD’s particular circumstances. (See Specification 5 of the registry agreement).

**Pay recurring fees to ICANN.** In addition to supporting expenditures made to accomplish the objectives set out in ICANN’s mission statement, these funds enable the support required for new gTLDs, including: contractual compliance, registry liaison, increased registrar accreditations, and other registry support activities. The fees include both a fixed component (USD 25,000 annually) and, where the TLD exceeds a transaction volume, a variable fee based on transaction volume. See Article 6 of the registry agreement.

**Regularly deposit data into escrow.** This serves an important role in registrant protection and continuity for certain instances where the registry or one aspect of the registry operations experiences a system failure or loss of data. (See Specification 2 of the registry agreement.)

**Deliver monthly reports in a timely manner.** A registry operator must submit a report to ICANN on a monthly basis. The report includes registrar transactions for the month and is used by ICANN for calculation of registrar fees. (See Specification 3 of the registry agreement.)

**Provide Whois service.** A registry operator must provide a publicly available Whois service for registered domain names in the TLD. (See Specification 4 of the registry agreement.)

**Maintain partnerships with ICANN-accredited registrars.** A registry operator creates a Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA) to define requirements for its registrars. This must include certain terms that are specified in the Registry Agreement, and may include additional terms specific to the TLD. A registry operator must provide non-discriminatory access to its registry services to all ICANN-accredited registrars with whom it has entered into an RRA, and who are in compliance with the requirements. This includes providing advance notice of pricing changes to all
registrars, in compliance with the time frames specified in the agreement. (See Article 2 of the registry agreement.)

**Maintain an abuse point of contact.** A registry operator must maintain and publish on its website a single point of contact responsible for addressing matters requiring expedited attention and providing a timely response to abuse complaints concerning all names registered in the TLD through all registrars of record, including those involving a reseller. A registry operator must also take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any reports from law enforcement, governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. (See Article 2 and Specification 6 of the registry agreement.)

**Cooperate with contractual compliance audits.** To maintain a level playing field and a consistent operating environment, ICANN staff performs periodic audits to assess contractual compliance and address any resulting problems. A registry operator must provide documents and information requested by ICANN that are necessary to perform such audits. (See Article 2 of the registry agreement.)

**Maintain a Continued Operations Instrument.** A registry operator must, at the time of the agreement, have in place a continued operations instrument sufficient to fund basic registry operations for a period of three (3) years. This requirement remains in place for five (5) years after delegation of the TLD, after which time the registry operator is no longer required to maintain the continued operations instrument. (See Specification 8 to the registry agreement.)

**Maintain community-based policies and procedures.** If the registry operator designated its application as community-based at the time of the application, the registry operator has requirements in its registry agreement to maintain the community-based policies and procedures it specified in its application. The registry operator is bound by the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure with respect to disputes regarding execution of its community-based policies and procedures. (See Article 2 to the registry agreement.)

**Have continuity and transition plans in place.** This includes performing failover testing on a regular basis. In the event that a transition to a new registry operator becomes necessary, the registry operator is expected to cooperate
by consulting with ICANN on the appropriate successor, providing the data required to enable a smooth transition, and complying with the applicable registry transition procedures. (See Articles 2 and 4 of the registry agreement.)

Make TLD zone files available via a standardized process. This includes provision of access to the registry’s zone file to credentialed users, according to established access, file, and format standards. The registry operator will enter into a standardized form of agreement with zone file users and will accept credential information for users via a clearinghouse. (See Specification 4 of the registry agreement.)

Implement DNSSEC. The registry operator is required to sign the TLD zone files implementing Domain Name System Security Extensions (DNSSEC) in accordance with the relevant technical standards. The registry must accept public key material from registrars for domain names registered in the TLD, and publish a DNSSEC Policy Statement describing key material storage, access, and usage for the registry’s keys. (See Specification 6 of the registry agreement.)

5.4.2 What is Expected of ICANN

ICANN will continue to provide support for gTLD registry operators as they launch and maintain registry operations. ICANN’s gTLD registry liaison function provides a point of contact for gTLD registry operators for assistance on a continuing basis.

ICANN’s contractual compliance function will perform audits on a regular basis to ensure that gTLD registry operators remain in compliance with agreement obligations, as well as investigate any complaints from the community regarding the registry operator’s adherence to its contractual obligations. See http://www.icann.org/en/compliance/ for more information on current contractual compliance activities.

ICANN’s Bylaws require ICANN to act in an open and transparent manner, and to provide equitable treatment among registry operators. ICANN is responsible for maintaining the security and stability of the global Internet, and looks forward to a constructive and cooperative relationship with future gTLD registry operators in furtherance of this goal.
New gTLD Agreement

This document contains the registry agreement associated with the Applicant Guidebook for New gTLDs.

Successful gTLD applicants would enter into this form of registry agreement with ICANN prior to delegation of the new gTLD. (Note: ICANN reserves the right to make reasonable updates and changes to this proposed agreement during the course of the application process, including as the possible result of new policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process).
This REGISTRY AGREEMENT (this “Agreement”) is entered into as of ___________ (the “Effective Date”) between Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation (“ICANN”), and __________, a _____________ (“Registry Operator”).

ARTICLE 1.

DELEGATION AND OPERATION OF TOP–LEVEL DOMAIN; REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES

1.1 Domain and Designation. The Top-Level Domain to which this Agreement applies is ____ (the “TLD”). Upon the Effective Date and until the end of the Term (as defined in Section 4.1), ICANN designates Registry Operator as the registry operator for the TLD, subject to the requirements and necessary approvals for delegation of the TLD and entry into the root-zone.

1.2 Technical Feasibility of String. While ICANN has encouraged and will continue to encourage universal acceptance of all top-level domain strings across the Internet, certain top-level domain strings may encounter difficulty in acceptance by ISPs and webhosters and/or validation by web applications. Registry Operator shall be responsible for ensuring to its satisfaction the technical feasibility of the TLD string prior to entering into this Agreement.

1.3 Representations and Warranties.

(a) Registry Operator represents and warrants to ICANN as follows:

   (i) all material information provided and statements made in the registry TLD application, and statements made in writing during the negotiation of this Agreement, were true and correct in all material respects at the time made, and such information or statements continue to be true and correct in all material respects as of the Effective Date except as otherwise previously disclosed in writing by Registry Operator to ICANN;

   (ii) Registry Operator is duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the jurisdiction set forth in the preamble hereto, and Registry Operator has all requisite power and authority and obtained all necessary approvals to enter into and duly execute and deliver this Agreement; and

   (iii) Registry Operator has delivered to ICANN a duly executed instrument that secures the funds required to perform registry functions for the TLD in the event of the termination or expiration of this Agreement (the “Continued Operations Instrument”), and such instrument is a binding obligation of the parties thereto, enforceable against the parties thereto in accordance with its terms.

(b) ICANN represents and warrants to Registry Operator that ICANN is a nonprofit public benefit corporation duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the State of California, United States of America. ICANN has all requisite power and authority and obtained all necessary corporate approvals to enter into and duly execute and deliver this Agreement.
ARTICLE 2.

COVENANTS OF REGISTRY OPERATOR

Registry Operator covenants and agrees with ICANN as follows:

2.1 Approved Services; Additional Services. Registry Operator shall be entitled to provide the Registry Services described in clauses (a) and (b) of the first paragraph of Section 2.1 in the specification at [see specification 6] (“Specification 6”) and such other Registry Services set forth on Exhibit A (collectively, the “Approved Services”). If Registry Operator desires to provide any Registry Service that is not an Approved Service or is a modification to an Approved Service (each, an “Additional Service”), Registry Operator shall submit a request for approval of such Additional Service pursuant to the Registry Services Evaluation Policy at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html, as such policy may be amended from time to time in accordance with the bylaws of ICANN (as amended from time to time, the “ICANN Bylaws”) applicable to Consensus Policies (the “RSEP”). Registry Operator may offer Additional Services only with the written approval of ICANN, and, upon any such approval, such Additional Services shall be deemed Registry Services under this Agreement. In its reasonable discretion, ICANN may require an amendment to this Agreement reflecting the provision of any Additional Service which is approved pursuant to the RSEP, which amendment shall be in a form reasonably acceptable to the parties.

2.2 Compliance with Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies. Registry Operator shall comply with and implement all Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies found at <http://www.icann.org/general/consensus-policies.htm>, as of the Effective Date and as may in the future be developed and adopted in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws, provided such future Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies are adopted in accordance with the procedure and relate to those topics and subject to those limitations set forth at [see specification 1] (“Specification 1”).

2.3 Data Escrow. Registry Operator shall comply with the registry data escrow procedures posted at [see specification 2].

2.4 Monthly Reporting. Within twenty (20) calendar days following the end of each calendar month, Registry Operator shall deliver to ICANN reports in the format posted in the specification at [see specification 3].

2.5 Publication of Registration Data. Registry Operator shall provide public access to registration data in accordance with the specification posted at [see specification 4] (“Specification 4”).

2.6 Reserved Names. Except to the extent that ICANN otherwise expressly authorizes in writing, Registry Operator shall comply with the restrictions on registration of character strings set forth at [see specification 5] (“Specification 5”). Registry Operator may establish policies concerning the reservation or blocking of additional character strings within the TLD at its discretion. If Registry Operator is the registrant for any domain names in the Registry TLD (other than the Second-Level Reservations for Registry Operations from Specification 5), such registrations must be through an ICANN accredited registrar. Any such registrations will be considered Transactions (as defined in Section 6.1) for purposes of calculating the Registry-Level Transaction Fee to be paid to ICANN by Registry Operator pursuant to Section 6.1.

2.7 Registry Interoperability and Continuity. Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Interoperability and Continuity Specifications as set forth in Specification 6.
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2.8 Protection of Legal Rights of Third Parties. Registry Operator must specify, and comply with, a process and procedures for launch of the TLD and initial registration-related and ongoing protection of the legal rights of third parties as set forth in the specification at [see specification 7]* (“Specification 7”). Registry Operator may, at its election, implement additional protections of the legal rights of third parties. Any changes or modifications to the process and procedures required by Specification 7 following the Effective Date must be approved in advance by ICANN in writing. Registry Operator must comply with all remedies imposed by ICANN pursuant to Section 2 of Specification 7, subject to Registry Operator’s right to challenge such remedies as set forth in the applicable procedure described therein. Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any reports from law enforcement and governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. In responding to such reports, Registry Operator will not be required to take any action in contravention of applicable law.

2.9 Registrars.

(a) Registry Operator must use only ICANN accredited registrars in registering domain names. Registry Operator must provide non-discriminatory access to Registry Services to all ICANN accredited registrars that enter into and are in compliance with the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD; provided, that Registry Operator may establish non-discriminatory criteria for qualification to register names in the TLD that are reasonably related to the proper functioning of the TLD. Registry Operator must use a uniform non-discriminatory agreement with all registrars authorized to register names in the TLD. Such agreement may be revised by Registry Operator from time to time; provided, however, that any such revisions must be approved in advance by ICANN.

(b) If Registry Operator (i) becomes an Affiliate or reseller of an ICANN accredited registrar, or (ii) subcontracts the provision of any Registry Services to an ICANN accredited registrar, registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, then, in either such case of (i) or (ii) above, Registry Operator will give ICANN prompt notice of the contract, transaction or other arrangement that resulted in such affiliation, reseller relationship or subcontract, as applicable, including, if requested by ICANN, copies of any contract relating thereto; provided, that ICANN will not disclose such contracts to any third party other than relevant competition authorities. ICANN reserves the right, but not the obligation, to refer any such contract, transaction or other arrangement to relevant competition authorities in the event that ICANN determines that such contract, transaction or other arrangement might raise competition issues.

(c) For the purposes of this Agreement: (i) “Affiliate” means a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the person or entity specified, and (ii) “control” (including the terms “controlled by” and “under common control with”) means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of a person or entity, whether through the ownership of securities, as trustee or executor, by serving as an employee or a member of a board of directors or equivalent governing body, by contract, by credit arrangement or otherwise.

2.10 Pricing for Registry Services.

(a) With respect to initial domain name registrations, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN and each ICANN accredited registrar that has executed the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD advance written notice of any price increase (including as a result of the elimination of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs which had the effect of reducing the price charged to registrars, unless such refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs are of a limited
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duration that is clearly and conspicuously disclosed to the registrar when offered) of no less than thirty (30) calendar days. Registry Operator shall offer registrars the option to obtain initial domain name registrations for periods of one to ten years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten years.

(b) With respect to renewal of domain name registrations, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN and each ICANN accredited registrar that has executed the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD advance written notice of any price increase (including as a result of the elimination of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying, Qualified Marketing Programs or other programs which had the effect of reducing the price charged to registrars) of no less than one hundred eighty (180) calendar days. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, with respect to renewal of domain name registrations: (i) Registry Operator need only provide thirty (30) calendar days notice of any price increase if the resulting price is less than or equal to (A) for the period beginning on the Effective Date and ending twelve (12) months following the Effective Date, the initial price charged for registrations in the TLD, or (B) for subsequent periods, a price for which Registry Operator provided a notice pursuant to the first sentence of this Section 2.10(b) within the twelve (12) month period preceding the effective date of the proposed price increase; and (ii) Registry Operator need not provide notice of any price increase for the imposition of the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3. Registry Operator shall offer registrars the option to obtain domain name registration renewals at the current price (i.e. the price in place prior to any noticed increase) for periods of one to ten years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten years.

(c) In addition, Registry Operator must have uniform pricing for renewals of domain name registrations (“Renewal Pricing”). For the purposes of determining Renewal Pricing, the price for each domain name registration renewal must be identical to the price of all other domain name registration renewals in place at the time of such renewal, and such price must take into account universal application of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs in place at the time of renewal. The foregoing requirements of this Section 2.10(c) shall not apply for (i) purposes of determining Renewal Pricing if the registrar has provided Registry Operator with documentation that demonstrates that the applicable registrant expressly agreed in its registration agreement with registrar to higher Renewal Pricing at the time of the initial registration of the domain name following clear and conspicuous disclosure of such Renewal Pricing to such registrant, and (ii) discounted Renewal Pricing pursuant to a Qualified Marketing Program (as defined below). The parties acknowledge that the purpose of this Section 2.10(c) is to prohibit abusive and/or discriminatory Renewal Pricing practices imposed by Registry Operator without the written consent of the applicable registrant at the time of the initial registration of the domain and this Section 2.10(c) will be interpreted broadly to prohibit such practices. For purposes of this Section 2.10(c), a “Qualified Marketing Program” is a marketing program pursuant to which Registry Operator offers discounted Renewal Pricing, provided that each of the following criteria is satisfied: (i) the program and related discounts are offered for a period of time not to exceed one hundred eighty (180) calendar days (with consecutive substantially similar programs aggregated for purposes of determining the number of calendar days of the program), (ii) all ICANN accredited registrars are provided the same opportunity to qualify for such discounted Renewal Pricing; and (iii) the intent or effect of the program is not to exclude any particular class(es) of registrations (e.g., registrations held by large corporations) or increase the renewal price of any particular class(es) of registrations. Nothing in this Section 2.10(c) shall limit Registry Operator’s obligations pursuant to Section 2.10(b).

(d) Registry Operator shall provide public query-based DNS lookup service for the TLD (that is, operate the Registry TLD zone servers) at its sole expense.

2.11 Contractual and Operational Compliance Audits.
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(a) ICANN may from time to time (not to exceed twice per calendar year) conduct, or engage a third party to conduct, contractual compliance audits to assess compliance by Registry Operator with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement and its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement. Such audits shall be tailored to achieve the purpose of assessing compliance, and ICANN will (a) give reasonable advance notice of any such audit, which notice shall specify in reasonable detail the categories of documents, data and other information requested by ICANN, and (b) use commercially reasonable efforts to conduct such audit in such a manner as to not unreasonably disrupt the operations of Registry Operator. As part of such audit and upon request by ICANN, Registry Operator shall timely provide all responsive documents, data and any other information necessary to demonstrate Registry Operator’s compliance with this Agreement. Upon no less than five (5) business days notice (unless otherwise agreed to by Registry Operator), ICANN may, as part of any contractual compliance audit, conduct site visits during regular business hours to assess compliance by Registry Operator with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement and its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement.

(b) Any audit conducted pursuant to Section 2.11(a) will be at ICANN’s expense, unless (i) Registry Operator (A) controls, is controlled by, is under common control or is otherwise Affiliated with, any ICANN accredited registrar or registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, or (B) has subcontracted the provision of Registry Services to an ICANN accredited registrar or registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, and, in either case of (A) or (B) above, the audit relates to Registry Operator’s compliance with Section 2.14, in which case Registry Operator shall reimburse ICANN for all reasonable costs and expenses associated with the portion of the audit related to Registry Operator’s compliance with Section 2.14, or (ii) the audit is related to a discrepancy in the fees paid by Registry Operator hereunder in excess of 5% to ICANN’s detriment, in which case Registry Operator shall reimburse ICANN for all reasonable costs and expenses associated with the entirety of such audit. In either such case of (i) or (ii) above, such reimbursement will be paid together with the next Registry-Level Fee payment due following the date of transmittal of the cost statement for such audit.

(c) Notwithstanding Section 2.11(a), if Registry Operator is found not to be in compliance with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement or its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement in two consecutive audits conducted pursuant to this Section 2.11, ICANN may increase the number of such audits to one per calendar quarter.

(d) Registry Operator will give ICANN immediate notice of the commencement of any of the proceedings referenced in Section 4.3(d) or the occurrence of any of the matters specified in Section 4.3(f).

2.12 Continued Operations Instrument. Registry Operator shall comply with the terms and conditions relating to the Continued Operations Instrument set forth in the specification at [see specification 8].

2.13 Emergency Transition. Registry Operator agrees that in the event that any of the registry functions set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 fails for a period longer than the emergency threshold for such function set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10, ICANN may designate an emergency interim registry operator of the registry for the TLD (an “Emergency Operator”) in accordance with ICANN’s registry transition process (available at ____________) (as the same may be amended from time to time, the “Registry Transition Process”) until such time as Registry Operator has demonstrated to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that it can resume operation of the registry for the TLD without the reoccurrence of such failure. Following such demonstration, Registry Operator may transition back into operation of the registry for the TLD pursuant to the procedures set out in the Registry Transition Process,
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provided that Registry Operator pays all reasonable costs incurred (i) by ICANN as a result of the
designation of the Emergency Operator and (ii) by the Emergency Operator in connection with the
operation of the registry for the TLD, which costs shall be documented in reasonable detail in records
that shall be made available to Registry Operator. In the event ICANN designates an Emergency Operator
pursuant to this Section 2.13 and the Registry Transition Process, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN
or any such Emergency Operator with all data (including the data escrowed in accordance with Section
2.3) regarding operations of the registry for the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry
functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such Emergency Operator. Registry Operator
agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and
WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event that an Emergency Operator is designated pursuant
to this Section 2.13. In addition, in the event of such failure, ICANN shall retain and may enforce its
rights under the Continued Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable.

2.14 Registry Code of Conduct. In connection with the operation of the registry for the
TLD, Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Code of Conduct as set forth in the specification
at [see specification 9].

2.15 Cooperation with Economic Studies. If ICANN initiates or commissions an economic
study on the impact or functioning of new generic top-level domains on the Internet, the DNS or related
matters, Registry Operator shall reasonably cooperate with such study, including by delivering to ICANN
or its designee conducting such study all data reasonably necessary for the purposes of such study
requested by ICANN or its designee, provided, that Registry Operator may withhold any internal analyses
or evaluations prepared by Registry Operator with respect to such data. Any data delivered to ICANN or
its designee pursuant to this Section 2.15 shall be fully aggregated and anonymized by ICANN or its
designee prior to any disclosure of such data to any third party.

2.16 Registry Performance Specifications. Registry Performance Specifications for
operation of the TLD will be as set forth in the specification at [see specification 10]*. Registry Operator
shall comply with such Performance Specifications and, for a period of at least one year, shall keep
technical and operational records sufficient to evidence compliance with such specifications for each
calendar year during the Term.

2.17 Personal Data. Registry Operator shall (i) notify each ICANN-accredited registrar that
is a party to the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD of the purposes for which data about any
identified or identifiable natural person ("Personal Data") submitted to Registry Operator by such
registrar is collected and used under this Agreement or otherwise and the intended recipients (or
categories of recipients) of such Personal Data, and (ii) require such registrar to obtain the consent of each
registrant in the TLD for such collection and use of Personal Data. Registry Operator shall take
reasonable steps to protect Personal Data collected from such registrar from loss, misuse, unauthorized
disclosure, alteration or destruction. Registry Operator shall not use or authorize the use of Personal Data
in a way that is incompatible with the notice provided to registrars.

2.18 [Note: For Community-Based TLDs Only] Obligations of Registry Operator to TLD
Community. Registry Operator shall establish registration policies in conformity with the application
submitted with respect to the TLD for: (i) naming conventions within the TLD, (ii) requirements for
registration by members of the TLD community, and (iii) use of registered domain names in conformity
with the stated purpose of the community-based TLD. Registry Operator shall operate the TLD in a
manner that allows the TLD community to discuss and participate in the development and modification of
policies and practices for the TLD. Registry Operator shall establish procedures for the enforcement of
registration policies for the TLD, and resolution of disputes concerning compliance with TLD registration
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policies, and shall enforce such registration policies. Registry Operator agrees to implement and be bound by the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure as set forth at [insert applicable URL] with respect to disputes arising pursuant to this Section 2.18.]

ARTICLE 3.

COVENANTS OF ICANN

ICANN covenants and agrees with Registry Operator as follows:

3.1 Open and Transparent. Consistent with ICANN’s expressed mission and core values, ICANN shall operate in an open and transparent manner.

3.2 Equitable Treatment. ICANN shall not apply standards, policies, procedures or practices arbitrarily, unjustifiably, or inequitably and shall not single out Registry Operator for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause.

3.3 TLD Nameservers. ICANN will use commercially reasonable efforts to ensure that any changes to the TLD nameserver designations submitted to ICANN by Registry Operator (in a format and with required technical elements specified by ICANN at http://www.iana.org/domains/root/) will be implemented by ICANN within seven (7) calendar days or as promptly as feasible following technical verifications.

3.4 Root-zone Information Publication. ICANN’s publication of root-zone contact information for the TLD will include Registry Operator and its administrative and technical contacts. Any request to modify the contact information for the Registry Operator must be made in the format specified from time to time by ICANN at http://www.iana.org/domains/root/.

3.5 Authoritative Root Database. To the extent that ICANN is authorized to set policy with regard to an authoritative root server system, ICANN shall use commercially reasonable efforts to (a) ensure that the authoritative root will point to the top-level domain nameservers designated by Registry Operator for the TLD, (b) maintain a stable, secure, and authoritative publicly available database of relevant information about the TLD, in accordance with ICANN publicly available policies and procedures, and (c) coordinate the Authoritative Root Server System so that it is operated and maintained in a stable and secure manner; provided, that ICANN shall not be in breach of this Agreement and ICANN shall have no liability in the event that any third party (including any governmental entity or internet service provider) blocks or restricts access to the TLD in any jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 4.

TERM AND TERMINATION

4.1 Term. The term of this Agreement will be ten years from the Effective Date (as such term may be extended pursuant to Section 4.2, the “Term”).

4.2 Renewal.

(a) This Agreement will be renewed for successive periods of ten years upon the expiration of the initial Term set forth in Section 4.1 and each successive Term, unless:
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(i) Following notice by ICANN to Registry Operator of a fundamental and material breach of Registry Operator’s covenants set forth in Article 2 or breach of its payment obligations under Article 6 of this Agreement, which notice shall include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, and such breach has not been cured within thirty (30) calendar days of such notice, (A) an arbitrator or court has finally determined that Registry Operator has been in fundamental and material breach of such covenant(s) or in breach of its payment obligations, and (B) Registry Operator has failed to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court; or

(ii) During the then current Term, Registry Operator shall have been found by an arbitrator (pursuant to Section 5.2 of this Agreement) on at least three (3) separate occasions to have been in fundamental and material breach (whether or not cured) of Registry Operator’s covenants set forth in Article 2 or breach of its payment obligations under Article 6 of this Agreement.

(b) Upon the occurrence of the events set forth in Section 4.2(a) (i) or (ii), the Agreement shall terminate at the expiration of the then current Term.

4.3 Termination by ICANN.

(a) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if: (i) Registry Operator fails to cure (A) any fundamental and material breach of Registry Operator’s representations and warranties set forth in Article 1 or covenants set forth in Article 2, or (B) any breach of Registry Operator’s payment obligations set forth in Article 6 of this Agreement, each within thirty (30) calendar days after ICANN gives Registry Operator notice of such breach, which notice will include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, (ii) an arbitrator or court has finally determined that Registry Operator is in fundamental and material breach of such covenant(s) or in breach of its payment obligations, and (iii) Registry Operator fails to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court.

(b) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if Registry Operator fails to complete all testing and procedures (identified by ICANN in writing to Registry Operator prior to the date hereof) for delegation of the TLD into the root zone within twelve (12) months of the Effective Date. Registry Operator may request an extension for up to additional twelve (12) months for delegation if it can demonstrate, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, that Registry Operator is working diligently and in good faith toward successfully completing the steps necessary for delegation of the TLD. Any fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN prior to such termination date shall be retained by ICANN in full.

(c) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator fails to cure a material breach of Registry Operator’s obligations set forth in Section 2.12 of this Agreement within thirty (30) calendar days of delivery of notice of such breach by ICANN, or if the Continued Operations Instrument is not in effect for greater than sixty (60) consecutive calendar days at any time following the Effective Date, (ii) an arbitrator or court has finally determined that Registry Operator is in material breach of such covenant, and (iii) Registry Operator fails to cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court.

* Final text will be posted on ICANN website; agreement reference to be replaced by hyperlink.
(d) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator makes an assignment for the benefit of creditors or similar act, (ii) attachment, garnishment or similar proceedings are commenced against Registry Operator, which proceedings are a material threat to Registry Operator’s ability to operate the registry for the TLD, and are not dismissed within sixty (60) days of their commencement, (iii) a trustee, receiver, liquidator or equivalent is appointed in place of Registry Operator or maintains control over any of Registry Operator’s property, (iv) execution is levied upon any property of Registry Operator, (v) proceedings are instituted by or against Registry Operator under any bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization or other laws relating to the relief of debtors and such proceedings are not dismissed within thirty (30) days of their commencement, or (vi) Registry Operator files for protection under the United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. Section 101 et seq., or a foreign equivalent or liquidates, dissolves or otherwise discontinues its operations or the operation of the TLD.

(e) ICANN may, upon thirty (30) calendar days’ notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement pursuant to Section 2 of Specification 7, subject to Registry Operator’s right to challenge such termination as set forth in the applicable procedure described therein.

(f) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator knowingly employs any officer that is convicted of a misdemeanor related to financial activities or of any felony, or is judged by a court of competent jurisdiction to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or is the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN reasonably deems as the substantive equivalent of any of the foregoing and such officer is not terminated within thirty (30) calendar days of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the foregoing, or (ii) any member of Registry Operator’s board of directors or similar governing body is convicted of a misdemeanor related to financial activities or of any felony, or is judged by a court of competent jurisdiction to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or is the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN reasonably deems as the substantive equivalent of any of the foregoing and such member is not removed from Registry Operator’s board of directors or similar governing body within thirty (30) calendar days of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the foregoing.

(g) [Applicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities only.] ICANN may terminate this Agreement pursuant to Section 7.14.

4.4 Termination by Registry Operator.

(a) Registry Operator may terminate this Agreement upon notice to ICANN if, (i) ICANN fails to cure any fundamental and material breach of ICANN’s covenants set forth in Article 3, within thirty (30) calendar days after Registry Operator gives ICANN notice of such breach, which notice will include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, (ii) an arbitrator or court has finally determined that ICANN is in fundamental and material breach of such covenants, and (iii) ICANN fails to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court.

(b) Registry Operator may terminate this Agreement for any reason upon one hundred eighty (180) calendar day advance notice to ICANN.

4.5 Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement. Upon expiration of the Term pursuant to Section 4.1 or Section 4.2 or any termination of this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3 or Section 4.4, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or any successor registry operator that may be designated by ICANN for the TLD in accordance with this Section 4.5 with all data (including the data
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escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3) regarding operations of the registry for the TLD necessary to
maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such successor
registry operator. After consultation with Registry Operator, ICANN shall determine whether or not to
transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator in its sole discretion and in conformance
with the Registry Transition Process; provided, however, that if Registry Operator demonstrates to
ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that (i) all domain name registrations in the TLD are registered to, and
maintained by, Registry Operator for its own exclusive use, (ii) Registry Operator does not sell, distribute
or transfer control or use of any registrations in the TLD to any third party that is not an Affiliate of
Registry Operator, and (iii) transitioning operation of the TLD is not necessary to protect the public
interest, then ICANN may not transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator upon the
expiration or termination of this Agreement without the consent of Registry Operator (which shall not be
unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed). For the avoidance of doubt, the foregoing sentence shall
not prohibit ICANN from delegating the TLD pursuant to a future application process for the delegation
of top-level domains, subject to any processes and objection procedures instituted by ICANN in
connection with such application process intended to protect the rights of third parties. Registry Operator
agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and
WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event of a transition of the TLD pursuant to this Section
4.5. In addition, ICANN or its designee shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued
Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable, regardless of the reason for termination
or expiration of this Agreement.

[Alternative Section 4.5 Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement text for
intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities or other special circumstances:]

“Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement. Upon expiration of the Term
pursuant to Section 4.1 or Section 4.2 or any termination of this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3 or
Section 4.4, in connection with ICANN’s designation of a successor registry operator for the TLD,
Registry Operator and ICANN agree to consult each other and work cooperatively to facilitate and
implement the transition of the TLD in accordance with this Section 4.5. After consultation with Registry
Operator, ICANN shall determine whether or not to transition operation of the TLD to a successor
registry operator in its sole discretion and in conformance with the Registry Transition Process. In the
event ICANN determines to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator, upon
Registry Operator’s consent (which shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed), Registry
Operator shall provide ICANN or such successor registry operator for the TLD with any data regarding
operations of the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably
requested by ICANN or such successor registry operator in addition to data escrowed in accordance with
Section 2.3 hereof. In the event that Registry Operator does not consent to provide such data, any registry
data related to the TLD shall be returned to Registry Operator, unless otherwise agreed upon by the
parties. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA
database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event of a transition of the TLD
pursuant to this Section 4.5. In addition, ICANN or its designee shall retain and may enforce its rights
under the Continued Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable, regardless of the
reason for termination or expiration of this Agreement.”]

4.6 Effect of Termination. Upon any expiration of the Term or termination of this
Agreement, the obligations and rights of the parties hereto shall cease, provided that such expiration or
termination of this Agreement shall not relieve the parties of any obligation or breach of this Agreement
accruing prior to such expiration or termination, including, without limitation, all accrued payment
obligations arising under Article 6. In addition, Article 5, Article 7, Section 2.12, Section 4.5, and this
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Section 4.6 shall survive the expiration or termination of this Agreement. For the avoidance of doubt, the rights of Registry Operator to operate the registry for the TLD shall immediately cease upon any expiration of the Term or termination of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 5.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

5.1 Cooperative Engagement. Before either party may initiate arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2 below, ICANN and Registry Operator, following initiation of communications by either party, must attempt to resolve the dispute by engaging in good faith discussion over a period of at least fifteen (15) calendar days.

5.2 Arbitration. Disputes arising under or in connection with this Agreement, including requests for specific performance, will be resolved through binding arbitration conducted pursuant to the rules of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce. The arbitration will be conducted in the English language and will occur in Los Angeles County, California. Any arbitration will be in front of a single arbitrator, unless (i) ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, or (ii) the parties agree in writing to a greater number of arbitrators. In either case of clauses (i) or (ii) in the preceding sentence, the arbitration will be in front of three arbitrators with each party selecting one arbitrator and the two selected arbitrators selecting the third arbitrator. In order to expedite the arbitration and limit its cost, the arbitrator(s) shall establish page limits for the parties’ filings in conjunction with the arbitration, and should the arbitrator(s) determine that a hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be limited to one (1) calendar day, provided that in any arbitration in which ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, the hearing may be extended for one (1) additional calendar day if agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator(s) based on the arbitrator(s) independent determination or the reasonable request of one of the parties thereto. The prevailing party in the arbitration will have the right to recover its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, which the arbitrator(s) shall include in the awards. In the event the arbitrators determine that Registry Operator has been repeatedly and willfully in fundamental and material breach of its obligations set forth in Article 2, Article 6 or Section 5.4 of this Agreement, ICANN may request the arbitrators award punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions (including without limitation an order temporarily restricting Registry Operator’s right to sell new registrations). In any litigation involving ICANN concerning this Agreement, jurisdiction and exclusive venue for such litigation will be in a court located in Los Angeles County, California; however, the parties will also have the right to enforce a judgment of such a court in any court of competent jurisdiction.

[Alternative Section 5.2 Arbitration text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities or other special circumstances:

“Arbitration. Disputes arising under or in connection with this Agreement, including requests for specific performance, will be resolved through binding arbitration conducted pursuant to the rules of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce. The arbitration will be conducted in the English language and will occur in Geneva, Switzerland, unless another location is mutually agreed upon by Registry Operator and ICANN. Any arbitration will be in front of a single arbitrator, unless (i) ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, or (ii) the parties agree in writing to a greater number of arbitrators. In either case of clauses (i) or (ii) in the preceding sentence, the arbitration will be in front of three arbitrators with each party selecting one arbitrator and the two selected arbitrators selecting the third arbitrator. In order to expedite the arbitration and limit its cost, the arbitrator(s) shall establish page limits for the parties’ filings in conjunction with the
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arbitration, and should the arbitrator(s) determine that a hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be limited to one (1) calendar day, provided that in any arbitration in which ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, the hearing may be extended for one (1) additional calendar day if agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator(s) based on the arbitrator(s) independent determination or the reasonable request of one of the parties thereto. The prevailing party in the arbitration will have the right to recover its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, which the arbitrator(s) shall include in the awards. In the event the arbitrators determine that Registry Operator has been repeatedly and willfully in fundamental and material breach of its obligations set forth in Article 2, Article 6 or Section 5.4 of this Agreement, ICANN may request the arbitrators award punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions (including without limitation an order temporarily restricting Registry Operator’s right to sell new registrations). In any litigation involving ICANN concerning this Agreement, jurisdiction and exclusive venue for such litigation will be in a court located in Geneva, Switzerland, unless another location is mutually agreed upon by Registry Operator and ICANN; however, the parties will also have the right to enforce a judgment of such a court in any court of competent jurisdiction.”]

5.3  Limitation of Liability. ICANN’s aggregate monetary liability for violations of this Agreement will not exceed an amount equal to the Registry-Level Fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN within the preceding twelve-month period pursuant to this Agreement (excluding the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3, if any). Registry Operator’s aggregate monetary liability to ICANN for breaches of this Agreement will be limited to an amount equal to the fees paid to ICANN during the preceding twelve-month period (excluding the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3, if any), and punitive and exemplary damages, if any, awarded in accordance with Section 5.2. In no event shall either party be liable for special, punitive, exemplary or consequential damages arising out of or in connection with this Agreement or the performance or nonperformance of obligations undertaken in this Agreement, except as provided in Section 5.2. Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, neither party makes any warranty, express or implied, with respect to the services rendered by itself, its servants or agents, or the results obtained from their work, including, without limitation, any implied warranty of merchantability, non-infringement or fitness for a particular purpose.

5.4  Specific Performance. Registry Operator and ICANN agree that irreparable damage could occur if any of the provisions of this Agreement was not performed in accordance with its specific terms. Accordingly, the parties agree that they each shall be entitled to seek from the arbitrator specific performance of the terms of this Agreement (in addition to any other remedy to which each party is entitled).

ARTICLE 6.

FEES

6.1  Registry-Level Fees. Registry Operator shall pay ICANN a Registry-Level Fee equal to (i) the Registry Fixed Fee of US$6,250 per calendar quarter and (ii) the Registry-Level Transaction Fee. The Registry-Level Transaction Fee will be equal to the number of annual increments of an initial or renewal domain name registration (at one or more levels, and including renewals associated with transfers from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another, each a “Transaction”), during the applicable calendar quarter multiplied by US$0.25; provided, however that the Registry-Level Transaction Fee shall not apply until and unless more than 50,000 Transactions have occurred in the TLD during any calendar quarter or any four calendar quarter period (the “Transaction Threshold”) and shall apply to each Transaction that occurred during each quarter in which the Transaction Threshold has been met, but shall not apply to each quarter in which the Transaction Threshold has not been met. Registry Operator shall pay the Registry-
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Level Fees on a quarterly basis by the 20th day following the end of each calendar quarter (i.e., on April 20, July 20, October 20 and January 20 for the calendar quarters ending March 31, June 30, September 30 and December 31) of the year to an account designated by ICANN.

6.2 Cost Recovery for RSTEP. Requests by Registry Operator for the approval of Additional Services pursuant to Section 2.1 may be referred by ICANN to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel ("RSTEP") pursuant to that process at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/. In the event that such requests are referred to RSTEP, Registry Operator shall remit to ICANN the invoiced cost of the RSTEP review within ten (10) business days of receipt of a copy of the RSTEP invoice from ICANN, unless ICANN determines, in its sole and absolute discretion, to pay all or any portion of the invoiced cost of such RSTEP review.

6.3 Variable Registry-Level Fee.

(a) If the ICANN accredited registrars (as a group) do not approve pursuant to the terms of their registrar accreditation agreements with ICANN the variable accreditation fees established by the ICANN Board of Directors for any ICANN fiscal year, upon delivery of notice from ICANN, Registry Operator shall pay to ICANN a Variable Registry-Level Fee, which shall be paid on a fiscal quarter basis, and shall accrue as of the beginning of the first fiscal quarter of such ICANN fiscal year. The fee will be calculated and invoiced by ICANN on a quarterly basis, and shall be paid by Registry Operator within sixty (60) calendar days with respect to the first quarter of such ICANN fiscal year and within twenty (20) calendar days with respect to each remaining quarter of such ICANN fiscal year, of receipt of the invoiced amount by ICANN. The Registry Operator may invoice and collect the Variable Registry-Level Fees from the registrars who are party to a registry-registrar agreement with Registry Operator (which agreement may specifically provide for the reimbursement of Variable Registry-Level Fees paid by Registry Operator pursuant to this Section 6.3); provided, that the fees shall be invoiced to all ICANN accredited registrars if invoiced to any. The Variable Registry-Level Fee, if collectible by ICANN, shall be an obligation of Registry Operator and shall be due and payable as provided in this Section 6.3 irrespective of Registry Operator’s ability to seek and obtain reimbursement of such fee from registrars. In the event ICANN later collects variable accreditation fees for which Registry Operator has paid ICANN a Variable Registry-Level Fee, ICANN shall reimburse the Registry Operator an appropriate amount of the Variable Registry-Level Fee, as reasonably determined by ICANN. If the ICANN accredited registrars (as a group) do approve pursuant to the terms of their registrar accreditation agreements with ICANN the variable accreditation fees established by the ICANN Board of Directors for a fiscal year, ICANN shall not be entitled to a Variable-Level Fee hereunder for such fiscal year, irrespective of whether the ICANN accredited registrars comply with their payment obligations to ICANN during such fiscal year.

(b) The amount of the Variable Registry-Level Fee will be specified for each registrar, and may include both a per-registrar component and a transactional component. The per-registrar component of the Variable Registry-Level Fee shall be specified by ICANN in accordance with the budget adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors for each ICANN fiscal year. The transactional component of the Variable Registry-Level Fee shall be specified by ICANN in accordance with the budget adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors for each ICANN fiscal year but shall not exceed US$0.25 per domain name registration (including renewals associated with transfers from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another) per year.

6.4 Adjustments to Fees. Notwithstanding any of the fee limitations set forth in this Article 6, commencing upon the expiration of the first year of this Agreement, and upon the expiration of each year thereafter during the Term, the then current fees set forth in Section 6.1 and Section 6.3 may be
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adjusted, at ICANN’s discretion, by a percentage equal to the percentage change, if any, in (i) the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, U.S. City Average (1982-1984 = 100) published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, or any successor index (the “CPI”) for the month which is one (1) month prior to the commencement of the applicable year, over (ii) the CPI published for the month which is one (1) month prior to the commencement of the immediately prior year. In the event of any such increase, ICANN shall provide notice to Registry Operator specifying the amount of such adjustment. Any fee adjustment under this Section 6.4 shall be effective as of the first day of the year in which the above calculation is made.

6.5 Additional Fee on Late Payments. For any payments thirty (30) calendar days or more overdue under this Agreement, Registry Operator shall pay an additional fee on late payments at the rate of 1.5% per month or, if less, the maximum rate permitted by applicable law.

ARTICLE 7.

MISCELLANEOUS

7.1 Indemnification of ICANN.

(a) Registry Operator shall indemnify and defend ICANN and its directors, officers, employees, and agents (collectively, “Indemnitees”) from and against any and all third-party claims, damages, liabilities, costs, and expenses, including reasonable legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to intellectual property ownership rights with respect to the TLD, the delegation of the TLD to Registry Operator, Registry Operator’s operation of the registry for the TLD or Registry Operator’s provision of Registry Services, provided that Registry Operator shall not be obligated to indemnify or defend any Indemnitee to the extent the claim, damage, liability, cost or expense arose: (i) due to the actions or omissions of ICANN, its subcontractors, panelists or evaluators specifically related to and occurring during the registry TLD application process (other than actions or omissions requested by or for the benefit of Registry Operator), or (ii) due to a breach by ICANN of any obligation contained in this Agreement or any willful misconduct by ICANN. This Section shall not be deemed to require Registry Operator to reimburse or otherwise indemnify ICANN for costs associated with the negotiation or execution of this Agreement, or with monitoring or management of the parties’ respective obligations hereunder. Further, this Section shall not apply to any request for attorney’s fees in connection with any litigation or arbitration between or among the parties, which shall be governed by Article 5 or otherwise awarded by a court or arbitrator.

[Alternative Section 7.1(a) text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities:

“Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to cooperate with ICANN in order to ensure that ICANN does not incur any costs associated with claims, damages, liabilities, costs and expenses, including reasonable legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to intellectual property ownership rights with respect to the TLD, the delegation of the TLD to Registry Operator, Registry Operator’s operation of the registry for the TLD or Registry Operator’s provision of Registry Services, provided that Registry Operator shall not be obligated to provide such cooperation to the extent the claim, damage, liability, cost or expense arose due to a breach by ICANN of any of its obligations contained in this Agreement or any willful misconduct by ICANN. This Section shall not be deemed to require Registry Operator to reimburse or otherwise indemnify ICANN for costs associated with the negotiation or execution of this Agreement, or with monitoring or management of the parties’ respective obligations hereunder. Further, this Section shall not apply to any request for attorney’s fees in connection with any
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litigation or arbitration between or among the parties, which shall be governed by Article 5 or otherwise awarded by a court or arbitrator.”]

(b) For any claims by ICANN for indemnification whereby multiple registry operators (including Registry Operator) have engaged in the same actions or omissions that gave rise to the claim, Registry Operator’s aggregate liability to indemnify ICANN with respect to such claim shall be limited to a percentage of ICANN’s total claim, calculated by dividing the number of total domain names under registration with Registry Operator within the TLD (which names under registration shall be calculated consistently with Article 6 hereof for any applicable quarter) by the total number of domain names under registration within all top level domains for which the registry operators thereof are engaging in the same acts or omissions giving rise to such claim. For the purposes of reducing Registry Operator’s liability under Section 7.1(a) pursuant to this Section 7.1(b), Registry Operator shall have the burden of identifying the other registry operators that are engaged in the same actions or omissions that gave rise to the claim, and demonstrating, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, such other registry operators’ culpability for such actions or omissions. For the avoidance of doubt, in the event that a registry operator is engaged in the same acts or omissions giving rise to the claims, but such registry operator(s) do not have the same or similar indemnification obligations to ICANN as set forth in Section 7.1(a) above, the number of domains under management by such registry operator(s) shall nonetheless be included in the calculation in the preceding sentence. [Note: This Section 7.1(b) is inapplicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities.]

7.2 Indemnification Procedures. If any third-party claim is commenced that is indemnified under Section 7.1 above, ICANN shall provide notice thereof to Registry Operator as promptly as practicable. Registry Operator shall be entitled, if it so elects, in a notice promptly delivered to ICANN, to immediately take control of the defense and investigation of such claim and to employ and engage attorneys reasonably acceptable to ICANN to handle and defend the same, at Registry Operator’s sole cost and expense, provided that in all events ICANN will be entitled to control at its sole cost and expense the litigation of issues concerning the validity or interpretation of ICANN’s policies, Bylaws or conduct. ICANN shall cooperate, at Registry Operator’s cost and expense, in all reasonable respects with Registry Operator and its attorneys in the investigation, trial, and defense of such claim and any appeal arising therefrom, and may, at its own cost and expense, participate, through its attorneys or otherwise, in such investigation, trial and defense of such claim and any appeal arising therefrom. No settlement of a claim that involves a remedy affecting ICANN other than the payment of money in an amount that is fully indemnified by Registry Operator will be entered into without the consent of ICANN. If Registry Operator does not assume full control over the defense of a claim subject to such defense in accordance with this Section 7.2, ICANN will have the right to defend the claim in such manner as it may deem appropriate, at the cost and expense of Registry Operator and Registry Operator shall cooperate in such defense. [Note: This Section 7.2 is inapplicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities.]

7.3 Defined Terms. For purposes of this Agreement, unless such definitions are amended pursuant to a Consensus Policy at a future date, in which case the following definitions shall be deemed amended and restated in their entirety as set forth in such Consensus Policy, Security and Stability shall be defined as follows:

(a) For the purposes of this Agreement, an effect on “Security” shall mean (1) the unauthorized disclosure, alteration, insertion or destruction of registry data, or (2) the unauthorized access to or disclosure of information or resources on the Internet by systems operating in accordance with all applicable standards.
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For purposes of this Agreement, an effect on “Stability” shall refer to (1) lack of compliance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established and recognized Internet standards body, such as the relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice Requests for Comments (“RFCs”) sponsored by the Internet Engineering Task Force; or (2) the creation of a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems operating in accordance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established and recognized Internet standards body, such as the relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice RFCs, and relying on Registry Operator's delegated information or provisioning of services.

7.4 No Offset. All payments due under this Agreement will be made in a timely manner throughout the Term and notwithstanding the pendency of any dispute (monetary or otherwise) between Registry Operator and ICANN.

7.5 Change in Control; Assignment and Subcontracting. Neither party may assign this Agreement without the prior written approval of the other party, which approval will not be unreasonably withheld. Notwithstanding the foregoing, ICANN may assign this Agreement in conjunction with a reorganization or re-incorporation of ICANN to another nonprofit corporation or similar entity organized in the same legal jurisdiction in which ICANN is currently organized for the same or substantially the same purposes. For purposes of this Section 7.5, a direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator or any material subcontracting arrangement with respect to the operation of the registry for the TLD shall be deemed an assignment. ICANN shall be deemed to have reasonably withheld its consent to any such a direct or indirect change of control or subcontracting arrangement in the event that ICANN reasonably determines that the person or entity acquiring control of Registry Operator or entering into such subcontracting arrangement (or the ultimate parent entity of such acquiring or subcontracting entity) does not meet the ICANN-adopted registry operator criteria or qualifications then in effect. In addition, without limiting the foregoing, Registry Operator must provide no less than thirty (30) calendar days advance notice to ICANN of any material subcontracting arrangements, and any agreement to subcontract portions of the operations of the TLD must mandate compliance with all covenants, obligations and agreements by Registry Operator hereunder, and Registry Operator shall continue to be bound by such covenants, obligations and agreements. Without limiting the foregoing, Registry Operator must also provide no less than thirty (30) calendar days advance notice to ICANN prior to the consummation of any transaction anticipated to result in a direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator. Such change of control notification shall include a statement that affirms that the ultimate parent entity of the party acquiring such control meets the ICANN-adopted specification or policy on registry operator criteria then in effect, and affirms that Registry Operator is in compliance with its obligations under this Agreement. Within thirty (30) calendar days of such notification, ICANN may request additional information from Registry Operator establishing compliance with this Agreement, in which case Registry Operator must supply the requested information within fifteen (15) calendar days. If ICANN fails to expressly provide or withhold its consent to any direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator or any material subcontracting arrangement within thirty (30) (or, if ICANN has requested additional information from Registry Operator as set forth above, sixty (60)) calendar days of the receipt of written notice of such transaction from Registry Operator, ICANN shall be deemed to have consented to such transaction. In connection with any such transaction, Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Transition Process.

7.6 Amendments and Waivers.

(a) If ICANN determines that an amendment to this Agreement (including to the Specifications referred to herein) and all other registry agreements between ICANN and the Applicable
Registry Operators (the “Applicable Registry Agreements”) is desirable (each, a “Special Amendment”), ICANN may submit a Special Amendment for approval by the Applicable Registry Operators pursuant to the process set forth in this Section 7.6, provided that a Special Amendment is not a Restricted Amendment (as defined below). Prior to submitting a Special Amendment for such approval, ICANN shall first consult in good faith with the Working Group (as defined below) regarding the form and substance of a Special Amendment. The duration of such consultation shall be reasonably determined by ICANN based on the substance of the Special Amendment. Following such consultation, ICANN may propose the adoption of a Special Amendment by publicly posting such amendment on its website for no less than thirty (30) calendar days (the “Posting Period”) and providing notice of such amendment by ICANN to the Applicable Registry Operators in accordance with Section 7.8. ICANN will consider the public comments submitted on a Special Amendment during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators).

(b) If, within two (2) calendar years of the expiration of the Posting Period (the “Approval Period”), (i) the ICANN Board of Directors approves a Special Amendment (which may be in a form different than submitted for public comment) and (ii) such Special Amendment receives Registry Operator Approval (as defined below), such Special Amendment shall be deemed approved (an “Approved Amendment”) by the Applicable Registry Operators (the last date on which such approvals are obtained is herein referred to as the “Amendment Approval Date”) and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement upon sixty (60) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator (the “Amendment Effective Date”). In the event that a Special Amendment is not approved by the ICANN Board of Directors or does not receive Registry Operator Approval within the Approval Period, the Special Amendment will have no effect. The procedure used by ICANN to obtain Registry Operator Approval shall be designed to document the written approval of the Applicable Registry Operators, which may be in electronic form.

(c) During the thirty (30) calendar day period following the Amendment Approval Date, Registry Operator (so long as it did not vote in favor of the Approved Amendment) may apply in writing to ICANN for an exemption from the Approved Amendment (each such request submitted by Registry Operator hereunder, an “Exemption Request”). Each Exemption Request will set forth the basis for such request and provide detailed support for an exemption from the Approved Amendment. An Exemption Request may also include a detailed description and support for any alternatives to, or a variation of, the Approved Amendment proposed by such Registry Operator. An Exemption Request may only be granted upon a clear and convincing showing by Registry Operator that compliance with the Approved Amendment conflicts with applicable laws or would have a material adverse effect on the long-term financial condition or results of operations of Registry Operator. No Exemption Request will be granted if ICANN determines, in its reasonable discretion, that granting such Exemption Request would be materially harmful to registrants or result in the denial of a direct benefit to registrants. Within ninety (90) calendar days of ICANN’s receipt of an Exemption Request, ICANN shall either approve (which approval may be conditioned or consist of alternatives to or a variation of the Approved Amendment) or deny the Exemption Request in writing, during which time the Approved Amendment will not amend this Agreement; provided, that any such conditions, alternatives or variations shall be effective and, to the extent applicable, will amend this Agreement as of the Amendment Effective Date. If the Exemption Request is approved by ICANN, the Approved Amendment will not amend this Agreement. If such Exemption Request is denied by ICANN, the Approved Amendment will amend this Agreement as of the Amendment Effective Date (or, if such date has passed, such Approved Amendment shall be deemed effective immediately on the date of such denial), provided that Registry Operator may, within thirty (30) calendar days following receipt of ICANN’s determination, appeal ICANN’s decision to deny the Exemption Request pursuant to the dispute resolution procedures set forth in Article 5. The Approved
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Amendment will be deemed not to have amended this Agreement during the pendency of the dispute resolution process. For avoidance of doubt, only Exemption Requests submitted by Registry Operator that are approved by ICANN pursuant to this Section 7.6(c) or through an arbitration decision pursuant to Article 5 shall exempt Registry Operator from any Approved Amendment, and no exemption request granted to any other Applicable Registry Operator (whether by ICANN or through arbitration) shall have any effect under this Agreement or exempt Registry Operator from any Approved Amendment.

(d) Except as set forth in this Section 7.6, no amendment, supplement or modification of this Agreement or any provision hereof shall be binding unless executed in writing by both parties, and nothing in this Section 7.6 shall restrict ICANN and Registry Operator from entering into bilateral amendments and modifications to this Agreement negotiated solely between the two parties. No waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be binding unless evidenced by a writing signed by the party waiving compliance with such provision. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Agreement or failure to enforce any of the provisions hereof shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any other provision hereof, nor shall any such waiver constitute a continuing waiver unless otherwise expressly provided. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this Section 7.6 shall be deemed to limit Registry Operator’s obligation to comply with Section 2.2.

(e) For purposes of this Section 7.6, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(i) “Applicable Registry Operators” means, collectively, the registry operators of the top-level domains party to a registry agreement that contains a provision similar to this Section 7.6, including Registry Operator.

(ii) “Registry Operator Approval” means the receipt of each of the following: (A) the affirmative approval of the Applicable Registry Operators whose payments to ICANN accounted for two-thirds of the total amount of fees (converted to U.S. dollars, if applicable) paid to ICANN by all the Applicable Registry Operators during the immediately previous calendar year pursuant to the Applicable Registry Agreements, and (B) the affirmative approval of a majority of the Applicable Registry Operators at the time such approval is obtained. For avoidance of doubt, with respect to clause (B), each Applicable Registry Operator shall have one vote for each top-level domain operated by such Registry Operator pursuant to an Applicable Registry Agreement.

(iii) “Restricted Amendment” means the following: (i) an amendment of Specification 1, (ii) except to the extent addressed in Section 2.10 hereof, an amendment that specifies the price charged by Registry Operator to registrars for domain name registrations, (iii) an amendment to the definition of Registry Services as set forth in the first paragraph of Section 2.1 of Specification 6, or (iv) an amendment to the length of the Term.

(iv) “Working Group” means representatives of the Applicable Registry Operators and other members of the community that ICANN appoints, from time to time, to serve as a working group to consult on amendments to the Applicable Registry Agreements (excluding bilateral amendments pursuant to Section 7.6(d)).
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7.7 **No Third-Party Beneficiaries.** This Agreement will not be construed to create any obligation by either ICANN or Registry Operator to any non-party to this Agreement, including any registrar or registered name holder.

7.8 **General Notices.** Except for notices pursuant to Section 7.6, all notices to be given under or in relation to this Agreement will be given either (i) in writing at the address of the appropriate party as set forth below or (ii) via facsimile or electronic mail as provided below, unless that party has given a notice of change of postal or email address, or facsimile number, as provided in this agreement. All notices under Section 7.6 shall be given by both posting of the applicable information on ICANN’s web site and transmission of such information to Registry Operator by electronic mail. Any change in the contact information for notice below will be given by the party within thirty (30) calendar days of such change. Notices, designations, determinations, and specifications made under this Agreement will be in the English language. Other than notices under Section 7.6, any notice required by this Agreement will be deemed to have been properly given (i) if in paper form, when delivered in person or via courier service with confirmation of receipt or (ii) if via facsimile or by electronic mail, upon confirmation of receipt by the recipient’s facsimile machine or email server, provided that such notice via facsimile or electronic mail shall be followed by a copy sent by regular postal mail service within two (2) business days. Any notice required by Section 7.6 will be deemed to have been given when electronically posted on ICANN’s website and upon confirmation of receipt by the email server. In the event other means of notice become practically achievable, such as notice via a secure website, the parties will work together to implement such notice means under this Agreement.

If to ICANN, addressed to:
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
4676 Admiralty Way, Suite 330
Marina Del Rey, California 90292
Telephone: 1-310-823-9358
Facsimile: 1-310-823-8649
Attention: President and CEO

With a Required Copy to: General Counsel
Email: (As specified from time to time.)

If to Registry Operator, addressed to:

[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
Telephone:
Facsimile:
Attention:

With a Required Copy to:
Email: (As specified from time to time.)

7.9 **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement (including those specifications and documents incorporated by reference to URL locations which form a part of it) constitutes the entire agreement of the parties hereto pertaining to the operation of the TLD and supersedes all prior agreements, understandings, negotiations and discussions, whether oral or written, between the parties on that subject.
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7.10 **English Language Controls.** Notwithstanding any translated version of this Agreement and/or specifications that may be provided to Registry Operator, the English language version of this Agreement and all referenced specifications are the official versions that bind the parties hereto. In the event of any conflict or discrepancy between any translated version of this Agreement and the English language version, the English language version controls. Notices, designations, determinations, and specifications made under this Agreement shall be in the English language.

7.11 **Ownership Rights.** Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed as establishing or granting to Registry Operator any property ownership rights or interests in the TLD or the letters, words, symbols or other characters making up the TLD string.

7.12 **Severability.** This Agreement shall be deemed severable; the invalidity or unenforceability of any term or provision of this Agreement shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the balance of this Agreement or of any other term hereof, which shall remain in full force and effect. If any of the provisions hereof are determined to be invalid or unenforceable, the parties shall negotiate in good faith to modify this Agreement so as to effect the original intent of the parties as closely as possible.

7.13 **Court Orders.** ICANN will respect any order from a court of competent jurisdiction, including any orders from any jurisdiction where the consent or non-objection of the government was a requirement for the delegation of the TLD. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, ICANN's implementation of any such order will not be a breach of this Agreement.

[Note: The following section is applicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities only.]

7.14 **Special Provision Relating to Intergovernmental Organizations or Governmental Entities.**

(a) ICANN acknowledges that Registry Operator is an entity subject to public international law, including international treaties applicable to Registry Operator (such public international law and treaties, collectively hereinafter the “Applicable Laws”). Nothing in this Agreement and its related specifications shall be construed or interpreted to require Registry Operator to violate Applicable Laws or prevent compliance therewith. The Parties agree that Registry Operator’s compliance with Applicable Laws shall not constitute a breach of this Agreement.

(b) In the event Registry Operator reasonably determines that any provision of this Agreement and its related specifications, or any decisions or policies of ICANN referred to in this Agreement, including but not limited to Temporary Policies and Consensus Policies (such provisions, specifications and policies, collectively hereinafter, “ICANN Requirements”), may conflict with or violate Applicable Law (hereinafter, a “Potential Conflict”), Registry Operator shall provide detailed notice (a “Notice”) of such Potential Conflict to ICANN as early as possible and, in the case of a Potential Conflict with a proposed Consensus Policy, no later than the end of any public comment period on such proposed Consensus Policy. In the event Registry Operator determines that there is Potential Conflict between a proposed Applicable Law and any ICANN Requirement, Registry Operator shall provide detailed Notice of such Potential Conflict to ICANN as early as possible and, in the case of a Potential Conflict with a proposed Consensus Policy, no later than the end of any public comment period on such proposed Consensus Policy.

(c) As soon as practicable following such review, the parties shall attempt to resolve the Potential Conflict by cooperative engagement pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 5.1. In
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addition, Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to eliminate or minimize any impact arising from such Potential Conflict between Applicable Laws and any ICANN Requirement. If, following such cooperative engagement, Registry Operator determines that the Potential Conflict constitutes an actual conflict between any ICANN Requirement, on the one hand, and Applicable Laws, on the other hand, then ICANN shall waive compliance with such ICANN Requirement (provided that the parties shall negotiate in good faith on a continuous basis thereafter to mitigate or eliminate the effects of such non-compliance on ICANN), unless ICANN reasonably and objectively determines that the failure of Registry Operator to comply with such ICANN Requirement would constitute a threat to the Security and Stability of Registry Services, the Internet or the DNS (hereinafter, an “ICANN Determination”). Following receipt of notice by Registry Operator of such ICANN Determination, Registry Operator shall be afforded a period of ninety (90) calendar days to resolve such conflict with an Applicable Law. If the conflict with an Applicable Law is not resolved to ICANN’s complete satisfaction during such period, Registry Operator shall have the option to submit, within ten (10) calendar days thereafter, the matter to binding arbitration as defined in subsection (d) below. If during such period, Registry Operator does not submit the matter to arbitration pursuant to subsection (d) below, ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement with immediate effect.

(d) If Registry Operator disagrees with an ICANN Determination, Registry Operator may submit the matter to binding arbitration pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.2, except that the sole issue presented to the arbitrator for determination will be whether or not ICANN reasonably and objectively reached the ICANN Determination. For the purposes of such arbitration, ICANN shall present evidence to the arbitrator supporting the ICANN Determination. If the arbitrator determines that ICANN did not reasonably and objectively reach the ICANN Determination, then ICANN shall waive Registry Operator’s compliance with the subject ICANN Requirement. If the arbitrators or pre-arbitral referee, as applicable, determine that ICANN did reasonably and objectively reach the ICANN Determination, then, upon notice to Registry Operator, ICANN may terminate this Agreement with immediate effect.

(e) Registry Operator hereby represents and warrants that, to the best of its knowledge as of the date of execution of this Agreement, no existing ICANN Requirement conflicts with or violates any Applicable Law.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Section 7.14, following an ICANN Determination and prior to a finding by an arbitrator pursuant to Section 7.14(d) above, ICANN may, subject to prior consultations with Registry Operator, take such reasonable technical measures as it deems necessary to ensure the Security and Stability of Registry Services, the Internet and the DNS. These reasonable technical measures shall be taken by ICANN on an interim basis, until the earlier of the date of conclusion of the arbitration procedure referred to in Section 7.14(d) above or the date of complete resolution of the conflict with an Applicable Law. In case Registry Operator disagrees with such technical measures taken by ICANN, Registry Operator may submit the matter to binding arbitration pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.2 above, during which process ICANN may continue to take such technical measures. In the event that ICANN takes such measures, Registry Operator shall pay all costs incurred by ICANN as a result of taking such measures. In addition, in the event that ICANN takes such measures, ICANN shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable.

* * * * *
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IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized representatives.

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS

By: _____________________________
[_____________
President and CEO
Date:

[Registry Operator]

By: _____________________________
[_____________
Date:
EXHIBIT A

Approved Services
SPECIFICATION 1

CONSENSUS POLICIES AND TEMPORARY POLICIES SPECIFICATION


1.1. “Consensus Policies” are those policies established (1) pursuant to the procedure set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws and due process, and (2) covering those topics listed in Section 1.2 of this document. The Consensus Policy development process and procedure set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws may be revised from time to time in accordance with the process set forth therein.

1.2. Consensus Policies and the procedures by which they are developed shall be designed to produce, to the extent possible, a consensus of Internet stakeholders, including the operators of gTLDs. Consensus Policies shall relate to one or more of the following:

   1.2.1. issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or Domain Name System (“DNS”);
   1.2.2. functional and performance specifications for the provision of Registry Services;
   1.2.3. Security and Stability of the registry database for the TLD;
   1.2.4. registry policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to registry operations or registrars;
   1.2.5. resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names); or
   1.2.6. restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or registrar resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or registrar reseller are affiliated.

1.3. Such categories of issues referred to in Section 1.2 shall include, without limitation:

   1.3.1. principles for allocation of registered names in the TLD (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);
   1.3.2. prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;
   1.3.3. reservation of registered names in the TLD that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS or the Internet (e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration); and
   1.3.4. maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning domain name registrations; and procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility for serving registered domain names in a TLD affected by such a suspension or termination.

1.4. In addition to the other limitations on Consensus Policies, they shall not:
1.4.1. prescribe or limit the price of Registry Services;
1.4.2. modify the terms or conditions for the renewal or termination of the Registry Agreement;
1.4.3. modify the limitations on Temporary Policies (defined below) or Consensus Policies;
1.4.4. modify the provisions in the registry agreement regarding fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN; or
1.4.5. modify ICANN’s obligations to ensure equitable treatment of registry operators and act in an open and transparent manner.

2. Temporary Policies. Registry Operator shall comply with and implement all specifications or policies established by the Board on a temporary basis, if adopted by the Board by a vote of at least two-thirds of its members, so long as the Board reasonably determines that such modifications or amendments are justified and that immediate temporary establishment of a specification or policy on the subject is necessary to maintain the stability or security of Registry Services or the DNS ("Temporary Policies").

2.1. Such proposed specification or policy shall be as narrowly tailored as feasible to achieve those objectives. In establishing any Temporary Policy, the Board shall state the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted and shall immediately implement the Consensus Policy development process set forth in ICANN's Bylaws.

2.1.1. ICANN shall also issue an advisory statement containing a detailed explanation of its reasons for adopting the Temporary Policy and why the Board believes such Temporary Policy should receive the consensus support of Internet stakeholders.

2.1.2. If the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted exceeds 90 days, the Board shall reaffirm its temporary adoption every 90 days for a total period not to exceed one year, in order to maintain such Temporary Policy in effect until such time as it becomes a Consensus Policy. If the one year period expires or, if during such one year period, the Temporary Policy does not become a Consensus Policy and is not reaffirmed by the Board, Registry Operator shall no longer be required to comply with or implement such Temporary Policy.

3. Notice and Conflicts. Registry Operator shall be afforded a reasonable period of time following notice of the establishment of a Consensus Policy or Temporary Policy in which to comply with such policy or specification, taking into account any urgency involved. In the event of a conflict between Registry Services and Consensus Policies or any Temporary Policy, the Consensus Policies or Temporary Policy shall control, but only with respect to subject matter in conflict.
SPECIFICATION 2
DATA ESCROW REQUIREMENTS

Registry Operator will engage an independent entity to act as data escrow agent ("Escrow Agent") for the provision of data escrow services related to the Registry Agreement. The following Technical Specifications set forth in Part A, and Legal Requirements set forth in Part B, will be included in any data escrow agreement between Registry Operator and the Escrow Agent, under which ICANN must be named a third-party beneficiary. In addition to the following requirements, the data escrow agreement may contain other provisions that are not contradictory or intended to subvert the required terms provided below.

PART A – TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

1. **Deposits.** There will be two types of Deposits: Full and Differential. For both types, the universe of Registry objects to be considered for data escrow are those objects necessary in order to offer all of the approved Registry Services.
   
   1.1 **“Full Deposit”** will consist of data that reflects the state of the registry as of 00:00:00 UTC on each Sunday.

   1.2 **“Differential Deposit”** means data that reflects all transactions that were not reflected in the last previous Full or Differential Deposit, as the case may be. Each Differential Deposit will contain all database transactions since the previous Deposit was completed as of 00:00:00 UTC of each day, but Sunday. Differential Deposits must include complete Escrow Records as specified below that were not included or changed since the most recent full or Differential Deposit (i.e., newly added or modified domain names).

2. **Schedule for Deposits.** Registry Operator will submit a set of escrow files on a daily basis as follows:
   
   2.1 Each Sunday, a Full Deposit must be submitted to the Escrow Agent by 23:59 UTC.

   2.2 The other six days of the week, the corresponding Differential Deposit must be submitted to Escrow Agent by 23:59 UTC.

3. **Escrow Format Specification.**
   
   3.1 **Deposit’s Format.** Registry objects, such as domains, contacts, name servers, registrars, etc. will be compiled into a file constructed as described in draft-arias-noguchi-registry-data-escrow, see [1]. The aforementioned document describes some elements as optional; Registry Operator will include those elements in the Deposits if they are available. Registry Operator will use the draft version available at the time of signing the Agreement, if not already an RFC. Once the specification is published as an RFC, Registry Operator will implement that specification, no later than 180 days after. UTF-8 character encoding will be used.

   3.2 **Extensions.** If a Registry Operator offers additional Registry Services that require submission of additional data, not included above, additional “extension schemas” shall be defined in a case by case base to represent that data. These “extension schemas” will be specified as described in [1]. Data related to the “extensions schemas” will be included in the deposit file described in section 3.1. ICANN and the respective Registry shall work together to agree on such new objects’ data escrow specifications.
4. **Processing of Deposit files.** The use of compression is recommended in order to reduce electronic data transfer times, and storage capacity requirements. Data encryption will be used to ensure the privacy of registry escrow data. Files processed for compression and encryption will be in the binary OpenPGP format as per OpenPGP Message Format - RFC 4880, see [2]. Acceptable algorithms for Public-key cryptography, Symmetric-key cryptography, Hash and Compression are those enumerated in RFC 4880, not marked as deprecated in OpenPGP IANA Registry, see [3], that are also royalty-free. The process to follow for a data file in original text format is:

1. The file should be compressed. The suggested algorithm for compression is ZIP as per RFC 4880.
2. The compressed data will be encrypted using the escrow agent's public key. The suggested algorithms for Public-key encryption are Elgamal and RSA as per RFC 4880. The suggested algorithms for Symmetric-key encryption are TripleDES, AES128 and CAST5 as per RFC 4880.
3. The file may be split as necessary if, once compressed and encrypted is larger than the file size limit agreed with the escrow agent. Every part of a split file, or the whole file if split is not used, will be called a processed file in this section.
4. A digital signature file will be generated for every processed file using the Registry's private key. The digital signature file will be in binary OpenPGP format as per RFC 4880 [2], and will not be compressed or encrypted. The suggested algorithms for Digital signatures are DSA and RSA as per RFC 4880. The suggested algorithm for Hashes in Digital signatures is SHA256.
5. The processed files and digital signature files will then be transferred to the Escrow Agent through secure electronic mechanisms, such as, SFTP, SCP, HTTPS file upload, etc. as agreed between the Escrow Agent and the Registry Operator. Non-electronic delivery through a physical medium such as CD-ROMs, DVD-ROMs, or USB storage devices may be used if authorized by ICANN.
6. The Escrow Agent will then validate every (processed) transferred data file using the procedure described in section 8.

5. **File Naming Conventions.** Files will be named according to the following convention: `{gTLD}_{YYYY-MM-DD}_{type}_S{#}_R{rev}.{ext}` where:

1. `{gTLD}` is replaced with the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the ASCII-compatible form (A-Label) must be used;
2. `{YYYY-MM-DD}` is replaced by the date corresponding to the time used as a timeline watermark for the transactions; i.e. for the Full Deposit corresponding to 2009-08-02T00:00Z, the string to be used would be “2009-08-02”;
3. `{type}` is replaced by:
   1. “full”, if the data represents a Full Deposit;
   2. “diff”, if the data represents a Differential Deposit;
   3. “thin”, if the data represents a Bulk Registration Data Access file, as specified in section 3 of Specification 4;
4. `{#}` is replaced by the position of the file in a series of files, beginning with “1”; in case of a lone file, this must be replaced by “1”.
5. `{rev}` is replaced by the number of revision (or resend) of the file beginning with “0”;
6. `{ext}` is replaced by “sig” if it is a digital signature file of the quasi-homonymous file. Otherwise it is replaced by “ryde”.
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6. **Distribution of Public Keys.** Each of Registry Operator and Escrow Agent will distribute its public key to the other party (Registry Operator or Escrow Agent, as the case may be) via email to an email address to be specified. Each party will confirm receipt of the other party's public key with a reply email, and the distributing party will subsequently reconfirm the authenticity of the key transmitted via offline methods, like in person meeting, telephone, etc. In this way, public key transmission is authenticated to a user able to send and receive mail via a mail server operated by the distributing party. Escrow Agent, Registry and ICANN will exchange keys by the same procedure.

7. **Notification of Deposits.** Along with the delivery of each Deposit, Registry Operator will deliver to Escrow Agent and to ICANN a written statement (which may be by authenticated e-mail) that includes a copy of the report generated upon creation of the Deposit and states that the Deposit has been inspected by Registry Operator and is complete and accurate. Registry Operator will include the Deposit’s "id" and "resend" attributes in its statement. The attributes are explained in [1].

8. **Verification Procedure.**
   (1) The signature file of each processed file is validated.
   (2) If processed files are pieces of a bigger file, the latter is put together.
   (3) Each file obtained in the previous step is then decrypted and uncompressed.
   (4) Each data file contained in the previous step is then validated against the format defined in [1].
   (5) If [1] includes a verification process, that will be applied at this step. If any discrepancy is found in any of the steps, the Deposit will be considered incomplete.

9. **References.**
PART B – LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

1. **Escrow Agent.** Prior to entering into an escrow agreement, the Registry Operator must provide notice to ICANN as to the identity of the Escrow Agent, and provide ICANN with contact information and a copy of the relevant escrow agreement, and all amendment thereto. In addition, prior to entering into an escrow agreement, Registry Operator must obtain the consent of ICANN to (a) use the specified Escrow Agent, and (b) enter into the form of escrow agreement provided. ICANN must be expressly designated a third-party beneficiary of the escrow agreement. ICANN reserves the right to withhold its consent to any Escrow Agent, escrow agreement, or any amendment thereto, all in its sole discretion.

2. **Fees.** Registry Operator must pay, or have paid on its behalf, fees to the Escrow Agent directly. If Registry Operator fails to pay any fee by the due date(s), the Escrow Agent will give ICANN written notice of such non-payment and ICANN may pay the past-due fee(s) within ten business days after receipt of the written notice from Escrow Agent. Upon payment of the past-due fees by ICANN, ICANN shall have a claim for such amount against Registry Operator, which Registry Operator shall be required to submit to ICANN together with the next fee payment due under the Registry Agreement.

3. **Ownership.** Ownership of the Deposits during the effective term of the Registry Agreement shall remain with Registry Operator at all times. Thereafter, Registry Operator shall assign any such ownership rights (including intellectual property rights, as the case may be) in such Deposits to ICANN. In the event that during the term of the Registry Agreement any Deposit is released from escrow to ICANN, any intellectual property rights held by Registry Operator in the Deposits will automatically be licensed on a non-exclusive, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free, paid-up basis to ICANN or to a party designated in writing by ICANN.

4. **Integrity and Confidentiality.** Escrow Agent will be required to (i) hold and maintain the Deposits in a secure, locked, and environmentally safe facility, which is accessible only to authorized representatives of Escrow Agent, (ii) protect the integrity and confidentiality of the Deposits using commercially reasonable measures and (iii) keep and safeguard each Deposit for one year. ICANN and Registry Operator will be provided the right to inspect Escrow Agent's applicable records upon reasonable prior notice and during normal business hours. Registry Operator and ICANN will be provided with the right to designate a third-party auditor to audit Escrow Agent’s compliance with the technical specifications and maintenance requirements of this Specification 2 from time to time.

If Escrow Agent receives a subpoena or any other order from a court or other judicial tribunal pertaining to the disclosure or release of the Deposits, Escrow Agent will promptly notify the Registry Operator and ICANN unless prohibited by law. After notifying the Registry Operator and ICANN, Escrow Agent shall allow sufficient time for Registry Operator or ICANN to challenge any such order, which shall be the responsibility of Registry Operator or ICANN; provided, however, that Escrow Agent does not waive its rights to present its position with respect to any such order. Escrow Agent will cooperate with the Registry Operator or ICANN to support efforts to quash or limit any subpoena, at such party’s expense. Any party requesting additional assistance shall pay Escrow Agent’s standard charges or as quoted upon submission of a detailed request.
5. **Copies.** Escrow Agent may be permitted to duplicate any Deposit, in order to comply with the terms and provisions of the escrow agreement.

6. **Release of Deposits.** Escrow Agent will make available for electronic download (unless otherwise requested) to ICANN or its designee, within twenty-four hours, at the Registry Operator’s expense, all Deposits in Escrow Agent's possession in the event that the Escrow Agent receives a request from Registry Operator to effect such delivery to ICANN, or receives one of the following written notices by ICANN stating that:

6.1 the Registry Agreement has expired without renewal, or been terminated; or

6.2 ICANN failed, with respect to (a) any Full Deposit or (b) five Differential Deposits within any calendar month, to receive, within five calendar days after the Deposit's scheduled delivery date, notification of receipt from Escrow Agent; (x) ICANN gave notice to Escrow Agent and Registry Operator of that failure; and (y) ICANN has not, within seven calendar days after such notice, received notice from Escrow Agent that the Deposit has been received; or

6.3 ICANN has received notification from Escrow Agent of failed verification of a Full Deposit or of failed verification of five Differential Deposits within any calendar month and (a) ICANN gave notice to Registry Operator of that receipt; and (b) ICANN has not, within seven calendar days after such notice, received notice from Escrow Agent of verification of a remediated version of such Full Deposit or Differential Deposit; or

6.4 Registry Operator has: (i) ceased to conduct its business in the ordinary course; or (ii) filed for bankruptcy, become insolvent or anything analogous to any of the foregoing under the laws of any jurisdiction anywhere in the world; or

6.5 Registry Operator has experienced a failure of critical registry functions and ICANN has asserted its rights pursuant to Section 2.13 of the Registry Agreement; or

6.6 a competent court, arbitral, legislative, or government agency mandates the release of the Deposits to ICANN.

Unless Escrow Agent has previously released the Registry Operator’s Deposits to ICANN or its designee, Escrow Agent will deliver all Deposits to ICANN upon termination of the Registry Agreement or the Escrow Agreement.

7. **Verification of Deposits.**

7.1 Within twenty-four hours after receiving each Deposit or corrected Deposit, Escrow Agent must verify the format and completeness of each Deposit and deliver to ICANN a copy of the verification report generated for each Deposit. Reports will be delivered electronically, as specified from time to time by ICANN.

7.2 If Escrow Agent discovers that any Deposit fails the verification procedures, Escrow Agent must notify, either by email, fax or phone, Registry Operator and ICANN of such nonconformity within twenty-four hours after receiving the non-conformant Deposit. Upon notification of such verification failure, Registry Operator must begin developing modifications, updates, corrections, and other fixes of the Deposit necessary for the Deposit to pass the verification procedures and deliver such fixes to Escrow Agent as promptly as possible.

8. **Amendments.** Escrow Agent and Registry Operator shall amend the terms of the Escrow Agreement to conform to this Specification 2 within ten (10) calendar days of any amendment or modification to this Specification 2. In the event of a conflict between this Specification 2 and the Escrow Agreement, this Specification 2 shall control.

9. **Indemnity.** Registry Operator shall indemnify and hold harmless Escrow Agent and each of its directors, officers, agents, employees, members, and stockholders ("Escrow Agent Indemnitees")
absolutely and forever from and against any and all claims, actions, damages, suits, liabilities, obligations, costs, fees, charges, and any other expenses whatsoever, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, that may be asserted by a third party against any Escrow Agent Indemnitees in connection with the Escrow Agreement or the performance of Escrow Agent or any Escrow Agent Indemnitees thereunder (with the exception of any claims based on the misrepresentation, negligence, or misconduct of Escrow Agent, its directors, officers, agents, employees, contractors, members, and stockholders). Escrow Agent shall indemnify and hold harmless Registry Operator and ICANN, and each of their respective directors, officers, agents, employees, members, and stockholders ("Indemnitees") absolutely and forever from and against any and all claims, actions, damages, suits, liabilities, obligations, costs, fees, charges, and any other expenses whatsoever, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, that may be asserted by a third party against any Indemnitee in connection with the misrepresentation, negligence or misconduct of Escrow Agent, its directors, officers, agents, employees and contractors.
SPECIFICATION 3

FORMAT AND CONTENT FOR REGISTRY OPERATOR MONTHLY REPORTING

Registry Operator shall provide one set of monthly reports per gTLD to ___________ with the following content. ICANN may request in the future that the reports be delivered by other means and using other formats. ICANN will use reasonable commercial efforts to preserve the confidentiality of the information reported until three months after the end of the month to which the reports relate.

1. Per-Registrar Transactions Report. This report shall be compiled in a comma separated-value formatted file as specified in RFC 4180. The file shall be named “gTLD-transactions-yyyyymm.csv”, where “gTLD” is the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the A-label shall be used; “yyyyymm” is the year and month being reported. The file shall contain the following fields per registrar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>registrar-name</td>
<td>registrar's full corporate name as registered with IANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>iana-id</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids">http://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>total-domains</td>
<td>total domains under sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>total-nameservers</td>
<td>total name servers registered for TLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>net-adds-1-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of one year (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>net-adds-2-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of two years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>net-adds-3-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of three years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>net-adds-4-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of four years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>net-adds-5-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of five years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>net-adds-6-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of six years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>net-adds-7-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of seven years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>net-adds-8-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of eight years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>net-adds-9-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of nine years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>net-adds-10-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of ten years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>net-renews-1-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of one year (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>net-renews-2-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of two years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>net-renews-3-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of three years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>net-renews-4-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of four years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>net-renews-5-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of five years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>net-renews-6-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of six years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>net-renews-7-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of seven years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>net-renews-8-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of eight years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>net-renews-9-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of nine years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>net-renews-10-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of ten years (and not deleted within the renewal grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>transfer-gaining-successful</td>
<td>transfers initiated by this registrar that were ack'd by the other registrar – either by command or automatically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>transfer-gaining-nacked</td>
<td>transfers initiated by this registrar that were n'acked by the other registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>transfer-losing-successful</td>
<td>transfers initiated by another registrar that this registrar ack'd – either by command or automatically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>transfer-losing-nacked</td>
<td>transfers initiated by another registrar that this registrar n'acked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>transfer-disputed-won</td>
<td>number of transfer disputes in which this registrar prevailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>transfer-disputed-lost</td>
<td>number of transfer disputes this registrar lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>transfer-disputed-nodecision</td>
<td>number of transfer disputes involving this registrar with a split or no decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>deleted-domains-grace</td>
<td>domains deleted within the add grace period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>deleted-domains-nograce</td>
<td>domains deleted outside the add grace period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>restored-domains</td>
<td>domain names restored from redemption period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>restored-noreport</td>
<td>total number of restored names for which the registrar failed to submit a restore report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>agp-exemption-requests</td>
<td>total number of AGP (add grace period) exemption requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>agp-exemptions-granted</td>
<td>total number of AGP (add grace period) exemption requests granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>agp-exempted-domains</td>
<td>total number of names affected by granted AGP (add grace period) exemption requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>attempted-adds</td>
<td>number of attempted (successful and failed) domain name create commands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first line shall include the field names exactly as described in the table above as a “header line” as described in section 2 of RFC 4180. The last line of each report shall include totals for each column across all registrars; the first field of this line shall read “Totals” while the second field shall be left empty in that line. No other lines besides the ones described above shall be included. Line breaks shall be `<U+000D, U+000A>` as described in RFC 4180.
2. Registry Functions Activity Report. This report shall be compiled in a comma separated-value formatted file as specified in RFC 4180. The file shall be named “gTLD-activity-yyyymm.csv”, where “gTLD” is the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the A-label shall be used; “yyyymm” is the year and month being reported. The file shall contain the following fields:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>operational-registrars</td>
<td>number of operational registrars at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>ramp-up-registrars</td>
<td>number of registrars that have received a password for access to OT&amp;E at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>pre-ramp-up-registrars</td>
<td>number of registrars that have requested access, but have not yet entered the ramp-up period at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>zfa-passwords</td>
<td>number of active zone file access passwords at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>whois-43-queries</td>
<td>number of WHOIS (port-43) queries responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>web-whois-queries</td>
<td>number of Web-based Whois queries responded during the reporting period, not including searchable Whois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>searchable-whois-queries</td>
<td>number of searchable Whois queries responded during the reporting period, if offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>dns-udp-queries-received</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over UDP transport during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>dns-udp-queries-responded</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over UDP transport that were responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>dns-tcp-queries-received</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over TCP transport during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>dns-tcp-queries-responded</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over TCP transport that were responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>srs-dom-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>srs-dom-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>srs-dom-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>srs-dom-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>srs-dom-renew</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>srs-dom-rgp-restore-report</td>
<td>“renew” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>srs-dom-rgp-restore-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name RGP “restore” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-approve</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to approve transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-cancel</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to cancel transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-query</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to query about a transfer responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-reject</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to reject transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to request transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>srs-dom-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “update” requests (not including RGP restore requests) responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>srs-host-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>srs-host-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>srs-host-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>srs-host-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>srs-host-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “update” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>srs-cont-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>srs-cont-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>srs-cont-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>srs-cont-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-approve</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to approve transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-cancel</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to cancel transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-query</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to query about a transfer responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-reject</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to reject transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to request transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>srs-cont-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “update” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first line shall include the field names exactly as described in the table above as a “header line” as described in section 2 of RFC 4180. No other lines besides the ones described above shall be included. Line breaks shall be `<U+000D, U+000A>` as described in RFC 4180.
SPECIFICATION 4

SPECIFICATION FOR REGISTRATION DATA PUBLICATION SERVICES

1. **Registration Data Directory Services.** Until ICANN requires a different protocol, Registry Operator will operate a WHOIS service available via port 43 in accordance with RFC 3912, and a web-based Directory Service at <whois.nic.TLD> providing free public query-based access to at least the following elements in the following format. ICANN reserves the right to specify alternative formats and protocols, and upon such specification, the Registry Operator will implement such alternative specification as soon as reasonably practicable.

1.1. The format of responses shall follow a semi-free text format outline below, followed by a blank line and a legal disclaimer specifying the rights of Registry Operator, and of the user querying the database.

1.2. Each data object shall be represented as a set of key/value pairs, with lines beginning with keys, followed by a colon and a space as delimiters, followed by the value.

1.3. For fields where more than one value exists, multiple key/value pairs with the same key shall be allowed (for example to list multiple name servers). The first key/value pair after a blank line should be considered the start of a new record, and should be considered as identifying that record, and is used to group data, such as hostnames and IP addresses, or a domain name and registrant information, together.

1.4. **Domain Name Data:**

1.4.1. **Query format:** whois EXAMPLE.TLD

1.4.2. **Response format:**

```
Domain Name: EXAMPLE.TLD
Domain ID: D1234567-TLD
WHOIS Server: whois.example.tld
Referral URL: http://www.example.tld
Updated Date: 2009-05-29T20:13:00Z
Creation Date: 2000-10-08T00:45:00Z
Registry Expiry Date: 2010-10-08T00:44:59Z
Sponsoring Registrar: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR LLC
Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID: 5555555
Domain Status: clientDeleteProhibited
Domain Status: clientRenewProhibited
Domain Status: clientTransferProhibited
Domain Status: serverUpdateProhibited
Registrant ID: 5372808-ERL
Registrant Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT
Registrant Organization: EXAMPLE ORGANIZATION
Registrant Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Registrant City: ANYTOWN
Registrant State/Province: AP
Registrant Postal Code: A1A1A1
Registrant Country: EX
```
Registrant Phone: +1.5555551212
Registrant Phone Ext: 1234
Registrant Fax: +1.5555551213
Registrant Fax Ext: 4321
Registrant Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Admin ID: 5372809-ERL
Admin Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT ADMINISTRATIVE
Admin Organization: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT ORGANIZATION
Admin Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Admin City: ANYTOWN
Admin State/Province: AP
Admin Postal Code: A1A1A1
Admin Country: EX
Admin Phone: +1.5555551212
Admin Phone Ext: 1234
Admin Fax: +1.5555551213
Admin Fax Ext: 
Admin Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Tech ID: 5372811-ERL
Tech Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR TECHNICAL
Tech Organization: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR LLC
Tech Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Tech City: ANYTOWN
Tech State/Province: AP
Tech Postal Code: A1A1A1
Tech Country: EX
Tech Phone: +1.1235551234
Tech Phone Ext: 1234
Tech Fax: +1.5555551213
Tech Fax Ext: 93
Tech Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Name Server: NS01.EXAMPLEREGISTRAR.TLD
Name Server: NS02.EXAMPLEREGISTRAR.TLD
DNSSEC: signedDelegation
DNSSEC: unsigned

>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.5. Registrar Data:

1.5.1. Query format: whois "registrar Example Registrar, Inc."

1.5.2. Response format:

Registrar Name: Example Registrar, Inc.
Street: 1234 Admiralty Way
City: Marina del Rey
State/Province: CA
Postal Code: 90292
Country: US
Phone Number: +1.3105551212
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
1.6. Name Server Data:

1.6.1. **Query format:** whois "NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD" or whois "nameserver (IP Address)"

1.6.2. **Response format:**

- Server Name: NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD
- IP Address: 192.0.2.123
- IP Address: 2001:0DB8::1
- Registrar: Example Registrar, Inc.
- WHOIS Server: whois.example-registrar.tld
- Referral URL: http://www.example-registrar.tld

>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.7. The format of the following data fields: domain status, individual and organizational names, address, street, city, state/province, postal code, country, telephone and fax numbers, email addresses, date and times should conform to the mappings specified in EPP RFCs 5730-5734 so that the display of this information (or values return in WHOIS responses) can be uniformly processed and understood.

1.8. **Searchability.** Offering searchability capabilities on the Directory Services is optional but if offered by the Registry Operator it shall comply with the specification described in this section.

1.8.1. Registry Operator will offer searchability on the web-based Directory Service.

1.8.2. Registry Operator will offer partial match capabilities, at least, on the following fields: domain name, contacts and registrant’s name, and contact and registrant’s postal address, including all the sub-fields described in EPP (e.g., street, city, state or province, etc.).

1.8.3. Registry Operator will offer exact-match capabilities, at least, on the following fields: registrar id, name server name, and name server’s IP address (only applies to IP addresses stored by the registry, i.e., glue records).
1.8.4. Registry Operator will offer Boolean search capabilities supporting, at least, the following logical operators to join a set of search criteria: AND, OR, NOT.

1.8.5. Search results will include domain names matching the search criteria.

1.8.6. Registry Operator will: 1) implement appropriate measures to avoid abuse of this feature (e.g., permitting access only to legitimate authorized users); and 2) ensure the feature is in compliance with any applicable privacy laws or policies.

2. Zone File Access

2.1. Third-Party Access

2.1.1. Zone File Access Agreement. Registry Operator will enter into an agreement with any Internet user that will allow such user to access an Internet host server or servers designated by Registry Operator and download zone file data. The agreement will be standardized, facilitated and administered by a Centralized Zone Data Access Provider (the “CZDA Provider”). Registry Operator will provide access to zone file data per Section 2.1.3 and do so using the file format described in Section 2.1.4. Notwithstanding the foregoing, (a) the CZDA Provider may reject the request for access of any user that does not satisfy the credentialing requirements in Section 2.1.2 below; (b) Registry Operator may reject the request for access of any user that does not provide correct or legitimate credentials under Section 2.1.2 or where Registry Operator reasonably believes will violate the terms of Section 2.1.5 below; and, (c) Registry Operator may revoke access of any user if Registry Operator has evidence to support that the user has violated the terms of Section 2.1.5.

2.1.2. Credentialing Requirements. Registry Operator, through the facilitation of the CZDA Provider, will request each user to provide it with information sufficient to correctly identify and locate the user. Such user information will include, without limitation, company name, contact name, address, telephone number, facsimile number, email address, and the Internet host machine name and IP address.

2.1.3. Grant of Access. Each Registry Operator will provide the Zone File FTP (or other Registry supported) service for an ICANN-specified and managed URL (specifically, <TLD>.zda.icann.org where <TLD> is the TLD for which the registry is responsible) for the user to access the Registry’s zone data archives. Registry Operator will grant the user a non-exclusive, non-transferable, limited right to access Registry Operator’s Zone File FTP server, and to transfer a copy of the top-level domain zone files, and any associated cryptographic checksum files no more than once per 24 hour period using FTP, or other data transport and access protocols that may be prescribed by ICANN. For every zone file access server, the zone files are in the top-level directory called <zone>.zone.gz, with <zone>.zone.gz.md5 and <zone>.zone.gz.sig to verify downloads. If the Registry Operator also provides historical data, it will use the naming pattern <zone>-yyyymmdd.zone.gz, etc.

2.1.4. File Format Standard. Registry Operator will provide zone files using a sub-format of the standard Master File format as originally defined in RFC 1035, Section 5, including all the records present in the actual zone used in the public DNS. Sub-format is as follows:

1. Each record must include all fields in one line as: <domain-name> <TTL> <class> <type> <RDATA>.
2. Class and Type must use the standard mnemonics and must be in lower case.
3. TTL must be present as a decimal integer.
4. Use of /X and /DDD inside domain names is allowed.
5. All domain names must be in lower case.
6. Must use exactly one tab as separator of fields inside a record.
7. All domain names must be fully qualified.
8. No $ORIGIN directives.
9. No use of "@" to denote current origin.
10. No use of "blank domain names" at the beginning of a record to continue the use of the domain name in the previous record.
11. No $INCLUDE directives.
12. No $TTL directives.
13. No use of parentheses, e.g., to continue the list of fields in a record across a line boundary.
14. No use of comments.
15. No blank lines.
16. The SOA record should be present at the top and (duplicated at) the end of the zone file.
17. With the exception of the SOA record, all the records in a file must be in alphabetical order.
18. One zone per file. If a TLD divides its DNS data into multiple zones, each goes into a separate file named as above, with all the files combined using tar into a file called <tld>.zone.tar.

2.1.5. Use of Data by User. Registry Operator will permit user to use the zone file for lawful purposes; provided that, (a) user takes all reasonable steps to protect against unauthorized access to and use and disclosure of the data, and (b) under no circumstances will Registry Operator be required or permitted to allow user to use the data to, (i) allow, enable, or otherwise support the transmission by e-mail, telephone, or facsimile of mass unsolicited, commercial advertising or solicitations to entities other than user’s own existing customers, or (ii) enable high volume, automated, electronic processes that send queries or data to the systems of Registry Operator or any ICANN-accredited registrar.

2.1.6. Term of Use. Registry Operator, through CZDA Provider, will provide each user with access to the zone file for a period of not less than three (3) months. Registry Operator will allow users to renew their Grant of Access.

2.1.7. No Fee for Access. Registry Operator will provide, and CZDA Provider will facilitate, access to the zone file to user at no cost.

2.2 Co-operation

2.2.1. Assistance. Registry Operator will co-operate and provide reasonable assistance to ICANN and the CZDA Provider to facilitate and maintain the efficient access of zone file data by permitted users as contemplated under this Schedule.

2.3 ICANN Access. Registry Operator shall provide bulk access to the zone files for the TLD to ICANN or its designee on a continuous basis in the manner ICANN may reasonably specify from time to time.

2.4 Emergency Operator Access. Registry Operator shall provide bulk access to the zone files for the TLD to the Emergency Operators designated by ICANN on a continuous basis in the manner ICANN may reasonably specify from time to time.
3. Bulk Registration Data Access to ICANN

3.1. Periodic Access to Thin Registration Data. In order to verify and ensure the operational stability of Registry Services as well as to facilitate compliance checks on accredited registrars, Registry Operator will provide ICANN on a weekly basis (the day to be designated by ICANN) with up-to-date Registration Data as specified below. Data will include data committed as of 00:00:00 UTC on the day previous to the one designated for retrieval by ICANN.

3.1.1. Contents. Registry Operator will provide, at least, the following data for all registered domain names: domain name, domain name repository object id (roid), registrar id (IANA ID), statuses, last updated date, creation date, expiration date, and name server names. For sponsoring registrars, at least, it will provide: registrar name, registrar repository object id (roid), hostname of registrar Whois server, and URL of registrar.

3.1.2. Format. The data will be provided in the format specified in Specification 2 for Data Escrow (including encryption, signing, etc.) but including only the fields mentioned in the previous section, i.e., the file will only contain Domain and Registrar objects with the fields mentioned above. Registry Operator has the option to provide a full deposit file instead as specified in Specification 2.

3.1.3. Access. Registry Operator will have the file(s) ready for download as of 00:00:00 UTC on the day designated for retrieval by ICANN. The file(s) will be made available for download by SFTP, though ICANN may request other means in the future.

3.2. Exceptional Access to Thick Registration Data. In case of a registrar failure, de-accreditation, court order, etc. that prompts the temporary or definitive transfer of its domain names to another registrar, at the request of ICANN, Registry Operator will provide ICANN with up-to-date data for the domain names of the losing registrar. The data will be provided in the format specified in Specification 2 for Data Escrow. The file will only contain data related to the domain names of the losing registrar. Registry Operator will provide the data within 2 business days. Unless otherwise agreed by Registry Operator and ICANN, the file will be made available for download by ICANN in the same manner as the data specified in Section 3.1. of this Specification.
SPECIFICATION 5

SCHEDULE OF RESERVED NAMES AT THE SECOND LEVEL IN GTLD REGISTRIES

Except to the extent that ICANN otherwise expressly authorizes in writing, Registry Operator shall reserve (i.e., Registry Operator shall not register, delegate, use or otherwise make available such labels to any third party, but may register such labels in its own name in order to withhold them from delegation or use) names formed with the following labels from initial (i.e. other than renewal) registration within the TLD:

1. **Example. The label “EXAMPLE”** shall be reserved at the second level and at all other levels within the TLD at which Registry Operator makes registrations.

2. **Two-character labels.** All two-character labels shall be initially reserved. The reservation of a two-character label string may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the government and country-code manager. The Registry Operator may also propose release of these reservations based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes.

3. **Tagged Domain Names.** Labels may only include hyphens in the third and fourth position if they represent valid internationalized domain names in their ASCII encoding (for example "xn--ndk061n").

4. **Second-Level Reservations for Registry Operations.** The following names are reserved for use in connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD. Registry Operator may use them, but upon conclusion of Registry Operator's designation as operator of the registry for the TLD they shall be transferred as specified by ICANN: NIC, WWW, IRIS and WHOIS.

5. **Country and Territory Names.** The country and territory names contained in the following internationally recognized lists shall be initially reserved at the second level and at all other levels within the TLD at which the Registry Operator provides for registrations:

   5.1. the short form (in English) of all country and territory names contained on the ISO 3166-1 list, as updated from time to time, including the European Union, which is exceptionally reserved on the ISO 3166-1 list, and its scope extended in August 1999 to any application needing to represent the name European Union <http://www.iso.org/iso/support/country_codes/iso_3166_code_lists/iso-3166-1_decoding_table.htm#EU>;

   5.2. the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, Technical Reference Manual for the Standardization of Geographical Names, Part III Names of Countries of the World; and


provided, that the reservation of specific country and territory names may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the applicable government(s), provided, further, that
Registry Operator may also propose release of these reservations, subject to review by ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee and approval by ICANN.
NEW GTLD AGREEMENT SPECIFICATIONS

SPECIFICATION 6

REGISTRY INTEROPERABILITY AND CONTINUITY SPECIFICATIONS

1. Standards Compliance

1.1. DNS. Registry Operator shall comply with relevant existing RFCs and those published in the future by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) including all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to the DNS and name server operations including without limitation RFCs 1034, 1035, 1982, 2181, 2182, 2671, 3226, 3596, 3597, 4343, and 5966.

1.2. EPP. Registry Operator shall comply with relevant existing RFCs and those published in the future by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) including all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to the provisioning and management of domain names using the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) in conformance with RFCs 5910, 5730, 5731, 5732, 5733 and 5734. If Registry Operator implements Registry Grace Period (RGP), it will comply with RFC 3915 and its successors. If Registry Operator requires the use of functionality outside the base EPP RFCs, Registry Operator must document EPP extensions in Internet-Draft format following the guidelines described in RFC 3735. Registry Operator will provide and update the relevant documentation of all the EPP Objects and Extensions supported to ICANN prior to deployment.

1.3. DNSSEC. Registry Operator shall sign its TLD zone files implementing Domain Name System Security Extensions (“DNSSEC”). During the Term, Registry Operator shall comply with RFCs 4033, 4034, 4035, 4509 and their successors, and follow the best practices described in RFC 4641 and its successors. If Registry Operator implements Hashed Authenticated Denial of Existence for DNS Security Extensions, it shall comply with RFC 5155 and its successors. Registry Operator shall accept public-key material from child domain names in a secure manner according to industry best practices. Registry shall also publish in its website the DNSSEC Practice Statements (DPS) describing critical security controls and procedures for key material storage, access and usage for its own keys and secure acceptance of registrants’ public-key material. Registry Operator shall publish its DPS following the format described in “DPS-framework” (currently in draft format, see http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-dnsop-dnssec-dps-framework) within 180 days after the “DPS-framework” becomes an RFC.

1.4. IDN. If the Registry Operator offers Internationalized Domain Names (“IDNs”), it shall comply with RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893 and their successors. Registry Operator shall comply with the ICANN IDN Guidelines at <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm>, as they may be amended, modified, or superseded from time to time. Registry Operator shall publish and keep updated its IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules in the IANA Repository of IDN Practices as specified in the ICANN IDN Guidelines.

1.5. IPv6. Registry Operator shall be able to accept IPv6 addresses as glue records in its Registry System and publish them in the DNS. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for, at least, two of the Registry’s name servers listed in the root zone with the corresponding IPv6 addresses registered with IANA. Registry Operator should follow “DNS IPv6 Transport Operational Guidelines” as described in BCP 91 and the recommendations and considerations described in RFC 4472. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for its Registration Data Publication Services as defined in Specification 4 of this Agreement; e.g. Whois (RFC 3912), Web based Whois. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for its Shared Registration System (SRS) to any Registrar, no later than six months after receiving the first request in writing from a gTLD accredited Registrar willing to operate with the SRS over IPv6.
2. **Registry Services**

   2.1. **Registry Services**. “Registry Services” are, for purposes of the Registry Agreement, defined as the following: (a) those services that are operations of the registry critical to the following tasks: the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; dissemination of TLD zone files; operation of the registry DNS servers; and dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by this Agreement; (b) other products or services that the Registry Operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a Consensus Policy as defined in Specification 1; (c) any other products or services that only a registry operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the registry operator; and (d) material changes to any Registry Service within the scope of (a), (b) or (c) above.

   2.2. **Wildcard Prohibition**. For domain names which are either not registered, or the registrant has not supplied valid records such as NS records for listing in the DNS zone file, or their status does not allow them to be published in the DNS, the use of DNS wildcard Resource Records as described in RFCs 1034 and 4592 or any other method or technology for synthesizing DNS Resources Records or using redirection within the DNS by the Registry is prohibited. When queried for such domain names the authoritative name servers must return a “Name Error” response (also known as NXDOMAIN), RCODE 3 as described in RFC 1035 and related RFCs. This provision applies for all DNS zone files at all levels in the DNS tree for which the Registry Operator (or an affiliate engaged in providing Registration Services) maintains data, arranges for such maintenance, or derives revenue from such maintenance.

3. **Registry Continuity**

   3.1. **High Availability**. Registry Operator will conduct its operations using network and geographically diverse, redundant servers (including network-level redundancy, end-node level redundancy and the implementation of a load balancing scheme where applicable) to ensure continued operation in the case of technical failure (widespread or local), or an extraordinary occurrence or circumstance beyond the control of the Registry Operator.

   3.2. **Extraordinary Event**. Registry Operator will use commercially reasonable efforts to restore the critical functions of the registry within 24 hours after the termination of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator and restore full system functionality within a maximum of 48 hours following such event, depending on the type of critical function involved. Outages due to such an event will not be considered a lack of service availability.

   3.3. **Business Continuity**. Registry Operator shall maintain a business continuity plan, which will provide for the maintenance of Registry Services in the event of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator or business failure of Registry Operator, and may include the designation of a Registry Services continuity provider. If such plan includes the designation of a Registry Services continuity provider, Registry Operator shall provide the name and contact information for such Registry Services continuity provider to ICANN. In the case of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator where the Registry Operator cannot be contacted, Registry Operator consents that ICANN may contact the designated Registry Services continuity provider, if one exists. Registry Operator shall conduct Registry Services Continuity testing at least once per year.

4. **Abuse Mitigation**
4.1. Abuse Contact. Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN and publish on its website its accurate contact details including a valid email and mailing address as well as a primary contact for handling inquiries related to malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details.

4.2. Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.

5. Supported Initial and Renewal Registration Periods

5.1. Initial Registration Periods. Initial registrations of registered names may be made in the registry in one (1) year increments for up to a maximum of ten (10) years. For the avoidance of doubt, initial registrations of registered names may not exceed ten (10) years.

5.2. Renewal Periods. Renewal of registered names may be made in one (1) year increments for up to a maximum of ten (10) years. For the avoidance of doubt, renewal of registered names may not extend their registration period beyond ten (10) years from the time of the renewal.
SPECIFICATION 7

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR RIGHTS PROTECTION MECHANISMS

1. Rights Protection Mechanisms. Registry Operator shall implement and adhere to any rights protection mechanisms (“RPMs”) that may be mandated from time to time by ICANN. In addition to such RPMs, Registry Operator may develop and implement additional RPMs that discourage or prevent registration of domain names that violate or abuse another party’s legal rights. Registry Operator will include all ICANN mandated and independently developed RPMs in the registry-registrar agreement entered into by ICANN-accredited registrars authorized to register names in the TLD. Registry Operator shall implement in accordance with requirements established by ICANN each of the mandatory RPMs set forth in the Trademark Clearinghouse (posted at [url to be inserted when final Trademark Clearinghouse is adopted]), which may be revised by ICANN from time to time. Registry Operator shall not mandate that any owner of applicable intellectual property rights use any other trademark information aggregation, notification, or validation service in addition to or instead of the ICANN-designated Trademark Clearinghouse.

2. Dispute Resolution Mechanisms. Registry Operator will comply with the following dispute resolution mechanisms as they may be revised from time to time:

   a. the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP) and the Registration Restriction Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP) adopted by ICANN (posted at [urls to be inserted when final procedure is adopted]). Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PDDRP or RRDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination; and

   b. the Uniform Rapid Suspension system (“URS”) adopted by ICANN (posted at [url to be inserted]), including the implementation of determinations issued by URS examiners.
SPECIFICATION 8

CONTINUED OPERATIONS INSTRUMENT

1. The Continued Operations Instrument shall (a) provide for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the critical registry functions related to the TLD set forth in Section [__] of the Applicant Guidebook posted at [url to be inserted upon finalization of Applicant Guidebook] (which is hereby incorporated by reference into this Specification 8) for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period of one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6th) anniversary of the Effective Date, and (b) be in the form of either (i) an irrevocable standby letter of credit, or (ii) an irrevocable cash escrow deposit, each meeting the requirements set forth in Section [__] of the Applicant Guidebook posted at [url to be inserted upon finalization of Applicant Guidebook] (which is hereby incorporated by reference into this Specification 8). Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to take all actions necessary or advisable to maintain in effect the Continued Operations Instrument for a period of six (6) years from the Effective Date, and to maintain ICANN as a third party beneficiary thereof. Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN copies of all final documents relating to the Continued Operations Instrument and shall keep ICANN reasonably informed of material developments relating to the Continued Operations Instrument. Registry Operator shall not agree to, or permit, any amendment of, or waiver under, the Continued Operations Instrument or other documentation relating thereto without the prior written consent of ICANN (such consent not to be unreasonably withheld). The Continued Operations Instrument shall expressly state that ICANN may access the financial resources of the Continued Operations Instrument pursuant to Section 2.13 or Section 4.5 [insert for government entity: or Section 7.14] of the Registry Agreement.

2. If, notwithstanding the use of best efforts by Registry Operator to satisfy its obligations under the preceding paragraph, the Continued Operations Instrument expires or is terminated by another party thereto, in whole or in part, for any reason, prior to the sixth anniversary of the Effective Date, Registry Operator shall promptly (i) notify ICANN of such expiration or termination and the reasons therefor and (ii) arrange for an alternative instrument that provides for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the Registry Services related to the TLD for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period of one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6) anniversary of the Effective Date (an “Alternative Instrument”). Any such Alternative Instrument shall be on terms no less favorable to ICANN than the Continued Operations Instrument and shall otherwise be in form and substance reasonably acceptable to ICANN.

3. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Specification 8, at any time, Registry Operator may replace the Continued Operations Instrument with an alternative...
instrument that (i) provides for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the Registry Services related to the TLD for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6) anniversary of the Effective Date, and (ii) contains terms no less favorable to ICANN than the Continued Operations Instrument and is otherwise in form and substance reasonably acceptable to ICANN. In the event Registry Operation replaces the Continued Operations Instrument either pursuant to paragraph 2 or this paragraph 3, the terms of this Specification 8 shall no longer apply with respect to the original Continuing Operations Instrument, but shall thereafter apply with respect to such replacement instrument(s).
SPECIFICATION 9

Registry Operator Code of Conduct

1. In connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD, Registry Operator will not, and will not allow any parent, subsidiary, Affiliate, subcontractor or other related entity, to the extent such party is engaged in the provision of Registry Services with respect to the TLD (each, a “Registry Related Party”), to:

a. directly or indirectly show any preference or provide any special consideration to any registrar with respect to operational access to registry systems and related registry services, unless comparable opportunities to qualify for such preferences or considerations are made available to all registrars on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions;

b. register domain names in its own right, except for names registered through an ICANN accredited registrar that are reasonably necessary for the management, operations and purpose of the TLD, provided, that Registry Operator may reserve names from registration pursuant to Section 2.6 of the Registry Agreement;

c. register names in the TLD or sub-domains of the TLD based upon proprietary access to information about searches or resolution requests by consumers for domain names not yet registered (commonly known as, "front-running");

d. allow any Affiliated registrar to disclose user data to Registry Operator or any Registry Related Party, except as necessary for the management and operations of the TLD, unless all unrelated third parties (including other registry operators) are given equivalent access to such user data on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions; or

e. disclose confidential registry data or confidential information about its Registry Services or operations to any employee of any DNS services provider, except as necessary for the management and operations of the TLD, unless all unrelated third parties (including other registry operators) are given equivalent access to such confidential registry data or confidential information on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions.

2. If Registry Operator or a Registry Related Party also operates as a provider of registrar or registrar-reseller services, Registry Operator will, or will cause such Registry Related Party to, ensure that such services are offered through a legal entity separate from Registry Operator, and maintain separate books of accounts with respect to its registrar or registrar-reseller operations.

3. Registry Operator will conduct internal reviews at least once per calendar year to
ensure compliance with this Code of Conduct. Within twenty (20) calendar days following the end of each calendar year, Registry Operator will provide the results of the internal review, along with a certification executed by an executive officer of Registry Operator certifying as to Registry Operator’s compliance with this Code of Conduct, via email to an address to be provided by ICANN. (ICANN may specify in the future the form and contents of such reports or that the reports be delivered by other reasonable means.) Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may publicly post such results and certification.

4. Nothing set forth herein shall: (i) limit ICANN from conducting investigations of claims of Registry Operator’s non-compliance with this Code of Conduct; or (ii) provide grounds for Registry Operator to refuse to cooperate with ICANN investigations of claims of Registry Operator’s non-compliance with this Code of Conduct.

5. Nothing set forth herein shall limit the ability of Registry Operator or any Registry Related Party, to enter into arms-length transactions in the ordinary course of business with a registrar or reseller with respect to products and services unrelated in all respects to the TLD.

6. Registry Operator may request an exemption to this Code of Conduct, and such exemption may be granted by ICANN in ICANN’s reasonable discretion, if Registry Operator demonstrates to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that (i) all domain name registrations in the TLD are registered to, and maintained by, Registry Operator for its own exclusive use, (ii) Registry Operator does not sell, distribute or transfer control or use of any registrations in the TLD to any third party that is not an Affiliate of Registry Operator, and (iii) application of this Code of Conduct to the TLD is not necessary to protect the public interest.
NEW GTLD AGREEMENT SPECIFICATIONS

SPECIFICATION 10
REGISTRY PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS

1. Definitions

1.1. DNS. Refers to the Domain Name System as specified in RFCs 1034, 1035, and related RFCs.

1.2. DNSSEC proper resolution. There is a valid DNSSEC chain of trust from the root trust anchor to a particular domain name, e.g., a TLD, a domain name registered under a TLD, etc.

1.3. EPP. Refers to the Extensible Provisioning Protocol as specified in RFC 5730 and related RFCs.

1.4. IP address. Refers to IPv4 or IPv6 addresses without making any distinction between the two. When there is need to make a distinction, IPv4 or IPv6 is used.

1.5. Probes. Network hosts used to perform (DNS, EPP, etc.) tests (see below) that are located at various global locations.

1.6. RDDS. Registration Data Directory Services refers to the collective of WHOIS and Web-based WHOIS services as defined in Specification 4 of this Agreement.

1.7. RTT. Round-Trip Time or RTT refers to the time measured from the sending of the first bit of the first packet of the sequence of packets needed to make a request until the reception of the last bit of the last packet of the sequence needed to receive the response. If the client does not receive the whole sequence of packets needed to consider the response as received, the request will be considered unanswered.

1.8. SLR. Service Level Requirement is the level of service expected for a certain parameter being measured in a Service Level Agreement (SLA).

2. Service Level Agreement Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>SLR (monthly basis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DNS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS service availability</td>
<td>0 min downtime = 100% availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS name server availability</td>
<td>( \leq 432 ) min of downtime (( \approx 99% ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP DNS resolution RTT</td>
<td>( \leq 1500 ) ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP DNS resolution RTT</td>
<td>( \leq 500 ) ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS update time</td>
<td>( \leq 60 ) min, for at least 95% of the probes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS availability</td>
<td>( \leq 864 ) min of downtime (( \approx 98% ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS query RTT</td>
<td>( \leq 2000 ) ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS update time</td>
<td>( \leq 60 ) min, for at least 95% of the probes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP service availability</td>
<td>( \leq 864 ) min of downtime (( \approx 98% ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP session-command RTT</td>
<td>( \leq 4000 ) ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP query-command RTT</td>
<td>( \leq 2000 ) ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP transform-command RTT</td>
<td>( \leq 4000 ) ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Registry Operator is encouraged to do maintenance for the different services at the times and dates of statistically lower traffic for each service. However, note that there is no provision for planned outages or similar; any downtime, be it for maintenance or due to system failures, will be noted simply as downtime and counted for SLA purposes.

3. **DNS**

3.1. **DNS service availability.** Refers to the ability of the group of listed-as-authoritative name servers of a particular domain name (e.g., a TLD), to answer DNS queries from DNS probes. For the service to be considered available at a particular moment, at least, two of the delegated name servers registered in the DNS must have successful results from “DNS tests” to each of their public-DNS registered “IP addresses” to which the name server resolves. If 51% or more of the DNS testing probes see the service as unavailable during a given time, the DNS service will be considered unavailable.

3.2. **DNS name server availability.** Refers to the ability of a public-DNS registered “IP address” of a particular name server listed as authoritative for a domain name, to answer DNS queries from an Internet user. All the public DNS-registered “IP address” of all name servers of the domain name being monitored shall be tested individually. If 51% or more of the DNS testing probes get undefined/unanswered results from “DNS tests” to a name server “IP address” during a given time, the name server “IP address” will be considered unavailable.

3.3. **UDP DNS resolution RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of two packets, the UDP DNS query and the corresponding UDP DNS response. If the RTT is 5 times greater than the time specified in the relevant SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

3.4. **TCP DNS resolution RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the DNS response for only one DNS query. If the RTT is 5 times greater than the time specified in the relevant SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

3.5. **DNS resolution RTT.** Refers to either “UDP DNS resolution RTT” or “TCP DNS resolution RTT”.

3.6. **DNS update time.** Refers to the time measured from the reception of an EPP confirmation to a transform command on a domain name, until the name servers of the parent domain name answer “DNS queries” with data consistent with the change made. This only applies for changes to DNS information.

3.7. **DNS test.** Means one non-recursive DNS query sent to a particular “IP address” (via UDP or TCP). If DNSSEC is offered in the queried DNS zone, for a query to be considered answered, the signatures must be positively verified against a corresponding DS record published in the parent zone or, if the parent is not signed, against a statically configured Trust Anchor. The answer to the query must contain the corresponding information from the Registry System, otherwise the query will be considered unanswered. A query with a “DNS resolution RTT” 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR, will be considered unanswered. The possible results to a DNS test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the “DNS resolution RTT” or, undefined/unanswered.

3.8. **Measuring DNS parameters.** Every minute, every DNS probe will make an UDP or TCP “DNS test” to each of the public-DNS registered “IP addresses” of the name servers of the domain
name being monitored. If a “DNS test” result is undefined/unanswered, the tested IP will be considered unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

3.9. **Collating the results from DNS probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 20 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

3.10. **Distribution of UDP and TCP queries.** DNS probes will send UDP or TCP “DNS test” approximating the distribution of these queries.

3.11. **Placement of DNS probes.** Probes for measuring DNS parameters shall be placed as near as possible to the DNS resolvers on the networks with the most users across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

4. **RDDS**

4.1. **RDDS availability.** Refers to the ability of all the RDDS services for the TLD, to respond to queries from an Internet user with appropriate data from the relevant Registry System. If 51% or more of the RDDS testing probes see any of the RDDS services as unavailable during a given time, the RDDS will be considered unavailable.

4.2. **WHOIS query RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the WHOIS response. If the RTT is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

4.3. **Web-based-WHOIS query RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the HTTP response for only one HTTP request. If Registry Operator implements a multiple-step process to get to the information, only the last step shall be measured. If the RTT is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

4.4. **RDDS query RTT.** Refers to the collective of “WHOIS query RTT” and “Web-based-WHOIS query RTT”.

4.5. **RDDS update time.** Refers to the time measured from the reception of an EPP confirmation to a transform command on a domain name, host or contact, up until the servers of the RDDS services reflect the changes made.

4.6. **RDDS test.** Means one query sent to a particular “IP address” of one of the servers of one of the RDDS services. Queries shall be about existing objects in the Registry System and the responses must contain the corresponding information otherwise the query will be considered unanswered. Queries with an RTT 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR will be considered as unanswered. The possible results to an RDDS test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the RTT or undefined/unanswered.

4.7. **Measuring RDDS parameters.** Every 5 minutes, RDDS probes will select one IP address from all the public-DNS registered “IP addresses” of the servers for each RDDS service of the TLD being monitored and make an “RDDS test” to each one. If an “RDDS test” result is
undefined/unanswered, the corresponding RDDS service will be considered as unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

4.8. **Collating the results from RDDS probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 10 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

4.9. **Placement of RDDS probes.** Probes for measuring RDDS parameters shall be placed inside the networks with the most users across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

5. **EPP**

5.1. **EPP service availability.** Refers to the ability of the TLD EPP servers as a group, to respond to commands from the Registry accredited Registrars, who already have credentials to the servers. The response shall include appropriate data from the Registry System. An EPP command with “EPP command RTT” 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR will be considered unanswered. If 51% or more of the EPP testing probes see the EPP service as unavailable during a given time, the EPP service will be considered unavailable.

5.2. **EPP session-command RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a session command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP session command. For the login command it will include packets needed for starting the TCP session. For the logout command it will include packets needed for closing the TCP session. EPP session commands are those described in section 2.9.1 of EPP RFC 5730. If the RTT is 5 times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

5.3. **EPP query-command RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a query command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP query command. It does not include packets needed for the start or close of either the EPP or the TCP session. EPP query commands are those described in section 2.9.2 of EPP RFC 5730. If the RTT is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

5.4. **EPP transform-command RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a transform command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP transform command. It does not include packets needed for the start or close of either the EPP or the TCP session. EPP transform commands are those described in section 2.9.3 of EPP RFC 5730. If the RTT is 5 times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

5.5. **EPP command RTT.** Refers to “EPP session-command RTT”, “EPP query-command RTT” or “EPP transform-command RTT”.

5.6. **EPP test.** Means one EPP command sent to a particular “IP address” for one of the EPP servers. Query and transform commands, with the exception of “create”, shall be about existing objects in the Registry System. The response shall include appropriate data from the Registry System. The possible results to an EPP test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the “EPP command RTT” or undefined/unanswered.
5.7. **Measuring EPP parameters.** Every 5 minutes, EPP probes will select one “IP address” of the EPP servers of the TLD being monitored and make an “EPP test”; every time they should alternate between the 3 different types of commands and between the commands inside each category. If an “EPP test” result is undefined/unanswered, the EPP service will be considered as unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

5.8. **Collating the results from EPP probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 5 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

5.9. **Placement of EPP probes.** Probes for measuring EPP parameters shall be placed inside or close to Registrars points of access to the Internet across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

6. **Emergency Thresholds**

The following matrix presents the Emergency Thresholds that, if reached by any of the services mentioned above for a TLD, would cause the Emergency Transition of the Critical Functions as specified in Section 2.13. of this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Function</th>
<th>Emergency Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS service (all servers)</td>
<td>4-hour downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNSSEC proper resolution</td>
<td>4-hour downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>24-hour downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS (WHOIS/Web-based WHOIS)</td>
<td>24-hour downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Escrow</td>
<td>Breach of the Registry Agreement caused by missing escrow deposits as described in Specification 2, Part B, Section 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Emergency Escalation**

Escalation is strictly for purposes of notifying and investigating possible or potential issues in relation to monitored services. The initiation of any escalation and the subsequent cooperative investigations do not in themselves imply that a monitored service has failed its performance requirements.

Escalations shall be carried out between ICANN and Registry Operators, Registrars and Registry Operator, and Registrars and ICANN. Registry Operators and ICANN must provide said emergency operations departments. Current contacts must be maintained between ICANN and Registry Operators and published to Registrars, where relevant to their role in escalations, prior to any processing of an Emergency Escalation by all related parties, and kept current at all times.

7.1. **Emergency Escalation initiated by ICANN**

Upon reaching 10% of the Emergency thresholds as described in Section 6, ICANN’s emergency operations will initiate an Emergency Escalation with the relevant Registry Operator. An Emergency Escalation consists of the following minimum elements: electronic (i.e., email or SMS) and/or voice contact notification to the Registry Operator’s emergency operations department with detailed information concerning the issue being escalated, including evidence of monitoring failures, cooperative trouble-shooting of the monitoring failure between ICANN staff and the Registry Operator, and the
commitment to begin the process of rectifying issues with either the monitoring service or the service being monitoring.

7.2. Emergency Escalation initiated by Registrars

Registry Operator will maintain an emergency operations departments prepared to handle emergency requests from registrars. In the event that a registrar is unable to conduct EPP transactions with the Registry because of a fault with the Registry Service and is unable to either contact (through ICANN mandated methods of communication) the Registry Operator, or the Registry Operator is unable or unwilling to address the fault, the registrar may initiate an Emergency Escalation to the emergency operations department of ICANN. ICANN then may initiate an Emergency Escalation with the Registry Operator as explained above.

7.3. Notifications of Outages and Maintenance

In the event that a Registry Operator plans maintenance, they will provide related notice to the ICANN emergency operations department, at least, 24 hours ahead of that maintenance. ICANN’s emergency operations department will note planned maintenance times, and suspend Emergency Escalation services for the monitored services during the expected maintenance outage period.

If Registry Operator declares an outage, as per their contractual obligations with ICANN, on services under SLA and performance requirements, it will notify the ICANN emergency operations department. During that declared outage, ICANN’s emergency operations department will note and suspend Emergency Escalation services for the monitored services involved.

8. Covenants of Performance Measurement

8.1. No interference. Registry Operator shall not interfere with measurement Probes, including any form of preferential treatment of the requests for the monitored services. Registry Operator shall respond to the measurement tests described in this Specification as it would do with any other request from Internet users (for DNS and RDDS) or registrars (for EPP).

8.2. ICANN testing registrar. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN will have a testing registrar used for purposes of measuring the SLRs described above. Registry Operator agrees to not provide any differentiated treatment for the testing registrar other than no billing of the transactions. ICANN shall not use the registrar for registering domain names (or other registry objects) for itself or others, except for the purposes of verifying contractual compliance with the conditions described in this Agreement.
1. PURPOSE OF CLEARINGHOUSE

1.1 The Trademark Clearinghouse is a central repository for information to be authenticated, stored, and disseminated, pertaining to the rights of trademark holders. ICANN will enter into an arms-length contract with service provider or providers, awarding the right to serve as a Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider, i.e., to accept, authenticate, validate and facilitate the transmission of information related to certain trademarks.

1.2 The Clearinghouse will be required to separate its two primary functions: (i) authentication and validation of the trademarks in the Clearinghouse; and (ii) serving as a database to provide information to the new gTLD registries to support pre-launch Sunrise or Trademark Claims Services. Whether the same provider could serve both functions or whether two providers will be determined in the tender process.

1.3 The Registry shall only need to connect with one centralized database to obtain the information it needs to conduct its Sunrise or Trademark Claims Services regardless of the details of the Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider’s contract(s) with ICANN.

1.4 Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider may provide ancillary services, as long as those services and any data used for those services are kept separate from the Clearinghouse database.

1.5 The Clearinghouse database will be a repository of authenticated information and disseminator of the information to a limited number of recipients. Its functions will be performed in accordance with a limited charter, and will not have any discretionary powers other than what will be set out in the charter with respect to authentication and validation. The Clearinghouse administrator(s) cannot create policy. Before material changes are made to the Clearinghouse functions, they will be reviewed through the ICANN public participation model.

1.6 Inclusion in the Clearinghouse is not proof of any right, nor does it create any legal rights. Failure to submit trademarks into the Clearinghouse should not be perceived to be lack of vigilance by trademark holders or a waiver of any rights, nor can any negative influence be drawn from such failure.

2. SERVICE PROVIDERS

2.1 The selection of Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider(s) will be subject to predetermined criteria, but the foremost considerations will be the ability to store, authenticate, validate and disseminate the data at the highest level of technical stability
and security without interference with the integrity or timeliness of the registration process or registry operations.

2.2 Functions – Authentication/Validation; Database Administration. Public commentary has suggested that the best way to protect the integrity of the data and to avoid concerns that arise through sole-source providers would be to separate the functions of database administration and data authentication/validation.

2.2.1 One entity will authenticate registrations ensuring the word marks qualify as registered or are court-validated word marks or word marks that are protected by statute or treaty. This entity would also be asked to ensure that proof of use of marks is provided, which can be demonstrated by furnishing a signed declaration and one specimen of current use.

2.2.2 The second entity will maintain the database and provide Sunrise and Trademark Claims Services (described below).

2.3 Discretion will be used, balancing effectiveness, security and other important factors, to determine whether ICANN will contract with one or two entities - one to authenticate and validate, and the other to, administer in order to preserve integrity of the data.

2.4 Contractual Relationship.

2.4.1 The Clearinghouse shall be separate and independent from ICANN. It will operate based on market needs and collect fees from those who use its services. ICANN may coordinate or specify interfaces used by registries and registrars, and provide some oversight or quality assurance function to ensure rights protection goals are appropriately met.

2.4.2 The Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider(s) (authenticator/validator and administrator) will be selected through an open and transparent process to ensure low costs and reliable, consistent service for all those utilizing the Clearinghouse services.

2.4.3 The Service Provider(s) providing the authentication of the trademarks submitted into the Clearinghouse shall adhere to rigorous standards and requirements that would be specified in an ICANN contractual agreement.

2.4.4 The contract shall include service level requirements, customer service availability (with the goal of seven days per week, 24 hours per day, 365 days per year), data escrow requirements, and equal access requirements for all persons and entities required to access the Trademark Clearinghouse database.
2.4.5 To the extent practicable, the contract should also include indemnification by Service Provider for errors such as false positives for participants such as Registries, ICANN, Registrants and Registrars.

2.5. Service Provider Requirements. The Clearinghouse Service Provider(s) should utilize regional marks authentication service providers (whether directly or through subcontractors) to take advantage of local experts who understand the nuances of the trademark in question. Examples of specific performance criteria details in the contract award criteria and service-level-agreements are:

2.5.1 provide 24 hour accessibility seven days a week (database administrator);
2.5.2 employ systems that are technically reliable and secure (database administrator);
2.5.3 use globally accessible and scalable systems so that multiple marks from multiple sources in multiple languages can be accommodated and sufficiently cataloged (database administrator and validator);
2.5.4 accept submissions from all over the world - the entry point for trademark holders to submit their data into the Clearinghouse database could be regional entities or one entity;
2.5.5 allow for multiple languages, with exact implementation details to be determined;
2.5.6 provide access to the Registrants to verify and research Trademark Claims Notices;
2.5.7 have the relevant experience in database administration, validation or authentication, as well as accessibility to and knowledge of the various relevant trademark laws (database administrator and authenticator); and
2.5.8 ensure through performance requirements, including those involving interface with registries and registrars, that neither domain name registration timeliness, nor registry or registrar operations will be hindered (database administrator).

3. CRITERIA FOR TRADEMARK INCLUSION IN CLEARINGHOUSE

3.1 The trademark holder will submit to one entity – a single entity for entry will facilitate access to the entire Clearinghouse database. If regional entry points are used, ICANN will publish an information page describing how to locate regional submission points. Regardless of the entry point into the Clearinghouse, the authentication procedures established will be uniform.

3.2 The standards for inclusion in the Clearinghouse are:

3.2.1 Nationally or regionally registered word marks from all jurisdictions.
3.2.2 Any word mark that has been validated through a court of law or other judicial proceeding.
3.2.3 Any word mark protected by a statute or treaty in effect at the time the mark is submitted to the Clearinghouse for inclusion.
3.2.4 Other marks that constitute intellectual property.
3.2.5 Protections afforded to trademark registrations do not extend to applications for registrations, marks within any opposition period or registered marks that were the subject of successful invalidation, cancellation or rectification proceedings.

3.3 The type of data supporting entry of a registered word mark into the Clearinghouse must include a copy of the registration or the relevant ownership information, including the requisite registration number(s), the jurisdictions where the registrations have issued, and the name of the owner of record.

3.4 Data supporting entry of a judicially validated word mark into the Clearinghouse must include the court documents, properly entered by the court, evidencing the validation of a given word mark.

3.5 Data supporting entry into the Clearinghouse of word marks protected by a statute or treaty in effect at the time the mark is submitted to the Clearinghouse for inclusion, must include a copy of the relevant portion of the statute or treaty and evidence of its effective date.

3.6 Data supporting entry into the Clearinghouse of marks that constitute intellectual property of types other than those set forth in sections 3.2.1-3.2.3 above shall be determined by the registry operator and the Clearinghouse based on the services any given registry operator chooses to provide.

3.7 Registrations that include top level extensions such as “icann.org” or “.icann” as the word mark will not be permitted in the Clearinghouse regardless of whether that mark has been registered or it has been otherwise validated or protected (e.g., if a mark existed for icann.org or .icann, neither will not be permitted in the Clearinghouse).

3.8 All mark holders seeking to have their marks included in the Clearinghouse will be required to submit a declaration, affidavit, or other sworn statement that the information provided is true and current and has not been supplied for an improper purpose. The mark holder will also be required to attest that it will keep the information supplied to the Clearinghouse current so that if, during the time the mark is included in the Clearinghouse, a registration gets cancelled or is transferred to another entity, or in the case of a court- or Clearinghouse-validated mark the holder abandons use of the mark, the mark holder has an affirmative obligation to notify the Clearinghouse. There will be penalties for failing to keep information current. Moreover, it is anticipated that there will be a process whereby registrations can be
removed from the Clearinghouse if it is discovered that the marks are procured by fraud or if the data is inaccurate.

3.9 As an additional safeguard, the data will have to be renewed periodically by any mark holder wishing to remain in the Clearinghouse. Electronic submission should facilitate this process and minimize the cost associated with it. The reason for periodic authentication is to streamline the efficiencies of the Clearinghouse and the information the registry operators will need to process and limit the marks at issue to the ones that are in use.

4. **USE OF CLEARINGHOUSE DATA**

4.1 All mark holders seeking to have their marks included in the Clearinghouse will have to consent to the use of their information by the Clearinghouse. However, such consent would extend only to use in connection with the stated purpose of the Trademark Clearinghouse Database for Sunrise or Trademark Claims services. The reason for such a provision would be to presently prevent the Clearinghouse from using the data in other ways without permission. There shall be no bar on the Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider or other third party service providers providing ancillary services on a non-exclusive basis.

4.2 In order not to create a competitive advantage, the data in the Trademark Clearinghouse should be licensed to competitors interested in providing ancillary services on equal and non-discriminatory terms and on commercially reasonable terms if the mark holders agree. Accordingly, two licensing options will be offered to the mark holder: (a) a license to use its data for all required features of the Trademark Clearinghouse, with no permitted use of such data for ancillary services either by the Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider or any other entity; or (b) license to use its data for the mandatory features of the Trademark Clearinghouse and for any ancillary uses reasonably related to the protection of marks in new gTLDs, which would include a license to allow the Clearinghouse to license the use and data in the Trademark Clearinghouse to competitors that also provide those ancillary services. The specific implementation details will be determined, and all terms and conditions related to the provision of such services shall be included in the Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider’s contract with ICANN and subject to ICANN review.

4.3 Access by a prospective registrant to verify and research Trademark Claims Notices shall not be considered an ancillary service, and shall be provided at no cost to the Registrant. Misuse of the data by the service providers would be grounds for immediate termination.
5. DATA AUTHENTICATION AND VALIDATION GUIDELINES

5.1 One core function for inclusion in the Clearinghouse would be to authenticate that the data meets certain minimum criteria. As such, the following minimum criteria are suggested:

5.1.1 An acceptable list of data authentication sources, i.e. the web sites of patent and trademark offices throughout the world, third party providers who can obtain information from various trademark offices;

5.1.2 Name, address and contact information of the applicant is accurate, current and matches that of the registered owner of the trademarks listed;

5.1.3 Electronic contact information is provided and accurate;

5.1.4 The registration numbers and countries match the information in the respective trademark office database for that registration number.

5.2 For validation of marks by the Clearinghouse that were not protected via a court, statute or treaty, the mark holder shall be required to provide evidence of use of the mark in connection with the bona fide offering for sale of goods or services prior to application for inclusion in the Clearinghouse. Acceptable evidence of use will be a signed declaration and a single specimen of current use, which might consist of labels, tags, containers, advertising, brochures, screen shots, or something else that evidences current use.

6. MANDATORY RIGHTS PROTECTION MECHANISMS

All new gTLD registries will be required to use the Trademark Clearinghouse to support its pre-launch or initial launch period rights protection mechanisms (RPMs). These RPMs, at a minimum, must consist of a Trademark Claims service and a Sunrise process.

6.1 Trademark Claims service

6.1.1 New gTLD Registry Operators must provide Trademark Claims services during an initial launch period for marks in the Trademark Clearinghouse. This launch period must occur for at least the first 60 days that registration is open for general registration.

6.1.2 A Trademark Claims service is intended to provide clear notice to the prospective registrant of the scope of the mark holder’s rights in order to minimize the chilling effect on registrants (Trademark Claims Notice). A form that describes the required elements is attached. The specific statement by
prospective registrant warrants that: (i) the prospective registrant has received notification that the mark(s) is included in the Clearinghouse; (ii) the prospective registrant has received and understood the notice; and (iii) to the best of the prospective registrant’s knowledge, the registration and use of the requested domain name will not infringe on the rights that are the subject of the notice.

6.1.3 The Trademark Claims Notice should provide the prospective registrant access to the Trademark Clearinghouse Database information referenced in the Trademark Claims Notice to enhance understanding of the Trademark rights being claimed by the trademark holder. These links (or other sources) shall be provided in real time without cost to the prospective registrant. Preferably, the Trademark Claims Notice should be provided in the language used for the rest of the interaction with the registrar or registry, but it is anticipated that at the very least in the most appropriate UN-sponsored language (as specified by the prospective registrant or registrar/registry).

6.1.4 If the domain name is registered in the Clearinghouse, the registrar (again through an interface with the Clearinghouse) will promptly notify the mark holders(s) of the registration after it is effectuated.

6.1.5 The Trademark Clearinghouse Database will be structured to report to registries when registrants are attempting to register a domain name that is considered an “Identical Match” with the mark in the Clearinghouse. “Identical Match” means that the domain name consists of the complete and identical textual elements of the mark. In this regard: (a) spaces contained within a mark that are either replaced by hyphens (and vice versa) or omitted; (b) only certain special characters contained within a trademark are spelled out with appropriate words describing it (@ and &); (c) punctuation or special characters contained within a mark that are unable to be used in a second-level domain name may either be (i) omitted or (ii) replaced by spaces, hyphens or underscores and still be considered identical matches; and (d) no plural and no “marks contained” would qualify for inclusion.

6.2 Sunrise service

6.2.1 Sunrise registration services must be offered for a minimum of 30 days during the pre-launch phase and notice must be provided to all trademark holders in the Clearinghouse if someone is seeking a sunrise registration. This notice will be provided to holders of marks in the Clearinghouse that are an Identical Match to the name to be registered during Sunrise.

6.2.2 Sunrise Registration Process. For a Sunrise service, sunrise eligibility requirements (SERs) will be met as a minimum requirement, verified by Clearinghouse data, and
incorporate a Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policy (SDRP).

6.2.3 The proposed SERs include: (i) ownership of a mark (that satisfies the criteria in section 7.2 below), (ii) optional registry elected requirements re: international class of goods or services covered by registration; (iii) representation that all provided information is true and correct; and (iv) provision of data sufficient to document rights in the trademark.

6.2.4 The proposed SDRP must allow challenges based on at least the following four grounds: (i) at time the challenged domain name was registered, the registrant did not hold a trademark registration of national effect (or regional effect) or the trademark had not been court-validated or protected by statute or treaty; (ii) the domain name is not identical to the mark on which the registrant based its Sunrise registration; (iii) the trademark registration on which the registrant based its Sunrise registration is not of national effect (or regional effect) or the trademark had not been court-validated or protected by statute or treaty; or (iv) the trademark registration on which the domain name registrant based its Sunrise registration did not issue on or before the effective date of the Registry Agreement and was not applied for on or before ICANN announced the applications received.

6.2.5 The Clearinghouse will maintain the SERs, validate and authenticate marks, as applicable, and hear challenges.

7. PROTECTION FOR MARKS IN CLEARINGHOUSE

The scope of registered marks that must be honored by registries in providing Trademarks Claims services is broader than those that must be honored by registries in Sunrise services.

7.1 For Trademark Claims services - Registries must recognize and honor all word marks that have been or are: (i) nationally or regionally registered; (ii) court-validated; or (iii) specifically protected by a statute or treaty in effect at the time the mark is submitted to the Clearinghouse for inclusion. No demonstration of use is required.

7.2 For Sunrise services - Registries must recognize and honor all word marks: (i) nationally or regionally registered and for which proof of use – which can be a declaration and a single specimen of current use – was submitted to, and validated by, the Trademark Clearinghouse; or (ii) that have been court-validated; or (iii) that are specifically protected by a statute or treaty currently in effect and that was in effect on or before 26 June 2008.

8. COSTS OF CLEARINGHOUSE

Costs should be completely borne by the parties utilizing the services. Trademark holders will pay to register the Clearinghouse, and registries will pay for Trademark Claims and Sunrise services. Registrars and others who avail themselves of Clearinghouse services will pay the Clearinghouse directly.
TRADEMARK NOTICE

[In English and the language of the registration agreement]

You have received this Trademark Notice because you have applied for a domain name which matches at least one trademark record submitted to the Trademark Clearinghouse.

You may or may not be entitled to register the domain name depending on your intended use and whether it is the same or significantly overlaps with the trademarks listed below. Your rights to register this domain name may or may not be protected as noncommercial use or “fair use” by the laws of your country. [in bold italics or all caps]

Please read the trademark information below carefully, including the trademarks, jurisdictions, and goods and service for which the trademarks are registered. Please be aware that not all jurisdictions review trademark applications closely, so some of the trademark information below may exist in a national or regional registry which does not conduct a thorough or substantive review of trademark rights prior to registration.

If you have questions, you may want to consult an attorney or legal expert on trademarks and intellectual property for guidance.

If you continue with this registration, you represent that, you have received and you understand this notice and to the best of your knowledge, your registration and use of the requested domain name will not infringe on the trademark rights listed below. The following [number] Trademarks are listed in the Trademark Clearinghouse:

1. Mark: Jurisdiction: Goods: [click here for more if maximum character count is exceeded] International Class of Goods and Services or Equivalent if applicable: Trademark Registrant: Trademark Registrant Contact:

[with links to the TM registrations as listed in the TM Clearinghouse]

2. Mark: Jurisdiction: Goods: [click here for more if maximum character count is exceeded] International Class of Goods and Services or Equivalent if applicable: Trademark Registrant:

Trademark Registrant Contact:
****** [with links to the TM registrations as listed in the TM Clearinghouse]

X. 1. Mark: Jurisdiction: Goods: [click here for more if maximum character count is exceeded] International Class of Goods and Services or Equivalent if applicable: Trademark Registrant: Trademark Registrant Contact:
UNIFORM RAPID SUSPENSION SYSTEM (“URS”)
4 JUNE 2012

DRAFT PROCEDURE

1. Complaint

1.1 Filing the Complaint

a) Proceedings are initiated by electronically filing with a URS Provider a Complaint outlining the trademark rights and the actions complained of entitling the trademark holder to relief.

b) Each Complaint must be accompanied by the appropriate fee, which is under consideration. The fees will be non-refundable.

c) One Complaint is acceptable for multiple related companies against one Registrant, but only if the companies complaining are related. Multiple Registrants can be named in one Complaint only if it can be shown that they are in some way related. There will not be a minimum number of domain names imposed as a prerequisite to filing.

1.2 Contents of the Complaint

The form of the Complaint will be simple and as formulaic as possible. There will be a Form Complaint. The Form Complaint shall include space for the following:

1.2.1 Name, email address and other contact information for the Complaining Party (Parties).

1.2.2 Name, email address and contact information for any person authorized to act on behalf of Complaining Parties.

1.2.3 Name of Registrant (i.e. relevant information available from Whois) and Whois listed available contact information for the relevant domain name(s).

1.2.4 The specific domain name(s) that are the subject of the Complaint. For each domain name, the Complainant shall include a copy of the currently available Whois information and a description and copy, if available, of the offending portion of the website content associated with each domain name that is the subject of the Complaint.

1.2.5 The specific trademark/service marks upon which the Complaint is based and pursuant to which the Complaining Parties are asserting their rights to them, for which goods and in connection with what services.

1.2.6 A statement of the grounds upon which the Complaint is based setting forth facts showing that the Complaining Party is entitled to relief, namely:
1.2.6.1. that the registered domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark: (i) for which the Complainant holds a valid national or regional registration and that is in current use; or (ii) that has been validated through court proceedings; or (iii) that is specifically protected by a statute or treaty in effect at the time the URS complaint is filed.

a. Use can be shown by demonstrating that evidence of use – which can be a declaration and one specimen of current use in commerce - was submitted to, and validated by, the Trademark Clearinghouse.

b. Proof of use may also be submitted directly with the URS Complaint.

and

1.2.6.2. that the Registrant has no legitimate right or interest to the domain name; and

1.2.6.3. that the domain was registered and is being used in bad faith.

A non-exclusive list of circumstances that demonstrate bad faith registration and use by the Registrant include:

a. Registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

b. Registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the trademark holder or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

c. Registrant registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

d. By using the domain name Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to Registrant’s web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Registrant’s web site or location or of a product or service on that web site or location.
1.2.7 A box in which the Complainant may submit up to 500 words of explanatory free form text.

1.2.8 An attestation that the Complaint is not being filed for any improper basis and that there is a sufficient good faith basis for filing the Complaint.

2. Fees

2.1 URS Provider will charge fees to the Complainant. Fees are thought to be in the range of USD 300 per proceeding, but will ultimately be set by the Provider.

2.2 Complaints listing fifteen (15) or more disputed domain names registered by the same registrant will be subject to a Response Fee which will be refundable to the prevailing party. Under no circumstances shall the Response Fee exceed the fee charged to the Complainant.

3. Administrative Review

3.1 Complaints will be subjected to an initial administrative review by the URS Provider for compliance with the filing requirements. This is a review to determine that the Complaint contains all of the necessary information, and is not a determination as to whether a prima facie case has been established.

3.2 The Administrative Review shall be conducted within two (2) business days of submission of the Complaint to the URS Provider.

3.3 Given the rapid nature of this Procedure, and the intended low level of required fees, there will be no opportunity to correct inadequacies in the filing requirements.

3.4 If a Complaint is deemed non-compliant with filing requirements, the Complaint will be dismissed without prejudice to the Complainant filing a new complaint. The initial filing fee shall not be refunded in these circumstances.

4. Notice and Locking of Domain

4.1 Upon completion of the Administrative Review, the URS Provider must immediately notify the registry operator (via email) (“Notice of Complaint”) after the Complaint has been deemed compliant with the filing requirements. Within 24 hours of receipt of the Notice of Complaint from the URS Provider, the registry operator shall “lock” the domain, meaning the registry shall restrict all changes to the registration data, including transfer and deletion of the domain names, but the name will continue to resolve. The registry operator will notify the URS Provider immediately upon locking the domain name (“Notice of Lock”).

4.2 Within 24 hours after receiving Notice of Lock from the registry operator, the URS Provider shall notify the Registrant of the Complaint, sending a hard copy of the Notice of Complaint to the addresses listed in the Whois contact information, and providing an electronic copy of the Complaint, advising of the locked status, as well as the potential
effects if the Registrant fails to respond and defend against the Complaint. Notices must be clear and understandable to Registrants located globally. The Notice of Complaint shall be in English and translated by the Provider into the predominant language used in the registrant’s country or territory.

4.3 All Notices to the Registrant shall be sent through email, fax (where available) and postal mail. The Complaint and accompanying exhibits, if any, shall be served electronically.

4.4 The URS Provider shall also electronically notify the registrar of record for the domain name at issue via the addresses the registrar has on file with ICANN.

5. **The Response**

5.1 A Registrant will have 14 calendar days from the date the URS Provider sent its Notice of Complaint to the Registrant to electronically file a Response with the URS Provider. Upon receipt, the Provider will electronically send a copy of the Response, and accompanying exhibits, if any, to the Complainant.

5.2 No filing fee will be charged if the Registrant files its Response prior to being declared in default or not more than thirty (30) days following a Determination. For Responses filed more than thirty (30) days after a Determination, the Registrant should pay a reasonable non-refundable fee for re-examination, plus a Response Fee as set forth in section 2.2 above if the Complaint lists twenty-six (26) or more disputed domain names against the same registrant. The Response Fee will be refundable to the prevailing party.

5.3 Upon request by the Registrant, a limited extension of time to respond may be granted by the URS Provider if there is a good faith basis for doing so. In no event shall the extension be for more than seven (7) calendar days.

5.4 The Response shall be no longer than 2,500 words, excluding attachments, and the content of the Response should include the following:

5.4.1 Confirmation of Registrant data.

5.4.2 Specific admission or denial of each of the grounds upon which the Complaint is based.

5.4.3 Any defense which contradicts the Complainant’s claims.

5.4.4 A statement that the contents are true and accurate.

5.5 In keeping with the intended expedited nature of the URS and the remedy afforded to a successful Complainant, affirmative claims for relief by the Registrant will not be permitted except for an allegation that the Complainant has filed an abusive Complaint.

5.6 Once the Response is filed, and the URS Provider determines that the Response is compliant with the filing requirements of a Response (which shall be on the same day),
the Complaint, Response and supporting materials will immediately be sent to a qualified Examiner, selected by the URS Provider, for review and Determination. All materials submitted are considered by the Examiner.

5.7 The Response can contain any facts refuting the claim of bad faith registration by setting out any of the following circumstances:

5.7.1 Before any notice to Registrant of the dispute, Registrant’s use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

5.7.2 Registrant (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if Registrant has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

5.7.3 Registrant is making a legitimate or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Such claims, if found by the Examiner to be proved based on its evaluation of all evidence, shall result in a finding in favor of the Registrant.

5.8 The Registrant may also assert Defenses to the Complaint to demonstrate that the Registrant’s use of the domain name is not in bad faith by showing, for example, one of the following:

5.8.1 The domain name is generic or descriptive and the Registrant is making fair use of it.

5.8.2 The domain name sites are operated solely in tribute to or in criticism of a person or business that is found by the Examiner to be fair use.

5.8.3 Registrant’s holding of the domain name is consistent with an express term of a written agreement entered into by the disputing Parties and that is still in effect.

5.8.4 The domain name is not part of a wider pattern or series of abusive registrations because the Domain Name is of a significantly different type or character to other domain names registered by the Registrant.

5.9 Other factors for the Examiner to consider:

5.9.1 Trading in domain names for profit, and holding a large portfolio of domain names, are of themselves not indicia of bad faith under the URS. Such conduct, however, may be abusive in a given case depending on the circumstances of the dispute. The Examiner must review each case on its merits.

5.9.2 Sale of traffic (i.e. connecting domain names to parking pages and earning click-per-view revenue) does not in and of itself constitute bad faith under the URS.
Such conduct, however, may be abusive in a given case depending on the circumstances of the dispute. The Examiner will take into account:

5.9.2.1. the nature of the domain name;

5.9.2.2. the nature of the advertising links on any parking page associated with the domain name; and

5.9.2.3. that the use of the domain name is ultimately the Registrant’s responsibility.

6. Defa ult

6.1 If at the expiration of the 14-day answer period (or extended period if granted), the Registrant does not submit an answer, the Complaint proceeds to Default.

6.2 In either case, the Provider shall provide Notice of Default via email to the Complainant and Registrant, and via mail and fax to Registrant. During the Default period, the Registrant will be prohibited from changing content found on the site to argue that it is now a legitimate use and will also be prohibited from changing the Whois information.

6.3 All Default cases proceed to Examination for review on the merits of the claim.

6.4 If after Examination in Default cases, the Examiner rules in favor of Complainant, Registrant shall have the right to seek relief from Default via de novo review by filing a Response at any time up to six months after the date of the Notice of Default. The Registrant will also be entitled to request an extension of an additional six months if the extension is requested before the expiration of the initial six-month period.

6.5 If a Response is filed after: (i) the Respondent was in Default (so long as the Response is filed in accordance with 6.4 above); and (ii) proper notice is provided in accordance with the notice requirements set forth above, the domain name shall again resolve to the original IP address as soon as practical, but shall remain locked as if the Response had been filed in a timely manner before Default. The filing of a Response after Default is not an appeal; the case is considered as if responded to in a timely manner.

6.5 If after Examination in Default case, the Examiner rules in favor of Registrant, the Provider shall notify the Registry Operator to unlock the name and return full control of the domain name registration to the Registrant.

7. Examiners

7.1 One Examiner selected by the Provider will preside over a URS proceeding.

7.2 Examiners should have demonstrable relevant legal background, such as in trademark law, and shall be trained and certified in URS proceedings. Specifically, Examiners shall be provided with instructions on the URS elements and defenses and how to conduct the examination of a URS proceeding.
7.3 Examiners used by any given URS Provider shall be rotated to the extent feasible to avoid “forum or examiner shopping.” URS Providers are strongly encouraged to work equally with all certified Examiners, with reasonable exceptions (such as language needs, non-performance, or malfeasance) to be determined on a case by case analysis.

8. Examination Standards and Burden of Proof

8.1 The standards that the qualified Examiner shall apply when rendering its Determination are whether:

8.1.2 The registered domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark: (i) for which the Complainant holds a valid national or regional registration and that is in current use; or (ii) that has been validated through court proceedings; or (iii) that is specifically protected by a statute or treaty currently in effect and that was in effect at the time the URS Complaint is filed; and

8.1.2.1 Use can be shown by demonstrating that evidence of use – which can be a declaration and one specimen of current use – was submitted to, and validated by, the Trademark Clearinghouse.

8.1.2.2 Proof of use may also be submitted directly with the URS Complaint.

8.1.2 The Registrant has no legitimate right or interest to the domain name; and

8.1.3 The domain was registered and is being used in a bad faith.

8.2 The burden of proof shall be clear and convincing evidence.

8.3 For a URS matter to conclude in favor of the Complainant, the Examiner shall render a Determination that there is no genuine issue of material fact. Such Determination may include that: (i) the Complainant has rights to the name; and (ii) the Registrant has no rights or legitimate interest in the name. This means that the Complainant must present adequate evidence to substantiate its trademark rights in the domain name (e.g., evidence of a trademark registration and evidence that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith in violation of the URS).

8.4 If the Examiner finds that the Complainant has not met its burden, or that genuine issues of material fact remain in regards to any of the elements, the Examiner will reject the Complaint under the relief available under the URS. That is, the Complaint shall be dismissed if the Examiner finds that evidence was presented or is available to the Examiner to indicate that the use of the domain name in question is a non-infringing use or fair use of the trademark.

8.5 Where there is any genuine contestable issue as to whether a domain name registration and use of a trademark are in bad faith, the Complaint will be denied, the URS proceeding will be terminated without prejudice, e.g., a UDRP, court proceeding or
another URS may be filed. The URS is not intended for use in any proceedings with open questions of fact, but only clear cases of trademark abuse.

8.6 To restate in another way, if the Examiner finds that all three standards are satisfied by clear and convincing evidence and that there is no genuine contestable issue, then the Examiner shall issue a Determination in favor of the Complainant. If the Examiner finds that any of the standards have not been satisfied, then the Examiner shall deny the relief requested, thereby terminating the URS proceeding without prejudice to the Complainant to proceed with an action in court of competent jurisdiction or under the UDRP.

9. Determination

9.1 There will be no discovery or hearing; the evidence will be the materials submitted with the Complaint and the Response, and those materials will serve as the entire record used by the Examiner to make a Determination.

9.2 If the Complainant satisfies the burden of proof, the Examiner will issue a Determination in favor of the Complainant. The Determination will be published on the URS Provider’s website. However, there should be no other preclusive effect of the Determination other than the URS proceeding to which it is rendered.

9.3 If the Complainant does not satisfy the burden of proof, the URS proceeding is terminated and full control of the domain name registration shall be returned to the Registrant.

9.4 Determinations resulting from URS proceedings will be published by the service provider in a format specified by ICANN.

9.5 Determinations shall also be emailed by the URS Provider to the Registrant, the Complainant, the Registrar, and the Registry Operator, and shall specify the remedy and required actions of the registry operator to comply with the Determination.

9.6 To conduct URS proceedings on an expedited basis, examination should begin immediately upon the earlier of the expiration of a fourteen (14) day Response period (or extended period if granted), or upon the submission of the Response. A Determination shall be rendered on an expedited basis, with the stated goal that it be rendered within three (3) business days from when Examination began. Absent extraordinary circumstances, however, Determinations must be issued no later than five (5) days after the Response is filed. Implementation details will be developed to accommodate the needs of service providers once they are selected. (The tender offer for potential service providers will indicate that timeliness will be a factor in the award decision.)

10. Remedy

10.1 If the Determination is in favor of the Complainant, the decision shall be immediately transmitted to the registry operator.
10.2 Immediately upon receipt of the Determination, the registry operator shall suspend the domain name, which shall remain suspended for the balance of the registration period and would not resolve to the original web site. The nameservers shall be redirected to an informational web page provided by the URS Provider about the URS. The URS Provider shall not be allowed to offer any other services on such page, nor shall it directly or indirectly use the web page for advertising purposes (either for itself or any other third party). The Whois for the domain name shall continue to display all of the information of the original Registrant except for the redirection of the nameservers. In addition, the Whois shall reflect that the domain name will not be able to be transferred, deleted or modified for the life of the registration.

10.3 There shall be an option for a successful Complainant to extend the registration period for one additional year at commercial rates.

10.4 No other remedies should be available in the event of a Determination in favor of the Complainant.

11. Abusive Complaints

11.1 The URS shall incorporate penalties for abuse of the process by trademark holders.

11.2 In the event a party is deemed to have filed two (2) abusive Complaints, or one (1) “deliberate material falsehood,” that party shall be barred from utilizing the URS for one-year following the date of issuance of a Determination finding a complainant to have: (i) filed its second abusive complaint; or (ii) filed a deliberate material falsehood.

11.3 A Complaint may be deemed abusive if the Examiner determines:

11.3.1 it was presented solely for improper purpose such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of doing business; and

11.3.2 (i) the claims or other assertions were not warranted by any existing law or the URS standards; or (ii) the factual contentions lacked any evidentiary support

11.4 An Examiner may find that Complaint contained a deliberate material falsehood if it contained an assertion of fact, which at the time it was made, was made with the knowledge that it was false and which, if true, would have an impact on the outcome on the URS proceeding.

11.5 Two findings of “deliberate material falsehood” shall permanently bar the party from utilizing the URS.

11.6 URS Providers shall be required to develop a process for identifying and tracking barred parties, and parties whom Examiners have determined submitted abusive complaints or deliberate material falsehoods.
11.7 The dismissal of a complaint for administrative reasons or a ruling on the merits, in itself, shall not be evidence of filing an abusive complaint.

11.8 A finding that filing of a complaint was abusive or contained a deliberate materially falsehoood can be appealed solely on the grounds that an Examiner abused his/her discretion, or acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner.

12. **Appeal**

12.1 Either party shall have a right to seek a de novo appeal of the Determination based on the existing record within the URS proceeding for a reasonable fee to cover the costs of the appeal. An appellant must identify the specific grounds on which the party is appealing, including why the appellant claims the Examiner’s Determination was incorrect.

12.2 The fees for an appeal shall be borne by the appellant. A limited right to introduce new admissible evidence that is material to the Determination will be allowed upon payment of an additional fee, provided the evidence clearly pre-dates the filing of the Complaint. The Appeal Panel, to be selected by the Provider, may request, in its sole discretion, further statements or documents from either of the Parties.

12.3 Filing an appeal shall not change the domain name’s resolution. For example, if the domain name no longer resolves to the original nameservers because of a Determination in favor or the Complainant, the domain name shall continue to point to the informational page provided by the URS Provider. If the domain name resolves to the original nameservers because of a Determination in favor of the registrant, it shall continue to resolve during the appeal process.

12.4 An appeal must be filed within 14 days after a Determination is issued and any Response must be filed 14 days after an appeal is filed.

12.5 If a respondent has sought relief from Default by filing a Response within six months (or the extended period if applicable) of issuance of initial Determination, an appeal must be filed within 14 days from date the second Determination is issued and any Response must be filed 14 days after the appeal is filed.

12.6 Notice of appeal and findings by the appeal panel shall be sent by the URS Provider via e-mail to the Registrant, the Complainant, the Registrar, and the Registry Operator.

12.7 The Providers’ rules and procedures for appeals, other than those stated above, shall apply.

13. **Other Available Remedies**

The URS Determination shall not preclude any other remedies available to the appellant, such as UDRP (if appellant is the Complainant), or other remedies as may be available in a court of competition jurisdiction. A URS Determination for or against a party shall not prejudice the
party in UDRP or any other proceedings.

14. **Review of URS**

A review of the URS procedure will be initiated one year after the first Examiner Determination is issued. Upon completion of the review, a report shall be published regarding the usage of the procedure, including statistical information, and posted for public comment on the usefulness and effectiveness of the procedure.
1. Parties to the Dispute

The parties to the dispute will be the trademark holder and the gTLD registry operator. ICANN shall not be a party.

2. Applicable Rules

2.1 This procedure is intended to cover Trademark post-delegation dispute resolution proceedings generally. To the extent more than one Trademark PDDRP provider ("Provider") is selected to implement the Trademark PDDRP, each Provider may have additional rules that must be followed when filing a Complaint. The following are general procedures to be followed by all Providers.

2.2 In the Registry Agreement, the registry operator agrees to participate in all post-delegation procedures and be bound by the resulting Determinations.

3. Language

3.1 The language of all submissions and proceedings under the procedure will be English.

3.2 Parties may submit supporting evidence in their original language, provided and subject to the authority of the Expert Panel to determine otherwise, that such evidence is accompanied by an English translation of all relevant text.

4. Communications and Time Limits

4.1 All communications with the Provider must be submitted electronically.

4.2 For the purpose of determining the date of commencement of a time limit, a notice or other communication will be deemed to have been received on the day that it is transmitted to the appropriate contact person designated by the parties.

4.3 For the purpose of determining compliance with a time limit, a notice or other communication will be deemed to have been sent, made or transmitted on the day that it is dispatched.

4.4 For the purpose of calculating a period of time under this procedure, such period will begin to run on the day following the date of receipt of a notice or other communication.

4.5 All references to day limits shall be considered as calendar days unless otherwise specified.
5. **Standing**

5.1 The mandatory administrative proceeding will commence when a third-party complainant (“Complainant”) has filed a Complaint with a Provider asserting that the Complainant is a trademark holder (which may include either registered or unregistered marks as defined below) claiming that one or more of its marks have been infringed, and thereby the Complainant has been harmed, by the registry operator’s manner of operation or use of the gTLD.

5.2 Before proceeding to the merits of a dispute, and before the Respondent is required to submit a substantive Response, or pay any fees, the Provider shall appoint a special one-person Panel to perform an initial “threshold” review (“Threshold Review Panel”).

6. **Standards**

For purposes of these standards, “registry operator” shall include entities directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by or under common control with a registry operator, whether by ownership or control of voting securities, by contract or otherwise where ‘control’ means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of an entity, whether by ownership or control of voting securities, by contract or otherwise.

6.1 **Top Level:**

A complainant must assert and prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that the registry operator’s affirmative conduct in its operation or use of its gTLD string that is identical or confusingly similar to the complainant’s mark, causes or materially contributes to the gTLD doing one of the following:

(a) taking unfair advantage of the distinctive character or the reputation of the complainant’s mark; or

(b) impairing the distinctive character or the reputation of the complainant’s mark; or

(c) creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark.

An example of infringement at the top-level is where a TLD string is identical to a trademark and then the registry operator holds itself out as the beneficiary of the mark.

6.2 **Second Level**

Complainants are required to prove, by clear and convincing evidence that, through the registry operator’s affirmative conduct:

(a) there is a substantial pattern or practice of specific bad faith intent by the registry operator to profit from the sale of trademark infringing domain names; and
7. Complaint

7.1 Filing:

The Complaint will be filed electronically. Once the Administrative Review has been completed and the Provider deems the Complaint be in compliance, the Provider will electronically serve the Complaint and serve a paper notice on the registry operator that is the subject of the Complaint (“Notice of Complaint”) consistent with the contact information listed in the Registry Agreement.

7.2 Content:

7.2.1 The name and contact information, including address, phone, and email address, of the Complainant, and, to the best of Complainant’s knowledge, the name and address of the current owner of the registration.
7.2.2 The name and contact information, including address, phone, and email address of any person authorized to act on behalf of Complainant.

7.2.3 A statement of the nature of the dispute, and any relevant evidence, which shall include:

(a) The particular legal rights claim being asserted, the marks that form the basis for the dispute and a short and plain statement of the basis upon which the Complaint is being filed.

(b) A detailed explanation of how the Complainant’s claim meets the requirements for filing a claim pursuant to that particular ground or standard.

(c) A detailed explanation of the validity of the Complaint and why the Complainant is entitled to relief.

(d) A statement that the Complainant has at least 30 days prior to filing the Complaint notified the registry operator in writing of: (i) its specific concerns and specific conduct it believes is resulting in infringement of Complainant’s trademarks and (ii) its willingness to meet to resolve the issue.

(e) An explanation of how the mark is used by the Complainant (including the type of goods/services, period and territory of use – including all online usage) or otherwise protected by statute, treaty or has been validated by a court or the Clearinghouse.

(f) Copies of any documents that the Complainant considers to evidence its basis for relief, including evidence of current use of the Trademark at issue in the Complaint and domain name registrations.

(g) A statement that the proceedings are not being brought for any improper purpose.

(h) A statement describing how the registration at issue has harmed the trademark owner.

7.3 Complaints will be limited 5,000 words and 20 pages, excluding attachments, unless the Provider determines that additional material is necessary.

7.4 At the same time the Complaint is filed, the Complainant will pay a non-refundable filing fee in the amount set in accordance with the applicable Provider rules. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within 10 days of the receipt of the Complaint by the Provider, the Complaint will be dismissed without prejudice.
8. **Administrative Review of the Complaint**

8.1 All Complaints will be reviewed by the Provider within five (5) business days of submission to the Provider to determine whether the Complaint contains all necessary information and complies with the procedural rules.

8.2 If the Provider finds that the Complaint complies with procedural rules, the Complaint will be deemed filed, and the proceedings will continue to the Threshold Review. If the Provider finds that the Complaint does not comply with procedural rules, it will electronically notify the Complainant of such non-compliant and provide the Complainant five (5) business days to submit an amended Complaint. If the Provider does not receive an amended Complaint within the five (5) business days provided, it will dismiss the Complaint and close the proceedings without prejudice to the Complainant’s submission of a new Complaint that complies with procedural rules. Filing fees will not be refunded.

8.3 If deemed compliant, the Provider will electronically serve the Complaint on the registry operator and serve the Notice of Complaint consistent with the contact information listed in the Registry Agreement.

9. **Threshold Review**

9.1 Provider shall establish a Threshold Review Panel, consisting of one panelist selected by the Provider, for each proceeding within five (5) business days after completion of Administrative Review and the Complaint has been deemed compliant with procedural rules.

9.2 The Threshold Review Panel shall be tasked with determining whether the Complainant satisfies the following criteria:

9.2.1 The Complainant is a holder of a word mark that: (i) is nationally or regionally registered and that is in current use; or (ii) has been validated through court proceedings; or (iii) that is specifically protected by a statute or treaty at the time the PDDRP complaint is filed;

9.2.1.1 Use can be shown by demonstrating that evidence of use – which can be a declaration and one specimen of current use – was submitted to, and validated by, the Trademark Clearinghouse

9.2.1.2 Proof of use may also be submitted directly with the Complaint.

9.2.2 The Complainant has asserted that it has been materially harmed as a result of trademark infringement;

9.2.3 The Complainant has asserted facts with sufficient specificity that, if everything the Complainant asserted is true, states a claim under the Top Level Standards herein OR
The Complainant has asserted facts with sufficient specificity that, if everything the Complainant asserted is true, states a claim under the Second Level Standards herein;

9.2.4 The Complainant has asserted that: (i) at least 30 days prior to filing the Complaint the Complainant notified the registry operator in writing of its specific concerns and specific conduct it believes is resulting in infringement of Complainant’s trademarks, and it willingness to meet to resolve the issue; (ii) whether the registry operator responded to the Complainant’s notice of specific concerns; and (iii) if the registry operator did respond, that the Complainant attempted to engage in good faith discussions to resolve the issue prior to initiating the PDDRP.

9.3 Within ten (10) business days of date Provider served Notice of Complaint, the registry operator shall have the opportunity, but is not required, to submit papers to support its position as to the Complainant’s standing at the Threshold Review stage. If the registry operator chooses to file such papers, it must pay a filing fee.

9.4 If the registry operator submits papers, the Complainant shall have ten (10) business days to submit an opposition.

9.5 The Threshold Review Panel shall have ten (10) business days from due date of Complainant’s opposition or the due date of the registry operator’s papers if none were filed, to issue Threshold Determination.

9.6 Provider shall electronically serve the Threshold Determination on all parties.

9.7 If the Complainant has not satisfied the Threshold Review criteria, the Provider will dismiss the proceedings on the grounds that the Complainant lacks standing and declare that the registry operator is the prevailing party.

9.8 If the Threshold Review Panel determines that the Complainant has standing and satisfied the criteria then the Provider to will commence the proceedings on the merits.

10. Response to the Complaint

10.1 The registry operator must file a Response to each Complaint within forty-five (45) days after the date of the Threshold Review Panel Declaration.

10.2 The Response will comply with the rules for filing of a Complaint and will contain the name and contact information for the registry operator, as well as a point-by-point response to the statements made in the Complaint.

10.3 The Response must be filed with the Provider and the Provider must serve it upon the Complainant in electronic form with a hard-copy notice that it has been served.
10.4 Service of the Response will be deemed effective, and the time will start to run for a Reply, upon confirmation that the electronic Response and hard-copy notice of the Response was sent by the Provider to the addresses provided by the Complainant.

10.5 If the registry operator believes the Complaint is without merit, it will affirmatively plead in its Response the specific grounds for the claim.

11. Reply

11.1 The Complainant is permitted ten (10) days from Service of the Response to submit a Reply addressing the statements made in the Response showing why the Complaint is not “without merit.” A Reply may not introduce new facts or evidence into the record, but shall only be used to address statements made in the Response. Any new facts or evidence introduced in a Response shall be disregarded by the Expert Panel.

11.2 Once the Complaint, Response and Reply (as necessary) are filed and served, a Panel will be appointed and provided with all submissions.

12. Default

12.1 If the registry operator fails to respond to the Complaint, it will be deemed to be in default.

12.2 Limited rights to set aside the finding of default will be established by the Provider, but in no event will they be permitted absent a showing of good cause to set aside the finding of default.

12.3 The Provider shall provide notice of Default via email to the Complainant and registry operator.

12.4 All Default cases shall proceed to Expert Determination on the merits.

13. Expert Panel

13.1 The Provider shall establish an Expert Panel within 21 days after receiving the Reply, or if no Reply is filed, within 21 days after the Reply was due to be filed.

13.2 The Provider shall appoint a one-person Expert Panel, unless any party requests a three-member Expert Panel. No Threshold Panel member shall serve as an Expert Panel member in the same Trademark PDDRP proceeding.

13.3 In the case where either party requests a three-member Expert Panel, each party (or each side of the dispute if a matter has been consolidated) shall select an Expert and the two selected Experts shall select the third Expert Panel member. Such selection shall be made pursuant to the Providers rules or procedures. Trademark PDDRP panelists within a Provider shall be rotated to the extent feasible.
13.4 Expert Panel member must be independent of the parties to the post-delegation challenge. Each Provider will follow its adopted procedures for requiring such independence, including procedures for challenging and replacing a panelist for lack of independence.

14. Costs

14.1 The Provider will estimate the costs for the proceedings that it administers under this procedure in accordance with the applicable Provider rules. Such costs will be estimated to cover the administrative fees of the Provider, the Threshold Review Panel and the Expert Panel, and are intended to be reasonable.

14.2 The Complainant shall be required to pay the filing fee as set forth above in the “Complaint” section, and shall be required to submit the full amount of the Provider estimated administrative fees, the Threshold Review Panel fees and the Expert Panel fees at the outset of the proceedings. Fifty percent of that full amount shall be in cash (or cash equivalent) to cover the Complainant’s share of the proceedings and the other 50% shall be in either cash (or cash equivalent), or in bond, to cover the registry operator’s share if the registry operator prevails.

14.3 If the Panel declares the Complainant to be the prevailing party, the registry operator is required to reimburse Complainant for all Panel and Provider fees incurred. Failure to do shall be deemed a violation of the Trademark PDDRP and a breach of the Registry Agreement, subject to remedies available under the Agreement up to and including termination.

15. Discovery

15.1 Whether and to what extent discovery is allowed is at the discretion of the Panel, whether made on the Panel’s own accord, or upon request from the Parties.

15.2 If permitted, discovery will be limited to that for which each Party has a substantial need.

15.3 In extraordinary circumstances, the Provider may appoint experts to be paid for by the Parties, request live or written witness testimony, or request limited exchange of documents.

15.4 At the close of discovery, if permitted by the Expert Panel, the Parties will make a final evidentiary submission, the timing and sequence to be determined by the Provider in consultation with the Expert Panel.

16. Hearings

16.1 Disputes under this Procedure will be resolved without a hearing unless either party requests a hearing or the Expert Panel determines on its own initiative that one is necessary.
16.2 If a hearing is held, videoconferences or teleconferences should be used if at all possible. If not possible, then the Expert Panel will select a place for hearing if the Parties cannot agree.

16.3 Hearings should last no more than one day, except in the most extraordinary circumstances.

16.4 All dispute resolution proceedings will be conducted in English.

17. Burden of Proof

The Complainant bears the burden of proving the allegations in the Complaint; the burden must be by clear and convincing evidence.

18. Remedies

18.1 Since registrants are not a party to the action, a recommended remedy cannot take the form of deleting, transferring or suspending registrations (except to the extent registrants have been shown to be officers, directors, agents, employees, or entities under common control with a registry operator).

18.2 Recommended remedies will not include monetary damages or sanctions to be paid to any party other than fees awarded pursuant to section 14.

18.3 The Expert Panel may recommend a variety of graduated enforcement tools against the registry operator if it the Expert Panel determines that the registry operator is liable under this Trademark PDDRP, including:

18.3.1 Remedial measures for the registry to employ to ensure against allowing future infringing registrations, which may be in addition to what is required under the registry agreement, except that the remedial measures shall not:

(a) Require the Registry Operator to monitor registrations not related to the names at issue in the PDDRP proceeding; or

(b) Direct actions by the registry operator that are contrary to those required under the Registry Agreement;

18.3.2 Suspension of accepting new domain name registrations in the gTLD until such time as the violation(s) identified in the Determination is(are) cured or a set period of time;

OR,

18.3.3 In extraordinary circumstances where the registry operator acted with malice, providing for the termination of a Registry Agreement.
18.4 In making its recommendation of the appropriate remedy, the Expert Panel will consider the ongoing harm to the Complainant, as well as the harm the remedies will create for other, unrelated, good faith domain name registrants operating within the gTLD.

18.5 The Expert Panel may also determine whether the Complaint was filed “without merit,” and, if so, award the appropriate sanctions on a graduated scale, including:

18.5.1 Temporary bans from filing Complaints;

18.5.2 Imposition of costs of registry operator, including reasonable attorney fees; and

18.5.3 Permanent bans from filing Complaints after being banned temporarily.

18.6 Imposition of remedies shall be at the discretion of ICANN, but absent extraordinary circumstances, those remedies will be in line with the remedies recommended by the Expert Panel.

19. The Expert Panel Determination

19.1 The Provider and the Expert Panel will make reasonable efforts to ensure that the Expert Determination is issued within 45 days of the appointment of the Expert Panel and absent good cause, in no event later than 60 days after the appointment of the Expert Panel.

19.2 The Expert Panel will render a written Determination. The Expert Determination will state whether or not the Complaint is factually founded and provide the reasons for that Determination. The Expert Determination should be publicly available and searchable on the Provider’s web site.

19.3 The Expert Determination may further include a recommendation of specific remedies. Costs and fees to the Provider, to the extent not already paid, will be paid within thirty (30) days of the Expert Panel’s Determination.

19.4 The Expert Determination shall state which party is the prevailing party.

19.5 While the Expert Determination that a registry operator is liable under the standards of the Trademark PDDRP shall be taken into consideration, ICANN will have the authority to impose the remedies, if any, that ICANN deems appropriate given the circumstances of each matter.

20. Appeal of Expert Determination

20.1 Either party shall have a right to seek a de novo appeal of the Expert Determination of liability or recommended remedy based on the existing record within the Trademark PDDRP proceeding for a reasonable fee to cover the costs of the appeal.

20.2 An appeal must be filed with the Provider and served on all parties within 20 days after an Expert Determination is issued and a response to the appeal must be filed within 20
days after the appeal. Manner and calculation of service deadlines shall in consistent with those set forth in Section 4 above, “Communication and Time Limits.”

20.3 A three-member Appeal Panel is to be selected by the Provider, but no member of the Appeal Panel shall also have been an Expert Panel member.

20.4 The fees for an appeal in the first instance shall be borne by the appellant.

20.5 A limited right to introduce new admissible evidence that is material to the Determination will be allowed upon payment of an additional fee, provided the evidence clearly pre-dates the filing of the Complaint.

20.6 The Appeal Panel may request at its sole discretion, further statements or evidence from any party regardless of whether the evidence pre-dates the filing of the Complaint if the Appeal Panel determines such evidence is relevant.

20.7 The prevailing party shall be entitled to an award of costs of appeal.

20.8 The Providers rules and procedures for appeals, other than those stated above, shall apply.

21. Challenge of a Remedy

21.1 ICANN shall not implement a remedy for violation of the Trademark PDDRP for at least 20 days after the issuance of an Expert Determination, providing time for an appeal to be filed.

21.2 If an appeal is filed, ICANN shall stay its implementation of a remedy pending resolution of the appeal.

21.3 If ICANN decides to implement a remedy for violation of the Trademark PDDRP, ICANN will wait ten (10) business days (as observed in the location of its principal office) after notifying the registry operator of its decision. ICANN will then implement the decision unless it has received from the registry operator during that ten (10) business-day period official documentation that the registry operator has either: (a) commenced a lawsuit against the Complainant in a court of competent jurisdiction challenging the Expert Determination of liability against the registry operator, or (b) challenged the intended remedy by initiating dispute resolution under the provisions of its Registry Agreement. If ICANN receives such documentation within the ten (10) business day period, it will not seek to implement the remedy in furtherance of the Trademark PDDRP until it receives: (i) evidence of a resolution between the Complainant and the registry operator; (ii) evidence that registry operator’s lawsuit against Complainant has been dismissed or withdrawn; or (iii) a copy of an order from the dispute resolution provider selected pursuant to the Registry Agreement dismissing the dispute against ICANN whether by reason of agreement of the parties or upon determination of the merits.
21.4 The registry operator may challenge ICANN’s imposition of a remedy imposed in furtherance of an Expert Determination that the registry operator is liable under the PDDRP, to the extent a challenge is warranted, by initiating dispute resolution under the provisions of its Registry Agreement. Any arbitration shall be determined in accordance with the parties’ respective rights and duties under the Registry Agreement. Neither the Expert Determination nor the decision of ICANN to implement a remedy is intended to prejudice the registry operator in any way in the determination of the arbitration dispute. Any remedy involving a termination of the Registry Agreement must be according to the terms and conditions of the termination provision of the Registry Agreement.

21.5 Nothing herein shall be deemed to prohibit ICANN from imposing remedies at any time and of any nature it is otherwise entitled to impose for a registry operator’s non-compliance with its Registry Agreement.

22. Availability of Court or Other Administrative Proceedings

22.1 The Trademark PDDRP is not intended as an exclusive procedure and does not preclude individuals from seeking remedies in courts of law, including, as applicable, review of an Expert Determination as to liability.

22.2 In those cases where a Party submits documented proof to the Provider that a Court action involving the same Parties, facts and circumstances as the Trademark PDDRP was instituted prior to the filing date of the Complaint in the Trademark PDDRP, the Provider shall suspend or terminate the Trademark PDDRP.
REGISTRY RESTRICTIONS DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURE (RRDRP)¹
4 JUNE 2012

1. Parties to the Dispute

The parties to the dispute will be the harmed established institution and the gTLD registry operator. ICANN shall not be a party.

2. Applicable Rules

2.1 This procedure is intended to cover these dispute resolution proceedings generally. To the extent more than one RRDRP provider ("Provider") is selected to implement the RRDRP, each Provider may have additional rules and procedures that must be followed when filing a Complaint. The following are the general procedure to be followed by all Providers.

2.2 In any new community-based gTLD registry agreement, the registry operator shall be required to agree to participate in the RRDRP and be bound by the resulting Determinations.

3. Language

3.1 The language of all submissions and proceedings under the procedure will be English.

3.2 Parties may submit supporting evidence in their original language, provided and subject to the authority of the RRDRP Expert Panel to determine otherwise, that such evidence is accompanied by an English translation of all relevant text.

4. Communications and Time Limits

4.1 All communications with the Provider must be filed electronically.

4.2 For the purpose of determining the date of commencement of a time limit, a notice or other communication will be deemed to have been received on the day that it is transmitted to the appropriate contact person designated by the parties.

4.3 For the purpose of determining compliance with a time limit, a notice or other communication will be deemed to have been sent, made or transmitted on the day that it is dispatched.

¹ Initial complaints that a Registry has failed to comply with registration restrictions shall be processed through a Registry Restriction Problem Report System (RRPRS) using an online form similar to the Whois Data Problem Report System (WDPRS) at InterNIC.net. A nominal processing fee could serve to decrease frivolous complaints. The registry operator shall receive a copy of the complaint and will be required to take reasonable steps to investigate (and remedy if warranted) the reported non-compliance. The Complainant will have the option to escalate the complaint in accordance with this RRDRP, if the alleged non-compliance continues. Failure by the Registry to address the complaint to complainant’s satisfaction does not itself give the complainant standing to file an RRDRP complaint.
4.4 For the purpose of calculating a period of time under this procedure, such period will begin to run on the day following the date of receipt of a notice or other communication.

4.5 All references to day limits shall be considered as calendar days unless otherwise specified.

5. **Standing**

5.1 The mandatory administrative proceeding will commence when a third-party complainant ("Complainant") has filed a Complaint with a Provider asserting that the Complainant is a harmed established institution as a result of the community-based gTLD registry operator not complying with the registration restrictions set out in the Registry Agreement.

5.2 Established institutions associated with defined communities are eligible to file a community objection. The “defined community” must be a community related to the gTLD string in the application that is the subject of the dispute. To qualify for standing for a community claim, the Complainant must prove both: it is an established institution, and has an ongoing relationship with a defined community that consists of a restricted population that the gTLD supports.

5.3 Complainants must have filed a claim through the Registry Restriction Problem Report System (RRPRS) to have standing to file an RRDRP.

5.4 The Panel will determine standing and the Expert Determination will include a statement of the Complainant’s standing.

6. **Standards**

6.1 For a claim to be successful, the claims must prove that:

6.1.1 The community invoked by the objector is a defined community;

6.1.2 There is a strong association between the community invoked and the gTLD label or string;

6.1.3 The TLD operator violated the terms of the community-based restrictions in its agreement;

6.1.4 There is a measureable harm to the Complainant and the community named by the objector.

7. **Complaint**

7.1 Filing:
The Complaint will be filed electronically. Once the Administrative Review has been completed and the Provider deems the Complaint to be in compliance, the Provider will electronically serve the Complaint and serve a hard copy and fax notice on the registry operator consistent with the contact information listed in the Registry Agreement.

7.2 Content:

7.2.1 The name and contact information, including address, phone, and email address, of the Complainant, the registry operator and, to the best of Complainant’s knowledge, the name and address of the current owner of the registration.

7.2.2 The name and contact information, including address, phone, and email address of any person authorized to act on behalf of Complainant.

7.2.3 A statement of the nature of the dispute, which must include:

7.2.3.1 The particular registration restrictions in the Registry Agreement with which the registry operator is failing to comply; and

7.2.3.2 A detailed explanation of how the registry operator’s failure to comply with the identified registration restrictions has caused harm to the complainant.

7.2.4 A statement that the proceedings are not being brought for any improper purpose.

7.2.5 A statement that the Complainant has filed a claim through the RRPRS and that the RRPRS process has concluded.

7.2.6 A statement that Complainant has not filed a Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP) complaint relating to the same or similar facts or circumstances.

7.3 Complaints will be limited to 5,000 words and 20 pages, excluding attachments, unless the Provider determines that additional material is necessary.

7.4 Any supporting documents should be filed with the Complaint.

7.5 At the same time the Complaint is filed, the Complainant will pay a filing fee in the amount set in accordance with the applicable Provider rules. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within 10 days of the receipt of the Complaint by the Provider, the Complaint will be dismissed without prejudice to the Complainant to file another complaint.

8. Administrative Review of the Complaint

8.1 All Complaints will be reviewed within five (5) business days of submission by panelists designated by the applicable Provider to determine whether the Complainant has complied with the procedural rules.
8.2 If the Provider finds that the Complaint complies with procedural rules, the Complaint will be deemed filed, and the proceedings will continue. If the Provider finds that the Complaint does not comply with procedural rules, it will electronically notify the Complainant of such non-compliance and provide the Complainant five (5) business days to submit an amended Complaint. If the Provider does not receive an amended Complaint within the five (5) business days provided, it will dismiss the Complaint and close the proceedings without prejudice to the Complainant’s submission of a new Complaint that complies with procedural rules. Filing fees will not be refunded if the Complaint is deemed not in compliance.

8.3 If deemed compliant, the Provider will electronically serve the Complaint on the registry operator and serve a paper notice on the registry operator that is the subject of the Complaint consistent with the contact information listed in the Registry Agreement.

9. Response to the Complaint

9.1 The registry operator must file a response to each Complaint within thirty (30) days of service the Complaint.

9.2 The Response will comply with the rules for filing of a Complaint and will contain the names and contact information for the registry operator, as well as a point by point response to the statements made in the Complaint.

9.3 The Response must be electronically filed with the Provider and the Provider must serve it upon the Complainant in electronic form with a hard-copy notice that it has been served.

9.4 Service of the Response will be deemed effective, and the time will start to run for a Reply, upon electronic transmission of the Response.

9.5 If the registry operator believes the Complaint is without merit, it will affirmatively plead in it Response the specific grounds for the claim.

9.6 At the same time the Response is filed, the registry operator will pay a filing fee in the amount set in accordance with the applicable Provider rules. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within ten (10) days of the receipt of the Response by the Provider, the Response will be deemed improper and not considered in the proceedings, but the matter will proceed to Determination.

10 Reply

10.1 The Complainant is permitted ten (10) days from Service of the Response to submit a Reply addressing the statements made in the Response showing why the Complaint is not “without merit.” A Reply may not introduce new facts or evidence into the record, but shall only be used to address statements made in the Response. Any new facts or evidence introduced in a Response shall be disregarded by the Expert Panel.

10.2 Once the Complaint, Response and Reply (as necessary) are filed and served, a Panel will be appointed and provided with all submissions.
11. Default

11.1 If the registry operator fails to respond to the Complaint, it will be deemed to be in default.

11.2 Limited rights to set aside the finding of default will be established by the Provider, but in no event will it be permitted absent a showing of good cause to set aside the finding of Default.

11.3 The Provider shall provide Notice of Default via email to the Complainant and registry operator.

11.4 All Default cases shall proceed to Expert Determination on the merits.

12. Expert Panel

12.1 The Provider shall select and appoint a single-member Expert Panel within (21) days after receiving the Reply, or if no Reply is filed, within 21 days after the Reply was due to be filed.

12.2 The Provider will appoint a one-person Expert Panel unless any party requests a three-member Expert Panel.

12.3 In the case where either party requests a three-member Expert Panel, each party (or each side of the dispute if a matter has been consolidated) shall select an Expert and the two selected Experts shall select the third Expert Panel member. Such selection shall be made pursuant to the Provider’s rules or procedures. RRDRP panelists within a Provider shall be rotated to the extent feasible.

12.4 Expert Panel members must be independent of the parties to the post-delegation challenge. Each Provider will follow its adopted procedures for requiring such independence, including procedures for challenging and replacing an Expert for lack of independence.

13. Costs

13.1 The Provider will estimate the costs for the proceedings that it administers under this procedure in accordance with the applicable Provider Rules. Such costs will cover the administrative fees, including the Filing and Response Fee, of the Provider, and the Expert Panel fees, and are intended to be reasonable.

13.2 The Complainant shall be required to pay the Filing fee as set forth above in the “Complaint” section, and shall be required to submit the full amount of the other Provider-estimated administrative fees, including the Response Fee, and the Expert Panel fees at the outset of the proceedings. Fifty percent of that full amount shall be in cash (or cash equivalent) to cover the Complainant’s share of the proceedings and the other 50% shall be in either cash (or cash equivalent), or in bond, to cover the registry operator’s share if the registry operator prevails.
13.3 If the Panel declares the Complainant to be the prevailing party, the registry operator is required to reimburse Complainant for all Panel and Provider fees incurred, including the Filing Fee. Failure to do shall be deemed a violation of the RRDRP and a breach of the Registry Agreement, subject to remedies available under the Agreement up to and including termination.

13.4 If the Panel declares the registry operator to be the prevailing party, the Provider shall reimburse the registry operator for its Response Fee.

14. Discovery/Evidence

14.1 In order to achieve the goal of resolving disputes rapidly and at a reasonable cost, discovery will generally not be permitted. In exceptional cases, the Expert Panel may require a party to provide additional evidence.

14.2 If permitted, discovery will be limited to that for which each Party has a substantial need.

14.3 Without a specific request from the Parties, but only in extraordinary circumstances, the Expert Panel may request that the Provider appoint experts to be paid for by the Parties, request live or written witness testimony, or request limited exchange of documents.

15. Hearings

15.1 Disputes under this RRDRP will usually be resolved without a hearing.

15.2 The Expert Panel may decide on its own initiative, or at the request of a party, to hold a hearing. However, the presumption is that the Expert Panel will render Determinations based on written submissions and without a hearing.

15.3 If a request for a hearing is granted, videoconferences or teleconferences should be used if at all possible. If not possible, then the Expert Panel will select a place for hearing if the parties cannot agree.

15.4 Hearings should last no more than one day, except in the most exceptional circumstances.

15.5 If the Expert Panel grants one party’s request for a hearing, notwithstanding the other party’s opposition, the Expert Panel is encouraged to apportion the hearing costs to the requesting party as the Expert Panel deems appropriate.

15.6 All dispute resolution proceedings will be conducted in English.

16. Burden of Proof

The Complainant bears the burden of proving its claim; the burden should be by a preponderance of the evidence.
17. **Recommended Remedies**

17.1 Since registrants of domain names registered in violation of the agreement restriction are not a party to the action, a recommended remedy cannot take the form of deleting, transferring or suspending registrations that were made in violation of the agreement restrictions (except to the extent registrants have been shown to be officers, directors, agents, employees, or entities under common control with a registry operator).

17.2 Recommended remedies will not include monetary damages or sanctions to be paid to any party other than fees awarded pursuant to section 13.

17.3 The Expert Panel may recommend a variety of graduated enforcement tools against the registry operator if the Expert Panel determines that the registry operator allowed registrations outside the scope of its promised limitations, including:

17.3.1 Remedial measures, which may be in addition to requirements under the registry agreement, for the registry to employ to ensure against allowing future registrations that do not comply with community-based limitations; except that the remedial measures shall not:

(a) Require the registry operator to monitor registrations not related to the names at issue in the RRDRP proceeding, or

(b) Direct actions by the registry operator that are contrary to those required under the registry agreement

17.3.2 Suspension of accepting new domain name registrations in the gTLD until such time as the violation(s) identified in the Determination is(are) cured or a set period of time;

OR,

17.3.3 In extraordinary circumstances where the registry operator acted with malice providing for the termination of a registry agreement.

17.3 In making its recommendation of the appropriate remedy, the Expert Panel will consider the ongoing harm to the Complainant, as well as the harm the remedies will create for other, unrelated, good faith domain name registrants operating within the gTLD.

18. **The Expert Determination**

18.1 The Provider and the Expert Panel will make reasonable efforts to ensure that the Expert Determination is rendered within 45 days of the appointment of the Expert Panel and absent good cause, in no event later than 60 days after the appointment of the Expert Panel.

18.2 The Expert Panel will render a written Determination. The Expert Determination will state whether or not the Complaint is factually founded and provide the reasons for its
Determination. The Expert Determination should be publicly available and searchable on the Provider’s web site.

18.3 The Expert Determination may further include a recommendation of specific remedies. Costs and fees to the Provider, to the extent not already paid, will be paid within thirty (30) days of the Expert Determination.

18.4 The Expert Determination shall state which party is the prevailing party.

18.5 While the Expert Determination that a community-based restricted gTLD registry operator was not meeting its obligations to police the registration and use of domains within the applicable restrictions shall be considered, ICANN shall have the authority to impose the remedies ICANN deems appropriate, given the circumstances of each matter.

19. Appeal of Expert Determination

19.1 Either party shall have a right to seek a de novo appeal of the Expert Determination based on the existing record within the RRDRP proceeding for a reasonable fee to cover the costs of the appeal.

19.2 An appeal must be filed with the Provider and served on all parties within 20 days after an Expert Determination is issued and a response to the appeal must be filed within 20 days after the appeal. Manner and calculation of service deadlines shall in consistent with those set forth in Section 4 above, “Communication and Time Limits.”

19.3 A three-member Appeal Panel is to be selected by the Provider, but no member of the Appeal Panel shall also have been an Expert Panel member.

19.4 The fees for an appeal in the first instance shall be borne by the appellant.

19.5 A limited right to introduce new admissible evidence that is material to the Determination will be allowed upon payment of an additional fee, provided the evidence clearly pre-dates the filing of the Complaint.

19.6 The Appeal Panel may request at its sole discretion, further statements or evidence from any party regardless of whether the evidence pre-dates the filing of the Complaint if the Appeal Panel determines such evidence is relevant.

19.7 The prevailing party shall be entitled to an award of costs of appeal.

19.8 The Providers rules and procedures for appeals, other than those stated above, shall apply.

20. Breach

20.1 If the Expert determines that the registry operator is in breach, ICANN will then proceed to notify the registry operator that it is in breach. The registry operator will be given the opportunity to cure the breach as called for in the Registry Agreement.
20.2 If registry operator fails to cure the breach then both parties are entitled to utilize the options available to them under the registry agreement, and ICANN may consider the recommended remedies set forth in the Expert Determination when taking action.

20.3 Nothing herein shall be deemed to prohibit ICANN from imposing remedies at any time and of any nature it is otherwise entitled to impose for a registry operator’s non-compliance with its Registry Agreement.

21. Availability of Court or Other Administrative Proceedings

21.1 The RRDRP is not intended as an exclusive procedure and does not preclude individuals from seeking remedies in courts of law, including, as applicable, review of an Expert Determination as to liability.

21.2 The parties are encouraged, but not required to participate in informal negotiations and/or mediation at any time throughout the dispute resolution process but the conduct of any such settlement negotiation is not, standing alone, a reason to suspend any deadline under the proceedings.
Module 6

Top-Level Domain Application – Terms and Conditions

By submitting this application through ICANN’s online interface for a generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) (this application), applicant (including all parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, contractors, employees and any and all others acting on its behalf) agrees to the following terms and conditions (these terms and conditions) without modification. Applicant understands and agrees that these terms and conditions are binding on applicant and are a material part of this application.

1. Applicant warrants that the statements and representations contained in the application (including any documents submitted and oral statements made and confirmed in writing in connection with the application) are true and accurate and complete in all material respects, and that ICANN may rely on those statements and representations fully in evaluating this application. Applicant acknowledges that any material misstatement or misrepresentation (or omission of material information) may cause ICANN and the evaluators to reject the application without a refund of any fees paid by Applicant. Applicant agrees to notify ICANN in writing of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading.

2. Applicant warrants that it has the requisite organizational power and authority to make this application on behalf of applicant, and is able to make all agreements, representations, waivers, and understandings stated in these terms and conditions and to enter into the form of registry agreement as posted with these terms and conditions.

3. Applicant acknowledges and agrees that ICANN has the right to determine not to proceed with any and all applications for new gTLDs, and that there is no assurance that any additional gTLDs will be created. The decision to review, consider and approve an application to establish one or more
gTLDs and to delegate new gTLDs after such approval is entirely at ICANN’s discretion. ICANN reserves the right to reject any application that ICANN is prohibited from considering under applicable law or policy, in which case any fees submitted in connection with such application will be returned to the applicant.

4. Applicant agrees to pay all fees that are associated with this application. These fees include the evaluation fee (which is to be paid in conjunction with the submission of this application), and any fees associated with the progress of the application to the extended evaluation stages of the review and consideration process with respect to the application, including any and all fees as may be required in conjunction with the dispute resolution process as set forth in the application. Applicant acknowledges that the initial fee due upon submission of the application is only to obtain consideration of an application. ICANN makes no assurances that an application will be approved or will result in the delegation of a gTLD proposed in an application. Applicant acknowledges that if it fails to pay fees within the designated time period at any stage of the application review and consideration process, applicant will forfeit any fees paid up to that point and the application will be cancelled. Except as expressly provided in this Application Guidebook, ICANN is not obligated to reimburse an applicant for or to return any fees paid to ICANN in connection with the application process.

5. Applicant shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless ICANN (including its affiliates, subsidiaries, directors, officers, employees, consultants, evaluators, and agents, collectively the ICANN Affiliated Parties) from and against any and all third-party claims, damages, liabilities, costs, and expenses, including legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to: (a) ICANN’s or an ICANN Affiliated Party’s consideration of the application, and any approval rejection or withdrawal of the application; and/or (b) ICANN’s or an ICANN Affiliated Party’s reliance on information provided by applicant in the application.
6. Applicant hereby releases ICANN and the ICANN Affiliated Parties from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN or any ICANN Affiliated Party in connection with ICANN’s or an ICANN Affiliated Party’s review of this application, investigation or verification, any characterization or description of applicant or the information in this application, any withdrawal of this application or the decision by ICANN to recommend, or not to recommend, the approval of applicant's gTLD application. APPLICANT AGREES NOT TO CHALLENGE, IN COURT OR IN ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA, ANY FINAL DECISION MADE BY ICANN WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION, AND IRREVOCABLY WAIVES ANY RIGHT TO SUE OR PROCEED IN COURT OR ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA ON THE BASIS OF ANY OTHER LEGAL CLAIM AGAINST ICANN AND ICANN AFFILIATED PARTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION. APPLICANT ACKNOWLEDGES AND ACCEPTS THAT APPLICANT'S NONENTITLEMENT TO PURSUE ANY RIGHTS, REMEDIES, OR LEGAL CLAIMS AGAINST ICANN OR THE ICANN AFFILIATED PARTIES IN COURT OR ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION SHALL MEAN THAT APPLICANT WILL FOREGO ANY RECOVERY OF ANY APPLICATION FEES, MONIES INVESTED IN BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE OR OTHER STARTUP COSTS AND ANY AND ALL PROFITS THAT APPLICANT MAY EXPECT TO REALIZE FROM THE OPERATION OF A Registry FOR THE TLD; PROVIDED, THAT APPLICANT MAY UTILIZE ANY ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISM SET FORTH IN ICANN’S BYLAWS FOR PURPOSES OF CHALLENGING ANY FINAL DECISION MADE BY ICANN WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION. APPLICANT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT ANY ICANN AFFILIATED PARTY IS AN EXPRESS THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARY OF THIS SECTION 6 AND MAY ENFORCE EACH PROVISION OF THIS SECTION 6 AGAINST APPLICANT.

7. Applicant hereby authorizes ICANN to publish on ICANN’s website, and to disclose or publicize in any other manner, any materials submitted to, or obtained or generated by, ICANN and the ICANN Affiliated Parties in connection with the application, including evaluations, analyses and any other
materials prepared in connection with the evaluation of the application; provided, however, that information will not be disclosed or published to the extent that this Applicant Guidebook expressly states that such information will be kept confidential, except as required by law or judicial process. Except for information afforded confidential treatment, applicant understands and acknowledges that ICANN does not and will not keep the remaining portion of the application or materials submitted with the application confidential.

8. Applicant certifies that it has obtained permission for the posting of any personally identifying information included in this application or materials submitted with this application. Applicant acknowledges that the information that ICANN posts may remain in the public domain in perpetuity, at ICANN’s discretion. Applicant acknowledges that ICANN will handle personal information collected in accordance with its gTLD Program privacy statement http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/program-privacy, which is incorporated herein by this reference. If requested by ICANN, Applicant will be required to obtain and deliver to ICANN and ICANN’s background screening vendor any consents or agreements of the entities and/or individuals named in questions 1-11 of the application form necessary to conduct these background screening activities. In addition, Applicant acknowledges that to allow ICANN to conduct thorough background screening investigations:

   a. Applicant may be required to provide documented consent for release of records to ICANN by organizations or government agencies;

   b. Applicant may be required to obtain specific government records directly and supply those records to ICANN for review;

   c. Additional identifying information may be required to resolve questions of identity of individuals within the applicant organization;
d. Applicant may be requested to supply certain information in the original language as well as in English.

9. Applicant gives ICANN permission to use applicant’s name in ICANN’s public announcements (including informational web pages) relating to Applicant’s application and any action taken by ICANN related thereto.

10. Applicant understands and agrees that it will acquire rights in connection with a gTLD only in the event that it enters into a registry agreement with ICANN, and that applicant’s rights in connection with such gTLD will be limited to those expressly stated in the registry agreement. In the event ICANN agrees to recommend the approval of the application for applicant’s proposed gTLD, applicant agrees to enter into the registry agreement with ICANN in the form published in connection with the application materials. (Note: ICANN reserves the right to make reasonable updates and changes to this proposed draft agreement during the course of the application process, including as the possible result of new policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process). Applicant may not resell, assign, or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.

11. Applicant authorizes ICANN to:

   a. Contact any person, group, or entity to request, obtain, and discuss any documentation or other information that, in ICANN’s sole judgment, may be pertinent to the application;

   b. Consult with persons of ICANN’s choosing regarding the information in the application or otherwise coming into ICANN’s possession, provided, however, that ICANN will use reasonable efforts to ensure that such persons maintain the confidentiality of information in the application that this Applicant Guidebook expressly states will be kept confidential.
12. For the convenience of applicants around the world, the application materials published by ICANN in the English language have been translated into certain other languages frequently used around the world. Applicant recognizes that the English language version of the application materials (of which these terms and conditions is a part) is the version that binds the parties, that such translations are non-official interpretations and may not be relied upon as accurate in all respects, and that in the event of any conflict between the translated versions of the application materials and the English language version, the English language version controls.

13. Applicant understands that ICANN has a long-standing relationship with Jones Day, an international law firm, and that ICANN intends to continue to be represented by Jones Day throughout the application process and the resulting delegation of TLDs. ICANN does not know whether any particular applicant is or is not a client of Jones Day. To the extent that Applicant is a Jones Day client, by submitting this application, Applicant agrees to execute a waiver permitting Jones Day to represent ICANN adverse to Applicant in the matter. Applicant further agrees that by submitting its Application, Applicant is agreeing to execute waivers or take similar reasonable actions to permit other law and consulting firms retained by ICANN in connection with the review and evaluation of its application to represent ICANN adverse to Applicant in the matter.

14. ICANN reserves the right to make reasonable updates and changes to this applicant guidebook and to the application process, including the process for withdrawal of applications, at any time by posting notice of such updates and changes to the ICANN website, including as the possible result of new policies that might be adopted or advice to ICANN from ICANN advisory committees during the course of the application process. Applicant acknowledges that ICANN may make such updates and changes and agrees that its application will be subject to any such updates and changes. In the event that Applicant has completed and submitted its application prior to
such updates or changes and Applicant can demonstrate to ICANN that compliance with such updates or changes would present a material hardship to Applicant, then ICANN will work with Applicant in good faith to attempt to make reasonable accommodations in order to mitigate any negative consequences for Applicant to the extent possible consistent with ICANN's mission to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems.
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Auction Rules for New gTLDs

1. This document ("Auction Rules") sets out the auction rules for resolving string contention among applicants for new gTLDs by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN").

2. Auctions for resolving string contention among applicants for new gTLDs will occur in a series of auction events. In each auction event ("Auction"), bidding will occur for one or more Contention Sets. If bidding occurs for at least two Contention Sets within an Auction, the bidding will occur simultaneously.

3. ICANN will be assisted in the implementation of these Auctions by its independent auction consultant, Power Auctions LLC (the "Auction Manager").

Definitions and Interpretation

4. The definitions are set out in the Glossary at the end of the Auction Rules. The majority of the terms are explained in the body of the Auction Rules. Terms used but not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the "Applicant Guidebook") or the "Bidder Agreement" (defined below). In the event of any inconsistency between the Bidder Agreement and the Applicant Guidebook or the Auction Rules, the Bidder Agreement shall prevail.

5. All prices in the Auction are expressed in whole numbers of United States dollars ($US).

6. All references to time, unless otherwise stated, are to time defined under the UTC time standard.

7. Text boxes containing additional explanations and examples have been included in this document to assist applicants. The contents of these text boxes are not formally part of the Auction Rules.

Participation in the Auction

8. Prior to the scheduling of an Auction, an Intent to Auction notice will be provided to all members of an eligible Contention Set via the ICANN Customer Portal. To be eligible to receive an Intent to Auction notice from ICANN, requirements a-d below must be met:

   All active applications in the Contention Set have:

   a) Passed evaluation

   b) Resolved any applicable GAC advice

   c) Resolved any objections

   d) No pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms
ICANN intends to initiate the Auction process once the composition of the contention set has stabilized. ICANN reserves the right not to send Intent to Auction notices and/or to postpone a scheduled Auction if a change request by one or more applicants in the Contention Set is pending, but believes that in most instances the Auction should be able proceed without further delay.

9. If ICANN has not yet made the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework for each applied for gTLD in the Contention Set available, ICANN will defer the Auction upon the request of any applicant in the Contention Set until the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework is made available.

The deferment of an Auction until receipt of the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework provides applicants an opt-out mechanism to postpone the Auctions prior to the Framework finalization.

10. After an applicant receives the Intent to Auction notice from ICANN pursuant to the eligibility requirements described in clause 8, if each and every member of the Contention Set submits a postponement request through the ICANN Customer Portal, ICANN at its sole discretion may postpone the Auction for that Contention Set to a future date. Postponement requests must be submitted by all members of the Contention Set by the due date specified within the ICANN Customer Portal, generally twenty eight (28) days after receipt of Intent to Auction notice from ICANN. If a postponement request is not submitted by the due date specified within the ICANN Customer Portal or is not accommodated by ICANN, an applicant may request an advancement/postponement request via submission of the Auction Date Advancement/Postponement Request Form. The form must be submitted at least 45 days prior to the scheduled Auction Date and ICANN must receive a request from each member of the contention set. Without limiting the foregoing, ICANN reserves the right at its sole discretion to postpone the Auction for any Contention Set to a future date regardless of whether each and every member of the Contention Set has submitted a postponement request.

11. Eligible Contention Sets, pursuant to clauses 8 -10, will generally be notified in priority order by using the lowest priority number of an application within a Contention Set.

12. Before an Auction to resolve a given Contention Set, each Qualified Applicant may designate a party to bid on its behalf (“Designated Bidder”). Each Qualified Applicant or its Designated Bidder must execute a Bidder Agreement with the Auction Manager. The Bidder Agreement must be signed and returned to ICANN by the deadline specified in the Intent to Auction notice. A Qualified Applicant or its Designated Bidder, after executing a Bidder Agreement with Auction Manager, will henceforth be referred to as a “Bidder”. Participation in an Auction is limited to Bidders. Failure to execute a Bidder Agreement by the deadline specified in the Intent to Auction notice and to submit a Deposit which is received into the Auction Bank Account by the Deposit Deadline may result in the inability to participate in the Auction for the Contention Set, which will result in the rejection of the Qualified Applicant’s application for the Contention String and the Contention String not being assigned or delegated to the relevant Qualified Applicant.
13. Before each Auction, each Bidder shall nominate up to two people ("Authorized Individuals") to bid on its behalf in the Auction.

- Training materials will be made available to Authorized Individuals in advance of each Auction. In addition, Authorized Individuals will be invited and encouraged to participate in a mock auction, which will be conducted on the Auction Site prior to the live Auction.

14. The first time in each Auction that an Authorized Individual accesses the Auction Site, he/she will be required to confirm acceptance of the Bidder Agreement and the Auction Rules.

15. All actions of Authorized Individuals on the Auction Site will be attributed to the Bidder that nominated the Authorized Individual to bid on its behalf.

Auction Process

16. Bidding will take place online at the Auction Site. Authorized Individuals will be given the web address of the Auction Site and will be provided with individual user names and passwords in order to access it. Authorized Individuals shall be obligated to keep this information confidential. The public will not have any access to the Auction Site.

17. Each Auction will take place in a number of Rounds, using an auction format known as an ascending clock auction. Each Round of an Auction will have a Starting Time and an Ending Time designated by the Auction Manager. There will be a Recess after each Round. Bids will be submitted between the Starting Time and Ending Time of the Round, subject to clause 39, and the results of the Round will be posted during the Recess after the Round.

18. These Auction Rules set out the rules for Contention Sets without “indirect contention” relationships. That is, the rules set forth within this document assume that there are direct contention relationships only, a condition that holds for the substantial majority of Auctions. In the event that an Auction will include a Contention Set that does not satisfy this condition, ICANN or the Auction Manager may issue an Addendum to the Auction Rules to address Contention Sets with both direct and indirect contention relationships. Such an Addendum will have the same force as these Auction Rules.

Auction Information and Scheduling

19. Prior to the Commencement Date of the Auction, ICANN or the Auction Manager will inform Bidders of relevant information relating to the Auction, including:

- The Contention Set or Sets that will be the subject of the Auction;
- confirmation of the Commencement Date; and
- the Starting Time, Ending Time and duration of Round 1.
It is anticipated that Auctions will be conducted once per month to resolve 20 Contention Sets per Auction, with the intention to complete all Auctions within one (1) year from the date of the first Auction. ICANN and Power Auctions may modify the frequency of Auctions and the number of Contention Sets to be resolved per Auction based on ICANN’s and Power Auctions’ mutual discretion.

20. The first Round of an Auction will start on the Commencement Date and last 30 minutes, the recess after the first Round will last 20 minutes, and all subsequent Rounds and recesses will last 20 minutes each. The Auction Manager may open Round 1 for Early Bidding, a time period prior to the standard 30 minutes of bidding for Round 1 of a duration designated by the Auction Manager. A Bid submitted during Early Bidding has the same effect as a Bid submitted during the standard 30 minutes of Round 1. All Contention Sets within a single Auction event will follow the same Auction Schedule. The Auction Manager may modify the Round or Recess timescales on an ad hoc basis with the electronic written consent of all remaining participants in an Auction.

21. The Auction Site will contain a schedule showing the indicative times for each Round and each Recess (the “Auction Schedule”). The Auction Schedule will be updated as necessary during the course of the Auction. When applicable, the Early Bidding Starting Time will be announced by the Auction Manager.

The Auction Manager intends to provide Early Bidding for most Auction events. Early Bidding will provide an additional period of time prior to the standard bidding time allotted in Round 1 to accommodate Bidders in various time zones who may prefer to submit a Proxy Bid. The Auction Manager generally intends to open Early Bidding approximately 8 hours prior to the start of Round 1. Due to the rotating Auction start times (13:00, 16:00 or 20:00 UTC), opening for Early Bidding may take place on the day prior to the official Commencement Date of the Auction. ICANN or the Auction Manager will communicate the opening of Round 1 to Bidders, pursuant to clause 19.

It should be noted, the Auction Manager does not intend to provide live customer support throughout the Early Bidding period. Live customer support will begin approximately 1 hour prior to the start of Round 1.

Auction Bank Account and Deposits

22. In advance of an Auction, each Bidder will receive wire instructions for an Auction Bank Account, which will be established for auction purposes by ICANN and Power Auctions LLC at a major US commercial bank. The funds in the Auction Bank Account will be held in escrow and segregated on a Bidder-by-Bidder basis.

23. All Deposits to the Auction Bank Account must be made by bank wire. All bank wires to the Auction Bank Account must be denominated in $US. All bank wires to the Auction Bank Account must clearly identify the relevant Bidder and the relevant Contention Set. All Deposits to the Auction Bank Account and all payments of the net balance of the aggregate Winning Prices to the Auction Bank Account must be net of all taxes, tariffs and duties of any kind and all wire and service fees, all of which are the sole responsibility of the Bidder.
24. All bank wires to the Auction Bank Account must be made from a bank account owned by the Bidder. If the Qualified Applicant is an entity that does not own a bank account, it is required to designate a Designated Bidder that owns a bank account. All refunds from the Auction Bank Account will be made only to the same bank account from which the associated deposit was made, except for exceptional circumstances and at the sole discretion of the Auction Manager.

**Bidding Limits**

25. Each Bidder will be assigned a Bidding Limit applicable to a Contention Set within an Auction based on the amount of the Deposit, net of any bank fees, submitted by the Bidder for such Contention Set.

26. The Bidding Limit will be determined by the amount of the Deposit applicable to the Contention Set received from the Bidder. If the Deposit is less than $2,000,000, the Bidding Limit will be set at ten (10) times the Deposit. If the Deposit is $2,000,000 or greater, the Bidding Limit will be deemed to be “Unlimited”.

27. If a Bidder is eligible to bid for more than one Contention Set within an Auction, the Bidder will be assigned a separate Bidding Limit for each such Contention Set, and the Bidding Limits will be non-transferable among Contention Sets. If any wire to the Auction Bank Account is intended to provide Deposits for more than one Contention Set, the Bidder must provide clear instructions in a specified form to the Auction Manager as to the allocation of Deposits among the Contention Sets.

28. All wires and all instructions associated with Deposits, including instructions regarding the allocation of funds among Contention Sets from wires and funds rolled over from previous Auctions, must be received no later than 16:00 UTC on the day that is seven (7) calendar days prior to the Commencement Date of the relevant Auction (the “Deposit Deadline”), unless this deadline is waived, at the Auction Manager’s sole discretion.

**Participation in an Auction**

29. To place Bids on a Contention Set within an Auction, a Bidder must submit a Deposit and thereby establish a positive Bidding Limit pursuant to clauses 25 – 28. In the event that no Qualified Applicant in a given Contention Set submits a Deposit by the Deposit Deadline, ICANN reserves the right to reject all Applications subject to the Contention Set and not delegate any of the Contention Strings.

30. A Bidder who has submitted a Deposit for a Contention Set is required to participate in the Auction for the Contention Set unless the Bidder sends ICANN and the Auction Manager written notice that it has withdrawn from the Auction for the Contention Set. Such notification must be received by ICANN and the Auction Manager no later than the Deposit Deadline. In the absence of written notification or non-participation in the Auction, a default bid of one dollar ($1), pursuant to clauses 31 and 42, will be entered automatically on the Bidders behalf.

**Bidding**

31. For each Round and for each Open Contention Set, a Start-of-Round Price and an End-of-Round Price will be announced to Bidders for the Contention Set. The Start-of-Round Price for each Contention Set in Round 1 will be one dollar ($1). The Start-of-Round and End-of-Round Prices will increase as the Auction progresses, pursuant to clauses 44(c), 45 and 48.
32. A Bid represents a price, which a Bidder is willing to pay to resolve string contention within a Contention Set in favor of its Application.

33. There are two types of Bids:

   (a) **Continue Bids:** A Continue Bid is a Bid for an Application at the End-of-Round Price for the relevant Contention Set (or a Proxy Bid at a specified greater price, see clauses 37 and 38 for further explanation of Proxy Bids); and

   (b) **Exit Bids:** An Exit Bid is a Bid for an Application at a specified price, which is less than the End-of-Round Price but at least the Start-of-Round Price.

   The Auction Site will include a link to make it very easy to submit a Continue Bid. Clicking on this link will generate a bid at the End-of-Round Price. Bids may also be typed at other allowable prices.

34. A Bidder is permitted to submit a Bid for an Application in Round \( n (n \geq 2) \) if and only if the Bidder submitted a Continue Bid for the same Application in Round \( n - 1 \).

35. Thus, a Continue Bid guarantees that the Bidder’s Application will not be eliminated from the Contention Set in the then current Round. By contrast, an Exit Bid is the final bid that the Bidder will be permitted to place for its Application, subject to clause 48.

   The purpose of the bidding restriction in clause 34 is to prevent “bid sniping”: a Bidder is not permitted to wait until the very end of the Auction to bid. Instead, the Bidder is required to bid for its Application in each and every Round (or to place a Proxy Bid that has the same effect).

36. Bids may only be submitted during a Round (i.e. between the Starting Time and the Ending Time). During a Round, a Bidder may edit or cancel its Bids as often as desired, subject to the conditions set out in these Auction Rules. The valid Bids residing on the Auction Site at the Ending Time of the Round are binding on the respective Bidders and may not be amended or removed except pursuant to clause 39.

37. The End-of-Round Price for a Round is only the minimum price for a Continue Bid. Subject to limitations in clause 40, Continue Bids may be placed at prices higher than the End-of-Round Price. These are often referred to as Proxy Bids.

38. A Proxy Bid submitted by a Bidder in a prior Round, at a price of at least the relevant Start-of-Round Price for the current Round, will be treated the same as a Bid that has been placed in the current Round. It will be treated as an Exit Bid if its price is less than the relevant End-of-Round Price of the current Round, or otherwise as a Continue Bid.
The Proxy Bid capability makes it possible to submit a Bid in Round 1 and to take no further active part in the auction. In other words, it is not necessary to bid in real time in each Round. Proxy Bids submitted in a given Round will be processed by the auction software in each subsequent Round in exactly the same way as equivalent bids submitted during the Round. A Proxy Bid entered in one Round may also be amended during a subsequent Round, so long as the price was sufficiently large to keep the Bidder in the Auction until the subsequent Round.

39. In the event that an Authorized Individual loses access to the Internet or is otherwise unable to place a Bid, the Auction Manager, at its sole discretion, may permit the submission of Bids by alternative means, generally by fax. The Auction Manager will provide forms for any submissions by fax. All such submissions by alternative means must be validated by an Authorized Individual. Any Authorized Individual who submits Bids by alternative means shall be deemed to have confirmed acceptance of the Bidder Agreement and the Auction Rules as if he or she had accepted them on the Auction Site pursuant to clause 14.

Validity of Bids

40. In order to be valid, a Bid must satisfy each and all of the following conditions:

(a) the Bid must have been submitted no earlier than the Starting Time of the relevant Round and no later than the Ending Time of the relevant Round, with the exception of Bids permitted by the Auction Manager pursuant to clause 39;

(b) the Bid must be placed by a Bidder for its Application in an Open Contention Set;

(c) in Round 2 or later, the Bid must be placed by a Bidder who submitted a Continue Bid for the same Application in the previous Round;

(d) the price of the Bid must be a whole number of $US that is not less than the Start-of-Round Price for the Round; and

(e) the price of the Bid must not exceed the Bidding Limit assigned to the Bidder for the Contention Set—this clause will not place any constraint if the Bidding Limit is “Unlimited”.

41. The Auction Site will enforce the conditions of clause 40 on Bid submissions.

42. If a Bidder who is eligible to bid for a Contention Set in a given Round does not submit a valid Bid during the Round and is unable to correct this omission pursuant to clause 39, then a Bid at the Start-of-Round Price will be entered automatically on the Bidder’s behalf.

Processing of Bids after a Round

43. During the Recess after each Round, the Auction Manager will process the Bids for each Open Contention Set and post the following results on the Auction Site to Bidders for the Contention Set:

(a) Number of eligible Bidders for next round (but not the identity of the remaining eligible Bidders); and
(b) Start-of-Round Price and an End-of-Round Price for the next round of the Auction.

44. An Open Contention Set will remain Open in the next Round if and only if valid Continue Bids were received for Applications within the Contention Set from at least two (2) Bidders. In this event:

(a) the number of Bidders remaining in the Contention Set at the End-of-Round Price (i.e. the number of Bidders who submitted Continue Bids) (“Aggregate Demand”) (but not the identity of the remaining eligible Bidders) will be posted to Bidders for the Contention Set;

(b) the next Round’s Start-of-Round Price for the Contention Set, equal to the current Round’s End-of-Round Price, will be announced to Bidders for the Contention Set; and

(c) the next Round’s End-of-Round Price for the Contention Set, strictly greater than the current Round’s End-of-Round Price, will be announced to Bidders for the Contention Set.

45. The price increment used to obtain the End-of-Round Price in clause 44(c) will be set by the Auction Manager taking into account Aggregate Demand for the Contention Set and other information relevant to the likely level of prices for the Contention Set, but the actual level of increment that is selected will be at the Auction Manager’s sole discretion.

Aggregate Demand is defined as the number of Continue Bids for Applications received in a Round, aggregated over all Bidders for the Contention Set. It does not attempt to describe commercial demand for the gTLD.

46. An Open Contention Set will close after a Round if valid Continue Bids for the Contention Set were received from only one (1) Bidder. In this event:

(a) the Bidder who submitted the only Continue Bid for the Contention Set will be deemed the Winner of the Contention Set;

(b) the Winning Price will be deemed to be the amount of the highest Exit Bid for the Contention Set, including automatic bids entered pursuant to clauses 30 and 42 and

(c) the fact that the Contention Set has closed, and the amount of the Winning Price, will be announced to all Bidders for the Contention Set.

47. An Open Contention Set will also close after a Round if no valid Continue Bid was received for the Contention Set from any Bidder. In this event:

(a) the Bidder who submitted the highest Exit Bid for the Contention Set, including automatic bids entered pursuant to clauses 30 and 42, will be deemed the Winner of the Contention Set, subject to clauses 48 – 50;

(b) the Winning Price will be deemed to be the amount of the second-highest Exit Bid for the Contention Set, including automatic bids entered pursuant to clauses 30 and 42 and

(c) the fact that the Contention Set has closed, and the amount of the Winning Price, will be announced to all Bidders for the Contention Set.
48. In the event that there is a tie among the highest Exit Bids ("Tying Bid Price") in the application of clause 47, the Contention Set will enter a single Tie-Breaking Round, which will be conducted as follows:

(a) only those Bidders whose Exit Bids for the Contention Set equalled the Tying Bid Price are eligible to bid in the Tie-Breaking Round;

(b) the price of the Bid must be a whole number of $US that is not less than the Tying Bid Price; and

(c) the price of the Bid must not exceed the Bidding Limit assigned to the Bidder for the Contention Set by more than $50,000—this clause will not place any constraint if the Bidding Limit is “Unlimited”.

49. If a Bidder who is eligible to bid in a Tie-Breaking Round does not submit a valid Bid during the Round and is unable to correct this omission pursuant to clause 39, then a Bid at the Tying Bid Price will be entered automatically on the Bidder’s behalf.

50. The highest Bidder wins the Tie-Breaking Round and the Winning Price is deemed to be the amount of the second-highest Bid of the Tie-Breaking Round, including automatic bids entered pursuant to clause 49. In the event that there is a tie for Winner of the Tie-Breaking Round, the tie will be broken by means of a quasi-random number generator accessed by the Auction Site.

The probability of ties can be reduced by utilizing the full richness of allowable prices, rather than bidding round numbers. For example, instead of placing a Bid at $250,000, consider placing a Bid at $250,017. The use of quasi–random numbers to break ties is a well-established practice in spectrum auctions organized by various national telecommunications regulators around the world.

Conclusion of the Auction

51. The Auction concludes when every Contention Set in the Auction has Closed.

52. After a Contention Set has Closed, the Winning Bidder will be informed that it has won and will be informed of the Winning Price. All other Bidders for the Contention Set will be informed of the Winning Price only.

53. After the Auction has concluded, the Auction Manager will provide a complete, confidential report about the Auction to ICANN.

54. After receiving the Auction Manager’s report, ICANN will make the following information publicly available on its website within seven (7) Calendar Days:

(a) the Start-of-Round and End-of-Round Prices of each Round, for each Contention Set;

(b) the Aggregate Demand of each Round (except the final Round) for each Contention Set (but not the identities of the participants in each Round);
(c) the Winning Price for each Contention Set; and

(d) the identity of the Winner.

Payments, Defaults and Penalties

55. If a Bidder wins the Auction for one or more Contention Sets, its aggregate Deposit for the Auction will be automatically applied toward payment of its aggregate Winning Prices. To the extent the aggregate Deposit exceeds the aggregate Winning Prices and any penalties, if applicable, the Bidder will be entitled to a refund.

56. The Winner of any Contention Set is required to pay the net balance of the aggregate Winning Prices by bank wire to the Auction Bank Account. Payment must be received within twenty (20) Business Days of the Close of the Auction for the Contention Set. In the event that a Bidder anticipates that it would require a longer payment period than twenty (20) Business Days due to verifiable government-imposed currency restrictions, the Bidder may advise Auction Manager well in advance of the Auction and Auction Manager will consider applying a longer payment period to all Bidders within the same Contention Set.

57. Any Winner from whom the net balance owed of the Winning Price(s) is not received within twenty (20) Business Days of the Close of the Auction for the Contention Set is subject to being declared in default. The Auction Manager, at its sole discretion, may delay the declaration of default for a brief period, but only if the Auction Manager determines in its sole discretion that receipt of full payment appears to be imminent.

58. Once declared in default, any Winner is subject to immediate forfeiture of its position in the Auction and assessment of default penalties.

59. After a Winner is declared in default, the remaining Bidders (with Applications that have not been withdrawn from the New gTLD Program) will receive offers to have their Applications accepted, one at a time, in descending order of and subject to payment of its respective Exit Bid. In this way, the next Bidder would be declared the winner subject to payment of its Exit Bid. In the event that there is a tie between two or more of the remaining Bidders that are next in descending order, the tie will be broken by means of a quasi-random number generator accessed by the Auction Site to determine the order in which the tied Bidders will receive offers to have their Applications accepted. Each Bidder that is offered the relevant gTLD will be given four (4) Business Days to respond as to whether it wants its Application to win. A Bidder who responds in the affirmative will have four (4) Business Days after its response to submit a 10% deposit and an additional sixteen (16) Business Days to submit the balance of its payment. The same default procedures and penalties are in place for any runner-up Bidder receiving such an offer. A Bidder who declines such an offer cannot rescind its decision to decline the offer, has no further obligations in this context and will not be considered in default.

60. The penalty for defaulting on the Winning Price will equal 10% of the Winning Price, but not to exceed two million dollars ($2,000,000). Default penalties will be forfeited on an individual Contention String basis and charged against the Bidder’s aggregate Deposit for the Auction. In the event a Bidder participates in multiple Contention Sets in an Auction and defaults on its net balance owed, the Bidder must provide by written notice the order of allocation of the aggregate Deposit net of penalties to those Contention Sets it has won.
61. A Bidder will be subject to a penalty of up to the full amount of the Deposit forfeiture of its Applications and/or termination of any or all of its registry agreements for a serious violation of the Auction Rules or Bidder Agreement. Without limiting the foregoing, violations of clause 68 (the anti-collusion clause) shall be considered to be serious violations of the Auction Rules.

**Effect of Ineligibility of Winner To Sign a Registry Agreement or To Be Delegated the Contention String**

62. If, at any time following the conclusion of an Auction, the Winner is determined by ICANN to be ineligible to sign a Registry Agreement for the Contention String that was the subject of the Auction, the remaining Bidders (with applications that have not been withdrawn from the New gTLD Program) will receive offers to have their Applications accepted, one at a time, in descending order of and subject to payment of its respective Exit Bid. In this way, the next Bidder would be declared the Winner subject to payment of its Exit Bid. Each Bidder that is offered the relevant gTLD will be given four (4) Business Days to respond as to whether it wants its Application to win. A Bidder who responds in the affirmative will have four (4) Business Days after its response to submit a 10% deposit and an additional sixteen (16) Business Days to submit the balance of its payment. The same procedures and penalties are in place for any runner-up Bidder receiving such an offer. A Bidder who declines such an offer cannot rescind its decision to decline the offer, has no further obligations in this context and will not be considered in default.

**Refunds and Rollovers**

63. If a Bidder did not win any Contention Sets in an Auction, its Deposits will be eligible for a refund. All refunds are denominated in $US.

64. If a Bidder wins at least one Contention Set in an Auction, and the Bidder’s aggregate Deposit exceed its aggregate Winning Prices for an auction and any applicable Penalties, the Bidder will be entitled to a refund of the excess funds.

65. If a Winner is determined by ICANN following the conclusion of the Auction to be ineligible to sign a Registry Agreement, it will be eligible for a refund of the amount of any Deposit and Winning Price paid by the Winner for the Contention String. Nothing contained in this clause 65 limits any of ICANN’s rights or remedies under the Applicant Guidebook in the event the Winner (a) fails to pay the full amount of the Winning Price within 20 business days of the end of an auction or (b) fails to fulfil its obligation to execute the required Registry Agreement within 90 days of the end of the auction for any reason other than a determination by ICANN that the Winner is ineligible to sign the Registry Agreement.

66. All refunds are net of any associated wire fees and will be initiated to the Bidder within seven (7) calendar days after the conclusion of the Auction unless the Bidder requests the funds be committed to Deposits for a future Auction, subject to clause 67.

67. Upon the Bidder’s request and to the extent practical, the Auction Manager will work with the Bidder to roll over the Deposit to a future Auction. Such a request must be received no later than 16.00 UTC two (2) calendar days following the day on which the Auction concluded.
Rollover: After the conclusion of an Auction a Bidder may request the excess funds from its Deposit to be applied toward a future Auction. This request is due to the Auction Manager by 16.00 UTC 2 calendar days after the conclusion of the Auction. The allocation of the Rollover to various Contention Sets must be provided to the Auction Manager prior to the Deposit Deadline for the next applicable Auction.

General Terms and Conditions

68. For each Contention Set in an Auction, there will be a Blackout Period, extending from the Deposit Deadline for the Auction until full payment has been received in the Auction Bank Account from the Winner of the Contention Set, pursuant to clause 55, or another Bidder, pursuant to clauses 57-59. During the Blackout Period, all applicants for Contention Strings within the Contention Set are prohibited from cooperating or collaborating with respect to, discussing with each other, or disclosing to each other in any manner the substance of their own, or each other’s, or any other competing applicants’ bids or bidding strategies, or discussing or negotiating settlement agreements or post-Auction ownership transfer arrangements, with respect to any Contention Strings in the Auction. The prohibition against these activities applies only with respect to Contention Strings that are within Blackout Periods; during the same time periods, applicants are permitted to engage in these activities with respect to other Contention Strings that are not within Blackout Periods and applicants are permitted to engage in discussions unrelated to Contention Strings.

69. ICANN or the Auction Manager may terminate, suspend and resume, re-run a round, or change all or any part of an Auction, if ICANN or the Auction Manager determines in its sole discretion that such decision is justified by a technical or operational reason. ICANN or the Auction Manager will, without undue delay, give notice to each Bidder of any decision taken under this clause 69 and the respective reason(s).

70. ICANN shall be entitled, in its sole reasonable discretion, to amend these Auction Rules for any Auction at any time at least fifteen (15) days prior to that Auction. Any amendments to these Auction Rules will be published to the New gTLD microsite.

71. (a) The Bidder agrees to indemnify, defend and hold Auction Manager harmless from and against any and all claims, damages, losses, liabilities, costs or expenses, including reasonable attorneys’ fees, whether direct or indirect, which may arise from or be related to the actual or alleged acts or omissions of the Bidder respecting (i) its participation in the Auction, (ii) its performance under the Bidder Agreement, or (iii) any other transaction in which the Bidder participates to which the Bidder Agreement relates.

(b) Except to the extent set forth in Section 71(c) below, the Bidder expressly releases Auction Manager from any liability for (i) any and all claims, damages, losses, liabilities, costs or expenses, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, whether direct or indirect, which may arise from or be related to any Auction, the Bidder Agreement, or any other transaction to which the Bidder Agreement relates, including without limitation the conduct of the Auction, the quality or availability of the Auction Site or any tools or materials provided by the Auction Manager, any disturbance in the technical process, the receipt, storage and/or security of bids, or the award or failure to award a Contention String to any Bidder or other person, and (ii) any incidental or consequential damage, lost
profits or lost opportunity which may arise from or be related to any Auction, the Bidder Agreement, or any other transaction to which the Bidder Agreement relates.

(c) Auction Manager agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the Bidder from any and all third-party claims (including all damages, losses, liabilities, costs or expenses and claims thereof) which may arise from a claim that the Bidder’s use of the Auction-Manager-provided Auction Site or participation in the Auction-Manager-provided Auction, as such use or participation is intended within the scope of the Bidder Agreement, infringes, violates or misappropriates a valid third-party patent, copyright or other intellectual property right, provided that: (1) Auction Manager is notified promptly in writing of any such claim or action; (2) Bidder has neither reached any compromise or settlement of such claim or action nor made any admissions in respect of the same; (3) Auction Manager, at its option and expense, has sole control over the defense of any such claim or action and any related settlement negotiations; and (4) Bidder provides all requested reasonable assistance to defend the same (including, without limitation, by making available to Auction Manager all documents and information in Bidder’s possession or control that are relevant to the infringement or misappropriation claims, and by making Bidder’s personnel available to testify or consult with Auction Manager or its attorneys in connection with such defense). For the avoidance of doubt, this Section applies only in relation to claims of infringement, violation or misappropriation of intellectual property rights in auction technology or auction software arising directly from an Auction administered by the Auction Manager on behalf of ICANN, and, without limitation, this Section does not apply to any claims involving ownership rights, trademark rights or other rights to (or third-party agreements or rights involving) any gTLD.

(d) The Auction-Manager-Provided Auction Site and Auction-Manager-Provided Auction are provided “As Is” without warranty of any kind, either express or implied, including without limitation of any implied warranties of condition, uninterrupted use, merchantability, and fitness for a particular purpose.

72. If any dispute or disagreement arises in connection with these Auction Rules, including the interpretation or application of these Auction Rules, or the form, content, validity or time of receipt of any Bid, ICANN’s decision shall be final and binding.
## Schedule – Table of Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Applies to</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
<td>Round</td>
<td>A Round status denoting the Round is open for bidding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Demand</strong></td>
<td>Contention Set, with respect to a Round</td>
<td>The number of Continue Bids for Applications received in a Round, aggregated over all Bidders for the Contention Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
<td>Contention Set</td>
<td>An application for a specific gTLD string.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auction</strong></td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>The ICANN auction event for resolving string contention among Applications for one or more Contention Sets, governed by a Bidder Agreement and the Auction Rules as set out in this document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auction Bank Account</strong></td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>A bank account maintained by Power Auctions or ICANN to receive Deposits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auction Manager</strong></td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>Power Auctions LLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auction Schedule</strong></td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>A schedule showing the indicative timing of each Round and each Recess in relation to an Auction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auction Site</strong></td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>The website at which Bids will be submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorized Individuals</strong></td>
<td>Bidder</td>
<td>Up to two individuals nominated by a Bidder to bid on its behalf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blackout Period</strong></td>
<td>Contention Set</td>
<td>A time period, extending from the Deposit Deadline until full payment has been received, during which applicants are prohibited from engaging in the activities described in clause 68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bid</strong></td>
<td>Contention Set during a Round</td>
<td>A Bidder’s binding willingness to secure its Application within the Contention Set at prices up to the specified price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bidder</strong></td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>A Qualified Applicant or its Designated Bidder identified as the Bidder in the ICANN Registration Form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bidder Agreement</strong></td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>The Agreement entered into between Bidders and the Auction Manager that provides terms and conditions for participation in the Auction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Applies to</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding Limit</td>
<td>Bidder, for a Contention Set</td>
<td>An upper limit on the price that a Bidder can specify for its Bid on an Application within a Contention Set, based on the Deposit submitted by the Bidder for that Contention Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monday to Friday, excluding days that banks are closed in New York City, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Contention Set</td>
<td>A status for a Contention Set indicating that one of the conditions set out in clauses 46 and 47 has been met. Bidding on Applications in the Contention Set is no longer permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Date</td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>The date on which the standard 30 minutes of Round 1 of the Auction is scheduled to occur. If applicable, Early Bidding may start prior to the Commencement Date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contention Set</td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>A group of strings that are identical or similar to one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Bid</td>
<td>Application during a Round</td>
<td>A Bid for an Application within a Contention Set at the End-of-Round Price for that Contention Set or any higher price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Bidder, for a Contention Set</td>
<td>Money deposited into the Auction Bank Account by a Bidder for a nominated Contention Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit Deadline</td>
<td>Bidder, for a Contention Set</td>
<td>16:00 UTC on the day that is seven calendar days prior to the Commencement Date of the relevant Auction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Bidder</td>
<td>Qualified Applicant</td>
<td>A party designated by a Qualified Applicant to bid on its behalf in an Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bidding</td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>A time period prior to the standard 30 minutes of Round 1 that allows for Bidders to submit bids. Bids placed during Early Bidding will have the same effect as Bids submitted during the standard 30 minutes of Round 1. During this time period, the Auction Manager may not be available by phone or email, subject to the Auction Manager’s standard business hours (i.e. 1 hour before an Auction, and Monday to Friday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM US Eastern Time Zone). Offering Early Bidding for any particular Auction event is in the Auction Managers discretion, as is the duration of the Early Bidding period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Time</td>
<td>Round</td>
<td>The time at which any particular Round ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Applies to</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-Round Price</td>
<td>Contention Set during a Round</td>
<td>The lowest price at which a Continue Bid for an Application within a Contention Set may be placed in a Round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Bid</td>
<td>Application during a Round</td>
<td>A Bid for an Application at any price less than the End-of-Round Price but greater than or equal to the Start-of-Round Price for that Contention Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Contention Set during Round</td>
<td>A status indicating that any eligible Bidder for that Contention Set may place a Bid on its Application, if that Bid meets the requirements in clause 34. All Contention Sets are Open in Round 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted</td>
<td>Round</td>
<td>A Round status indicating that the Bids from the most recent Round have been processed and that the results have been made available to Bidders. When a Round is Posted, Bidders will be able to see the Aggregate Demand for the Contention Sets that they have Applications within, whether any of these Contention Sets have Closed, the Applications that they have secured and the associated Winning Prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxy Bid</td>
<td>Application during a Round</td>
<td>A Bid for an Application within a Contention Set at a price higher than the End-of-Round Price for that Contention Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Applicant</td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>An entity that has submitted an Application for a new gTLD, has received all necessary approvals from ICANN, and which is included within a Contention Set to be resolved by an Auction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>The time interval between Rounds when Bids are processed, during which no bids may be submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>The time interval during which Bids may be submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Time</td>
<td>Round</td>
<td>The time at which any particular Round starts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-of-Round Price</td>
<td>Contention Set during a Round</td>
<td>The lowest price at which an Exit Bid may be placed for an Application within a Contention Set in a Round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie-Breaking Round</td>
<td>Contention Set</td>
<td>A single Round that is held in the case where there is a tie among the highest Exit Bids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Applies to</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tying Bid Price</td>
<td>Contention Set</td>
<td>The price of the highest Exit Bids that were tied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>Bidding Limit</td>
<td>The absence of any Bidding Limit for a Bidder for a Contention Set that has submitted a Deposit of $2,000,000 or greater amount for that Contention Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winner</td>
<td>Contention Set</td>
<td>The Bidder that secures its Application in the Contention Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning Price</td>
<td>Contention Set</td>
<td>The highest Exit Bid that did not win or $1 if there are no such Exit Bids. This is the price paid by the Winner to secure its Application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 6
REGISTRY AGREEMENT

This REGISTRY AGREEMENT (this “Agreement”) is entered into as of ___________ (the “Effective Date”) between Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation (“ICANN”), and __________, a ___________ (“Registry Operator”).

ARTICLE 1.

DELEGATION AND OPERATION
OF TOP–LEVEL DOMAIN; REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES

1.1 Domain and Designation. The Top-Level Domain to which this Agreement applies is ___ (the “TLD”). Upon the Effective Date and until the earlier of the expiration of the Term (as defined in Section 4.1) or the termination of this Agreement pursuant to Article 4, ICANN designates Registry Operator as the registry operator for the TLD, subject to the requirements and necessary approvals for delegation of the TLD and entry into the root-zone.

1.2 Technical Feasibility of String. While ICANN has encouraged and will continue to encourage universal acceptance of all top-level domain strings across the Internet, certain top-level domain strings may encounter difficulty in acceptance by ISPs and webhosters and/or validation by web applications. Registry Operator shall be responsible for ensuring to its satisfaction the technical feasibility of the TLD string prior to entering into this Agreement.

1.3 Representations and Warranties.

(a) Registry Operator represents and warrants to ICANN as follows:

(i) all material information provided and statements made in the registry TLD application, and statements made in writing during the negotiation of this Agreement, were true and correct in all material respects at the time made, and such information or statements continue to be true and correct in all material respects as of the Effective Date except as otherwise previously disclosed in writing by Registry Operator to ICANN;

(ii) Registry Operator is duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the jurisdiction set forth in the preamble hereto, and Registry Operator has all requisite power and authority and has obtained all necessary approvals to enter into and duly execute and deliver this Agreement; and

(iii) Registry Operator has delivered to ICANN a duly executed instrument that secures the funds required to perform registry functions for the TLD in the event of the termination or expiration of this Agreement (the “Continued Operations Instrument”), and such instrument is a binding
obligation of the parties thereto, enforceable against the parties thereto in accordance with its terms.

(b) ICANN represents and warrants to Registry Operator that ICANN is a nonprofit public benefit corporation duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the State of California, United States of America. ICANN has all requisite power and authority and has obtained all necessary corporate approvals to enter into and duly execute and deliver this Agreement.

ARTICLE 2.

COVENANTS OF REGISTRY OPERATOR

Registry Operator covenants and agrees with ICANN as follows:

2.1 Approved Services; Additional Services. Registry Operator shall be entitled to provide the Registry Services described in clauses (a) and (b) of the first paragraph of Section 2.1 in the Specification 6 attached hereto (“Specification 6”) and such other Registry Services set forth on Exhibit A (collectively, the “Approved Services”). If Registry Operator desires to provide any Registry Service that is not an Approved Service or is a material modification to an Approved Service (each, an “Additional Service”), Registry Operator shall submit a request for approval of such Additional Service pursuant to the Registry Services Evaluation Policy at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html, as such policy may be amended from time to time in accordance with the bylaws of ICANN (as amended from time to time, the “ICANN Bylaws”) applicable to Consensus Policies (the “RSEP”). Registry Operator may offer Additional Services only with the written approval of ICANN, and, upon any such approval, such Additional Services shall be deemed Registry Services under this Agreement. In its reasonable discretion, ICANN may require an amendment to this Agreement reflecting the provision of any Additional Service which is approved pursuant to the RSEP, which amendment shall be in a form reasonably acceptable to the parties.

2.2 Compliance with Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies. Registry Operator shall comply with and implement all Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies found at <http://www.icann.org/general/consensus-policies.htm>, as of the Effective Date and as may in the future be developed and adopted in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws, provided such future Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies are adopted in accordance with the procedure and relate to those topics and subject to those limitations set forth in Specification 1 attached hereto (“Specification 1”).

2.3 Data Escrow. Registry Operator shall comply with the registry data escrow procedures set forth in Specification 2 attached hereto (“Specification 2”) within fourteen (14) calendar days after delegation.

2.4 Monthly Reporting. Within twenty (20) calendar days following the end of each calendar month, commencing with the first calendar month in which the TLD is delegated in the root zone, Registry Operator shall deliver to ICANN reports in the format
set forth in Specification 3 attached hereto (“Specification 3”); provided, however, that if
the TLD is delegated in the root zone after the fifteenth (15th) calendar day of the calendar
month, Registry Operator may defer the delivery of the reports for such first calendar
month and instead deliver to ICANN such month’s reports no later than the time that
Registry Operator is required to deliver the reports for the immediately following calendar
month. Registry Operator must include in the Per-Registrar Transactions Report any
domain name created during pre-delegation testing that has not been deleted as of the time
of delegation (notably but not limited to domains registered by Registrar IDs 9995 and/or
9996).

2.5 Publication of Registration Data. Registry Operator shall provide public
access to registration data in accordance with Specification 4 attached hereto
(“Specification 4”).

2.6 Reserved Names. Except to the extent that ICANN otherwise expressly
authorizes in writing, Registry Operator shall comply with the requirements set forth in
Specification 5 attached hereto (“Specification 5”). Registry Operator may at any time
establish or modify policies concerning Registry Operator’s ability to reserve (i.e., withhold
from registration or allocate to Registry Operator, but not register to third parties, delegate,
use, activate in the DNS or otherwise make available) or block additional character strings
within the TLD at its discretion. Except as specified in Specification 5, if Registry Operator
is the registrant for any domain names in the registry TLD, such registrations must be
through an ICANN accredited registrar, and will be considered Transactions (as defined in
Section 6.1) for purposes of calculating the Registry-level transaction fee to be paid to
ICANN by Registry Operator pursuant to Section 6.1.

2.7 Registry Interoperability and Continuity. Registry Operator shall comply
with the Registry Interoperability and Continuity Specifications as set forth in Specification
6 attached hereto (“Specification 6”).

2.8 Protection of Legal Rights of Third Parties. Registry Operator must
specify, and comply with, the processes and procedures for launch of the TLD and initial
registration-related and ongoing protection of the legal rights of third parties as set forth
Specification 7 attached hereto (“Specification 7”). Registry Operator may, at its election,
implement additional protections of the legal rights of third parties. Any changes or
modifications to the process and procedures required by Specification 7 following the
Effective Date must be approved in advance by ICANN in writing. Registry Operator must
comply with all remedies imposed by ICANN pursuant to Section 2 of Specification 7,
subject to Registry Operator’s right to challenge such remedies as set forth in the applicable
procedure described therein. Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate
and respond to any reports from law enforcement and governmental and
quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. In
responding to such reports, Registry Operator will not be required to take any action in
contravention of applicable law.
2.9 Registrars.

(a) All domain name registrations in the TLD must be registered through an ICANN accredited registrar; provided, that Registry Operator need not use a registrar if it registers names in its own name in order to withhold such names from delegation or use in accordance with Section 2.6. Subject to the requirements of Specification 11, Registry Operator must provide non-discriminatory access to Registry Services to all ICANN accredited registrars that enter into and are in compliance with the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD; provided that Registry Operator may establish non-discriminatory criteria for qualification to register names in the TLD that are reasonably related to the proper functioning of the TLD. Registry Operator must use a uniform non-discriminatory agreement with all registrars authorized to register names in the TLD (the “Registry-Registrar Agreement”). Registry Operator may amend the Registry-Registrar Agreement from time to time; provided, however, that any material revisions thereto must be approved by ICANN before any such revisions become effective and binding on any registrar. Registry Operator will provide ICANN and all registrars authorized to register names in the TLD at least fifteen (15) calendar days written notice of any revisions to the Registry-Registrar Agreement before any such revisions become effective and binding on any registrar. During such period, ICANN will determine whether such proposed revisions are immaterial, potentially material or material in nature. If ICANN has not provided Registry Operator with notice of its determination within such fifteen (15) calendar-day period, ICANN shall be deemed to have determined that such proposed revisions are immaterial in nature. If ICANN determines, or is deemed to have determined under this Section 2.9(a), that such revisions are immaterial, then Registry Operator may adopt and implement such revisions. If ICANN determines such revisions are either material or potentially material, ICANN will thereafter follow its procedure regarding review and approval of changes to Registry-Registrar Agreements at <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/rra-amendment-procedure>, and such revisions may not be adopted and implemented until approved by ICANN. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Section 2.9(a), any change to the Registry-Registrar Agreement that relates exclusively to the fee charged by Registry Operator to register domain names in the TLD will not be subject to the notice and approval process specified in this Section 2.9(a), but will be subject to the requirements in Section 2.10 below.

(b) If Registry Operator (i) becomes an Affiliate or reseller of an ICANN accredited registrar, or (ii) subcontracts the provision of any Registry Services to an ICANN accredited registrar, registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, then, in either such case of (i) or (ii) above, Registry Operator will give ICANN prompt notice of the contract, transaction or other arrangement that resulted in such affiliation, reseller relationship or subcontract, as applicable, including, if requested by ICANN, copies of any contract relating thereto; provided, that ICANN will treat such contract or related documents that are appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of Registry Operator in accordance with Section 7.15 (except that ICANN may disclose such contract and related documents to relevant competition authorities). ICANN reserves the right, but not the obligation, to refer any such contract,
related documents, transaction or other arrangement to relevant competition authorities in the event that ICANN determines that such contract, related documents, transaction or other arrangement might raise significant competition issues under applicable law. If feasible and appropriate under the circumstances, ICANN will give Registry Operator advance notice prior to making any such referral to a competition authority.

(c) For the purposes of this Agreement: (i) “Affiliate” means a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, or in combination with one or more other persons or entities, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the person or entity specified, and (ii) “control” (including the terms “controlled by” and “under common control with”) means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of a person or entity, whether through the ownership of securities, as trustee or executor, by serving as an employee or a member of a board of directors or equivalent governing body, by contract, by credit arrangement or otherwise.

2.10 Pricing for Registry Services.

(a) With respect to initial domain name registrations, Registry Operator shall provide each ICANN accredited registrar that has executed the Registry-Registrar Agreement for the TLD advance written notice of any price increase (including as a result of the elimination of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs which had the effect of reducing the price charged to registrars, unless such refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs are of a limited duration that is clearly and conspicuously disclosed to the registrar when offered) of no less than thirty (30) calendar days. Registry Operator shall offer registrars the option to obtain initial domain name registrations for periods of one (1) to ten (10) years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten (10) years.

(b) With respect to renewal of domain name registrations, Registry Operator shall provide each ICANN accredited registrar that has executed the Registry-Registrar Agreement for the TLD advance written notice of any price increase (including as a result of the elimination of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying, Qualified Marketing Programs or other programs which had the effect of reducing the price charged to registrars) of no less than one hundred eighty (180) calendar days. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, with respect to renewal of domain name registrations: (i) Registry Operator need only provide thirty (30) calendar days notice of any price increase if the resulting price is less than or equal to (A) for the period beginning on the Effective Date and ending twelve (12) months following the Effective Date, the initial price charged for registrations in the TLD, or (B) for subsequent periods, a price for which Registry Operator provided a notice pursuant to the first sentence of this Section 2.10(b) within the twelve (12) month period preceding the effective date of the proposed price increase; and (ii) Registry Operator need not provide notice of any price increase for the imposition of the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3. Registry Operator shall offer registrars the option to obtain domain name registration renewals at the current
price (i.e., the price in place prior to any noticed increase) for periods of one (1) to ten (10) years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten (10) years.

(c) In addition, Registry Operator must have uniform pricing for renewals of domain name registrations ("Renewal Pricing"). For the purposes of determining Renewal Pricing, the price for each domain registration renewal must be identical to the price of all other domain name registration renewals in place at the time of such renewal, and such price must take into account universal application of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs in place at the time of renewal. The foregoing requirements of this Section 2.10(c) shall not apply for (i) purposes of determining Renewal Pricing if the registrar has provided Registry Operator with documentation that demonstrates that the applicable registrant expressly agreed in its registration agreement with registrar to higher Renewal Pricing at the time of the initial registration of the domain name following clear and conspicuous disclosure of such Renewal Pricing to such registrant, and (ii) discounted Renewal Pricing pursuant to a Qualified Marketing Program (as defined below). The parties acknowledge that the purpose of this Section 2.10(c) is to prohibit abusive and/or discriminatory Renewal Pricing practices imposed by Registry Operator without the written consent of the applicable registrant at the time of the initial registration of the domain name and this Section 2.10(c) will be interpreted broadly to prohibit such practices. For purposes of this Section 2.10(c), a “Qualified Marketing Program” is a marketing program pursuant to which Registry Operator offers discounted Renewal Pricing, provided that each of the following criteria is satisfied: (i) the program and related discounts are offered for a period of time not to exceed one hundred eighty (180) calendar days (with consecutive substantially similar programs aggregated for purposes of determining the number of calendar days of the program), (ii) all ICANN accredited registrars are provided the same opportunity to qualify for such discounted Renewal Pricing; and (iii) the intent or effect of the program is not to exclude any particular class(es) of registrations (e.g., registrations held by large corporations) or increase the renewal price of any particular class(es) of registrations. Nothing in this Section 2.10(c) shall limit Registry Operator’s obligations pursuant to Section 2.10(b).

(d) Registry Operator shall provide public query-based DNS lookup service for the TLD (that is, operate the Registry TLD zone servers) at its sole expense.

2.11 Contractual and Operational Compliance Audits.

(a) ICANN may from time to time (not to exceed twice per calendar year) conduct, or engage a third party to conduct, contractual compliance audits to assess compliance by Registry Operator with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement and its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement. Such audits shall be tailored to achieve the purpose of assessing compliance, and ICANN will (a) give reasonable advance notice of any such audit, which notice shall specify in reasonable detail the categories of documents, data and other information requested by ICANN, and (b) use commercially reasonable efforts to conduct such audit during regular business hours and in such a manner as to not unreasonably disrupt the operations of Registry Operator. As part of such audit and upon request by ICANN, Registry Operator shall timely
provide all responsive documents, data and any other information reasonably necessary to demonstrate Registry Operator’s compliance with this Agreement. Upon no less than ten (10) calendar days notice (unless otherwise agreed to by Registry Operator), ICANN may, as part of any contractual compliance audit, conduct site visits during regular business hours to assess compliance by Registry Operator with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement and its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement. ICANN will treat any information obtained in connection with such audits that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of Registry Operator in accordance with Section 7.15.

(b) Any audit conducted pursuant to Section 2.11(a) will be at ICANN’s expense, unless (i) Registry Operator (A) controls, is controlled by, is under common control or is otherwise Affiliated with, any ICANN accredited registrar or registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, or (B) has subcontracted the provision of Registry Services to an ICANN accredited registrar or registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, and, in either case of (A) or (B) above, the audit relates to Registry Operator’s compliance with Section 2.14, in which case Registry Operator shall reimburse ICANN for all reasonable costs and expenses associated with the portion of the audit related to Registry Operator’s compliance with Section 2.14, or (ii) the audit is related to a discrepancy in the fees paid by Registry Operator hereunder in excess of 5% in a given quarter to ICANN’s detriment, in which case Registry Operator shall reimburse ICANN for all reasonable costs and expenses associated with the entirety of such audit. In either such case of (i) or (ii) above, such reimbursement will be paid together with the next Registry-Level Fee payment due following the date of transmittal of the cost statement for such audit.

(c) Notwithstanding Section 2.11(a), if Registry Operator is found not to be in compliance with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement or its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement in two consecutive audits conducted pursuant to this Section 2.11, ICANN may increase the number of such audits to one per calendar quarter.

(d) Registry Operator will give ICANN immediate notice of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the commencement of any of the proceedings referenced in Section 4.3(d) or the occurrence of any of the matters specified in Section 4.3(f).


2.13 Emergency Transition. Registry Operator agrees that, in the event that any of the emergency thresholds for registry functions set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 is reached, ICANN may designate an emergency interim registry operator of the registry for the TLD (an “Emergency Operator”) in accordance with ICANN’s registry transition process (available at <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/transition-processes>) (as the same may be amended from time to time, the “Registry Transition Process”) until such
time as Registry Operator has demonstrated to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that it can resume operation of the registry for the TLD without the reoccurrence of such failure. Following such demonstration, Registry Operator may transition back into operation of the registry for the TLD pursuant to the procedures set out in the Registry Transition Process, provided that Registry Operator pays all reasonable costs incurred (i) by ICANN as a result of the designation of the Emergency Operator and (ii) by the Emergency Operator in connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD, which costs shall be documented in reasonable detail in records that shall be made available to Registry Operator. In the event ICANN designates an Emergency Operator pursuant to this Section 2.13 and the Registry Transition Process, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or any such Emergency Operator with all data (including the data escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3) regarding operations of the registry for the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such Emergency Operator. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event that an Emergency Operator is designated pursuant to this Section 2.13. In addition, in the event of such failure, ICANN shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument.


2.15 Cooperation with Economic Studies. If ICANN initiates or commissions an economic study on the impact or functioning of new generic top-level domains on the Internet, the DNS or related matters, Registry Operator shall reasonably cooperate with such study, including by delivering to ICANN or its designee conducting such study all data related to the operation of the TLD reasonably necessary for the purposes of such study requested by ICANN or its designee, provided, that Registry Operator may withhold (a) any internal analyses or evaluations prepared by Registry Operator with respect to such data and (b) any data to the extent that the delivery of such data would be in violation of applicable law. Any data delivered to ICANN or its designee pursuant to this Section 2.15 that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) shall be treated as Confidential Information of Registry Operator in accordance with Section 7.15, provided that, if ICANN aggregates and makes anonymous such data, ICANN or its designee may disclose such data to any third party. Following completion of an economic study for which Registry Operator has provided data, ICANN will destroy all data provided by Registry Operator that has not been aggregated and made anonymous.

2.16 Registry Performance Specifications. Registry Performance Specifications for operation of the TLD will be as set forth in Specification 10 attached hereto (“Specification 10”). Registry Operator shall comply with such Performance Specifications and, for a period of at least one (1) year, shall keep technical and operational records sufficient to evidence compliance with such specifications for each calendar year during the Term.
2.17 **Additional Public Interest Commitments.** Registry Operator shall comply with the public interest commitments set forth in Specification 11 attached hereto ("Specification 11").

2.18 **Personal Data.** Registry Operator shall (i) notify each ICANN-accredited registrar that is a party to the Registry-Registrar Agreement for the TLD of the purposes for which data about any identified or identifiable natural person ("Personal Data") submitted to Registry Operator by such registrar is collected and used under this Agreement or otherwise and the intended recipients (or categories of recipients) of such Personal Data, and (ii) require such registrar to obtain the consent of each registrant in the TLD for such collection and use of Personal Data. Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to protect Personal Data collected from such registrar from loss, misuse, unauthorized disclosure, alteration or destruction. Registry Operator shall not use or authorize the use of Personal Data in a way that is incompatible with the notice provided to registrars.

2.19 **[Note: For Community-Based TLDs Only] Obligations of Registry Operator to TLD Community.** Registry Operator shall establish registration policies in conformity with the application submitted with respect to the TLD for: (i) naming conventions within the TLD, (ii) requirements for registration by members of the TLD community, and (iii) use of registered domain names in conformity with the stated purpose of the community-based TLD. Registry Operator shall operate the TLD in a manner that allows the TLD community to discuss and participate in the development and modification of policies and practices for the TLD. Registry Operator shall establish procedures for the enforcement of registration policies for the TLD, and resolution of disputes concerning compliance with TLD registration policies, and shall enforce such registration policies. Registry Operator agrees to implement and be bound by the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure as set forth at [http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/rrdorp](http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/rrdorp) with respect to disputes arising pursuant to this Section 2.19. Registry Operator shall implement and comply with the community registration policies set forth on Specification 12 attached hereto.

**ARTICLE 3.**

**COVENANTS OF ICANN**

ICANN covenants and agrees with Registry Operator as follows:

3.1 **Open and Transparent.** Consistent with ICANN's expressed mission and core values, ICANN shall operate in an open and transparent manner.

3.2 **Equitable Treatment.** ICANN shall not apply standards, policies, procedures or practices arbitrarily, unjustifiably, or inequitably and shall not single out Registry Operator for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause.

3.3 **TLD Nameservers.** ICANN will use commercially reasonable efforts to ensure that any changes to the TLD nameserver designations submitted to ICANN by
Registry Operator (in a format and with required technical elements specified by ICANN at http://www.iana.org/domains/root/ will be implemented by ICANN within seven (7) calendar days or as promptly as feasible following technical verifications.

3.4 Root-zone Information Publication. ICANN’s publication of root-zone contact information for the TLD will include Registry Operator and its administrative and technical contacts. Any request to modify the contact information for the Registry Operator must be made in the format specified from time to time by ICANN at http://www.iana.org/domains/root/.

3.5 Authoritative Root Database. To the extent that ICANN is authorized to set policy with regard to an authoritative root server system (the “Authoritative Root Server System”), ICANN shall use commercially reasonable efforts to (a) ensure that the authoritative root will point to the top-level domain nameservers designated by Registry Operator for the TLD, (b) maintain a stable, secure, and authoritative publicly available database of relevant information about the TLD, in accordance with ICANN publicly available policies and procedures, and (c) coordinate the Authoritative Root Server System so that it is operated and maintained in a stable and secure manner; provided, that ICANN shall not be in breach of this Agreement and ICANN shall have no liability in the event that any third party (including any governmental entity or internet service provider) blocks or restricts access to the TLD in any jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 4.

TERM AND TERMINATION

4.1 Term. The term of this Agreement will be ten (10) years from the Effective Date (as such term may be extended pursuant to Section 4.2, the “Term”).

4.2 Renewal.

(a) This Agreement will be renewed for successive periods of ten (10) years upon the expiration of the initial Term set forth in Section 4.1 and each successive Term, unless:

(i) Following notice by ICANN to Registry Operator of a fundamental and material breach of Registry Operator’s covenants set forth in Article 2 or breach of its payment obligations under Article 6 of this Agreement, which notice shall include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, and such breach has not been cured within thirty (30) calendar days of such notice, (A) an arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction has finally determined that Registry Operator has been in fundamental and material breach of such covenant(s) or in breach of its payment obligations, and (B) Registry Operator has failed to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction; or
During the then current Term, Registry Operator shall have been found by an arbitrator (pursuant to Section 5.2 of this Agreement) or a court of competent jurisdiction on at least three (3) separate occasions to have been in (A) fundamental and material breach (whether or not cured) of Registry Operator’s covenants set forth in Article 2 or (B) breach of its payment obligations under Article 6 of this Agreement.

(b) Upon the occurrence of the events set forth in Section 4.2(a) (i) or (ii), the Agreement shall terminate at the expiration of the then-current Term.

4.3 Termination by ICANN.

(a) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if: (i) Registry Operator fails to cure (A) any fundamental and material breach of Registry Operator’s representations and warranties set forth in Article 1 or covenants set forth in Article 2, or (B) any breach of Registry Operator’s payment obligations set forth in Article 6 of this Agreement, each within thirty (30) calendar days after ICANN gives Registry Operator notice of such breach, which notice will include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, (ii) an arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction has finally determined that Registry Operator is in fundamental and material breach of such covenant(s) or in breach of its payment obligations, and (iii) Registry Operator fails to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction.

(b) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if Registry Operator fails to complete all testing and procedures (identified by ICANN in writing to Registry Operator prior to the date hereof) for delegation of the TLD into the root zone within twelve (12) months of the Effective Date. Registry Operator may request an extension for up to additional twelve (12) months for delegation if it can demonstrate, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, that Registry Operator is working diligently and in good faith toward successfully completing the steps necessary for delegation of the TLD. Any fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN prior to such termination date shall be retained by ICANN in full.

(c) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator fails to cure a material breach of Registry Operator’s obligations set forth in Section 2.12 of this Agreement within thirty (30) calendar days of delivery of notice of such breach by ICANN, or if the Continued Operations Instrument is not in effect for greater than sixty (60) consecutive calendar days at any time following the Effective Date, (ii) an arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction has finally determined that Registry Operator is in material breach of such covenant, and (iii) Registry Operator fails to cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction.
(d) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator makes an assignment for the benefit of creditors or similar act, (ii) attachment, garnishment or similar proceedings are commenced against Registry Operator, which proceedings are a material threat to Registry Operator’s ability to operate the registry for the TLD, and are not dismissed within sixty (60) calendar days of their commencement, (iii) a trustee, receiver, liquidator or equivalent is appointed in place of Registry Operator or maintains control over any of Registry Operator’s property, (iv) execution is levied upon any material property of Registry Operator that, if levied, would reasonably be expected to materially and adversely affect Registry Operator’s ability to operate the registry for the TLD, (v) proceedings are instituted by or against Registry Operator under any bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization or other laws relating to the relief of debtors and such proceedings are not dismissed within sixty (60) calendar days of their commencement (if such proceedings are instituted by Registry Operator or its Affiliates) or one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days of their commencement (if such proceedings are instituted by a third party against Registry Operator), or (vi) Registry Operator files for protection under the United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. Section 101, et seq., or a foreign equivalent or liquidates, dissolves or otherwise discontinues its operations or the operation of the TLD.

(e) ICANN may, upon thirty (30) calendar days’ notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement pursuant to a determination by any PDDRP panel or RRDRP panel under Section 2 of Specification 7 or a determination by any PICDRP panel under Section 2, Section 3 or any other applicable Section of Specification 11, subject to Registry Operator’s right to challenge such termination as set forth in the applicable procedure described therein.

(f) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator knowingly employs any officer who is convicted of a misdemeanor related to financial activities or of any felony, or is judged by a court of competent jurisdiction to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or is the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN reasonably deems as the substantive equivalent of any of the foregoing and such officer is not terminated within thirty (30) calendar days of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the foregoing, or (ii) any member of Registry Operator’s board of directors or similar governing body is convicted of a misdemeanor related to financial activities or of any felony, or is judged by a court of competent jurisdiction to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or is the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN reasonably deems as the substantive equivalent of any of the foregoing and such member is not removed from Registry Operator’s board of directors or similar governing body within thirty (30) calendar days of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the foregoing.

(g) ICANN may, upon thirty (30) calendar days’ notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement as specified in Section 7.5.

(h) [Applicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities only.] ICANN may terminate this Agreement pursuant to Section 7.16.
4.4 Termination by Registry Operator.

(a) Registry Operator may terminate this Agreement upon notice to ICANN if (i) ICANN fails to cure any fundamental and material breach of ICANN’s covenants set forth in Article 3, within thirty (30) calendar days after Registry Operator gives ICANN notice of such breach, which notice will include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, (ii) an arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction has finally determined that ICANN is in fundamental and material breach of such covenants, and (iii) ICANN fails to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction.

(b) Registry Operator may terminate this Agreement for any reason upon one hundred eighty (180) calendar day advance notice to ICANN.

4.5 Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement. Upon expiration of the Term pursuant to Section 4.1 or Section 4.2 or any termination of this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3 or Section 4.4, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or any successor registry operator that may be designated by ICANN for the TLD in accordance with this Section 4.5 with all data (including the data escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3) regarding operations of the registry for the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such successor registry operator. After consultation with Registry Operator, ICANN shall determine whether or not to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator in its sole discretion and in conformance with the Registry Transition Process; provided, however, that (i) ICANN will take into consideration any intellectual property rights of Registry Operator (as communicated to ICANN by Registry Operator) in determining whether to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator and (ii) if Registry Operator demonstrates to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that (A) all domain name registrations in the TLD are registered to, and maintained by, Registry Operator or its Affiliates for their exclusive use, (B) Registry Operator does not sell, distribute or transfer control or use of any registrations in the TLD to any third party that is not an Affiliate of Registry Operator, and (C) transitioning operation of the TLD is not necessary to protect the public interest, then ICANN may not transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator upon the expiration or termination of this Agreement without the consent of Registry Operator (which shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed). For the avoidance of doubt, the foregoing sentence shall not prohibit ICANN from delegating the TLD pursuant to a future application process for the delegation of top-level domains, subject to any processes and objection procedures instituted by ICANN in connection with such application process intended to protect the rights of third parties. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event of a transition of the TLD pursuant to this Section 4.5. In addition, ICANN or its designee shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument for the maintenance and operation of the TLD, regardless of the reason for termination or expiration of this Agreement.
Alternative Section 4.5 Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement

text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities or other special circumstances:

“Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement. Upon expiration of the Term pursuant to Section 4.1 or Section 4.2 or any termination of this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3 or Section 4.4, in connection with ICANN’s designation of a successor registry operator for the TLD, Registry Operator and ICANN agree to consult each other and work cooperatively to facilitate and implement the transition of the TLD in accordance with this Section 4.5. After consultation with Registry Operator, ICANN shall determine whether or not to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator in its sole discretion and in conformance with the Registry Transition Process. In the event ICANN determines to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator, upon Registry Operator’s consent (which shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed), Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or such successor registry operator for the TLD with any data regarding operations of the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such successor registry operator in addition to data escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3 hereof. In the event that Registry Operator does not consent to provide such data, any registry data related to the TLD shall be returned to Registry Operator, unless otherwise agreed upon by the parties. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event of a transition of the TLD pursuant to this Section 4.5. In addition, ICANN or its designee shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument, regardless of the reason for termination or expiration of this Agreement.”

4.6 Effect of Termination. Upon any expiration of the Term or termination of this Agreement, the obligations and rights of the parties hereto shall cease, provided that such expiration or termination of this Agreement shall not relieve the parties of any obligation or breach of this Agreement accruing prior to such expiration or termination, including, without limitation, all accrued payment obligations arising under Article 6. In addition, Article 5, Article 7, Section 2.12, Section 4.5, and this Section 4.6 shall survive the expiration or termination of this Agreement. For the avoidance of doubt, the rights of Registry Operator to operate the registry for the TLD shall immediately cease upon any expiration of the Term or termination of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 5.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

5.1 Mediation. In the event of any dispute arising under or in connection with this Agreement, before either party may initiate arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2 below, ICANN and Registry Operator must attempt to resolve the dispute through mediation in accordance with the following terms and conditions:
(a) A party shall submit a dispute to mediation by written notice to the other party. The mediation shall be conducted by a single mediator selected by the parties. If the parties cannot agree on a mediator within fifteen (15) calendar days of delivery of written notice pursuant to this Section 5.1, the parties will promptly select a mutually acceptable mediation provider entity, which entity shall, as soon as practicable following such entity’s selection, designate a mediator, who is a licensed attorney with general knowledge of contract law, has no ongoing business relationship with either party and, to the extent necessary to mediate the particular dispute, general knowledge of the domain name system. Any mediator must confirm in writing that he or she is not, and will not become during the term of the mediation, an employee, partner, executive officer, director, or security holder of ICANN or Registry Operator. If such confirmation is not provided by the appointed mediator, then a replacement mediator shall be appointed pursuant to this Section 5.1(a).

(b) The mediator shall conduct the mediation in accordance with the rules and procedures that he or she determines following consultation with the parties. The parties shall discuss the dispute in good faith and attempt, with the mediator’s assistance, to reach an amicable resolution of the dispute. The mediation shall be treated as a settlement discussion and shall therefore be confidential and may not be used against either party in any later proceeding relating to the dispute, including any arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2. The mediator may not testify for either party in any later proceeding relating to the dispute.

(c) Each party shall bear its own costs in the mediation. The parties shall share equally the fees and expenses of the mediator. Each party shall treat information received from the other party pursuant to the mediation that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of such other party in accordance with Section 7.15.

(d) If the parties have engaged in good faith participation in the mediation but have not resolved the dispute for any reason, either party or the mediator may terminate the mediation at any time and the dispute can then proceed to arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2 below. If the parties have not resolved the dispute for any reason by the date that is ninety (90) calendar days following the date of the notice delivered pursuant to Section 5.1(a), the mediation shall automatically terminate (unless extended by agreement of the parties) and the dispute can then proceed to arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2 below.

5.2 Arbitration. Disputes arising under or in connection with this Agreement that are not resolved pursuant to Section 5.1, including requests for specific performance, will be resolved through binding arbitration conducted pursuant to the rules of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce (the “ICC”). The arbitration will be conducted in the English language and will occur in Los Angeles County, California. Any arbitration will be in front of a single arbitrator, unless (i) ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, (ii) the parties agree in writing to a greater number of arbitrators, or (iii) the dispute arises under Section 7.6 or
7.7. In the case of clauses (i), (ii) or (iii) in the preceding sentence, the arbitration will be in front of three arbitrators with each party nominating one arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC and the two selected arbitrators nominating the third arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. For an arbitration in front of a sole arbitrator, Registry Operator and ICANN may, by mutual agreement, nominate the sole arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. If the parties fail to nominate a sole arbitrator or, in the case of an arbitration in front of three arbitrators, either party fails to nominate an arbitrator, in each case within thirty (30) calendar days from the date when a party’s request for arbitration has been received by the other party, or within such additional time as may be allowed by the Secretariat of the Court of the ICC, the arbitrator(s) shall be appointed by the ICC. If any nominated arbitrator is not confirmed by the ICC, the party or persons that appointed such arbitrator shall promptly nominate a replacement arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. In order to expedite the arbitration and limit its cost, the arbitrator(s) shall establish page limits for the parties’ filings in conjunction with the arbitration, and should the arbitrator(s) determine that a hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be limited to one (1) calendar day, provided that in any arbitration in which ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, the hearing may be extended for one (1) additional calendar day if agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator(s) based on the arbitrator(s) independent determination or the reasonable request of one of the parties thereto. The prevailing party in the arbitration will have the right to recover its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, which the arbitrator(s) shall include in the awards. In the event the arbitrators determine that Registry Operator has been repeatedly and willfully in fundamental and material breach of its obligations set forth in Article 2, Article 6 or Section 5.4 of this Agreement, ICANN may request the arbitrators award punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions (including without limitation an order temporarily restricting Registry Operator’s right to sell new registrations). Each party shall treat information received from the other party pursuant to the arbitration that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of such other party in accordance with Section 7.15. In any litigation involving ICANN concerning this Agreement, jurisdiction and exclusive venue for such litigation will be in a court located in Los Angeles County, California; however, the parties will also have the right to enforce a judgment of such a court in any court of competent jurisdiction.

[Alternative Section 5.2 Arbitration text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities or other special circumstances:

"Arbitration. Disputes arising under or in connection with this Agreement that are not resolved pursuant to Section 5.1, including requests for specific performance, will be resolved through binding arbitration conducted pursuant to the rules of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce (the “ICC”). The arbitration will be conducted in the English language and will occur in Geneva, Switzerland, unless another location is mutually agreed upon by Registry Operator and ICANN. Any arbitration will be in front of a single arbitrator, unless (i) ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, (ii) the parties agree in writing to a greater number of arbitrators, or (iii) the dispute arises under Section 7.6 or 7.7. In the case of clauses (i), (ii) or (iii) in the preceding sentence, the arbitration will be in front of three arbitrators with
each party nominating one arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC and the two selected arbitrators nominating the third arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. For an arbitration in front of a sole arbitrator, Registry Operator and ICANN may, by mutual agreement, nominate the sole arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. If the parties fail to nominate a sole arbitrator or, in the case of an arbitration in front of three arbitrators, either party fails to nominate an arbitrator, in each case within thirty (30) calendar days from the date when a party’s request for arbitration has been received by the other party, or within such additional time as may be allowed by the Secretariat of the Court of the ICC, the arbitrator(s) shall be appointed by the ICC. If any nominated arbitrator is not confirmed by the ICC, the party or persons that appointed such arbitrator shall promptly nominate a replacement arbitrator for confirmation by the ICC. In order to expedite the arbitration and limit its cost, the arbitrator(s) shall establish page limits for the parties’ filings in conjunction with the arbitration, and should the arbitrator(s) determine that a hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be limited to one (1) calendar day, provided that in any arbitration in which ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, the hearing may be extended for one (1) additional calendar day if agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator(s) based on the arbitrator(s) independent determination or the reasonable request of one of the parties thereto. The prevailing party in the arbitration will have the right to recover its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, which the arbitrator(s) shall include in the awards. In the event the arbitrators determine that Registry Operator has been repeatedly and willfully in fundamental and material breach of its obligations set forth in Article 2, Article 6 or Section 5.4 of this Agreement, ICANN may request the arbitrators award punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions (including without limitation an order temporarily restricting Registry Operator’s right to sell new registrations). Each party shall treat information received from the other party pursuant to the arbitration that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Section 7.15) as Confidential Information of such other party in accordance with Section 7.15. In any litigation involving ICANN concerning this Agreement, jurisdiction and exclusive venue for such litigation will be in a court located in Geneva, Switzerland, unless another location is mutually agreed upon by Registry Operator and ICANN; however, the parties will also have the right to enforce a judgment of such a court in any court of competent jurisdiction.”

5.3 Limitation of Liability. ICANN's aggregate monetary liability for violations of this Agreement will not exceed an amount equal to the Registry-Level Fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN within the preceding twelve-month period pursuant to this Agreement (excluding the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3, if any). Registry Operator’s aggregate monetary liability to ICANN for breaches of this Agreement will be limited to an amount equal to the fees paid to ICANN during the preceding twelve-month period (excluding the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3, if any), and punitive and exemplary damages, if any, awarded in accordance with Section 5.2, except with respect to Registry Operator’s indemnification obligations pursuant to Section 7.1 and Section 7.2. In no event shall either party be liable for special, punitive, exemplary or consequential damages arising out of or in connection with this Agreement or the performance or nonperformance of obligations undertaken in this Agreement, except as provided in Section 5.2. Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, neither party
makes any warranty, express or implied, with respect to the services rendered by itself, its servants or agents, or the results obtained from their work, including, without limitation, any implied warranty of merchantability, non-infringement or fitness for a particular purpose.

5.4 **Specific Performance.** Registry Operator and ICANN agree that irreparable damage could occur if any of the provisions of this Agreement was not performed in accordance with its specific terms. Accordingly, the parties agree that they each shall be entitled to seek from the arbitrator or court of competent jurisdiction specific performance of the terms of this Agreement (in addition to any other remedy to which each party is entitled).

**ARTICLE 6.**

**FEES**

6.1 **Registry-Level Fees.**

(a) Registry Operator shall pay ICANN a registry-level fee equal to (i) the registry fixed fee of US$6,250 per calendar quarter and (ii) the registry-level transaction fee (collectively, the “Registry-Level Fees”). The registry-level transaction fee will be equal to the number of annual increments of an initial or renewal domain name registration (at one or more levels, and including renewals associated with transfers from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another, each a “Transaction”), during the applicable calendar quarter multiplied by US$0.25; provided, however that the registry-level transaction fee shall not apply until and unless more than 50,000 Transactions have occurred in the TLD during any calendar quarter or any consecutive four calendar quarter period in the aggregate (the “Transaction Threshold”) and shall apply to each Transaction that occurred during each quarter in which the Transaction Threshold has been met, but shall not apply to each quarter in which the Transaction Threshold has not been met. Registry Operator’s obligation to pay the quarterly registry-level fixed fee will begin on the date on which the TLD is delegated in the DNS to Registry Operator. The first quarterly payment of the registry-level fixed fee will be prorated based on the number of calendar days between the delegation date and the end of the calendar quarter in which the delegation date falls.

(b) Subject to Section 6.1(a), Registry Operator shall pay the Registry-Level Fees on a quarterly basis to an account designated by ICANN within thirty (30) calendar days following the date of the invoice provided by ICANN.

6.2 **Cost Recovery for RSTEP.** Requests by Registry Operator for the approval of Additional Services pursuant to Section 2.1 may be referred by ICANN to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (“RSTEP”) pursuant to that process at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/. In the event that such requests are referred to RSTEP, Registry Operator shall remit to ICANN the invoiced cost of the RSTEP review within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of a copy of the RSTEP invoice from ICANN,
unless ICANN determines, in its sole and absolute discretion, to pay all or any portion of the invoiced cost of such RSTEP review.

6.3 Variable Registry-Level Fee.

(a) If the ICANN accredited registrars (accounting, in the aggregate, for payment of two-thirds of all registrar-level fees (or such portion of ICANN accredited registrars necessary to approve variable accreditation fees under the then-current registrar accreditation agreement), do not approve, pursuant to the terms of their registrar accreditation agreements with ICANN, the variable accreditation fees established by the ICANN Board of Directors for any ICANN fiscal year, upon delivery of notice from ICANN, Registry Operator shall pay to ICANN a variable registry-level fee, which shall be paid on a fiscal quarter basis, and shall accrue as of the beginning of the first fiscal quarter of such ICANN fiscal year (the “Variable Registry-Level Fee”). The fee will be calculated and invoiced by ICANN on a quarterly basis, and shall be paid by Registry Operator within sixty (60) calendar days with respect to the first quarter of such ICANN fiscal year and within twenty (20) calendar days with respect to each remaining quarter of such ICANN fiscal year, of receipt of the invoiced amount by ICANN. The Registry Operator may invoice and collect the Variable Registry-Level Fees from the registrars that are party to a Registry-Registrar Agreement with Registry Operator (which agreement may specifically provide for the reimbursement of Variable Registry-Level Fees paid by Registry Operator pursuant to this Section 6.3); provided, that the fees shall be invoiced to all ICANN accredited registrars if invoiced to any. The Variable Registry-Level Fee, if collectible by ICANN, shall be an obligation of Registry Operator and shall be due and payable as provided in this Section 6.3 irrespective of Registry Operator’s ability to seek and obtain reimbursement of such fee from registrars. In the event ICANN later collects variable accreditation fees for which Registry Operator has paid ICANN a Variable Registry-Level Fee, ICANN shall reimburse the Registry Operator an appropriate amount of the Variable Registry-Level Fee, as reasonably determined by ICANN. If the ICANN accredited registrars (as a group) do approve, pursuant to the terms of their registrar accreditation agreements with ICANN, the variable accreditation fees established by the ICANN Board of Directors for a fiscal year, ICANN shall not be entitled to a Variable-Level Fee hereunder for such fiscal year, irrespective of whether the ICANN accredited registrars comply with their payment obligations to ICANN during such fiscal year.

(b) The amount of the Variable Registry-Level Fee will be specified for each registrar, and may include both a per-registrar component and a transactional component. The per-registrar component of the Variable Registry-Level Fee shall be specified by ICANN in accordance with the budget adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors for each ICANN fiscal year. The transactional component of the Variable Registry-Level Fee shall be specified by ICANN in accordance with the budget adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors for each ICANN fiscal year but shall not exceed US$0.25 per domain name registration (including renewals associated with transfers from one ICANN accredited registrar to another) per year.
6.4 **Pass Through Fees.** Registry Operator shall pay to ICANN (i) a one-time fee equal to US$5,000 for access to and use of the Trademark Clearinghouse as described in Specification 7 (the “RPM Access Fee”) and (ii) US$0.25 per Sunrise Registration and Claims Registration (as such terms are used in Trademark Clearinghouse RPMs incorporated herein pursuant to Specification 7) (the “RPM Registration Fee”). The RPM Access Fee will be invoiced as of the Effective Date of this Agreement, and Registry Operator shall pay such fee to an account specified by ICANN within thirty (30) calendar days following the date of the invoice. ICANN will invoice Registry Operator quarterly for the RPM Registration Fee, which shall be due in accordance with the invoicing and payment procedure specified in Section 6.1.

6.5 **Adjustments to Fees.** Notwithstanding any of the fee limitations set forth in this Article 6, commencing upon the expiration of the first year of this Agreement, and upon the expiration of each year thereafter during the Term, the then-current fees set forth in Section 6.1 and Section 6.3 may be adjusted, at ICANN’s discretion, by a percentage equal to the percentage change, if any, in (i) the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, U.S. City Average (1982-1984 = 100) published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, or any successor index (the “CPI”) for the month which is one (1) month prior to the commencement of the applicable year, over (ii) the CPI published for the month which is one (1) month prior to the commencement of the immediately prior year. In the event of any such increase, ICANN shall provide notice to Registry Operator specifying the amount of such adjustment. Any fee adjustment under this Section 6.5 shall be effective as of the first day of the first calendar quarter following at least thirty (30) days after ICANN’s delivery to Registry Operator of such fee adjustment notice.

6.6 **Additional Fee on Late Payments.** For any payments thirty (30) calendar days or more overdue under this Agreement, Registry Operator shall pay an additional fee on late payments at the rate of 1.5% per month or, if less, the maximum rate permitted by applicable law.

6.7 **Fee Reduction Waiver.** In ICANN’s sole discretion, ICANN may reduce the amount of registry fees payable hereunder by Registry Operator for any period of time ("Fee Reduction Waiver"). Any such Fee Reduction Waiver may, as determined by ICANN in its sole discretion, be (a) limited in duration and (b) conditioned upon Registry Operator’s acceptance of the terms and conditions set forth in such waiver. A Fee Reduction Waiver shall not be effective unless executed in writing by ICANN as contemplated by Section 7.6(i). ICANN will provide notice of any Fee Reduction Waiver to Registry Operator in accordance with Section 7.9.

**ARTICLE 7.**

**MISCELLANEOUS**

7.1 **Indemnification of ICANN.**
(a) Registry Operator shall indemnify and defend ICANN and its directors, officers, employees, and agents (collectively, “Indemnitees”) from and against any and all third-party claims, damages, liabilities, costs, and expenses, including reasonable legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to intellectual property ownership rights with respect to the TLD, the delegation of the TLD to Registry Operator, Registry Operator’s operation of the registry for the TLD or Registry Operator’s provision of Registry Services, provided that Registry Operator shall not be obligated to indemnify or defend any Indemnitee to the extent the claim, damage, liability, cost or expense arose: (i) due to the actions or omissions of ICANN, its subcontractors, panelists or evaluators specifically related to and occurring during the registry TLD application process (other than actions or omissions requested by or for the benefit of Registry Operator), or (ii) due to a breach by ICANN of any obligation contained in this Agreement or any willful misconduct by ICANN. This Section shall not be deemed to require Registry Operator to reimburse or otherwise indemnify ICANN for costs associated with the negotiation or execution of this Agreement, or with monitoring or management of the parties’ respective obligations hereunder. Further, this Section shall not apply to any request for attorney’s fees in connection with any litigation or arbitration between or among the parties, which shall be governed by Article 5 or otherwise awarded by a court of competent jurisdiction or arbitrator.

[Alternative Section 7.1(a) text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities:

“Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to cooperate with ICANN in order to ensure that ICANN does not incur any costs associated with claims, damages, liabilities, costs and expenses, including reasonable legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to intellectual property ownership rights with respect to the TLD, the delegation of the TLD to Registry Operator, Registry Operator’s operation of the registry for the TLD or Registry Operator’s provision of Registry Services, provided that Registry Operator shall not be obligated to provide such cooperation to the extent the claim, damage, liability, cost or expense arose due to a breach by ICANN of any of its obligations contained in this Agreement or any willful misconduct by ICANN. This Section shall not be deemed to require Registry Operator to reimburse or otherwise indemnify ICANN for costs associated with the negotiation or execution of this Agreement, or with monitoring or management of the parties’ respective obligations hereunder. Further, this Section shall not apply to any request for attorney’s fees in connection with any litigation or arbitration between or among the parties, which shall be governed by Article 5 or otherwise awarded by a court of competent jurisdiction or arbitrator.”]

(b) For any claims by ICANN for indemnification whereby multiple registry operators (including Registry Operator) have engaged in the same actions or omissions that gave rise to the claim, Registry Operator’s aggregate liability to indemnify ICANN with respect to such claim shall be limited to a percentage of ICANN’s total claim, calculated by dividing the number of total domain names under registration with Registry Operator within the TLD (which names under registration shall be calculated consistently with Article 6 hereof for any applicable quarter) by the total number of domain names under registration within all top level domains for which the registry operators thereof are
engaging in the same acts or omissions giving rise to such claim. For the purposes of reducing Registry Operator’s liability under Section 7.1(a) pursuant to this Section 7.1(b), Registry Operator shall have the burden of identifying the other registry operators that are engaged in the same actions or omissions that gave rise to the claim, and demonstrating, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, such other registry operators’ culpability for such actions or omissions. For the avoidance of doubt, in the event that a registry operator is engaged in the same acts or omissions giving rise to the claims, but such registry operator(s) do not have the same or similar indemnification obligations to ICANN as set forth in Section 7.1(a) above, the number of domains under management by such registry operator(s) shall nonetheless be included in the calculation in the preceding sentence. [Note: This Section 7.1(b) is inapplicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities.]

7.2 Indemnification Procedures. If any third-party claim is commenced that is indemnified under Section 7.1 above, ICANN shall provide notice thereof to Registry Operator as promptly as practicable. Registry Operator shall be entitled, if it so elects, in a notice promptly delivered to ICANN, to immediately take control of the defense and investigation of such claim and to employ and engage attorneys reasonably acceptable to ICANN to handle and defend the same, at Registry Operator’s sole cost and expense, provided that in all events ICANN will be entitled to control at its sole cost and expense the litigation of issues concerning the validity or interpretation of ICANN’s policies, Bylaws or conduct. ICANN shall cooperate, at Registry Operator’s cost and expense, in all reasonable respects with Registry Operator and its attorneys in the investigation, trial, and defense of such claim and any appeal arising therefrom, and may, at its own cost and expense, participate, through its attorneys or otherwise, in such investigation, trial and defense of such claim and any appeal arising therefrom. No settlement of a claim that involves a remedy affecting ICANN other than the payment of money in an amount that is fully indemnified by Registry Operator will be entered into without the consent of ICANN. If Registry Operator does not assume full control over the defense of a claim subject to such defense in accordance with this Section 7.2, ICANN will have the right to defend the claim in such manner as it may deem appropriate, at the cost and expense of Registry Operator and Registry Operator shall cooperate in such defense. [Note: This Section 7.2 is inapplicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities.]

7.3 Defined Terms. For purposes of this Agreement, unless such definitions are amended pursuant to a Consensus Policy at a future date, in which case the following definitions shall be deemed amended and restated in their entirety as set forth in such Consensus Policy, Security and Stability shall be defined as follows:

(a) For the purposes of this Agreement, an effect on “Security” shall mean (1) the unauthorized disclosure, alteration, insertion or destruction of registry data, or (2) the unauthorized access to or disclosure of information or resources on the Internet by systems operating in accordance with all applicable standards.

(b) For purposes of this Agreement, an effect on “Stability” shall refer to (1) lack of compliance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established and recognized Internet standards body, such as the
relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice Requests for Comments ("RFCs") sponsored by the Internet Engineering Task Force; or (2) the creation of a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems operating in accordance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established and recognized Internet standards body, such as the relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice RFCs, and relying on Registry Operator’s delegated information or provisioning of services.

7.4 **No Offset.** All payments due under this Agreement will be made in a timely manner throughout the Term and notwithstanding the pendency of any dispute (monetary or otherwise) between Registry Operator and ICANN.

7.5 **Change of Control; Assignment and Subcontracting.** Except as set forth in this Section 7.5, neither party may assign any of its rights and obligations under this Agreement without the prior written approval of the other party, which approval will not be unreasonably withheld. For purposes of this Section 7.5, a direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator or any subcontracting arrangement that relates to any Critical Function (as identified in Section 6 of Specification 10) for the TLD (a "Material Subcontracting Arrangement") shall be deemed an assignment.

(a) Registry Operator must provide no less than thirty (30) calendar days advance notice to ICANN of any assignment or Material Subcontracting Arrangement, and any agreement to assign or subcontract any portion of the operations of the TLD (whether or not a Material Subcontracting Arrangement) must mandate compliance with all covenants, obligations and agreements by Registry Operator hereunder, and Registry Operator shall continue to be bound by such covenants, obligations and agreements. Registry Operator must also provide no less than thirty (30) calendar days advance notice to ICANN prior to the consummation of any transaction anticipated to result in a direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator.

(b) Within thirty (30) calendar days of either such notification pursuant to Section 7.5(a), ICANN may request additional information from Registry Operator establishing (i) compliance with this Agreement and (ii) that the party acquiring such control or entering into such assignment or Material Subcontracting Arrangement (in any case, the “Contracting Party”) and the ultimate parent entity of the Contracting Party meets the ICANN-adopted specification or policy on registry operator criteria then in effect (including with respect to financial resources and operational and technical capabilities), in which case Registry Operator must supply the requested information within fifteen (15) calendar days.

(c) Registry Operator agrees that ICANN’s consent to any assignment, change of control or Material Subcontracting Arrangement will also be subject to background checks on any proposed Contracting Party (and such Contracting Party’s Affiliates).
(d) If ICANN fails to expressly provide or withhold its consent to any assignment, direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator or any Material Subcontracting Arrangement within thirty (30) calendar days of ICANN’s receipt of notice of such transaction (or, if ICANN has requested additional information from Registry Operator as set forth above, thirty (30) calendar days of the receipt of all requested written information regarding such transaction) from Registry Operator, ICANN shall be deemed to have consented to such transaction.

(e) In connection with any such assignment, change of control or Material Subcontracting Arrangement, Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Transition Process.

(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing, (i) any consummated change of control shall not be voidable by ICANN; provided, however, that, if ICANN reasonably determines to withhold its consent to such transaction, ICANN may terminate this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(g), (ii) ICANN may assign this Agreement without the consent of Registry Operator upon approval of the ICANN Board of Directors in conjunction with a reorganization, reconstitution or re-incorporation of ICANN upon such assignee’s express assumption of the terms and conditions of this Agreement, (iii) Registry Operator may assign this Agreement without the consent of ICANN directly to an Affiliated Assignee, as that term is defined herein below, upon such Affiliated Assignee’s express written assumption of the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and (iv) ICANN shall be deemed to have consented to any assignment, Material Subcontracting Arrangement or change of control transaction in which the Contracting Party is an existing operator of a generic top-level domain pursuant to a registry agreement between such Contracting Party and ICANN (provided that such Contracting Party is then in compliance with the terms and conditions of such registry agreement in all material respects), unless ICANN provides to Registry Operator a written objection to such transaction within ten (10) calendar days of ICANN’s receipt of notice of such transaction pursuant to this Section 7.5. Notwithstanding Section 7.5(a), in the event an assignment is made pursuant to clauses (ii) or (iii) of this Section 7.5(f), the assigning party will provide the other party with prompt notice following any such assignment. For the purposes of this Section 7.5(f), (A) “Affiliated Assignee” means a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the person or entity specified, and (B) “control” (including the terms “controlled by” and “under common control with”) shall have the same meaning specified in Section 2.9(c) of this Agreement.

7.6 Amendments and Waivers.

(a) If the ICANN Board of Directors determines that an amendment to this Agreement (including to the Specifications referred to herein) and all other registry agreements between ICANN and the Applicable Registry Operators (the “Applicable Registry Agreements”) is desirable (each, a “Special Amendment”), ICANN may adopt a Special Amendment pursuant to the requirements of and process set forth in this Section 7.6; provided that a Special Amendment may not be a Restricted Amendment.
(b) Prior to submitting a Special Amendment for Registry Operator Approval, ICANN shall first consult in good faith with the Working Group regarding the form and substance of such Special Amendment. The duration of such consultation shall be reasonably determined by ICANN based on the substance of the Special Amendment. Following such consultation, ICANN may propose the adoption of a Special Amendment by publicly posting such amendment on its website for no less than thirty (30) calendar days (the “Posting Period”) and providing notice of such proposed amendment to the Applicable Registry Operators in accordance with Section 7.9. ICANN will consider the public comments submitted on a Special Amendment during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators).

(c) If, within one hundred eighty (180) calendar days following the expiration of the Posting Period (the “Approval Period”), the ICANN Board of Directors approves a Special Amendment (which may be in a form different than submitted for public comment, but must address the subject matter of the Special Amendment posted for public comment, as modified to reflect and/or address input from the Working Group and public comments), ICANN shall provide notice of, and submit, such Special Amendment for approval or disapproval by the Applicable Registry Operators. If, during the sixty (60) calendar day period following the date ICANN provides such notice to the Applicable Registry Operators, such Special Amendment receives Registry Operator Approval, such Special Amendment shall be deemed approved (an “Approved Amendment”) by the Applicable Registry Operators, and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement on the date that is sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice of the approval of such Approved Amendment to Registry Operator (the “Amendment Effective Date”). In the event that a Special Amendment does not receive Registry Operator Approval, the Special Amendment shall be deemed not approved by the Applicable Registry Operators (a “Rejected Amendment”). A Rejected Amendment will have no effect on the terms and conditions of this Agreement, except as set forth below.

(d) If the ICANN Board of Directors reasonably determines that a Rejected Amendment falls within the subject matter categories set forth in Section 1.2 of Specification 1, the ICANN Board of Directors may adopt a resolution (the date such resolution is adopted is referred to herein as the “Resolution Adoption Date”) requesting an Issue Report (as such term is defined in ICANN’s Bylaws) by the Generic Names Supporting Organization (the “GNSO”) regarding the substance of such Rejected Amendment. The policy development process undertaken by the GNSO pursuant to such requested Issue Report is referred to herein as a “PDP.” If such PDP results in a Final Report supported by a GNSO Supermajority (as defined in ICANN’s Bylaws) that either (i) recommends adoption of the Rejected Amendment as Consensus Policy or (ii) recommends against adoption of the Rejected Amendment as Consensus Policy, and, in the case of (i) above, the Board adopts such Consensus Policy, Registry Operator shall comply with its obligations pursuant to Section 2.2 of this Agreement. In either case, ICANN will abandon the Rejected Amendment and it will have no effect on the terms and conditions of this Agreement. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Section 7.6(d), the ICANN Board of Directors shall not be required to initiate a PDP with respect to a Rejected Amendment if, at any time in the twelve (12) month period preceding the submission of such Rejected
Amendment for Registry Operator Approval pursuant to Section 7.6(c), the subject matter of such Rejected Amendment was the subject of a concluded or otherwise abandoned or terminated PDP that did not result in a GNSO Supermajority recommendation.

(e) If (a) a Rejected Amendment does not fall within the subject matter categories set forth in Section 1.2 of Specification 1, (b) the subject matter of a Rejected Amendment was, at any time in the twelve (12) month period preceding the submission of such Rejected Amendment for Registry Operator Approval pursuant to Section 7.6(c), the subject of a concluded or otherwise abandoned or terminated PDP that did not result in a GNSO Supermajority recommendation, or (c) a PDP does not result in a Final Report supported by a GNSO Supermajority that either (A) recommends adoption of the Rejected Amendment as Consensus Policy or (B) recommends against adoption of the Rejected Amendment as Consensus Policy (or such PDP has otherwise been abandoned or terminated for any reason), then, in any such case, such Rejected Amendment may still be adopted and become effective in the manner described below. In order for the Rejected Amendment to be adopted, the following requirements must be satisfied:

(i) the subject matter of the Rejected Amendment must be within the scope of ICANN’s mission and consistent with a balanced application of its core values (as described in ICANN’s Bylaws);

(ii) the Rejected Amendment must be justified by a Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest, must be likely to promote such interest, taking into account competing public and private interests that are likely to be affected by the Rejected Amendment, and must be narrowly tailored and no broader than reasonably necessary to address such Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest;

(iii) to the extent the Rejected Amendment prohibits or requires conduct or activities, imposes material costs on the Applicable Registry Operators, and/or materially reduces public access to domain name services, the Rejected Amendment must be the least restrictive means reasonably available to address the Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest;

(iv) the ICANN Board of Directors must submit the Rejected Amendment, along with a written explanation of the reasoning related to its determination that the Rejected Amendment meets the requirements set out in subclauses (i) through (iii) above, for public comment for a period of no less than thirty (30) calendar days; and

(v) following such public comment period, the ICANN Board of Directors must (a) engage in consultation (or direct ICANN management to engage in consultation) with the Working Group, subject matter experts, members of the GNSO, relevant advisory committees and other interested stakeholders with respect to such Rejected Amendment for a period of no
less than sixty (60) calendar days; and (b) following such consultation, reapprove the Rejected Amendment (which may be in a form different than submitted for Registry Operator Approval, but must address the subject matter of the Rejected Amendment, as modified to reflect and/or address input from the Working Group and public comments) by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the ICANN Board of Directors eligible to vote on such matter, taking into account any ICANN policy affecting such eligibility, including ICANN’s Conflict of Interest Policy (a “Board Amendment”).

Such Board Amendment shall, subject to Section 7.6(f), be deemed an Approved Amendment, and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement on the date that is sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice of the approval of such Board Amendment to Registry Operator (which effective date shall be deemed the Amendment Effective Date hereunder). Notwithstanding the foregoing, a Board Amendment may not amend the registry fees charged by ICANN hereunder, or amend this Section 7.6.

(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 7.6(e), a Board Amendment shall not be deemed an Approved Amendment if, during the thirty (30) calendar day period following the approval by the ICANN Board of Directors of the Board Amendment, the Working Group, on the behalf of the Applicable Registry Operators, submits to the ICANN Board of Directors an alternative to the Board Amendment (an “Alternative Amendment”) that meets the following requirements:

(i) sets forth the precise text proposed by the Working Group to amend this Agreement in lieu of the Board Amendment;

(ii) addresses the Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest identified by the ICANN Board of Directors as the justification for the Board Amendment; and

(iii) compared to the Board Amendment is: (a) more narrowly tailored to address such Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest, and (b) to the extent the Alternative Amendment prohibits or requires conduct or activities, imposes material costs on Affected Registry Operators, or materially reduces access to domain name services, is a less restrictive means to address the Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest.

Any proposed amendment that does not meet the requirements of subclauses (i) through (iii) in the immediately preceding sentence shall not be considered an Alternative Amendment hereunder and therefore shall not supersede or delay the effectiveness of the Board Amendment. If, following the submission of the Alternative Amendment to the ICANN Board of Directors, the Alternative Amendment receives Registry Operator Approval, the Alternative Amendment shall supersede the Board Amendment and shall be
deemed an Approved Amendment hereunder (and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement on the date that is sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice of the approval of such Alternative Amendment to Registry Operator, which effective date shall deemed the Amendment Effective Date hereunder), unless, within a period of sixty (60) calendar days following the date that the Working Group notifies the ICANN Board of Directors of Registry Operator Approval of such Alternative Amendment (during which time ICANN shall engage with the Working Group with respect to the Alternative Amendment), the ICANN Board of Directors by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the ICANN Board of Directors eligible to vote on such matter, taking into account any ICANN policy affecting such eligibility, including ICANN’s Conflict of Interest Policy, rejects the Alternative Amendment. If (A) the Alternative Amendment does not receive Registry Operator Approval within thirty (30) calendar days of submission of such Alternative Amendment to the Applicable Registry Operators (and the Working Group shall notify ICANN of the date of such submission), or (B) the ICANN Board of Directors rejects the Alternative Amendment by such two-thirds vote, the Board Amendment (and not the Alternative Amendment) shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement on the date that is sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice to Registry Operator (which effective date shall deemed the Amendment Effective Date hereunder). If the ICANN Board of Directors rejects an Alternative Amendment, the board shall publish a written rationale setting forth its analysis of the criteria set forth in Sections 7.6(f)(i) through 7.6(f)(iii). The ability of the ICANN Board of Directors to reject an Alternative Amendment hereunder does not relieve the Board of the obligation to ensure that any Board Amendment meets the criteria set forth in Section 7.6(e)(i) through 7.6(e)(v).

(g) In the event that Registry Operator believes an Approved Amendment does not meet the substantive requirements set out in this Section 7.6 or has been adopted in contravention of any of the procedural provisions of this Section 7.6, Registry Operator may challenge the adoption of such Special Amendment pursuant to the dispute resolution provisions set forth in Article 5, except that such arbitration shall be conducted by a three-person arbitration panel. Any such challenge must be brought within sixty (60) calendar days following the date ICANN provided notice to Registry Operator of the Approved Amendment, and ICANN may consolidate all challenges brought by registry operators (including Registry Operator) into a single proceeding. The Approved Amendment will be deemed not to have amended this Agreement during the pendency of the dispute resolution process.

(h) Registry Operator may apply in writing to ICANN for an exemption from the Approved Amendment (each such request submitted by Registry Operator hereunder, an "Exemption Request") during the thirty (30) calendar day period following the date ICANN provided notice to Registry Operator of such Approved Amendment. Each Exemption Request will set forth the basis for such request and provide detailed support for an exemption from the Approved Amendment. An Exemption Request may also include a detailed description and support for any alternatives to, or a variation of, the Approved Amendment proposed by such Registry Operator. An Exemption Request may only be granted upon a clear and convincing showing by Registry Operator that compliance with
the Approved Amendment conflicts with applicable laws or would have a material adverse effect on the long-term financial condition or results of operations of Registry Operator. No Exemption Request will be granted if ICANN determines, in its reasonable discretion, that granting such Exemption Request would be materially harmful to registrants or result in the denial of a direct benefit to registrants. Within ninety (90) calendar days of ICANN’s receipt of an Exemption Request, ICANN shall either approve (which approval may be conditioned or consist of alternatives to or a variation of the Approved Amendment) or deny the Exemption Request in writing, during which time the Approved Amendment will not amend this Agreement. If the Exemption Request is approved by ICANN, the Approved Amendment will not amend this Agreement; provided, that any conditions, alternatives or variations of the Approved Amendment required by ICANN shall be effective and, to the extent applicable, will amend this Agreement as of the Amendment Effective Date. If such Exemption Request is denied by ICANN, the Approved Amendment will amend this Agreement as of the Amendment Effective Date (or, if such date has passed, such Approved Amendment shall be deemed effective immediately on the date of such denial), provided that Registry Operator may, within thirty (30) calendar days following receipt of ICANN’s determination, appeal ICANN’s decision to deny the Exemption Request pursuant to the dispute resolution procedures set forth in Article 5. The Approved Amendment will be deemed not to have amended this Agreement during the pendency of the dispute resolution process. For avoidance of doubt, only Exemption Requests submitted by Registry Operator that are approved by ICANN pursuant to this Section 7.6(j), agreed to by ICANN following mediation pursuant to Section 5.1 or through an arbitration decision pursuant to Section 5.2 shall exempt Registry Operator from any Approved Amendment, and no Exemption Request granted to any other Applicable Registry Operator (whether by ICANN or through arbitration) shall have any effect under this Agreement or exempt Registry Operator from any Approved Amendment.

(i) Except as set forth in this Section 7.6, Section 7.7 and as otherwise set forth in this Agreement and the Specifications hereto, no amendment, supplement or modification of this Agreement or any provision hereof shall be binding unless executed in writing by both parties, and nothing in this Section 7.6 or Section 7.7 shall restrict ICANN and Registry Operator from entering into bilateral amendments and modifications to this Agreement negotiated solely between the two parties. No waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be binding unless evidenced by a writing signed by the party waiving compliance with such provision. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Agreement or failure to enforce any of the provisions hereof shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any other provision hereof, nor shall any such waiver constitute a continuing waiver unless otherwise expressly provided. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this Sections 7.6 or 7.7 shall be deemed to limit Registry Operator’s obligation to comply with Section 2.2.

(j) For purposes of this Section 7.6, the following terms shall have the following meanings:
(i) “Applicable Registry Operators” means, collectively, the registry operators of top-level domains party to a registry agreement that contains a provision similar to this Section 7.6, including Registry Operator.

(ii) “Registry Operator Approval” means the receipt of each of the following: (A) the affirmative approval of the Applicable Registry Operators whose payments to ICANN accounted for two-thirds of the total amount of fees (converted to U.S. dollars, if applicable, at the prevailing exchange rate published the prior day in the U.S. Edition of the Wall Street Journal for the date such calculation is made by ICANN) paid to ICANN by all the Applicable Registry Operators during the immediately previous calendar year pursuant to the Applicable Registry Agreements, and (B) the affirmative approval of a majority of the Applicable Registry Operators at the time such approval is obtained. For the avoidance of doubt, with respect to clause (B), each Applicable Registry Operator shall have one vote for each top-level domain operated by such Registry Operator pursuant to an Applicable Registry Agreement.

(iii) “Restricted Amendment” means the following: (A) an amendment of Specification 1, (B) except to the extent addressed in Section 2.10 hereof, an amendment that specifies the price charged by Registry Operator to registrars for domain name registrations, (C) an amendment to the definition of Registry Services as set forth in the first paragraph of Section 2.1 of Specification 6, or (D) an amendment to the length of the Term.

(iv) “Substantial and Compelling Reason in the Public Interest” means a reason that is justified by an important, specific, and articulated public interest goal that is within ICANN’s mission and consistent with a balanced application of ICANN’s core values as defined in ICANN’s Bylaws.

(v) “Working Group” means representatives of the Applicable Registry Operators and other members of the community that the Registry Stakeholders Group appoints, from time to time, to serve as a working group to consult on amendments to the Applicable Registry Agreements (excluding bilateral amendments pursuant to Section 7.6(i)).

(k) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 7.6 to the contrary, (i) if Registry Operator provides evidence to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that the Approved Amendment would materially increase the cost of providing Registry Services, then ICANN will allow up to one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days for Approved Amendment to become effective with respect to Registry Operator, and (ii) no Approved Amendment adopted pursuant to Section 7.6 shall become effective with respect to Registry Operator if Registry Operator provides ICANN with an irrevocable notice of termination pursuant to Section 4.4(b).
7.7 Negotiation Process.

(a) If either the Chief Executive Officer of ICANN ("CEO") or the Chairperson of the Registry Stakeholder Group ("Chair") desires to discuss any revision(s) to this Agreement, the CEO or Chair, as applicable, shall provide written notice to the other person, which shall set forth in reasonable detail the proposed revisions to this Agreement (a "Negotiation Notice"). Notwithstanding the foregoing, neither the CEO nor the Chair may (i) propose revisions to this Agreement that modify any Consensus Policy then existing, (ii) propose revisions to this Agreement pursuant to this Section 7.7 on or before June 30, 2014, or (iii) propose revisions or submit a Negotiation Notice more than once during any twelve (12) month period beginning on July 1, 2014.

(b) Following receipt of the Negotiation Notice by either the CEO or the Chair, ICANN and the Working Group (as defined in Section 7.6) shall consult in good faith negotiations regarding the form and substance of the proposed revisions to this Agreement, which shall be in the form of a proposed amendment to this Agreement (the "Proposed Revisions"), for a period of at least ninety (90) calendar days (unless a resolution is earlier reached) and attempt to reach a mutually acceptable agreement relating to the Proposed Revisions (the "Discussion Period").

(c) If, following the conclusion of the Discussion Period, an agreement is reached on the Proposed Revisions, ICANN shall post the mutually agreed Proposed Revisions on its website for public comment for no less than thirty (30) calendar days (the "Posting Period") and provide notice of such revisions to all Applicable Registry Operators in accordance with Section 7.9. ICANN and the Working Group will consider the public comments submitted on the Proposed Revisions during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators). Following the conclusion of the Posting Period, the Proposed Revisions shall be submitted for Registry Operator Approval (as defined in Section 7.6) and approval by the ICANN Board of Directors. If such approvals are obtained, the Proposed Revisions shall be deemed an Approved Amendment (as defined in Section 7.6) by the Applicable Registry Operators and ICANN, and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement upon sixty (60) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator.

(d) If, following the conclusion of the Discussion Period, an agreement is not reached between ICANN and the Working Group on the Proposed Revisions, either the CEO or the Chair may provide the other person written notice (the "Mediation Notice") requiring each party to attempt to resolve the disagreements related to the Proposed Revisions through impartial, facilitative (non-evaluative) mediation in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth below. In the event that a Mediation Notice is provided, ICANN and the Working Group shall, within fifteen (15) calendar days thereof, simultaneously post the text of their desired version of the Proposed Revisions and a position paper with respect thereto on ICANN’s website.

(i) The mediation shall be conducted by a single mediator selected by the parties. If the parties cannot agree on a mediator within fifteen (15)
calendar days following receipt by the CEO or Chair, as applicable, of the Mediation Notice, the parties will promptly select a mutually acceptable mediation provider entity, which entity shall, as soon as practicable following such entity’s selection, designate a mediator, who is a licensed attorney with general knowledge of contract law, who has no ongoing business relationship with either party and, to the extent necessary to mediate the particular dispute, general knowledge of the domain name system. Any mediator must confirm in writing that he or she is not, and will not become during the term of the mediation, an employee, partner, executive officer, director, or security holder of ICANN or an Applicable Registry Operator. If such confirmation is not provided by the appointed mediator, then a replacement mediator shall be appointed pursuant to this Section 7.7 (d)(i).

(ii) The mediator shall conduct the mediation in accordance with the rules and procedures for facilitative mediation that he or she determines following consultation with the parties. The parties shall discuss the dispute in good faith and attempt, with the mediator’s assistance, to reach an amicable resolution of the dispute.

(iii) Each party shall bear its own costs in the mediation. The parties shall share equally the fees and expenses of the mediator.

(iv) If an agreement is reached during the mediation, ICANN shall post the mutually agreed Proposed Revisions on its website for the Posting Period and provide notice to all Applicable Registry Operators in accordance with Section 7.9. ICANN and the Working Group will consider the public comments submitted on the agreed Proposed Revisions during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators). Following the conclusion of the Posting Period, the Proposed Revisions shall be submitted for Registry Operator Approval and approval by the ICANN Board of Directors. If such approvals are obtained, the Proposed Revisions shall be deemed an Approved Amendment (as defined in Section 7.6) by the Applicable Registry Operators and ICANN, and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement upon sixty (60) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator.

(v) If the parties have not resolved the dispute for any reason by the date that is ninety (90) calendar days following receipt by the CEO or Chair, as applicable, of the Mediation Notice, the mediation shall automatically terminate (unless extended by agreement of the parties). The mediator shall deliver to the parties a definition of the issues that could be considered in future arbitration, if invoked. Those issues are subject to the limitations set forth in Section 7.7(e)(ii) below.

(e) If, following mediation, ICANN and the Working Group have not reached an agreement on the Proposed Revisions, either the CEO or the Chair may provide
the other person written notice (an “Arbitration Notice”) requiring ICANN and the Applicable Registry Operators to resolve the dispute through binding arbitration in accordance with the arbitration provisions of Section 5.2, subject to the requirements and limitations of this Section 7.7(e).

(i) If an Arbitration Notice is sent, the mediator’s definition of issues, along with the Proposed Revisions (be those from ICANN, the Working Group or both) shall be posted for public comment on ICANN’s website for a period of no less than thirty (30) calendar days. ICANN and the Working Group will consider the public comments submitted on the Proposed Revisions during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators), and information regarding such comments and consideration shall be provided to a three (3) person arbitrator panel. Each party may modify its Proposed Revisions before and after the Posting Period. The arbitration proceeding may not commence prior to the closing of such public comment period, and ICANN may consolidate all challenges brought by registry operators (including Registry Operator) into a single proceeding. Except as set forth in this Section 7.7, the arbitration shall be conducted pursuant to Section 5.2.

(ii) No dispute regarding the Proposed Revisions may be submitted for arbitration to the extent the subject matter of the Proposed Revisions (i) relates to Consensus Policy, (ii) falls within the subject matter categories set forth in Section 1.2 of Specification 1, or (iii) seeks to amend any of the following provisions or Specifications of this Agreement: Articles 1, 3 and 6; Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10, 2.16, 2.17, 2.19, 4.1, 4.2, 7.3, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11, 7.12, 7.13, 7.14, 7.16; Section 2.8 and Specification 7 (but only to the extent such Proposed Revisions seek to implement an RPM not contemplated by Sections 2.8 and Specification 7); Exhibit A; and Specifications 1, 4, 6, 10 and 11.

(iii) The mediator will brief the arbitrator panel regarding ICANN and the Working Group’s respective proposals relating to the Proposed Revisions.

(iv) No amendment to this Agreement relating to the Proposed Revisions may be submitted for arbitration by either the Working Group or ICANN, unless, in the case of the Working Group, the proposed amendment has received Registry Operator Approval and, in the case of ICANN, the proposed amendment has been approved by the ICANN Board of Directors.

(v) In order for the arbitrator panel to approve either ICANN or the Working Group’s proposed amendment relating to the Proposed Revisions, the arbitrator panel must conclude that such proposed amendment is consistent with a balanced application of ICANN’s core values (as described in ICANN’s Bylaws) and reasonable in light of the balancing of
the costs and benefits to the business interests of the Applicable Registry Operators and ICANN (as applicable), and the public benefit sought to be achieved by the Proposed Revisions as set forth in such amendment. If the arbitrator panel concludes that either ICANN or the Working Group’s proposed amendment relating to the Proposed Revisions meets the foregoing standard, such amendment shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement upon sixty (60) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator and deemed an Approved Amendment hereunder.

(f) With respect to an Approved Amendment relating to an amendment proposed by ICANN, Registry may apply in writing to ICANN for an exemption from such amendment pursuant to the provisions of Section 7.6.

(g) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 7.7 to the contrary, (a) if Registry Operator provides evidence to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that the Approved Amendment would materially increase the cost of providing Registry Services, then ICANN will allow up to one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days for the Approved Amendment to become effective with respect to Registry Operator, and (b) no Approved Amendment adopted pursuant to Section 7.7 shall become effective with respect to Registry Operator if Registry Operator provides ICANN with an irrevocable notice of termination pursuant to Section 4.4(b).

7.8 No Third-Party Beneficiaries. This Agreement will not be construed to create any obligation by either ICANN or Registry Operator to any non-party to this Agreement, including any registrar or registered name holder.

7.9 General Notices. Except for notices pursuant to Sections 7.6 and 7.7, all notices to be given under or in relation to this Agreement will be given either (i) in writing at the address of the appropriate party as set forth below or (ii) via facsimile or electronic mail as provided below, unless that party has given a notice of change of postal or email address, or facsimile number, as provided in this Agreement. All notices under Sections 7.6 and 7.7 shall be given by both posting of the applicable information on ICANN’s web site and transmission of such information to Registry Operator by electronic mail. Any change in the contact information for notice below will be given by the party within thirty (30) calendar days of such change. Other than notices under Sections 7.6 or 7.7, any notice required by this Agreement will be deemed to have been properly given (i) if in paper form, when delivered in person or via courier service with confirmation of receipt or (ii) if via facsimile or by electronic mail, upon confirmation of receipt by the recipient’s facsimile machine or email server, provided that such notice via facsimile or electronic mail shall be followed by a copy sent by regular postal mail service within three (3) calendar days. Any notice required by Sections 7.6 or 7.7 will be deemed to have been given when electronically posted on ICANN’s website and upon confirmation of receipt by the email server. In the event other means of notice become practically achievable, such as notice via a secure website, the parties will work together to implement such notice means under this Agreement.
7.10 Entire Agreement. This Agreement (including those specifications and documents incorporated by reference to URL locations which form a part of it) constitutes the entire agreement of the parties hereto pertaining to the operation of the TLD and supersedes all prior agreements, understandings, negotiations and discussions, whether oral or written, between the parties on that subject.

7.11 English Language Controls. Notwithstanding any translated version of this Agreement and/or specifications that may be provided to Registry Operator, the English language version of this Agreement and all referenced specifications are the official versions that bind the parties hereto. In the event of any conflict or discrepancy between any translated version of this Agreement and the English language version, the English language version controls. Notices, designations, determinations, and specifications made under this Agreement shall be in the English language.

7.12 Ownership Rights. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed as (a) establishing or granting to Registry Operator any property ownership rights or interests of Registry Operator in the TLD or the letters, words, symbols or other characters making up the TLD string, or (b) affecting any existing intellectual property or ownership rights of Registry Operator.

7.13 Severability; Conflicts with Laws. This Agreement shall be deemed severable; the invalidity or unenforceability of any term or provision of this Agreement shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the balance of this Agreement or of any other term hereof, which shall remain in full force and effect. If any of the provisions hereof are determined to be invalid or unenforceable, the parties shall negotiate in good
faith to modify this Agreement so as to effect the original intent of the parties as closely as possible. ICANN and the Working Group will mutually cooperate to develop an ICANN procedure for ICANN’s review and consideration of alleged conflicts between applicable laws and non-WHOIS related provisions of this Agreement. Until such procedure is developed and implemented by ICANN, ICANN will review and consider alleged conflicts between applicable laws and non-WHOIS related provisions of this Agreement in a manner similar to ICANN’s Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law.

7.14 Court Orders. ICANN will respect any order from a court of competent jurisdiction, including any orders from any jurisdiction where the consent or non-objection of the government was a requirement for the delegation of the TLD. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, ICANN’s implementation of any such order will not be a breach of this Agreement.

7.15 Confidentiality

(a) Subject to Section 7.15(c), during the Term and for a period of three (3) years thereafter, each party shall, and shall cause its and its Affiliates’ officers, directors, employees and agents to, keep confidential and not publish or otherwise disclose to any third party, directly or indirectly, any information that is, and the disclosing party has marked as, or has otherwise designated in writing to the receiving party as, “confidential trade secret,” “confidential commercial information” or “confidential financial information” (collectively, “Confidential Information”), except to the extent such disclosure is permitted by the terms of this Agreement.

(b) The confidentiality obligations under Section 7.15(a) shall not apply to any Confidential Information that (i) is or hereafter becomes part of the public domain by public use, publication, general knowledge or the like through no fault of the receiving party in breach of this Agreement, (ii) can be demonstrated by documentation or other competent proof to have been in the receiving party’s possession prior to disclosure by the disclosing party without any obligation of confidentiality with respect to such information, (iii) is subsequently received by the receiving party from a third party who is not bound by any obligation of confidentiality with respect to such information, (iv) has been published by a third party or otherwise enters the public domain through no fault of the receiving party, or (v) can be demonstrated by documentation or other competent evidence to have been independently developed by or for the receiving party without reference to the disclosing party’s Confidential Information.

(c) Each party shall have the right to disclose Confidential Information to the extent that such disclosure is (i) made in response to a valid order of a court of competent jurisdiction or, if in the reasonable opinion of the receiving party’s legal counsel, such disclosure is otherwise required by applicable law; provided, however, that the receiving party shall first have given notice to the disclosing party and given the disclosing party a reasonable opportunity to quash such order or to obtain a protective order or confidential treatment order requiring that the Confidential Information that is the subject of such order or other applicable law be held in confidence by such court or other third
party recipient, unless the receiving party is not permitted to provide such notice under such order or applicable law, or (ii) made by the receiving party or any of its Affiliates to its or their attorneys, auditors, advisors, consultants, contractors or other third parties for use by such person or entity as may be necessary or useful in connection with the performance of the activities under this Agreement, provided that such third party is bound by confidentiality obligations at least as stringent as those set forth herein, either by written agreement or through professional responsibility standards.

[Note: The following section is applicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities only.]

7.16 Special Provision Relating to Intergovernmental Organizations or Governmental Entities.

(a) ICANN acknowledges that Registry Operator is an entity subject to public international law, including international treaties applicable to Registry Operator (such public international law and treaties, collectively hereinafter the “Applicable Laws”). Nothing in this Agreement and its related specifications shall be construed or interpreted to require Registry Operator to violate Applicable Laws or prevent compliance therewith. The Parties agree that Registry Operator’s compliance with Applicable Laws shall not constitute a breach of this Agreement.

(b) In the event Registry Operator reasonably determines that any provision of this Agreement and its related specifications, or any decisions or policies of ICANN referred to in this Agreement, including but not limited to Temporary Policies and Consensus Policies (such provisions, specifications and policies, collectively hereinafter, “ICANN Requirements”), may conflict with or violate Applicable Law (hereinafter, a “Potential Conflict”), Registry Operator shall provide detailed notice (a “Notice”) of such Potential Conflict to ICANN as early as possible and, in the case of a Potential Conflict with a proposed Consensus Policy, no later than the end of any public comment period on such proposed Consensus Policy. In the event Registry Operator determines that there is Potential Conflict between a proposed Applicable Law and any ICANN Requirement, Registry Operator shall provide detailed Notice of such Potential Conflict to ICANN as early as possible and, in the case of a Potential Conflict with a proposed Consensus Policy, no later than the end of any public comment period on such proposed Consensus Policy.

(c) As soon as practicable following such review, the parties shall attempt to resolve the Potential Conflict by mediation pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 5.1. In addition, Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to eliminate or minimize any impact arising from such Potential Conflict between Applicable Laws and any ICANN Requirement. If, following such mediation, Registry Operator determines that the Potential Conflict constitutes an actual conflict between any ICANN Requirement, on the one hand, and Applicable Laws, on the other hand, then ICANN shall waive compliance with such ICANN Requirement (provided that the parties shall negotiate in good faith on a continuous basis thereafter to mitigate or eliminate the effects of such noncompliance on ICANN), unless ICANN reasonably and objectively determines that the failure of Registry
Operator to comply with such ICANN Requirement would constitute a threat to the Security and Stability of Registry Services, the Internet or the DNS (hereinafter, an “ICANN Determination”). Following receipt of notice by Registry Operator of such ICANN Determination, Registry Operator shall be afforded a period of ninety (90) calendar days to resolve such conflict with an Applicable Law. If the conflict with an Applicable Law is not resolved to ICANN’s complete satisfaction during such period, Registry Operator shall have the option to submit, within ten (10) calendar days thereafter, the matter to binding arbitration as defined in subsection (d) below. If during such period, Registry Operator does not submit the matter to arbitration pursuant to subsection (d) below, ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement with immediate effect.

(d) If Registry Operator disagrees with an ICANN Determination, Registry Operator may submit the matter to binding arbitration pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.2, except that the sole issue presented to the arbitrator for determination will be whether or not ICANN reasonably and objectively reached the ICANN Determination. For the purposes of such arbitration, ICANN shall present evidence to the arbitrator supporting the ICANN Determination. If the arbitrator determines that ICANN did not reasonably and objectively reach the ICANN Determination, then ICANN shall waive Registry Operator’s compliance with the subject ICANN Requirement. If the arbitrators or pre-arbitral referee, as applicable, determine that ICANN did reasonably and objectively reach the ICANN Determination, then, upon notice to Registry Operator, ICANN may terminate this Agreement with immediate effect.

(e) Registry Operator hereby represents and warrants that, to the best of its knowledge as of the date of execution of this Agreement, no existing ICANN Requirement conflicts with or violates any Applicable Law.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Section 7.16, following an ICANN Determination and prior to a finding by an arbitrator pursuant to Section 7.16(d) above, ICANN may, subject to prior consultations with Registry Operator, take such reasonable technical measures as it deems necessary to ensure the Security and Stability of Registry Services, the Internet and the DNS. These reasonable technical measures shall be taken by ICANN on an interim basis, until the earlier of the date of conclusion of the arbitration procedure referred to in Section 7.16(d) above or the date of complete resolution of the conflict with an Applicable Law. In case Registry Operator disagrees with such technical measures taken by ICANN, Registry Operator may submit the matter to binding arbitration pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.2 above, during which process ICANN may continue to take such technical measures. In the event that ICANN takes such measures, Registry Operator shall pay all costs incurred by ICANN as a result of taking such measures. In addition, in the event that ICANN takes such measures, ICANN shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable.

* * * * *
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized representatives.

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS

By: ____________________________
   [__________]
   President and CEO
   Date:

[Registry Operator]

By: ____________________________
   [__________]
   [__________]
   Date:
EXHIBIT A

Approved Services

The ICANN gTLD Applicant Guidebook (located at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb) and the RSEP specify processes for consideration of proposed registry services. Registry Operator may provide any service that is required by the terms of this Agreement. In addition, the following services (if any) are specifically identified as having been approved by ICANN prior to the effective date of the Agreement, and Registry Operator may provide such services:

1. DNS Service – TLD Zone Contents

Notwithstanding anything else in this Agreement, as indicated in section 2.2.3.3 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, permissible contents for the TLD’s DNS service are:

1.1. For the "Internet" (IN) Class:

   1.1.1. Apex SOA record
   1.1.2. Apex NS records and in-bailiwick glue for the TLD’s DNS servers
   1.1.3. NS records and in-bailiwick glue for DNS servers of registered names in the TLD
   1.1.4. DS records for registered names in the TLD
   1.1.5. Records associated with signing the TLD zone (e.g., RRSIG, DNSKEY, NSEC, NSEC3PARAM and NSEC3)
   1.1.6. Apex TXT record for zone versioning purposes
   1.1.7. Apex TYPE65534 record for automatic dnssec signing signaling

1.2. For the “Chaos” (CH) Class:

   1.2.1. TXT records for server version/identification (e.g., TXT records for “version.bind.”, “id.server.”, “authors.bind” and/or “hostname.bind.”)

(Note: The above language effectively does not allow, among other things, the inclusion of DNS resource records that would enable a dotless domain name (e.g., apex A, AAAA, MX records) in the TLD zone.)

If Registry Operator wishes to place any DNS resource record type or class into its TLD DNS service (other than those listed in Sections 1.1 or 1.2 above), it must describe in detail its proposal and submit a Registry Services Evaluation Process (RSEP) request. This will be
evaluated per RSEP to determine whether the service would create a risk of a meaningful adverse impact on security or stability of the DNS. Registry Operator recognizes and acknowledges that a service based on the use of less-common DNS resource records and/or classes in the TLD zone, even if approved, might not work as intended for all users due to lack of software support.
1. **Consensus Policies.**

1.1. “**Consensus Policies**” are those policies established (1) pursuant to the procedure set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws and due process, and (2) covering those topics listed in Section 1.2 of this Specification. The Consensus Policy development process and procedure set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws may be revised from time to time in accordance with the process set forth therein.

1.2. Consensus Policies and the procedures by which they are developed shall be designed to produce, to the extent possible, a consensus of Internet stakeholders, including the operators of gTLDs. Consensus Policies shall relate to one or more of the following:

1.2.1 issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or Domain Name System (“DNS”);

1.2.2 functional and performance specifications for the provision of Registry Services;

1.2.3 Security and Stability of the registry database for the TLD;

1.2.4 registry policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to registry operations or registrars;

1.2.5 resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names); or

1.2.6 restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or registrar resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or registrar reseller are affiliated.

1.3. Such categories of issues referred to in Section 1.2 of this Specification shall include, without limitation:

1.3.1 principles for allocation of registered names in the TLD (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);

1.3.2 prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;
1.3.3 reservation of registered names in the TLD that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS or the Internet (e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration); and

1.3.4 maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning domain name registrations; and procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility for serving registered domain names in a TLD affected by such a suspension or termination.

1.4. In addition to the other limitations on Consensus Policies, they shall not:

1.4.1 prescribe or limit the price of Registry Services;

1.4.2 modify the terms or conditions for the renewal or termination of the Registry Agreement;

1.4.3 modify the limitations on Temporary Policies (defined below) or Consensus Policies;

1.4.4 modify the provisions in the registry agreement regarding fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN; or

1.4.5 modify ICANN’s obligations to ensure equitable treatment of registry operators and act in an open and transparent manner.

2. **Temporary Policies.** Registry Operator shall comply with and implement all specifications or policies established by the Board on a temporary basis, if adopted by the Board by a vote of at least two-thirds of its members, so long as the Board reasonably determines that such modifications or amendments are justified and that immediate temporary establishment of a specification or policy on the subject is necessary to maintain the stability or security of Registry Services or the DNS (“Temporary Policies”).

2.1. Such proposed specification or policy shall be as narrowly tailored as feasible to achieve those objectives. In establishing any Temporary Policy, the Board shall state the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted and shall immediately implement the Consensus Policy development process set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws.

2.1.1 ICANN shall also issue an advisory statement containing a detailed explanation of its reasons for adopting the Temporary Policy and why
the Board believes such Temporary Policy should receive the consensus support of Internet stakeholders.

2.1.2 If the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted exceeds ninety (90) calendar days, the Board shall reaffirm its temporary adoption every ninety (90) calendar days for a total period not to exceed one (1) year, in order to maintain such Temporary Policy in effect until such time as it becomes a Consensus Policy. If the one (1) year period expires or, if during such one (1) year period, the Temporary Policy does not become a Consensus Policy and is not reaffirmed by the Board, Registry Operator shall no longer be required to comply with or implement such Temporary Policy.

3. **Notice and Conflicts.** Registry Operator shall be afforded a reasonable period of time following notice of the establishment of a Consensus Policy or Temporary Policy in which to comply with such policy or specification, taking into account any urgency involved. In the event of a conflict between Registry Services and Consensus Policies or any Temporary Policy, the Consensus Policies or Temporary Policy shall control, but only with respect to subject matter in conflict.
REGISTRY OPERATOR will engage an independent entity to act as data escrow agent ("Escrow Agent") for the provision of data escrow services related to the Registry Agreement. The following Technical Specifications set forth in Part A, and Legal Requirements set forth in Part B, will be included in any data escrow agreement between Registry Operator and the Escrow Agent, under which ICANN must be named a third-party beneficiary. In addition to the following requirements, the data escrow agreement may contain other provisions that are not contradictory or intended to subvert the required terms provided below.

PART A – TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

1. **Deposits.** There will be two types of Deposits: Full and Differential. For both types, the universe of Registry objects to be considered for data escrow are those objects necessary in order to offer all of the approved Registry Services.

   1.1. "Full Deposit" will consist of data that reflects the state of the registry as of 00:00:00 UTC (Coordinated Universal Time) on the day that such Full Deposit is submitted to Escrow Agent.

   1.2. "Differential Deposit" means data that reflects all transactions that were not reflected in the last previous Full or Differential Deposit, as the case may be. Each Differential Deposit will contain all database transactions since the previous Deposit was completed as of 00:00:00 UTC of each day, but Sunday. Differential Deposits must include complete Escrow Records as specified below that were not included or changed since the most recent full or Differential Deposit (i.e., all additions, modifications or removals of data).

2. **Schedule for Deposits.** Registry Operator will submit a set of escrow files on a daily basis as follows:

   2.1. Each Sunday, a Full Deposit must be submitted to the Escrow Agent by 23:59 UTC.

   2.2. The other six (6) days of the week, a Full Deposit or the corresponding Differential Deposit must be submitted to Escrow Agent by 23:59 UTC.

3. **Escrow Format Specification.**

   3.1. **Deposit’s Format.** Registry objects, such as domains, contacts, name servers, registrars, etc. will be compiled into a file constructed as described in draft-arias-noguchi-registry-data-escrow, see Part A, Section 9, reference 1 of this Specification and draft-arias-noguchi-dnrd-objects-mapping, see Part A, Section 9, reference 2 of this Specification (collectively, the "DNDE Specification"). The DNDE Specification describes some elements as
optional; Registry Operator will include those elements in the Deposits if they are available. If not already an RFC, Registry Operator will use the most recent draft version of the DNDE Specification available at the Effective Date. Registry Operator may at its election use newer versions of the DNDE Specification after the Effective Date. Once the DNDE Specification is published as an RFC, Registry Operator will implement that version of the DNDE Specification, no later than one hundred eighty (180) calendar days after. UTF-8 character encoding will be used.

3.2. **Extensions.** If a Registry Operator offers additional Registry Services that require submission of additional data, not included above, additional “extension schemas” shall be defined in a case by case basis to represent that data. These “extension schemas” will be specified as described in Part A, Section 9, reference 2 of this Specification. Data related to the “extension schemas” will be included in the deposit file described in Part A, Section 3.1 of this Specification. ICANN and the respective Registry Operator shall work together to agree on such new objects’ data escrow specifications.

4. **Processing of Deposit files.** The use of compression is recommended in order to reduce electronic data transfer times, and storage capacity requirements. Data encryption will be used to ensure the privacy of registry escrow data. Files processed for compression and encryption will be in the binary OpenPGP format as per OpenPGP Message Format - RFC 4880, see Part A, Section 9, reference 3 of this Specification. Acceptable algorithms for Public-key cryptography, Symmetric-key cryptography, Hash and Compression are those enumerated in RFC 4880, not marked as deprecated in OpenPGP IANA Registry, see Part A, Section 9, reference 4 of this Specification, that are also royalty-free. The process to follow for the data file in original text format is:

1. The XML file of the deposit as described in Part A, Section 9, reference 1 of this Specification must be named as the containing file as specified in Section 5 but with the extension xml.

2. The data file(s) are aggregated in a tarball file named the same as (1) but with extension tar.

3. A compressed and encrypted OpenPGP Message is created using the tarball file as sole input. The suggested algorithm for compression is ZIP as per RFC 4880. The compressed data will be encrypted using the escrow agent’s public key. The suggested algorithms for Public-key encryption are Elgamal and RSA as per RFC 4880. The suggested algorithms for Symmetric-key encryption are TripleDES, AES128 and CAST5 as per RFC 4880.

4. The file may be split as necessary if, once compressed and encrypted, it is larger than the file size limit agreed with the escrow agent. Every part of a
split file, or the whole file if not split, will be called a processed file in this section.

(5) A digital signature file will be generated for every processed file using the Registry Operator’s private key. The digital signature file will be in binary OpenPGP format as per RFC 4880 Section 9, reference 3, and will not be compressed or encrypted. The suggested algorithms for Digital signatures are DSA and RSA as per RFC 4880. The suggested algorithm for Hashes in Digital signatures is SHA256.

(6) The processed files and digital signature files will then be transferred to the Escrow Agent through secure electronic mechanisms, such as, SFTP, SCP, HTTPS file upload, etc. as agreed between the Escrow Agent and the Registry Operator. Non-electronic delivery through a physical medium such as CD-ROMs, DVD-ROMs, or USB storage devices may be used if authorized by ICANN.

(7) The Escrow Agent will then validate every (processed) transferred data file using the procedure described in Part A, Section 8 of this Specification.

5. **File Naming Conventions.** Files will be named according to the following convention: `{gTLD}_{YYYY-MM-DD}_{type}_S#{_R(rev).{ext} where:

5.1. `{gTLD}` is replaced with the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the ASCII-compatible form (A-Label) must be used;

5.2. `{YYYY-MM-DD}` is replaced by the date corresponding to the time used as a timeline watermark for the transactions; i.e. for the Full Deposit corresponding to 2009-08-02T00:00Z, the string to be used would be “2009-08-02”;

5.3. `{type}` is replaced by:

   (1) “full”, if the data represents a Full Deposit;

   (2) “diff”, if the data represents a Differential Deposit;

   (3) “thin”, if the data represents a Bulk Registration Data Access file, as specified in Section 3 of Specification 4;

   (4) "thick-{gurid}", if the data represent Thick Registration Data from a specific registrar, as defined in Section 3.2 of Specification 4. The `{gurid}` element must be replaced with the IANA Registrar ID associated with the data.

5.4. `{#}` is replaced by the position of the file in a series of files, beginning with “1”; in case of a lone file, this must be replaced by “1”.
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5.5.  \{rev\} is replaced by the number of revision (or resend) of the file beginning with “0”:

5.6.  \{ext\} is replaced by “sig” if it is a digital signature file of the quasi-homonymous file. Otherwise it is replaced by “ryde”.

6.  **Distribution of Public Keys.** Each of Registry Operator and Escrow Agent will distribute its public key to the other party (Registry Operator or Escrow Agent, as the case may be) via email to an email address to be specified. Each party will confirm receipt of the other party’s public key with a reply email, and the distributing party will subsequently reconfirm the authenticity of the key transmitted via offline methods, like in person meeting, telephone, etc. In this way, public key transmission is authenticated to a user able to send and receive mail via a mail server operated by the distributing party. Escrow Agent, Registry Operator and ICANN will exchange public keys by the same procedure.

7.  **Notification of Deposits.** Along with the delivery of each Deposit, Registry Operator will deliver to Escrow Agent and to ICANN (using the API described in draft-lozano-icann-registry-interfaces, see Part A, Section 9, reference 5 of this Specification (the “Interface Specification”)) a written statement from Registry Operator (which may be by authenticated e-mail) that includes a copy of the report generated upon creation of the Deposit and states that the Deposit has been inspected by Registry Operator and is complete and accurate. The preparation and submission of this statement must be performed by the Registry Operator or its designee, provided that such designee may not be the Escrow Agent or any of Escrow Agent’s Affiliates. Registry Operator will include the Deposit’s “id” and “resend” attributes in its statement. The attributes are explained in Part A, Section 9, reference 1 of this Specification.

If not already an RFC, Registry Operator will use the most recent draft version of the Interface Specification at the Effective Date. Registry Operator may at its election use newer versions of the Interface Specification after the Effective Date. Once the Interface Specification is published as an RFC, Registry Operator will implement that version of the Interface Specification, no later than one hundred eighty (180) calendar days after such publishing.

8.  **Verification Procedure.**

   (1)  The signature file of each processed file is validated.

   (2)  If processed files are pieces of a bigger file, the latter is put together.

   (3)  Each file obtained in the previous step is then decrypted and uncompressed.

   (4)  Each data file contained in the previous step is then validated against the format defined in Part A, Section 9, reference 1 of this Specification.
The data escrow agent extended verification process, as defined below in reference 2 of Part A of this Specification 2, as well as any other data escrow verification process contained in such reference.

If any discrepancy is found in any of the steps, the Deposit will be considered incomplete.

9. References


(4) OpenPGP parameters, http://www.iana.org/assignments/pgp-parameters/pgp-parameters.xhtml

PART B - LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

1. Escrow Agent. Prior to entering into an escrow agreement, the Registry Operator must provide notice to ICANN as to the identity of the Escrow Agent, and provide ICANN with contact information and a copy of the relevant escrow agreement, and all amendments thereto. In addition, prior to entering into an escrow agreement, Registry Operator must obtain the consent of ICANN to (a) use the specified Escrow Agent, and (b) enter into the form of escrow agreement provided. ICANN must be expressly designated as a third-party beneficiary of the escrow agreement. ICANN reserves the right to withhold its consent to any Escrow Agent, escrow agreement, or any amendment thereto, all in its sole discretion.

2. Fees. Registry Operator must pay, or have paid on its behalf, fees to the Escrow Agent directly. If Registry Operator fails to pay any fee by the due date(s), the Escrow Agent will give ICANN written notice of such non-payment and ICANN may pay the past-due fee(s) within fifteen (15) calendar days after receipt of the written notice from Escrow Agent. Upon payment of the past-due fees by ICANN, ICANN shall have a claim for such amount against Registry Operator, which Registry Operator shall be required to submit to ICANN together with the next fee payment due under the Registry Agreement.

3. Ownership. Ownership of the Deposits during the effective term of the Registry Agreement shall remain with Registry Operator at all times. Thereafter, Registry Operator shall assign any such ownership rights (including intellectual property rights, as the case may be) in such Deposits to ICANN. In the event that during the term of the Registry Agreement any Deposit is released from escrow to ICANN, any intellectual property rights held by Registry Operator in the Deposits will automatically be licensed to ICANN or to a party designated in writing by ICANN on a non-exclusive, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free, paid-up basis, for any use related to the operation, maintenance or transition of the TLD.

4. Integrity and Confidentiality. Escrow Agent will be required to (i) hold and maintain the Deposits in a secure, locked, and environmentally safe facility, which is accessible only to authorized representatives of Escrow Agent, (ii) protect the integrity and confidentiality of the Deposits using commercially reasonable measures and (iii) keep and safeguard each Deposit for one (1) year. ICANN and Registry Operator will be provided the right to inspect Escrow Agent’s applicable records upon reasonable prior notice and during normal business hours. Registry Operator and ICANN will be provided with the right to designate a third-party auditor to audit Escrow Agent’s compliance with the technical specifications and maintenance requirements of this Specification 2 from time to time.

If Escrow Agent receives a subpoena or any other order from a court or other judicial tribunal pertaining to the disclosure or release of the Deposits, Escrow Agent will promptly notify the Registry Operator and ICANN unless prohibited by law. After notifying the Registry Operator and ICANN, Escrow Agent shall allow
sufficient time for Registry Operator or ICANN to challenge any such order, which shall be the responsibility of Registry Operator or ICANN; provided, however, that Escrow Agent does not waive its rights to present its position with respect to any such order. Escrow Agent will cooperate with the Registry Operator or ICANN to support efforts to quash or limit any subpoena, at such party’s expense. Any party requesting additional assistance shall pay Escrow Agent's standard charges or as quoted upon submission of a detailed request.

5. **Copies.** Escrow Agent may be permitted to duplicate any Deposit, in order to comply with the terms and provisions of the escrow agreement.

6. **Release of Deposits.** Escrow Agent will make available for electronic download (unless otherwise requested) to ICANN or its designee, within twenty-four (24) hours, at the Registry Operator’s expense, all Deposits in Escrow Agent’s possession in the event that the Escrow Agent receives a request from Registry Operator to effect such delivery to ICANN, or receives one of the following written notices by ICANN stating that:

6.1. the Registry Agreement has expired without renewal, or been terminated; or

6.2. ICANN has not received a notification as described in Part B, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of this Specification from Escrow Agent within five (5) calendar days after the Deposit’s scheduled delivery date; (a) ICANN gave notice to Escrow Agent and Registry Operator of that failure; and (b) ICANN has not, within seven (7) calendar days after such notice, received the notification from Escrow Agent; or

6.3. ICANN has received notification as described in Part B, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of this Specification from Escrow Agent of failed verification of the latest escrow deposit for a specific date or a notification of a missing deposit, and the notification is for a deposit that should have been made on Sunday (i.e., a Full Deposit); (a) ICANN gave notice to Registry Operator of that receipt; and (b) ICANN has not, within seven (7) calendar days after such notice, received notification as described in Part B, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of this Specification from Escrow Agent of verification of a remediated version of such Full Deposit; or

6.4. ICANN has received five notifications from Escrow Agent within the last thirty (30) calendar days notifying ICANN of either missing or failed escrow deposits that should have been made Monday through Saturday (i.e., a Differential Deposit), and (x) ICANN provided notice to Registry Operator of the receipt of such notifications; and (y) ICANN has not, within seven (7) calendar days after delivery of such notice to Registry Operator, received notification from Escrow Agent of verification of a remediated version of such Differential Deposit; or
6.5. Registry Operator has: (i) ceased to conduct its business in the ordinary course; or (ii) filed for bankruptcy, become insolvent or anything analogous to any of the foregoing under the laws of any jurisdiction anywhere in the world; or

6.6. Registry Operator has experienced a failure of critical registry functions and ICANN has asserted its rights pursuant to Section 2.13 of the Agreement; or

6.7. a competent court, arbitral, legislative, or government agency mandates the release of the Deposits to ICANN; or

6.8. pursuant to Contractual and Operational Compliance Audits as specified under Section 2.11 of the Agreement.

Unless Escrow Agent has previously released the Registry Operator’s Deposits to ICANN or its designee, Escrow Agent will deliver all Deposits to ICANN upon expiration or termination of the Registry Agreement or the Escrow Agreement.

7. **Verification of Deposits.**

7.1. Within twenty-four (24) hours after receiving each Deposit or corrected Deposit, Escrow Agent must verify the format and completeness of each Deposit and deliver to ICANN a notification generated for each Deposit. Reports will be delivered electronically using the API described in draft-lozano-icann-registry-interfaces, see Part A, Section 9, reference 5 of this Specification.

7.2. If Escrow Agent discovers that any Deposit fails the verification procedures or if Escrow Agent does not receive any scheduled Deposit, Escrow Agent must notify Registry Operator either by email, fax or phone and ICANN (using the API described in draft-lozano-icann-registry-interfaces, see Part A, Section 9, reference 5 of this Specification) of such nonconformity or non-receipt within twenty-four (24) hours after receiving the non-conformant Deposit or the deadline for such Deposit, as applicable. Upon notification of such verification or delivery failure, Registry Operator must begin developing modifications, updates, corrections, and other fixes of the Deposit necessary for the Deposit to be delivered and pass the verification procedures and deliver such fixes to Escrow Agent as promptly as possible.

8. **Amendments.** Escrow Agent and Registry Operator shall amend the terms of the Escrow Agreement to conform to this Specification 2 within ten (10) calendar days of any amendment or modification to this Specification 2. In the event of a conflict between this Specification 2 and the Escrow Agreement, this Specification 2 shall control.
9. **Indemnity.** Escrow Agent shall indemnify and hold harmless Registry Operator and ICANN, and each of their respective directors, officers, agents, employees, members, and stockholders ("Indemnitees") absolutely and forever from and against any and all claims, actions, damages, suits, liabilities, obligations, costs, fees, charges, and any other expenses whatsoever, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, that may be asserted by a third party against any Indemnitee in connection with the misrepresentation, negligence or misconduct of Escrow Agent, its directors, officers, agents, employees and contractors.
SPECIFICATION 3

FORMAT AND CONTENT FOR REGISTRY OPERATOR MONTHLY REPORTING

Registry Operator shall provide one set of monthly reports per gTLD, using the API described in draft-lozano-icann-registry-interfaces, see Specification 2, Part A, Section 9, reference 5, with the following content.

ICANN may request in the future that the reports be delivered by other means and using other formats. ICANN will use reasonable commercial efforts to preserve the confidentiality of the information reported until three (3) months after the end of the month to which the reports relate. Unless set forth in this Specification 3, any reference to a specific time refers to Coordinated Universal Time (UTC). Monthly reports shall consist of data that reflects the state of the registry at the end of the month (UTC).

1. **Per-Registrar Transactions Report.** This report shall be compiled in a comma separated-value formatted file as specified in RFC 4180. The file shall be named “gTLD-transactions-yyyyym.csv”, where “gTLD” is the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the A-label shall be used; “yyyyym” is the year and month being reported. The file shall contain the following fields per registrar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Field name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>registrar-name</td>
<td>Registrar's full corporate name as registered with IANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>iana-id</td>
<td>For cases where the registry operator acts as registrar (i.e., without the use of an ICANN accredited registrar) either 9998 or 9999 should be used depending on registration type (as described in Specification 5), otherwise the sponsoring Registrar IANA id should be used as specified in <a href="http://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids">http://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>total-domains</td>
<td>total domain names under sponsorship in any EPP status but pendingCreate that have not been purged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>total-nameservers</td>
<td>total name servers (either host objects or name server hosts as domain name attributes) associated with domain names registered for the TLD in any EPP status but pendingCreate that have not been purged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>net-adds-1-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of one (1) year (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-adds-2-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of two (2) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-adds-3-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of three (3) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-adds-4-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of four (4) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-adds-5-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of five (5) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-adds-6-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of six (6) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-adds-7-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of seven (7) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-adds-8-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of eight (8) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-adds-9-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of nine (9) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-adds-10-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered (i.e., not in EPP pendingCreate status) with an initial term of ten (10) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>term of ten (10) years (and not deleted within the add grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the add grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>net-renews-1-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of one (1) year (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>net-renews-2-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of two (2) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>net-renews-3-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of three (3) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>net-renews-4-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of four (4) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>net-renews-5-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of five (5) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>net-renews-6-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of six (6) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>net-renews-7-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of seven (7) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>net-renews-8-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of eight (8) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>net-renews-9-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of nine (9) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>net-renews-10-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed (i.e., not in EPP pendingRenew status) either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of ten (10) years (and not deleted within the renew or auto-renew grace period). A transaction must be reported in the month the renew or auto-renew grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>transfer-gaining-successful</td>
<td>number of domain transfers initiated by this registrar that were successfully completed (either explicitly or automatically approved) and not deleted within the transfer grace period. A transaction must be reported in the month the transfer grace period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>transfer-gaining-nacked</td>
<td>number of domain transfers initiated by this registrar that were rejected (e.g., EPP transfer op=&quot;reject&quot;) by the other registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>transfer-losing-successful</td>
<td>number of domain transfers initiated by another registrar that were successfully completed (either explicitly or automatically approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>transfer-losing-nacked</td>
<td>number of domain transfers initiated by another registrar that this registrar rejected (e.g., EPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of transfer disputes in which this registrar prevailed (reported in the month where the determination happened)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>transfer-disputed-won</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of transfer disputes this registrar lost (reported in the month where the determination happened)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>transfer-disputed-lost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of transfer disputes involving this registrar with a split or no decision (reported in the month where the determination happened)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>transfer-disputed-nodecision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>domains deleted within the add grace period (does not include names deleted while in EPP pendingCreate status). A deletion must be reported in the month the name is purged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>deleted-domains-grace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>domains deleted outside the add grace period (does not include names deleted while in EPP pendingCreate status). A deletion must be reported in the month the name is purged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>deleted-domains-nograce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>domain names restored during reporting period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>restored-domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total number of restored names for which a restore report is required by the registry, but the registrar failed to submit it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>restored-noreport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total number of AGP (add grace period) exemption requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>agp-exemption-requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total number of AGP (add grace period) exemption requests granted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>agp-exemptions-granted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total number of names affected by granted AGP (add grace period) exemption requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>agp-exempted-domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of attempted (both successful and failed) domain name create commands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>attempted-adds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first line shall include the field names exactly as described in the table above as a “header line” as described in section 2 of RFC 4180. The last line of each report shall include totals for each column across all registrars; the first field of this line shall read “Totals” while the second field shall be left empty in that line. No other lines besides the ones described above shall be included. Line breaks shall be \(<U+000D, U+000A>\) as described in RFC 4180.

2. **Registry Functions Activity Report.** This report shall be compiled in a comma separated-value formatted file as specified in RFC 4180. The file shall be named “gTLD-activity-yyyy_mm.csv”, where “gTLD” is the gTLD name; in case of an
IDN-TLD, the A-label shall be used; “yyyymm” is the year and month being reported.
The file shall contain the following fields:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>operational-registrars</td>
<td>number of operational registrars in the production system at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>zfa-passwords</td>
<td>number of active zone file access passwords at the end of the reporting period; “CZDS” may be used instead of the number of active zone file access passwords, if the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) is used to provide the zone file to the end user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>whois-43-queries</td>
<td>number of WHOIS (port-43) queries responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>web-whois-queries</td>
<td>number of Web-based Whois queries responded during the reporting period, not including searchable Whois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>searchable-whois-queries</td>
<td>number of searchable Whois queries responded during the reporting period, if offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>dns-udp-queries-received</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over UDP transport during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>dns-udp-queries-responded</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over UDP transport that were responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>dns-tcp-queries-received</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over TCP transport during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>dns-tcp-queries-responded</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over TCP transport that were responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>srs-dom-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>srs-dom-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>srs-dom-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>srs-dom-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “info” requests responded during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field #</td>
<td>Field Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>srs-dom-renew</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “renew” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>srs-dom-rgp-restore-report</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name RGP “restore” requests delivering a restore report responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>srs-dom-rgp-restore-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name RGP “restore” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-approve</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to approve transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-cancel</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to cancel transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-query</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to query about a transfer responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-reject</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to reject transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to request transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>srs-dom-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “update” requests (not including RGP restore requests) responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>srs-host-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>srs-host-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field #</td>
<td>Field Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reporting period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>srs-host-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>srs-host-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>srs-host-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “update” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>srs-cont-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>srs-cont-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>srs-cont-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>srs-cont-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-approve</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to approve transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-cancel</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to cancel transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-query</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to query about a transfer responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-reject</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to reject transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to request transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>srs-cont-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “update” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first line shall include the field names exactly as described in the table above as a “header line” as described in section 2 of RFC 4180. No other lines besides the ones described above shall be included. Line breaks shall be \textless U+000D, U+000A \textgreater as described in RFC 4180.

For gTLDs that are part of a single-instance Shared Registry System, the Registry Functions Activity Report may include the total contact or host transactions for all the gTLDs in the system.
SPECIFICATION 4

REGISTRATION DATA PUBLICATION SERVICES

1. **Registration Data Directory Services.** Until ICANN requires a different protocol, Registry Operator will operate a WHOIS service available via port 43 in accordance with RFC 3912, and a web-based Directory Service at <whois.nic.TLD> providing free public query-based access to at least the following elements in the following format. ICANN reserves the right to specify alternative formats and protocols, and upon such specification, the Registry Operator will implement such alternative specification as soon as reasonably practicable.

Registry Operator shall implement a new standard supporting access to domain name registration data (SAC 051) no later than one hundred thirty-five (135) days after it is requested by ICANN if: 1) the IETF produces a standard (i.e., it is published, at least, as a Proposed Standard RFC as specified in RFC 2026); and 2) its implementation is commercially reasonable in the context of the overall operation of the registry.

1.1. The format of responses shall follow a semi-free text format outline below, followed by a blank line and a legal disclaimer specifying the rights of Registry Operator, and of the user querying the database.

1.2. Each data object shall be represented as a set of key/value pairs, with lines beginning with keys, followed by a colon and a space as delimiters, followed by the value.

1.3. For fields where more than one value exists, multiple key/value pairs with the same key shall be allowed (for example to list multiple name servers). The first key/value pair after a blank line should be considered the start of a new record, and should be considered as identifying that record, and is used to group data, such as hostnames and IP addresses, or a domain name and registrant information, together.

1.4. The fields specified below set forth the minimum output requirements. Registry Operator may output data fields in addition to those specified below, subject to approval by ICANN, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld.

1.5. **Domain Name Data:**

   1.5.1 **Query format:** whois EXAMPLE.TLD

   1.5.2 **Response format:**

   Domain Name: EXAMPLE.TLD
   Domain ID: D1234567-TLD
WHOIS Server: whois.example.tld
Referral URL: http://www.example.tld
Updated Date: 2009-05-29T20:13:00Z
Creation Date: 2000-10-08T00:45:00Z
Registry Expiry Date: 2010-10-08T00:44:59Z
Sponsoring Registrar: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR LLC
Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID: 5555555
Domain Status: clientDeleteProhibited
Domain Status: clientRenewProhibited
Domain Status: clientTransferProhibited
Domain Status: serverUpdateProhibited
Registrant ID: 5372808-ERL
Registrant Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT
Registrant Organization: EXAMPLE ORGANIZATION
Registrant Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Registrant City: ANYTOWN
Registrant State/Province: AP
Registrant Postal Code: A1A1A1
Registrant Country: EX
Registrant Phone: +1.5555551212
Registrant Phone Ext: 1234
Registrant Fax: +1.5555551213
Registrant Fax Ext: 4321
Registrant Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Admin ID: 5372809-ERL
Admin Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT ADMINISTRATIVE
Admin Organization: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT ORGANIZATION
Admin Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Admin City: ANYTOWN
Admin State/Province: AP
Admin Postal Code: A1A1A1
Admin Country: EX
Admin Phone: +1.5555551212
Admin Phone Ext: 1234
Admin Fax: +1.5555551213
Admin Fax Ext: 
Admin Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Tech ID: 5372811-ERL
Tech Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR TECHNICAL
Tech Organization: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR LLC
Tech Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Tech City: ANYTOWN
Tech State/Province: AP
Tech Postal Code: A1A1A1
Tech Country: EX
Tech Phone: +1.1235551234
Tech Phone Ext: 1234
Tech Fax: +1.5555551213
Tech Fax Ext: 93
Tech Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Name Server: NS01.EXAMPLEREGISTRAR.TLD
Name Server: NS02.EXAMPLEREGISTRAR.TLD
DNSSEC: signedDelegation
DNSSEC: unsigned
>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.6. Registrar Data:

1.6.1 Query format: whois “registrar Example Registrar, Inc.”

1.6.2 Response format:

Registrar Name: Example Registrar, Inc.
Street: 1234 Admiralty Way
City: Marina del Rey
State/Province: CA
Postal Code: 90292
Country: US
Phone Number: +1.3105551212
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
Email: registrar@example.tld
WHOIS Server: whois.example-registrar.tld
Referral URL: http://www.example-registrar.tld
Admin Contact: Joe Registrar
Phone Number: +1.3105551213
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
Email: joeregistrar@example-registrar.tld
Admin Contact: Jane Registrar
Phone Number: +1.3105551214
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
Email: janeregistrar@example-registrar.tld
Technical Contact: John Geek
Phone Number: +1.3105551215
Fax Number: +1.3105551216
Email: johngeek@example-registrar.tld

>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.7. Nameserver Data:

1.7.1 Query format: whois “nameserver (nameserver name)”, or whois “nameserver (IP Address).” For example: whois “nameserver NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD”.
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1.7.2 **Response format:**

- Server Name: NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD
- IP Address: 192.0.2.123
- IP Address: 2001:0DB8::1
- Registrar: Example Registrar, Inc.
- WHOIS Server: whois.example-registrar.tld
- Referral URL: http://www.example-registrar.tld

>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.8. The format of the following data fields: domain status, individual and organizational names, address, street, city, state/province, postal code, country, telephone and fax numbers (the extension will be provided as a separate field as shown above), email addresses, date and times should conform to the mappings specified in EPP RFCs 5730-5734 so that the display of this information (or values return in WHOIS responses) can be uniformly processed and understood.

1.9. In order to be compatible with ICANN’s common interface for WHOIS (InterNIC), WHOIS output shall be in the format outline above.

1.10. **Searchability.** Offering searchability capabilities on the Directory Services is optional but if offered by the Registry Operator it shall comply with the specification described in this section.

1.10.1 Registry Operator will offer searchability on the web-based Directory Service.

1.10.2 Registry Operator will offer partial match capabilities, at least, on the following fields: domain name, contacts and registrant’s name, and contact and registrant’s postal address, including all the sub-fields described in EPP (e.g., street, city, state or province, etc.).

1.10.3 Registry Operator will offer exact-match capabilities, at least, on the following fields: Registrar ID, name server name, and name server’s IP address (only applies to IP addresses stored by the registry, i.e., glue records).

1.10.4 Registry Operator will offer Boolean search capabilities supporting, at least, the following logical operators to join a set of search criteria: AND, OR, NOT.

1.10.5 Search results will include domain names matching the search criteria.

1.10.6 Registry Operator will: 1) implement appropriate measures to avoid abuse of this feature (e.g., permitting access only to legitimate
authorized users); and 2) ensure the feature is in compliance with any applicable privacy laws or policies.

1.11. Registry Operator shall provide a link on the primary website for the TLD (i.e., the website provided to ICANN for publishing on the ICANN website) to a webpage designated by ICANN containing WHOIS policy and educational materials.

2. Zone File Access

2.1. Third-Party Access

2.1.1 Zone File Access Agreement. Registry Operator will enter into an agreement with any Internet user, which will allow such user to access an Internet host server or servers designated by Registry Operator and download zone file data. The agreement will be standardized, facilitated and administered by a Centralized Zone Data Access Provider, which may be ICANN or an ICANN designee (the “CZDA Provider”). Registry Operator (optionally through the CZDA Provider) will provide access to zone file data per Section 2.1.3 of this Specification and do so using the file format described in Section 2.1.4 of this Specification. Notwithstanding the foregoing, (a) the CZDA Provider may reject the request for access of any user that does not satisfy the credentialing requirements in Section 2.1.2 below; (b) Registry Operator may reject the request for access of any user that does not provide correct or legitimate credentials under Section 2.1.2 below or where Registry Operator reasonably believes will violate the terms of Section 2.1.5 below; and, (c) Registry Operator may revoke access of any user if Registry Operator has evidence to support that the user has violated the terms of Section 2.1.5 below.

2.1.2 Credentialing Requirements. Registry Operator, through the facilitation of the CZDA Provider, will request each user to provide it with information sufficient to correctly identify and locate the user. Such user information will include, without limitation, company name, contact name, address, telephone number, facsimile number, email address and IP address.

2.1.3 Grant of Access. Each Registry Operator (optionally through the CZDA Provider) will provide the Zone File SFTP (or other Registry supported) service for an ICANN-specified and managed URL (specifically, <TLD>.zda.icann.org where <TLD> is the TLD for which the registry is responsible) for the user to access the Registry’s zone data archives. Registry Operator will grant the user a non-exclusive, nontransferable, limited right to access Registry Operator’s (optionally CZDA Provider’s) Zone File hosting server, and to transfer
a copy of the top-level domain zone files, and any associated
cryptographic checksum files no more than once per 24 hour period
using SFTP, or other data transport and access protocols that may be
prescribed by ICANN. For every zone file access server, the zone files
are in the top-level directory called <zone>.zone.gz, with
<zone>.zone.gz.md5 and <zone>.zone.gz.sig to verify downloads. If
the Registry Operator (or the CZDA Provider) also provides historical
data, it will use the naming pattern <zone>-yyyyymmdd.zone.gz, etc.

2.1.4 **File Format Standard.** Registry Operator (optionally through the
CZDA Provider) will provide zone files using a subformat of the
standard Master File format as originally defined in RFC 1035, Section
5, including all the records present in the actual zone used in the
public DNS. Sub-format is as follows:

1. Each record must include all fields in one line as:
   <domain-name> <TTL> <class> <type> <RDATA>.

2. Class and Type must use the standard mnemonics and must be
   in lower case.

3. TTL must be present as a decimal integer.

4. Use of \X and \DDD inside domain names is allowed.

5. All domain names must be in lower case.

6. Must use exactly one tab as separator of fields inside a record.

7. All domain names must be fully qualified.

8. No $ORIGIN directives.

9. No use of “@” to denote current origin.

10. No use of “blank domain names” at the beginning of a record to
    continue the use of the domain name in the previous record.

11. No $INCLUDE directives.

12. No $TTL directives.

13. No use of parentheses, e.g., to continue the list of fields in a
    record across a line boundary.

14. No use of comments.

15. No blank lines.
16. The SOA record should be present at the top and (duplicated at) the end of the zone file.

17. With the exception of the SOA record, all the records in a file must be in alphabetic order.

18. One zone per file. If a TLD divides its DNS data into multiple zones, each zone goes into a separate file named as above, with all the files combined using tar into a file called <tld>.zone.tar.

2.1.5 Use of Data by User. Registry Operator will permit user to use the zone file for lawful purposes; provided that (a) user takes all reasonable steps to protect against unauthorized access to, use of, and disclosure of the data, and (b) under no circumstances will Registry Operator be required or permitted to allow user to use the data to (i) allow, enable or otherwise support any marketing activities to entities other than the user’s existing customers, regardless of the medium used (such media include but are not limited to transmission by e-mail, telephone, facsimile, postal mail, SMS, and wireless alerts of mass unsolicited, commercial advertising or solicitations to entities), (ii) enable high volume, automated, electronic processes that send queries or data to the systems of Registry Operator or any ICANN-accredited registrar, or (iii) interrupt, disrupt or interfere in the normal business operations of any registrant.

2.1.6 Term of Use. Registry Operator, through CZDA Provider, will provide each user with access to the zone file for a period of not less than three (3) months. Registry Operator will allow users to renew their Grant of Access.

2.1.7 No Fee for Access. Registry Operator will provide, and CZDA Provider will facilitate, access to the zone file to user at no cost.

2.2. Co-operation

2.2.1 Assistance. Registry Operator will co-operate and provide reasonable assistance to ICANN and the CZDA Provider to facilitate and maintain the efficient access of zone file data by permitted users as contemplated under this Schedule.

2.3. ICANN Access. Registry Operator shall provide bulk access to the zone files for the TLD to ICANN or its designee on a continuous basis in the manner ICANN may reasonably specify from time to time. Access will be provided at least daily. Zone files will include SRS data committed as close as possible to 00:00:00 UTC.
2.4. **Emergency Operator Access.** Registry Operator shall provide bulk access to the zone files for the TLD to the Emergency Operators designated by ICANN on a continuous basis in the manner ICANN may reasonably specify from time to time.

3. **Bulk Registration Data Access to ICANN**

3.1. **Periodic Access to Thin Registration Data.** In order to verify and ensure the operational stability of Registry Services as well as to facilitate compliance checks on accredited registrars, Registry Operator will provide ICANN on a weekly basis (the day to be designated by ICANN) with up-to-date Registration Data as specified below. Data will include data committed as of 00:00:00 UTC on the day previous to the one designated for retrieval by ICANN.

3.1.1 **Contents.** Registry Operator will provide, at least, the following data for all registered domain names: domain name, domain name repository object id (roid), Registrar ID (IANA ID), statuses, last updated date, creation date, expiration date, and name server names. For sponsoring registrars, at least, it will provide: registrar name, registrar id (IANA ID), hostname of registrar Whois server, and URL of registrar.

3.1.2 **Format.** The data will be provided in the format specified in Specification 2 for Data Escrow (including encryption, signing, etc.) but including only the fields mentioned in the previous section, i.e., the file will only contain Domain and Registrar objects with the fields mentioned above. Registry Operator has the option to provide a full deposit file instead as specified in Specification 2.

3.1.3 **Access.** Registry Operator will have the file(s) ready for download as of 00:00:00 UTC on the day designated for retrieval by ICANN. The file(s) will be made available for download by SFTP, though ICANN may request other means in the future.

3.2. **Exceptional Access to Thick Registration Data.** In case of a registrar failure, deaccreditation, court order, etc. that prompts the temporary or definitive transfer of its domain names to another registrar, at the request of ICANN, Registry Operator will provide ICANN with up-to-date data for the domain names of the losing registrar. The data will be provided in the format specified in Specification 2 for Data Escrow. The file will only contain data related to the domain names of the losing registrar. Registry Operator will provide the data as soon as commercially practicable, but in no event later than five (5) calendar days following ICANN's request. Unless otherwise agreed by Registry Operator and ICANN, the file will be made available for...
download by ICANN in the same manner as the data specified in Section 3.1 of this Specification.
SPECIFICATION 5

SCHEDULE OF RESERVED NAMES

Except to the extent that ICANN otherwise expressly authorizes in writing, and subject to the terms and conditions of this Specification, Registry Operator shall reserve the following labels from initial (i.e., other than renewal) registration within the TLD. If using self-allocation, the Registry Operator must show the registration in the RDDS. In the case of IDN names (as indicated below), IDN variants will be identified according to the registry operator IDN registration policy, where applicable.

1. **Example.** The ASCII label “EXAMPLE” shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level and at all other levels within the TLD at which Registry Operator offers registrations (such second level and all other levels are collectively referred to herein as, “All Levels”). Such label may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, such withheld or allocated label shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such name without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

2. **Two-character labels.** All two-character ASCII labels shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level within the TLD. Such labels may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator, provided that such two-character label strings may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the related government and country-code manager of the string as specified in the ISO 3166-1 alpha-2 standard. The Registry Operator may also propose the release of these reservations based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes, subject to approval by ICANN. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such labels that remain withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

3. **Reservations for Registry Operations.**

   3.1. The following ASCII labels must be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at All Levels for use in connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD: WWW, RDDS and WHOIS. The following ASCII label must be allocated to Registry Operator upon delegation into the root zone at All Levels for use in connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD: NIC. Registry Operator may activate WWW, RDDS and WHOIS in the DNS,
but must activate NIC in the DNS, as necessary for the operation of the TLD (in accordance with the provisions of Exhibit A, the ASCII label NIC must be provisioned in the DNS as a zone cut using NS resource records). None of WWW, RDDS, WHOIS or NIC may be released or registered to any person (other than Registry Operator) or third party. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD all such withheld or allocated names shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement. Such domains shall be identified by Registrar ID 9999.

3.1.1 If Exhibit A to the Agreement specifically provides that Registry Operator may offer registration of IDNs, Registry Operator may also activate a language-specific translation or transliteration of the term "NIC" or an abbreviation for the translation of the term "Network Information Center" in the DNS in accordance with Registry Operator’s IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules. Such translation, transliteration or abbreviation may be reserved by Registry Operator and used in addition to the label NIC to provide any required registry functions. For the avoidance of doubt, Registry Operator is required to activate the ASCII label NIC pursuant to Section 3.1 of this Specification 3.

3.2. Registry Operator may activate in the DNS at All Levels up to one hundred (100) names (plus their IDN variants, where applicable) necessary for the operation or the promotion of the TLD. Registry Operator must act as the Registered Name Holder of such names as that term is defined in the then-current ICANN Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). These activations will be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement. Registry Operator must either (i) register such names through an ICANN accredited registrar; or (ii) self-allocate such names and with respect to those names submit to and be responsible to ICANN for compliance with ICANN Consensus Policies and the obligations set forth in Subsections 3.7.7.1 through 3.7.7.12 of the then-current RAA (or any other replacement clause setting out the terms of the registration agreement between a registrar and a registered name holder). If Registry Operator chooses option (ii) above, it shall identify these transactions using Registrar ID 9998. At Registry Operator’s discretion and in compliance with all other terms of this Agreement, including the RPMs set forth in Specification 7, such names may be released for registration to another person or entity.

3.3. Registry Operator may withhold from registration or allocate to Registry Operator names (including their IDN variants, where applicable) at All Levels in accordance with Section 2.6 of the Agreement. Such names may not be activated in the DNS, but may be released for registration to Registry
Operator or another person or entity at Registry Operator’s discretion, subject to compliance with all the terms of this Agreement, including applicable RPMs set forth in Specification 7. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such names that remain withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Upon ICANN’s request, Registry Operator shall provide a listing of all names withheld or allocated to Registry Operator pursuant to Section 2.6 of the Agreement. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

3.4. Effective upon the conclusion of the No-Activation Period specified in Section 6.1 of Specification 6, Registry Operator shall allocate the domain name "icann-sla-monitoring.<tld>" to the ICANN testing registrar (as such registrar is described in Section 8.2 of Specification 10). If such domain name is not available for registration in the TLD or is otherwise inconsistent with the registration policies of the TLD, Registry Operator may allocate a different domain name to the ICANN testing registrar in consultation with ICANN. The allocation of any such alternative domain name will be communicated to ICANN following such consultation. The allocation of the domain name "icann-sla-monitoring.<tld>" to the ICANN testing registrar will not (i) be considered a Transaction for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement, (ii) count towards the one hundred domain names available to Registry Operator under Section 3.2 of this Specification 5, or (iii) adversely affect Registry Operator’s qualification as a .BRAND TLD pursuant to Specification 13 (.BRAND TLD Provisions) hereto (as applicable).

4. **Country and Territory Names.** The country and territory names (including their IDN variants, where applicable) contained in the following internationally recognized lists shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at All Levels:

4.1. the short form (in English) of all country and territory names contained on the ISO 3166-1 list, as updated from time to time, including the European Union, which is exceptionally reserved on the ISO 3166-1 list, and its scope extended in August 1999 to any application needing to represent the name European Union <http://www.iso.org/iso/support/country_codes/iso_3166_code_lists/iso-3166-1_decoding_table.htm>;

4.2. the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, Technical Reference Manual for the Standardization of Geographical Names, Part III Names of Countries of the World; and

provided, that the reservation of specific country and territory names (including their IDN variants according to the registry operator IDN registration policy, where applicable) may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the applicable government(s). Registry Operator must not activate such names in the DNS; provided, that Registry Operator may propose the release of these reservations, subject to review by ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee and approval by ICANN. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such names that remain withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

5. **International Olympic Committee; International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.** As instructed from time to time by ICANN, the names (including their IDN variants, where applicable) relating to the International Olympic Committee, International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement listed at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/reserved shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level within the TLD. Additional International Olympic Committee, International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement names (including their IDN variants) may be added to the list upon ten (10) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator. Such names may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such names withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.

6. **Intergovernmental Organizations.** As instructed from time to time by ICANN, Registry Operator will implement the protections mechanism determined by the ICANN Board of Directors relating to the protection of identifiers for Intergovernmental Organizations. A list of reserved names for this Section 6 is available at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/reserved. Additional names (including their IDN variants) may be added to the list upon ten (10) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator. Any such protected identifiers for Intergovernmental Organizations may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator. Upon conclusion of Registry Operator’s designation as operator of the registry for the TLD, all such protected identifiers shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. Registry Operator may self-allocate and renew such names without use
of an ICANN accredited registrar, which will not be considered Transactions for purposes of Section 6.1 of the Agreement.
SPECIFICATION 6

REGISTRY INTEROPERABILITY AND CONTINUITY SPECIFICATIONS

1. Standards Compliance

1.1. DNS. Registry Operator shall comply with relevant existing RFCs and those published in the future by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), including all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to the DNS and name server operations including without limitation RFCs 1034, 1035, 1123, 1982, 2181, 2182, 3226, 3596, 3597, 4343, 5966 and 6891. DNS labels may only include hyphens in the third and fourth position if they represent valid IDNs (as specified above) in their ASCII encoding (e.g., “xn--ndk061n”).

1.2. EPP. Registry Operator shall comply with relevant existing RFCs and those published in the future by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) including all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to the provisioning and management of domain names using the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) in conformance with RFCs 5910, 5730, 5731, 5732 (if using host objects), 5733 and 5734. If Registry Operator implements Registry Grace Period (RGP), it will comply with RFC 3915 and its successors. If Registry Operator requires the use of functionality outside the base EPP RFCs, Registry Operator must document EPP extensions in Internet-Draft format following the guidelines described in RFC 3735. Registry Operator will provide and update the relevant documentation of all the EPP Objects and Extensions supported to ICANN prior to deployment.

1.3. DNSSEC. Registry Operator shall sign its TLD zone files implementing Domain Name System Security Extensions (“DNSSEC”). For the absence of doubt, Registry Operator shall sign the zone file of <TLD> and zone files used for in-bailiwick glue for the TLD’s DNS servers. During the Term, Registry Operator shall comply with RFCs 4033, 4034, 4035, 4509 and their successors, and follow the best practices described in RFC 6781 and its successors. If Registry Operator implements Hashed Authenticated Denial of Existence for DNS Security Extensions, it shall comply with RFC 5155 and its successors. Registry Operator shall accept public-key material from child domain names in a secure manner according to industry best practices. Registry shall also publish in its website the DNSSEC Practice Statements (DPS) describing critical security controls and procedures for key material storage, access and usage for its own keys and secure acceptance of registrants’ public-key material. Registry Operator shall publish its DPS following the format described in RFC 6841. DNSSEC validation must be active and use the IANA DNS Root Key Signing Key set (available at https://www.iana.org/dnssec/files) as a trust anchor for Registry Operator’s Registry Services making use of data obtained via DNS responses.
1.4. **IDN.** If the Registry Operator offers Internationalized Domain Names ("IDNs"), it shall comply with RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893 and their successors. Registry Operator shall comply with the ICANN IDN Guidelines at <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm>, as they may be amended, modified, or superseded from time to time. Registry Operator shall publish and keep updated its IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules in the IANA Repository of IDN Practices.

1.5. **IPv6.** Registry Operator shall be able to accept IPv6 addresses as glue records in its Registry System and publish them in the DNS. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for, at least, two of the Registry’s name servers listed in the root zone with the corresponding IPv6 addresses registered with IANA. Registry Operator should follow “DNS IPv6 Transport Operational Guidelines” as described in BCP 91 and the recommendations and considerations described in RFC 4472. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for its Registration Data Publication Services as defined in Specification 4 of this Agreement; e.g., Whois (RFC 3912), Web based Whois. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for its Shared Registration System (SRS) to any Registrar, no later than six (6) months after receiving the first request in writing from a gTLD accredited Registrar willing to operate with the SRS over IPv6.

1.6. **IANA Rootzone Database.** In order to ensure that authoritative information about the TLD remains publicly available, Registry Operator shall submit a change request to the IANA functions operator updating any outdated or inaccurate DNS or WHOIS records of the TLD. Registry Operator shall use commercially reasonable efforts to submit any such change request no later than seven (7) calendar days after the date any such DNS or WHOIS records becomes outdated or inaccurate. Registry Operator must submit all change requests in accordance with the procedures set forth at <http://www.iana.org/domains/root>.

1.7. **Network Ingress Filtering.** Registry Operator shall implement network ingress filtering checks for its Registry Services as described in BCP 38 and BCP 84, which ICANN will also implement.

2. **Registry Services**

2.1. **Registry Services.** “Registry Services” are, for purposes of the Agreement, defined as the following: (a) those services that are operations of the registry critical to the following tasks: the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; dissemination of TLD zone files; operation of the registry DNS servers; and dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by this Agreement; (b) other
products or services that the Registry Operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a Consensus Policy as defined in Specification 1; (c) any other products or services that only a registry operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the registry operator; and (d) material changes to any Registry Service within the scope of (a), (b) or (c) above.

2.2. **Wildcard Prohibition.** For domain names which are either not registered, or the registrant has not supplied valid records such as NS records for listing in the DNS zone file, or their status does not allow them to be published in the DNS, the use of DNS wildcard Resource Records as described in RFCs 1034 and 4592 or any other method or technology for synthesizing DNS Resources Records or using redirection within the DNS by the Registry is prohibited. When queried for such domain names the authoritative name servers must return a “Name Error” response (also known as NXDOMAIN), RCODE 3 as described in RFC 1035 and related RFCs. This provision applies for all DNS zone files at all levels in the DNS tree for which the Registry Operator (or an affiliate engaged in providing Registration Services) maintains data, arranges for such maintenance, or derives revenue from such maintenance.

3. **Registry Continuity**

3.1. **High Availability.** Registry Operator will conduct its operations using network and geographically diverse, redundant servers (including network-level redundancy, end-node level redundancy and the implementation of a load balancing scheme where applicable) to ensure continued operation in the case of technical failure (widespread or local), or an extraordinary occurrence or circumstance beyond the control of the Registry Operator. Registry Operator’s emergency operations department shall be available at all times to respond to extraordinary occurrences.

3.2. **Extraordinary Event.** Registry Operator will use commercially reasonable efforts to restore the critical functions of the registry within twenty-four (24) hours after the termination of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator and restore full system functionality within a maximum of forty-eight (48) hours following such event, depending on the type of critical function involved. Outages due to such an event will not be considered a lack of service availability.

3.3. **Business Continuity.** Registry Operator shall maintain a business continuity plan, which will provide for the maintenance of Registry Services in the event of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator or business failure of Registry Operator, and may include the designation of a Registry Services continuity provider. If such plan includes the designation of a Registry Services continuity provider, Registry Operator shall provide
the name and contact information for such Registry Services continuity provider to ICANN. In the case of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator where the Registry Operator cannot be contacted, Registry Operator consents that ICANN may contact the designated Registry Services continuity provider, if one exists. Registry Operator shall conduct Registry Services Continuity testing at least once per year.

4. **Abuse Mitigation**

4.1. **Abuse Contact.** Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN and publish on its website its accurate contact details including a valid email and mailing address as well as a primary contact for handling inquiries related to malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details.

4.2. **Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records.** Registry Operator shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at http://www.icann.org/encommittees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.

5. **Supported Initial and Renewal Registration Periods**

5.1. **Initial Registration Periods.** Initial registrations of registered names may be made in the registry in one (1) year increments for up to a maximum of ten (10) years. For the avoidance of doubt, initial registrations of registered names may not exceed ten (10) years.

5.2. **Renewal Periods.** Renewal of registered names may be made in one (1) year increments for up to a maximum of ten (10) years. For the avoidance of doubt, renewal of registered names may not extend their registration period beyond ten (10) years from the time of the renewal.

6. **Name Collision Occurrence Management**

6.1. **No-Activation Period.** Registry Operator shall not activate any names in the DNS zone for the Registry TLD (except for "NIC") until at least 120 calendar days after the effective date of this agreement. Registry Operator may allocate names (subject to subsection 6.2 below) during this period only if Registry Operator causes registrants to be clearly informed of the inability to activate names until the No-Activation Period ends.

6.2. **Name Collision Occurrence Assessment**

6.2.1 Registry Operator shall not activate any names in the DNS zone for the Registry TLD except in compliance with a Name Collision Occurrence Assessment provided by ICANN regarding the Registry TLD. Registry
Operator will either (A) implement the mitigation measures described in its Name Collision Occurrence Assessment before activating any second-level domain name, or (B) block those second-level domain names for which the mitigation measures as described in the Name Collision Occurrence Assessment have not been implemented and proceed with activating names that are not listed in the Assessment.

6.2.2 Notwithstanding subsection 6.2.1, Registry Operator may proceed with activation of names in the DNS zone without implementation of the measures set forth in Section 6.2.1 only if (A) ICANN determines that the Registry TLD is eligible for this alternative path to activation of names; and (B) Registry Operator blocks all second-level domain names identified by ICANN and set forth at <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-2-17nov13-en> as such list may be modified by ICANN from time to time. Registry Operator may activate names pursuant to this subsection and later activate names pursuant to subsection 6.2.1.

6.2.3 The sets of names subject to mitigation or blocking pursuant to Sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 will be based on ICANN analysis of DNS information including "Day in the Life of the Internet" data maintained by the DNS Operations, Analysis, and Research Center (DNS-OARC) <https://www.dns-oarc.net/oarc/data/ditl>.

6.2.4 Registry Operator may participate in the development by the ICANN community of a process for determining whether and how these blocked names may be released.

6.2.5 If ICANN determines that the TLD is ineligible for the alternative path to activation of names, ICANN may elect not to delegate the TLD pending completion of the final Name Collision Occurrence Assessment for the TLD, and Registry Operator's completion of all required mitigation measures. Registry Operator understands that the mitigation measures required by ICANN as a condition to activation of names in the DNS zone for the TLD may include, without limitation, mitigation measures such as those described in Section 3.2 of the New gTLD Name Collision Occurrence Management Plan approved by the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) on 7 October 2013 as found at <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-07oct13-en.pdf>.

6.3. Name Collision Report Handling

6.3.1 During the first two years after delegation of the TLD, Registry Operator's emergency operations department shall be available to
receive reports, relayed by ICANN, alleging demonstrably severe harm from collisions with overlapping use of the names outside of the authoritative DNS.

6.3.2 Registry Operator shall develop an internal process for handling in an expedited manner reports received pursuant to subsection 6.3.1 under which Registry Operator may, to the extent necessary and appropriate, remove a recently activated name from the TLD zone for a period of up to two years in order to allow the affected party to make changes to its systems.
SPECIFICATION 7

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR RIGHTS PROTECTION MECHANISMS

1. **Rights Protection Mechanisms.** Registry Operator shall implement and adhere to the rights protection mechanisms (“RPMs”) specified in this Specification. In addition to such RPMs, Registry Operator may develop and implement additional RPMs that discourage or prevent registration of domain names that violate or abuse another party’s legal rights. Registry Operator will include all RPMs required by this Specification 7 and any additional RPMs developed and implemented by Registry Operator in the Registry-Registrar Agreement entered into by ICANN-accredited registrars authorized to register names in the TLD. Registry Operator shall implement in accordance with requirements set forth therein each of the mandatory RPMs set forth in the Trademark Clearinghouse as of the date hereof, as posted at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/tmch-requirements (the “Trademark Clearinghouse Requirements”), which may be revised in immaterial respects by ICANN from time to time. Registry Operator shall not mandate that any owner of applicable intellectual property rights use any other trademark information aggregation, notification, or validation service in addition to or instead of the ICANN-designated Trademark Clearinghouse. If there is a conflict between the terms and conditions of this Agreement and the Trademark Clearinghouse Requirements, the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall control. Registry Operator must enter into a binding and enforceable Registry-Registrar Agreement with at least one ICANN accredited registrar authorizing such registrar(s) to register domain names in the TLD as follows:

   a. if Registry Operator conducts a Qualified Launch Program or is authorized by ICANN to conduct an Approved Launch Program (as those terms are defined in the Trademark Clearinghouse Requirements), Registry Operator must enter into a binding and enforceable Registry-Registrar Agreement with at least one ICANN accredited registrar prior to allocating any domain names pursuant to such Qualified Launch Program or Approved Launch Program, as applicable;

   b. if Registry Operator does not conduct a Qualified Launch Program or is not authorized by ICANN to conduct an Approved Launch Program, Registry Operator must enter into a binding and enforceable Registry-Registrar Agreement with at least one ICANN accredited registrar at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the expiration date of the Sunrise Period (as defined in the Trademark Clearinghouse Requirements) for the TLD; or

   c. if this Agreement contains a Specification 13, Registry Operator must enter into a binding and enforceable Registry-Registrar Agreement with at least one ICANN accredited registrar prior to the Claims Commencement Date (as defined in Specification 13).
Nothing in this Specification 7 shall limit or waive any other obligations or requirements of this Agreement applicable to Registry Operator, including Section 2.9(a) and Specification 9.

2. **Dispute Resolution Mechanisms.** Registry Operator will comply with the following dispute resolution mechanisms as they may be revised from time to time:

   a. the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP) and the Registration Restriction Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP) adopted by ICANN (posted at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/pddrp and http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/rrdrp, respectively). Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Agreement) following a determination by any PDDRP or RRDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination; and

   b. the Uniform Rapid Suspension system (“URS”) adopted by ICANN (posted at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/urs), including the implementation of determinations issued by URS examiners.
SPECIFICATION 8

CONTINUED OPERATIONS INSTRUMENT

1. The Continued Operations Instrument shall (a) provide for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the critical registry functions related to the TLD set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 to this Agreement for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period of one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6th) anniversary of the Effective Date, and (b) be in the form of either (i) an irrevocable standby letter of credit, or (ii) an irrevocable cash escrow deposit, each meeting the requirements set forth in item 50(b) of Attachment to Module 2 – Evaluation Questions and Criteria – of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, as published and supplemented by ICANN prior to the date hereof (which is hereby incorporated by reference into this Specification 8). Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to take all actions necessary or advisable to maintain in effect the Continued Operations Instrument for a period of six (6) years from the Effective Date, and to maintain ICANN as a third party beneficiary thereof. If Registry Operator elects to obtain an irrevocable standby letter of credit but the term required above is unobtainable, Registry Operator may obtain a letter of credit with a one-year term and an “evergreen provision,” providing for annual extensions, without amendment, for an indefinite number of additional periods until the issuing bank informs ICANN of its final expiration or until ICANN releases the letter of credit as evidenced in writing, if the letter of credit otherwise meets the requirements set forth in item 50(b) of Attachment to Module 2 – Evaluation Questions and Criteria – of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook, as published and supplemented by ICANN prior to the date hereof; provided, however, that if the issuing bank informs ICANN of the expiration of such letter of credit prior to the sixth (6th) anniversary of the Effective Date, such letter of credit must provide that ICANN is entitled to draw the funds secured by the letter of credit prior to such expiration. The letter of credit must require the issuing bank to give ICANN at least thirty (30) calendar days’ notice of any such expiration or non-renewal. If the letter of credit expires or is terminated at any time prior to the sixth (6th) anniversary of the Effective Date, Registry Operator will be required to obtain a replacement Continued Operations Instrument. ICANN may draw the funds under the original letter of credit, if the replacement Continued Operations Instrument is not in place prior to the expiration of the original letter of credit. Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN copies of all final documents relating to the Continued Operations Instrument and shall keep ICANN reasonably informed of material developments relating to the Continued Operations Instrument. Registry Operator shall not agree to, or permit, any amendment of, or waiver under, the Continued Operations Instrument or other documentation relating thereto without the prior written consent of ICANN (such consent not to be unreasonably withheld).
2. If, notwithstanding the use of best efforts by Registry Operator to satisfy its obligations under the preceding paragraph, the Continued Operations Instrument expires or is terminated by another party thereto, in whole or in part, for any reason, prior to the sixth anniversary of the Effective Date, Registry Operator shall promptly (i) notify ICANN of such expiration or termination and the reasons therefor and (ii) arrange for an alternative instrument that provides for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the critical registry functions related to the TLD set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 to this Agreement for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period of one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6) anniversary of the Effective Date (an “Alternative Instrument”). Any such Alternative Instrument shall be on terms no less favorable to ICANN than the Continued Operations Instrument and shall otherwise be in form and substance reasonably acceptable to ICANN.

3. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Specification 8, at any time, Registry Operator may replace the Continued Operations Instrument with an Alternative Instrument that (i) provides for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the critical registry functions related to the TLD set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 to this Agreement for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6) anniversary of the Effective Date, and (ii) contains terms no less favorable to ICANN than the Continued Operations Instrument and is otherwise in form and substance reasonably acceptable to ICANN. In the event Registry Operator replaces the Continued Operations Instrument either pursuant to paragraph 2 or this paragraph 3, the terms of this Specification 8 shall no longer apply with respect to the original Continuing Operations Instrument, but shall thereafter apply with respect to such Alternative Instrument(s), and such instrument shall thereafter be considered the Continued Operations Instrument for purposes of this Agreement.
SPECIFICATION 9

REGISTRY OPERATOR CODE OF CONDUCT

1. In connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD, Registry Operator will not, and will not allow any parent, subsidiary, Affiliate, subcontractor or other related entity, to the extent such party is engaged in the provision of Registry Services with respect to the TLD (each, a "Registry Related Party"), to:

   a. directly or indirectly show any preference or provide any special consideration to any registrar with respect to operational access to registry systems and related registry services, unless comparable opportunities to qualify for such preferences or considerations are made available to all registrars on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions;

   b. register domain names in its own right, except for names registered through an ICANN accredited registrar; provided, however, that Registry Operator may (a) reserve names from registration pursuant to Section 2.6 of the Agreement and (b) may withhold from registration or allocate to Registry Operator up to one hundred (100) names pursuant to Section 3.2 of Specification 5;

   c. register names in the TLD or sub-domains of the TLD based upon proprietary access to information about searches or resolution requests by consumers for domain names not yet registered (commonly known as, “front-running”); or

   d. allow any Affiliated registrar to disclose Personal Data about registrants to Registry Operator or any Registry Related Party, except as reasonably necessary for the management and operations of the TLD, unless all unrelated third parties (including other registry operators) are given equivalent access to such user data on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions.

2. If Registry Operator or a Registry Related Party also operates as a provider of registrar or registrar-reseller services, Registry Operator will, or will cause such Registry Related Party to, ensure that such services are offered through a legal entity separate from Registry Operator, and maintain separate books of accounts with respect to its registrar or registrar-reseller operations.

3. If Registry Operator or a Registry Related Party also operates as a provider of registrar or registrar-reseller services, Registry Operator will conduct internal reviews at least once per calendar year to ensure compliance with this Code of Conduct. Within twenty (20) calendar days following the end of each calendar year, Registry Operator will provide the results of the internal review, along with a certification executed by an executive officer of Registry Operator certifying as to
Registry Operator’s compliance with this Code of Conduct, via email to an address to be provided by ICANN. (ICANN may specify in the future the form and contents of such reports or that the reports be delivered by other reasonable means.) Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may publicly post such results and certification; provided, however, ICANN shall not disclose Confidential Information contained in such results except in accordance with Section 7.15 of the Agreement.

4. Nothing set forth herein shall: (i) limit ICANN from conducting investigations of claims of Registry Operator’s non-compliance with this Code of Conduct; or (ii) provide grounds for Registry Operator to refuse to cooperate with ICANN investigations of claims of Registry Operator’s non-compliance with this Code of Conduct.

5. Nothing set forth herein shall limit the ability of Registry Operator or any Registry Related Party, to enter into arms-length transactions in the ordinary course of business with a registrar or reseller with respect to products and services unrelated in all respects to the TLD.

6. Registry Operator may request an exemption to this Code of Conduct, and such exemption may be granted by ICANN in ICANN’s reasonable discretion, if Registry Operator demonstrates to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that (i) all domain name registrations in the TLD are registered to, and maintained by, Registry Operator for the exclusive use of Registry Operator or its Affiliates, (ii) Registry Operator does not sell, distribute or transfer control or use of any registrations in the TLD to any third party that is not an Affiliate of Registry Operator, and (iii) application of this Code of Conduct to the TLD is not necessary to protect the public interest.
1. **Definitions**

1.1. **DNS.** Refers to the Domain Name System as specified in RFCs 1034, 1035, and related RFCs.

1.2. **DNSSEC proper resolution.** There is a valid DNSSEC chain of trust from the root trust anchor to a particular domain name, e.g., a TLD, a domain name registered under a TLD, etc.

1.3. **EPP.** Refers to the Extensible Provisioning Protocol as specified in RFC 5730 and related RFCs.

1.4. **IP address.** Refers to IPv4 or IPv6 addresses without making any distinction between the two. When there is need to make a distinction, IPv4 or IPv6 is used.

1.5. **Probes.** Network hosts used to perform (DNS, EPP, etc.) tests (see below) that are located at various global locations.

1.6. **RDDS.** Registration Data Directory Services refers to the collective of WHOIS and Web-based WHOIS services as defined in Specification 4 of this Agreement.

1.7. **RTT.** Round-Trip Time or RTT refers to the time measured from the sending of the first bit of the first packet of the sequence of packets needed to make a request until the reception of the last bit of the last packet of the sequence needed to receive the response. If the client does not receive the whole sequence of packets needed to consider the response as received, the request will be considered unanswered.

1.8. **SLR.** Service Level Requirement is the level of service expected for a certain parameter being measured in a Service Level Agreement (SLA).

2. **Service Level Agreement Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>SLR (monthly basis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS service availability</td>
<td>0 min downtime = 100% availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS name server availability</td>
<td>(\leq 432) min of downtime ((\approx 99%))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP DNS resolution RTT</td>
<td>(\leq 1500) ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP DNS resolution RTT</td>
<td>(\leq 500) ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS update time</td>
<td>(\leq 60) min, for at least 95% of the probes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS availability</td>
<td>(\leq 864) min of downtime ((\approx 98%))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS query RTT</td>
<td>≤ 2000 ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS update time</td>
<td>≤ 60 min, for at least 95% of the probes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP service availability</td>
<td>≤ 60 min of downtime (∼ 98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP session-command RTT</td>
<td>≤ 4000 ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP query-command RTT</td>
<td>≤ 2000 ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP transform-command RTT</td>
<td>≤ 4000 ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registry Operator is encouraged to do maintenance for the different services at the times and dates of statistically lower traffic for each service. However, note that there is no provision for planned outages or similar periods of unavailable or slow service; any downtime, be it for maintenance or due to system failures, will be noted simply as downtime and counted for SLA purposes.

3. **DNS**

3.1. **DNS service availability.** Refers to the ability of the group of listed-as-authoritative name servers of a particular domain name (e.g., a TLD), to answer DNS queries from DNS probes. For the service to be considered available at a particular moment, at least, two of the delegated name servers registered in the DNS must have successful results from "DNS tests" to each of their public-DNS registered "IP addresses" to which the name server resolves. If 51% or more of the DNS testing probes see the service as unavailable during a given time, the DNS service will be considered unavailable.

3.2. **DNS name server availability.** Refers to the ability of a public-DNS registered "IP address" of a particular name server listed as authoritative for a domain name, to answer DNS queries from an Internet user. All the public DNS-registered "IP address" of all name servers of the domain name being monitored shall be tested individually. If 51% or more of the DNS testing probes get undefined/unanswered results from "DNS tests" to a name server "IP address" during a given time, the name server "IP address" will be considered unavailable.

3.3. **UDP DNS resolution RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of two packets, the UDP DNS query and the corresponding UDP DNS response. If the RTT is 5 times greater than the time specified in the relevant SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

3.4. **TCP DNS resolution RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the DNS response for only one DNS query. If the RTT is 5 times greater than the time specified in the relevant SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

3.5. **DNS resolution RTT.** Refers to either “UDP DNS resolution RTT” or “TCP DNS resolution RTT”.
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3.6. **DNS update time.** Refers to the time measured from the reception of an EPP confirmation to a transform command on a domain name, until the name servers of the parent domain name answer “DNS queries” with data consistent with the change made. This only applies for changes to DNS information.

3.7. **DNS test.** Means one non-recursive DNS query sent to a particular “IP address” (via UDP or TCP). If DNSSEC is offered in the queried DNS zone, for a query to be considered answered, the signatures must be positively verified against a corresponding DS record published in the parent zone or, if the parent is not signed, against a statically configured Trust Anchor. The answer to the query must contain the corresponding information from the Registry System, otherwise the query will be considered unanswered. A query with a “DNS resolution RTT” 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR, will be considered unanswered. The possible results to a DNS test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the “DNS resolution RTT” or, undefined/unanswered.

3.8. **Measuring DNS parameters.** Every minute, every DNS probe will make an UDP or TCP “DNS test” to each of the public-DNS registered “IP addresses” of the name servers of the domain name being monitored. If a “DNS test” result is undefined/unanswered, the tested IP will be considered unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

3.9. **Collating the results from DNS probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 20 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

3.10. **Distribution of UDP and TCP queries.** DNS probes will send UDP or TCP “DNS test” approximating the distribution of these queries.

3.11. **Placement of DNS probes.** Probes for measuring DNS parameters shall be placed as near as possible to the DNS resolvers on the networks with the most users across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

4. **RDDS**

4.1. **RDDS availability.** Refers to the ability of all the RDDS services for the TLD, to respond to queries from an Internet user with appropriate data from the relevant Registry System. If 51% or more of the RDDS testing probes see any of the RDDS services as unavailable during a given time, the RDDS will be considered unavailable.
4.2. **WHOIS query RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the WHOIS response. If the RTT is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

4.3. **Web-based-WHOIS query RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the HTTP response for only one HTTP request. If Registry Operator implements a multiple-step process to get to the information, only the last step shall be measured. If the RTT is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

4.4. **RDDS query RTT.** Refers to the collective of “WHOIS query RTT” and “Web-based- WHOIS query RTT”.

4.5. **RDDS update time.** Refers to the time measured from the reception of an EPP confirmation to a transform command on a domain name, host or contact, up until the servers of the RDDS services reflect the changes made.

4.6. **RDDS test.** Means one query sent to a particular “IP address” of one of the servers of one of the RDDS services. Queries shall be about existing objects in the Registry System and the responses must contain the corresponding information otherwise the query will be considered unanswered. Queries with an RTT 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR will be considered as unanswered. The possible results to an RDDS test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the RTT or undefined/unanswered.

4.7. **Measuring RDDS parameters.** Every 5 minutes, RDDS probes will select one IP address from all the public-DNS registered “IP addresses” of the servers for each RDDS service of the TLD being monitored and make an “RDDS test” to each one. If an “RDDS test” result is undefined/unanswered, the corresponding RDDS service will be considered as unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

4.8. **Collating the results from RDDS probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 10 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

4.9. **Placement of RDDS probes.** Probes for measuring RDDS parameters shall be placed inside the networks with the most users across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.
5. **EPP**

5.1. **EPP service availability.** Refers to the ability of the TLD EPP servers as a group, to respond to commands from the Registry accredited Registrars, who already have credentials to the servers. The response shall include appropriate data from the Registry System. An EPP command with “EPP command RTT” 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR will be considered as unanswered. If 51% or more of the EPP testing probes see the EPP service as unavailable during a given time, the EPP service will be considered unavailable.

5.2. **EPP session-command RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a session command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP session command. For the login command it will include packets needed for starting the TCP session. For the logout command it will include packets needed for closing the TCP session. EPP session commands are those described in section 2.9.1 of EPP RFC 5730. If the RTT is 5 times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

5.3. **EPP query-command RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a query command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP query command. It does not include packets needed for the start or close of either the EPP or the TCP session. EPP query commands are those described in section 2.9.2 of EPP RFC 5730. If the RTT is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

5.4. **EPP transform-command RTT.** Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a transform command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP transform command. It does not include packets needed for the start or close of either the EPP or the TCP session. EPP transform commands are those described in section 2.9.3 of EPP RFC 5730. If the RTT is 5 times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

5.5. **EPP command RTT.** Refers to “EPP session-command RTT”, “EPP query-command RTT” or “EPP transform-command RTT”.

5.6. **EPP test.** Means one EPP command sent to a particular “IP address” for one of the EPP servers. Query and transform commands, with the exception of “create”, shall be about existing objects in the Registry System. The response shall include appropriate data from the Registry System. The possible results to an EPP test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the “EPP command RTT” or undefined/unanswered.
5.7. **Measuring EPP parameters.** Every 5 minutes, EPP probes will select one "IP address" of the EPP servers of the TLD being monitored and make an "EPP test"; every time they should alternate between the 3 different types of commands and between the commands inside each category. If an "EPP test" result is undefined/unanswered, the EPP service will be considered as unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

5.8. **Collating the results from EPP probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 5 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

5.9. **Placement of EPP probes.** Probes for measuring EPP parameters shall be placed inside or close to Registrars points of access to the Internet across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

6. **Emergency Thresholds**

The following matrix presents the emergency thresholds that, if reached by any of the services mentioned above for a TLD, would cause the emergency transition of the Registry for the TLD as specified in Section 2.13 of this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Function</th>
<th>Emergency Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS Service</td>
<td>4-hour total downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNSSEC proper resolution</td>
<td>4-hour total downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>24-hour total downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS</td>
<td>24-hour total downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Escrow</td>
<td>Reaching any of the criteria for the release of deposits described in Specification 2, Part B, Section 6.2 through Section 6.6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Emergency Escalation**

Escalation is strictly for purposes of notifying and investigating possible or potential issues in relation to monitored services. The initiation of any escalation and the subsequent cooperative investigations do not in themselves imply that a monitored service has failed its performance requirements.

Escalations shall be carried out between ICANN and Registry Operators, Registrars and Registry Operator, and Registrars and ICANN. Registry Operators and ICANN must provide said emergency operations departments. Current contacts must be maintained between
ICANN and Registry Operators and published to Registrars, where relevant to their role in escalations, prior to any processing of an Emergency Escalation by all related parties, and kept current at all times.

7.1. **Emergency Escalation initiated by ICANN**

Upon reaching 10% of the Emergency thresholds as described in Section 6 of this Specification, ICANN’s emergency operations will initiate an Emergency Escalation with the relevant Registry Operator. An Emergency Escalation consists of the following minimum elements: electronic (i.e., email or SMS) and/or voice contact notification to the Registry Operator’s emergency operations department with detailed information concerning the issue being escalated, including evidence of monitoring failures, cooperative trouble-shooting of the monitoring failure between ICANN staff and the Registry Operator, and the commitment to begin the process of rectifying issues with either the monitoring service or the service being monitoring.

7.2. **Emergency Escalation initiated by Registrars**

Registry Operator will maintain an emergency operations department prepared to handle emergency requests from Registrars. In the event that a registrar is unable to conduct EPP transactions with the registry for the TLD because of a fault with the Registry Service and is unable to either contact (through ICANN mandated methods of communication) the Registry Operator, or the Registry Operator is unable or unwilling to address the fault, the registrar may initiate an emergency escalation to the emergency operations department of ICANN. ICANN then may initiate an emergency escalation with the Registry Operator as explained above.

7.3. **Notifications of Outages and Maintenance**

In the event that a Registry Operator plans maintenance, it will provide notice to the ICANN emergency operations department, at least, twenty-four (24) hours ahead of that maintenance. ICANN’s emergency operations department will note planned maintenance times, and suspend Emergency Escalation services for the monitored services during the expected maintenance outage period.

If Registry Operator declares an outage, as per its contractual obligations with ICANN, on services under a service level agreement and performance requirements, it will notify the ICANN emergency operations department. During that declared outage, ICANN’s emergency operations department will note and suspend emergency escalation services for the monitored services involved.

8. **Covenants of Performance Measurement**

8.1. **No interference.** Registry Operator shall not interfere with measurement Probes, including any form of preferential treatment of the requests for the monitored services. Registry Operator shall respond to the measurement
tests described in this Specification as it would to any other request from an
Internet user (for DNS and RDDS) or registrar (for EPP).

8.2. **ICANN testing registrar.** Registry Operator agrees that ICANN will have a
testing registrar used for purposes of measuring the **SLRs** described above.
Registry Operator agrees to not provide any differentiated treatment for the
testing registrar other than no billing of the transactions. ICANN shall not
use the registrar for registering domain names (or other registry objects) for
itself or others, except for the purposes of verifying contractual compliance
with the conditions described in this Agreement. Registry Operator shall
identify these transactions using Registrar ID 9997.
SPECIFICATION 11

PUBLIC INTEREST COMMITMENTS

1. Registry Operator will use only ICANN accredited registrars that are party to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement approved by the ICANN Board of Directors on 27 June 2013 in registering domain names. A list of such registrars shall be maintained by ICANN on ICANN’s website.

2. Registry Operator will operate the registry for the TLD in compliance with all commitments, statements of intent and business plans stated in the following sections of Registry Operator’s application to ICANN for the TLD, which commitments, statements of intent and business plans are hereby incorporated by reference into this Agreement. Registry Operator’s obligations pursuant to this paragraph shall be enforceable by ICANN and through the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process established by ICANN (posted at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/picdrp), which may be revised in immaterial respects by ICANN from time to time (the “PICDRP”). Registry Operator shall comply with the PICDRP. Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

3. Registry Operator agrees to perform the following specific public interest commitments, which commitments shall be enforceable by ICANN and through the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process established by ICANN (posted at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/picdrp), which may be revised in immaterial respects by ICANN from time to time (the “PICDRP”). Registry Operator shall comply with the PICDRP. Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Agreement) following a determination by any PICDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination.

   a. Registry Operator will include a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive
practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domain name.

b. Registry Operator will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in the TLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. Registry Operator will maintain statistical reports on the number of security threats identified and the actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operator will maintain these reports for the term of the Agreement unless a shorter period is required by law or approved by ICANN, and will provide them to ICANN upon request.

c. Registry Operator will operate the TLD in a transparent manner consistent with general principles of openness and non-discrimination by establishing, publishing and adhering to clear registration policies.

d. Registry Operator of a “Generic String” TLD may not impose eligibility criteria for registering names in the TLD that limit registrations exclusively to a single person or entity and/or that person’s or entity’s “Affiliates” (as defined in Section 2.9(c) of the Registry Agreement). “Generic String” means a string consisting of a word or term that denominates or describes a general class of goods, services, groups, organizations or things, as opposed to distinguishing a specific brand of goods, services, groups, organizations or things from those of others.
Registry Operator shall implement and comply with all community registration policies described below and/or attached to this Specification 12.

[Insert registration policies]
ICANN New gTLD Auction Schedule dated 27 April 2016

This Auction schedule has been developed based on an anticipated volume of 20 contention sets per event. However, several factors, including self-resolution of contention sets, Auction eligibility, and postponement requests, will affect the actual number of contention sets participating in each Auction Event. Because of these and other factors, the Auction event for a contention set is subject to change, and the schedule will be updated periodically to reflect these changes. Auction Dates will be confirmed to the application primary contact via the customer portal at least 21 days prior to the Auction.

The latest contention set statuses, including Auction Dates for any contention set, are available on the contention set status page: [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/stringcontentionstatus).

The table below contains Auction Dates and Times as well as Deposit Due Dates and Times. The subsequent pages show the list of the contention sets planned for each Auction, which, as mentioned above, is subject to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Auction Dates</th>
<th>Deposit Due Date</th>
<th>Deposit Due Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auction #</strong></td>
<td><strong>Auction Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>Auction Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4-Jun-2014</td>
<td>13:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9-Jul-2014</td>
<td>16:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-Aug-2014</td>
<td>20:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17-Sep-2014</td>
<td>13:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22-Oct-2014</td>
<td>16:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19-Nov-2014</td>
<td>20:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17-Dec-2014</td>
<td>13:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21-Jan-2015</td>
<td>16:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25-Feb-2015</td>
<td>20:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29-Apr-2015</td>
<td>16:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27-May-2015</td>
<td>20:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29-Jul-2015</td>
<td>13:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16-Sep-2015</td>
<td>16:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14-Oct-2015</td>
<td>20:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18-Nov-2015</td>
<td>13:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20-Jan-2016</td>
<td>16:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25-May-2016</td>
<td>20:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>27-Jul-2016</td>
<td>13:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Auction Dates: Indirect Contention</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>20-May-2015</td>
<td>13:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>27-Jan-2016</td>
<td>16:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>27-Jul-2016</td>
<td>13:00 UTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Auction Date and Time refer to the Auction Commencement Date and may not reflect Auction Manager’s intention to provide Early Bidding -- a time period prior to the standard 30 minutes of bidding for Round 1.

**This indirect set changed to a direct set due to resolution of one of the strings contained in the set. See Announcement.

Updates to the Auction Schedule as of 27 April 2016.
This version is updated to reflect eligible contention sets. Additional Auctions may be scheduled based on eligibility.
## Auction Schedule

**Dated: 27 April 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Schedule as of 19 March 2014</th>
<th>Contention Set Number</th>
<th>Contention Set Name</th>
<th>Contention Set Status</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auction #1 - Commencement Date on 4 June 2014 at 13:00 UTC</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>信息 (xn--vuq861b)</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #2 - Commencement Date on 9 July 2014 at 16:00 UTC</td>
<td>No Contention Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #3 - Commencement Date on 6 August 2014 at 20:00 UTC</td>
<td>No Contention Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #4 - Commencement Date on 17 September 2014 at 13:00 UTC</td>
<td>1 *</td>
<td>16 BUY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 *</td>
<td>20 TECH</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 *</td>
<td>41 VIP</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #5 - Commencement Date on 22 October 2014 16:00 UTC</td>
<td>2 * †</td>
<td>28 SALON</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 109</td>
<td>109 SPOT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 112</td>
<td>112 REALTY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #6 - Commencement Date on 19 November 2014 at 20:00 UTC</td>
<td>3 * †</td>
<td>52 DOT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #7 - Commencement Date on 17 December 2014 at 13:00 UTC</td>
<td>3 * †</td>
<td>67 BABY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 144</td>
<td>144 MLS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #8 - Commencement Date on 21 January 2015 at 16:00 UTC</td>
<td>No Contention Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #9 - Commencement Date on 25 February 2015 at 20:00 UTC</td>
<td>2 †</td>
<td>39 APP</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #10 - Commencement Date on 25 March 2015 at 13:00 UTC</td>
<td>10 214</td>
<td>214 PING</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 226</td>
<td>226 SRL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #11 - Commencement Date on 29 April 2015 at 16:00 UTC</td>
<td>No Contention Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #12 - Commencement Date on 20 May 2015 at 13:00 UTC</td>
<td>No Contention Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #13 - Commencement Date on 27 May 2015 at 20:00 UTC</td>
<td>No Contention Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #14 - Commencement Date on 29 July 2015 at 13:00 UTC</td>
<td>No Contention Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #15 - Commencement Date on 14 October 2015 at 20:00 UTC</td>
<td>No Contention Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #16 - Commencement Date on 18 November 2015 at 13:00 UTC</td>
<td>4 82</td>
<td>HOTELS/HOTEIS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #17 - Commencement Date on 20 January 2016 at 16:00 UTC</td>
<td>No Contention Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #B - Commencement Date on 27 January 2016 at 16:00 UTC</td>
<td>N/A 229</td>
<td>SHOP</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #18 - Commencement Date on 25 May 2016 at 20:00 UTC</td>
<td>9 †</td>
<td>187 DOCTOR</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #19 - Commencement Date on 27 July 2016 at 13:00 UTC</td>
<td>10 215</td>
<td>KID/KIDS</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction #C - Commencement Date on 27 July 2016 at 13:00 UTC</td>
<td>N/A 233</td>
<td>WEB/WEBS</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Letters denote Indirect Auctions. For Auction #B (SHOP), this set changed from indirect to direct due to resolution of SHOPPING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Schedule as of 19 March 2014</th>
<th>Contention Set Number</th>
<th>Contention Set Name</th>
<th>Contention Set Status</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ECO</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>GAY</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>RADIO</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>LLP</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>HOTEL</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>MAIL</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>MERCK</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>RUGBY</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>LLC</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>CORP</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>CHARITY</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>SPORT / SPORTS</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contention Sets: Not Yet Eligible:

- 231 SPORT / SPORTS
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## Auction Schedule

**Dated:** 27 April 2016

### Contention Sets: Resolved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Schedule as of 19 March 2014</th>
<th>Contention Set Number</th>
<th>Contention Set Name</th>
<th>Contention Set Status</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>網址 (xn--ses554g)</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>網店 (xn--htx814e)</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>點看 (xn--c1yn36f) / 点看 (xn--3pxu8k)</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>盛貿飯店 (xn--hxt035cmppuel) / 盛贸饭店 (xn--hxt035czzpffl)</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>微博 (xn--9krt00a)</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>娛樂 (xn--fjq720a)</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>广东 (xn--xhq521b)</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>網站 (xn--5tzm5g)</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PLAY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>PARTY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ENERGY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>FOOD</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FISHING</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>WEDDING</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>CHURCH</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FURNITURE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>DOCS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>COUPON</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>CASA</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GMBH</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>HELP</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>BLOG</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>INSURANCE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>DESI</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>ONLINE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>BROADWAY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TRADING</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>LIVE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>AUCTION</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>POKER</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>FLOWERS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>TALK</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>DIET</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>TICKETS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>LOVE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GDN</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>LEGAL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>BASKETBALL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>CLOUD</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>NEWS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>AUTO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>BOOK</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Schedule as of 19 March 2014</td>
<td>Contention Set Number</td>
<td>Contention Set Name</td>
<td>Contention Set Status</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>* 71 DEAL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72 ART</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73 LTD</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74 HOSTING</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75 AFRICA</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76 PROPERTY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77 MOBILE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78 FASHION</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4 †</td>
<td>79 FILM</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80 RED</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83 GUIDE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84 WEIBO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85 GOO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87 YOGA</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88 GROCERY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4 †</td>
<td>89 CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90 THEATER</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91 DATA</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92 HEALTH</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93 GRATIS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4 †</td>
<td>94 EARTH</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95 DELIVERY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96 MEDIA</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97 SKI</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5 †</td>
<td>98 MONSTER</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99 IMMO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100 SAVE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101 DESIGN</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5 †</td>
<td>103 PET / PETS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>104 DEALS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105 PIZZA</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>107 MEMORIAL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>108 LAW</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5 †</td>
<td>109 LAWYER</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110 REALSTATE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>111 GIFTS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113 MED</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>114 BAND</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5 †</td>
<td>115 RESTAURANT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>116 REVIEW</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118 SARL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>119 FORSALE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6 †</td>
<td>120 TOUR / TOURS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>122 DEV</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6 †</td>
<td>123 PHOTOGRAPHY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>124 PAY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6 †</td>
<td>125 PLUS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>126 APARTMENTS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6 †</td>
<td>127 WOW</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>128 MONEY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Auction Schedule
**Dated: 27 April 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Schedule as of 19 March 2014</th>
<th>Contention Set Number</th>
<th>Contention Set Name</th>
<th>Contention Set Status</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>CHAT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>OSAKA</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>MOVIE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>LATINO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>SUCKS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>TENNIS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>VOTE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>HOT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>VIDEO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>BINGO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>DRIVE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>STYLE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>STORE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>TEAM</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>BOATS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>YOU</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>CRUISE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>GIFT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>SALE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>STORAGE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>CRICKET</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>SHOW</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>FOOTBALL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>DIRECT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>LIFE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>CASINO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>MOTO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>MARKETING</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>MOM</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>TUBE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>GOLF</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>SECURE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>RACING</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>BANK</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>JEWELRY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>LUXURY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>TIRES</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>LOL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>FYI</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>WINE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>DIY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Schedule as of 19 March 2014</th>
<th>Contention Set Number</th>
<th>Contention Set Name</th>
<th>Contention Set Status</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>FIT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>GOLD</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 †</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>SOCCER</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 †</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 †</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>UNICOM / UNICORN</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>BET</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>GARDEN</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 †</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>CLICK</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>HAIR</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 †</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>BEAUTY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 †</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>LIVING</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>DISCOUNT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>CLUB</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>YUN</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>BOX</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>AUDIO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>CAFE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>FISH</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>BROKER</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 †</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>EXPRESS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 †</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>FUN</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>FORUM</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>HOCKEY</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>EXPERT</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>RUN</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>JUEGOS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>GUARDIAN</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>BASEBALL</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>LOANS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 †</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>STREAM</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>WORLD</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>COUPONS</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>STUDIO</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>TAXI</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>CARS / CAR</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>GAME / GAMES</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>SHOPPING</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>N/A: Resolved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:

* Postponement accommodated per pending finalization of Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework

† Postponement accommodated per request by all members in the Contention Set

‡ Pending Auction Eligibility. Once a Contention Set is Eligible, ICANN will attempt to schedule the Contention Sets based on the original Auction Date as stated 19 March 2014. If the Auction Date has passed or does not meet a minimum amount of lead time, the Contention Set will be scheduled for the next available Auction Date.
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Hi,

We support a postponement of the .WEB auction to give ICANN and the other applicants time to investigate whether there has been a change of leadership and/or control of another applicant, NU DOT CO LLC. To do otherwise would be unfair, as we do not have transparency into who leads and controls that applicant as the auction approaches.

Brijesh Joshi
Director,
Radix FZC, Dot Web, Inc.
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JUL 11 2016

Schlund Technologies GmbH | Maximilianstr. 8 | 93047 Regensburg | Germany

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536
USA

To: Akram Atallah, Christine Willett, John Jeffrey
Via e-mail and fax

July 11, 2016

RE: Postponement of ICANN Auction .WEB/.WEBS

Dear Mr. Atallah, Ms. Willett, and Mr. Jeffrey,

Schlund Technologies GmbH is one of the applicants for .WEB with a scheduled ICANN Auction on July 27, 2016.

We support a postponement of the auction, to give ICANN and the other applicants time to investigate whether there has been a change of leadership and/or control of another applicant, NU DOT CO LLC. To do otherwise would be unfair, as we do not have transparency into who leads and controls that applicant as the auction approaches.

Sincerely,

Thomas Moarz
CEO
Exhibit 10
Exhibit 11
Reconsideration Request by Ruby Glen, LLC and Radix FZC

Regarding Staff Action Taken in Response to Concerns Raised by Multiple Members of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set in Relation to Apparent Discrepancies in the Application of Contention Set Member, NU DOT CO LLC

Introductory Summary

Ruby Glen, LLC and Radix FZC (on behalf of its applicant affiliate DotWeb Inc.), applicants for the .WEB/.WEBS gTLD contention set (hereinafter, the “Applicants”), submit this Request for Reconsideration (the “Request”) to provide ICANN with an opportunity to correct the actions and inactions of its staff (collectively, the “Staff Action”) that (a) violate established ICANN policy and guidelines, (b) materially affect the rights of the contention set members, and (c) compromise the integrity of ICANN’s administration of the .WEB/.WEBS auction.

The Staff Action at issue arises from apparent discrepancies in the application of NU DOT CO LLC (“NDC”) to participate in the upcoming .WEB/.WEBS contention set auction. Specifically, on June 7, 2016, when explaining NDC’s decision to forego agreement to resolve the .WEB/.WEBS contention set prior to ICANN auction (as it had done before with its other applied-for gTLDs), NDC stated that (a) Nicolai Bezsonoff, who is identified as NDC’s Secondary Contact, Manager, and COO, is "no longer involved with [NDC’s] applications" and (b) there were “several other[]” new members of the NDC “board” not listed in its application. NDC also advised of a potential change in the ownership and/or leadership of NDC.¹ Noting that NDC’s statements directly

¹ In the time since NDC made these statements, Applicants have learned of speculation within the industry that NDC has sold its application to Neustar, Inc. or Verisign, Inc. See e.g., Kevin Murphy, Is Verisign .web applicant’s secret sugar
contradict information contained in its application, Applicants and other members of the contention set diligently reached out to alert both ICANN staff and the ICANN ombudsman to the apparent changes in leadership and/or control of NDC.

On July 13, 2016, in response to the concerns raised by multiple .WEB applicants, ICANN staff issued a statement acknowledging that it had received multiple requests to investigate “potential changes of control of [NDC]” and postpone the .WEB/.WEBS auction of last resort. Despite the gravity of the concerns raised by these applicants, ICANN staff summarily dismissed the requests with a blunt three-line statement that ICANN had “investigated the matter” and “found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.” Notably, ICANN’s statement made no mention of having conducted an inquiry into (a) Mr. Bezsonoff’s current status, if any, with NDC; (b) any new board members or managers not listed in the application; or (c) any change in ownership or leadership of NDC.

The decision by ICANN staff to forego a full and transparent investigation into the material representations made by NDC is a clear violation of the principles and procedures set forth in the ICANN Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (the “ICANN Bylaws”) and the ICANN gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Applicant Guidebook”). Indeed, the unceremonious nature of the statement provided by ICANN raises serious issues as to the thoroughness of any investigation undertaken by ICANN staff and the impartiality with which ICANN administers its own guidelines and policies. The curt

daddy?, DOMAIN INCITE (July 14, 2016) http://domainincite.com/20748-is-verisign-web-applicants-secret-sugar-daddy. Although Applicants are unaware of the legitimacy of these reports, they cannot help but observe that such a transfer would explain NDC’s statements regarding an apparent change of control and its decision to deviate from prior auction behavior by pushing the .WEB/WEBS contention set to an ICANN auction of last resort.
dismissal also provokes suspicion as to whether the inherent conflict of interest presented by the benefit to ICANN of conducting an auction of last resort impacted the manner in which NDC’s change of leadership and control was “investigated.”

The Staff Action has placed ICANN in a position of having to defend against questions of accountability and self-interest in the face of clearly contradictory statements provided by a gTLD applicant in the .WEB/.WEBS contention set. Applicants respectfully request that the Board remedy the missteps presented by the Staff Action and restore integrity to the transparency, accountability mechanisms, and rules upon which Applicants relied in applying to participate in the .WEB/.WEBS auction.

1. Requester Information

Name: Ruby Glen, LLC (“Ruby Glen”)
Address: c/o Donuts Inc., Contact Information Redacted
Email: Contact Information Redacted
Counsel: Alvaro Alvarez – Donuts Inc. SVP, General Counsel & Secretary

Name: Radix FZC on behalf of applicant affiliate DotWeb Inc. (“Radix”)
Address: c/o Brijesh Joshi, Contact Information Redacted
Email: Contact Information Redacted

2. Request for Reconsideration of (check one only):

   ___ Board action/inaction
   X Staff action/inaction

3. Description of specific action you are seeking to have reconsidered.
Applicants seek reconsideration of (a) ICANN’s determination that it “found no basis to initiate the application change request process” in response to the contradictory statements of NDC and (b) ICANN’s improper denial of Applicants’ (and at least one other .WEB applicant’s) request to postpone the .WEB/.WEBS auction, currently scheduled for July 27, 2016. The requested postponement would have provided ICANN and the .WEB/.WEBS applicants the time necessary to conduct a full and transparent investigation into material discrepancies in NDC’s application and its eligibility as a contention set member.

4. **Date of action/inaction:**

    July 13, 2016. The Staff Action was set forth in a statement from Christine Willett, Vice President of gTLD Operations for ICANN to the members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set.

5. **On what date did you became aware of the action or that action would not be taken?**

    July 13, 2016. Notice of the Staff Action was provided to the .WEB/.WEBS contention set members via electronic mail.

6. **Describe how you believe you are materially affected by the action or inaction:**

    Applicants and other members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set, with the exception of NDC, continue to be adversely affected by ICANN’s (a) failure to thoroughly investigate the issues raised by NDC’s own statements and (b) refusal to postpone the .WEB/.WEBS auction of last resort to allow for a full and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies in NDC’s .WEB/.WEBS application.
Applicants applied for the .WEB gTLD in reliance on ICANN’s representations that, in accordance with well-established ICANN policies and procedures, the application, evaluation, and auction processes would be administered in a fair and transparent manner. Applicants also relied on ICANN’s representations that applicants would be held accountable for the accuracy of their submissions. Just as Applicants understood that they were bound to the obligations set forth in the Applicant Guidebook to preserve a level playing field, Applicants understood and relied upon ICANN’s representations that each of the other members of the contention set would be required to abide by the same obligations. By failing to hold NDC accountable for its own contradictory statements, ICANN has placed all other .WEB applicants in a situation where they will be forced to bid against a party that has violated ICANN guidelines by being less than transparent as to changes in its ownership and/or leadership and, as a result, may be subject to disqualification.

Proceeding to the ICANN auction of last resort now would also ensure that Applicants and the remaining members continue to face an unsettled result. Applicants anticipate that if NDC is the successful bidder at the .WEB/.WEBS auction, multiple members of the contention set will renew their calls for ICANN to investigate and perhaps even take legal action to enforce their rights. This is especially true if it later comes to light that there was any truth to the rumors that NDC has sold or otherwise transferred its interest in the .WEB application to an ineligible third party—rumors that could be easily vetted by ICANN in the process of investigating NDC’s recent and undisputed statements at issue in this Request. There exists the very real likelihood that ICANN will be forced to unwind the transaction, further delaying the release of the
.WEB/.WEBS gTLD to the public, eroding ICANN’s legitimacy and reputation, and causing ICANN and the members of the contention set to expend additional time, money, and resources in resolving an issue that could have easily been addressed at this juncture with a modest delay.

7. Describe how others may be adversely affected by the action or inaction, if you believe that this is a concern.

The damage caused by ICANN’s failure to adhere to the accountability and transparency mechanisms by which it agreed to administer the .WEB/.WEBS auction is not limited to Applicants and the members of the contention set. As stated above, it is more than likely that absent an investigation into the contradictory statements made by NDC, a successful bid by NDC at an auction of last resort will ultimately be challenged by way of an appeal within the ICANN process, a multi-party lawsuit filed in the court system, and potentially, an antitrust review conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice. By proceeding with the .WEB/.WEBS auction, in the face of admissions by NDC and other credible evidence of discrepancies in NDC’s application and an apparent change of control, leadership and/or ownership, there is a strong likelihood of a further and more significant delay in releasing these domains, thereby adversely affecting the public at large.

More fundamentally, ICANN’s decision to forego a harmless postponement of the .WEB/.WEBS auction to conduct a transparent investigation into these issues does nothing to dispel questions surrounding ICANN’s ability to be accountable and transparent in its administration of the gTLD program—questions that were raised recently by a federal court in California regarding the .AFRICA gTLD. The ramifications
of yet another breakdown in ICANN’s transparency and accountability obligations will further harm ICANN and the Internet community at large by (a) broadening the public perception that ICANN lacks either the ability or the willingness to effectively combat the appearance of disparate treatment among gTLD applicants and (b) advising gTLD applicants that there will be neither penalty nor recourse for failing to abide by the obligations set forth in the Application Guidebook. Each of these results will severely affect ICANN, the Internet community, and the public at large.

8. **Detail of Board or Staff Action – Required Information**

The Staff Action at issue arises from apparent discrepancies in NDC’s .WEB/.WEBS application and recent statements regarding an apparent change of control, leadership and/or ownership over its application. As relevant here, Section 1.2.7 of the Applicant Guidebook requires an applicant to notify ICANN of any changes to its application; the failure to do so can result in the denial of an application. *See e.g.*, Applicant Guidebook at § 1.2.7 (stating ongoing duty to update “applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant”); § 6.1 (confirming that “[a]pplicant agrees to notify ICANN in writing of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading”). Similarly, under Section 6.10 of the Applicant Guidebook, an applicant may not “resell, assign, or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application”; violating this provision may result in the disqualification of an active application. *Id.* at § 6.10. As set forth below, there is significant evidence that NDC may have violated each of these guidelines.

On June 13, 2012, NDC submitted application number 1-1296-36138 for the
.WEB/.WEBS contention set. Among other things, the application required NDC to provide “the identification of directors, officers, partners, and major shareholders of that entity.” See Applicant Guidebook at § 1.2.1. As relevant here, NDC provided the following response to Sections 7 and 11 of the application:

**Secondary Contact**

7(a). Name

Mr. Nicolai Bezsonoff

7(b). Title

Manager

**Applicant Background**

11(a). Name(s) and position(s) of all directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ignacio Rasco III</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Diego Calle</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolai Bezsonoff</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(b). Name(s) and position(s) of all officers and partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ignacio Rasco III</td>
<td>CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Diego Calle</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolai Bezsonoff</td>
<td>CCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(c). Name(s) and position(s) of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain Marketing Holdings, LLC</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUCO LP, LLC</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By submitting its application for the .WEB gTLD and electing to participate in the .WEB/.WEBS auction, NDC expressly agreed to the terms and conditions set forth in the Applicant Guidebook as well as ICANN’s Auction Rules for New gTLDs ("Auction Rules"), including specifically, and without limitation, Sections 1.2.1, 1.2.7, 6.1 and 6.10
of the Applicant Guidebook.

On June 7, 2016, Ruby Glen contacted NDC to inquire as to whether NDC might reconsider its then-recent decision to forego resolution of the .WEB/.WEBS contention prior to ICANN’s auction of last resort. In response, NDC stated that its position had not changed. NDC also advised, however, that Nicolai Bezsonoff, who is identified on NDC’s .WEB application (see above) as Secondary Contact, Manager, and COO, is “no longer involved with [NDC’s] applications.” NDC also made statements indicating a potential change in the ownership of NDC, including an admission that the board of NDC had changed to add “several others.” The email communication containing these statements is set forth in pertinent part below:

From: Jose Ignacio Rasco  Contact information Redacted
Subject: Re: .web
Date: June 7, 2016 at 11:32:17 AM EDT
To: Jon Nevett  Contact information Redacted
Cc: Juan Diego Calle  Contact information Redacted

Jon,

[Redacted]

Nicolai is at NSR full time and no longer involved with our TLD applications. I’m still running our program and Juan sits on the board with me and several others.

[Redacted]

Best,
Jose

Noting that (a) NDC’s statements appeared to directly contradict information in

To the extent it may be relevant to this Request, NDC applied for 13 gTLDs in the New gTLD Program. As of the date of this submission, nine of those gTLDs were resolved with NDC’s agreement to participate in a private resolution. NDC did not become the registry operator for any of the gTLDs it resolved to date. The auction for the .WEB gTLD is the first auction in which NDC has pushed for an ICANN auction of last resort.

An unredacted copy of the embedded email was previously provided by Ruby Glen to the ICANN Ombudsman.
NDC’s .WEB application and (b) strong direct and circumstantial evidence shows that NDC has either resold, assigned or transferred its rights in the application in violation of its duties under the Applicant Guidebook, Ruby Glen diligently contacted ICANN staff in writing with the discrepancy on or about June 22. Ruby Glen also formally raised the issue with the ICANN Ombudsman on or about June 30, 2016. It also discussed the matter with ICANN staff and the Ombudsman at ICANN’s most recent meeting in Helsinki, Finland. At the time of submission of this Request, Ruby Glen’s most recent correspondence with the ICANN Ombudsman, dated July 10, 2016, in which it provided further information related to the statements made by NDC, remains unanswered.

At every opportunity, Ruby Glen raised the need for a postponement of the .WEB/.WEBS auction to allow ICANN (and the other applicants) time to investigate and address the contradictory representations made by NDC in relation to its pending application and status as an auction participant. On July 11, 2016, Radix (on behalf of DotWeb Inc.) and Schlund Technologies GmbH, each members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set, sent correspondence to ICANN stating their own concerns in proceeding with the .WEB/.WEBS auction as currently scheduled. The correspondence stated:

We support a postponement of the auction, to give ICANN and the other applicants time to investigate whether there has been a change of leadership and/or control of another applicant, NU DOT CO LLC. To do otherwise would be unfair, as we do not have transparency into who leads and controls that applicant as the auction approaches.

On July 13, 2016, ICANN issued a statement denying the collective request of multiple members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set to postpone the July 27, 2016 auction to allow for a full and transparent investigation into apparent discrepancies in the NDC application, as highlighted by NDC’s own statements. Without providing any
detail, ICANN simply stated as follows:

Secondly, in regards to potential changes of control of NU DOT CO LLC, we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.

ICANN’s decision did not address the manner or scope of the claimed investigation nor did it specifically address whether specific inquiry was made into (a) Mr. Bezsonoff’s current status, if any, with NDC, (b) the identity of “several other[]” new and unvetted members of NDC’s board or (c) any change in ownership—the very issues raised by NDC’s own statements.

As set forth more fully in Section 10, infra, the brief statement provided by ICANN in response to the applicants’ concerns—without any explanation to resolve the issues presented by NDC’s provision of contradictory information or to address the failure to grant the requested postponement—is inconsistent with ICANN’s stated commitment to accountability and transparency in the auction process, and innumerable provisions of the rules and regulations governing ICANN’s administration of the New gTLD Program.

9. **What are you asking ICANN to do now?**

Applicants respectfully request ICANN (1) delay the ICANN auction of last resort for the .WEB/.WEBS contention set **on an emergency basis** and (2) conduct a thorough and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies and/or changes in NDC’s .WEB/.WEBS application in accordance with ICANN’s Bylaws (including ICANN’s guiding principles to ensure transparency, openness and accountability), the Auction Rules, and the Applicant Guidebook.

**A. Urgent Request for Immediate Stay of .WEB/.WEBS Auction**

In light of the rapidly approaching .WEB/.WEBS auction date, Applicants request
a stay of the pending .WEB/.WEBS auction of last resort until (45) days after the issuance of a ruling on the merits of this Request. This Request for stay is supported by the factual background underlying the Staff Action, the grounds upon which the Request is based, and the ongoing harm to the affected parties. See supra Sections 6-8 and infra Section 10.

More to the point, the stay requested by Applicants is mandated by ICANN’s own rules governing Auction Eligibility given the pendency of (a) Ruby Glen’s complaint to the ICANN Ombudsman and (b) this Request. As plainly stated on ICANN’s “New gTLD Program Auctions”, a string contention set will be eligible to enter into a New gTLD Program auction only where all active applications in the contention set have “no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms.” See ICANN’s New gTLD Program Auctions page, available at https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/auctions (emphasis added).

Pursuant to Article IV of ICANN’s Bylaws, entitled “Accountability and Review of ICANN’s By-Laws,” both the ongoing Ombudsman investigation and the Reconsideration Request process constitute ICANN Accountability Mechanisms. As

4 Applicants are aware of the position taken by ICANN with regard to a similar argument advanced in connection with the “DETERMINATION OF THE BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (BGC) RECONSIDERATION REQUESTS 16-1 AND 16-2” dated 25 February 2016. As an initial matter, Applicants believe that the position taken by ICANN in response to Requests 16-1 and 16-2 is limited to the facts presented by the underlying request, which are wholly distinguishable from those presented here. Specifically, Applicants’ Request is supported by (a) good cause, as established by NDC’s own contradictory statements, and (b) Applicants’ diligent efforts to address this issue in the month and half preceding the July 27, 2016 auction date. Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagree with ICANN’s awkward attempt to rewrite the phrase “enter into a New gTLD Program Auction” as “enter[] into the auction process.” ICANN’s argument in support of the proffered interpretation is contradicted not only by the plain language of the Auction Eligibility statement, but also by ICANN’s historical administration of the New gTLD Program. It is also unlikely to pass legal muster.
such, ICANN must refrain from proceeding with the .WEB/.WEBS auction until the resolution of Ruby Glen’s Ombudsman complaint, this Request and any other ICANN Accountability Mechanisms that may currently be in process or outstanding.

The stay is further supported by the fact that NDC’s statements have called into question whether, under the New gTLD Auction Bidder Agreement for the .WEB/.WEBS contention set (the “ICANN Auction Agreement”), NDC meets the standard of a “Qualified Applicant.” In light of these questions, the requested stay will also allow ICANN the opportunity to “conduct due diligence on the Qualified Applicant…in an effort to ensure compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and rules governing the [ICANN auction of last resort].” See ICANN Auction Agreement at § 2.7.

Applicants’ request to stay the .WEB/.WEBS auction of last resort for an additional (45) days after the issuance of a ruling on the merits of this Request will provide the members of the contention set, as well as ICANN, with a reasonable opportunity to re-engage with each other in advance of the auction and give ICANN the time it needs to conduct the investigation this matter deserves. As addressed above, the failure to grant the requested stay will have wide-ranging repercussions that extend far beyond the .WEB/.WEBS auction.

B. Request for ICANN to Conduct Thorough Investigation into Issues Raised by NDC’s Contradictory Statements

Concurrent with the above request, Applicants ask ICANN to utilize the broad investigatory controls described in the Applicant Guidebook—notably, those under Sections 6.8 and 6.11 that seemingly exist precisely for situations such as this—to investigate (a) changes in Mr. Bezsonoff’s status, if any, with NDC and (b) changes in
the control, ownership, or leadership of NDC since the time of NDC’s original gTLD application. Such inquiry should include, at the very least, interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Section 11 of NDC’s application.

10. Please state specifically the grounds under which you have the standing and the right to assert this Request for Reconsideration, and the grounds or justifications that support your request.

Applicants are a approved members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set, with a scheduled auction for July 27, 2016. As approved members, and as set forth more fully throughout this Request, Applicants have been “adversely affected by ... one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy.” ICANN Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.2(a). Specifically, the Staff Action was taken in contradiction of various policy provisions contained in ICANN’s Bylaws (including ICANN’s guiding principles to ensure transparency, openness and accountability), the Auction Rules, and the Applicant Guidebook, all of which require a full and transparent investigation into the discrepancies presented by NDC’s application and its current status as an auction participant.

A. The Staff Action Contradicted Established Policy By Failing to Utilize the Broad Investigative Powers at ICANN’s Disposal in Investigating NDC’s Potential Violation of Guidelines Contained in the Applicant Guidebook

As set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, ICANN has broad authority to investigate all applicants who apply to participate in the New gTLD Auction Program. This investigative authority, willingly provided by each applicant as part of the terms and
conditions set forth in the guidelines contained in the Applicant Guidebook, is set forth in relevant part below:

8. ... In addition, Applicant acknowledges that [sic] to allow ICANN to conduct thorough background screening investigations:

... 

c. Additional identifying information may be required to resolve questions of identity of individuals within the applicant organization; ...

... 

11. Applicant authorizes ICANN to:

a. Contact any person, group, or entity to request, obtain, and discuss any documentation or other information that, in ICANN's sole judgment, may be pertinent to the application;

b. Consult with persons of ICANN's choosing regarding the information in the application or otherwise coming into ICANN's possession . . .

See Applicant Guidebook at §§ 6.8, 6.10 (emphasis added).

ICANN’s obligation to conduct a thorough investigation is necessary to ensure the integrity of the auction process and the existence of a level playing field among the ultimate members of a contention set. Background investigations into “applicants (including all parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, contractors, employees and any all others acting on [their] behalf)” also ensure that each applicant is capable of administering any new gTLD that it may secure at auction, thereby benefiting the public at large. See Applicant Guidebook, § 6 at Introduction. This information also allows ICANN to determine whether an entity applicant, or an individual associated with an entity applicant, has engaged in the automatically disqualifying conduct set forth in Section 1.2.1 of the Applicant Guidebook. Indeed, ICANN requires those submitting a
gTLD application to provide warranties as to the truth and accuracy of their representations, even going so far as to mandate a continuing obligation to notify ICANN of “any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading.” See id. at 1.

In spite of the above, when faced with recent statements by NDC that expressly contradict those contained in its gTLD application—and directly affect its ability to participate in the .WEB/.WEBS auction—ICANN appears to have engaged in only a cursory examination of the issue. The only available conclusion is that the Staff Action was taken without attention to, in contravention of, and with apparent disregard for its obligation to investigate the veracity of the representations made by NDC and its potential changes of control, leadership, and/or ownership.5

In light of the noted deficiencies identified in relation to the Staff Action, Applicants respectfully request ICANN now take the time to engage in a full and transparent investigation into material discrepancies in NDC’s application and its status as a contention set member and postpone the .WEB/.WEBS auction, currently scheduled for July 27, 2016. All .WEB/.WEBS applicants deserve to participate in an auction with transparency as to the competition and integrity as to the process.

B. The Staff Action Contradicted Established Policy By Failing to Adhere to the Transparency and Accountability Guidelines Set Forth in ICANN’s Bylaws

5 Because the Staff Action also contradicted established policy relating to transparency, as set forth infra, Applicants are unfortunately forced to presume that a thorough background investigation of the nature described in Sections 6.8 and 6.11 of the Applicant Guidebook did not occur during the course of the decision-making process.
In addition to ICANN’s failure to adhere to the specific guidelines established for the administration of gTLD auctions, the Staff Action (and the events leading thereto) were taken in contravention of multiple provisions of the ICANN Bylaws, all of which require ICANN to administer the .WEB/.WEBS auction process with transparency, accountability, good faith and fair dealing. Collectively, these violations not only provide a solid basis for granting this Request but also revive serious doubts as to ICANN’s ability to process and manage the New gTLD Program in a transparent and accountable manner.

i. The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. I, § 2.8:

Article 1, section 2.8 of ICANN’s Bylaws requires ICANN to “[m]ak[e] decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.” As set forth above, ICANN obligates each applicant who seeks to participate in the gTLD auction process to affirm that the statements and representations contained in the application are true and accurate; applicants also undertake a continuing obligation to update their application when changes in circumstance affect an application’s accuracy. See Applicant Guidebook at § 6.1. In turn, ICANN represents to the applicants that it will safeguard the entire gTLD application process, including any auctions of last resort, by taking steps to diligently investigate the information provided by each applicant to ensure its accuracy. By failing to engage in a thorough, open and transparent investigation of the contradictory statements made by NDC in relation to its application, as well as an apparent change of control with potential antitrust implications, the Staff Action plainly—and inexplicably—failed to reach its decisions by “applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.” See ICANN Bylaws, Art. I,
§ 2.8.

ii. The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. I, § 2.9:

Article 1, section 2.9 of ICANN’s Bylaws requires ICANN to “[act] with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.” In undertaking only a cursory examination of the contradictory statements made by NDC and the apparent change in NDC’s rights to its application, the Staff Action failed to balance ICANN’s interest in a swift resolution of the concerns raised by the members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set with its obligation to obtain sufficient assurances and information from the individuals and entities at the center of the statements made by NDC; at the very least, ICANN staff should have conducted interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Section 11 of NDC’s application prior to reaching its conclusion.

iii. The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. I, § 2.10

Article 1, section 2.10 of ICANN’s Bylaws requires ICANN to “[r]emain[] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness.” By failing to make use of the processes established in Sections 6.8 and 6.10 to the Applicant Guidebook in investigating an admitted failure by NDC to abide by its continuing obligation to update its application, ICANN staff disregarded the very accountability mechanisms put in place to serve and protect not only the Internet community but the public at large. This error was compounded by the cursory dismissal of the concerns raised by multiple members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set relating to the accuracy of the representations made in NDC’s application. By failing to apprise
the members of the contention set as to the manner and scope of the investigation conducted by ICANN staff, ICANN failed to ensure that it would hold itself accountable to any gTLD applicant, let alone the broader Internet community.

iv. **The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. II, § 3:**

Article II, section 3 of ICANN’s Bylaws states that “ICANN shall not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition.” There can be no questioning the fact that the Staff Action resulted in disparate treatment in favor of NDC. On one hand, there are clear statements from NDC that representations made in its application are, at best, misleading and there is ample evidence that NDC has either resold, assigned or transferred all or some of its rights to the application. On the other hand, when pressed by multiple members of the contention set to fully investigate the matter, ICANN provided only a conclusory statement that raises more questions than it resolves. To the extent it had reason to engage in such disparate treatment of the members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set, ICANN failed to provide such a reason in reaching the determinations at issue in this Request. Certainly, Applicants can think of no “substantial and reasonable cause,” to justify the Staff Action. *Id.* at ICANN Bylaws, Art. II, § 3.

v. **The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. III, § 1:**

Article 3, section 1 ICANN’s Bylaws states the “ICANN and its constituent bodies shall operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.” Over the course of its
existence, ICANN has repeatedly prevailed upon the stakeholders in the ICANN policy process to trust that it will administer its obligations in a fair and transparent manner. The continued trust of ICANN’s stakeholders, however, can only extend as far as ICANN is willing to honor its stated commitments to accountability and transparency in every aspect of its work.

If any situation demanded the full transparency to which ICANN has repeatedly committed itself, it must certainly be the one presented here, where a single, hasty backroom decision effectively ensures that the proceeds from the .WEB/.WEBS auction will flow to ICANN under an unfortunate cloud of suspected conflicts of interest and disparate treatment. Applicants respectfully request that ICANN reconsider the Staff Action and provide relief in the manner set forth in Section 8 of its Request.

11. Are you bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities? (Check one)

  ____ Yes
  ___ No

11a. If yes, is the causal connection between the circumstances of the Reconsideration Request and the harm the same for all of the complaining parties? Explain.

  Applicants have joined together to submit this Request. Moreover, as of date of the submission of this Request, Applicants are aware that other members of the .WEB/WEBS contention set also may join in Applicants’ Request. With the exception of NDC, both the circumstances of this Request and the harm described herein is the same for Applicants and all other contention members.
Terms and Conditions for Submission of Reconsideration Requests

The Board Governance Committee has the ability to consolidate the consideration of Reconsideration Requests if the issues stated within are sufficiently similar. The Board Governance Committee may dismiss Reconsideration Requests that are querulous or vexatious. Hearings are not required in the Reconsideration Process, however Requestors may request a hearing. The BGC retains the absolute discretion to determine whether a hearing is appropriate, and to call people before it for a hearing. The BGC may take a decision on reconsideration of requests relating to staff action/inaction without reference to the full ICANN Board. Whether recommendations will issue to the ICANN Board is within the discretion of the BGC. The ICANN Board of Director’s decision on the BGC’s reconsideration recommendation is final and not subject to a reconsideration request.

DATED: 17 July 2016 Respectfully submitted,

/ama/
Alvaro Alvarez
SVP, General Counsel & Secretary
Donuts Inc.

/bj/
Brijesh Joshi
Director, Radix FZC, on behalf of its applicant affiliate DotWeb Inc.
Exhibit 12
DETERMINATION
OF THE BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (BGC)
RECONSIDERATION REQUEST 16-9

21 JULY 2016

The Requesters, Ruby Glen, LLC and Radix FZC, submitted a reconsideration request seeking urgent reconsideration of ICANN’s decision not to delay the .WEB/.WEBS auction (scheduled for 27 July 2016) following ICANN’s investigation into alleged material changes in Nu Dot Co LLC’s (Nu Dot’s) application for .WEB.

I. Brief Summary.

Seven applications for .WEB and one application for .WEBS are currently in a contention set (.WEB/.WEBS Contention Set) and scheduled to participate in an auction of last resort on 27 July 2016 (Auction). The Requesters and Nu Dot each submitted an application for .WEB and are Auction participants. The Requesters contacted ICANN staff on or about 23 June 2016 and submitted a complaint to the Ombudsman during ICANN56 in June 2016 alleging that Nu Dot had experienced changes in leadership and/or control without notifying ICANN, as it is obligated to do. The Requesters then submitted an urgent Reconsideration Request on 17 July 2016 (Request 16-9) claiming that: (a) the Auction should be postponed because there are pending accountability mechanisms (initiated by the Requesters); and (b) reconsideration is warranted because ICANN’s investigation of the alleged changes in Nu Dot’s application was insufficient and, in the Requesters’ view, comprises “a clear violation of the principles and procedures set forth in the ICANN Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws[,] and the ICANN gTLD Applicant Guidebook.”¹

¹ Request, Pg. 2.
The Requesters’ claims do not warrant postponement of the Auction or reconsideration. First, the Requesters argue that their pending complaint with the Ombudsman and initiation of Request 16-9 require ICANN to postpone the Auction. However, there is no policy requiring ICANN to postpone the Auction here because these accountability mechanisms were not initiated before the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set entered into the Auction process on 27 April 2016. Indeed, the timing parameters within the auction rules were established specifically so that auction participants could not game the system by filing last-minute accountability mechanisms. Second, reconsideration is not warranted because the Requesters do not identify any misapplication of policy or procedure by ICANN staff in its investigation of the allegations regarding Nu Dot’s application.

Contrary to the Requesters’ claims, ICANN diligently investigated the alleged potential changes to Nu Dot’s application and found no basis to initiate the application change request process.² Because the Requesters have failed to show that ICANN staff acted in contravention of established policy or procedure, the BGC concludes that Request 16-9 be denied.

II. Facts.

A. Background Facts.

In June 2012, Ruby Glen, LLC, DotWeb Inc. (an affiliate of Radix FZC), Nu Dot, Charleston Road Registry, Inc., Web.com Group, Inc., Afifias Domains No. 3 Limited, and Schlund Technologies GmbH each submitted an application for .WEB; Vistaprint Limited filed two applications for .WEBS (one standard, and one community-based that was later withdrawn).

² Furthermore, even if ICANN had determined that an applicant change request was necessary, ICANN has discretion to determine whether a change request warrants postponing an auction.
Nu Dot’s application listed three officers/directors: Jose Ignacio Rasco II, CFO; Juan Diego Calle, CEO; and Nicolai Bezsonoff, COO.3

The seven applications for .WEB and the remaining application for .WEBS are in the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set.4

On 27 April 2016, ICANN initiated the Auction process by notifying all active members of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set that the Auction had been scheduled and providing instructions and deadlines to participate in the Auction.

According to the Requesters, on or about 7 June 2016 they contacted Nu Dot and asked Nu Dot to reconsider its decision to forego private resolution of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set. The Requesters have indicated that Nu Dot’s reply included the following statement: “Nicolai [Bezsonoff] is at NSR full-time and is no longer involved with our TLD applications. [Jose Ignacio Rasco II is] still running our program and Juan [Diego Calle] sits on the board with me and several others.”5 This communication apparently led the Requesters to believe that Nu Dot had experienced some change in ownership and/or leadership. Thereafter, on or about 23 June 2016, the Requesters contacted ICANN staff regarding their apparent belief that changes to Nu Dot’s application were required. The Requesters also formally raised the issue with the ICANN Ombudsman during ICANN56 in June 2016.

After receiving the Requesters’ notification that they believed Nu Dot’s application needed to be changed, ICANN staff proceeded to investigate the claims. On 27 June 2016, ICANN sent Nu Dot’s authorized primary contact a message to determine whether there had been any “changes to your application or the [Nu Dot] organization that need to be reported to

---

5 Request, § 8, Pg. 9.
ICANN. This may include any information that is no longer true and accurate in the application, including changes that occur as part of regular business operations (e.g., changes to officers and directors, application contacts).” Jose Ignacio Rasco, CFO of Nu Dot, replied that same day to “confirm that there have been no changes to the [Nu Dot] organization that would need to be reported to ICANN.”

Subsequently, both ICANN staff and the Ombudsman reached out to Mr. Rasco to again inquire about the claims of potential changes in Nu Dot’s organization that the Requesters believed required notification to ICANN. Specifically, ICANN staff conducted a telephone conversation with Mr. Rasco on 8 July 2016 regarding the allegations. During that call, and later in a confirming email on 11 July 2016, Mr. Rasco stated that: “Neither the ownership nor the control of Nu Dotco, LLC has changed since we filed our application. The Managers designated pursuant to the company’s LLC operating agreement (the LLC equivalent of a corporate Board) have not changed. And there have been no changes to the membership of the LLC either.” Mr. Rasco also confirmed to ICANN that he provided this same information to the ICANN Ombudsman in responding to the Ombudsman’s investigation of the complaint lodged with him. According to Mr. Rasco, he informed the Ombudsman that there had been no changes to Nu Dot’s ownership, operating agreement, or LLC membership. After receiving information from Nu Dot and ICANN, the Ombudsman informed ICANN that, in his opinion, there was nothing to justify a postponement of the .WEB/.WEBS Auction based on unfairness to the other applicants.

On 11 July 2016, the Requesters sent an email to ICANN “support[ing] a postponement of the .WEB auction to give ICANN and the other applicants time to investigate whether there has been a change of leadership and/or control of another applicant, [Nu Dot.]” and stating that,
“[t]o do otherwise would be unfair, as we do not have transparency into who leads and controls that applicant as the auction approaches.”

After completing its investigation of the allegations regarding Nu Dot’s application, ICANN sent a letter to the members of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set on 13 July 2016 stating, among other things, that “in regards to potential changes of control of [Nu Dot], we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.”

On 17 July 2016, the Requesters filed Request 16-9, seeking postponement of the .WEB/.WEBS Auction and requesting a “thorough and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies and/or changes in [Nu Dot’s] .WEB/.WEBS application.”

The .WEB/.WEBS Auction is scheduled to occur on 27 July 2016.

B. Relief Requested.

The Requesters ask ICANN to:

1. “[D]elay the ICANN auction of last resort for the .WEB/.WEBS contention set on an emergency basis”, and;

2. “[C]onduct a thorough and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies and/or changes in [Nu Dot’s] .WEB/.WEBS application in accordance with ICANN’s Bylaws (including ICANN’s guiding principles to ensure transparency, openness and accountability), the Auction Rules, and the

---

8 Request, § 9, Pg. 11. On 20 July 2016, ICANN received a letter of support from Donuts Inc. regarding Request 16-9. Donuts requested that the letter not be published.
III. The Relevant Standard For Reconsideration Requests.

ICANN’s Bylaws provide for reconsideration of a Board or staff action or inaction in accordance with specified criteria.\(^{11}\) The Requesters challenge staff action. Dismissal of a request for reconsideration of staff action or inaction is appropriate only if the BGC concludes, and the Board agrees to the extent that the BGC deems that further consideration by the Board is necessary, that the requesting party does not have standing because the party failed to satisfy the reconsideration criteria set forth in the Bylaws.

IV. Analysis and Rationale.

A. No Established Policy Requires ICANN to Postpone the .WEB/.WEBS Auction.

The Requesters argue that the Auction should be postponed because of the pending accountability mechanisms. Those accountability mechanisms, however, were not pending at the required time—namely, the time when the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set entered into the Auction process—and do not warrant postponement of the Auction.

The Requesters argue that a stay is “mandated by ICANN’s own rules governing Auction Eligibility given the pendency of (a) [the Requesters’] complaint to the ICANN Ombudsman and (b) this Request.”\(^{12}\) In particular, the Requesters assert that “[a]s plainly stated on ICANN’s ‘New gTLD Program Auctions’, a string contention set will be eligible to enter into a New gTLD

---

\(^{10}\) Request, § 9, Pg. 11 (emphasis in original).

\(^{11}\) Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2. Article IV, § 2.2 of ICANN’s Bylaws states in relevant part that any entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction to the extent that it has been adversely affected by:
(a) one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy(ies); or
(b) one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the party submitting the request could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board’s consideration at the time of action or refusal to act; or
(c) one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that are taken as a result of the Board’s reliance on false or inaccurate material information.

\(^{12}\) Request, § 9, Pg. 12.
Program auction only where all active applications in the contention set have ‘no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms.’”

Contrary to what the Requesters argue, there were no pending accountability mechanisms when the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set entered into the Auction process. ICANN initiated the Auction process on 27 April 2016 by notifying all active members of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set that the Auction had been scheduled and providing instructions and deadlines to participate in the Auction. The Requesters did not lodge a complaint with the Ombudsman until two months later (and less than one month before the Auction) during ICANN56 in June 2016. Similarly, Request 16-9 was not filed until 17 July 2016. As such, there were no accountability mechanisms pending on the date that the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set entered the Auction process. Indeed, the auction rules were designed to, among other things, prevent exactly this sort of last-minute attempt to delay. The Requesters have not identified any violation of process or procedure. The .WEB/.WEBS Auction will therefore proceed as scheduled on 27 July 2016.

B. ICANN Staff Complied with Established Policy when Investigating the Requesters’ Allegations Regarding Nu Dot.

The Requesters contend that ICANN’s investigation regarding Nu Dot “was taken without attention to, in contravention of, and with apparent disregard for its obligation to investigate the veracity of the representations made by [Nu Dot] and its potential changes of control, leadership, and/or ownership.” However, there is no established policy or procedure requiring ICANN to undertake an investigation in the manner that the Requesters would prefer. Nevertheless, ICANN did diligently investigate the Requesters’ claims and found nothing to support them.

---

14 Request, § 10, Pg. 16.
The Requesters cite the “Top-Level Domain Application – Terms and Conditions” (Guidebook Terms and Conditions) in which gTLD applicants authorize ICANN to:

8. … [C]onduct thorough background screening[s] … [including] identifying information may be required to resolve questions of identity of individuals within the applicant organization investigations[; and]

10. (a) Contact any person, group, or entity to request, obtain, and discuss any documentation or other information that, in ICANN’s sole judgment, may be pertinent to the application; (b) Consult with persons of ICANN’s choosing regarding the information in the application or otherwise coming into ICANN’s possession, provided, however, that ICANN will use reasonable efforts to ensure that such persons maintain the confidentiality of information in the application that this Applicant Guidebook expressly states will be kept confidential.15

These provisions of the Guidebook Terms and Conditions do not support the Requesters’ argument. In the course of evaluating Nu Dot’s application, ICANN performed the above referenced background screening in accordance with the Applicant Guidebook and standard procedures, and the results were released with the Initial Evaluation Report on 7 June 2013.16 Thus, there is no dispute that ICANN performed all necessary checks of the application.

Rather, just one month before the scheduled Auction, the Requesters seemingly are suggesting that ICANN should have conducted another in-depth investigation and background check of Nu Dot because, according to the Requesters, certain unknown changes may have occurred with respect to Nu Dot’s organization which might require changes to Nu Dot’s application. Specifically, the Requesters claim that ICANN was obligated to investigate Nu Dot because the Applicant Guidebook grants ICANN “broad authority to investigate all applicants who apply to participate in the New gTLD Auction Program.”17 But the Requesters’ proposed level of investigation is not what is required at this stage of the process. While the Requesters

15 Guidebook, §§ 6.8, 6.10 (emphasis supplied).
17 Request, § 10, Pg. 14.
are correct that the Applicant Guidebook gives ICANN the authority to conduct investigations, the Applicant Guidebook does not require ICANN to investigate the Requesters’ claims regarding Nu Dot in the manner that the Requesters suggest. Furthermore, the Guidebook Terms and Conditions cited by the Requesters confirm that it is within “ICANN’s sole judgment” to determine whether additional information may be pertinent to an application and, consequently, to determine whether any investigation is warranted.\textsuperscript{18} Accordingly, the Requesters fail to identify any policy or procedure that would require ICANN to investigate their claims.

Nevertheless, in response to the Requesters’ allegations, ICANN \textit{did} diligently investigate the claims regarding potential changes to Nu Dot’s leadership and/or ownership. Indeed, on several occasions, ICANN staff communicated with the primary contact for Nu Dot both through emails and a phone conversation to determine whether there had been any changes to the Nu Dot organization that would require an application change request. On each occasion, Nu Dot confirmed that no such changes had occurred, and ICANN is entitled to rely upon those representations. For example, on 27 June 2016, ICANN sent Nu Dot’s authorized primary contact a message to determine whether there had been any “changes to your application or the [Nu Dot] organization that need to be reported to ICANN … [including] changes to officers and directors, [or] application contacts.” Jose Ignacio Rasco, CFO of Nu Dot, replied that same day to “confirm that there have been no changes to the [Nu Dot] organization that would need to be reported to ICANN.” Shortly thereafter, both ICANN staff and the Ombudsman reached out to Mr. Rasco to again inquire about the claims of potential changes requiring notification to ICANN. Specifically, ICANN staff conducted a telephone conversation with Mr. Rasco on 8 July 2016 regarding the allegations. During that call, and later in a confirming email on 11 July 2016, Mr. Rasco stated that “[n]either the ownership nor the control of Nu Dotco, LLC has

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Guidebook, §§ 6.8, 6.10.}
changed since we filed our application. The Managers designated pursuant to the company’s LLC operating agreement (the LLC equivalent of a corporate Board) have not changed. And there have been no changes to the membership of the LLC either.” Mr. Rasco also confirmed that he had provided this same information to the ICANN Ombudsman in responding to the Ombudsman’s investigation of the complaint lodged with him. After completing its investigation of the Requesters’ allegations regarding Nu Dot’s organization, ICANN informed the Requesters that “we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.”

C. ICANN Staff Complied with Established Policy when Determining that No Changes Were Necessary to Nu Dot’s Application.

The Requesters also suggest that ICANN violated its established policy of non-discriminatory treatment by allowing Nu Dot’s application to proceed without a change request. Specifically, the Requesters claim that ICANN engaged in “disparate treatment in favor of Nu Dot” by allowing Nu Dot’s application to proceed despite “clear statements from [Nu Dot] that representations made in its application are, at best, misleading.”

The Applicant Guidebook provides that, “[i]f at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate, the applicant must promptly notify ICANN.” First, Nu Dot never notified ICANN that there were any changes to the information provided in the application. Second, as discussed above, after investigating the Requesters’ allegations that there were changes in Nu Dot’s organization requiring changes to the application, ICANN concluded that there was no evidence to suggest

---

20 Bylaws, Article II, § 3 (“ICANN shall not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition.”)
21 Request, § 10, Pg. 20.
22 Guidebook, § 1.2.7.
that Nu Dot’s application was no longer accurate. Thus, as ICANN explained to the Requesters, there was no need for Nu Dot to “initiate the application change request process.”

Finally, the Requesters’ claims rest upon one email (provided in redacted form), purportedly received from Nu Dot, stating that: “Nicolai [Bezsonoff] is at NSR full-time and is no longer involved with our TLD applications. [Jose Ignacio Rasco II is] still running our program and Juan [Diego Calle] sits on the board with me and several others.” This email does not indicate that these persons have left the organization or that the organization has “resold, assigned or transferred its rights in the application.” Moreover, after investigating the Requesters’ allegations, ICANN found no evidence to suggest that Nu Dot experienced a change of leadership and/or control, and in fact received explicit confirmation from the primary contact for Nu Dot, Jose Ignacio Rasco, that no such changes had occurred, which ICANN is entitled to rely upon. Thus, there appears to be no need for an application change request, and ICANN acted in accordance with established policy and procedure in reaching this conclusion.

V. Determination.

Based on the foregoing, the BGC concludes that the Requesters have not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and therefore denies Request 16-9. If the Requesters believe that they have somehow been treated unfairly here, they are free to ask the Ombudsman to review this matter.

The Bylaws provide that the BGC is authorized to make a final determination for all Reconsideration Requests brought regarding staff action or inaction and that no Board consideration is required. As discussed above, Request 16-9 seeks reconsideration of a staff

---

24 Request, § 8, Pg. 9.
25 Id at 10.
action or inaction. As such, after consideration of Request 16-9, the BGC concludes that this determination is final and that no further consideration by the Board is warranted.

In terms of the timing, because the BGC agreed to consider the matter on an urgent basis, Section 2.19 of Article IV of the Bylaws provides that the BGC shall make a final determination or recommendation with respect to a reconsideration request within seven days, or as soon thereafter as feasible. The Requesters submitted this Request on 17 July 2016. By issuing its Determination on 21 July 2016, the BGC has acted within the established time limit for urgent reconsideration requests.

---

26 Bylaws Article IV, Section 2.19.
Exhibit 13
New gTLD Auctions
BIDDER AGREEMENT
Version 2014-02-26

This Qualified Applicant / Bidder Agreement (the “Bidder Agreement”), is made and entered into by the Qualified Applicant or Designated Bidder (collectively the “Bidder”), and Power Auctions, a limited liability company organized in the State of Delaware, United States of America, with offices in Washington DC (the “Auction Manager”), each of the Bidder and the Auction Manager referred to as a “Party” and, together, referred to as the “Parties”. The terms and conditions set forth in this Bidder Agreement are to be read together with the Auction Rules. Terms used but not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Applicant Guidebook”) or the “Auction Rules” (as defined below). In the event of any inconsistency between the Bidder Agreement and the Applicant Guidebook or the Auction Rules, the Bidder Agreement shall prevail.

RECOLALS

WHEREAS, the Qualified Applicant has submitted an application (the “gTLD Application”) for a new generic top-level domain (“gTLD String”), to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”) pursuant to the ICANN new gTLD program (the “gTLD Program”);

WHEREAS, ICANN has identified and published a group of applications (the “Contention Set”) containing identical or confusingly similar applied-for gTLD Strings (the “Contention Strings”);

WHEREAS, the Qualified Applicant’s gTLD Application is for a Contention String that has been included in a Contention Set;

WHEREAS, the Auction Manager will be administering an auction on behalf of ICANN to resolve string contention for the Contention Strings in the Contention Set (the “Auction”) pursuant to section 4.3 of the ICANN gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Applicant Guidebook”);

WHEREAS, the Auction Manager will provide an auction service on the internet (“Auction Site”) which Bidders will use to participate in the Auction;

WHEREAS, ICANN has published an auction rules document (“Auction Rules”) on its website which is binding upon Bidders in the Auction;

WHEREAS, the Qualified Applicant will place bids in the Auction on its own behalf or may designate an agent (“Designated Bidder”) to enter bids in the Auction on the Qualified Applicant’s behalf;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the premises and agreements of the parties contained in this Agreement, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and
sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the Bidder and the Auction Manager agree as follows:

**ARTICLE 1**

**STRING CONTENTION RESOLUTION BY AUCTION**

Section 1.1 The Bidder. The Bidder represents that it is either: (a) a Qualified Applicant for one or more Contention Strings for which ICANN has provided to the Qualified Applicant a Notice of Intent to Auction; or (b) the Designated Bidder authorized by a Qualified Applicant for one or more Contention Strings for which ICANN has provided to the Qualified Applicant a Notice of Intent to Auction.

Section 1.2 Effective Date. This Bidder Agreement will become effective on the day that it has been executed by the Bidder and countersigned by the Auction Manager.

Section 1.3 Endorsement. The Parties agree that the Bidder may endorse this Bidder Agreement for additional gTLD Applications for Contention Strings for which it is the Qualified Applicant or the Designated Bidder, and that the Bidder may make such endorsement on the Auction Site by purely electronic means. If the Bidder endorses this Agreement for additional gTLD Applications, then this Agreement will apply with the same force and effect to the additional gTLD Applications as it does to the initial gTLD Application.

Section 1.4 The Auction. The Bidder shall participate in the Auction(s) for the relevant Contention Sets on the terms set forth herein and under the Auction Rules. The Auction(s) shall be conducted in accordance with the procedure set out in the Auction Rules. The Bidder acknowledges that it has reviewed the Auction Rules that will govern the participation of the Bidder in the Auction(s) and that the Auction(s) will be administered by the Auction Manager. By this Agreement, the Bidder agrees to be bound by the Auction Rules as published on ICANN’s website.

Section 1.5 Consequences of Losing. The Bidder acknowledges and agrees that failure to submit a deposit by the specified deadline, failure to participate in the Auction or losing in the Auction will result in the rejection of the Qualified Applicant’s application for the Contention String and the Contention String not being assigned or delegated to the relevant Qualified Applicant.

**ARTICLE 2**

**BIDDER REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES**

The Bidder represents and warrants to the Auction Manager as follows:

Section 2.1 Good Standing. The Bidder (i) is duly organized and validly existing under the laws of the jurisdiction of its organization or incorporation, (ii) is in good standing under such laws and (iii) has full power and authority to execute, deliver and perform its obligations, under this Bidder Agreement.
Section 2.2 Authorization. The Bidder Agreement has been duly and validly authorized, executed and delivered by the Bidder to the Auction Manager and constitutes the legal, valid and binding obligation of the Bidder, enforceable against the Bidder in accordance with its terms.

Section 2.3 Notifications and Instructions. Any notifications, including but not limited to the documents provided to the Auction Manager as represented by the Bidder Form or Bidder Designation Form included in this Bidder Agreement, signed by any authorized signatories of the Bidder, and delivered to the Auction Manager shall be deemed a representation and warranty by the Bidder to the Auction Manager as to the matters covered thereby.

Section 2.4 Account Information. The Bidder agrees not to disclose to any unauthorized party the Bidder’s usernames, passwords, Auction Site URL or any other authentication credentials assigned to the Bidder (“Account Information”) in connection with the gTLD Application or the Auction. The Bidder acknowledges that it shall be responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of such Account Information and for all utilizations of the Account Information.

Section 2.5 Auction Site. The Bidder agrees not to use the Auction Site for any purpose other than participation in Auctions that the Bidder is entitled to participate or to take any actions aimed at preventing the appropriate use of the Auction Site by any party.

Section 2.6 Anti-Collusion Rules. The Bidder and the Qualified Applicant each acknowledges for each Contention Set in an Auction, there will be a Blackout Period, extending from the Deposit Deadline for the Auction until full payment has been received in the Auction Bank Account from the Winner of the Contention Set, pursuant to Clause 55, or another Bidder, pursuant to clauses 57-59 of the Auction Rules. During the Blackout Period, all applicants for Contention Strings within the Contention Set are prohibited from cooperating or collaborating with respect to, discussing with each other, or disclosing to each other in any manner the substance of their own, or each other's, or any other competing applicants' bids or bidding strategies, or discussing or negotiating settlement agreements or post-Auction ownership transfer arrangements, with respect to any Contention Strings in the Auction. The prohibition against these activities applies only with respect to Contention Strings that are within Blackout Periods; during the same time periods, applicants are permitted to engage in these activities with respect to other Contention Strings that are not within Blackout Periods and applicants are permitted to engage in discussions unrelated to Contention Strings.

Section 2.7 Compliance. ICANN reserves the right to conduct due diligence on the Qualified Applicant and the Designated Bidder in an effort to ensure compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and rules governing the Auction and the transfer of funds in connection with the Auction. ICANN reserves the right to require the Qualified Applicant to substitute its Designated Bidder and/or the bank account from which Bidder wires funds to its designated Auction Bank Account if a compliance issue is identified with respect to an applicable law, regulation or rule governing the Auction or the transfer of funds in connection with the Auction.
Section 2.8 Assignment of Contention String. In the event the Bidder is designated a winner at the close of an Auction (“Winner”) for one or more Contention Sets, its aggregate Deposits for such Auction will be automatically applied towards payment of its aggregate Winning Price(s). In the event the aggregate Deposits exceed the aggregate Winning Prices and penalties, if applicable, a refund will be initiated to the Bidder no later than 16:00 UTC on the day that is seven (7) calendar days after the conclusion of the Auction, subject to Section 2.9. If a net balance of the aggregate Winning Prices is due, the Winner is required to settle the amount owed by bank wire to its designated Auction Bank Account. Payment must be received no later than 16:00 UTC on the day that is twenty (20) "Business Days" (as defined in the Auction Rules) after the close of the Auction. In the event Bidder is a Winner and anticipates that it would require a longer payment period due to verifiable government-imposed currency restrictions, Bidder may advise Auction Manager well in advance of the Auction and Auction Manager will consider applying a longer payment period for all Winner(s) within the same Contention Set.

Section 2.9 Default. A Winner not in compliance with Section 2.8 is subject to being declared in default. Auction Manager at its sole discretion, may delay the declaration of default for a brief period, but only if Auction Manager determines in its sole discretion that receipt of full payment appears to be imminent. Once declared in default, the Winner is subject to immediate forfeiture of its position in the Auction and assessment of default penalties as set forth in clauses 58-60 in the Auction Rules. Default penalties will be forfeited and charged against the Bidder’s aggregate Deposit(s) of the Auction. If a Winner defaults on multiple contention sets, ICANN reserve the right, in its sole discretion, to ban such Winner from future Auctions.

Section 2.10 Penalties. The Bidder acknowledges that it may be subject to a penalty of up to the full amount of the Deposit and forfeiture of its Applications or termination of its registry agreements for a serious violation of the Auction Rules or Bidder Agreement. Without limiting the foregoing, a violation of Section 2.6 of the Bidder Agreement shall be considered to be a serious violation of the Bidder Agreement.

Section 2.11 Reliance on Counsel. The Bidder acknowledges that it has been advised by its own counsel regarding the terms of the Bidder Agreement and Auction Rules and in participating in the Auction has not relied and is not relying on any representations, warranties or other statements whatsoever, whether written or oral, from or by the Auction Manager or ICANN, other than those expressly set out in this Bidder Agreement, the Auction Rules and the Applicant Guidebook.

ARTICLE 3

AUCTION BANK ACCOUNT

Section 3.1 Escrow Agreement. The Auction Manager represents that it and ICANN have entered into an agreement (“Escrow Agreement”) whereby any funds provided by the Bidder to be used in connection with the Auction shall be held in escrow in a bank account (“Auction Bank Account”) by an escrow agent (the “Escrow Agent”). The Auction Manager will provide the Bidder with Auction Bank Account details and wire instructions.
Section 3.2  Auction Bank Account. The Bidder will deposit funds by bank wire into the Auction Bank Account to be held in escrow pursuant to this Bidder Agreement and the Escrow Agreement. The Auction Bank Account is denominated in United States dollars ($US) and all transactions to and from such account must be in $US. Funds deposited into escrow by the Bidder may be applied by the Auction Manager in accordance with the Bidder Agreement and Auction Rules. Upon the occurrence of a withdrawal by a Qualified Applicant pursuant to Section 3.4 or termination of this Bidder Agreement pursuant to Section 5 or otherwise, the Auction Manager may direct the Escrow Agent to set-off and apply any amount deposited by the Bidder against any, to the extent amounts are owed, other payments due. The Auction Manager agrees promptly to notify the Bidder after any such set-off is made by the Auction Manager, provided that the failure to give such notice shall not affect the validity of the action.

Section 3.3  Deposits, Refunds, Rollovers. In all respects, including in relation to deposits, refunds and rollovers the Bidder agrees to comply with the provisions of the Bidder Agreement and Auction Rules. The deposit amount(s) made into the Auction Bank Account (the “Deposit(s)”) including all instructions associated with Deposits and allocation of funds among Contention Sets from wires and funds rolled over from previous Auctions, must be received by the Auction Manager no later than 16:00 UTC on the day that is seven (7) calendar days prior to the commencement date of the Auction (“Deposit Deadline”). Failure by Bidder to deposit the Deposit(s) by the Deposit Deadline may, at the Auction Manager’s sole discretion, result in the Bidder’s ineligibility to participate in the Auction for the Contention Set, which will result in the rejection of the Qualified Applicant’s application for the Contention String and the Contention String not being assigned or delegated to the relevant Qualified Applicant. If a Deposit(s) is received and the Bidder is determined to be ineligible for the Auction, a refund of the Deposit will be initiated to the bank account as specified by the Bidder no later than 16:00 UTC on the day that is seven (7) calendar days after the conclusion of the Auction. In the event the Bidder does not win in an Auction, or a Bidder’s aggregate Deposits exceed its aggregate Winning Prices for an Auction, any excess amount will be refunded subject to Section 2.8 and 2.9. In the event a refund becomes due, a Bidder may request, by submitting rollover instructions to the Auction Manager by no later than 16:00 UTC two calendar days following the day on which the Auction concluded, that the Auction Manager, to the extent practical, assigns funds to a future Auction (“Rollover”). If this Bidder Agreement is terminated for any reason other than breach of contract by the Bidder, a refund of any remaining Deposit will be initiated to the Bidder no later than 16:00 UTC on the day that is seven (7) calendar days after the conclusion of the next scheduled Auction. All refunds are net of associated wire fees.

Section 3.4  Withdrawal Notices and Withdrawal Refunds. In all respects, including in relation to withdrawal refunds and the Qualified Applicant’s notice of withdrawal, the Bidder agrees to comply with the provisions of the Bidder Agreement and Auction Rules. Applicants that are identified as being in contention are encouraged by ICANN to reach a settlement or agreement among themselves that resolves the contention prior to the date of the Auction, as set forth in section 4.1.3 of the Applicant Guidebook. Such settlement or agreement is allowed up until the Deposit Deadline of the Auction for such applicable Contention Set(s). In the event settlement is reached prior to the Deposit Deadline, the relevant Qualified Applicants shall send both ICANN and the Auction Manager written notice and follow the process specified by ICANN to withdraw any application(s) for such Contention Strings that will not proceed as a result of the resolution. Such notification must be received by ICANN and the Auction Manager no later than the Deposit
Deadline. The Auction Manager will remove such Contention Sets from the Auction upon receipt of instructions from ICANN applicable to such Contention Sets. A refund for the Deposit(s) corresponding to these Contention Sets will be initiated to the Bidder no later than 16:00 UTC on the day seven (7) calendar days after the conclusion of the Auction unless the Auction Manager receives rollover instructions from the Bidder by no later than 16:00 UTC two calendar days following the day on which the Auction concluded. After the Deposit Deadline each Bidder that submitted a Deposit is required to participate in the Auction.

ARTICLE 4

INDEMNIFICATION, WAIVERS OF LIABILITY AND RELEASE

Section 4.1  Auction Rules. The Auction Manager acknowledges its obligation to make a good-faith effort to administer the Auction in accordance with the Auction Rules.

Section 4.2  Indemnification. The Bidder expressly releases, indemnifies and holds harmless the Auction Manager from any and all claims, including all damages, losses, liabilities, costs or expenses and claims thereof, whether direct or indirect, which may arise from, or be related to the Auction, including but not limited to: (i) the quality or availability of the Auction Site, any disturbance in the technical process, the receipt, storage and/or security of bids, or the Bidder being awarded a Contention String or not; (ii) reasonable attorneys’ fees and expenses and other professional fees and expenses, which the Auction Manager may suffer or incur by reason of any action, claim or proceeding brought against Auction Manager arising out of or relating in any way to this Bidder Agreement or any transaction to which this Bidder Agreement relates; and (iii) any incidental or consequential damage, lost profits or lost opportunity.

Section 4.3  Exceptions. The indemnification set forth in Section 4.2 shall not apply to cases of gross negligence or willful misconduct by the Auction Manager.

Section 4.4  Force Majeure. No Party to this Bidder Agreement shall be responsible or liable for any failure or delay in the performance of its obligation under this Bidder Agreement arising out of or caused, directly or indirectly, by circumstances beyond their reasonable control, including, without limitation, acts of God; earthquakes; fire; flood; wars; acts of terrorism; civil or military disturbances; sabotage; epidemic; riots; accidents; labor disputes; acts of civil or military authority or governmental action; it being understood that each party to this Bidder Agreement shall use commercially reasonable efforts which are consistent with accepted practices to resume performance as soon as reasonably practicable under the circumstances; provided that Bidder’s loss of access to the Internet during an Auction shall not be deemed a matter beyond Bidder’s reasonable control in light of Bidder’s ability to (a) designate two Authorized Individuals under the Auction Rules; and (b) employ alternative bidding mechanisms during the Auction via fax.

Section 4.5  Liability of ICANN. Qualified Applicant and Designated Bidder each understands, acknowledges and agrees that the Auction is a method of contention resolution contemplated by the gTLD Applicant Guidebook for Qualified Applicant’s application and that, as between Qualified Applicant and ICANN, the provisions of Module 6: Top-Level Domain
Application – Terms and Conditions of the Applicant Guidebook apply to the Auction. Without limiting the foregoing, Designated Bidder understands, acknowledges and agrees that it is participating in the Auction as an authorized agent of Qualified Applicant and its rights and remedies with respect to ICANN are limited to the same extent that Qualified Applicant’s rights and remedies are limited by the provisions of Module 6: Top-Level Domain Application – Terms and Conditions of the Applicant Guidebook.

ARTICLE 5

TERMINATION

Section 5.1 Termination. This Bidder Agreement shall terminate 90 days after notice of termination is provided by either Party; provided, however, that the provisions of Section 4.2 (Indemnification), Section 6.1 (Confidentiality), Section 7.1 (Survival; Successors or Assigns), Section 7.3 (Notices), and Section 7.8 (Governing Law) shall survive termination of this Bidder Agreement.

ARTICLE 6

CONFIDENTIALITY

Section 6.1 Confidentiality. Except as otherwise stated in this Bidder Agreement, each Party agrees, to maintain the confidentiality of any confidential and proprietary information received by it from the other Party pursuant to this Bidder Agreement, including, without limitation, any Account Information or any material nonpublic information (“Confidential Information”); provided, however, that Confidential Information shall not include any information that: (a) is or becomes generally available to the public other than as a result of a disclosure by the receiving Party or its representatives; (b) is already in the receiving Party’s possession, provided that such information is not subject to a contractual, legal or fiduciary obligation of confidentiality for the benefit of another; or (c) becomes available to the receiving Party on a non-confidential basis from a source not bound by a contractual, legal or fiduciary obligation to keep such information confidential for the benefit of another. The foregoing will not prohibit either Party from disclosing Confidential Information: to the extent it is required to do so by applicable law so long as the Party, prior to disclosure that is legally required, provides the Party with written notice of the Confidential Information to be disclosed and takes appropriate steps to preserve the confidentiality of such information to the extent reasonably practicable; to its affiliates, attorneys, accountants, consultants, and other professionals bound by similar confidentiality obligations. Bids in the Auction shall be deemed Confidential Information; however, the Auction Manager shall be permitted to disclose bids or bidding information to ICANN during the Auction only if reasonably necessary to inform ICANN of a potential pending dispute requiring resolution or input, and to disclose bids or bidding information publicly after the conclusion of the Auction to the extent permitted by and pursuant to the Auction Rules. Notwithstanding the above, the Auction Manager is expressly permitted to share with the Bidder such other information as may be provided or set forth in the Auction Rules.
ARTICLE 7

MISCELLANEOUS

Section 7.1 Survival; Successors and Assigns. All representations, warranties, covenants, indemnities and other provisions made by the parties shall be considered to have been relied upon by the parties, shall be true and correct as of the date hereof, and shall survive the execution, delivery, and performance of this Bidder Agreement. This Bidder Agreement, including the declarations, acknowledgments, guarantees and indemnities contained in this Bidder Agreement, shall inure to the benefit of, be binding upon and be enforceable by and against the parties and their respective successors and permitted assigns.

Section 7.2 Interpretation; Severability. The Bidder intends for this Bidder Agreement to comply with applicable state and federal laws. If any term or provision hereof is illegal or invalid for any reason whatsoever, such provisions will be replaced with a valid provision that as closely as possible resembles the purposes and intents of the invalid provision or, if not possible, will be severed from this Bidder Agreement, and such invalid or unenforceable provision will not affect the enforceability or validity of the remainder of this Bidder Agreement.

Section 7.3 Notices. All notices, requests, demands, and other communications required under this Bidder Agreement shall be in writing, in English, and shall be delivered by electronic transmission with written confirmation of receipt via RPost or a similar service that authenticates email delivery or via acknowledgement from the recipient, or via fax. If notice is given to a Bidder, it shall be delivered to the email address or fax number for such Bidder as provided by the Bidder to the Auction Manager. It shall be the responsibility of the Bidders to notify the Auction Manager of any changes in name, address or contact information.

Section 7.4 Entire Agreement. This Bidder Agreement, including the Bidder Form and Bidder Designation Form attached hereto and made a part hereof, sets forth the entire agreement and understanding of the parties related to the Auction.

Section 7.5 Amendment. This Bidder Agreement may be amended, modified, superseded, rescinded, or canceled only by a written instrument executed by the Auction Manager and Bidder.

Section 7.6 Auction Rules. ICANN shall be entitled to amend the Auction Rules for any Auction at any time at least fifteen (15) days prior to that Auction. ICANN will inform the Bidder of such changes via electronic written notice and the changes will be effective immediately. Such amendments will be published to the ICANN website. If any dispute or disagreement arises in connection with the Auction Rules, including the interpretation or application of the Auction Rules, or the form, content, validity or time of receipt of any Bid, ICANN’s decision shall be final and binding.

Section 7.7 Waivers. The failure of any party to this Bidder Agreement at any time or times to require performance of any provision under this Bidder Agreement shall in no manner affect the right at a later time to enforce the same performance. A waiver by any party to this Bidder Agreement of any such condition or breach of any term, covenant, representation, or
warranty contained in this Bidder Agreement, in any one or more instances, will neither be construed as a further or continuing waiver of any such condition or breach nor a waiver of any other condition or breach of any other term, covenant, representation, or warranty contained in this Bidder Agreement.

Section 7.8 Governing Law. This Bidder Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Delaware, United States of America, excluding any choice of law provisions.

Section 7.9 Jurisdiction. Subject to Section 8.2 on arbitration, the Bidder and the Auction Manager irrevocably and unconditionally submit to and accept the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal and state courts located in the State of Delaware for any action, suit, or proceeding arising out of or based upon this Bidder Agreement or any matter relating to it, and waive any objection that it may have to the laying of venue in any such court or that such court is an inconvenient forum or does not have personal jurisdiction over it.

Section 7.10 Third Party Beneficiary. ICANN is an intended third party beneficiary of this Bidder Agreement entitled to enforce this Bidder Agreement against the Bidder and the Auction Manager as if ICANN was a direct party to this Bidder Agreement.

Section 7.11 Execution in Counterparts. This Bidder Agreement may be executed in counterparts. All executed counterparts constitute one document.

ARTICLE 8
DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Section 8.1 Mediation. In the event of any dispute arising under or in connection with this Bidder Agreement, before either party may initiate arbitration pursuant to Section 8.2 below, the Auction Manager and the Bidder must attempt to resolve the dispute through mediation in accordance with the following terms and conditions:

(a) - a party shall submit a dispute to mediation by written notice to the other party. The mediation shall be conducted by a single mediator selected by the parties. If the parties cannot agree on a mediator within fifteen (15) calendar days of delivery of written notice pursuant to this Section 8.1, the parties will promptly select a mutually acceptable mediation provider entity, which entity shall, as soon as practicable following such entity’s selection, designate a mediator, who is a licensed attorney with general knowledge of contract law and, to the extent necessary to mediate the particular dispute, general knowledge of the gTLD Program. Any mediator must confirm in writing that he or she is not, and will not become during the term of the mediation, an employee, partner, executive officer, director, or security holder of ICANN, the Auction Manager or the Bidder. If such confirmation is not provided by the appointed mediator, then a replacement mediator shall be appointed pursuant to this Section 8.1(a);
(b) - the mediator shall conduct the mediation in accordance with the rules and procedures that he or she determines following consultation with the parties. The parties shall discuss the dispute in good faith and attempt, with the mediator’s assistance, to reach an amicable resolution of the dispute. The mediation shall be treated as a settlement discussion and shall therefore be confidential and may not be used against either party in any later proceeding relating to the dispute, including any arbitration pursuant to Section 8.2. The mediator may not testify for either party in any later proceeding relating to the dispute;

(c) - each party shall bear its own costs in the mediation. The parties shall share equally the fees and expenses of the mediator. Each party shall treat information received from the other party pursuant to the mediation that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Article 6) as Confidential Information of such other party in accordance with Article 6.

(d) - if the parties have engaged in good faith participation in the mediation but have not resolved the dispute for any reason, either party or the mediator may terminate the mediation at any time and the dispute can then proceed to arbitration pursuant to Section 8.2 below. If the parties have not resolved the dispute for any reason by the date that is ninety (90) calendar days following the date of the notice delivered pursuant to Section 8.1(a), the mediation shall automatically terminate (unless extended by agreement of the parties) and the dispute can then proceed to arbitration pursuant to Section 8.2 below.

Section 8.2 Arbitration. Disputes arising under or in connection with this Bidder Agreement that are not resolved pursuant to Section 8.1, including requests for specific performance, will be resolved through binding arbitration conducted pursuant to the rules of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce. The arbitration will be conducted in the English language and will occur in the State of Delaware. Any arbitration will be in front of a single arbitrator, unless the parties agree in writing to a greater number of arbitrators in which event the arbitration will be in front of three arbitrators with each party selecting one arbitrator and the two selected arbitrators selecting the third arbitrator. In order to expedite the arbitration and limit its cost, the arbitrator(s) shall establish page limits for the parties’ filings in conjunction with the arbitration, and should the arbitrator(s) determine that a hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be limited to one (1) calendar day, provided that the hearing may be extended for one (1) additional calendar day if agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator(s) based on the arbitrator(s) independent determination or the reasonable request of one of the parties thereto. The prevailing party in the arbitration will have the right to recover its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, which the arbitrator(s) shall include in the awards. Each party shall treat information received from the other party pursuant to the arbitration that is appropriately marked as confidential (as required by Article 6) as Confidential Information of such other party in accordance with Article 6. In any litigation involving the Auction Manager concerning this Bidder Agreement, jurisdiction and exclusive venue for such litigation will be in a court located in the State of Delaware; however, the parties will also have the right to enforce a judgment of such a court in any court of competent jurisdiction. The provisions for arbitration set forth herein shall be in lieu of any other procedure for the determination of controversies between the Parties to this Agreement or any claim by such Party against any other such Party arising thereunder and the Parties agree not to invoke the intervention of the courts of Delaware or any
other jurisdiction in relation to the appointment of the arbitrators, procedures adopted by or proceedings at the sitting of the arbitral tribunal in any dispute.

[Signature page follows]
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Bidder Agreement has been duly executed by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualified Applicant</th>
<th>Designated Bidder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check the box if Qualified Applicant and Designated Bidder are the same entity. If so, only complete the Qualified Applicant portion of the table.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Entity</td>
<td>Name of Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Entity (e.g. corporation)</td>
<td>Type of Entity (e.g. corporation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction of incorporation or organization</td>
<td>Jurisdiction of incorporation or organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIN, corporate registration no., or equivalent</td>
<td>TIN, corporate registration no., or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Authorized Representative</td>
<td>Name of Authorized Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Representative</td>
<td>Title of Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Signature</td>
<td>Authorized Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (DD-MM-YYYY)</td>
<td>Date (DD-MM-YYYY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Bidder Agreement has been duly executed by

POWER AUCTIONS LLC

Name:_____________________________

Title:_____________________________

Signature:____________________

Date: ________________________
Exhibit 14
Dear Jose Ignacio Rasco,

You are reminded that the Deposit Deadline for .WEB/.WEBS has passed and we are now in the Blackout Period. During the Blackout Period, all applicants for Contention Strings in the Auction are prohibited from cooperating or collaborating with respect to, discussing with each other, or disclosing to each other in any manner the substance of their own, or each other’s, or any other competing applicants’ bids or bidding strategies, or discussing or negotiating settlement agreements or post-Auction ownership transfer arrangements, with respect to any Contention Strings in the Auction.

You are also reminded of the following upcoming events in relation to the Auction:

- Connectivity Test: 21 July 2016 at 13:00 UTC (9:00 am New York time).
• Mock Auction: 26 July 2016 at 13:00 UTC (9:00 am New York time).
• Auction: 27 July 2016 at 13:00 UTC (9:00 am New York time).

Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

Larry Ausubel

Power Auctions LLC
Paula L. Zecchini (SBN 238731)
Aaron M. McKown (SBN 208781)
Jeffrey M. Monhait (pro hac vice to be submitted)
COZEN O’CONNOR
999 Third Avenue, Suite 1900
Seattle, WA  98104
Telephone: 206.340.1000
Toll Free Phone: 1.800.423.1950
Facsimile: 206.621.8783
E-Mail: pzacchini@cozen.com
  amckown@cozen.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUBY GLEN, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RUBY GLEN, LLC

Plaintiff,

vs.

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR
ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS
AND DOES 1-10

Defendant.

Case No.:

PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT FOR:

1) BREACH OF CONTRACT

2) BREACH OF IMPLIED
COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH
AND FAIR DEALING

3) NEGLIGENCE

4) UNFAIR COMPETITION
(VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA
BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS
CODE § 17200)

5) DECLARATORY RELIEF

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
Plaintiff RUBY GLEN, LLC (hereinafter, “Plaintiff”) alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff was formed for the purpose of applying to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”) for the right to operate the .WEB generic top-level domain (“gTLD”). In reliance on ICANN’s agreement to administer the bid process in accordance with the rules and guidelines contained in its gTLD Applicant Guidebook (“Applicant Guidebook”), Plaintiff paid ICANN a mandatory $185,000 application fee for the opportunity to secure the rights to the .WEB gTLD.

2. Throughout every stage of the four years it has taken to bring the .WEB gTLD to market, Plaintiff worked diligently to follow the rules and procedures promulgated by ICANN. In the past month, ICANN has done just the opposite. Instead of functioning as a disinterested regulator of a fair and transparent gTLD bid process, ICANN used its authority and oversight to unfairly benefit an applicant who is in admitted violation of a number of provisions of the Applicant Guidebook. Even more problematic, ICANN’s conduct, tainted by an inherent conflict of interest, ensured that it would be the sole beneficiary of the multi-million dollar proceeds from the .WEB auction—a result that ICANN’s own guidelines identify as a “last resort” outcome.

3. As set forth more fully herein, ICANN has deprived Plaintiff and other applicants for the .WEB gTLD of the right to compete for the .WEB gTLD in accordance with established ICANN policy and guidelines. Court intervention is necessary to ensure ICANN’s compliance with its own accountability and transparency mechanisms in the ongoing .WEB bid process.
PARTIES

4. Plaintiff RUBY GLEN, LLC is a limited liability company, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and operated by an affiliate located in Bellevue, Washington.

5. Defendant INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS ("ICANN") is a nonprofit corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California.

6. Defendants Does 1-10 are persons who instigated, encouraged, facilitated, acted in concert or conspiracy with, aided and abetted, and/or are otherwise responsible in some manner or degree for the breaches and wrongful conduct averred herein. Plaintiff is presently ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of DOES 1 through 10, and will amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).

8. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c), in that Defendant ICANN resides and transacts business in this judicial district. Moreover, a substantial part of the events, omissions, and acts that are the subject matter of this action occurred within the Central District of California.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

A. ICANN’S FORMATION AND PURPOSE

9. ICANN is a non-profit corporation originally established to assist in the transition of the Internet domain name system from one of a single domain name operator to one with multiple companies competing to provide domain name
registration services to Internet users “in a manner that w[ould] permit market mechanisms to support competition and consumer choice in the technical management of the [domain name system].”

10. ICANN’s ongoing role is to provide technical coordination of the Internet’s domain name system by introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names, while ensuring the security and stability of the domain name system. In that role, and as relevant here, ICANN was delegated the task of administering generic top level domains (“gTLDs”) such as .COM, .ORG, or, in this case, .WEB.

11. Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation requires ICANN to “operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law and, to the extent appropriate and consistent with these Articles and its Bylaws, through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets.” A true and correct copy of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

12. ICANN is accountable to the Internet community for operating in a manner consistent with its Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation as a whole. ICANN’s Bylaws require ICANN, its Board of Directors and its staff to act in an open, transparent and fair manner with integrity. A true and correct copy of ICANN’s Bylaws are attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference. Specifically, the ICANN Bylaws require ICANN, its Board of Directors, and staff to:

   a. “Mak[e] decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.”
b. “[Act] with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.”

c. “Remain[] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness.”

d. Ensure that it does “not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition.”

e. “[O]perate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.”

B. THE NEW gTLD PROGRAM AND APPLICANT GUIDEBOOK

13. ICANN is the sole organization worldwide with the power and ability to administer the bid processes for, and assign rights to, gTLDs. As of 2011, there were only 22 gTLDs in existence; the most common of which are .COM, .NET, and .ORG.

14. In or about 2011, ICANN approved the expansion of a number of the gTLDs available to eligible applicants as part of its 2012 Generic Top Level Domains Internet Expansion Program (the “New gTLD Program”).

15. In January 2012, as part of the New gTLD Program, ICANN invited eligible parties to submit applications to obtain the rights to operate various new gTLDs, including, the .WEB and .WEBS gTLDs (collectively referred to herein as “.WEB” or the “.WEB gTLD”). In return, ICANN agreed to (a) conduct the bid process in a transparent manner and (b) abide by its own bylaws and the rules and guidelines set forth in ICANN’s gTLD Applicant Guidebook (“Applicant Guidebook”). A true and correct copy of the Applicant Guidebook is attached hereto as Exhibit C and incorporated herein by reference.
16. The Applicant Guidebook obligates ICANN to, among other things, conduct a thorough investigation into each of the applicants’ backgrounds. This investigation is necessary to ensure the integrity of the application process, including a potential auction of last resort, and the existence of a level playing field among those competing to secure the rights to a particular new gTLD. It also ensures that each applicant is capable of administering any new gTLD, whether secured at the auction of last resort or privately beforehand, thereby benefiting the public at large.

17. ICANN has broad authority to investigate all applicants who apply to participate in the New gTLD Program. This investigative authority, willingly provided by each applicant as part of the terms and conditions in the guidelines contained in the Applicant Guidebook, is set forth in relevant part in Section 6 as follows:

8. … In addition, Applicant acknowledges that [sic] to allow ICANN to conduct thorough background screening investigations:

…

c. Additional identifying information may be required to resolve questions of identity of individuals within the applicant organization; …

…

11. Applicant authorizes ICANN to:

a. Contact any person, group, or entity to request, obtain, and discuss any documentation or other information that, in ICANN’s sole judgment, may be pertinent to the application;

b. Consult with persons of ICANN’s choosing regarding the information in the application or otherwise coming into ICANN’s possession…

///
18. To aid ICANN in fulfilling its investigatory obligations, “applicant[s] (including all parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, contractors, employees and any and all others acting on [their] behalf)” are required to provide extensive background information in their respective applications. In addition to serving the purposes noted above, this information also allows ICANN to determine whether an entity applicant or individuals associated with an entity applicant have engaged in the automatically disqualifying conduct set forth in Section 1.2.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, including convictions of certain crimes or disciplinary actions by governments or regulatory bodies. Finally, this background information is important to provide transparency to other applicants competing for the same gTLD.

19. Indeed, ICANN deemed transparency into an applicant’s background so important when drafting the Applicant Guidebook that applicants submitting a new gTLD application are required to undertake a continuing obligation to notify ICANN of “any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading,” including “applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant.”

20. As a further condition of participating in the .WEB Auction, ICANN required Plaintiff and other applicants to agree to a broad covenant not to sue in order to apply for the .WEB contention set (the “Purported Release”). The Purported Release applies to all new gTLD applicants and states, in relevant part:

   Applicant hereby releases ICANN . . . from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN . . . in connection with ICANN’s . . . review of this application. . . . Applicant agrees not to challenge . . . and irrevocably waives any right to sue or proceed in court.

21. The Purported Release is not subject to negotiation. If a potential applicant does not agree to the release, it cannot be considered for participation in the .WEB
auction. The Purported Release is also entirely one-sided in that it allows ICANN to absolve itself of wrongdoing while affording no remedy to applicants. Moreover, the Purported Release does not apply equally as between ICANN and the applicants because it does not prevent ICANN from proceeding with litigation against an applicant.

22. In lieu of the rights ICANN claims are waived by the Purported Release, ICANN purports to provide applicants with an independent review process, as a means to challenge ICANN’s actions with respect to a gTLD application. The IRP is effectively an arbitration, operated by the International Centre for Dispute Resolution of the American Arbitration Association, comprised of an independent panel of arbitrators. The IRP is officially identified by ICANN as an Accountability Mechanism.

23. In accordance with the IRP, any entity materially affected by a decision or action by the Board that the entity believes is inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws may submit a request for independent review of that decision or action. In order to be materially affected, the person must suffer injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the Board’s alleged violation of the Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation, and not as a result of third parties acting in line with the Board’s action. The IRP results are advisory to the ICANN Board.

C. THE AUCTION PROCESS FOR NEW gTLDs

24. A large number of new gTLDs made available by ICANN in 2012 received multiple applications. In accordance with the Applicant Guidebook, where multiple new gTLD applicants apply to obtain the rights to operate the same new gTLD, those applicants are grouped into a “contention set.” Applicants are encouraged in the Applicant Guidebook to resolve a new gTLD contention set (i.e., reach a determination as to which applicant will ultimately be assigned the right to operate the new gTLD at issue). If no other resolution occurs among the contention set members, ICANN ultimately facilitates and collects the proceeds of an auction process.

///
25. Pursuant to the Applicant Guidebook, a contention set may be resolved privately among the members of a contention set or facilitated by ICANN as an auction of last resort. An ICANN auction of last resort will only be conducted when the members of a contention cannot reach agreement privately. By refusing to agree to resolve a contention set privately, one member of a contention set has the ability to force the other members, all of whom may be willing to resolve the contention set privately, to an ICANN auction of last resort.

26. For purposes of this matter, it is important to understand that the manner in which a contention set is resolved—whether by private agreement or ICANN auction—determines which entities will receive the proceeds from the winning bid. When a contention set is resolved privately, ICANN receives no financial benefit; in an ICANN auction, the entirety of the auction proceeds go to ICANN.

D. PLAINTIFF’S APPLICATION FOR THE .WEB gTLD

27. In May 2012, Plaintiff submitted application 1-1527-54849 for the .WEB contention set. Plaintiff also submitted with its application the sum of $185,000—the mandatory application fee.

28. In consideration of Plaintiff paying the $185,000 application fee, ICANN agreed to conduct the application process for the .WEB gTLD in a manner consistent with its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures set forth in both the Applicant Guidebook and the Auction Rules, and in conformity with the laws of fair competition. Plaintiff would not have paid the $185,000 mandatory application fee absent the mutual consideration and promises set forth above.

29. Plaintiff’s application passed ICANN’s “Initial Evaluation” process on July 19, 2013. It is an approved member of the .WEB contention set and qualified to participate in the ICANN auction process for .WEB.

///

///
E. NDC’S APPLICATION FOR THE .WEB gTLD


31. Among other things, the application required NDC to provide “the identification of directors, officers, partners, and major shareholders of that entity.” As relevant here, NDC provided the following response to Sections 7 and 11 of the application:

Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Nicolai Bezsonoff

7(b). Title
Manager

Applicant Background

11(a). Name(s) and position(s) of all directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ignacio Rasco</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Diego Calle</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolai Bezsonoff</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(b). Name(s) and position(s) of all officers and partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ignacio Rasco</td>
<td>CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Diego Calle</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolai Bezsonoff</td>
<td>COO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(c). Name(s) and position(s) of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain Marketing</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdings, LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.NUCO LP, LLC</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. By submitting its application for the .WEB gTLD and electing to participate in for the .WEB contention set, NDC expressly agreed to the terms and
conditions set forth in the Applicant Guidebook as well as Auction Rules, including specifically, and without limitation, Sections 1.2.1, 1.2.7, 6.1 and 6.10 of the Applicant Guidebook.

33. The Applicant Guidebook requires an applicant to notify ICANN of any changes to its application; including the applicant background screening information required under Section 1.2.1, the failure to do so can result in the denial of an application. For example, Section 1.2.7 imposes an ongoing duty to update “applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant.” Similarly, pursuant to Section 6.1, “[a]pplicant agrees to notify ICANN in writing of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading.”

34. In addition to a continuing obligation to provide complete, updated, and accurate information related to its application, Section 6.10 of the Applicant Guidebook, strictly prohibits an applicant from “resell[ing], assign[ing], or transfer[ring] any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.” An applicant that violates this prohibition is subject to disqualification from the contention set.

35. ICANN failed to investigate credible evidence supporting a determination that NDC violated each of these guidelines—evidence that it has held for over a month. Despite the urging of multiple .WEB applicants and NDC’s written admissions of potentially disqualifying changes to NDC’s application, ICANN continues to turn a blind eye to the direct detriment of other .WEB applicants and to ICANN’s foundational duties to administer the New gTLD Program with fairness and transparency.

F. NDC’S FAILURE TO NOTIFY ICANN OF CHANGES TO ITS APPLICATION

36. On or about June 1, 2016, Plaintiff learned that NDC was the only member of the .WEB contention set unwilling to resolve the contention set in advance and in lieu of the ICANN auction.
37. At the time, Plaintiff found the decision unusual given NDC’s historical willingness and enthusiasm to participate in the private resolution process. Overall, NDC has applied for 13 gTLDs in the New gTLD Program; nine of those gTLDs were resolved privately with NDC’s agreement. The auction for the .WEB gTLD is the first auction in which NDC has pushed for an ICANN auction of last resort.

38. On June 7, 2016, Plaintiff contacted NDC in writing to inquire as to whether NDC might reconsider its recent decision to forego resolution of the .WEB contention prior to ICANN’s auction of last resort. In response, NDC stated that its position had not changed. NDC also advised, however, that Nicolai Bezsonoff, who is identified on NDC’s .WEB application as Secondary Contact, Manager, and COO, is “no longer involved with [NDC’s] applications.” NDC also made statements indicating a potential change in the ownership of NDC, including an admission that the board of NDC had changed to add “several others” and that he had to check with the “powers that be,” implying that he and his associate on the email were no longer in control. The email communication containing these statements is set forth in pertinent part below:

From: Jose Ignacio Raspo - Contact information redacted
Subject: Re: .web
Date: June 7, 2016 at 11:32:17 AM EDT
To: Jon Nevett - Contact information redacted
Cc: Juan Diego Callie - Contact information redacted

Jon,

[Redacted]

Nicolai is at NSR full time and no longer involved with our TLD applications. I’m still running our program and Juan sits on the board with me and several others.

[Redacted]

Best,

Jose

39. Noting that NDC’s conduct and statements (a) appeared to directly contradict information in NDC’s .WEB application and (b) suggested that NDC had
either resold, assigned, or transferred its rights in the application in violation of its duties under the Applicant Guidebook, Plaintiff diligently contacted ICANN staff in writing with the discrepancy on or about June 22, 2016 to understand who it was competing against for .WEB and improve transparency over the process for ICANN and the other .WEB applicants.

40. After engaging in a series of discussions with ICANN staff, Plaintiff decided to formally raise the issue with the ICANN Ombudsman on or about June 30, 2016; as of the filing of this Complaint, Plaintiff’s most recent correspondence with the ICANN Ombudsman, dated July 10, 2016, in which it provided further information related to the statements made by NDC, remains unanswered.

41. At every opportunity, Plaintiff raised the need for a postponement of the .WEB auction to allow ICANN time to fulfill its obligations to (a) investigate the contradictory representations made by NDC in relation to its pending application; (b) address NDC’s continued status as an auction participant; and (c) provide all the other .WEB applicants the necessary transparency into who they were competing against. It also discussed the matter with ICANN staff and the Ombudsman at ICANN’s most recent meeting in Helsinki, Finland, which took place from June 27-30, 2016.

42. On July 11, 2016, Radix FZC (on behalf of DotWeb Inc.) and Schlund Technologies GmbH, each members of the .WEB contention set, sent correspondence to ICANN stating their own concerns in proceeding with the auction of last resort scheduled for July 27, 2016. The correspondence stated:

We support a postponement of the auction, to give ICANN and the other applicants time to investigate whether there has been a change of leadership and/or control of another applicant, NU DOT CO LLC. To do otherwise would be unfair, as we do not have transparency into who leads and controls that applicant as the auction approaches.
G. ICANN’S DECISION TO PROCEED WITH THE .WEB AUCTION

43. On July 13, 2016, ICANN issued a statement denying the collective request of multiple members of the .WEB contention set to postpone the July 27, 2016 auction to allow for a full and transparent investigation into apparent discrepancies in the NDC application, as highlighted by NDC’s own statements. Without providing any detail, ICANN simply stated as follows:

Secondly, in regards to potential changes of control of NU DOT CO LLC, we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.

44. Contrary to its obligations of accountability and transparency, ICANN’s decision did not address the manner or scope of the claimed investigation nor did it address whether a specific inquiry was made into (a) Mr. Bezsonoff’s current status, if any, with NDC, (b) the identity of “several other[...]” new and unvetted members of NDC’s board, or (c) any change in ownership—the very issues raised by NDC’s own statements.

45. Plaintiff was unable to learn any further information regarding the extent of the investigation undertaken by ICANN, other than it was limited to inquiries only to NDC and no independent corroboration was sought or obtained.

46. Despite the clear credibility issues raised by NDC’s own contradictory statements, ICANN conducted no further investigation. Indeed, ICANN informed Plaintiff that it never even contacted Mr. Bezsonoff or interviewed the other individuals identified in Sections 7 and 11 of NDC’s application prior to reaching its conclusion.

47. To be clear, the financial benefit to ICANN of resolving the .WEB contention set by way of an ICANN auction is no small matter—ICANN’s stated net proceeds from the 15 ICANN auctions conducted since June 2014 total $101,357,812. The most profitable gTLDs from those auctions commanded winning bids of $41,501,000 (.SHOP), $25,001,000 (.APP), $6,706,000 (.TECH), $5,588,888...
(.REALTY), $5,100,175 (.SALON) and $3,359,000 (.MLS). ICANN has not yet determined what it will do with the enormous proceeds from these auctions.

H. PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

48. ICANN’s Bylaws provide an established accountability mechanism by which an entity that believes it was materially affected by an action or inaction by ICANN staff that contravened established policies and procedures may submit a request for reconsideration or review of the conduct at issue. The review is conducted by ICANN’s Board Governance Committee.

49. On July 17, 2016, Plaintiff and Radix FZC, an affiliate of another member of the .WEB contention set, jointly submitted a Reconsideration Request to ICANN, in response to the actions and inactions of ICANN staff in connection with the decision set forth in the ICANN’s July 13, 2016 correspondence.

50. The Reconsideration Request sought reconsideration of (a) ICANN’s determination that it “found no basis to initiate the application change request process” in response to the contradictory statements of NDC and (b) ICANN’s improper denial of the request made by multiple contention set members to postpone the .WEB auction of last resort, which would have provided ICANN the time necessary to conduct a full and transparent investigation into material discrepancies in NDC’s application and its eligibility as a contention set member.

51. The Reconsideration Request highlighted the following issues:
   a. ICANN’s failure to forego a full and transparent investigation into the material representations made by NDC is a clear violation of the principles and procedures set forth in the ICANN Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and the Applicant Guidebook.
   b. ICANN is the party with the power and resources necessary to delay the ICANN auction of last resort while the accuracy of NDC’s current application is evaluated utilizing the broad investigatory
controls contained in the Applicant Guidebook, to which all applicants, including NDC, agreed.

c. Postponement of the .WEB auction of last resort provides the most efficient manner for resolving the current dispute for all parties by (i) sparing ICANN and the many aggrieved applicants the time and expense of legal action while (ii) avoiding the very real likelihood of a court-mandated unwinding of the ICANN auction of last resort should it proceed.

d. ICANN’S July 13, 2016 decision raises serious concerns as to whether the scope of ICANN’s investigation was impacted by the inherent conflict of interest arising from a perceived financial benefit to ICANN if the Auction goes forward as scheduled.

e. ICANN’s New gTLD Program Auctions guidelines state that a contention set would only proceed to auction where all active applications in the contention set have “no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms,” i.e., no pending Ombudsman complaints, Reconsideration Requests or IRPs.

52. On July 21, 2016, ICANN denied the Request for Reconsideration. In doing so, ICANN merely relied on statements from NDC that directly contradicted those contained in NDC’s earlier correspondence. Once again, despite the clear credibility issues raised by NDC’s own contradictory statements, ICANN failed and refused to contact Mr. Bezsonoff or interview the other individuals identified in Sections 7 and 11 of NDC’s application prior to reaching its conclusion.


///

///
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Breach of Contract against Defendant ICANN)

54. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 53 above as though fully set forth herein.

55. In June 2012, ICANN invited eligible parties to submit applications to obtain the rights to, among others, the .WEB gTLD as part of the New gTLD Program. In doing so, ICANN promised the potential applicants that it would (a) conduct the bid process in a transparent manner, (b) ensure competition, and (c) abide by its own Bylaws and the rules set forth in the Applicant Guidebook.

56. On or about June 13, 2012, Plaintiff submitted an application to ICANN to obtain the rights to the .WEB gTLD. In consideration of ICANN’s promise to abide by its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures set forth in the Applicant Guidebook in its administration of the .WEB auction process, Plaintiff paid ICANN a sum of $185,000—the mandatory application fee.

57. In consideration of Plaintiff paying the sum of $185,000, ICANN promised to conduct the application process for the .WEB gTLD in a manner consistent with its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures set forth in both the Applicant Guidebook and the Auction Rules, and in conformity with the laws of fair competition.

58. Plaintiff would not have paid the $185,000 mandatory application fee or spent time and other resources absent the mutual consideration and promises set forth above. Plaintiff performed all conditions, covenants, and promises on its part to be performed in accordance with the agreed upon terms of participating in the New gTLD Program, except those obligations, if any, that it has been prevented or excused from performing as a result of the misconduct set forth in this Complaint.

59. ICANN has materially breached its obligations to Plaintiff, as set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation, and the Applicant Guidebook by (a)
failing to thoroughly investigate the issues raised by NDC’s own statements and (b) refusing to postpone the .WEB auction of last resort to allow for a full and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies in NDC’s .WEB application.

60. Specifically, ICANN’s acts and omission violated, among other things:
   a. Article 1, section 2.8 and Article III, Section 1 of ICANN’s Bylaws, which require ICANN to “[m]ake decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness” and “operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.” ICANN obligates each applicant who seeks to participate in the New gTLD auction process to affirm that the statements and representations contained in the application are true and accurate; applicants also undertake a continuing obligation to update their application when changes in circumstance affect an application’s accuracy. By failing to engage in a thorough, open, and transparent investigation of the contradictory statements made by NDC in relation to its application, as well as an apparent change of control with potential antitrust implications, ICANN plainly—and inexplicably—failed to reach its decisions by “applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.”

   b. Article 1, section 2.9 of ICANN’s Bylaws, which requires ICANN to “[a]ct with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.” In undertaking only a cursory examination of the contradictory statements made by NDC and the apparent change in NDC’s rights to its application, ICANN
failed to balance ICANN’s interest in a swift resolution of the concerns raised by the members of the .WEB contention set with its obligation to obtain sufficient assurances and information from the individuals and entities at the center of the statements made by NDC; at the very least, ICANN should have conducted interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Section 11 of NDC’s application prior to reaching its conclusion.

c. Article 1, section 2.10 of ICANN’s Bylaws, which requires ICANN to “[r]emain[] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness.” By failing to make use of the processes established in Sections 6.8 and 6.11 to the Applicant Guidebook in investigating an admitted failure by NDC to abide by its continuing obligation to update its application, ICANN staff disregarded the very accountability mechanisms put in place to serve and protect the .WEB contention set, the Internet community, and the public at large. This error was compounded by the cursory dismissal of the concerns raised by multiple members of the .WEB contention set relating to the accuracy of the representations made in NDC’s application. By failing to apprise the members of the contention set as to the manner and scope of the investigation conducted by ICANN staff, ICANN failed to ensure that it would hold itself accountable to any gTLD applicant, let alone the Internet community and the public.

d. Article II, section 3 of ICANN’s Bylaws, which states that “ICANN shall not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the
promotion of effective competition.” There can be no questioning the fact that the Staff Action resulted in disparate treatment in favor of NDC. On one hand, there are clear statements from NDC that representations made in its application are inaccurate and there is ample evidence that NDC has either resold, assigned, or transferred all or some of its rights to its .WEB application. On the other hand, when pressed by multiple members of the contention set to fully investigate the matter, ICANN provided only a conclusory statement that raises more questions than it resolves. To the extent it had reason to engage in such disparate treatment of the members of the .WEB contention set, ICANN failed to provide such a reason in reaching the determinations at issue in this Request.

61. ICANN also promised that a contention set would only proceed to auction where all active applications in the contention set have “no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms.” ICANN breached this promise by refusing to postpone the .WEB auction of last resort while Plaintiff’s Reconsideration Request remains pending and its Ombudsman complaint remains unresolved. ICANN further breached this promise by moving forward with the .WEB auction of last resort while Plaintiff’s IRP, initiated on July 22, 2016, remains pending.

62. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that the breaches set forth above resulted from a pre-textual “investigation” into the admissions made by NDC and ICANN’s issuance of its subsequent July 13, 2016 decision. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN intentionally failed to abide by its contractual obligations to conduct a full and open investigation into NDC’s admission because it was in ICANN’s interest that the .WEB contention set be resolved by way of an ICANN auction. As such, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN willfully and intentionally committed the wrongful acts described above.
63. As a direct and proximate result of ICANN’s breaches, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, without limitation, losses of revenue from third parties, profits, consequential costs and expenses, market share, reputation, and goodwill, in an amount to be determined at trial but not less than ten million dollars ($10,000,000) plus interest.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing against Defendant ICANN)

64. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 53 above as though fully set forth herein.

65. An implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing exists between Plaintiff and ICANN as a result of the contractual relationship entered into as part of the .WEB gTLD application process.

66. ICANN breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing when it acted in a way that deprived Plaintiff of the benefits of the agreement as set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, namely that the administration of the bid process for the .WEB gTLD would be founded on the principles of fairness and transparency.

67. ICANN breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing when it:
   a. Failed to conduct due diligence and an adequate investigation into apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions;
   b. Failed to conduct interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Sections 7 and 11 of NDC’s application as part of an investigation into apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions;
   c. Failed to provide a necessary level of transparency into the identity and leadership of a competing applicant; and
d. Refused to postpone the ICANN auction of last resort to allow for a full and transparent investigation into the apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions.

68. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that the breaches set forth above resulted from a pre-textual “investigation” into the admissions made by NDC and ICANN’s issuance of its subsequent July 13, 2016 decision. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN intentionally failed to abide by its contractual obligations to conduct a full and open investigation into NDC’s admission because it was in ICANN’s interest that the .WEB contention set be resolved by way of an ICANN auction. As such, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN willfully and intentionally committed the wrongful acts described above.

69. As a direct and proximate result of ICANN’s breaches as set forth above, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, without limitation, losses of revenue from third parties, profits, consequential costs and expenses, market share, reputation, and good will.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Negligence against Defendant ICANN)

70. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 53 above as though fully set forth herein.

71. ICANN owed Plaintiff a duty to act with proper care and diligence in administering the .WEB auction process in accordance with its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures as stated in the Applicant Guidebook.

72. ICANN breached the duty owed Plaintiff by, among other things:
   a. Failing to conduct due diligence and an adequate investigation into apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions;
b. Failing to conduct interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Sections 7 and 11 of NDC’s application as part of an investigation into apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions;

c. Refusing to postpone the ICANN auction of last resort to allow for a full and transparent investigation into the apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions; and

d. Failing to provide a rationale for the decision set forth in the July 13, 2016 correspondence.

73. As a direct and proximate result of ICANN’s breaches as set forth above, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, without limitation, losses of revenue from third parties, profits, consequential costs and expenses, market share, reputation, and good will.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Unfair Competition in Violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 against Defendant ICANN)

74. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 53 above as though fully set forth herein.

75. The California Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) protects both consumers and competitors by prohibiting “unfair competition,” which is defined, in the disjunctive, by Business and Professions Code section 17200 as including “any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice” as well as “unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising.”

76. Plaintiff has standing to pursue this claim under Business and Professions Code section 17204 because Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of ICANN’s actions as set forth above. The losses include, but are not limited to, expenses incurred by Plaintiff in exhausting every available formal and
informal avenue of recourse with ICANN prior to the filing of the above-captioned action, including legal fees related to the preparation and submission of the Reconsideration Request. Losses also include the $185,000 application fee paid to ICANN to participate as an application in the .WEB contention set.

77. The following acts and omissions of ICANN, among others, were unlawful under the UCL:

a. ICANN’s imposition of the unenforceable contract terms contained in the Purported Release, in violation of California Civil Code section 1668, which declares violative of public policy those contracts that “have for their object, directly or indirectly, to exempt anyone from the responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury to the person or property of another, or violation of law, whether willful or negligent….”

b. ICANN’s imposition of the unenforceable contract terms contained in the Purported Release, in violation of California Civil Code § 1770(a)(19), which defines as unlawful, the “[i]nsert[i]on of an unconscionable provision in [a] contract.”

78. The following acts and omissions of ICANN, among others, were unfair under the UCL:

a. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by this reference the allegations of Paragraph 77 and its subparts as stated herein; each act therein alleged is also an unfair act or practice under the UCL;

b. ICANN’s decision to conduct a cursory investigation into the apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions without regard for rights of the other .WEB contention set members;
c. ICANN’s decision to forego a postponement of the ICANN auction of last resort scheduled for July 27, 2016 without conducting an open and transparent investigation into the apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions; and

d. ICANN’s decision to allow NDC to continue to participate as a .WEB contention set member despite NDC’s own admission of inaccuracies contained in its application, in violation of the guidelines contained in the Applicant Guidebook.

79. The following acts and omissions of ICANN, among others, were fraudulent under the UCL in that they were likely to deceive, and in fact did deceive, members of the public:

   a. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by this reference the allegations of Paragraphs 77 and its subparts as if restated herein; each is also a fraudulent act or practice under the UCL;

   b. ICANN’s false representation that it would make all decisions in administering the .WEB auction process “by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness”;  

   c. ICANN’s false representation that in administering the .WEB auction process, it would “[act] with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected”;  

   d. ICANN’s false representation that in administering the .WEB auction process, it would “[r]emain[] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness”;  

   e. ICANN’s false representation that in administering the .WEB auction process, it would “apply its standards, policies, procedures,
or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment”;

f. ICANN’s false representation that all applicants would be subject to the same agreement, rules, and procedures;

g. ICANN’s false representation that it would require applicants to update their applications with “any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading,” including “applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant”; and

h. ICANN’s false representation that a contention set would only proceed to auction where all active applications in the contention set have “no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms.”

80. On information and belief, the conduct identified in Paragraphs 77-79 and their subparts resulted from the intentional conduct of ICANN.

81. With specific reference to the conduct identified in Paragraphs 78-79 and their subparts conduct alleged above, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN’s “investigation” into the admissions made by NDC and ICANN’s subsequent issuance of its July 13, 2016 decision were pre-textual in nature, the goal of which was to ensure ICANN secured a windfall from the .WEB contention set being resolved by way of an ICANN auction of last resort. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN intentionally failed to abide by its contractual obligations to conduct a full and open investigation into NDC’s admission because it was in ICANN’s interest that the .WEB contention set be resolved by way of an ICANN auction. As such, Plaintiff alleges that it was in ICANN’s interest to willfully and intentionally commit the wrongful acts described above.

82. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203 and the equitable powers of the Court, Plaintiff seeks an order (a) enjoining ICANN from proceeding
with the ICANN auction of last resort currently scheduled for July 27, 2016 until the claims presented by way of the above-captioned action are resolved and (b) enjoining ICANN from engaging in the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business acts and practices described above. Plaintiff also seeks an order requiring ICANN to comply with its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, in the continued administration of the .WEB contention set process and to take such corrective actions and adopt such remedial measures as are necessary to prevent the further occurrence of the acts or practices alleged herein.

83. Plaintiff also seeks an order requiring restitution of any and all monies obtained by ICANN from Plaintiff as a result of the intentionally unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent described above. Plaintiff’s request includes, but is not limited to, the restitution of any and all fees paid by or monies received from Plaintiff in relation to the .WEB contention set process.

84. Preventing the unlawful business practices engaged in by ICANN will ensure a significant benefit to the other .WEB contention set members as well as the public at large. Moreover, the financial burden of pursuing private enforcement substantially exceeds the financial benefit to Plaintiff. Thus, in the interest of justice, Plaintiff seeks attorneys’ fees in bringing this private attorney general claim pursuant to Civil Code section 1021.5 in an amount subject to proof.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Declaratory Relief—Against Defendant ICANN)

85. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 53 above as though fully set forth herein.

86. An actual and justiciable controversy has arisen, and now exists, between Plaintiff, on one hand, and ICANN, on the other, regarding the legality and effect of the Purported Release contained in the Applicant Guidebook.
87. As a condition of participating in the .WEB contention set process, ICANN required Plaintiff and other applicants to sign the Applicant Guidebook, which contained a covenant not to sue in order to apply for the .WEB contention set. The Purported Release applies to all New gTLD applicants and states, in relevant part:

   Applicant hereby releases ICANN . . . from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN . . . in connection with ICANN’s . . . review of this application . . . . Applicant agrees not to challenge . . . and irrevocably waives any right to sue or proceed in court.

32. The Purported Release is not subject to negotiation: If a potential applicant does not agree to the release, it cannot be considered for participation in the .WEB contention set process. The Purported Release is also entirely unilateral in that it allows ICANN to absolve itself of wrongdoing while affording no remedy to applicants. Moreover, the Purported Release does not apply equally as between ICANN and the applicants because it does not prevent ICANN from proceeding with litigation against an applicant.

33. Plaintiff seeks a declaration of its rights regarding the enforceability of the Purported Release in light of California Civil Code Section 1668, which prohibits the type of broad exculpatory clauses contained in the Purported Release: “All contracts which have for their object, directly or indirectly, to exempt anyone from responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury to the person or property or another, or violation of law, whether willful or negligent, are against the policy of the law.”

34. Plaintiff maintains that, on its face, the Release is “against the policy of the law” because it exempts ICANN from any and all claims arising out of the application process, even those arising from fraudulent or willful conduct.

35. As such, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Plaintiff and ICANN as to the enforceability of the Purported Release. Plaintiff desires a judicial
determination and declaration that the Purported Release is unenforceable, unconscionable, and/or void as a matter of public policy. Such a declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time so that Plaintiff may ascertain its rights with respect to the enforceability of the Purported Release.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff RUBY GLEN, LLC prays for relief as follows:

1. For compensatory damages according to proof at the time trial;
2. For general damages according to proof;
3. For restitutionary damages according to proof;
4. An injunction requiring ICANN to refrain from conducting the auction of last resort for the .WEB gTLD pending a final decision on the merits of this matter;
5. An injunction requiring ICANN to refrain from assigning the rights to the .WEB gTLD pending a final decision in the merits of this matter;
6. Attorneys’ fees and costs to the extent permitted by law; and
7. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper against all Defendants.
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby requests a jury trial on the following causes of action asserted in the Complaint:

1. First Cause of Action for Breach of Contract;
2. Second Cause of Action for Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing;
3. Third Cause of Action for Negligence; and
4. Fourth Cause of Action for Unfair Competition in Violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200

Dated: July 22, 2016

By: /s/ Paula Zecchini
Paula L. Zecchini (SBN 238731)
Aaron M. McKown (SBN 208781)
pzecchini@cozen.com
amckown@cozen.com
COZEN O’CONNOR
999 Third Avenue, Suite 1900
Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: 206.340.1000
Toll Free Phone: 1.800.423.1950
Facsimile: 206.621.8783
Attorneys for Ruby Glen, LLC
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Before the Court is an Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order ("Application for TRO") filed by plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC ("Plaintiff"). Plaintiff seeks to temporarily enjoin defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") from conducting an auction for the rights to operate the registry for the generic top level domain ("gTLD") for .web. Currently, that auction is set for 6:00 a.m. on July 27, 2016. Pursuant to Rule 78 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 7-15, the Court finds that this matter is appropriate for decision without oral argument.

Plaintiff applied to ICANN in 2012 to operate the registry for the .web gTLD. Because other entities also applied to operate the .web gTLD, ICANN’s procedures require all of the applicants, what are referred to as “contention sets,” to first attempt to resolve their competing claims, but if they cannot do so, ICANN will conduct an auction and award the rights to operate the registry to the winning bidder. According to Plaintiff, one of the competing entities, Nu Dotco, LLC ("NDC") is unwilling to informally resolve the competing claims and has instead insisted on proceeding to an auction. Plaintiff asserts that it learned on June 7, 2016, that NDC has experienced recent changes in its management and ownership since it initially submitted its application to ICANN but that NDC has not provided ICANN with updated information as required by ICANN’s application requirements. Specifically, the email from NDC’s Jose Ignacio Rasco stated:

> The three of us are still technically the managers of the LLC, but the decision goes beyond just us. Nicolai [Bezsonoff] is at [Neustar, Inc.] full time and no longer involved with our TLD applications. I’m still running our program and Juan [Diego Calle] sits on the board with me and several others. Based on your request, I went back to check with all the powers that be and there was no change in the response and [we] will not be seeking an extension.

(Docket No. 8, Decl. of Jonathon Nevett, Ex. A.)

1/ According to Plaintiff, Bezsonoff was identified on NDC’s ICANN application as NDC’s “secondary contact.”
Plaintiff alleges that it requested that ICANN conduct an investigation regarding the discrepancies in NDC’s application beginning on June 22, 2016 and requested a postponement of the auction. At least one other applicant seeking to operate the .web registry has also requested that ICANN postpone the auction and investigate NDC’s current management and ownership structure. ICANN denied the requests on July 13, 2016, and stated that “in regards to potential changes of control of Nu DOT CO LLC, we have investigated the matter and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.” Plaintiff and another of the applicants then submitted a request for reconsideration to ICANN on July 17, 2016. ICANN denied the request for reconsideration on July 21, 2016.

Plaintiff, relying on the Court’s diversity jurisdiction, filed this action in this Court on July 22, 2016. According to the Complaint, Plaintiff “is a limited liability company, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and operated by an affiliate located in Bellevue, Washington.” (Compl. ¶ 4.) The Complaint alleges that ICANN “is a nonprofit corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California.” (Id. ¶ 5.) Plaintiff asserts claims for: (1) breach of contract; (2) breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; (3) negligence; (4) unfair competition pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 17200; and (5) declaratory relief. Plaintiff filed its Application for TRO at the same time it filed its Complaint.

As an initial matter, the Court notes that the Application for TRO fails to satisfy the requirements for a valid Ex Parte Application. Specifically, under Local Rule 7-19.1, an attorney making an ex parte application has a duty to give notice by making reasonable good faith efforts to orally advise counsel for the other parties, if known, of the proposed ex parte application, and “to advise the Court in writing of efforts to contact other counsel and whether any other counsel, after such advice, opposes the application or has requested to be present when the application is presented to the Court.” Here, Plaintiff did not notify the Court in writing of its efforts to notify opposing counsel of the Application for TRO or if ICANN intended to file an Opposition. These violations of the Local Rules are themselves sufficient to deny Plaintiff’s Application for TRO. See Standing Order 6:5-7 (“Applications which fail to conform with Local Rules 7-19 and 7-19.1, including a statement of opposing counsel’s position, will not be considered.”). Additionally, Plaintiff did not submit a proposed order with the Application for TRO as required by Local Rule 7-20. See Local Rule 7-20 (“A separate proposed order shall be lodged with any motion or application requiring an order of the Court, pursuant to L.R. 52-4.1.”). Finally, the Application for TRO was not accompanied by a proof of service as required by Local Rule 5-3.1. Indeed, according to ICANN, as of July 25, 2016, Plaintiff had not served ICANN with the Complaint or Application for TRO. Had ICANN not filed its Notice of Intent to File Opposition, the Court would have denied the Application for TRO as a result of these procedural deficiencies and violations of the Local Rules. See, e.g., Reno Air Racing Ass’n, Inc. v. McCord, 452 F.3d 1126, 1131 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[C]ourts have recognized very few circumstances justifying the issuance of an ex parte TRO [without notice].”). Despite these violations of the Local Rules, the Court will address the merits of Plaintiff’s Application for TRO because ICANN filed an Opposition. Future violations of the Local Rules, this Court’s Orders, or the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure may result in the striking of the offending documents or the imposition of sanctions.
The standard for issuing a temporary restraining order is identical to the standard for issuing a preliminary injunction. See Lockheed Missile & Space Co., Inc. v. Hughes Aircraft Co., 887 F. Supp. 1320, 1323 (N.D. Cal. 1995). “A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 555 U.S. 7, 20, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374, 172 L. Ed. 2d 249 (2008). “A preliminary injunction is an extraordinary remedy never awarded as of right.” Id. The Ninth Circuit employs a “sliding scale” approach to preliminary injunctions as part of this four-element test. Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1135 (9th Cir. 2011). Under this “sliding scale,” a preliminary injunction may issue “when a plaintiff demonstrates . . . that serious questions going to the merits were raised and the balance of hardships tips sharply in the plaintiff’s favor,” as long as the other two Winter factors have also been met. Id. (internal citations omitted). “[A] preliminary injunction is an extraordinary and drastic remedy, one that should not be granted unless the movant, by a clear showing, carries the burden of persuasion.” Mazurek v. Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972, 117 S. Ct. 1865, 1867, 138 L. Ed. 2d 162 (1997).

Plaintiff’s breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and negligence claims are all based on provisions in ICANN’s bylaws and the ICANN Applicant Guidebook stating, for instance, that ICANN will make “decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness,” that ICANN will remain “accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness,” and that no contention set will proceed to auction unless there is “no pending ICANN accountability mechanism.” Plaintiff’s unlawful business practices act and declaratory relief claims allege that a covenant not to sue contained in the ICANN Application Guidebook is invalid and unlawful under California law. That release states:

Applicant hereby releases ICANN and the ICANN Affiliated Parties from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN or any ICANN Affiliated Party in connection with ICANN’s or an ICANN Affiliated Party’s review of this application, investigation or verification, any characterization or description of applicant or the information in this application, any withdrawal of this application or the decision by ICANN to recommend, or not to recommend, the approval of applicant’s gTLD application. APPLICANT AGREES NOT TO CHALLENGE, IN COURT OR IN ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA, ANY FINAL DECISION MADE BY ICANN WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION, AND IRREVOCABLY WAIVES ANY RIGHT TO SUE OR PROCEED IN COURT OR ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA ON THE BASIS OF ANY OTHER LEGAL CLAIM AGAINST ICANN AND ICANN AFFILIATED PARTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION . . .
Even if, as Plaintiff contends, this release is not valid, and Plaintiff could therefore be considered likely to prevail on its unlawful business practices and declaratory relief claims, the potential invalidity of the release is an issue the Court does not reach is a separate issue that is not related to the propriety of proceeding with the auction for the .web registry. As a result, those claims, and Plaintiff’s likelihood of success on them, are not relevant to Plaintiff’s Application for TRO and do not provide a basis for enjoining the .web auction.

In its Opposition to the Application for TRO, ICANN contends that Plaintiff has not established the requisite likelihood of success on the merits or irreparable harm to justify the issuance of the preliminary injunctive relief it seeks. Specifically, ICANN has provided evidence that it has conducted investigations into Plaintiff’s allegations concerning potential changes in NDC’s management and ownership structure at each level of Plaintiff’s appeals to ICANN for an investigation and postponement of the auction. During those investigations, NDC provided evidence to ICANN that it had made no material changes to its management and ownership structure. Additionally, ICANN’s Opposition is supported by the Declarations of Nicolai Bezsonoff and Jose Ignacio Rasco, who declare under penalty of perjury that there have been no changes to NDC’s management, membership, or ownership since NDC first filed its application with ICANN.

Based on the strength of ICANN’s evidence submitted in opposition to the Application for TRO, and the weakness of Plaintiff’s efforts to enforce vague terms contained in the ICANN bylaws and Applicant Guidebook, the Court concludes that Plaintiff has failed to establish that it is likely to succeed on the merits, raise serious issues, or show that the balance of hardships tips sharply in its favor on its breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and negligence claims. Moreover, because the results of the auction could be unwound, Plaintiff has not met its burden to establish that it will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of the preliminary injunctive relief it seeks. The Court additionally concludes that the public interest does not favor the postponement of the auction.

Finally, the Court notes that Plaintiff’s Complaint has not adequately alleged a basis for this Court’s jurisdiction. Jurisdiction may be based on complete diversity of citizenship, requiring all plaintiffs to have a different citizenship from all defendants and for the amount in controversy to exceed $75,000.00. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332; Owen Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger, 437 U.S. 365, 373, 98 S. Ct. 2396, 2402, 57 L. Ed. 2d 274 (1978). To establish citizenship for diversity purposes, a natural person must be a citizen of the United States and be domiciled in a particular state. Kantor v. Wellesley Galleries, Ltd., 704 F.2d 1088, 1090 (9th Cir. 1983). Persons are domiciled in the places they reside with the intent to remain or to which they intend to return. See Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co., 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001). “A person residing in a given state is not necessarily domiciled there, and thus is not necessarily a citizen of that state.” Id. A corporation is a citizen of both its state of incorporation and the state in which it has its principal place of business. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1); see also New Alaska Dev. Corp. v. Guetschow, 869 F.2d 1298, 1300-01 (9th Cir. 1989). Finally, the citizenship of a partnership or other unincorporated entity is the citizenship of its members. See Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[L]ike a partnership, an LLC is a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are citizens.”); Marseilles Hydro Power, LLC v. Marseilles Land & Water Co., 299 F.3d 643, 652 (7th Cir. 2002) (“the relevant citizenship [of an LLC] for
diversity purposes is that of the members, not of the company”); Handelsman v. Bedford Village
Assocs., Ltd. P’ship, 213 F.3d 48, 51-52 (2d Cir. 2000) (“a limited liability company has the citizenship
of its membership”); Cosgrove v. Bartolotta, 150 F.3d 729, 731 (7th Cir. 1998); TPS Utilicom Servs.,
Inc. v. AT & T Corp., 223 F. Supp. 2d 1089, 1101 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (“A limited liability company . . . is
treated like a partnership for the purpose of establishing citizenship under diversity jurisdiction.”).

The Complaint fails to establish that the parties are completely diverse. Specifically, by failing
to identify and allege the citizenship of its own members, Plaintiff, a limited liability company, has not
properly alleged its own citizenship. Accordingly, the Court is unable to ascertain whether it may
exercise subject matter jurisdiction over this action. Without Plaintiff having adequately alleged a
proper jurisdictional basis, the Court would not grant Plaintiff’s Application for TRO even if Plaintiff
had otherwise satisfied the requirements for injunctive relief.

Despite Plaintiff’s failure to properly allege the Court’s subject matter jurisdiction, a district
court may, and should, grant leave to amend when it appears that subject matter jurisdiction may exist,
even though the complaint inadequately alleges jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1653; Trentacosta v.
Frontier Pacific Aircraft Industries, Inc., 813 F.2d 1553, 1555 (9th Cir. 1987). Therefore, the Court
grants Plaintiff leave to amend the Complaint to attempt to establish federal subject matter jurisdiction.
Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, if any, is to be filed by August 8, 2016. The failure to file a First
Amended Complaint by that date or to adequately allege the Court’s jurisdiction may result in the
dismissal of this action without prejudice.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Court concludes that Plaintiff is not entitled to the injunctive
relief it seeks. The Court therefore denies the Application for TRO.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
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## COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT AND INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESSES
### STATUS UPDATE – 22 SEPTEMBER 2017

### ACTIVE COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT PROCESS (CEP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Requester</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-Feb-2014</td>
<td>GCCIX, W.L.L.</td>
<td>.GCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jan-2015</td>
<td>Asia Green IT System Ltd.</td>
<td>.PERSIANGULF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jan-2016</td>
<td>Donuts Inc.</td>
<td>.SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Jul-2016</td>
<td>American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)</td>
<td>.CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Jul-2016</td>
<td>CPA Australia Ltd.</td>
<td>.CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Aug-2016</td>
<td>Donuts Inc. and Ruby Glen, LLC</td>
<td>.WEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Sep-2016</td>
<td>DotMusic Limited</td>
<td>.MUSIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP) is a process voluntarily invoked by a complainant prior to the filing of an Independent Review Process (IRP) for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP. (See Bylaws, Art. 4 § 4.3(c).) The requesting party may invoke the CEP by providing written notice to ICANN, noting the invocation of the process, identifying the Board action(s) at issue, identifying the provisions of the ICANN Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation that are alleged to be violated, and designating a single point of contact for the resolution of the issue. Further information regarding the CEP is available at: [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf).
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT AND INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESSES
STATUS UPDATE – 22 SEPTEMBER 2017

RECENTLY CLOSED COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT PROCESS (CEP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Requester</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>IRP Filing Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-Dec-2015</td>
<td>SportAccord</td>
<td>.SPORTS</td>
<td>N/A (Withdrawn on 21-Sep-2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The CEP process provides that “[i]f ICANN and the requester have not agreed to a resolution of the issues upon the conclusion of the cooperative engagement process, or if issues remain for a request for independent review, the requestor’s time to file a request for independent review designated in the Bylaws shall be extended for each day of the cooperative engagement process, but in no event, absent mutual written agreement by the parties, shall the extension be for more than fourteen (14) days.” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf)
**COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT AND INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESSES**

**STATUS UPDATE – 22 SEPTEMBER 2017**

**ACTIVE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS (IRP) PROCEEDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ICANN Received Notice of IRP</th>
<th>Date IRP Commenced by ICDR</th>
<th>Requester</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 IRP proceedings initiated before 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws in effect before 1 October 2016: The Independent Review Process (IRP) is a process by which any person materially affected by a decision or action by the Board that he or she asserts is inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws may submit a request for independent review of that decision or action. (See Bylaws, Art. IV, § 3.) In order to be materially affected, the person must suffer injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the Board's alleged violation of the Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation, and not as a result of third parties acting in line with the Board's action. Further information regarding the IRP is available at: [https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/mechanisms-2014-03-20-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/mechanisms-2014-03-20-en).

IRP proceedings initiated on or after 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws in effect as of 1 October 2016: The IRP is intended to hear and resolve Disputes for the following purposes: (i) ensure that ICANN does not exceed the scope of its Mission and otherwise complies with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws; (ii) empower the global Internet community and Claimants to enforce compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws through meaningful, affordable and accessible expert review of Covered Actions (as defined in § 4.3(b)(i)); (iii) ensure that ICANN is accountable to the global Internet community and Claimants; (iv) address claims that ICANN has failed to enforce its rights under the IANA Naming Function Contract (as defined in Section 16.3(a)); (v) provide a mechanism by which direct customers of the IANA naming functions may seek resolution of PTI (as defined in Section 16.1) service complaints that are not resolved through mediation; (vi) reduce Disputes by creating precedent to guide and inform the Board, Officers (as defined in Section 15.1), Staff members, Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and the global Internet community in connection with policy development and implementation; (vii) secure the accessible, transparent, efficient, consistent, coherent, and just resolution of Disputes; (viii) lead to binding, final resolutions consistent with international arbitration norms that are enforceable in any court with proper jurisdiction; and (ix) provide a mechanism for the resolution of Disputes, as an alternative to legal action in the civil courts of the United States or other jurisdictions. (See Bylaws, Art. 4, § 4.3)
## RECENTLY CLOSED INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS (IRP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ICANN Received Notice of IRP</th>
<th>Date IRP Commenced by ICDR</th>
<th>Requester</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Date IRP Closed</th>
<th>Date of Board Consideration of IRP Panel’s Final Declaration[^4]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar-2016</td>
<td>2-Mar-2016</td>
<td>Amazon EU S.à.r.l.</td>
<td>.AMAZON</td>
<td>11-Jul-2017</td>
<td>Board consideration scheduled for September 2017 Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^4]: IRP proceedings initiated before 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws in effect before 1 October 2016: Pursuant to Article IV, Section 3.21 of the ICANN Bylaws, “[w]here feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP Panel declaration at the Board’s next meeting. The declarations of the IRP Panel, and the Board’s subsequent action on those declarations, are final and have precedential value.” ([https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV))

IRP proceedings initiated on or after 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws as of 1 October 2016: IRP proceedings initiated Pursuant to Article 4, § 4.3(x)(iii)(A) of the ICANN Bylaws, “[w]here feasible, the Board shall consider its response to IRP Panel decisions at the Board’s next meeting, and shall affirm or reject compliance with the decision of the public record based on an expressed rationale. The decision by the IRP Panel, or en banc Standing Panel, shall be final regardless of such Board action, to the fullest extent allowed by law. ([https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article4](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article4))
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COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT AND INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESSES
STATUS UPDATE – 29 MARCH 2018

ACTIVE COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT PROCESS (CEP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-Feb-2014</td>
<td>GCCIX, W.L.L.</td>
<td>.GCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jan-2015</td>
<td>Asia Green IT System Ltd.</td>
<td>.PERSIANGULF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jan-2016</td>
<td>Donuts Inc.</td>
<td>.SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Jul-2016</td>
<td>American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)</td>
<td>.CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Jul-2016</td>
<td>CPA Australia Ltd.</td>
<td>.CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Sep-2016</td>
<td>DotMusic Limited</td>
<td>.MUSIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Oct-2017</td>
<td>dotgay LLC</td>
<td>.GAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nov-2017</td>
<td>dotgay LLC</td>
<td>.GAY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP) is a process voluntarily invoked by a complainant prior to the filing of an Independent Review Process (IRP) for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP. (See Bylaws, Art. 4 § 4.3(c).) The requesting party may invoke the CEP by providing written notice to ICANN, noting the invocation of the process, identifying the Board action(s) at issue, identifying the provisions of the ICANN Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation that are alleged to be violated, and designating a single point of contact for the resolution of the issue. Further information regarding the CEP is available at: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf.
## RECENTLY CLOSED COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT PROCESS (CEP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>IRP Filing Deadline&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Aug-2016</td>
<td>Donuts Inc. and Ruby Glen, LLC</td>
<td>.WEB</td>
<td>14-Feb-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>2</sup> The CEP process provides that “[i]f ICANN and the requestor have not agreed to a resolution of the issues upon the conclusion of the cooperative engagement process, or if issues remain for a request for independent review, the requestor’s time to file a request for independent review designated in the Bylaws shall be extended for each day of the cooperative engagement process, but in no event, absent mutual written agreement by the parties, shall the extension be for more than fourteen (14) days.” ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf))
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ACTIVE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS (IRP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ICANN Received Notice of IRP</th>
<th>Date IRP Commenced by ICDR</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no active IRPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 IRP proceedings initiated before 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws in effect before 1 October 2016: The Independent Review Process (IRP) is a process by which any person materially affected by a decision or action by the Board that he or she asserts is inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws may submit a request for independent review of that decision or action. (See Bylaws, Art. IV, § 3.) In order to be materially affected, the person must suffer injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the Board's alleged violation of the Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation, and not as a result of third parties acting in line with the Board's action. Further information regarding the IRP is available at: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/mechanisms-2014-03-20-en.

IRP proceedings initiated on or after 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws in effect as of 1 October 2016: The IRP is intended to hear and resolve Disputes for the following purposes: (i) ensure that ICANN does not exceed the scope of its Mission and otherwise complies with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws; (ii) empower the global Internet community and Claimants to enforce compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws through meaningful, affordable and accessible expert review of Covered Actions (as defined in § 4.3(b)(i)); (iii) ensure that ICANN is accountable to the global Internet community and Claimants; (iv) address claims that ICANN has failed to enforce its rights under the IANA Naming Function Contract (as defined in Section 16.3(a)); (v) provide a mechanism by which direct customers of the IANA naming functions may seek resolution of PTI (as defined in Section 16.1) service complaints that are not resolved through mediation; (vi) reduce Disputes by creating precedent to guide and inform the Board, Officers (as defined in Section 15.1), Staff members, Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and the global Internet community in connection with policy development and implementation; (vii) secure the accessible, transparent, efficient, consistent, coherent, and just resolution of Disputes; (viii) lead to binding, final resolutions consistent with international arbitration norms that are enforceable in any court with proper jurisdiction; and (ix) provide a mechanism for the resolution of Disputes, as an alternative to legal action in the civil courts of the United States or other jurisdictions. (See Bylaws, Art. 4, § 4.3)
## RECENTLY CLOSED INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS (IRP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ICANN Received Notice of IRP</th>
<th>Date IRP Commenced by ICDR</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Date IRP Closed</th>
<th>Date of Board Consideration of IRP Panel’s Final Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar-2016</td>
<td>2-Mar-2016</td>
<td>Amazon EU S.à.r.l.</td>
<td>.AMAZON</td>
<td>11-Jul-2017</td>
<td>23-Sep-2017 (See <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV">here</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 IRP proceedings initiated before 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws in effect before 1 October 2016: Pursuant to Article IV, Section 3.21 of the ICANN Bylaws, “[w]here feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP Panel declaration at the Board’s next meeting. The declarations of the IRP Panel, and the Board’s subsequent action on those declarations, are final and have precedential value.” ([https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV))

IRP proceedings initiated on or after 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws as of 1 October 2016: IRP proceedings initiated Pursuant to Article 4, § 4.3(x)(iii)(A) of the ICANN Bylaws, “[w]here feasible, the Board shall consider its response to IRP Panel decisions at the Board’s next meeting, and shall affirm or reject compliance with the decision of the public record based on an expressed rationale. The decision by the IRP Panel, or en banc Standing Panel, shall be final regardless of such Board action, to the fullest extent allowed by law. ([https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article4](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article4))
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8 August 2016

Mr. Akram Atallah
President, Global Domains Division
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094

Re: .WEB Auction

Dear Akram:

Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Afilias plc, is an applicant for the .WEB top-level domain under the ICANN new gTLD program. On 27-28 August 2016, ICANN conducted an auction (the “Auction”) for the .WEB string per the rules and procedures set forth in the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Guidebook”). As announced by ICANN on 28 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2016-07-28-en), the successful bidder in the Auction was Nu Dot Co LLC (“NDC”).

Subsequent to the conclusion of the auction, it has been publically disclosed that VeriSign, Inc. acquired rights in the NDC application for .WEB. VeriSign’s press release, dated 1 August 2016, states “The Company [i.e., VeriSign] entered into an agreement with Nu Dot Co LLC wherein the Company provided funds for Nu Dot Co’s bid for the .web TLD. We are pleased that the Nu Dot Co bid was successful. We anticipate that Nu Dot Co will execute the .web Registry Agreement with the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) and will then seek to assign the Registry Agreement to Verisign upon consent from ICANN.” (https://investor.verisign.com/releasedetail.cfm?ReleaseID=981994)

Further, in its 10-Q for the quarter ended 30 June 2016, filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission on 28 July 2016, VeriSign states “Subsequent to June 30, 2016, the Company incurred a commitment to pay approximately $130.0 million for the future assignment of contractual rights, which are subject to third-party consent. The payment is expected to occur during the third quarter of 2016.

Paragraph 10 of the Terms and Conditions set forth in the Guidebook includes in part the following language: “Applicant may not resell, assign or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.” We have not been able to review a copy of the agreement(s) between NDC and VeriSign with respect to this arrangement, but it appears likely, given the public statements of VeriSign, that DNC and VeriSign entered into an agreement in the form of an option or similar arrangement with respect to the rights and obligations of NDC regarding its .WEB application. An option to acquire a string won at auction, together with a promise to fund the auction, is exactly the type of transfer of rights and obligations in connection with an application that ICANN was attempting to stop by including this language in the Terms and Conditions. Otherwise, such language would have no real purpose. The language of paragraph 10 precludes not only a transfer of all rights or obligations in an application, but of any rights or obligations. There is no materiality threshold, and
no procedure to seek consent or waiver of these terms. It is an absolute prohibition of this type of arrangement in clear and unambiguous terms.

The purposes of a prohibition on transferring rights and obligations in an application are obvious. ICANN and the community spent years engaged in a stakeholder driven process to develop the important processes and procedures by which one could submit an application for a new gTLD. These procedures were developed to endure a level playing field for gTLD applicants and to protect the integrity of the process. The application requirements and associated filing deadlines were clear and strictly enforced from the beginning. To allow third parties to circumvent the entire Guidebook process simply by buying rights in an application once filed renders the entire Guidebook and ICANN process mere folly and negatively impacts to a material degree the rights and expectations of applicants that have played by the rules.

There is no cure provided in the Guidebook for violations of paragraph 10 of the Terms and Conditions. The only reasonable and fair solution is to disqualify the NDC application and proceed to the next highest bidder in the auction to contract for the string, at the price at which the third highest bidder exited the auction.

Further, section 1.2.7 of the Guidebook provides:

If at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate, the applicant must promptly notify ICANN via submission of the appropriate forms. This includes applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant.

ICANN reserves the right to require a re-evaluation of the application in the event of a material change. This could involve additional fees or evaluation in a subsequent application round.

Failure to notify ICANN of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading may result in denial of the application.

Clearly, an agreement to provide at least $135 Million to an applicant constitutes a material change in that applicant’s financial condition. Further, the type of option agreement that apparently exists between NDC and VeriSign likely constitutes a change in control of the applicant. A change in control can be effected by contract as well as by changes in equity ownership. It is our understanding that NDC never notified ICANN of these changes per the terms of the Guidebook. In the interest of fairness to the other .WEB auction participants, ICANN should exercise its right under paragraph 1.2.7 and deny NDC’s application.

We request that ICANN promptly undertake an investigation of the matters set forth in this letter and take appropriate action against NDC and its .WEB application for violations of the Guidebook as we have requested.

In addition to this letter, we are filing a complaint with the ICANN Ombudsman with regard to this matter. We strongly urge ICANN to stay any further action in this matter with respect to NDC, including entering into a registry agreement for .WEB with NDC, or acting on any request of NDC or VeriSign to
assign such agreement to VeriSign, until the Ombudsman has had an opportunity to investigate and report on this matter.

Regards,

M. Scott Hemphill  
Vice President & General Counsel

cc:    Steve Crocker, Chairman of the Board  
       Göran Marby, President and CEO
9 September 2016

Via E-Mail

Mr Akram Atallah
President, Global Domains Division
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094

Re: .WEB auction

Dear Mr. Atallah:

On behalf of Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited ("Afilias"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Afilias plc, I write with reference to our letter of 8 August 2016, in which we requested that ICANN disqualify and reject Nu Dot Co LLC’s ("NDC") application for .WEB.

Specifically, NDC entered into an agreement to transfer any rights it acquired in connection with its application for .WEB to VeriSign, Inc. ("VeriSign"), which it did not disclose prior to the .WEB auction. The evidence strongly suggests that NDC acted as a front for and participated in the .WEB auction (the "Auction") for and on behalf of VeriSign. Given ICANN’s failure to respond to our prior letter, we request that ICANN promptly, and by no later than 16 September, 2016, (1) disclose the steps (if any) that it has taken to disqualify NDC’s bid on the basis that NDC violated the rules applicable to its application; and (2) provide an undertaking that it has not, and will not, enter into a registry agreement for .WEB with NDC until (a) the Ombudsman has completed his investigation; (b) ICANN’s Board has reviewed NDC’s conduct and determined whether or not to disqualify NDC’s bid and reject its application; and, (c) to the extent Afilias seeks review of any decision of ICANN relating to .WEB through ICANN’s accountability mechanisms, such mechanisms are completed. We nonetheless emphasize that Afilias reserves all of its rights to pursue any and all rights or remedies available to it in any forum against ICANN, NDC or VeriSign in connection with the delegation of the .WEB gTLD.

We take the opportunity of this letter to further explain the reasons why ICANN must disqualify NDC’s application for .WEB and proceed to contract for .WEB with Afilias, the next highest bidder in the Auction, in compliance with its obligations under ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (as well as principles of international law and California law), as set forth below.
NDC violated the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook and the Auction Rules for New gTLDs

First, NDC violated Paragraph 10 of the Terms and Conditions in Module 6 of the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Guidebook”), which expressly prohibits any applicant for a gTLD to “resell, assign or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application”. As we explained in our letter of August 8, 2016, Verisign publicly disclosed that it “provided funds” for NDC’s bid for .WEB and that NDC would “seek to assign the Registry Agreement to VeriSign.” Although the specific terms of the agreement between VeriSign and NDC have not been disclosed, it is clear from Verisign’s own press release and its disclosure in its Form 10-Q filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission for the quarter ended June 30, 2016, that both companies entered into an arrangement well in advance of the Auction to transfer NDC’s rights and obligations regarding its .WEB application to VeriSign.

Second, NDC violated Section 1.2.7 of the Guidebook, which requires applicants to “promptly notify ICANN via submission of the appropriate forms” “if at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate,” including “changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant”. In this regard, we find remarkable that the Form 10-Q VeriSign filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission on 28 July, 2016—the day after the Auction—contained the following statement: “Subsequent to June 30, 2016, the Company incurred a commitment to pay approximately $130.0 million for the future assignment of contractual rights, which are subject to third-party consent. The payment is expected to occur during the third quarter of 2016.” When rumors surfaced that another company was behind NDC’s application for .WEB, NDC sent a note to ICANN’s Ombudsman on 8 July 2016, stating merely that “neither the governance, management nor the ownership in NuDotcoco [sic] has changed.” Clearly, by then, relevant changes concerning NDC’s financial position had, at a minimum, been agreed to and should have been reported to ICANN, namely, that the VeriSign had agreed to fund NDC’s bid for .WEB.

Third, NDC violated the Auction Rules for New gTLDs (“Auction Rules”). Rule 12 provides that “participation in an Auction is limited to Bidders, which is defined by the Auction Rules as a “Qualified Applicant” or a “party designated by a Qualified Applicant to bid on its behalf”. This rule prohibits bids placed on behalf of a third-party that is not a “Qualified Applicant”, defined by the Auction Rules as “an entity that has submitted an Application for a new gTLD, has received all necessary approvals from ICANN, and which is included within a Contention Set to be resolved by an Auction.” Accordingly, Rule 40(b) provides that “in order to be valid” “a Bid must be placed by a Bidder for its Application in an Open Contention Set.”
ICANN has the duty to deny NDC’s application, disqualify its bid and proceed to contract with the next highest bidder in the Auction.

ICANN’s governing documents clearly dictate the appropriate response ICANN should take in connection with NDC’s improper conduct:

- ICANN is required to “...operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law and, to the extent appropriate and consistent with these Articles and its Bylaws, through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets.” [Articles of Incorporation, Art.4]

- ICANN is required to “mak[e] decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness” [Bylaws, Art.I § 2 (8)]

- ICANN is required to “not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition.” [Bylaws, Art. II3]

- ICANN is required to “Act[ ] with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.” [Bylaws, Art. I§ 2 (9)]

- ICANN is directed to “operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness” [Bylaws, Art. III § 1].

- ICANN is required to “promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest” [Bylaws, Art. I. § 2 (6)]

- ICANN is required to “Remain[ ] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness.” [Bylaws, Art. I. § 2 (10)]

VeriSign chose not to apply for .WEB, as it could have done. Instead, VeriSign improperly and surreptitiously funded NDC’s application. NDC’s and VeriSign’s attempt to game the system and obtain control over .WEB for VeriSign (which already controls.COM), must be sanctioned by ICANN by disqualifying NDC’s bid and rejecting its application.

In these circumstances, we submit that ICANN should disqualify NDC’s bid and offer to accept the application of Afilias, which placed the second highest exit bid. Consistent with Auction Rules No. 46 and No. 47, the winning price should be deemed to be the second-highest remaining exit bid after disqualifying NDC and striking its exit bid as invalid.

This course of action is consistent not only with ICANN’s Guidebook and Auction Rules, but also with the principles of due process and fairness that ICANN is obligated to observe pursuant to its governing documents. In this regard, we note that NDC’s violations must not affect the rights of other applicants that participated in the Auction in full compliance with the applicable rules, and that a new auction would be improper since the bidders have already
seen the outcome of the first Auction. Thus, ICANN must protect the integrity of the gTLD auction and delegation process from being tainted by the actions of one bidder. The only way to do this is to disqualify NDC and proceed as we have outlined above.

Finally, we remind ICANN that “ICANN’s Board of Directors has ultimate responsibility for the New gTLD Program” (Bylaws, Art. II, § 1; Guidebook, Section 5.1), and that “material changes in circumstances” require “additional Board review” before “formal approval” of a registry agreement for the delegation of a gTLD. We therefore request that ICANN provide us with an undertaking that it has not, and will not, enter into a registry agreement for .WEB with NDC until ICANN’s Board has reviewed NDC’s conduct and reached a considered decision on whether or not to disqualify NDC’s bid and reject its application; the Ombudsman has completed his investigation and the Board has considered and reached a decision on his report; and, to the extent Afilias seeks review of any decision of ICANN relating to .WEB through ICANN’s accountability mechanisms, Afilias has exhausted such mechanisms.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, ICANN’s Board and officers are obligated under the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and the Guidebook (as well as international law and California law) to disqualify NDC’s bid immediately and proceed with the contracting of a registry agreement with Afilias, the second highest bidder. We look forward to receiving a response from ICANN by no later than 16 September 2016.

Afilias reserves all of its rights at law and in equity, including, without limitation, relating to the issues raised in this letter.

Sincerely,

M. Scott Hemphill
Vice President & General Counsel

cc: Steve Crocker, Chairman of the ICANN Board
    Göran Marby, President and Chief Executive Officer
    Arif Hyder Ali, Dechert LLP
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October 7, 2016

Christine A. Willett
Vice President, gTLD Operations
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094

Re: Response of Afilias Domains No. 3 Ltd. ("Afilias") to 16 September 2016 Request for Comments from the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN")

Dear Ms. Willett:

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on behalf of Afilias to the questions posed by ICANN in its 16 September 2016 letter. Further, we acknowledge receipt of the letter from Mr. Atallah, dated 30 September 2016, providing a response to previous letters submitted by Afilias regarding this matter. However, we note that Mr. Atallah’s letter fails to respond to the serious issues concerning the auction for the rights to administer the .WEB generic top-level domain ("gTLD") raised in Scott Hemphill’s letters of 8 August 2016 and 9 September 2016. Further, Mr. Atallah states that, while the .WEB/.WEBs contention set was placed on hold by ICANN on 19 August 2016, such action was taken because of the initiation of an ICANN Accountability Mechanism by another applicant. We are concerned that this statement appears to imply that ICANN is not placing the contention set on hold in order to address the issues raised by Afilias.

As reflected in the accompanying answers to ICANN’s questions, Afilias reaffirms its position that the actions taken by NU DOT CO LLC ("NDC") and Verisign, Inc. ("Verisign") in connection with the auction and NDC’s failure to disclose material information relating to its bid for the .WEB rights should result in the disqualification of NDC as a member of the contention set for .WEB and the invalidation of NDC’s bid.

As part of its review, ICANN must recognize and investigate the significant harm to competition arising from Verisign’s agreement with NDC to acquire the rights to .WEB. Verisign’s actions are clearly designed to preserve Verisign’s existing monopoly in gTLD services that results from its control of .COM and .NET. If awarded to Afilias, the .WEB gTLD will be uniquely situated to challenge Verisign’s gTLD services dominance by providing registrants a compelling alternative to .COM and .NET. If Verisign is permitted by ICANN to succeed in its efforts to secure the rights to .WEB, on the other hand, this potential for important new competition will be destroyed. Verisign (through NDC) cannot be allowed to obtain the rights to .WEB through subterfuge, when all of the remaining applicants agreed to and played by the rules.

Accordingly, we urge ICANN to disqualify NDC’s bid and prevent Verisign from obtaining control over the .WEB gTLD in order to ensure competition in the gTLD marketplace and prevent an unlawful act of monopolization based on anti-competitive behavior.

Sincerely,

John Kane
Vice President, Corporate Services
Afilias’ Comments on ICANN’s September 16, 2016 Topics

Topic 01. Afilias and Ruby Glen have alleged that NDC failed promptly to notify ICANN of “changes in ownership and control of the applicant” [i.e., NDC], as contemplated by Section 1.2.7 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (Version 2012-06-04) (AGB). Please provide or describe any evidence of which you are aware regarding whether ownership or control of NDC changed after NDC applied for the .WEB gTLD.

Response. According to Afilias’ review of publicly available documents, “ownership or control of NDC changed after NDC applied for the .WEB gTLD.” Specifically,

- Verisign’s 1 August 2016 press release states that it “entered into an agreement with Nu Dot Co LLC wherein the Company provided funds for Nu Dot Co’s bid for the .web TLD. … We anticipate that Nu Dot Co … will then seek to assign the Registry Agreement to Verisign upon consent from ICANN.”

- Verisign’s 10-Q for the quarter ended 30 June 2016, filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission on 28 July 2016, states that “[s]ubsequent to June 30, 2016, the Company incurred a commitment to pay approximately $130.0 million for the future assignment of contractual rights, which are subject to third-party consent. The payment is expected to occur during third quarter of 2016.”

- Ruby Glen alleges that “NDC also made statements indicating a potential change in the ownership of NDC, including an admission that the board of NDC had changed to add ‘several others’” in its Amended Complaint for Ruby Glen, LLC v. ICANN.

In the unique circumstances of the present case, the arrangement between Verisign and NDC constitutes the effective control of NDC by Verisign. If NDC is granted the rights to administer the .WEB gTLD from ICANN, those rights would constitute the principal business asset of NDC. NDC appears to have given Verisign de facto control over NDC’s business by entering into an agreement by which Verisign will fund NDC’s bid for .WEB and which gives Verisign the power to direct and control NDC’s participation in the auction for .WEB in exchange for an assignment of all rights in .WEB from NDC to Verisign. Thus, Afilias has a good faith basis to believe that “ownership or control of NDC changed after NDC applied for the .WEB gTLD” and NDC did not disclose this change in violation of ICANN’s rules.

Accordingly, ICANN must carefully investigate NDC’s conduct by obtaining further information from NDC and Verisign, including: (1) agreements between NDC and Verisign; (2) changes to NDC’s board of directors; and (3) inter-company transactions between NDC and Verisign, including the sale of assets to Verisign. Such information must also be disclosed to Afilias, the party materially affected and injured by Verisign’s and NDC’s actions.

Topic 02. In the Ruby Glen, LLC v. ICANN lawsuit, two NDC officers, Jose Ignacio Rasco III and Nicolai Bezsonoff, provided declarations dated 25 July 2016 under penalty of perjury regarding ownership and control of NDC. What evidence, if any, is there that statements made in those declarations are false?

Response. Please see our response to Topic 01. In the event that Messrs. Rasco and Bezsonoff are deposed or questioned by ICANN, Afilias requests that it be informed of the
same. If necessary, in due course, we will seek the deposition of Messrs. Rasco and Bezsonoff among others.

**Topic 03.** AGB Section 1.2.7 speaks of changes in ownership and control specifically "of the applicant." Please describe other NDC activities besides its having applied for the .WEB gTLD, and the activities relating to that application. Do you think that a change regarding only one of many activities of an applicant constitutes a change in ownership and control within the meaning of AGB Section 1.2.7? Please explain why or why not.

**Response.** Please see our response to Topic 01.

**Topic 04.** In his 8 August 2016, letter, Scott Hemphill stated: "A change in control can be effected by contract as well as by changes in equity ownership." Do you think that an applicant's making a contractual promise to conduct particular activities in which it is engaged in a particular manner constitutes a "change in control" of the applicant? Do you think that compliance with such a contractual promise constitutes such a change in control? Please give reasons.

**Response.** Please see our response to Topic 01.

**Topic 05.** Do you think that AGB Section 1.2.7 requires an applicant to disclose to ICANN all contractual commitments it makes to conduct its affairs in particular ways? If not, in what circumstances (if any) would disclosure be required?

**Response.** The plain language of AGB § 1.2.7 states that disclosure "via submission of the appropriate forms" is required when "information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate" or gives rise to a material "change in circumstances" during the evaluation process. The plain language of the AGB thus clearly identifies circumstances that require a disclosure to ICANN. Afilias believes that the AGB requires applicants to disclose extraordinary commitments and changes in circumstances that materially affect the implications of the award of registry rights in terms of ICANN's authorities. Here, as the commitment between NDC and Verisign uniquely raises antitrust issues, Afilias believes that NDC was required to disclose its contractual arrangement with Verisign because such arrangement will potentially destroy any new competition given Verisign's existing monopoly in gTLD services. ICANN's exercise of its authorities includes a duty to ensure that there will be an effective potential for development of competition among providers of gTLD registry services. One of ICANN's core values is to "promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest." Bylaws, Art. 1 § 2(6). A third party (such as Verisign) secretly funding bids to gain or preserve a monopoly directly contravenes this core value.

**Topic 06.** In his 8 August 2016, letter, Scott Hemphill stated that "an agreement to provide at least $135 Million to an applicant constitutes a material change in that applicant's financial condition." In your view, does AGB Section 1.2.7 require applicants to notify ICANN of all changes in their financial condition? If the requirement is limited by an (unstated) materiality test, how should materiality be determined?

**Response.** Please see our response to Topic 05.
**Topic 07.** Do you think that changes to an applicant’s financial condition that do not negatively reflect on an applicant’s qualifications to operate the gTLD should be deemed material? If so, why? Do you think that an applicant’s obtaining a funding commitment from a third party to fund bidding at auction negatively affects that applicant’s qualifications to operate the gTLD? Please explain why, describing your view of the relevance of (a) the funding commitment the applicant received and (b) the consideration the applicant gave to obtain that commitment (e.g., a promise to repay; a promise to use a particular backend provider; an option to receive some ownership interest in the applicant in the future; some promise about how the gTLD will be operated).

**Response.** The plain language of AGB § 1.2.7 requires the applicant to “promptly notify ICANN” if “at any time during the evaluation process information [including changes in financial position] previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate”. And failure to notify ICANN of “any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading may result in denial of the application.”

An applicant that obtains a funding commitment from a third party to fund bidding at an auction negatively affects that applicant’s qualifications when the third party is attempting to gain or preserve a monopoly. One of ICANN’s core values is to “promote[ ] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(6). A third party secretly funding bids to obtain a monopoly directly contravenes this core value.

Verisign’s significant financial strength was built upon its ICANN-granted position as a monopoly provider of registry services. When those monopolist profits are then employed to finance a bid to maintain that dominant market position, it is anticompetitive and material to the affected bid and to ICANN new gTLD process as a whole.

Here, NDC’s agreement with Verisign is essentially an agreement not-to-compete, which stifles competition. Neither NDC nor Verisign has offered any procompetitive justification for the deal or otherwise indicated that they are engaged in a procompetitive joint venture to operate the .WEB gTLD. Verisign’s monopoly position gives it significant market power in the gTLD registration market. Through its secret agreement with NDC, Verisign intends to foreclose the possibility of any competition from .WEB.

Verisign’s acquisition of .WEB likely means (1) fewer resources being invested in maximizing .WEB’s competitive potential, (2) a dramatically reduced chance that .WEB will act as a competitive check on .COM and .NET; and (3) that .WEB will not be marketed to compete and siphon away customers from .COM and .NET. This will deprive Internet users, businesses, and Web site developers of commercially promising and viable new domains for their Web sites. This competitive harm will likely never be undone.

**Topic 08.** Do you have any knowledge or information that applicants in other circumstances have obtained post-application funding commitments (whether received through loans, contributions from affiliated companies, or otherwise) for their auction bidding or other operations? If so, please elaborate. Do you know if applicants have commonly notified ICANN of those funding commitments? If so, please explain. Should applicants be required to notify ICANN of those funding commitments? If so, in what circumstances?

**Response.** We are not aware of similar arrangements that would have the effect of creating or preserving a monopoly in gTLD registry services like Verisign’s monopoly. Afilias is aware
of applications in other circumstances that have obtained post-application funding commitments. These situations are not analogous to the commitment between NDC and Verisign, however, because Verisign’s acquisition of .WEB raises serious antitrust issues by stifling competition in favor of Verisign’s dominance in gTLD services. Prior applicants’ circumstances have no relevance to this unique situation.

**Topic 09.** Do you think that requiring applicants to disclose funding commitments (whether through loans, contributions from affiliated companies, or otherwise) they obtain for auction bids would help or harm the auction process? Would a requirement that applicants disclose their funding arrangements create problems for applicants (for example, making funding commitments harder to obtain)? To what extent, if any, do you think scrutinizing such arrangements (beyond determining whether they negatively reflect on an applicant’s qualifications) would be within ICANN’s proper mission? Would required disclosure of applicants’ funding sources pose any threat to robust competition?

**Response.** Please see our response to Topic 08.

Disclosure is required when there is a change in circumstances that affects competition. AGB § 1.2.7 clearly states that a disclosure “via submission of the appropriate forms” is required when “information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate” during the application process. NDC deliberately chose not to disclose its relationship with Verisign in order to avoid questions about their anti-competitive relationship, deliberately violating AGB § 1.2.7 and thus harming the auction process.

ICANN should act in accordance with its core values, which dictate that it should not only “promote and sustain a competitive environment” but also “introduce[e] and promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial to the public interest.” Bylaws, Art. I §§ 2(5), (6). In accordance with its mission, then, ICANN must therefore scrutinize arrangements that contravene these values and stifle competition – such as the one between NDC and Verisign.

The importance of a competitive environment is particularly stressed in ICANN’s Bylaws. Despite ICANN’s core value of “applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness”, Bylaws, Art. I § 2(8), ICANN’s own Bylaws permit the disparate treatment of parties for the “promotion of effective competition.” Bylaws, Art. II § 3.

**Topic 10.** The final sentence of AGB Section 1.2.7 states that failures to notify ICANN of changes “may result in denial of the application.” What standards do you think ICANN should follow in determining whether a particular failure to make a required notification should lead to denial of an application? If an applicant or related entities have multiple applications and it is discovered that the applicant or related entities have external funding commitments not disclosed to ICANN, should all of that applicant’s or its related entities’ applications be denied?

**Response.** Consistent with ICANN’s obligations to promote competition, ICANN must deny an application improperly and surreptitiously funded by a third party in order to obtain control over a gTLD and to stifle competition and harm consumers. Here, ICANN must disqualify NDC’s bid and prevent Verisign from acquiring the rights in .WEB. Verisign, which already exercises exclusive control over .COM and .NET, chose not to apply for .WEB, as it could have done. Rather, Verisign secretly funded NDC’s application to game the system and to obtain control over .WEB for Verisign in order to stifle competition for .COM and .NET’s
existing monopoly. Indeed, Verisign has few incentives to market .WEB aggressively because its growth would inevitably come at the expense of Verisign’s dominant position with .COM and .NET. The damage will likely be irreparable as ICANN contracts are generally automatically renewed.

Indeed, there are several standards from ICANN’s own Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws that support NDC’s disqualification. They are as follows:

- ICANN is required to “operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law and, to the extent appropriate and consistent with these Articles and its Bylaws, through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets.” Articles of Incorporation, Art. 4.

- ICANN is required to “[m]ake[] decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(8).

- ICANN is required to “not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition.” Bylaws, Art. II § 3.

- ICANN is required to “[a]ct[] with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(9).

- ICANN is directed to “operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.” Bylaws, Art. III § 1.

- ICANN is required to “promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(6).

- ICANN is required to “[r]emain[] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(10).

Topic 11. Afilias and Ruby Glen have also raised questions as to whether NDC violated the last sentence of AGB, Module 6, Paragraph 10, which states: “Applicant may not resell, assign, or transfer any of the applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.” Do you think the “rights or obligations” mentioned in that sentence are limited to those that flow from approval of the application (e.g., the right to enter a registry agreement), or do you think that they also include rights and obligations concerning the prosecution of the application (e.g., obligations to respond to additional inquiries from ICANN; rights to assist in pursuing the application by raising or addressing concerns)? In responding on this topic, please address the context established by the first two sentences of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10.

Response. Under the plain language of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10, an “[a]pplicant may not resell, assign, or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.” Thus, it is clear that “any” rights or obligations in “connection” with the application cannot be resold, assigned, or transferred to a third party.
**Topic 12.** Do you have knowledge or information that gTLD applicants in other circumstances have assigned others to handle aspects of the process by which applications are evaluated? If so, please describe with specifics what you know about this practice. For example, do applicants empower persons or companies with which they are working to take charge of handling various stages of the evaluation process? If so, do you think this violates AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10?

**Response.** Afilias is not aware of other circumstances where an applicant (such as NDC) empowers a person or a company to improperly gain or preserve a monopoly in violation of ICANN’s Bylaws. The commitment between NDC and Verisign uniquely raises antitrust issues for the reasons discussed above. Prior applicants’ circumstances thus have no relevance to this unique situation.

**Topic 13.** Specifically with regard to the auction process, what knowledge or information do you have regarding the extent to which applicants within contention sets have taken suggestions or direction from others regarding how to conduct bidding? How common is this practice? (It is noted that Clause 68 of the “Auction Rules for New gTLDs (Version 2014-11-03)” (Auction Rules) and Section 2.6 of the “New gTLD Auctions Bidder Agreement (Version 2014-04-03)” (Bidder Agreement) prohibit certain collusive activities between applicants; the immediately preceding two questions are directed to suggestions or directions not violating those prohibitions.) Clause 12 of the Auction Rules states in part “Before an Auction to resolve a given Contention Set, each Qualified Applicant may designate a party to bid on its behalf (‘Designated Bidder’).” Designated Bidders must execute Bidder Agreements with the Auction Manager reflecting their rights and obligations concerning the conduct of the auction. Do you think that designation of a Designated Bidder violates the last sentence of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10?

**Response.** The actions of other gTLD applicants are not relevant to NDC’s actions. NDC deliberately chose not to disclose its relationship with Verisign in order to avoid questions about their anti-competitive relationship and deliberately violated AGB § 1.2.7’s requirement to “promptly notify ICANN” of “any change in circumstance” that would have a material effect on the potential to create effective new competition for Verisign’s existing monopoly in gTLD services.

NDC is helping Verisign solidify its monopoly over gTLDs. Verisign has enjoyed uninterrupted gTLD dominance for over a decade thanks to its control over .COM and .NET. As a result of this control, Verisign has a dominant share of all gTLD registrations. The next closest competitors have much smaller shares.

As stated above, Verisign’s acquisition of .WEB likely means (1) fewer resources being invested in maximizing .WEB’s competitive potential, (2) a dramatically reduced change that .WEB will act as a competitive check on .COM and .NET, and (3) that .WEB will not be marketed to compete and siphon away customers from .COM and .NET. If NDC and Verisign are permitted to consummate their arrangement, the result will deprive Internet users, businesses, and Web site developers of commercially promising and viable new domains for their Web sites. This competitive harm will likely never be undone.

**Topic 14.** Clause 12 of the Auction Rules states that a purpose for an applicant’s selection of a Designated Bidder is to allow the Designated Bidder to bid on the applicant’s behalf. Do you think that clause merely states a purpose for designation, or does it obligate the Designated Bidder to bid on
behalf of only the applicant? What do you think the phrase "its behalf" means in the Auction Rules and Bidder Agreement? Do you think it indicates that the Designated Bidder acts in the stead of the applicant, or does it additionally indicate that the Designated Bidder must act in only the interest of the applicant? (In this regard, please discuss the wording of the seventh recital in the Bidder Agreement.) Where no Designated Bidder is designated, do you think the Auction Rules or the Bidder Agreement requires that an applicant acting for itself as the Bidder act only in its own interest? If so, please explain why. As relevant to this topic 14, do you think there are any inconsistencies between the Auction Rules and the Bidder Agreement? If so, please explain those inconsistencies in detail.

Response. Afilias believes that in applying its rules in the present circumstances, ICANN should focus on the uniquely harmful competition implications of an undisclosed arrangement between NDC and Verisign, the current dominant monopolist in gTLD services. Other applications or potential applications of the rules in other circumstances are not necessarily relevant to the present unique situation.

Topic 15. Clause 13 of the Auction Rules states: "Before each Auction, each Bidder shall nominate up to two people ("Authorized Individuals") to bid on its behalf in the Auction." Authorized Individuals have certain rights and obligations in connection with the auction. Do you think that an applicant’s nomination of an Authorized Individual violates the last sentence of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10?

Response. Please see our response to Topic 14.

Topic 16. Do you think that an applicant’s entry into a contract promising in exchange for a payment of money to make bids and otherwise participate in the auction in the manner directed by the other party to the contract constitutes “resell[ing], assign[ing], or transfer[ing] any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application,” as prohibited by AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10? Please explain why or why not.

Response. Please see our responses to Topics 05, 07, 08, and 14.

Topic 17. Do you think that AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 would be violated by a contractual promise by an applicant to request ICANN’s consent to transfer to another party any registry agreement it receives as the result of its application? If so, under what circumstances? To the best of your knowledge and information, in the context of any other gTLD has an applicant agreed, before entry into a registry agreement, to seek ICANN’s consent to transfer the agreement after it is entered?

Response. Please see our responses to Topics 05, 07, 08, and 14.

Topic 18. Do you think that AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 would be violated by a contractual promise by an applicant to seek to transfer to another party, but only upon consent of ICANN, any registry agreement it receives as the result of its application? If so, under what circumstances? To the best of your knowledge and information, in the context of any other gTLD has an applicant made such an agreement?

Response. Please see our responses to Topics 05, 07, 08, and 14.
**Topic 19.** Do you think that AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 means that a resale, assignment, or transfer contrary to its last sentence constitutes a violation that can result in forfeiture or denial of the application, or is its effect simply that any such attempted resale, assignment, or transfer of the application is ineffective? In your response, please address Restatement (Second) of Contracts §§ 317 and 322 (including comment b) and any other applicable legal principles.

**Response.** Please see our responses to Topics 05, 07, 08, and 14.

**Topic 20.** In his 9 September 2016 letter, Scott Hemphill stated that NDC and Verisign’s efforts to give Verisign control over the .WEB gTLD “must be sanctioned by ICANN by disqualifying NDC’s bid and rejecting its application.” Assuming that a resale, assignment, or transfer contrary to the last sentence of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 can result in forfeiture or denial of the application (see topic 19 above), do you think that the application must be forfeited or denied in all cases? If ICANN has discretion to determine an appropriate remedy, what factors do you think should guide ICANN’s discretion?

**Response.** Afilias contests the specific circumstances surrounding NDC’s actions, which violate the AGB, and declines to make generalizations regarding resales, assignments, or transfers contrary to the AGB. For the reasons provided in our responses above, ICANN should disqualify NDC’s bid based on the principles found in ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation, and on NDC’s violations of the AGB. ICANN cannot permit Verisign to acquire rights in .WEB and thereby stifle competition and preserve its existing monopoly of gTLD services in direct contravention of ICANN’s core values, all to the likely detriment of consumer choice and trust in ICANN.
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VERISIGN, INC.
(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

12061 Bluemont Way, Reston, Virginia 20190
(Address of principal executive offices)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: (703) 948-3200

Common Stock $0.001 Par Value Per Share NASDAQ Global Select Market

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:
Title of each class Name of each exchange on which registered
Common Stock $0.001 Par Value Per Share NASDAQ Global Select Market

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act: None

Indicate by check mark if registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act.
þ Yes ☐ No

Indicate by check mark if registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Act.
☐ Yes ☒ No

Indicate by check mark if registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, all material contained in reports filed pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Act during the preceding 12 months (or for such portion of the filing period for which the registrant has been subject to such reporting requirements).
þ Yes ☐ No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of “large accelerated filer,” “accelerated filer,” “non-accelerated filer,” and “smaller reporting company” in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer ☐ Accelerated filer ☒ Non-accelerated filer ☐ Smaller reporting company ☒

If an emerging growth company, indicate by check mark if the registrant has elected not to use the extended transition period for compliance with any new or revised financial accounting standards provided pursuant to Section 13(a) of the Securities Act.
☐ Yes ☒ No

The aggregate market value of the voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates of the registrant on June 30, 2017 based on the last sale price as reported on National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations, was $49,412,211.

The number of shares of the registrant’s Common Stock outstanding as of February 9, 2018 was 97,120,531.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Pursuant to General Instruction C of Form 10-K, the registrant has filed as an exhibit to this report the following document:

The exhibits listed in the exhibit index that is filed as an exhibit to this report (by the instruction to Exhibit 3.1 to the Instruction to Part III of the Form 10-K).
ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

Our corporate headquarters are located in Reston, Virginia. We have administrative, sales, marketing, research and development and operations facilities located in the U.S., Europe, Asia, and Australia. As of December 3, 2007, we owned approximately 454,000 square feet of space, which includes facilities in Reston and Dulles, Virginia and New Castle, Delaware. As of December 3, 2007, we leased approximately 7,000 square feet of space in Europe, Australia and Asia. These facilities are under lease agreements that expire at various dates through 2022.

We believe that our existing facilities are well maintained and in good operating condition, and are sufficient for our needs for the foreseeable future. The following table lists our major locations and primary use as of December 3, 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Locations</th>
<th>Approximate Square Footage</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reston, Virginia</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>Corporate Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle, Delaware</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>Data Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulles, Virginia</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>Data Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fribourg, Switzerland</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>Data Center and Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above does not include approximately 68,000 square feet of space owned by us and leased to third parties.

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

On January 8, 2007, the Company received a Civil Investigative Demand from the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice ("DOJ") requesting certain material related to the Company becoming the registry operator for the .web gTLD. On January 9, 2008, the DOJ notified the Company that this investigation was closed.

ITEM 4. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES

Not applicable
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February 23, 2018

VIA E-MAIL

ICANN Board
c/o Cherine Chalaby, Chairman
Göran Marby, President and CEO
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094

Re: Request for Update on ICANN’s Investigation of .WEB Contention Set and Request for Documents under ICANN’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy

Dear ICANN:

We write on behalf of our client, Afilias Domains No. 3 Ltd. (“Afilias”), regarding the .WEB contention set. As stated in past correspondence, Afilias has several concerns with the 27-28 July 2016 auction for .WEB, including (1) Nu Dot Co LLC’s (“NDC”) apparent change in financial position, ownership, or control after submitting its application to ICANN but prior to the auction for .WEB; (2) NDC’s assignment of rights in its application for .WEB to Verisign, Inc. (“Verisign”) prior to the auction in breach of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (“AGB”); and (3) the serious competition issues raised by Verisign’s acquisition of .WEB in violation of ICANN’s Bylaws and the AGB. As discussed below, we are writing to: (1) request an update on ICANN’s investigation of the .WEB contention set; and (2) request documents under ICANN’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (“DIDP”).

---

I. Request for Update on ICANN’s Investigation of .WEB Contention Set

Pursuant to Afilias’ concerns in late 2016, ICANN requested “additional information” regarding the .WEB auction from Afilias, Ruby Glen LLC (“Ruby Glen”), NDC, and Verisign on 16 September 2016. Afilias promptly responded to ICANN’s request on 7 October 2016. Since Afilias submitted its response to ICANN over sixteen months ago, it has received no further communications from ICANN in regards to the .WEB contention set. ICANN has failed to update Afilias regarding its investigations relating to .WEB.

ICANN is obligated by its Bylaws to maintain “open and transparent processes.” The principle of “[t]ransparency is one of the essential principles in ICANN’s creation documents, and its name reverberates through its Articles [of Incorporation] and Bylaws.” Pursuant to its Bylaws, ICANN is required to (1) “[e]mploy open, transparent and bottom-up, multistakeholder transparent public development processes” and (2) to “operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.”

Therefore, pursuant to ICANN’s transparency obligations, we respectfully request that ICANN provide an update on the status of ICANN’s investigation of the .WEB contention set, including: (1) the steps (if any) taken by ICANN to disqualify NDC’s bid on the basis that NDC violated the rules applicable to its application; and (2) the steps (if any) taken by ICANN to assess competition issues arising out of delegation of .WEB to Verisign.

We further request that ICANN take no action in regards to .WEB until Afilias can review and respond to the documents provided as a result of the below DIDP request; and that ICANN confirm that it has not, and will not, enter into a registry agreement for .WEB with

---

3 See Letter from Christine A. Willett to John Kane (16 Sep. 2016).
4 See Letter from John Kane to Christine A. Willett (7 Oct. 2016).
5 ICANN Bylaws, Article 1, Section 1.2(a).
7 ICANN Bylaws, Article 1, Section 1.2(a)(iv).
8 ICANN Bylaws, Article 3, Section 3.1.
9 See ICANN Articles of Incorporation, Art. 2(III); ICANN Bylaws (22 Jul. 2017), Art. 1(1.2)(a), Art. 3(3.1), Art. 4(4.1).
NDC until, to the extent Afilias seeks review of any decisions relating to .WEB through ICANN’s accountability mechanisms, such mechanisms are completed. We nonetheless emphasize that Afilias reserves all of its rights to pursue any and all rights or remedies available to it in any forum against ICANN, NDC, or Verisign in connection with the delegation of the .WEB gTLD.

II. Request for Documents Pursuant to the DIDP

Afilias further submits this letter to request documents from ICANN, pursuant to ICANN’s DIDP, related to (1) ICANN’s 30 September 2016 request for additional information sent to Ruby Glen, Afilias, NDC, and Verisign; and (2) any investigation by ICANN of NDC and Verisign in relation to .WEB.10 The DIDP is “intended to ensure that information contained in documents concerning ICANN’s operational activities, and within ICANN’s possession, custody, or control, is made available to the public unless there is a compelling reason for confidentiality.”11 Pursuant to the DIDP, Afilias requests that ICANN provide the following documents:

1. All documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for additional information;12

2. Ruby Glen’s Notice of Independent Review, filed on 22 July 2016;13

3. All documents filed in relation to the Independent Review Process between ICANN and Ruby Glen, initiated on 22 July 2016;14

4. All applications, and all documents submitted with the applications, for the rights to .WEB;

---

10 See Letter from Christine A. Willett to John Kane (16 Sep. 2016).
5. All documents discussing the importance of .WEB to bringing competition to the provision of registry services;

6. All documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to
   a. the .WEB contention set,
   b. NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD,
   c. Verisign’s agreement with NDC to assign the rights to .WEB to Verisign, and
   d. Verisign’s involvement in the .WEB contention set, including all communications with NDC or Verisign;

7. Documents sufficient to show the current status of NDC’s request to assign .WEB to Verisign;

8. Documents sufficient to show the current status of the delegation of .WEB;

9. All documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (“DOJ”) investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB (“DOJ Investigation”), including:
   a. document productions to the DOJ;
   b. communications with the DOJ;
   c. submissions to DOJ, including letters, presentations, interrogatory responses, or other submissions;
   d. communications with Verisign or NDC relating to the investigation; and
   e. internal communications relating to the investigation, including all discussions by ICANN Staff and the ICANN Board; and
10. All joint defense or common interest agreements between ICANN and Verisign and/or NDC relating to the DOJ Investigation.

We reserve the right to request additional documents based on the provision of the above documents. Please promptly disclose the requested documents pursuant to the DIDP.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Arif Hyder Ali
Partner
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To: Arif Ali on behalf of Afilias Domains No. 3 Ltd.

Date: 24 March 2018

Re: Request No. 20180223-1

In your letter dated 23 February 2018 that you submitted on behalf of Afilias Domains No. 3 Ltd. (Afilias), among other things, you request: (1) an update on ICANN organization’s investigation of the .WEB contention set; and (2) documentary information pursuant to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers’ (ICANN’s) Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP). For reference, a copy of your letter is attached to the email transmitting this Response.

As an initial matter, the DIDP is limited to requests for documentary information already in existence within ICANN organization that is not publicly available. It is not a mechanism for one to make information requests or requests for “updates” concerning ICANN organization’s internal activities. As such, your request for “an update on ICANN’s investigation of the .WEB contention set” is beyond the scope of the DIDP and will not be addressed in this Response. Moreover, ICANN organization is not required to create or compile summaries of any documented information in response to a DIDP Request. (See DIDP (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/didp-2012-02-25-en).)

Items Requested

Your Request seeks the disclosure of documentary information relating to the .WEB applications and the .WEB contention set:

1. All documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for additional information;
2. Ruby Glen’s Notice of Independent Review, filed on 22 July 2016;
3. All documents filed in relation to the Independent Review Process between ICANN and Ruby Glen, initiated on 22 July 2016;
4. All applications, and all documents submitted with the applications, for the rights to .WEB;
5. All documents discussing the importance of .WEB to bringing competition to the provision of registry services;
6. All documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to
   a. the .WEB contention set,
   b. NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD,
   c. Verisign’s agreement with NDC to assign the rights to .WEB to Verisign, and
   d. Verisign’s involvement in the .WEB contention set, including all communications with NDC or Verisign;
7. Documents sufficient to show the current status of NDC’s request to assign .WEB to Verisign;
8. Documents sufficient to show the current status of the delegation of .WEB;

9. All documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (“DOJ”) investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB (“DOJ Investigation”), including:
   a. document productions to the DOJ;
   b. communications with the DOJ;
   c. submissions to DOJ, including letters, presentations, interrogatory responses, or other submissions;
   d. communications with Verisign or NDC relating to the investigation; and
   e. internal communications relating to the investigation, including all discussions by ICANN Staff and the ICANN Board; and

10. All joint defense or common interest agreements between ICANN and Verisign and/or NDC relating to the DOJ Investigation.

Response

The New gTLD Program and String Contention

In 2012, ICANN opened the application window for the New Generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Program and created the new gTLD microsite (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/), which provides detailed information about the Program. From the Program Status webpage of the new gTLD microsite (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status), people can access the public portions of each new gTLD application, including all of the .WEB applications, by clicking on “Current Application Status” and accessing the New gTLD Current Application Status webpage (https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/viewstatus).

ICANN received seven applications for .WEB, which were placed into a contention set (see Applicant Guidebook (Guidebook), §1.1.2.10 (String Contention)). Module 4 of the Guidebook (String Contention Procedures) describes situations in which contention for applied-for new gTLDs occurs, and the methods available to applicants for resolving contention absent private resolution: “It is expected that most cases of contention will be resolved by the community priority evaluation, or through voluntary agreement among the involved applicants. Auction is a tie-breaker method for resolving string contention among the applications within a contention set, if the contention has not been resolved by other means.” (Guidebook, § 4.3 (Auction: Mechanisms of Last Resort).)

Should private resolution not occur, the contention set will proceed to an auction of last resort governed by the Auction Rules that all applicants agreed to by applying. (Guidebook, § 1.1.2.10 (String Contention)). In furtherance of ICANN’s commitment to transparency, ICANN organization established the New gTLD Program Auctions webpage, which provides extensive detailed information about the auction process (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/auctions.).

Resolution of .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set

On or about 22 June 2016, Ruby Glen LLC (Ruby Glen) asserted that changes had occurred in NU DOT CO LLC’s (NDC’s) application for .WEB, in particular to NDC’s management and ownership, and asserted that the Auction should be postponed pending further investigation. (See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/litigation-ruby-glen-icann-memorandum-point-authorities-support-motion-dismiss-first-amended-complaint-26oct16-en.pdf.)

ICANN organization investigated Ruby Glen’s assertions regarding NDC’s application. After completing its investigation, ICANN org sent a letter to the members of the contention set stating, among other things, that “in regards to potential changes of control of [NDC], we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.” (See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/willett-to-web-webs-members-13jul16-en.pdf.)

Ruby Glen then invoked one of ICANN’s accountability mechanisms by submitting a reconsideration request on an urgent basis (Request 16-9), seeking postponement of the Auction and requesting a more detailed investigation. (See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-16-9-ruby-glen-radix-request-redacted-17jul16-en.pdf.) After carefully considering the information related to Request 16-9, on 21 July 2016 ICANN’s Board Governance Committee (BGC) denied Request 16-9. (See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-16-9-ruby-glen-radix-bgc-determination-21jul16-en.pdf.)


DIDP Process and Responses

The DIDP exemplifies ICANN’s Commitments and Core Values supporting transparency and accountability by setting forth a procedure through which documents concerning ICANN organization’s operations and within ICANN organization’s possession, custody, or control that are not already publicly available are made available unless there is a compelling reason for confidentiality. (See https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/didp-2012-02-25-en.)

Consistent with its commitment to operating to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner, ICANN org has published process guidelines for responding to requests for documents submitted pursuant to the DIDP (DIDP Response Process). (See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/didp-response-process-29oct13-en.pdf (DIDP Response Process).) The DIDP Response Process provides that, following the collection of potentially responsive documents, “[a] review is conducted as to whether any of the documents identified as responsive to the Request are subject to any of the Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure identified [on ICANN organization’s website].” If ICANN organization concludes that a document falls within one of the Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure (Nondisclosure Conditions), “a review is conducted as to whether, under the particular circumstances, the public interest in disclosing the documentary information outweighs the harm that may be caused by such disclosure.”

The DIDP was developed as the result of an independent review of standards of accountability and transparency within ICANN, which included extensive public comment and community input. (See https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-4-2007-03-29-en; https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/draft-mop-2007-2007-10-17-en.) Following the completion of this review, ICANN organization sought public comment on the resulting recommendations, and summarized and posted publicly the community feedback. (See https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/draft-mop-2007-2007-10-17-en.) Based on the community’s feedback, ICANN organization proposed changes to its frameworks and principles to “outline, define and expand upon the organisation’s accountability and transparency” (see https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/acct-trans-frameworks-principles-17oct07-en.pdf), and sought additional community input on the proposed changes before implementing them (see https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/draft-mop-2007-2007-10-17-en).

Neither the DIDP nor ICANN’s Commitments and Core Values supporting transparency and accountability obligates ICANN organization to make public every document in its possession. As noted above, the DIDP sets forth Nondisclosure Conditions for which other commitments or core values may compete or conflict with the transparency commitment. These Nondisclosure Conditions represent areas, vetted through public comment, that the community has agreed are presumed not to be appropriate for public disclosure. The public interest balancing test in turn allows ICANN organization to determine whether or not, under the specific circumstances, its commitment to transparency outweighs its other commitments and core values. Accordingly, ICANN organization may appropriately exercise its discretion, pursuant to the DIDP, in determining that certain documents are not appropriate for disclosure, without
contravening its commitment to transparency. As the Amazon EU S.à.r.l. Independent Review Process Panel noted, “notwithstanding ICANN’s transparency commitment, both ICANN’s By-Laws and its Publication Practices recognize that there are situations where non-public information, e.g., internal staff communications relevant to the deliberative processes of ICANN . . . may contain information that is appropriately protected against disclosure.” (Amazon EU S.à.r.l. v. ICANN, Procedural Order (7 June 2017) (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irp-amazon-procedural-order-3-07jun17-en.pdf).)

ICANN's Bylaws address the need to balance competing interests such as transparency and confidentiality, noting that "in any situation where one Core Value must be balanced with another, potentially competing Core Value, the result of the balancing test must serve a policy developed through the bottom-up multistakeholder process or otherwise best serve ICANN's Mission." (ICANN Bylaws, 22 July 2017, Art. 1, Section 1.2(c) (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article1).)

Afilias' DIDP Request

Item 1

Item 1 seeks “[a]ll documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign, Inc. (Verisign) in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for additional information.”

The documentary information received from NDC, Verisign, Afilias, and Ruby Glen in response to ICANN organization’s 16 September 2016 request for information are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- Information exchanged, prepared for, or derived from the deliberative and decision-making process between ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of the deliberative and decision-making process between and among ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications.

- Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.

- Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

Notwithstanding the above, ICANN organization will continue to review potentially responsive materials and consult with relevant third parties, as needed, to determine if additional documentary information is appropriate for disclosure under the DIDP. If it is determined that certain additional documentary information is appropriate for public
disclosure, ICANN organization will supplement this DIDP Response and notify the Requestor of the supplement.

**Items 2 and 3**

Item 2 seeks Ruby Glen’s Notice of Independent Review, filed on 22 July 2016; Item 3 seeks “[a]ll documents filed in relation to the Independent Review Process between ICANN and Ruby Glen, initiated on 22 July 2016.”

ICANN organization understands that, on 22 July 2016, Ruby Glen filed certain materials with the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (ICDR) relating to the initiation of an Independent Review Process (IRP) against ICANN. Ruby Glen did not provide ICANN organization with these materials; nor has Ruby Glen, the ICDR, or any other entity ever provided ICANN organization with a Notice of or Request for Independent Review Process that Ruby Glen might have filed against ICANN. As such, ICANN organization does not have any responsive documentary information in response to Items 2 or 3. ICANN understands that Ruby Glen withdrew its request for IRP on 18 August 2016; and that the ICDR later closed the IRP.

**Item 4**

Item 4 seeks “[a]ll applications, and all documents submitted with the applications, for the rights to .WEB.” Materials responsive to Item 4 are publicly available on ICANN’s website. Specifically, ICANN organization posts the public portions of each gTLD application and the public portions of any documents submitted with an application on the New gTLD Current Application Status webpage. (See [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/viewstatus](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/viewstatus).) The public portions of the .WEB applications can be accessed as follows:

- NU DOT CO LLC’s .WEB Application: [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1053](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1053);
- Charleston Road Registry Inc.’s .WEB Application: [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/520](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/520);
- Web.com Group, Inc.’s .WEB Application: [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1596](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1596);
- DotWeb Inc’s .WEB Application: [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1663](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1663);
- Ruby Glen, LLC’s .WEB Application: [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/692](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/692);
- Afilias Domains No. 3 Ltd’s .WEB Application: [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/292](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/292);
- Schlund Technologies GmbH’s .WEB Application: [https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/542](https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/542).
As stated in the Guidebook (Guidebook, Module 2 (Evaluation Questions and Criteria) (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb)), certain applicant information is not appropriate for public posting and ICANN organization informed applicants that the following types of information would not be publicly posted:

- Personally identifying information (see Applicant Questions 6, 7, 11);
- An applicant’s Business ID, Tax ID, VAT registration number, or equivalent (see Application Question 10);
- Involvement of any individual identified in an application in civil or criminal legal proceedings, (see Application Question 11);
- Bank details related to wire transfer payment of the evaluation fee (see Application Question 12);
- For geographic names, letters of support or non-objection (see Application Question 21(b));
- Descriptions of the applicant’s intended technical and operational approach for those registry functions that are internal to the infrastructure and operations of the registry (see Application Questions 30(b) – 44);
- Financial information (see Application Question 45-50).

The foregoing types of information contained in new gTLD applications and supporting materials are also subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- Information exchanged, prepared for, or derived from the deliberative and decision-making process between ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of the deliberative and decision-making process between and among ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications.
- Personnel, medical, contractual, remuneration, and similar records relating to an individual's personal information, when the disclosure of such information would or likely would constitute an invasion of personal privacy, as well as proceedings of internal appeal mechanisms and investigations.
- Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.
- Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

**Item 5**

Item 5 seeks “[a]ll documents discussing the importance of .WEB to bringing competition to the provision of registry services.” Item 5 is vague, and does not appear
to concern ICANN’s operational activities; as written, it is unclear what documents are being requested.

To the extent Item 5 seeks materials concerning ICANN organization’s review of how the New gTLD Program has impacted competition, consumer choice and consumer trust, ICANN organization has established a Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Review webpage (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews/cct), which includes documentary information concerning, among other things, the extent to which the introduction of new gTLDs has promoted competition.

To the extent Item 5 seeks materials that overlap with the materials responsive to Item 9(a) (“document productions to the DOJ” in response to the DOJ CID), ICANN organization incorporates and refers Requestor to the response to Item 9(a) below.

Should the Requestor wish to clarify or narrow the scope of Item 5, ICANN organization will consider the revised request. However, as currently written, Item 5 is so overbroad and vague that ICANN organization is not able to provide a further response at this time.

Item 6

Item 6 seeks “[a]ll documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to: (a) the .WEB contention set, (b) NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD, (c) Verisign’s agreement with NDC to assign the rights to .WEB to Verisign, and (d) Verisign’s involvement in the .WEB contention set, including all communications with NDC or Verisign.”

With regard to Items 6(a) and 6(b), these requests are exceedingly overbroad and vague; as written, it is unclear what documents are being requested. NDC (and all the applicants for .WEB) went through an extensive application process that included, among other things: the submission of the application and supporting materials; an administrative completeness check; comment period and a formal objection process; contention procedures and dispute resolution; an initial evaluation (which included string reviews and demonstrations of technical, operational, and financial capability, as well as reviews for DNS security issues); and background screening. As written, Items 6(a) and 6(b) seek “[a]ll documents” concerning every facet of the application process for each of the seven .WEB applications, which is not a reasonable request. As such, it is subject to the following Nondisclosure Condition:

- Information requests: (i) which are not reasonable; (ii) which are excessive or overly burdensome; (iii) complying with which is not feasible; or (iv) are made with an abusive or vexatious purpose or by a vexatious or querulous individual.

Should the Requestor wish to clarify or narrow the scope of Items 6(a) and 6(b), ICANN organization will consider the revised request. However, as currently written, Items 6(a) and 6(b) are so overbroad and vague that ICANN organization is not able to provide a
further response at this time. In addition, Items 6(a) and 6(b) potentially seek documents that are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- Information subject to the attorney-client, attorney work product privilege, or any other applicable privilege, or disclosure of which might prejudice any internal, governmental, or legal investigation.

- Internal information that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications, including internal documents, memoranda, and other similar communications to or from ICANN Directors, ICANN Directors' Advisors, ICANN staff, ICANN consultants, ICANN contractors, and ICANN agents.

- Information exchanged, prepared for, or derived from the deliberative and decision-making process between ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of the deliberative and decision-making process between and among ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications.

- Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.

- Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

- Drafts of all correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts, emails, or any other forms of communication.

With regard to Items 6(c) and 6(d), these requests seek “[a]ll documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to: […] (c) Verisign’s agreement with NDC to assign the rights to .WEB to Verisign, and (d) Verisign’s involvement in the .WEB contention set, including all communications with NDC or Verisign.” Certain materials responsive to Items 6(c) and 6(d) are publicly available. Verisign issued a public statement regarding its agreement with NDC and its involvement in the auction. (See “Verisign Statement Regarding .Web Auction Results,” available at https://investor.verisign.com/releasedetail.cfm?ReleaseID=981994.)

Any further documents responsive to Items 6(c) and 6(d) are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- Internal information that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of ICANN’s deliberative and decision-making process by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications, including internal documents,
memoranda, and other similar communications to or from ICANN Directors, ICANN Directors’ Advisors, ICANN staff, ICANN consultants, ICANN contractors, and ICANN agents.

- Information exchanged, prepared for, or derived from the deliberative and decision-making process between ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of the deliberative and decision-making process between and among ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications.

- Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.

- Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

- Information subject to the attorney-client, attorney work product privilege, or any other applicable privilege, or disclosure of which might prejudice any internal, governmental, or legal investigation.

- Drafts of all correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts, emails, or any other forms of communication.

To the extent Item 6 seeks materials that overlap with the materials responsive to Item 9(a) (“document productions to the DOJ” in response to the DOJ CID), ICANN organization incorporates and refers Requestor to the response to Item 9(a) below.

Notwithstanding the above, ICANN organization will continue to review potentially responsive materials and consult with relevant third parties, as needed, to determine if additional documentary information is appropriate for disclosure under the DIDP. If it is determined that certain additional documentary information is appropriate for public disclosure, ICANN organization will supplement this DIDP Response and notify the Requestor of the supplement.

Item 7

Item 7 seeks “[d]ocuments sufficient to show the current status of NDC’s request to assign .WEB to Verisign.” ICANN organization does not have any documentary information responsive to this request. That said, the current application status for each new gTLD application, including NDC’s .WEB application, is publicly available on the New gTLD Current Application Status webpage. (See https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/viewstatus; see also https://gtldresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1053.)
Item 8

Item 8 seeks “[d]ocuments sufficient to show the current status of the delegation of .WEB.” Materials responsive to Item 8 are publicly available. Specifically, ICANN organization makes publicly available information concerning the current application status for each gTLD application, including NDC’s .WEB application, on the New gTLD Current Application Status webpage. (See https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus/viewstatus; see also https://gtldresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1053.) As reflected on the foregoing webpages, .WEB is “in contracting.”

Item 9

Item 9 seeks “[a]ll documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (“DOJ”) investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB (“DOJ Investigation”), including: (a) document productions to the DOJ; (b) communications with the DOJ; (c) submissions to DOJ, including letters, presentations, interrogatory responses, or other submissions; (d) communications with Verisign or NDC relating to the investigation; and (e) internal communications relating to the investigation, including all discussions by ICANN Staff and the ICANN Board.”

On 1 February 2017, DOJ issued a Civil Investigative Demand (CID) to ICANN in connection with DOJ’s investigation of Verisign’s proposed acquisition of NDC’s contractual rights to operate the .WEB gTLD. ICANN provided DOJ with information responsive to the CID.

With regard to Item 9(a), the vast majority of the documents provided to DOJ are publicly available materials. Attachment A provides links to the publicly available documents that ICANN organization provided to DOJ in response to the CID. With respect to the non-public materials provided to DOJ, such materials are categorized as follows and are subject to various Nondisclosure Conditions:

- Confidential data reports, subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:
  - Information provided by or to a government or international organization, or any form of recitation of such information, in the expectation that the information will be kept confidential and/or would or likely would materially prejudice ICANN’s relationship with that party.
  - Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.
  - Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.
- Trade secrets and commercial and financial information not publicly disclosed by ICANN.

- Correspondence from, to, or among ICANN organization relating to .WEB, subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:
  - Information provided by or to a government or international organization, or any form of recitation of such information, in the expectation that the information will be kept confidential and/or would or likely would materially prejudice ICANN's relationship with that party.
  - Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.
  - Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.
  - Trade secrets and commercial and financial information not publicly disclosed by ICANN.

Certain of these documents comprise correspondence to or from the Requestor, which are undoubtedly already in the Requestor's possession, custody, or control. If the Requestor considers its correspondence with ICANN organization to be appropriate for public disclosure, ICANN organization can supplement this DIDP Response and make such documents publicly available.

- Auction forms from .WEB applicants, subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:
  - Information provided by or to a government or international organization, or any form of recitation of such information, in the expectation that the information will be kept confidential and/or would or likely would materially prejudice ICANN's relationship with that party.
  - Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.
  - Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.
  - Trade secrets and commercial and financial information not publicly disclosed by ICANN.
Again, certain of these documents comprise auction forms the Requestor submitted to ICANN organization, which are undoubtedly already in the Requestor’s possession, custody, or control. If the Requestor considers its auction forms to be appropriate for public disclosure, ICANN organization can supplement this DIDP Response and make such documents publicly available.

- Self-Resolution notices regarding gTLDs other than .WEB, subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:
  
  o Information provided by or to a government or international organization, or any form of recitation of such information, in the expectation that the information will be kept confidential and/or would or likely would materially prejudice ICANN's relationship with that party.

  o Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.

  o Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

  o Trade secrets and commercial and financial information not publicly disclosed by ICANN.

- Draft Board materials, draft announcements, and other internal documents, subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

  o Information provided by or to a government or international organization, or any form of recitation of such information, in the expectation that the information will be kept confidential and/or would or likely would materially prejudice ICANN's relationship with that party.

  o Internal information that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications, including internal documents, memoranda, and other similar communications to or from ICANN Directors, ICANN Directors' Advisors, ICANN staff, ICANN consultants, ICANN contractors, and ICANN agents.

  o Information exchanged, prepared for, or derived from the deliberative and decision-making process between ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of the deliberative and decision-making process between and among ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications.
Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

Information subject to the attorney–client, attorney work product privilege, or any other applicable privilege, or disclosure of which might prejudice any internal, governmental, or legal investigation.

Drafts of all correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts, emails, or any other forms of communication.

Trade secrets and commercial and financial information not publicly disclosed by ICANN.

Item 9(b) seeks “[a]ll documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s ("DOJ") investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB ("DOJ Investigation"), including […] (b) communications with the DOJ.” Documents responsive to Item 9(b) are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- Information provided by or to a government or international organization, or any form of recitation of such information, in the expectation that the information will be kept confidential and/or would or likely would materially prejudice ICANN's relationship with that party.

- Information subject to the attorney-client, attorney work product privilege, or any other applicable privilege, or disclosure of which might prejudice any internal, governmental, or legal investigation.

Item 9(c) seeks “[a]ll documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s ("DOJ") investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB ("DOJ Investigation"), including: […] (c) submissions to DOJ, including letters, presentations, interrogatory responses, or other submissions.” Documents responsive to Item 9(c) are subject to the following nondisclosure conditions:

- Information provided by or to a government or international organization, or any form of recitation of such information, in the expectation that the information will be kept confidential and/or would or likely would materially prejudice ICANN's relationship with that party.

- Information subject to the attorney-client, attorney work product privilege, or any other applicable privilege, or disclosure of which might prejudice any internal, governmental, or legal investigation.

- Internal information that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications, including internal documents, memoranda, and other similar communications to or from ICANN Directors, ICANN Directors’ Advisors, ICANN staff, ICANN consultants, ICANN contractors, and ICANN agents.
• Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

Item 9(d) seeks “[a]ll documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (‘DOJ’) investigation including Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB, including […] (d) communications with Verisign or NDC relating to the investigation….” ICANN organization did not engage in written communications with Verisign or NDC concerning the substance of DOJ’s investigation and therefore ICANN org does not have any documentary information responsive to this request.

Item 9(e) seeks “[a]ll documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (‘DOJ’) investigation including Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB, including […] (e) internal communications relating to the investigation, including all discussions by ICANN Staff and the ICANN Board.” Documents responsive to Item 9(e) are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

• Information subject to the attorney-client, attorney work product privilege, or any other applicable privilege, or disclosure of which might prejudice any internal, governmental, or legal investigation.

• Internal information that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of ICANN’s deliberative and decision-making process by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications, including internal documents, memoranda, and other similar communications to or from ICANN Directors, ICANN Directors’ Advisors, ICANN staff, ICANN consultants, ICANN contractors, and ICANN agents.

• Drafts of all correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts, emails, or any other forms of communication.

Item 10

Item 10 seeks “[a]ll joint defense or common interest agreements between ICANN and Verisign and/or NDC relating to the DOJ Investigation.” ICANN does not have any documentary information responsive to this request.

Public Interest in Disclosure of Information Subject to Nondisclosure Conditions

Notwithstanding the applicable Nondisclosure Conditions identified in this Response, ICANN organization has considered whether the public interest in disclosure of the information subject to these conditions at this point in time outweighs the harm that may be caused by such disclosure. ICANN org has determined that there are no current circumstances for which the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the harm that may be caused by the requested disclosure. ICANN org will continue to review potentially responsive materials and consult with relevant third parties, as needed, to determine if additional documentary information is appropriate for disclosure under the DIDP. If it is determined that certain additional documentary information is
appropriate for public disclosure, ICANN org will supplement this DIDP Response and notify the Requestor of the supplement.

About DIDP

ICANN’s DIDP is limited to requests for documentary information already in existence within ICANN that is not publicly available. In addition, the DIDP sets forth Defined Conditions of Nondisclosure. To review a copy of the DIDP, please see [http://www.icann.org/en/about/transparency/didp](http://www.icann.org/en/about/transparency/didp). ICANN organization makes every effort to be as responsive as possible to the entirety of your Request. As part of its accountability and transparency commitments, ICANN organization continually strives to provide as much information to the community as is reasonable. ICANN organization encourages you to sign up for an account at ICANN.org, through which you can receive daily updates regarding postings to the portions of ICANN organization’s website that are of interest. If you have any further inquiries, please forward them to didp@icann.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/resources/board mater a /m nutes 2015 10 22 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mater a s re December 2, 2015 Spec a Meet ng of the ICANN Board</td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/resources/board mater a /reso ut ons 2015 12 02 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mater a s re March 3, 2016 Regu ar Meet ng of the ICANN Board</td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/resources/board mater a /reso ut ons 2016 03 03 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mater a s re Ju ly 21, 2016 BGC Meet ng</td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/resources/board mater a /reso ut ons 2016 07 21 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mater a s re September 15, 2016 Regu ar Meet ng of the ICANN Board</td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/resources/board mater a /reso ut ons 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub c App cat on Mater a s for .WEB</td>
<td><a href="https://gt">https://gt</a> dresu t. cann.org/app cat onstatus/app cat ondata s/down oadapp cat on/1596?t:ac=1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://gt">https://gt</a> dresu t. cann.org/app cat onstatus/app cat ondata s/down oadapp cat on/292?t:ac=292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://gt">https://gt</a> dresu t. cann.org/app cat onstatus/app cat ondata s/down oadapp cat on/542?t:ac=542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://gt">https://gt</a> dresu t. cann.org/app cat onstatus/app cat ondata s/down oadapp cat on/1561?t:ac=1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://gt">https://gt</a> dresu t. cann.org/app cat onstatus/app cat ondata s/down oadapp cat on/1560?t:ac=1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEB/.WEB Content on Set Status</td>
<td><a href="https://gt">https://gt</a> dresu t. cann.org/app cat onstatus/app cat onstatus/down oadapp cat on/1053?t:ac=1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://gt">https://gt</a> dresu t. cann.org/app cat onstatus/app cat onstatus/down oadapp cat on/692?t:ac=692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://gt">https://gt</a> dresu t. cann.org/app cat onstatus/app cat onstatus/down oadapp cat on/520?t:ac=520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://gt">https://gt</a> dresu t. cann.org/app cat onstatus/app cat onstatus/down oadapp cat on/1663?t:ac=1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V stapr nt L m ted v. ICANN (WEBs) IRP Mater a s</td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/resources/pages/v stapr nt v. cann 2014 06 19 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann not ce mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/en/system/f">https://www.cann.org/en/system/f</a> es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en cann memorandum po nt author t es support mot on d sm ss f rst amended comp a nt 26oct16 en.pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Memorandum: | https://www.cann.org/en/system/f es/f es/ t gat on ruby g en can
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Econom c Study on New gTLD Program’s Compet t ve Effects: Phase II</td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/news/announcement 2016 10 11 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resu ts Ava b e for Pub c Comment, ava b e at:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Assessment of the Compet t ve Effects Assoc ated w th the New</td>
<td><a href="https://newgt">https://newgt</a> ds. cann.org/en/rev ews/cct/compet t ve effects phase two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD Program, by Greg Rafert and Cather ne Tucker, ava b e at</td>
<td>assessment 11oct16 en pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Econom c Study FAQs, ava b e at</td>
<td><a href="https://newgt">https://newgt</a> ds. cann.org/en/rev ews/cct/econom c study faqs 28sep15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compet t on, Consumer Trust and Consumer Cho ce Rev ew Team Draft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Webs te Announcement, ava b e at</td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/news/announcement 2 2017 03 07 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compet t on, Consumer Trust and Consumer Cho ce Rev ew Team Draft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report (on CCTRT rev ew of the degree to wh ch the New gTLD Program</td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoted consumer trust and cho ce and ncreased compet t on n the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doma n Name System market), ava b e at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11, 2013 Cover Ema n from Er k W bers (D rector, WIPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb trat on and Med at on Center) w th WIPO Arb trat on and Med at on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center End Report on Lega Rghts Object on Procedure, ava b e at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Announces Phase One Resu ts from Mu t year Consumer Stud on</td>
<td><a href="http://newgt">http://newgt</a> ds. cann.org/en/rev ews/cct/g oba â€œconsumerâ€œsurveyâ€œ2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Doma n Name Landscape (29 May 2015), ava b e at</td>
<td>9may1515â€œen.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New gTLD Reg strat ons of Brand TLD TM Str ngs 10 18 16, ava b e at</td>
<td><a href="https://commun">https://commun</a> ty. cann.org/down oad/attachments/56135378/gTLD%20reg s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tra on.s{x}7vers on=1&amp;mod f cat onDate=1470903888000&amp;ap =v2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTLDStats.com 30 May 2017 Park ng Def n t ons, ava b e at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTA New gTLD Cost Impact Survey Apr 2017, ava b e at</td>
<td><a href="https://commun">https://commun</a> ty. cann.org/down oad/attachments/56135378/INTA%20Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%20impact%20report%20rev sed%204 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%20v2.1.pdf?vers on=1&amp;mod f cat onDate=1494419285000&amp;ap =v2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Art c e The BIZ Top Leve Doma n Ten Years Later, ava b e at</td>
<td><a href="http://www">http://www</a>. c r.org/vern/papers/dot b z.pam12.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sen G oba Consumer Survey Phase 1 Data Tab es by Reg on, ava b e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from nk at <a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/news/announcement 2 2016 06 23 en</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Pub shes Updated gTLD Marketp ace Hea th Index, ava b e at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD Marketp ace Hea th Index, ava b e at</td>
<td><a href="https://commun">https://commun</a> ty. cann.org/d sp ay/projgt dmartkthea th/gTLD+Marketp ace+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hea th+Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN gTLD Marketp ace Hea th Index (Beta), ava b e at</td>
<td><a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/en/system/f es/f es/gt d marketp ace hea th ndex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beta 21dec16 en.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sen 2016 Consumer Study Gu de to Data Tab es, ava b e from nk at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sen 2016 Consumer Study Phase 2 Data Tab es by Reg on, ava b e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from nk at <a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/news/announcement 2 2016 06 23 en</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sen 2016 Consumer Study Phase 2 Data Tab es by Country Tab e 1,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ava b e from nk at <a href="https://www">https://www</a>. cann.org/news/announcement 2 2016 06 23 en</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen 2016 Consumer Study   Phase 2 Data Tab es by Country Tab e 2,</td>
<td>nk at <a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 06 23 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ava ab e from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen 2016 Consumer Study   Phase 2 Data Tab es for Teens, ava ab e</td>
<td>nk at <a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 06 23 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen 2015 Consumer Study   Phase 1 Data Tab es by Reg on, ava ab e</td>
<td>nk at <a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 06 23 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen 2015 Consumer Study   Phase 1 Data Tab es by Country, ava ab e</td>
<td>nk at <a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 06 23 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Econ m c Study FAQs, ava ab e at</td>
<td><a href="https://newgt">https://newgt</a> ds.cann.org/en/revews/cct/econom c study faqs 28sep15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jun 2016 Update from Two Day CCTRT Meet ng n Wash ngton ICANN,</td>
<td>ava ab e at <a href="https://www.cann.org/news/b">https://www.cann.org/news/b</a> og/update from two day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ava ab e at</td>
<td>compet t onconsumer trust consumer cho ce rev ew team meet ng n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ava ab e at</td>
<td>wash ngton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ava ab e at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Econ m c Study FAQs, ava ab e at</td>
<td><a href="https://newgt">https://newgt</a> ds.cann.org/en/revews/cct/econom c study faqs 28sep15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen 2015 Reg strant Survey Data Tab es by Reg on, ava ab e from</td>
<td>nk at <a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2015 09 25 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nk at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nk at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econom c Study on New gTLD Programâ€™s Compet t ve Effects: Phase II</td>
<td>ava ab e for Pub c Comment, ava ab e at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resu ts Ava ab e for Pub c Comment, ava ab e at:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2016 10 11 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen 2016 G oba Reg strant Survey 2015 and 2016 Data Tab es by Reg on, ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen 2016 G oba Reg strant Survey 2015 and 2016 Data Tab es by Reg on, ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen G oba Reg strant Surveys 2015 and 2016 Data Tab es by As a and Afr ca Countr es N e sen samp e on y, ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen G oba Reg strant Surveys 2015 and 2016 Data Tab es by As a and Afr ca Countr es a , ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen G oba Reg strant Surveys 2015 and 2016 Data Tab es by North Amer ca and Europe Countr es N e sen samp e on y, ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen G oba Reg strant Surveys 2015 and 2016 Data Tab es by North Amer ca and Europe Countr es a , ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen G oba Reg strant Surveys 2015 and 2016 Data Tab es by South Amer ca Countr es N e sen samp e on y, ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen G oba Reg strant Surveys 2015 and 2016 Data Tab es by South Amer ca Countr es a , ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen G oba Reg strant Survey 2016 Phase 2 Non qua f ed respondents data tab e, ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sen 2016 G oba Reg strant Survey Ne sen responses to quest ons from CCTRT on Reg strant Survey Wave 2 September 2016, ava ab e from nk at</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cann.org/news/announcement">https://www.cann.org/news/announcement</a> 2 2016 09 15 en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ne sen G oba Reg strant App cat on Process Data Tab es, ava ab e at https://commun ty. cann.org/down oad/attachments/56135378/App cat on%20Process%20Data%20Tab es 16 Dec 2016.pdf?vers on=1&mod f cat onDate=1482246930000&ap =v2

ICANN App cat on Process Survey November 2016 ICANN 57 Top ne Presentat on, pub c y ava ab e at https://commun ty. cann.org/down oad/attachments/56135378/2016%20ICANN%20Process%2020%20ICANN%2057%20Top ne%20v1.1.pptx?v ers on=1&mod f cat onDate=1

ne sen ICANN App cat on Process Survey (December 2016), ava ab e at https://commun ty. cann.org/down oad/attachments/56135378/App cat on%20Process%20Report.pdf?vers on=1&mod f cat onDate=1

Who s Reg strant Ident f cat on Study, Draft Report IC ANN Overv ew, ava ab e at https://www. cann.org/resources/pages/who s reg d 2013 02 15 en

Who s Reg strant Ident f cat on Study Pub c Comment Announcemen, ava ab e at https://www. cann.org/news/announcement 2013 02 15 en

Who s Reg strant Ident f cat on Study Comments Subm tted, ava ab e at http://forum. cann.org/ sts/comments who s reg d 15feb13/


Who s Reg strant Ident f cat on Study Rev sed Terms of Reference, ava ab e at http://gnso. cann.org/ ssues/who s/tor who s reg strant d stud es 20may11 en.pdf

Who s Reg strant Ident f cat on Study In t a Report to GNSO Counc, ava ab e at http://gnso. cann.org/ ssues/who s/who s stud es report for gnso 23mar10 en.pdf

Who s Reg strant Ident f cat on Study Rat ona e for Changes, ava ab e at http://gnso. cann.org/ ssues/who s/who s reg strant d study rat ona e 20may11 en.pdf


New gTLD Program Rev ews Overv ew, ava ab e at https://newgt ds. cann.org/en/rev ews

New gTLD Program Rev ews FAQ, ava ab e at https://newgt ds. cann.org/en/rev ews/faq


WHOIS Gener c Names Support ng Organ zat on, ava ab e at https://gnso. cann.org/en/group act v tes/other/who s
Exhibit 25
April 23, 2018

VIA E-MAIL

ICANN Board of Directors
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094

Re: ICANN’s Response to DIDP Request No. 20180223-1

Dear Members of the ICANN Board:

We write on behalf of our client, Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited (“Afilias”), regarding ICANN’s 24 March 2018 response (the “DIDP Response”) to Afilias’ Request No. 20180223-1 (the “DIDP Request”) pursuant to ICANN’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (“DIDP”).1 Afilias objects to the DIDP Response as detailed below.

However, in order to achieve an efficient and mutually acceptable resolution of this dispute, Afilias writes to offer a proposed solution.2 In part, ICANN refuses to produce certain information pursuant to Afilias’ DIDP Request because ICANN deems such materials to be confidential. While Afilias has no means to verify ICANN’s position, in the interests of resolving this issue, Afilias will agree to limit disclosure of any such material identified by ICANN to its outside counsel for review. In addition, to further facilitate documentary disclosure, Afilias amends several of its document requests, as set forth in Section 02 below, in response to the articulated concerns in ICANN’s DIDP Response.

---


01. The Proposed Confidentiality Agreement Governing Requests 01, 04, 06, and 09(a-c, e)

ICANN has asserted that several of Afilias’ document requests—specifically Requests 01, 04, 06, and 09(a-c, e)—seek documents that cannot be publically disclosed because they are subject to the DIDP’s Nondisclosure Conditions. Afilias agrees to limiting the disclosure of any material produced by ICANN pursuant to these requests, and identified by ICANN as “highly confidential,” to Afilias’ outside counsel. This agreement will protect the documents from public disclosure while permitting Afilias’ attorneys to review documents relevant to Afilias’ participation in the .WEB contention set.

Should ICANN find this proposal amenable, Afilias is willing to negotiate the specific terms of such a confidentiality agreement with ICANN’s counsel in order to reach a speedy resolution of this matter.

02. The Amendments to Requests 01, 04, 05, 06(a-b), and 09(a) Pursuant to the DIDP Response

Afilias has further amended certain document requests—specifically Requests 01, 04, 05, 06(a-b), and 09(a)—in order to facilitate further documentary disclosure from ICANN. These amendments take into account ICANN’s stated concerns regarding the scope and clarity of these requests, as articulated in the DIDP Response. In making these amendments, Afilias reserves its right to ask for additional information, should the materials produced by ICANN pursuant to these amended requests prove inadequate or insufficient.

---

3 Request 01 seeks “[a]ll documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for additional information.” DIDP Request, p. 3.
4 Request 04 seeks “[a]ll applications, and all documents submitted with the applications, for the rights to .WEB.” Id.
5 Request 06 seeks “[a]ll documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to: (a) the .WEB contention set, [and] (b) NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD, (c) Verisign’s agreement with NDC to assign the rights to .WEB to Verisign, and (d) Verisign’s involvement in the .WEB contention set, including all communications with NDC or Verisign.” Id., p. 4.
6 Request 09 seeks “[a]ll documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (‘DOJ’) investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB (‘DOJ Investigation’), including: (a) document productions to the DOJ; (b) communications with the DOJ; (c) submissions to DOJ, including letters, presentations, interrogatory responses, or other submissions; … and (e) internal communications relating to the investigation, including all discussions by ICANN Staff and the ICANN Board.” Id.
7 DIDP Response, pp. 5, 7-15.
8 See id. at pp. 8-9; Email to John Kane from Christine Willett (31 Mar. 2018).
02.01 Request 01: Documents Responsive to the 16 September 2016 Letter

The DIDP Response, and ICANN’s subsequent actions, warrant an amendment to Request 01. The request seeks “[a]ll documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for additional information.”

In its DIDP Response, ICANN refused to disclose the documents received from Ruby Glen, LLC (“Ruby Glen”), Nu Dot Co LLC (“NDC”), and Verisign, Inc. (“Verisign”) in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 letter requesting information from the aforementioned parties. ICANN asserted that the documents are subject to the DIDP’s Nondisclosure Conditions.

However, ICANN also committed itself to “continue to review potentially responsive materials and consult with relevant third parties, as needed, to determine if additional documentary information is appropriate for disclosure under the DIDP.” In accordance with this commitment, on 31 March 2018, ICANN requested permission from Afilias to disclose its response to the 16 September 2016 letter. ICANN’s request indicated that it also asked Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign for permission to disclose their responses to the 16 September 2016 letter as well.

Therefore, Afilias now requests the responses from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign, indicating whether they consent to the public disclosure of their responses to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for information. Afilias further reiterates its request for the prompt disclosure of the documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign related to the 16 September 2016 letter.

---

9 DIDP Request, p. 3.
10 Letter to John Kane from Christine Willett (16 Sep. 2016).
11 DIDP Response, p. 5.
12 Id.
13 Email to John Kane from Christine Willett (31 Mar. 2018). Afilias has given ICANN permission to disclose its own response to the 16 September 2016 letter.
14 Id.
15 As stated below, Afilias reserves its rights to contest any decision regarding the disclosure of these documents pursuant to the DIDP once it receives ICANN’s response to this letter.
02.02 Request 04: Documents Related to the .WEB Applications

Given ICANN’s stated concerns regarding the disclosure of documents related to the .WEB applications, Afilias is willing to further narrow Request 04, subject to its right to request additional information at a later date. The initial request sought “[a]ll applications, and all documents submitted with the applications, for the rights to .WEB.” Afilias’ amended Request 04 narrows the scope of the request, and seeks only NDC’s responses to Items 12 and 45 through 50 in its .WEB application, as well as any amendments, changes, revisions, supplements, or correspondence concerning those Items.

02.03 Request 05: Documents on the Importance of .WEB to Competition

Afilias’ Request 05 seeks “[a]ll documents discussing the importance of .WEB to bringing competition to the provision of registry services.” Despite this straightforward language, ICANN asserts that Request 05 is “unclear,” “overbroad,” and “vague.” To assist ICANN, the request seeks any documents, analyses, or studies that contain information regarding potential competition, substitution, and interchangeability between or among .WEB and .COM, .NET, or other gTLDs.

02.04 Request 06(a-b): Documents Related to the .WEB Investigation

Afilias is willing to narrow Request 6(a-b), subject to Afilias’ right to request additional information at a later date. The initial request sought “[a]ll documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to: (a) the .WEB contention set, [and] (b) NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD.” The amended Request 6(a-b) now seeks the following documents:

1. all documents reflecting NDC’s board structure and any changes thereto since NDC submitted its .WEB application on 13 June 2012;

---

16 DIDP Request, p. 3.
17 Id., p. 4.
18 DIDP Response, p. 8.
19 ICANN determined that “these requests are exceedingly overbroad and vague.” Id.
20 DIDP Request, p. 4. ICANN determined that “these requests are exceedingly overbroad and vague.” Id.
2. all documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to NDC’s board structure and any changes thereto since NDC submitted its .WEB application on 13 June 2012;

3. documents sufficient to show the date on which ICANN first learned that Verisign was going to or had in fact funded NDC’s bids for the .WEB gTLD at the 28-28 July 2016 auction; and

4. documents sufficient to show the date on which ICANN first learned that NDC did not intend to operate the .WEB registry itself, but rather intended to assign the rights it acquired related to .WEB to a third party.

02.05 Request 09(a): Documents related to the Department of Justice Investigation

Moreover, in its DIDP Response, ICANN stated that several documents responsive to Request 09(a)\(^{22}\) were “in the Requestor’s possession, custody, or control.”\(^{23}\) In order to further ease any burden on ICANN in responding to Afilias’ document requests, Afilias amends Request 09(a) to exclude those documents that ICANN has reasonably identified as already being in Afilias’ possession.

Afilias further reserves all of its rights and remedies in all available fora whether within or outside of the United States of America.

Sincerely,

Arif Hyder Ali
Partner

\(^{22}\) Request 09(a) includes “[a]ll documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust’s Division’s (‘DOJ’) investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB (‘DOJ Investigation’), including: (a) document productions to the DOJ.” DIDP Response, p. 11.

\(^{23}\) Id., pp. 11-12.
Exhibit 26
Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited Reconsideration Request (“RR”)

1. **Requestor Information**

   Requestor:

   **Name:** Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited  
   **Address:** Contact Information Redacted  
   **Email:** Scott Hemphill, Contact Information Redacted

   Requestor is represented by:

   **Counsel:** Dechert LLP  
   **Address:** Contact Information Redacted  
   **Email:** Arif Hyder Ali, Contact Information Redacted

2. **Request for Reconsideration of:**

   ___ Board action/inaction  
   **X** Staff action/inaction

3. **Description of specific action you are seeking to have reconsidered.**

   Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited (“Afilias” or “Requestor”) seeks reconsideration of ICANN’s 24 March 2018 response to Requestor’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (“DIDP”) request, which denied disclosure of certain categories of documents pursuant to ICANN’s DIDP.

   On 23 February 2018, Requestor submitted to ICANN a DIDP request seeking the disclosure of certain documentary information related to the .WEB contention set (the “DIDP
Specifically, the Requestor submitted 10 requests as follows:

Request 01: All documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for additional information;

Request 02: Ruby Glen’s Notice of Independent Review, filed on 22 July 2016;

Request 03: All documents filed in relation to the Independent Review Process between ICANN and Ruby Glen, initiated on 22 July 2016;

Request 04: All applications, and all documents submitted with applications, for the rights to .WEB;

Request 05: All documents discussing the importance of .WEB to bringing competition to the provision of registry services;

Request 06: All documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to (a) the .WEB contention set, (b) NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD, (c) Verisign’s agreement with NDC to assign the rights to .WEB to Verisign, and (d) Verisign’s involvement in the .WEB contention set, including all communications with NDC or Verisign;

Request 07: Documents sufficient to show the current status of NDC’s request to assign .WEB to Verisign;

Request 08: Documents sufficient to show the current status of the delegation of .WEB;

Request 09: All documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (“DOJ”) investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB (“DOJ Investigation”), including: (a) document productions to the DOJ; (b) communications with the DOJ; (c) submissions to DOJ, including letters, presentations, interrogatory responses, or other submissions; (d) communications with Verisign or NDC relating to the investigation; and (e) internal communications relating to the investigation, including all discussions by ICANN Staff and the ICANN Board; and

Request 10: All joint defense or common interest agreements between ICANN and Verisign and/or NDC relating to the DOJ.

---

Investigation.\(^2\)

Subsequently, on 24 March 2018, ICANN responded to the DIDP Request by issuing a response (the “DIDP Response”).\(^3\) ICANN’s DIDP Response is the basis for this reconsideration request. Of Requestor’s ten requests, ICANN stated that it was fully disclosing requested documents for only two requests (Requests 07, 08), and asked Requestor to revise an additional two requests (Requests 05, 06(a, b)).\(^4\) ICANN denied one request in whole (Request 01) and three requests in part (Requests 04, 06(c, d), and 09(a-c, e)) based on its assertion that the requested documents are subject to the DIDP’s Nondisclosure Conditions.\(^5\) ICANN stated that it has no documents responsive to four requests (Requests 02, 03, 09(d), 10).\(^6\)

Requestor subsequently submitted to ICANN a letter addressing and responding to ICANN’s stated concerns in the DIDP Response on 23 April 2018 (the “DIDP Reply”) in order to facilitate the timely disclosure of responsive documents.\(^7\) The DIDP Reply proposes that Requestor will limit the disclosure of any material identified by ICANN as “highly confidential” to only Requestor’s outside counsel pursuant to a confidentiality agreement.\(^8\) It also proposed modified document requests based on the DIDP Response. In accordance with the DIDP Reply, Requestor’s outstanding and amended document requests are as follows:

Request 01: All documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for additional information, and their email responses to ICANN that indicate whether they consent to the public disclosure of their responses to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for information.

Request 04: NDC’s responses to Items 12 and 45 through 50 in

\(^2\) Id. at pp. 3-5 (emphasis added).
\(^4\) Id. at pp. 7-11.
\(^5\) Id. at pp. 5-7, 9-15.
\(^6\) Id. at pp. 6, 15.
\(^7\) Exhibit 3, Letter from A. Ali to ICANN Board (23 Apr. 2018).
\(^8\) Id. at p. 2.
its .WEB application, as well as any amendments, changes, revisions, supplements, or correspondence concerning those Items.

Request 05: All documents discussing the importance of .WEB to bringing competition to the provision of registry services.

Request 06(a): Documents sufficient to show (1) the date on which ICANN first learned that Verisign was going to or had in fact funded NDC’s bids for the .WEB gTLD at the 27-28 July 2016 auction, and (2) the date on which ICANN first learned that NDC did not intend to operate the .WEB registry itself, but rather intended to assign the rights it acquired related to .WEB to a third party.

Request 6(b): All documents (1) reflecting NDC’s board structure and any changes thereto since NDC submitted its .WEB application on 13 June 2012, and (2) concerning any investigation or discussion related to NDC’s board structure and any changes thereto since NDC submitted its .WEB application on 13 June 2012.

Request 6(c): All documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to Verisign’s agreement with NDC to assign the rights to .WEB to Verisign.

Request 6(d): All documents concerning Verisign’s involvement in the .WEB contention set, including all communications with NDC or Verisign.

Request 09: All documents relating to the DOJ Investigation, excluding those documents that ICANN has reasonably identified as already being in Afilias’ possession, including: (a) document productions to the DOJ; (b) communications with the DOJ; (c) submissions to DOJ, including letters, presentations, interrogatory responses, or other submissions; (d) communications with Verisign or NDC relating to the investigation; and (e) internal communications relating to the investigation, including all discussions by ICANN Staff and the ICANN Board.9

Each of these requests plainly seek documents relevant to Requestor’s concerns, including:

the impact on competition if Verisign obtains the .WEB license; whether Verisign and NDC violated, inter alia, provisions of the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook ("AGB") and ICANN’s

Auction Rules; and whether ICANN’s handling of these matters has been consistent with its Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation (“Articles”).

We recognize that ICANN has not yet responded to the DIDP Reply. Requestor acknowledges that, to the extent it can reach an agreement with ICANN pursuant to the DIDP Reply, this request for reconsideration may become moot in full or in part. Requestor nonetheless submits this request to preserve its rights to contest the DIDP Response should ICANN and Requestor fail to reach an agreement based on the DIDP Reply. Requestor believes that the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee need not and should not decide this Reconsideration Request until after the ICANN Board has considered and responded to the proposed compromise set forth in the DIDP Reply. Requestor is prepared to discuss an appropriate “tolling” agreement that would allow Requestor and ICANN to attempt to reach an agreement concerning the DIDP Request and the DIDP Reply.

4. Date of action/inaction:

ICANN acted on 24 March 2018 by issuing the DIDP Response.

5. On what date did you become aware of action or that action would not be taken?

Requestor became aware of the action on 24 March 2018, when it received the DIDP Response from ICANN.

---

10 Afilias believes that the 30-day period for submitting a reconsideration request is stayed until 30 days after ICANN responds in writing to the DIDP Reply. See Exhibit 4, ICANN Bylaws (22 Jul. 2017), Art. 4, § 4.2(g), https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en (providing that a reconsideration request must be submitted within 30 days of the ICANN Staff action or inaction). However, in an abundance of caution, Afilias is submitting this Reconsideration Request now.
6. Describe how you believe you are materially affected by the action or inaction:

Requestor is materially affected by ICANN’s refusal to disclose certain documentary information concerning the .WEB contention set, as requested in the DIDP Request and amended in the DIDP Reply.

As described with more detail in Section 8 below, Requestor submitted to ICANN an application to operate the .WEB gTLD as part of ICANN’s New gTLD Program. Requestor consequentially became a member of the .WEB contention set. All of the members of the contention set agreed to resolve the contention set through a private auction. However, at the eleventh hour, one member—Nu Dot Co LLC (“NDC”)—suddenly withdrew from the private auction after having previously consented to that process. As a result of NDC’s withdrawal, the .WEB contention set was resolved through an ICANN-administered auction (“ICANN Auction”) pursuant to the AGB. NDC won the auction, apparently after agreeing to assign all rights to the .WEB license to Verisign, Inc. (“Verisign”), upon whose behalf NDC placed the winning bid.

After the ICANN Auction, Verisign, which had not applied for the .WEB license and was not part of the contention set, announced that it had entered into a secret agreement with NDC. Pursuant to the terms of that secret agreement, Verisign had agreed to fund NDC’s bid in exchange for NDC’s agreement to “assign the [.WEB] Registry Agreement to Verisign.” This secret agreement, and ICANN’s failure to timely address it, violates ICANN’s documented policies,

---

including, without limitation, the AGB, ICANN’s Auction Rules, and ICANN’s mandate to promote competition. ICANN consequently cannot permit the delegation of .WEB to NDC or to Verisign.\textsuperscript{14}

ICANN’s investigation of the matter, if any, has been entirely nontransparent. After Requestor raised concerns about the manner in which NDC had secretly acted as Verisign’s agent to obtain the .WEB license for the benefit of Verisign, ICANN sent Requestor a lengthy list of questions, purporting to seek information about Requestor’s concerns.\textsuperscript{15} Although Requestor provided detailed responses to ICANN on 7 October 2016, Requestor has received no meaningful information about ICANN’s investigation or how ICANN intends to address the subterfuge by which NDC acquired the .WEB license on Verisign’s behalf. Indeed, Requestor still has no information about what ICANN currently plans to do with respect to the delegation of .WEB.

6.1 ICANN Violated its own Bylaws in Refusing to Disclose the Requested Documents

In response to the lack of information from ICANN, Requestor filed the DIDP Request to obtain documents relevant to ICANN’s investigation of the .WEB contention set. ICANN, however, did not produce documents in response to certain requests—specifically Requests 01, 04-06, and 09.\textsuperscript{16} ICANN thereby failed to “operate in a manner consistent with [its] Bylaws,” which require that it operate with transparency and openness.\textsuperscript{17}

The DIDP is intended to promote transparency in accordance with ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles. ICANN implemented the DIDP as part of its “approach to transparency and information disclosure,” as codified in both ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles.\textsuperscript{18} These governing documents require

\textsuperscript{15} Exhibit 9, Letter from C. Willett to J. Kane (16 Sep. 2016).
\textsuperscript{17} Exhibit 4, ICANN Bylaws (22 Jul. 2017), Art. 1, § 1.2(a), https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en.
that ICANN operate “through open and transparent processes”\textsuperscript{19} and “to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner.”\textsuperscript{20} More specifically, they state that ICANN must:

- “operate in a manner consistent with [its] Articles and its Bylaws for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities . . . \textit{through open and transparent processes that enable competition} and open entry in Internet-related markets;”\textsuperscript{21}
- “operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistency with procedures designed to ensure fairness;”\textsuperscript{22}
- “[e]mploy open, transparent and bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development processes that are led by the private sector;”\textsuperscript{23} and
- “operate in a manner consistent with these Bylaws for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole.”\textsuperscript{24}

Yet, ICANN did not operate with openness or transparency in the DIDP Response. Requestor asked for information on ICANN’s investigation of NDC, Verisign, and the .WEB contention set.\textsuperscript{25} ICANN denied the requests for documentary information, choosing instead to maintain a veil of secrecy over its investigation, by unreasonably and illegitimately applying the DIDP’s Nondisclosure Conditions and asserting that the requests are “overbroad and vague.”\textsuperscript{26} These actions are not consistent with ICANN’s obligations to operate in “an open and transparent

\textsuperscript{21} Exhibit 11, Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation (3 Oct. 2016), Section 2(III), https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/articles-en (emphasis added).
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Id.} at Art. 1, § 1.2 (a)(iv).
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Id.} at Art. 1, § 1.2(a).
manner.” Resultantly, ICANN is not operating “in a manner consistent with [its] Bylaws for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole.”

Furthermore, Verisign exercises substantial market power through its exclusive licenses to operate the .COM and .NET registries, as evinced by ICANN’s continued subjugation of those registries to price caps. The .WEB gTLD, however, can threaten Verisign’s long-entrenched monopoly, obviating the need for continued regulation. In order to maintain its monopoly, Verisign entered into a secret arrangement with NDC to obtain the right to operate the .WEB gTLD and further diminish competition at the heart of the domain name system (“DNS”).

Allowing Verisign to carry out this subterfuge and acquire the .WEB license will harm the Internet community by stifling competition in the DNS. It will also allow applicants to obtain gTLD rights through secretive, unfair, and deceptive means that are inconsistent with ICANN’s stated rules and policies. Given ICANN’s mandate to operate openly and transparently and to “promote and sustain” competition in the DNS, and Requestor’s stated plan to contest Verisign’s acquisition of the .WEB gTLD in order to protect competition in the DNS, it is vitally important that ICANN disclose the requested documents—either publicly or pursuant to a confidentiality agreement.

---

27 Exhibit 4, ICANN Bylaws (22 Jul. 2017), Art. 3, § 3.1, https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en. Moreover, even assuming arguendo that ICANN’s objections have any validity (and they do not), Requestor has proposed reasonable compromises in the DIDP Reply.

28 Id. at Art. 1, § 1.2(a).


30 Exhibit 13, Kevin Murphy, “Verisign likely $135 million winner of .web gTLD,” DOMAINDINCITE (1 Aug. 2016), http://domainincite.com/20820-verisign-likely-135-million-winner-of-web-gtld (“.web has been seen, over the years, as the string that is both most sufficiently generic, sufficiently catchy, sufficiently short and of sufficient semantic value to provide a real challenge to .com.”); Exhibit 14, Andrew Allam, “Why Verisign paid $135 million for the .web top level domain,” DOMAINE NAME WIRE (29 Jul. 2016), https://domainnamewire.com/2016/07/29/verisign-paid-135-million-web-top-level-domain/ (“It views it as competitive to .com – a handful of industry watchers and top level domain name companies have said that .web is the one domain that could unseat .com.”); Exhibit 15, Derek Vaughan, “Inside the High Stakes Auction for .Web,” The HostingFINDERS (25 Jul. 2016), https://www.inetservices.com/blog/inside-the-high-stakes-auction-for-web/ (explaining how .WEB could become the new .COM).


32 See Exhibit 16, Letter from A. Ali to ICANN Board (16 Apr. 2018) (informing ICANN that Requestor will initiate the cooperative engagement process and file a Request for an Independent Review Process against ICANN should it proceed to delegate the .WEB gTLD to NDC).
agreement—to Requestor. Disclosure will benefit the entire Internet community by providing Requestor with information necessary to contest Verisign’s underhanded attempt to protect its competition-stifling monopoly.

6.2 The Public Interest Warrants Disclosure of the Requested Documents

Furthermore, pursuant to the DIDP, ICANN can disclose documents that are governed by the DIDP’s Nondisclosure Conditions. Indeed, ICANN must disclose a document covered by a Nondisclosure Condition if “the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the harm that may be caused by such disclosure.” Here, there is a significant public interest in ensuring a competitive market in the DNS that outweighs any harm in disclosure, especially given the proposed confidentiality agreement in the DIDP Reply.

First of all, the subterfuge by which Verisign secretly obtained its asserted rights to the .WEB license seriously undermines core ICANN principles, including “open and fair processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets” and the application of documented policies in a consistent, neutral, objective, fair, and transparent manner. Verisign hid behind NDC in order to secretly compete for and obtain the .WEB license. Investigating and rectifying such unfair and deceptive conduct is plainly in the public interest.

Second, Verisign’s secretive scheme to obtain the .WEB license for itself was not only unfair, deceptive, and lacking in transparency; Verisign’s conduct was also carried out specifically to harm competition. Competition is vital to the maintenance of the DNS and the promotion of competition is one of ICANN’s core values. Indeed, ICANN emphasizes its mandate to promote

---

33 Exhibit 3, Letter from A. Ali to ICANN Board (23 Apr. 2018), p. 2 (proposing that ICANN disclose the requested documents to Requestor pursuant to a confidentiality agreement).
35 Exhibit 11, Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation (3 Oct. 2016), Section 2(III), https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/articles-en (emphasis added).
competition several times in its Bylaws—and has even expressly granted itself permission to discriminate against a party in order to “promot[e] effective competition.” ICANN further implemented the New gTLD Program to “encourage competition” in the DNS because a more competitive environment in the DNS will “result in greater innovation, consumer choice, and satisfaction in the long run.” As explained in Requestor’s 16 April 2018 letter to ICANN, allowing Verisign to obtain the .WEB license based on its subterfuge and collusion with NDC would not only seriously undermine competition in the DNS, contrary to ICANN’s mandate, but would also constitute a serious and illegitimate distortion of the fundamental principles of fair play and transparency that underlie ICANN’s Bylaws. Clearly, the public’s interest in competition outweighs any compelling reason for ICANN to refuse documentary disclosure to Requestor—especially since Requestor is willing to protect the disclosed documents through a confidentiality agreement.

7. **Describe how others may be adversely affected by the action or inaction, if you believe that this is a concern.**

The entire Internet community is materially affected by ICANN’s refusal to disclose the requested documents.

Requestor submitted the DIDP Request in order to gain information to protect the legitimacy by which ICANN awards gTLD licensing rights, as well as to protect competition in

---

36 Exhibit 4, ICANN Bylaws (22 Jul. 2017), Art. 2, § 2.3, https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en (“ICANN shall not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition.”). ICANN has identified a core value as “introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial to the public interest,” and committed to operating “through open and transparent processes that enable competition.” Id. at Art. 1, § 1.2.


the DNS by contesting the delegation of .WEB to NDC and, consequentially, Verisign. If Verisign obtains the rights to operate .WEB, then, as described in Section 6.2 above, the entire Internet community will be affected by the further destruction of competition in the DNS. Verisign will stifle innovation, restrict consumer choice, and ensure that it maintains its monopoly. Moreover, Verisign will have extended its monopoly in a manner that shatters ICANN’s stated principles, including (without limitation) fairness, transparency, and the neutral, objective, and consistent application of documented policies. The deception and subterfuge deployed by Verisign and NDC have made a mockery of those principles.

If ICANN allows NDC and/or Verisign to succeed in obtaining the .WEB license through such deceptive means, ICANN will have established a disastrous precedent. Any person or company seeking a gTLD will be able to disguise its true identity by secretly funding a putative applicant to obtain gTLD rights on its behalf. Basic requirements for applicants—e.g., that they disclose their parent companies and affiliates; that they provide true, accurate, and complete background information; and that they disclose their funding sources and how they intend to finance the operation of the gTLD—will be rendered meaningless. The dangers posed by such a precedent are readily apparent in this case, where Verisign, the entrenched monopolist, has attempted to maintain its substantial market power even further by hiding behind a relatively small company such as NDC.

There can be no mincing of words concerning the dishonest scheme carried out by Verisign and NDC. They affirmatively concealed the identity of the true party seeking the .WEB license from ICANN, the rest of the contention set, and, indeed, every person with any interest in

the .WEB gTLD. They intentionally deceived all stakeholders. Of course, the mere fact that Verisign and NDC were willing to engage in such a deceptive scheme should in itself be disqualifying. That ICANN does not appear to have taken any serious action to address the deception and subterfuge carried out by Verisign and NDC—which took place in mid-2016 (nearly two years ago)—adversely affects the entire Internet community. Allowing such underhanded conduct to succeed would seriously undermine the legitimacy and integrity of ICANN. Given the principles at stake, ICANN’s refusal to provide the documents sought by the DIDP will adversely affect numerous other stakeholders—including, in particular, the numerous consumers of gTLD registry services.

8. **Detail of Staff/Board Action/Inaction – Required Information**

8.1 **The .WEB Contention Set**

Requestor submitted its application for the .WEB gTLD on 13 June 2012 pursuant to the policies and rules set forth in the AGB.\(^{40}\) Six other entities also applied to become the registry operator for .WEB: NDC; Google, through Charleston Road Registry Inc.; Web.com Group, Inc.; Radix FZC, through DotWeb Inc.; Ruby Glen, LLC ("Ruby Glen"), through Donuts, Inc.; and Schlund Technologies GmbH.\(^{41}\) Since ICANN encourages the private settlements of contention sets,\(^{42}\) all of the .WEB applicants agreed to resolve the contention set through a private auction. However, NDC


\(^{42}\) Exhibit 17, gTLD Applicant Guidebook (4 Jun. 2012), p. 4-6, https://newgtds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf ("Applicants that are identified as being in contention are encouraged to reach a settlement or agreement among themselves that resolves the contention.").
suddenly withdrew its support for the private auction, thereby forcing all of the .WEB applicants to participate in an ICANN Auction.\textsuperscript{43}

NDC’s withdrawal concerned Ruby Glen. In subsequent discussions, NDC implied to Ruby Glen that it underwent a change in ownership, which might explain NDC’s withdrawal from the private auction.\textsuperscript{44} Ruby Glen raised with ICANN its belief that NDC underwent a change in control without having notified ICANN of such change, as required by the AGB.\textsuperscript{45} However, both ICANN and its Ombudsman claimed that they investigated Ruby Glen’s concern and found that there was no change in control.\textsuperscript{46} In fact, it appears that ICANN and its Ombudsman did little more than ask NDC if it had undergone a change in ownership or corporate control, to which NDC answered ‘no.’\textsuperscript{47} Taking NDC’s answer at face value, and apparently asking no further questions, ICANN decided to proceed with the ICANN auction. Ruby Glen protested this decision by initiating both the IRP process and a lawsuit against ICANN, but neither delayed the ICANN Auction.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{43} Id. at p. 4-19 (“It is expected that most cases of contention will be resolved by the community priority evaluation, or through voluntary agreement among the involved applicants. Auction is a tie-breaker method for resolving string contention among the applications within a contention set, if the contention has not been resolved by other means.”).


Requestor, along with the other .WEB applicants, participated in the ICANN Auction on 27 July 2016. NDC prevailed at the auction with an unexpectedly high bid of $142 million. The source of NDC’s funding was revealed four days later: Verisign. NDC had entered into an agreement with Verisign where, in exchange for Verisign funding NDC’s bid for .WEB, NDC agreed to assign the .WEB Registry Agreement to Verisign.

Verisign had failed to apply for the gTLD in 2012 and was therefore not part of the contention set. Instead of publicly applying for the rights to the .WEB registry, Verisign secretly arranged with NDC to obtain the .WEB license through stealth. As a result of Verisign’s secret funding, NDC was able to make an unexpectedly high bid and win the .WEB license. By virtue of its secret arrangement with NDC, Verisign is now poised to take on the .WEB license and further consolidate its dominant position within the DNS.

ICANN did nothing in response to Verisign’s announcement about its agreement with NDC. Requestor voiced its concerns about Verisign’s involvement in the ICANN Auction to ICANN on both 8 August 2016 and 9 September 2016. It received no response from ICANN until 16 September 2016, when ICANN asked for “additional information” from Requestor, Ruby Glen, Verisign, and NDC to “help facilitate informed resolution” of Requestor’s “questions regarding,

---

49 Exhibit 6, “ICANN New gTLD Contention Set Resolution Auction Final Results for WEB/WEBS” ICANN, https://gtldresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/applicationdetails:downloadauctionreport/18?:ac=692 (listing results of and bid amounts for the .WEB auction).
52 Exhibit 12, Letter from the United State Senate to the Honorable Renata B. Hesse (12 Aug. 2016), p. 4, https://www.cruz.senate.gov/files/documents/Letters/20160812_DOJ-ICANNLetter.pdf (“Verisign’s bid to secure the .web registry may have been undertaken to protect its position in the .com market from additional competition.”).
among other things, whether [NDC] should have participated in the 27-28 July 2016 auction for the .WEB contention set and whether NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD should be rejected.”

Requestor submitted a detailed response to ICANN’s inquiries within the requested timeframe that further articulated Requestor’s concerns about Verisign and NDC. ICANN, though, did not respond until nearly a year and a half later. When ICANN finally contacted Requestor on 31 March 2018, it simply requested permission to disclose Requestor’s response to the 16 September 2016 letter.

ICANN has still provided no substantive response or meaningful information to address Requestor’s serious concerns. To the extent that ICANN has any position regarding Requestor’s concerns, it has failed to make that position known.

8.2 The DIDP Request

Requestor has waited over a year and a half to learn from ICANN the results of its supposed investigation into NDC and Verisign. Given the significant delay, Requestor sought to obtain some information from ICANN regarding its investigation through the DIDP. As described in Section 3 above, on 23 February 2018, Requestor submitted to ICANN the DIDP Request.

ICANN’s response to the DIDP Request did not provide Requestor with any significant new information regarding NDC, Verisign, or the .WEB contention set. Rather, for the majority of the requests, ICANN either (1) refused to disclose the requested documents pursuant to the DIDP’s Nondisclosure Conditions or (2) argued that there was some problem with the request itself. ICANN’s refusal to disclose documents in the DIDP Response is the basis for this reconsideration request, as described in Section 6 above.

54 Exhibit 9, Letter from C. Willett to J. Kane (16 Sep. 2016).
55 See Exhibit 32, Letter from J. Kane to C. Willett (7 Oct. 2016) (providing responses to ICANN’s request for information).
56 Exhibit 33, Email from C. Willett to J. Kane (31 Mar. 2018).
Requestor has since offered to resolve ICANN’s problems with its DIDP Request through the DIDP Reply. As stated above, if Requestor and ICANN agree to the disclosure of the requested documents pursuant to the proposed compromise set forth in the DIDP Reply, this reconsideration request will be moot and Requestor will withdraw the request. However, if Requestor and ICANN fail to reach an agreement, Requestor will pursue this reconsideration request in order to obtain the denied document requests as amended in the DIDP Reply.

9. What are you asking ICANN to do now?

Requestor asks ICANN to disclose the documents requested in the DIDP Request, as amended by the DIDP Reply.

10. Please state specifically grounds under which you have the standing and the right to assert this Request for Reconsideration, and the grounds or justifications that support your request.

A described in Section 8 above, Requestor is a member of the .WEB contention set and the entity that submitted both the DIDP Request and the DIDP Reply to ICANN. It is therefore materially affected by ICANN’s decision to deny its requests for documentary information, which directly relate to the .WEB contention set.

11a. Are you bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities?

No, Requestor is not bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities.

---

See Exhibit 3, Letter from A. Ali to ICANN Board (23 Apr. 2018).
11b. If yes, is the causal connection between the circumstances of the Reconsideration Request and the harm the same for all of the complaining parties?

This is not applicable.

12. Do you have any documents you want to provide to ICANN?

Yes, these documents are attached as Exhibits.

**Terms and Conditions for Submission of Reconsideration Requests:**

The Board Governance Committee has the ability to consolidate the consideration of Reconsideration Requests if the issues stated within are sufficiently similar. The Board Governance Committee may dismiss Reconsideration Requests that are querulous or vexatious. Hearings are not required in the Reconsideration Process, however Requestors may request a hearing. The BGC retains the absolute discretion to determine whether a hearing is appropriate, and to call people before it for a hearing. The BGC may take a decision on reconsideration of requests relating to staff action/inaction without reference to the full ICANN Board. Whether recommendations will issue to the ICANN Board is within the discretion of the BGC. The ICANN Board of Director’s decision on the BGC’s reconsideration recommendation is final and not subject to a reconsideration request.

________________________   April 23, 2018

Arif Hyder Ali   Date
Exhibit 27
The Requestor, Afilias Domains No. 3 Ltd., seeks reconsideration of ICANN organization’s response to the Requestor’s request, pursuant to ICANN organization’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP), for documents relating to the .WEB contention set (DIDP Request).\(^1\) Specifically, the Requestor claims that, in declining to produce certain requested documents, ICANN organization violated its Commitments established in the Bylaws concerning accountability, transparency, and openness.\(^2\)

I. \textbf{Facts.}

A. \textbf{Background Facts.}

The Requestor submitted an application for .WEB, which was placed in a contention set with other .WEB applicants. The Requestor was invited to, and did, participate in an auction to secure the right to operate .WEB. The Requestor did not prevail at the auction; another applicant, Nu Dot Co, LLC (NDC), secured the winning bid.

On 23 February 2018, the Requestor submitted a DIDP Request (First DIDP Request) to ICANN organization requesting documents related to the .WEB contention set.\(^3\) The First DIDP Request requested the following ten categories of documents:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item All documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for additional information;
  \item Ruby Glen’s Notice of Independent Review, filed on 22 July 2016;
  \item All documents filed in relation to the Independent Review Process between ICANN and Ruby Glen, initiated on 22 July 2016;
\end{enumerate}

\(^1\) Request 18-7, § 3, at Pgs. 1-5.  
\(^2\) Request 18-7, § 6, at Pg. 6-11.  
4. All applications, and all documents submitted with the applications, for the rights to .WEB;
5. All documents discussing the importance of .WEB to bringing competition to the provision of registry services;
6. All documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to
   a. The .WEB contention set,
   b. NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD,
   c. Verisign’s agreement with NDC to assign the rights to .WEB to Verisign, and
   d. Verisign’s involvement in the .WEB contention set, including all communications with NDC or Verisign;
7. Documents sufficient to show the current status of NDC’s request to assign .WEB to Verisign;
8. Documents sufficient to show the current status of the delegation of .WEB;
9. All documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (“DOJ”) investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB (“DOJ Investigation”), including:
   a. Document productions to the DOJ,
   b. Communications with the DOJ,
   c. Submissions to DOJ, including letters, presentations, interrogatory responses, or other submissions,
   d. Communications with Verisign or NDC relating to the investigation, and
   e. Internal communications relating to the investigation, including all discussions by ICANN Staff and the ICANN Board; and
10. All joint defense or common interest agreements between ICANN and Verisign and/or NDC relating to the DOJ investigation.

On 24 March 2018, ICANN organization responded to the Requestor’s First DIDP Request (DIDP Response). ICANN responded individually to each of the ten items (and their subparts) by providing links to the publicly available documents; objecting to certain requests as vague, overbroad, or unrelated to ICANN’s operational activities; or confirming that documents responsive to the items do not exist. With respect to certain requested materials that were in ICANN organization’s possession and not already publicly available, ICANN organization explained that those documents would not be produced because they were subject to certain Defined Conditions of Nondisclosure (Nondisclosure Conditions) set forth in the DIDP. Notwithstanding the Nondisclosure Conditions, “ICANN organization … considered whether the

\[4\] Id.
public interest in disclosure of the information subject to these conditions … outweigh[ed] the harm that may be caused by such disclosure” and “determined that there [were] no current circumstances for which the public interest in disclosing the information outweigh[ed] the harm” of disclosure. In response to Item 1, ICANN organization responded that it would contact relevant third parties to determine whether additional documentary information is appropriate for public disclosure. With respect to requests that were vague, ICANN organization suggested the Requestor could amend its DIDP request to clarify.

On 23 April 2018, the Requestor submitted Request 18-7 challenging ICANN organization’s responses Items 1, 4, 5, 6, and 9 in the DIDP Response. At the same time, the Requestor submitted a Reply to the DIDP Response (DIDP Reply) in which it revised Items 1, 4, 5, 6(a-b), and 9(a) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Original Request</th>
<th>Amended Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign in response to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for additional information</td>
<td>Responses from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign, indicating whether they consent to the public disclosure of their responses to ICANN’s 16 September 2016 request for information and prompt disclosure of the documents received from Ruby Glen, NDC, and Verisign related to the 16 September 2016 letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All applications, and all documents submitted with the applications, for the rights to .WEB</td>
<td>NDC’s responses to Items 12 and 45 through 50 in its .WEB application, as well as any amendments, changes, revisions, supplements, or correspondence concerning those Items;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All documents discussing the importance of .WEB to bringing</td>
<td>Any documents, analyses, or studies that contain information regarding potential competition, substitution, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 *Id.*
7 *Id.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6(a-b)          | All documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to:  
|                 | a. The .WEB contention set,  
|                 | b. NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD |  
|                 | All documents reflecting NDC’s board structure and any changes thereto since NDC submitted its .WEB application on 13 June 2012,  
|                 | All documents concerning any investigation or discussion related to NDC’s board structure and any changes thereto since NDC submitted its .WEB application on 13 June 2012,  
|                 | Documents sufficient to show the date on which ICANN first learned that Verisign was going to or had in fact funded NDC’s bids for the .WEB gTLD at the 28-28 July 2016 (sic) auction, and  
|                 | Documents sufficient to show the date on which ICANN first learned that NDC did not intend to operate the .WEB registry itself, but rather intended to assign the rights it acquired related to .WEB to a third party. |
| 9(a)            | All documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (“DOJ”) investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB (“DOJ Investigation”), including: (a) Document productions to the DOJ | All documents relating to the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s (“DOJ”) investigation into Verisign becoming the registry operator for .WEB (“DOJ Investigation”), including: (a) Document productions to the DOJ, excluding those documents that ICANN has reasonably identified as already being in Afilias’ possession. |

The Requestor also offered to enter into a confidentiality agreement under which the Requestor would limit disclosure of any material produced by ICANN organization in response to Requests 1, 4, 6, and 9 designated as “highly confidential” to the Requestor’s outside counsel.

The Requestor acknowledged in Request 18-7 that it had submitted the DIDP Reply and that Request 18-7 is premature. Specifically, the Requestor stated:
Requestor acknowledges that, to the extent it can reach an agreement with ICANN pursuant to the DIDP Reply, this request for reconsideration may become moot in full or in part. Requestor nonetheless submits this request to preserve its rights to contest the DIDP Response should ICANN and Requestor fail to reach an agreement based on the DIDP Reply. Requestor believes that the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee need not and should not decide this Reconsideration Request until after the ICANN Board has considered and responded to the proposed compromise set forth in the DIDP Reply. Requestor is prepared to discuss an appropriate “tolling” agreement that would allow Requestor and ICANN to attempt to reach an agreement concerning the DIDP Request and the DIDP Reply.9

On 27 April 2018, ICANN organization responded to the Requestor’s DIDP Reply.10

Regarding the Requestor’s offer to enter into a confidentiality agreement, ICANN organization stated:

The concept of a confidentiality agreement for the disclosure of documents through the DIDP runs afoul of the DIDP itself, which is to make public documents concerning ICANN organization’s operations unless there is a compelling reason for confidentiality. (See https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/didp-2012-02-25-en.) Moreover, your proposal is asking ICANN organization to treat Afilias differently than other requestors, and to act in a manner that is contrary to what is set forth in the DIDP Process, which as you know would be in contravention of ICANN’s Bylaws.11

With respect to the amended requests, ICANN organization offered, and the Requestor agreed, to treat them as a new DIDP request, with an effective submission date of 23 April 2018.

ICANN organization confirmed that it will respond to the DIDP Reply in accordance with the

9 Request 18-7, § 3, at Pg. 5.
11 Id.
DIDP Process. ICANN organization provided a response to the DIDP Reply on 23 May 2018.

B. Relief Requested.

The Requestor asks the BAMC to “disclose the documents requested in the DIDP Request, as amended by the DIDP Reply.”

II. Issue Presented.

The issue is whether Request 18-7 is sufficiently stated or whether summary dismissal is appropriate.

III. The Relevant Standards for Reconsideration Requests.

Article 4, Section 4.2(a) and (c) of ICANN’s Bylaws provide in relevant part that any entity may submit a request “for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction to the extent that it has been adversely affected by:

(i) One or more Board or Staff actions or inactions that contradict ICANN’s Mission, Commitments, Core Values and/or established ICANN policy(ies);

(ii) One or more actions or inactions of the Board or Staff that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the Requestor could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board’s or Staff’s consideration at the time of action or refusal to act; or

(iii) One or more actions or inactions of the Board or Staff that are taken as a result of the Board’s or staff’s reliance on false or inaccurate relevant information.”

Pursuant to Article 4, Section 4.2(k) of the Bylaws, the BAMC reviews each reconsideration request upon its receipt to determine if it is sufficiently stated. The BAMC

---

12 Id.
14 Request 18-7, § 9, at Pg. 17.
15 ICANN Bylaws, 22 July 2017, Art. 4, §§ 4.2(a), (c).
16 Id. at § 4.2(k).
may summarily dismiss a reconsideration request if the BAMC determines the request: (i) does not meet the requirements for filing reconsideration requests under the Bylaws; or (ii) it is frivolous.\textsuperscript{17} If a reconsideration request is not summarily dismissed, it shall be sent to the Ombudsman, who shall either recuse himself in accordance with Article 4, Section 4.2(l)(iii) of the Bylaws or shall review and consider the reconsideration request.\textsuperscript{18} The Ombudsman shall submit to the BAMC his substantive evaluation of the reconsideration request within 15 days of the Ombudsman’s receipt of the request.\textsuperscript{19} The BAMC shall then promptly proceed to review and consider the reconsideration request.\textsuperscript{20} The BAMC must make a nonbinding recommendation to the Board within 30 days following its receipt of the Ombudsman’s evaluation (or 30 days following receipt of the reconsideration request for those matters for which the Ombudsman recuses himself), unless impractical, after which the Board will make a final decision on the merits of the request.\textsuperscript{21} As noted above, this Determination is limited to evaluating Request 18-7 to determine if it is sufficiently stated.

\textbf{IV. Analysis and Rationale.}

In evaluating whether a reconsideration request is sufficiently stated, the following factors are considered: (1) is the reconsideration request timely; and (2) does the requestor meet the requirements for bringing a reconsideration request? We conclude that Request 18-7 is not sufficiently stated. Even though Request 18-7 was timely filed and identifies established ICANN policies that the Requestor claims ICANN organization violated, it does not demonstrate that the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[17] \textit{Id.}
\item[18] \textit{Id.} at § 4.2(l).
\item[19] \textit{Id.} at § 4.2(l)(ii).
\item[20] Where the Ombudsman has recused himself from consideration of a reconsideration request, the BAMC shall review the request without involvement by the Ombudsman. \textit{See id.} at § 4.2(l)(iii).
\item[21] ICANN Bylaws, 22 July 2017, Art. 4 §§ 4.2(q) and (r).
\end{footnotes}
Requestor is materially or adversely affected by ICANN staff action or inaction. Accordingly, the BAMC will summarily dismiss Request 18-7.

A. **Request 18-7 is Timely.**

Request 18-7 was timely filed. Pursuant to ICANN’s Bylaws, a reconsideration request challenging staff action must be filed “within 30 days after the date on which the Requestor became aware of, or reasonably should have become aware of, the challenged Staff action.” The Requestor challenges the 24 March 2018 response to the Requestor’s DIDP Request, which the Requestor became aware of on 24 March 2018. Request 18-7 was submitted on 23 April 2018, 30 days after the Requestor became aware of the challenged action.

B. **The Requestor Does Not Meet the Requirements Set Forth Under Article 4, Section 4.2 of the ICANN Bylaws for Bringing a Reconsideration Request.**

While Request 18-7 sufficiently identifies established ICANN policies that it claims ICANN organization violated, the Requestor has not sufficiently stated that it has been materially or adversely affected by the challenged conduct. The Bylaws provide that “ICANN shall have in place a process by which any person or entity *materially affected* by an action or inaction of the ICANN Board or Staff may request … the review or reconsideration of that action or inaction by the Board.” The Bylaws also provide that the Requestor may submit a Reconsideration Request “to the extent that the Requestor has been *adversely* affected by” Board or Staff action or inaction.

Here, although the Requestor states that it is challenging ICANN’s DIDP Response, the Requestor makes clear that in reality, it is challenging ICANN’s forthcoming response to the

---

22 ICANN Bylaws, 22 July 2017, Art. 4 § 4.2(g)(i)(B).
23 ICANN Bylaws, 22 July 2017, Art. 4 § 4.2(a).
24 *Id.* at Art. 4§ 4.2(c).
requests as amended in the DIDP Reply, including the Requestor’s offer to enter into a confidentiality agreement. Request 18-7 alleges that ICANN violated its Bylaws by refusing to produce documents in response to Requests 1, 4-6, and 9. These are the exact Requests addressed in the Requestor’s DIDP Reply, which was pending at the time the Requestor submitted Request 18-7.

As noted above, the Requestor even acknowledges that the DIDP Reply is pending, and states that “to the extent [the Requestor] can reach an agreement with ICANN pursuant to the DIDP Reply, this request for reconsideration may become moot in full or in part.” The Requestor submitted Request 18-7 only to “preserve its rights to contest the DIDP Response.” The Requestor further requests that the BAMC wait to decide Request 18-7 at least until ICANN organization responds to the DIDP Reply. The Requestor asks the Board to “disclose the documents requested in the DIDP Request, as amended by the DIDP Reply.” In other words, the Requestor asks the Board to disclose the documents requested in the DIDP Reply.

Accordingly, given that at the time the Requestor submitted Request 18-7, ICANN organization had not yet responded to the DIDP Reply, the Requestor has not demonstrated that it has been materially or adversely affected by the DIDP Response.

The Reconsideration process is not intended to be a mechanism for parties to simply file a Reconsideration Request to preserve their right to contest a future action or inaction that may or may not materially affect the parties. To do so would undermine with the purpose of the Reconsideration process as set forth in Article 4, Section 4.2(a):

25 Request 18-7, § 6, at Pg. 7.
26 Request 18-7, § 3, at Pg. 5; § 8, at Pg. 17.
27 Request 18-7, § 3, at Pg. 5.
28 Request 18-7, § 9, at Pg. 17.
ICANN shall have in place a process by which any person or entity materially affected by an action or inaction of the ICANN Board or Staff may request…the review or reconsideration of that action or inaction by the Board.29

Moreover, the Requestor’s suggestion of a tolling agreement on Request 18-7 “that would allow Requestor and ICANN to attempt to reach an agreement concerning the DIDP Request and the DIDP Reply” does not change the fact that there is no material adverse impact on the Requestor given that it did file Request 18-7, to which ICANN organization has now responded.

ICANN organization provided a response to the DIDP Reply on 23 May 2018.30 To the extent the Requestor wishes to seek reconsideration of that response, the Requestor has the option to submit a new reconsideration request.

V. Determination.

Based on the foregoing, the BAMC concludes that the Requestor does not meet the requirements for bringing a reconsideration request, and therefore summarily dismisses Request 18-7. If the Requestor believes that it has been treated unfairly in the process, it is free to ask the Ombudsman to review this matter.

A substantive review of the merits of the Requestor’s claims is beyond the scope of this memorandum. The BAMC’s conclusion is limited to only the preliminary assessment of whether the Requestor meets the requirements for bringing a reconsideration request. For the foregoing reasons, the BAMC concludes that Request 18-7 is not sufficiently stated and therefore is subject to summary dismissal. As a result, the BAMC hereby summarily dismisses Request 18-7.